

UNIVERSIDAD MAYOR DE SAN ANDRÉS
FACULTAD DE HUMANIDADES Y Cs. DE LA EDUCACIÓN
CARRERA DE LINGÜÍSTICA E IDIOMAS



TESIS DE GRADO

**“WHAT LIES BEHIND THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF
THE M.A.S.-POLITICAL PARTY WHICH IS NOW IN
POWER IN BOLIVIA”**

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
LICENCIATURA EN LINGÜÍSTICA E IDIOMAS.**

**By
Esteban Rojas Q.**

SUPERVISOR: Lic. M. Virginia Coronado

**LA PAZ – BOLIVIA
2014**

UNIVERSIDAD MAYOR DE SAN ANDRÉS
FACULTAD DE HUMANIDADES Y CIENCIAS DE LA EDUCACIÓN
CARRERA DE LINGÜÍSTICA E IDIOMAS

THESIS

**“WHAT LIES BEHIND THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF THE M.A.S.-
POLITICAL PARTY WHICH IS NOW IN POWER IN BOLIVIA”**

(A qualitative study)

© 2014 Esteban Rojas Q.

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Licenciatura en Lingüística e Idiomas.

.....
.....
.....

Head of Department: Lic. Orlando Montaña

Supervisor: Lic. M. Virginia Coronado

Committee: Lic. Gregorio Calisaya

Committee: Lic. David Aduviri

Date: / 2014

CONTENTS

	Page
Presentation -----	i
Acknowledgments -----	ii
Preface -----	iii
Abstract -----	iv
Acronyms/Abbreviations -----	vi
Chapter I	
INTRODUCTION -----	1
1. LANGUAGE AND DISCOURSE -----	4
a. Purpose -----	7
b. The context-----	8
c. The problem-----	10
1.1. Critical Discourse Analysis and Politics -----	11
1.2. Discourse and Ideology -----	13
1.3. Discourse and Power -----	17
1.3.1. Language of politics -----	25
1.3.2. The emotional dog and its rational tail -----	26
1.3.3. I want what you have, I have what you want -----	31
1.3.4. Theory of Envy -----	31
1.3.5. Theory of hate -----	32
1.3.6. The role of propaganda-----	35
1.3.7. What political language does-----	36
1.3.8. The script behind politicians-----	38
1.3.9. The advocacy work of NGOs -----	46
1.4. Uprisings Around the World -----	51
1.4.1. The Great Revolt of 1381-----	53
1.4.2. The Indian Mutiny of 1857-----	56
1.4.3. The Russian Revolution -----	61
The storming of the winter palace-----	65

The Russian civil war -----	67
The red terror -----	68
1.4.4. The French Revolution-----	72
The storming of the Bastille-----	75
The terror -----	76
Robespierre and the reign of terror of the Jacobins-----	78
The irony-----	81
1.4.5. The revolts in short -----	83
The Libelles -----	87

Chapter II

2. A BRIEF HISTORY -----	91
2.1. Morales Administration-----	91
2.1.1. The war over water as antecedent-----	93
2.1.2. The war over gas -----	94
2.1.3. Morales’s first presidential term -----	96
2.1.4. Morales’s second presidential term-----	97
2.1.5. M.A.S.-I.P.S.P. (Morales’s) current administration-----	97
2.1.6. Domestic Policy -----	98
2.1.7. Foreign Policy-----	107
2.2. The Discourse of the M.A.S-----	110
2.2.1. Recurrent Topics in Morales’s Speeches-----	114
2.2.2. Morales’s Current Situation-----	133

Chapter III

3. ANALYSIS-----	138
3.1. Methodology -----	138
3.2. Analysis -----	140
3.3. Analogies -----	164

Chapter IV

4. CONCLUSIONS-----	174
----------------------------	------------

References

Annexes

Presentation

As a sort of presentation of this study, rather than a dedication, I would like to assert that this study was not carried out under the aegis of any institution, therefore, the concepts, comments and opinions, if any, are the responsibility of the writer, who solely is responsible for the content of the entire work. Neither the institution (UMSA) nor the supervisor are by any means liable for the contents.

Acknowledgments

First of all, I want to thank my Maker for giving me the senses and the capacity for producing and doing ‘things.’ Thanks to the Lord.

I would like to thank Lic. M. Virginia Coronado, my supervisor, who in spite of being so busy made room in her agenda for seeing me. The exchanges of ideas we have had have been so productive and inspiring that I will always remember them.

Then, I would also like to thank Lic. Gregorio Calisaya and Lic. David Aduviri, members of the committee; whose observations helped to shape the final edition of this study into the traditional format of a thesis.

Finally, I might thank all the people that somehow, with their behaviour, led me to delve into the fascinating world of human behaviour, not only those in government but also people in general whose attitudes really made me think about the society we live in.

PREFACE

The following qualitative study was developed under the scope of Critical Discourse Analysis, and in order to fully understand its real dimension, the following aspects should be considered.

First, as the reader will notice, this study is not the sum of separate sections which need to be articulated, rather, it should be taken as a whole entity. The presentation might look a bit like a book, in fact the narrative form has been chosen because it reflects how the study developed itself (Creswell; 2013; 4). Thus, although it is divided into sections and chapters, there is a continuous chain of events. The introduction is related to the first section which is related to the next section, and so forth, until the conclusions section.

Then, as a characteristic of this type of study, most of the questions, research questions, arose gradually and led to make new associations. For instance, the section concerning the French Revolution is not just a historical review because the analysis of the data showed some similarities which led to a specific review of some facts of the French revolution. Moreover, after the review of some uprisings, it was necessary to highlight some facts of the uprisings as a summary, which was not planned *a priori*.

Keeping this in mind, the reader might benefit not only from this study, but also armed with this critical perspective, the reader hopefully will profit from other texts written about similar topics.

ABSTRACT

The following qualitative study has been developed under the scope of Critical Discourse Analysis. In order to get a real and scientific perspective, a brief history of the origins of language has been developed, followed by a short description of language which goes beyond the traditional performative functions of language, focusing on the powerful effects of language.

In that sense, discourse, considered as language in use, was taken as the basis for this research problem “What lies behind the political discourse of the MAS.” From that perspective, discourse has been analysed in the political field where it is used at its highest level. Since discourse is related to politics, the societal structuring and its individuals according to its ideology, besides, discourse is a determinant element in relations of power within society, those relations led to the analysis of human behaviour and the paradox good-evil and the corresponding emotions: love, hate and envy among others. Consequently, the concepts of influence and persuasion were also the core of the political activity.

On the other hand, because the ‘water war’ and the ‘gas war’ were events that somehow preceded the coming to power of the MAS, some uprisings around the world were reviewed in order to find similarities, differences or coincidences. As well as that a summary of the political background of the MAS was made which includes their policy and current behaviour. All this followed by an analysis of Evo Morales’s addresses.

Finally, the analysis, as an on-going process that took place from the very beginning of the study, was complemented with the findings in Morales’s discourse and the topics reviewed. The whole analysis, based on the work of renowned scholars, was summarised and interpreted in the conclusion section which condenses the fulfilment of the objectives proposed.

KEY WORDS: politics, discourse, hate, envy, jealousy, manipulation, self-abasement

ABSTRACT

El siguiente estudio cualitativo ha sido elaborado bajo los parámetros del Análisis Crítico del Discurso. Para darle una perspectiva científica, se desarrolló una breve revisión histórica de los orígenes del lenguaje, seguida de una corta revisión del lenguaje y su uso que va más allá de las tradicionales funciones performativas del lenguaje, enfocándose en el poderoso efecto que tiene el lenguaje.

En ese sentido, el discurso, concebido como el uso del lenguaje, fue la base para el problema de investigación “What lies behind the political discourse of the MAS.” Desde esa perspectiva se analizó el discurso en el área político, uno de las áreas donde se use el lenguaje a un alto nivel. Como el discurso está relacionado con la política, la estratificación social y los individuos, todo de acuerdo a su ideología, además el discurso es considerado un elemento determinante en la relaciones de poder dentro de cualquier sociedad, esas relaciones indujeron al estudio de la conducta humana y la paradoja del bien y el mal y la emociones correspondientes: amor, odio y envidia entre otras. Consecuentemente, los conceptos de influencia y persuasión fueron considerados como la parte central de la actividad política.

Por otro lado, como tanto la ‘guerra del agua’ como la ‘guerra del gas’ fueron eventos que de una u otra forma antecedieron la llegada al poder del M.A.S., se hizo una revisión histórica de hechos similares acontecidos en otras partes del mundo con el objetivo de buscar similitudes, diferencias o coincidencias. De igual manera, se hizo una revisión de los antecedentes históricos del M.A.S., revisión que incluye su política, ideología y su accionar. Todo esto complementado por un análisis crítico del discurso de Evo Morales.

Finalmente, el análisis, como un proceso paralelo al estudio, se lo realizó desde el mismo comienzo, complementado con los hallazgos y los temas complementarios. Todo el análisis, basado en el trabajo de reconocidos autores, fue resumido e interpretado en la sección de conclusiones, sección que condensa el logro de los objetivos.

PALABRAS CLAVES: política, discurso, odio, envidia, celos, manipulación, auto-humillación.

ACRONYMS / ABBREVIATIONS

A.D.N. – Acción Democrática Nacionalista.

A.S.P. – Asamblea por la Soberanía de los Pueblos.

APDHB – Asamblea Permanente de Derechos Humanos de Bolivia.

ASEP – Ley Avelino Siñani-Elizardo Perez (ley 070).

B.C. (BC) – Before Christ.

C.N.E. – Corte Nacional Electoral.

C.O.B. – Central Obrera Boliviana.

D.E.A. Drug Enforcement Administration.

ECP – Eje de Convergencia Patriótica.

Entel – Empresa Nacional de Telecomunicaciones.

F.A.O. – Food and Agriculture Organization.

FARC – Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia).

GDP – Gross Domestic Product.

GRO – Grass Roots Organisation.

GRSO – Grassroots Support Organisation.

I.A.L.P. – Informe de la Asamblea Legislativa Plurinacional.

IMF – International Monetary Fund.

KGB (Komité Gosudárstvennoï Bezopásnosti) – Committee for State Security.

LAB – Lloyd Aereo Boliviano.

M.A.S.-IPSP – Movimiento Al Socialismo-Instrumento Político para la Soberanía de los
Pueblos.

M.B.L. – Movimiento Bolivia Libre.

M.I.R. – Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario.

M.N.R – Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario.

M.S.M. – Movimiento Sin Miedo.

MAS-U – Movimiento Al Socialismo Unzaguista.

NGO – Non-governmental Organisation.

O.E.A. – Organización de Estados Americanos.

OEA – Organización de Estados Americanos.

PODEMOS – Poder Democrático y Social.

PROFOCOM – Programa de Formación Complementaria para Maestros.

U.D.P. – Unidad Democrática y Popular.

U.N. – General Assembly United Nations General Assembly.

U.S. (USA or The USA) – The United States of America.

U.S.S.R. – Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (CCCP in Russian).

UN – Unidad Nacional.

UNAM – Universidad Autónoma de México.

UNASUR – Unión de Naciones Suramericanas.

UPEA – Universidad Pública de El Alto.

USAID – United States Agency for International Development.

YPFB – Yacimientos Petrolíferos Fiscales Bolivianos.

“WHAT LIES BEHIND THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF THE M.A.S. – POLITICAL PARTY WHICH IS NOW IN POWER IN BOLIVIA”

(A qualitative study)

Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted.

(Albert Einstein)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Some of the events that took place in Bolivia in the early 2000s have been the motive of several studies. Likewise, the coming to power of the M.A.S.-IPSP, hereafter MAS, as it is commonly known, surrounded by other shocking events which altogether, constituted a landmark in Bolivian history, has been the reason behind this current study.

In order to study this political phenomenon, under the scope of Critical Discourse Analysis, in chapter one, the use and functions of language have been reviewed. Perhaps these functions go beyond what has been proposed by Jakobson (1982), Gricie (1996) or Austin (1962), because the idea was to show and perhaps explain how powerful the effect of words can be. That is why discourse, considered as language in use and because of the effect language can have, has been taken as the basis for the research problem “What lies behind the political discourse of the MAS”; analysed within the social context that surrounded the rise to power of this political party.

In order to fully understand the effects of language, and how ideology and power relations are expressed through language, the works of van Dijk, Wodak, Pierre Bourdieu, Regelsk, Louis Althuser amongst others have been reviewed. Besides, Language has proved to be related to ideology, which, from a current perspective is not considered a science of ideas but the ideas themselves that function as a routine frame of reference within society, which consequently makes the individual in its own image.

Since people usually adapt and change the way they use language, when they interact in society, according to different situations, people’s way of talking and behaviour have been analysed. That analysis led to the good-bad paradox involved in relations of power.

Those relations showed that power is not only exercised by means of force, which led to the study of influence, persuasion and manipulation by means of language.

On the other hand, since two shocking events (the gas war and the water war) are somehow related to the coming to power of the MAS, and in order to find whether there were some relationships or not among those events and others that took place somewhere else, some uprisings around the world were summarised. Eventually, the revision of the Indian mutiny, the Russian revolution, some characteristics of the Nazi Germany and the French Revolution proved to be relevant to this study.

Considering that the focus of the study is the discourse of the MAS and its main leader, in chapter two, there is a review of the events that somehow led Evo Morales and the MAS to power; events that include “the gas war” and the “water war,” of course, followed by a description of the MAS policy. Besides, some of Morales’s speeches issued between 2005 and 2013 have been reviewed in order to find some outstanding or recurrent topics. The topics found, because of their relevance and repetition, were sorted in certain categories such as: Colonialism, Us and Them, Ownership, Neoliberalism, the Empire, and Self-abasement, amongst the most outstanding ones.

Starting with a concise description of the methodology, data collection, analysis and how the conclusions were drawn, throughout chapter three, a detailed analysis was performed. The topics found in the previous section were analysed, compared, contrasted and evaluated. The analysis, and the study itself, was a sort of continuous chain of events with each link being an effect of the previous one. That is, some of the outcomes of the analysis of a topic led to a different theory or another topic. Therefore, all the topics found and analysed showed to be related among themselves.

Besides, in order to follow the procedures of an academic paper, several scientific theories were the basis for the analysis. Thus, the analysis was based on some traditional and ‘modern’ perspectives. For instance in the psychological area Freud’s postulates proved to be very useful, however complemented by current studies by Haidt (2001), Ninivaggi (2010) among others. Those theories explain how certain emotions can be instilled,

fostered, awoken and oriented toward a specific target. As well as that, the analysis proved that this research deals with what can be called ‘manipulation of emotions.’

On the other side, as a characteristic of Critical Discourse Analysis, the development of the study itself and the analysis that has been done along the whole process provided some outcomes. Some of the outcomes might explain not only the massive support Morales and the MAS have got from the Bolivian population but also the people’s behaviour during the water war and the gas war, and what force or forces might have been behind the uprisings that took place in Bolivia in the early 2000s.

Moreover, some similarities have been found between Morales’s government and the Jacobins’ (during the French Revolution), between Morales’s government and the Nazi Germany, between Morales and Robespierre, and so forth; which have been labelled as analogies. To end up this section some of the bibliography reviewed also showed that most of the topics this study deals with are somehow related to the same authors, editorials and sponsors.

Finally, the last chapter, chapter four, summarises the whole study. Here, the fulfilment of the objectives of the study is spelled out. The outcomes are divided into two parts: the ones that came as a result of the study itself, how the objectives were accomplished on the one hand, and the ones that emerged during the process, on the other.

1. LANGUAGE AND DISCOURSE

Language, as a primary means of communication used by humans, along history has become a rather complex system. Originally, the ancient Greeks studied it as part of the scope of Philosophy; Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and some other philosophers paid careful attention to what language was and how it worked. However, nowadays it is studied by several specialised fields such as Grammar, Semantics, Syntax, etc.

Besides, language has identified and given each society its own characteristic, and many languages have been spoken around the world after Babel. According to Christianity, God became angry because of people's pride and haughtiness, and mainly because they wanted to reach unto heaven by building the tallest tower.

“And the LORD said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. So the LORD scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city. Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth” and they could not understand among themselves (Genesis 11, 3-9, The Holy Bible).

Either legend, fable or history, the fact is that there are many different languages all over the world and although some of them are supposed to have a common origin, they are very different.

In order to fully understand how a language works, it is important to analyse it as a means of communication and the way its speakers use it to convey meaning in real situations, that is, in everyday use. In that sense, it is not the structure of language what counts only, language as a means of communication has got many properties or functions. Unlike animal language, some other animals make use of quite sophisticated communicative systems, human language possesses unique properties as the saying goes “no matter how eloquently a dog may bark, he cannot tell you that his parents were poor but honest” (Russell).

On the other hand, some scholars talk about the semantic omnipotence of language, with language people can talk about whatever they like; it refers to the capacity of using language to talk about almost everything even about language itself. These properties have been categorised and fully conceptualised as: The Emotive Function, The Conative Function, The Referential Function, The Phatic Function, The Metalinguistic Function and The Poetic Function (Jakobson, 1958, 62-94).

Language as an oral tradition is a communicative phenomenon, social essentially, that is why it cannot be explained without the people and the social context in which it is produced. Language means communication through which people can exchange different kinds of information, names, phone numbers, prices, directions, etc. as well as subjective things such as feelings, ideas, beliefs, and so forth. There is precisely where we meet political discourse which makes use of language at its highest level. Foucault's (1971) definition of discourse can be summarised as "systems of thoughts composed of ideas, attitudes, courses of action, beliefs and practices that systematically construct the subjects and the worlds of which they speak" (Lessa, 2006, 286).

The concept of discourse at its most basic can be thought of as the limits of what can be said. Using this as a definition, "discourse can be thought of as the limit not only of possible speech, but also of truth, knowledge, and morality. Besides, discourse in its very nature as the limits of acceptable speech, made up of interrelated categories, allows for tension, ambiguity and contention" (Zigon, 2008, 134). Through discourse people's views on almost anything can be changed or arranged, that is why it is closely linked to power.

Are we moving or is it the world around us that is moving? It all depends on the point of view Einstein might say. About the war in Iraq (1991), one side talked about 'liberation', which the other described as 'invasion.' The truth is that in social sciences discourse can depict anyone as a hero or criminal, depending on the intention of the discourse. How can it be that there would be two quite different concepts of the same person? Of course it is possible, since language has got many resources.

Mikhail Bakhtin (2004), following Jakobson's model (1958), concurs with the following classification: sender, context, message, channel, code and receiver, however, he

also asserts that discourse implies not only the aforementioned functions, but also a message which has a sense [an intention] that is basically subjective. The speaker “does not expect passive understanding, [...] rather, he expects response, agreement, sympathy, objection, execution, and so forth” (Bakhtin, 2004, 69).

Therefore, discourse is not only meant to tell true facts but it is also meant to other practical uses, that is, to move people, to organise them, to dominate them, to rule them, to democratise them or to tyrannise certain society. “Most people believe that the most important function of language is to communicate. This may be true to some extent. But we use language for other things, for example, we can use language to exert powerful control over people’s thoughts and actions, persuade them to what, ordinarily, they would never think of doing” (Ebiringa, 2013, 500).

Besides, “words can inform our mind, caress and comfort our feelings, excite and thrill our spirit, or warm and kindle the flame of our hearts. They can also slap our face, punch us in the stomach, rattle our nerves, kill our desire, or destroy our self-confidence” (Ebiringa, 2013, 499). Of course this is metaphorical, but these metaphors capture in words our physical reactions to what is said, and that is the power of language. As Toomey (1999) concludes; words can emotionally move and affect us as powerfully as physical actions.

On the other hand, language does not usually rely on the lexical meaning of words only, for instance if we say *they have cats and dogs*, it means that they have pets which are cats and dogs. However, if we say *it is raining cats and dogs*, it means it's raining heavily. “Language plays very vital roles in the survival of every given society. In fact none can exist without language, be it spoken, written or gesticulated” (Ebiringa, 2013, 508). Consequently, words should be understood in their full meaning, denotative and connotative, in order to fully understand the meaning that is being conveyed by its speakers.

Perhaps that is why language, through discourse, is closely related to politics and the corresponding relations of power, which will be seen later. Consequently, Critical Discourse Analysis permits us to study in detail those resources of language that deal with

relations of power, within society, that lie underneath the structure and functions of language proposed by Jakobson (1958).

a. Purpose

As it has been stated, language plays a very vital role within society. Language, by means of discourse, does not only perform the action of communication but it is also used for other purposes. Therefore, taking into account that the analysis of discourse does not only mean the study of the characteristics of language such as the resources of speech and their use when addressing huge audiences in order to fulfil certain purpose or purposes but also the social conception of discourse in everyday life, this study aims:

1. To demonstrate whether there are similarities or not in the discourse and the political background of the MAS compared to some other revolts that took place somewhere else.
2. To find out whether there is any intention or intentionality behind the discourse of Evo Morales.
3. To analyse some other elements that might, somehow, be related to the Discourse of Evo Morales and the MAS, by taking into consideration that they came to power by means of riots, blockades and protests as their political activity.

The tasks that will let us achieve the above objectives are:

- a) To describe the phenomenon, that has caused many changes in Bolivia, beginning as a group of coca growers which defeated experienced political parties until they got the administration of the country.
- b) To study the logic and behaviour of Evo Morales and the MAS.
- c) To compare the policy of Evo Morales and the MAS to some other rulers and politicians over the world.
- d) To interpret the addresses of Evo Morales, which represent most of the other representatives of the MAS, by identifying some indicators in his discourse.

b. The context

Since Evo Morales came into the Bolivian political scene, he has been subject of several studies. One of the most detailed studies was done by Martín Sivak (2010) “The extraordinary rise on the first indigenous president of Bolivia.” Sivak spent several months with Evo Morales in order to see Morales’s daily activities, or Gill (2000), who spent a bit more than a year in El Alto, Bolivia.

Most papers and books depict Morales’s rise from a campesino family, how he joined Bolivian military as a teen and how he became involved in efforts to organise campesinos, coca growers and Bolivian workers in their struggle against the traditional power elites in Bolivia. From those texts, we learn that Morales is a tireless campaigner and an honest politician, who holds cabinet meetings at 5 am, and sleeps two hours a day; a president who scolds his ministers for making decisions without his consent.

Morales is described as a key element in the struggle between the campesinos and workers and the neoliberal corporate order supported by the Bolivian elite. For instance, Sivak describes Morales’s life as a tale of a man who has helped to build a movement, who has helped the struggles of his people for justice and dignity and the struggles of a nation for economic and political independence.

Besides, most works tell how Morales felt persecuted by the U.S. backed Bolivian military, and how secret agents also tried to plant drugs in his luggage when he travelled; needless to say that he was portrayed as a drug trafficker.

Nevertheless, many of those works fail to explain Morales controversial relationship with Venezuela and the late Hugo Chavez. They do not say how much aid is coming to Bolivia from Venezuela, nor the criteria Morales uses to deliver Venezuelan aid money to some local governments or how he uses that money.

Previous works describe an austere president that saves money on ice cream but do not say much about a 40 million dollar private plane that he bought. They do not say much about why Morales flies around Bolivia in Venezuelan planes.

As well as that, those works fail to report on Morales' plans to curb drug-trafficking; a global problem that Bolivia is deeply involved in as a coca leaf producer and a location for clandestine cocaine laboratories. For instance, Sivak's (2010) book is full of references to Morales's opposition to the eradication of coca leaf fields; nonetheless his solution to the problem is not discussed. In most books, Morales position against the U.S.A. and coca eradication is very clear; moreover, he claimed that his people do not manufacture the drug. In a 1995 interview Morales said that they take coca to the market and what happens after that is not their responsibility (Sivak, 2010).

On the other hand, Monasterios, Do Alto and Stefanoni (2007) assert that Evo Morales and the MAS arise from the articulation of anti-colonialism, nationalist-revolutionary, anti-neoliberalism, and from the idea of Indian nationalism. However, they avoid explaining that Morales started his political activity fighting the eradication of illegal coca leaf.

On her side, Gill tends to describe Bolivian society, especially El Alto's where she lived for more than a year, and its struggles against an oppressive neoliberal system of government. When Gill focuses on Evo Morales, she describes him and the MAS policy as the result and answer to those problems.

Some studies carried out from the perspective of Discourse Analysis focus on the dual identity: indigenous and nationalist, and how they are expressed through the discourse of Evo Morales and the MAS. However, they end up claiming that Morales and the MAS were the catalyst that collected the demands of the poor, the peasants, and the excluded (Errejón & Canelas, n.d.). On the other hand, some other studies analyse Morales's specific addresses. In Morales speech to the Congress (2006), he highlights and reiterates his indigenous identity, the rights of the indigenous people (the majority, more than 60% of Bolivian population), his purpose to end the discrimination, oppression, inequality, and how he intends to assume the role of mediator among the different political and social forces (Félix, 2007).

Most papers which somehow mention Morales words or discourse try to describe his origins and how he identifies with poor, the peasants, the downtrodden, etc. Besides, some

analyse or explain Morales's "good" intentions; how he is trying (will try) to build a new government that will include all the social and political actors. Those books and papers do not take into consideration the overt or covert intention that may be behind Morales's discourse. Rather, they do not consider the possibility that dark forces may be at work behind Morales's discourse.

c. The problem

In the early 2000s several social movements took place in Bolivia and, undoubtedly the common factor among them was the discourse coming from many of the people involved. For or against, the discourse coming from those leaders had their impact on the rest of the people. Since those movements took place many things have changed in Bolivian society, maybe forever. There were lots of demonstrations, thousands of people marched for hours along the streets of the main cities of Bolivia. Thousands of people marched from El Alto to La Paz, many riots were caused and public property was destroyed, as well as some governmental offices were not only destroyed, they were also sacked and burnt.

One thing is certain; there was something which moved people to do such things, because thousands of people could not decide to move in such a way just like that. On the other hand, some of them, when being interviewed or when they were recorded by the mass media, repeated the same discourse made by some social and/or political leaders; whether it was something logical or not, or worst of all some people could not tell why they were doing such things.

Besides, the coming to power of the MAS, which happened as a 'follow up' of those events, and the massive support from certain sectors of Bolivian population cannot be separated from the discourse of the MAS leader(s). Then, it is logical to ask, is there anything in the discourse of the leaders of the MAS which moves people? Do those leaders use any *strategy* to convince people? How do they get unconditional support from people? What is there in the discourse that has such effect on people? Is there anything, in the discourse, that makes people identify themselves with those leaders? Does their discourse have certain elements meant to convince people? Are those elements openly said or are

they hidden? Besides the main objective, which is to discover what lies behind the political discourse of the MAS, the intention of this study is to answer, to a certain extent, some of the above questions.

*In a make-believe world there are make-believe politicians who use
make-believe words -Anonymous*

1.1 Critical Discourse Analysis and Politics

Since language has got several characteristics, it has been studied from different perspectives, as well. For instance, the spelling, the correct use and arrangement of words within sentences is studied and ruled by grammar, which prevents us from writing ‘politics’ instead of ‘politic’ (*poli*=many; *ticks*=blood sucking parasites). As well as that, Critical discourse Analysis has covered the study of language in use. van Dijk, Wodak among others have proved that the social dimensions of language are better analysed under its scope. Language in use, in any form written or spoken, is an essential part of culture, “and discourse constitutes social practice and is at the same time constituted by it” (Wodak, 2002, 149); which as a characteristic of human beings can be said to be a political issue as neither can be separated from the way in which human societies are structured and ruled.

On the other hand, politics is also defined as the activities of the government, members of law-making organisations or people who try to influence the way a country is governed; activities that relate to influencing the actions and policies of a government or getting and keeping power in a government; the study of the ways in which a country is governed (Merriam Webster Dictionary, 1993). Politics is perhaps the area that makes a broad use of language through discourse. Because of the above definition politics is closely linked to language and power.

“The study of political cognition largely deals with the mental representations people share as political actors” (van Dijk, 2002, 203), and human beings are by nature political animals (Aristotle, 1992). According to that concept, people do politics almost anytime or anywhere, therefore, it would be advisable to make the difference between language of politics and the language of talking politics, terms which might seem equivalent; the former is mostly represented by politicians and journalists and the latter, by all other speakers of

public life. Both, however, constitute what may be called political discourse. Thus, it can be said that political discourse is the means through which power one way or another is exercised, criticised, resisted, condoned, complied or legitimised; and it is the individual uniqueness and variation of political discourse and interaction with the socially shared political representations of political groups and institutions that this study deals with.

From a rather current perspective, Orwell criticises the use of language in politics, “our civilisation is decadent and our language -so the argument runs- must inevitably share in the general collapse” (Orwell, 1996, 591) because language is an instrument which politicians shape for their own purposes. The key question should be why politicians make such use of language and what political discourse is meant to. The political field, like the literary, “understood both as a field of forces and as a field of struggles” (Bourdieu, 1991, 171) aimed at transforming the relation of forces, is where political discourse plays its role.

First of all, when politicians try to convince why people should vote for them and not for the other(s), besides, people need parties (permanent organisations) whose aim is to win power by offering their militants and their electors not only a doctrine but also a programme of thought and action, and thereby demanding in advance total support. Of course, it is their discourse the means of achieving such thing. Let alone that political parties, like tendencies within these parties, have only a relational existence and it would be futile to try to define what they are and what they profess independently of what their competitors in the same field are and profess.

Then, once in power, a party’s discourse, whatever party it is, is meant to “inform” people; Mikhail Bakunin (1991) criticises that some politicians believe that “there are truths which should not be told to people” (cited in Bourdieu, 1991, 203). In fact, “in politics ‘to say is to do,’ that is, it is to get people believe that you can do what you say, [...] it is their ‘capacity’ to make people believe in their truthfulness and authority” (Bourdieu, 1991, 190) because they have got the power or capacity to convince people that they are in possession of the truth. They do all this through their political discourse; that capacity is condoned by “the withering of all individual activity. The passivity of the mass of members: the stupid confidence that there is always somebody else who is thinking of everything and taking care of everything,” (Gramsci, 1921-1926, 197) and thus, abdicating completely all

sovereignty and all power. In this way giving them freedom to impose the definition of the social world that is best suited for their interests. Lastly, when a party leaves or is not in power, their discourse takes form of opposition, their discourse tends to criticise, to prove that the ones who are in power are doing the wrong thing.

Even though we all do politics, as it has been said earlier, for the majority of people, due to the complexity of the discourse and the complexity of the social relations that are constitutive of the political field, power struggle appears less as something unintelligible or as something which appears pointless in their eyes. Politics seems to be something too complicated for those who, not being players in the game, cannot see the interest in it or cannot understand the distinction between two words or two turns of phrase in a crucial debate. Therefore, they cannot see whether they want to appropriate or not for their own benefit the power to define the social world that they hold by delegation. This means that “the political field produces an effect of censorship by limiting the universe of political discourse, and thereby the universe of what is political thinkable to the finite space of discourses capable of being produced” (Bourdieu, 1991, 172).

What has been said above is complemented by the passive attitude of people who by any reason grant, condone and legitimise the decision making of those who hold power. It is there when, even within parties, supporters and non-supporters are deprived from decision making. Hence, they are inclined to depend on the party, whether they are forced to or rather “they make it clear that they would prefer not to be much involved in political decision making. When it comes to politics, many people want [...] *to be left alone*” (Hibbing & Theiss-Morse, 2003, 129)

1.2 Discourse and ideology

Everything that happens in philosophy has, in the last instance, not only political consequences in theory, but also political consequences in politics: in the political class struggle.— Louis Althusser, *Essays in Self-Criticism*

Political parties as a whole, usually, if not always, reflect certain orientation which is usually expressed in their members’ behaviour as their ideology. From a dictionary definition, ideology is the integrated assertions, theories and aims that constitute a socio-

political program; a systematic body of concepts especially about human life or culture; a manner or the content of thinking characteristic of an individual, group, or culture (Merriam Webster Dictionary, 1993).

Although ideology is usually understood as legal systems which are regarded as liberal, fascist, communist, and so on, today it is generally taken to mean not a science of ideas but the ideas themselves, and moreover ideas of a particular kind. Such ideas come as the result of forces in the material environment. As Bell (2001) puts, ideologies are action-oriented systems of beliefs; “ideology looks at the world with eyes wide shut, a closed system which prefabricates answers to any questions that might be asked” (Bell, 2001, xi).

The role of ideology is not to render reality transparent, but to motivate people to do or not do certain things because ideology shapes what people think. The term is used to refer to a system of mutually dependent ideas, principles, traditions, gatherings, and even folklore that functions as a routine frame of reference. These routine ideas are taken for granted and used to interpret, understand, and guide values in a certain direction. Ideologies in this sense are types of “beliefs that involve foundational norms and routines that are typically uncritically regarded by adherents” (Regelsk, 2003, 2). Such belief systems are not typically susceptible to empirical verification or falsification. They are basic systems of fundamental social cognitions that organise the attitudes and other social representations shared by members of groups.

Therefore, “the terms of the communication and discourse by which such ideologically rooted belief is instituted, advanced, and legitimated become a code that has a special, usually unquestioned and unequivocal meaning for believers, despite being subjective and disputable. Accepting and using such an ideological code also distinguishes insiders from outsiders” (Ibid, 2003, 3). Thus, that code, one way or another, controls the mental representations (models). That is, most of what people say or do is based on those shared ideologies. People’s reactions and attitudes have got a foundation in those ideologies, as well. “Schools and Churches, for instance, ‘discipline’ not only their shepherds, but also their flocks, the same way family regulates its member’s behaviour according to its own ‘rules’” (Althusser, 1971, 146). Althusser (1971) also asserts that a person's desires, choices, intentions, preferences, judgements, and so forth, are the products

of social practices; he believes it necessary to conceive how society makes the individual in its own image. Similarly to what Bourdieu (1993) calls *habitus*.

Since ideology is reflected in social practices, and those social practices somehow determine the social inequalities, it is society that determines those relations of power. For decades theorists have attempted to explain the existing social inequalities. Critical Linguistics and other approaches have shown significant limitations, in that they merely describe but do not explain unequal social relations of power. “The way in which orders of discourse are structured and the ideologies which they embody, are determined by relationships of power in particular social institutions, and the society as a whole” (Fairclough, 1996, 31). It is Critical Discourse Analysis that explains what makes such inequalities and how they are successfully enacted.

Fairclough (1996) in his seminal work *Language and Power* concludes that it is through ideology that the main way consent and acquiescence is manufactured. This critical social issue of the ideological dimensions of language expressed through discourse takes place somehow and somewhere. On the other hand, Althusser (1971), in his *Ideological Structures or State Ideological Apparatuses*, provides the reason why; “these are small networks, closer localised to the people, with the power to covertly infiltrate the beliefs of the individual. Unlike the state repressive apparatuses, for example, the police, the courts, the prisons and also the army, these ‘ideological structures’ are the schools, the media, the church, the family, and even art” (Althusser, 1971, 143); “the former functions by violence and the latter by ideology” (Ibid, 1971, 145).

The institutions mentioned above, are structures which can further foster State ideology and reproduce the ideals and attitudes which adhere to the beliefs of the state and the political *status quo*. Even law itself might be involved in ideology; some countries or states within the same country have got different laws about the same matter, because each society views and perceives the issues from their own perspective. Therefore, law has an ideology because it conveys and transmits a complex set of attitudes, values and theories of each society. Its ideology reflects the dominant ideology through values and attitudes that legitimise the existing social order.

On the other hand, discourse defined as language in use is conceived as social practice because it happens in society, and social practice exists in a dialectical relationship with social structure which in its time has got ideological foundations. This shows how determinant discourse is in the societal structuring. Discourse is shaped by social structure by different factors such as class, age, sex, ethnicity, gender, etc., and creates social identity; in other words it is shaped by culture. It is through enculturation that individuals acquire the cultural know-how, which means to learn those conventions (systems of classification) which help them to use particular signs (words, gestures, visual images) to signify and make meaning out of concepts.

Fairclough (2003) distinguishes three dimensions of discourse; text, discursive practice and social practice. Text reflects the identity, relational and representational functions of language; discursive practice connects the level of culture and society. Therefore, social practice, social relations of power and domination within society are sustained by means of ideology.

Besides, according to Althusser (1971), ideology functions to secure the reproduction of capitalist relations of production by instilling the necessary skills into the mind of the population-subjecting to the ruling ideology. Based on the previous concepts, Fairclough (2003) makes three claims about ideology:

1. Ideology has a basis in the social practices of institutions. As a form of social practice, discourse practices are material forms of ideology.
2. Ideology 'interpellates subjects.' It works by constituting people as subjects within the framework of ideology. Patriarchal ideology interpellates individuals as more powerful men or less powerful women. Racist ideology interpellates groups as 'ourselves' and the 'others.'
3. Althusser's definition of the State repressive agencies' and the 'ideological state apparatuses,' in Fairclough's theory, gives rise to institutional and societal orders of discourse (the societal order of discourse is a condensation of the institutional orders of discourse).

For Fairclough (2003), ideologies are constructions of reality which are built into various dimensions of the forms and meanings of discursive practices. Through power

relations implicit in orders of discourse, discourse becomes invested ideologically; “through being ideologically invested, discourse is a mode of producing, reproducing or transforming social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and belief” (Fairclough, 1995, 70-84). Discourse contributes to the creation and maintenance of institutions. These constructive effects of discourse are emphasised within the school of thinking known as *social constructionism* (Gergen, 2001) and “language is at the heart of this construction process” (Burr, 2003, 46).

Different theorists and schools of thought have contributed to the development of contemporary social constructionist ideas, and socio-cultural processes provide the resources that make us human. Despite constructionists often being criticised as 'relativists', 'activists' and 'anti-establishment' and for making no concrete contributions, their ideas are now being adopted by practically-oriented disciplines such as management consultancy, advertising, therapy, education and nursing. More about the topic can be found in Lock's and Strong's “Social Constructionism: Sources and Stirrings in Theory and Practice” (2010), Gergen's & Gergen's “Social Construction: A Reader” (2003), Holstein's & Miller's “Reconsidering Social Constructionism: Debates in Social Problems Theory” (2007).

1.3 Discourse and Power

The line between good and evil passes right through every human heart.

-Aleksandre Solzhenitsyn-

Ideology, as it has been described above, is expressed in interactions in society. Interaction in society is a rather complex system of behaviour because there, in society, through discourse, people project who they are. This behaviour has been studied under the label of ‘face.’ Since politeness “differs from one person to the next and from one occasion to the next” (Watts, 2003, 8-9), throughout chapter five of his book, Watts develops an argument that politeness theory can never be fully equated with face theory, concept shared by Vilkki (2006). However, they both agree that face can be understood as the public self-image people project.

Brown and Levinson (1987) go even further than the above definition when they define the positive and negative face. Usually, social interaction involves something more than just the exchange of words; besides the topic and the means (words, sentences, ideas, etc.) a common factor is the self-image that the speakers try to project. Brown and Levinson (1987) define positive face as the individual's desire to be appreciated in social interaction, and negative face as the individual's desire for freedom of action and freedom from imposition. The theory assumes that most speech acts, for example requests, offers and compliments, inherently threaten either the hearer's or the speaker's face-wants. According to the previous definitions it might be assumed that in most speech acts, politeness is involved in redressing those face threatening acts. Therefore, let us briefly see what politeness is about.

Politeness has also been analysed, studied and defined from different perspectives, it has been conceptualised especially as a strategic conflict-avoidance or as a strategic construction of cooperative social interaction. Grice (1975), besides defining politeness, proposed four conversational maxims in order to have a good, clear and productive social interaction. Grice (1991) suggests that if someone asks "Could you close the door?" the hearer does not usually answer "Yes", instead they perform the non-linguistic act of closing the door, therefore, the hearer can infer that the speaker is making a request.

Austin (1962) in his book "How to do things with words" gives a detailed description and theory about such speech acts. Perhaps Grice goes a little further than that when he argues that if someone asks "*how X is getting on in his job*", and the hearer replies that "*he is doing fine, he likes his colleagues and he hasn't been to prison yet.*" The answer implies several things such as that X "is the sort of person or [the] person likely to yield to the temptation provided by his occupation, or that his colleagues are very unpleasant and treacherous people, and so forth" (Grice, 1991, 24).

Based on the fact that when people use language they usually *imply* something more than what they say, referred as *implicatures* by Grice; several things can be inferred depending on the context and the norms (maxims) "normally observed by participants in talk exchanges" (Grice, 1991, 28) which, therefore, generate non-conventional implicatures. The four general maxims proposed by Grice are the following:

1. **The maxim of quantity**, where one tries to be as informative as one possibly can, and gives as much information as is needed, and no more.
2. **The maxim of quality**, where one tries to be truthful, and does not give information that is false or that is not supported by evidence.
3. **The maxim of relation**, where one tries to be relevant, and says things that are pertinent to the discussion.
4. **The maxim of manner**, when one tries to be as clear, as brief, and as orderly as one can in what one says, and where one avoids obscurity and ambiguity

Although these maxims provide the basis for a good communication, as Grice himself admits, people tend to violate them according to their own interests and motives. Much can be said about the use and usefulness of Grice's maxims, as the same author suggests, they are not proscriptive rules which should be followed strictly, they are just prescriptive or suggestions because they are concerned with the ways in which meaning can be conveyed and do not consider what people say and imply, and how they say things or what they deliberately do not say or rather what they might purposefully be implying. Thus, the definition of politeness has been focused from different perspectives, from the most scholarly ones to the ironical ones such as Bierce's (1911) definition of politeness: "The most acceptable hypocrisy," definitions that altogether help us to understand what politeness really is.

In spite of some discrepancies, the concept of face and politeness perhaps may not be equated but they are closely related, especially because people live and interact with other people in society and their interactions are somehow controlled. The fact is that people tend to behave in certain way because of the social environment. Their discourse, namely, tends to be 'relaxed' and rather informal when they are addressing to a close friend, however, it changes to formal when addressing to a superior or authority. Now the question is, since people can change the way they talk according to the situation, how much do they change or can they change their behaviour or attitude due to the circumstances?

A person's change of attitude has been expressed dramatically by Neiderman (1990) in his book "The devil's Advocate," where thematically raises the proposition that winning is everything in the legal profession. Here, inevitably we fall into the paradox of good and bad, why not evil. According to the Bible, Satan the evil one originally was an angel:

"...Thus saith the Lord God; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created. Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee" (Ezekiel 28:12-19, The Holy Bible).

Some common and logical questions may arise: what really happened to the Lord's creation? Did the Lord make a mistake (when creating an angel)? How is it that the Lord's "perfect" creation turned into evil? From a rather different perspective, different from Christianity and talking about human beings, a logical question arises: is it possible that someone good can become evil? Or rather, how easily a good person can turn into evil?

If we address to an honest, hardworking, and fearful of God person and ask them whether they would cause harm, hurt physically or kill another person, the answer probably would be a resounding NO. Some people might say that only bad people would do that, there are history records all over the world which justify that only bad people have done such things.

Anyone would agree that everywhere, all over the world, there are good people and, unfortunately, bad people. One day a mother and her child were walking in front of Buckingham palace (London). When the child saw a soldier standing still at the door of the palace, the child asked her mother: "Mom, has that soldier ever been a baby?" Her mother

said “Yes.” Then the child commented to herself “I haven’t ever seen a baby soldier.” Therefore, the obvious question is, are the evil people evil since they are born?

From a psychological point of view, however, there is another perspective; Philip Zimbardo in his book *The Lucifer Effect* (2007) gives clear insights about the fact that good people can turn into evil. He ran an experiment (1971) at Stanford prison, Palo Alto, California, that backs up his hypothesis. He showed that good common people became evil under certain circumstances. In fact, as the experiment was developing, the outcomes turned out to be so dramatic that the experiment, literally, went out of control. Zimbardo admitted that since everything went out of control, he was forced to stop the whole process because the lives of many of the participants were in danger; many of them had to receive psychological help afterwards.

Zimbardo also recalled that once a child asked whether the Holocaust could happen nowadays (then) in the U.S. Of course the answer was NO, because times have changed, because it happened in the past, and especially it was the Nazis who caused such atrocities. However, the Abu Ghraib incident, the revelation of American soldiers abusing prisoners in Iraq showed the whole world something different when several photographs, showing the abuse of prisoners, were published. “The real issue is not the photographs themselves but what the photographs reveal to have happened to 'suspects' in American custody, No: the horror of what is shown in the photographs cannot be separated from the horror that the photographs were taken -- with the perpetrators posing, gloating, over their helpless captives” (Sontag, 2004, Magazine).

Seymour M. Hersh (2004) from the New Yorker gives a much more detailed description of the Abu Ghraib incident photographs:

“In one photograph, Private England, a cigarette dangling from her mouth, is giving a jaunty thumbs-up sign and pointing at the genitals of a young Iraqi, who is naked except for a sandbag over his head, as he masturbates. Three other hooded and naked Iraqi prisoners are shown; hands reflexively crossed over their genitals. A fifth prisoner has his hands at his sides. In another, England stands arm in arm with Specialist Graner; both are grinning and

giving the thumbs-up behind a cluster of perhaps seven naked Iraqis, knees bent, piled clumsily on top of each other in a pyramid. There is another photograph of a cluster of naked prisoners, again piled in a pyramid. Near them stands Graner, smiling, his arms crossed; a woman soldier stands in front of him, bending over, and she, too, is smiling. Then, there is another cluster of hooded bodies, with a female soldier standing in front, taking photographs. Yet another photograph shows a kneeling, naked, unhooded male prisoner, head momentarily turned away from the camera, posed to make it appear that he is performing oral sex on another male prisoner, who is naked and hooded. Such dehumanization is unacceptable in any culture, but it is especially so in the Arab world. Homosexual acts are against Islamic law and it is humiliating for men to be naked in front of other men” (Hersh, 2004, 125).

German soldiers in the Second World War took photographs of the atrocities they were committing in Poland and Russia, but snapshots in which executioners placed themselves among the victims are exceedingly rare, as may be seen in a book published, *Photographing the Holocaust* by Janina Struk (2004).

In February 2008 during a conference in Monterrey, Zimbardo showed some of the Abu Ghraib incident photographs in order to explain his hypothesis that the good can become evil, because these atrocities were committed by United States military police, army reservists. They were not soldiers prepared for this mission at all. And Zimbardo’s conclusion is that it was a matter of power, the circumstances gave those reservists a position of power which turned them into what the photographs show, although the U.S. administration referred to the incident as “the work of few bad apples” (Carter, 2004).

If it is a matter of power, what is power? Several definitions of power can be found; it is defined as the ability to act, regarded as latent or inherent; the faculty of doing or performing something; the capacity for action or performance; the capability of producing an effect, whether physical or moral: potency; might. “The ability to act or produce an effect, ability to get extra-base hits, capacity for being acted upon or undergoing an effect” (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 1993). In physics power is defined as the quantity work has to do with a force causing a displacement.

Since we are dealing with social sciences, The Cambridge Dictionary (2010) definition comes suitable: “ability to control people and events, the amount of political control a person or group has in a country.” In a more simplified sense we can say that power is ultimately understood as the ability to have things your way.

However, power in this sense is not exerted by means of force necessarily, as McClelland and Burnham (2003) in their study on managers show. Powerful people use several strategies to advance their agendas; helping people evokes reciprocity, a universal drive to want to repay a favour, either explicit or not there remains a *quid pro quo* notion.

Power can also be exercised successfully through persuasion which, according to their study, has four elements:

- a. **Credibility** which is built on trust and expertise.
- b. **An understanding of the audience** which means identifying the decision makers and centres of influence.
- c. **A solid argument**, considering what is perfectly sensible to you may elude others, can improve the chances of persuading others if: it is logical, it strikes an emotional cord, and it favourably addresses the interests of the parties you hope to persuade and neutralises competing alternatives.
- d. **Effective communication:** Do not mistakenly think that logic and rationality will win out and persuade people to your side. Originally published in 1976, and also reproduced by Sinclair (2011, 5).

Since the word persuasion became a key word, The Merriam-Webster Dictionary (1993) defines persuasion as:

1. The action or fact of persuading someone or of being persuaded to do or believe something.
2. The act or process or an instance of persuading.
3. An opinion held with complete assurance.

4. A system of religious beliefs; also: a group adhering to a particular system of beliefs.

In more simple words it can be said that persuasion is to make someone believe something, of course convincing arguments must be used for that purpose. From that perspective several events can be found, which are connected with persuasion. For instance one of the events that shocked the whole world took place in 1978. In Jonestown, Guyana (1978), a series of strange events ended up with the death of around 912 people including more than 280 children, a mass-suicide known as the “Jonestown Massacre.” Why over 900 people would decide to kill themselves? The strange event remains as the largest single event of mass suicide in history (or the largest mass murder – depending on how it is considered).

How is it possible that so many people decided to die willingly? The fact is that Preacher James Warren Jones -founder of his own cult “People’s Temple,” the philosophies of the People’s Temple cult were based on socialist ideologies that highlighted liberal, and radical anti-capitalism sentiments- persuaded his followers to take their lives by swallowing a deadly concoction. Whatever the preacher’s motives were - when he claimed to be their saviour, many believed it; “he had saved them from the street, fed, clothed, sheltered and empowered them. They worshipped him for it” (Scheeres, 2011, 24). Preacher Warren led many of his followers from California, where he originally had his cult’s headquarters, to a jungle in Guyana where, about a year later, they all committed suicide (The Times News, 15.03.1979).

Following Zimbardo’s theory, preacher Warren exercised his position as religious “authority” to influence a number of people to follow him, leaving their dear ones behind, to the South American jungle and to take their own lives (including their children’s). Should the reader think it was an isolated event, then, they had better have a look at “Waco Massacre” (1992), also known as *Waco Siege*. In Waco, Texas, perhaps fearing there was going to be a suicide-massacre within a religious group known as the Branch Davidians, first the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), and then the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) attempted to raid the ranch where the religious group was established. The incident ended up with the exchange of fire from both sides, the use of tanks, flame-throwers, and poison gas, and the death of nearly one hundred people which includes

women, children and the religious leader David Koresh. Once again, following Zimbardo's view, it was a matter of power.

For a more detailed description of the "Waco Siege", see Linedecker's "Massacre at Waco: The Shocking True Story of Cult Leader David Koresh and the Branch Davidians" (1993); Edward S. G. Dennis Jr.'s "Siege in Waco - the Handling of the Branch Davidian Stand-off" (1993), or Carol Moore's "Davidian Massacre: Disturbing Questions About Waco Which Must Be Answered" (1995).

1.3.1. Language of politics: just rhetoric?

"If you tell a big enough lie and tell it frequently enough, it will be believed"

-Adolf Hitler-

Thus far, clear evidence has been found that due to power good people can turn into evil, as well as that people can be convinced or persuaded to leave their homes and families and everything they have got behind and commit suicide. Thus, would it not be easier, during a political campaign, to persuade people to vote for certain candidate or support a political agenda without even knowing who and what they are supporting?

Now two terms have emerged: power and persuasion. In the field of politics they are perhaps the central core, and they are expressed through discourse. One way or another, politics is concerned with power; power to make decisions, power to control resources, power to control other people's behaviour, etc. Can politicians also influence thought? How do politicians reach their audience (people)? How do they get people's support? Can politicians also change peoples' minds?

Whether it is a matter of ethics or not, as Walter Landor's quote goes: "In argument, truth always prevails finally; in politics, falsehood always." Politicians are always trying to tell people that something is right, whether it is true or not, the means through which they persuade people, or at least they try to, is the use of language. John Earl Joseph (2006) throughout his book *Language and Politics* argues that language is political from top to bottom by exemplifying the numerous ways in which politics and language interact. All animals are political but some are more political than others, and one in particular is the

most political of all, the reason being language (Aristotle, 1992, 224), so wrote the Philosopher Aristotle (350 B.C.E) some 2,350 years ago, and who today would disagree?

Whether considered at the level of an individual speaker's choice of language or style of discourse with others, or at the level of political rhetoric, Joseph (2006) asserts that language itself has a deeply political dimension. The kind of language used is shaped by whom it is that you are speaking to, and by how your relationship with that person will be affected by what you say.

On the other hand, van Dijk and Wodak agree that the concept of politics may apply to any situation in which there is an unequal distribution of power, and where individuals' behaviour reflect the play of power or is guided by it, coincidentally to what Joseph (2006) says. Joseph also asserts that the politics of identity shapes how we interpret what people say to us. For Joseph (2006) the social environment is a pivotal learning mechanism which shapes the language, language use, and the implicit power negotiations witnessed in language usage. Similarly to Louis Althusser's (1971) critique of the reproduction of ideology in capitalist societies; "education is central to language and politics because it is through education that language and national identity are created, performed and above all reproduced" (Joseph, 2006, 49).

Joseph (2006) also discusses the role of language in the form of rhetoric and propaganda in what he calls, the "manufacture of consent" in modern democracies. He relies on language nature, origin and use in order to explain how propaganda is used by the political machinery and media in democratic nations to ideologically conform political views yet maintaining an illusion of political free will; "propaganda is to democracy as violence is to totalitarianism" (Chomsky, 1986, 286). Joseph skilfully relates what he calls the "manufacture of consent" with Chomsky's notion of "infinite linguistic creativity" (Joseph, 2006, 123) by stating that each one, although seemingly opposing views, belongs to a different side of the language equation: the production and the interpretation.

1.3.2. The emotional dog and its rational tail (Haidt, 2001)

In the previous section two new elements appeared: persuasion and propaganda, elements that are closely related to politics and politicians, and how they interact with the

rest of the people. Thus far, it has been stated how politicians work, and how they use language, and also the role of language used to influence people.

From an honest perspective, trying to exert influence on someone else's behaviour is not a bad thing. Some people, one way or another, exercise influence or persuasion. These people usually tend to influence others, especially when they are in a certain position (of authority): teachers to students, doctors to patients, parents to children, etc. In most cases, they believe that it is their duty because they are in a certain position that grants them the capacity to discern what is right from what is wrong.

How do some people influence or persuade others? The most common means is the use of words; with words we perform distinct types of actions beyond proposing statements. That is, people use utterances in which to say something is to do something or by saying something we are doing something (Austin, 1962). However, when the influence is driven by personal motives, and the tactics become coercive, the line is crossed from influence to manipulation.

Manipulative relationships “occur in families, organizations, friendships, professional relationships, and even at churches, synagogues, mosques, or other places of worship” (Braiker, 2004, 1)-the Jonestown Massacre is a good example. However, spotting manipulation or a manipulative relationship is not always easy because “agendas frequently are hidden and purposes disguised” (Ibid, 2004, 4). Moreover, manipulators seek the opportunity to ensnare and entrap their victims; “they often proceed in subtle, devious, or covert ways so that the manipulative character of the relationship can hardly be perceived” (Ibid, 2004, 5). Manipulators can be compared to water running downhill, always seeking the path of least resistance; “a good lip service is part of the manipulator's tactics as well” (Braiker, 2004, 54).

Manipulators seem to operate out of three principal interpersonal motives: (1) they need to advance their own purposes at virtually any cost to others, (2) they have strong needs to attain feelings of power and superiority in relationships with other people, and (3) they want and need to feel in control (Ibid, 2004, 54- 56).

Manipulators usually have got their own view of the world, they see the world in general in black and white; “their view is that either you play or you get played” (Ibid, 2004, 62). They see power as something finite. In other words, there is not enough power to go around for them to share or to acknowledge and respect someone else’s rights. They feel threatened when someone else has got certain degree of power or control, because they “need all the power that is around to get” (Ibid, 2004, 56). Their need to maintain control over others is frequently manifested by a need to be ‘right’ and to make others ‘wrong.’ For a manipulator, “only one person can be right—and that must be him, the other person necessarily becomes wrong” (Ibid, 2004, 57).

Manipulators do not necessarily understand their own motives, that is why they generally can be categorised into two groups: “those who are aware and conscious of their manipulative motives and goals and those who remain largely unconscious or unaware of the manipulative methods they employ in their relationships with others” (Ibid, 2004, 58); the latter may even lie to themselves about their motives, fact that makes “the lies they tell more believable or credible” (Ibid, 2004, 51-52).

Manipulators see life as a zero-sum game, in almost every important dimension which to a manipulator primarily comprises power, control, and superiority. The manipulator “believes that there are winners and losers. In a two-person relationship, someone must win, and someone must lose. It is not complicated math. There is no room for a win-win or a lose-lose scenario” (Ibid, 2004, 63). “They do not experience inner conflict or turmoil over the thought that their behaviour may violate the rights of others. They do not care, or they have rationalised their behaviour to the point that they may believe that they are doing what is good or right for others anyway” (Ibid, 2004, 59).

Moreover, manipulators usually cloak their motives in guises that are more socially acceptable, such as:

- **Love and caring**, “I’m doing this out of care /love for you”
- **Expertise**, “I am telling you this because I have had way more experience in these matters, and I know better”

- **Altruism and generosity**, “I am doing this for your own good, even though it does not benefit me”
- **Role endowment**, “I am telling you what to do because that is my role/obligation” (Ibid, 2004, 61).

Manipulators do not generally require themselves to act out of a sense of moral intention or personal code or value system of right and wrong or good and bad behaviour in the treatment of others. “Instead, they act out of a sense of what works to advance their own ends” (Ibid, 2004, 62). They are adept at “making their accusers (or anyone who even suggests that they may be manipulating) feel guilty and ill-mannered for even questioning their motives” (Ibid, 2004, 62).

Consequently, consciously or unconsciously, manipulators believe they deserve to have their needs met and purposes served because they perceive that other people (or life in general) wounded them in some important way; therefore, the world owes them back. Life, for a manipulator becomes about “evening up the score and making sure that he does not get cheated, mistreated, hurt, damaged, short-changed, or otherwise injured in any way” (Ibid, 2004, 64).

It is difficult for the manipulator “to grasp the concept of violating the rights of others because (1) he cannot really feel that others have rights of their own and (2) he is entitled to have other people subordinate their needs to his” (Ibid, 2004, 64). Because they believe that given a choice, everyone else would behave the same way they do. In other words, “other people see the world in the same stark win-lose terms. They feel that others also believe that they can play or they will get played—and that given a choice, others will always opt for doing the same as they do” (Ibid, 2004, 64); they view life as a dog-eat-dog game where each person must do what is necessary to advance their own personal needs even if it is at the expense of others.

Buss et al (1987) give a detailed description of the tactics this kind of people use, who, according to their personal traits are classified as: **People with Machiavellian personalities**, who are committed to the proposition that a desired end justifies virtually any means; **People with Narcissistic Personality Disorder**, who have a pattern of grandiosity, a need to be admired, and a lack of empathy for others’ feelings or needs;

People with Dependent Personality Disorder, who rely so much on others, they fail to learn age-appropriate decision-making skills; **People with Histrionic Personality Disorder**, dramatic or theatrical, who attempt to get attention in strange and unusual ways; **People with Passive-Aggressive Personalities**, who display their own hostility or aggression through passive rather than overt, actively aggressive means. The **Con or Antisocial Personality Disorder**, **The Addictive Personalities** and others, including a full description of their characteristics have been defined by the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV).

Simply put, a manipulator does not need to have a personality disorder; personality is the name psychologists give to the enduring pattern of thoughts, behaviours, and feelings that characterises each individual. In a sense, each of us has a kind of personality *fingerprint* that derives about “half from genetic programming and half from environmental influences, a roughly 50:50 nature/nurture split” (Braiker, 2004, 75). Therefore, the manipulative relationships depend on activating one (or both) of two principal human drives: gain (or reward) and loss (or avoidance). These are the two engines that drive the manipulation; one of the parties feels obligated to give them their way and feel terribly guilty if they do not.

As it has been stated in the previous paragraph, manipulation always boils down to the promise of a net gain and/or the threat of a net loss” (Ibid, 2004, 106), as the basic and elementary principle of control over others; this view, of course, gives “rise to competition, rivalry, and jealousy- toxic emotions that taint and compromise the quality of relationships” (Ibid, 2004, 63). The most common expression of manipulation is the emotional blackmail that is used as a powerful form of manipulation in which manipulators threaten, either directly or indirectly (overtly or subtly), to punish us if we do not do what they want. Usually, blackmailers make it nearly impossible to see how they are manipulating us, because they lay down a thick fog that obscures their actions so that they ensure that we literally cannot see what is happening to us. Should the reader want to know more insight about the topic in order to draw their own analogies, more can be found in Forward's “Emotional Blackmail” (2001).

1.3.3. I want what you have; I have what you want

The previous section led to a rather complex term, jealousy, which sometimes, in common parlance, is used in place of envy; both of them, however, are often interrelated. According to the Cambridge Dictionary (2010) they are emotions or basically thoughts fostered out of comparison to others, which cause negative feelings that do not dissipate with the passage of time. Although jealousy is usually studied as it occurs in romantic relationships, in its broad sense, jealousy is represented as a constant criticism of other people, and it is defined as the fear of losing someone or something already possessed, whereas envy is defined as wanting something belonging to another. As Takahashi, et al (2009) put “when your gain is my pain and your pain is my gain”; clearly expressed in the German term *schadenfreude*.

1.3.4. Theory of Envy

Some evidence of envy can be found in the past; according to the Holy Bible Cain killed his brother Abel out of envy (Genesis 4: 1-16, The Holy Bible), envy is also implied in one of the Ten Commandments: “Thou dost not covet the house of thy neighbour” (Exodus 20: 1-17, The Holy Bible), besides, it has also been catalogued among the seven deadly sins.

On the other hand, from a more scientific perspective, envy has been considered as one of the most common human emotions along with love, hatred and jealousy. Fitness and Fletcher (1993) argue that love, hate, anger, and jealousy are in close relationship. Besides, Davitz (1969) agrees that hatred is provoked by injustice and inequity; hate is most often elicited by unfair circumstances, which can be reconciled by revenge or restitution.

Each human is considered a bio-mental entity because “when the physical body of the whole person is referenced, terms such as human organism or physical body are used, when the psychological level of the whole person is addressed, the term ‘self’ is used” (Ninivaggi, 2010, 4). The self has got to do with those primary emotions such as envy; an unconscious, regularly occurring mental activity which develops as phantasy, a state of mind of an infant child during the early stages of development and is elaborated thereafter.

“This mental activity results from the oscillation between the paranoid-schizoid position and depressive position” (Ibid, 2010, 8). Although at an early stage it emerges from the relation / comparison between the subject and the object, the primary caregiver, “technically the term ‘object’ denotes the subject’s object of desire” (Ibid, 2010, 7).

A healthy maturation of envy may be expressed in rivalry among siblings, for instance. Rivalry and competition may be mostly harmless in early life; however it can bring out the absolute worst of us if it develops into envy in later life. In classic literature we can find the character of *Iago* in Shakespeare’s “Othello” [1604] (1993), *Claggart* in Melville’s “Billy Budd” [1888-1891] (1992), or *Uriah Heep* in Dickens’s “David Copperfield” [1849-1850] (2004) as clear examples of extreme attitudes and behaviours caused by envy.

The envier scans the environment for some hint of common ground between himself and another, and the connection is based on the “perceived absence in the envier and presence in the envied one. When the envier sees a figure in the environment that appears to possess what the envier lacks, that figure is used as a potential key to enable the envier to unlock his own wished-for potential” (Ninivaggi, 2010, 48). Besides, “the maturation of envy can change subjective attitudes and behaviours influenced by envy” (Ibid, 2010, 46).

Ninivaggi (2010) introduces the “love-envy” paradigm, “a primary couple, along with love and hate, another primary couple, which are the super ordinate dialectical forces underlying and shaping all mental functioning. In fact, envy theory proposes that both love and hate are the two major components making up envy” (Ibid, 2010, 39). Consequently, besides the wish for something the envier does not possess, what sort of emotion(s) and attitude(s) are or can be generated towards the envied one?

1.3.5. Theory of hate

“A coloured boy in Orange County [was] taken at midnight from his father, while they were burning charcoal, and hanged. The charge was that he had made some improper and foolish remark about the White ladies. His body hung ten days until the vultures

partly consumed it, and no one during that time dared to take him down” (Holden, 1871, cited by Sternberg & Sternberg, 2008, 9).

This is just one example of cases of scourging, mutilations, and murder of black people committed out of hatred by the Ku Klux Klan in the U.S.A. Although after the atrocities committed by the Nazis against Jews during World War II, people repeated the refrain *never again*, however, the incidents in Cambodia, Bosnia, Rwanda, or Burundi proved that the massacres and genocides are far from over.

According to Sternberg & Sternberg (2008) most massacres and genocides around the world have been caused by hate. For humans to be capable of such violence many psychological processes must be at work: “hate was not only an underlying factor in genocides, but is at the heart of many of the world's most serious problems” (Sternberg & Sternberg, 2008, 3).

In spite of the difficulty in explaining complex emotions such as love or hate, Sternberg & Sternberg (2008), in chapter three of their book, give a detailed description of seven different kinds of hate arising from the combination of three different components: negation of intimacy, passion and commitment. Besides, they also propose their *duplex theory of hate* based on the same three elements. The negation of intimacy means that an individual considers another individual or group as somehow less than what they are or even less than human, therefore one cannot feel care or compassion for such people. Passion arouses an aggressive attitude toward the hated target so as to strike at it or run away from it. Commitment provides a belief system that supports the feelings of hate. Moreover, there is another component: the context. This component is usually created and allegedly justifies the feelings of hate toward the target group.

Although some authors like Ekman (1992) and Allport (1950) contend that hate is an attitude rather than an emotion, at the same time attitudes are driven by emotions. For instance, in Rwanda (1994) Hutus and Tutsis who until then had lived as neighbours, “came to hate each other -more than 500,000 people were killed” (Sternberg & Sternberg, 2008, 2).

After the death of Yugoslavian president, Josip Tito, the power of the central government began to fade when the six republics, Yugoslavia was made of, wanted their independence. By the early 1990s the European Community recognised Slovenia and Croatia as sovereign republics, in the year 1992 a referendum called for Bosnian independence; the territory “was inhabited by Muslims, Serbs, and Croats, none of which had an absolute majority” (Ibid, 2008, 4). The three groups defined themselves strongly through their religious affiliation, with the majority of Serbs being Orthodox and the majority of the Croats being Catholics. Shortly after the referendum, war erupted among Bosnian Serbs, Bosnian Muslims and Croats. “Within weeks or even days, the relationships of once-peaceful neighbours changed” (Ibid, 2008, 5): they used to be neighbours, they lived together, they vacationed together and they spent holidays together, overnight, they were at war led by a deep feeling of hate.

How is it that people ‘suddenly’ come to hate each other?, because “hate is not natural in the sense of being inborn so individuals cannot act in an alternative way” (Ibid, 2008, 3). Besides, in chapter six of their book, Sternberg & Sternberg argue that humans do not necessarily hate from early childhood, on the contrary, they usually develop feelings of hate when they feel that others do wrong or cause harm to them. “Without considering moral reasoning, which might lead to moral judgement, people usually reach a judgement” (Haidt, 2001, 814) and they may develop the feeling of hate.

Moreover, Moshman (2007) asserts that the perceived emotions that lead to hatred, harm, wrong doing or emotions that may even lead to commit atrocities, might be wildly inaccurate (real or imaginary?), and their effects can be updated “even if they were committed before they were born” (Alicke & Sedikides, 2011, 117). “While engaged in their power struggles, individuals develop an intense hate and often use every means available to foment hate in their fellow citizens in order to gain the support they need to achieve their goals” (Sternberg & Sternberg, 2008, 6). “Hate is not in-born but rather, it is cynically fomented by individuals in power so as to maintain their power, or by individuals not in power, so as to gain it” (Ibid, 2008, 3). Therefore, those “sudden bursts of irrationality on the part of mobs are carefully planned and orchestrated” (Ibid, 2008, 32) usually by means of propaganda.

1.3.6. The role of propaganda

The use of propaganda to arouse hate among the masses / people has been widely analysed by Sternberg & Sternberg (2008) throughout chapter six of their book. Sternberg & Sternberg show the effect of propaganda as well as how propaganda is used to “create” and foster hate against certain people. For instance, the above mentioned authors describe how the Nazis spread, through Germany, hate against the Jews. They were treated more like bacteria, vermin or scum, to use just three of the metaphors the Nazis applied to their targets, the Jews. However, was it enough to depict the Jews in such terms? In order to cultivate, among German people, the feeling of hate and exclusion towards the Jews, the Nazis also spread their policy in the school system.

Pine (2010) throughout chapter three of her book explains how the content of the Nazi school curriculum was adapted according to their views. “Many subjects within the school were used to expound Nazi ideology, most notably biology, physics, chemistry, history, geography, mathematics and German” (Pine, 2010, 8) in order to spread hate, against the Jews, among school students. Children do not hate just like that, hatred is instilled in them; and that is what the Nazis did. Besides the wide use of propaganda throughout Germany, the Nazis focused on children as well. They described themselves as Christians, and the Jews were depicted, according to the New Testament, as the ones who killed Jesus.

The Nazis designed what was to be taught in schools. In History, children should have been taught that Germany lost World War I in large part because of disloyal Jewish spies, as Sharon Fabian (2009) wrote. In Science, students learnt that the Germans, the Aryan race, were a superior race. Perhaps the most shocking example can be found in Hiemer’s (1938) “Der Giftpliz” (“The Toadstool”, well known as “The Poisonous Mushroom”), a book aimed at German primary school children. The stories in the book reflect anti-Semitism. The book is filled with stories like: “How to identify a Jew”, “How Jewish traders cheat”, “How the Jews torment animals”, or “What Christ said about the Jews” amongst others and, of course, “The Poisonous Mushroom.” The latter is a story about a mother a her child who finds a poisonous mushroom, and then her mother “teaches” him that there are good and bad mushrooms as there are good and bad people;

and the boy claims that the bad people are the Jews. All stories are illustrated not only by pictures but also by quotes such as “He who fights the Jews battles the Devil” (unit 17). That is how hate was instilled among German people and among children specially, for whom the game of *Cowboys and Indians* was sometimes called *Aryans and Jews* (Grunberger, 1971, 285).

Unfortunately, it was not only the Nazis who did such things, the cleric-fascist regime in Austria, or the Mussolini’s regime in Italy also used education “to the shaping and forging of national identity, as well as self-perception and the perception of ‘others’” (Pine, 2010, 1) and therefore justified most of their policies.

Either by means of education or propaganda or just for the very sake of power, many crimes have been committed throughout the world, along history. Such ‘human’ behaviour and attitudes, because those crimes have been committed by human beings, make us turn to Freud’s (1922a) dualistic drive theory. Freud argues that human beings are capable of doing both opposing things: Freud assumes that humans have two different kinds of drives, a preserving and unifying one that he called ‘Eros’, and a destructive and killing one that he named ‘Thanatos’, or the aggression / death drive. Freud’s position coincides with Aleksandre Solzhenitsyn’s view which is expressed in his quote: “The line between good and evil passes right through every human heart.”

1.3.7. What political language does

“I’m not upset that you lied to me, I’m upset that from now on I can’t believe you.” - Friedrich Nietzsche

Throughout the previous sections it has been shown how some emotions can be instilled among people, and how language is related to politics, persuasion and manipulation. Because of the role that language plays in politics, George LaKoff (2002) tries to explain how political language affects our lives. He asserts that Conservatives (U.S. political party) have spent decades defining their ideas, carefully choosing the language with which to present them, and building an infrastructure to communicate them.

Language always comes with what is called "framing." Every word is defined relative to a conceptual framework. "If you have something like 'revolt,' that implies a population that is being ruled unfairly, or assumes it is being ruled unfairly, and that they are throwing off their rulers, which would be considered a good thing; that is a frame" (LaKoff, 2009, 306).

On the other hand, Harold Pinter exemplified that notion of framing by showing how the U.S. government usually justifies their foreign policies; "As every single person here knows, the justification for the invasion of Iraq was that Saddam Hussein possessed a highly dangerous body of weapons of mass destruction, some of which could be fired in 45 minutes, bringing about appalling devastation. We were assured that was true. It was not true. We were told that Iraq had a relationship with Al Qaeda and shared responsibility for the atrocity in New York in September 11th 2001. We were assured that this was true. It was not true. We were told that Iraq threatened the security of the world. We were assured it was true. It was not true" (Pinter, 2005).

According to Pinter, the majority of politicians –he points The U.S. as evidence- are interested not in truth but in power and in the maintenance of that power; as a salesman who is out on its own and its most saleable commodity is self-love. He highlights how most American presidents address to the public: 'I say to the American people it is time to pray and to defend the rights of the American people and I ask the American people to trust their president in the action he is about to take on behalf of the American people.' "It's a scintillating stratagem. Language is actually employed to keep thought at bay. The words 'the American people' provide a truly voluptuous cushion of reassurance. You do not need to think. Just lie back on the cushion. The cushion may be suffocating your intelligence and your critical faculties but it's very comfortable" (Pinter, 2005).

The Invasion at Bahia de Cochinos: Nixon proposed it, Eisenhower planned it, Robert F. Kennedy championed it, John F. Kennedy approved it and The CIA carried it out; 100 Cuban invaders were killed in battle (1961). In 1909 around 400 United States marines landed on the Caribbean coast of Nicaragua because President Zelaya made concessions to Germany and Japan for building a canal across Nicaragua. In 1912, 2,700 United States marines invaded Nicaragua because The U.S. refused to recognize the Constituent

Assembly's decision. In Chile (1973), Pinochet seized power in a bloody US-backed military coup, the presidential palace was attacked and Salvador Allende – Chile first socialist president- was killed (Klein, 2010). We might also mention Greece, Uruguay, Brazil, Paraguay, Haiti, Turkey, the Philippines, Guatemala, Grenada, Cambodia and other countries “where The U.S. have brought torture, cluster bombs, depleted uranium, innumerable acts of random murder, misery, degradation and death to the Iraqi people [the Abu Ghraib incident] and call it *bringing freedom and democracy to the Middle East*” (Pinter, 2005).

1.3.8. The script behind politicians

"Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities."

-Voltaire-

As it has been said in a previous section politics and politicians, through discourse, make use of language at its highest level. On his side, Pinter (2005) distinguishes between the search for truth in art and the avoidance of truth in politics. Consequently, some logical questions arise: how is it that politicians manage to persuade or convince their audiences? How do they know the right thing to say? Where do they learn that? Either leftists or rightists, either liberals or conservatives or even dictators, one way or another they have got arguments that support their policies, arguments that show that they are right. Sometimes, some of those arguments may be very persuasive because they get some support; their political discourse is expressed in speeches, interviews, and in any political propaganda.

The truth is that many, most, perhaps all, politicians have got a staff one way or another they depend upon. The “script writers” behind politicians, well known as Think-tanks or Spin Doctors, are not something new. Think tanks, sometimes known or disguised as NGOs (Non-governmental Organisations), have been interacting in society for a long time. Perhaps many decisive turns of world politics were guided, influenced, forced or finally schemed by Think tanks, Spin Doctors or NGOs.

“Of the many influences on U.S. foreign policy formulation, the role of think tanks is among the most important and least appreciated.”

— Richard Haass

Director of Policy and Planning
U.S. Department of State

“There are moments in the evolution of U.S. foreign policy where think tanks have had a decisive impact in reshaping conventional wisdom and setting a new course on a key strategic issue.”

— Ronald D. Asmus

Senior Transatlantic Fellow, German Marshall
Fund of the United States, and Adjunct Senior
Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations
(Journal of the U.S. Department of State, 2002)

“Think tanks are independent institutions organised to conduct research and produce independent, policy relevant knowledge. They fill a critical void between the academic world, on the one hand, and the realm of government, on the other. Within government, meanwhile, officials immersed in the concrete demands of day-to-day policy-making are often too busy to take a step back and reconsider the broader trajectory [of the country’s policy]. Think tanks’ primary contribution, therefore, is to help bridge this gap between the worlds of ideas and action” (Haass, 2002, 5). It is not surprising that the advice of the “guru” of economic policy, Jeffrey David Sachs, stopped the dramatic Bolivian 1985-hyperinflation in a couple of weeks.

If that is the case, what Think tanks really are? Although the name Think tank was used since the 1950s, a term “borrowed from World War II military jargon for a secure room where plans and strategies could be discussed” (Smith J., 1993, xiii), their origin dates back to the 19th century or perhaps earlier. Mendizabal (2009a), in his study for ODI and International Idea, asserts that the precursors of modern Think tanks are the academic societies of the late 1700s. Due to the kind of activity they do, it is not sure when they really appeared in the political scenario because they have not performed an overtly function, however, one thing is certain, they have grown in number after the Second World War. Moreover, the impact of globalisation on the Think tank movement increased

enormously their number as well. The role and activity of Think tanks is fully detailed in Mendizabal’s “Thinking Politics: Think tanks and Political Parties in Latin America” (2009b), and also in the Journal of the U.S. Department of State, (2002).

With budgets ranging from a few hundred thousand dollars to US\$ 80 million and despite the increasing significance of think tanks and / or NGOs in politics, it is often difficult to determine the sources of their private funding. “The trans-national boom in Think tank development has been prompted by foundations, corporations and other non-state actors such as NGOs” (Stone, 2000, 2), mainly because they are established as non-profit organisations and their nongovernmental status gives Think-tankers a semblance of academic freedom (Singer, 2010).

“Generally, these organisations are private bodies legally organised as charities or non-profit organisations, however some are semi-governmental” (Stone, 2000, 3); quasi-governmental or quasi-academic. Think tanks can also play roles as service providers, activists and educators (Keith Porter, n.d.). “In some instances, Think tanks double as activist nongovernmental organizations” (Haass, 2002, 6). Although within the nation-state, they are more often described as third sector organisations emerging from civil society, most rely heavily on financial donations from private foundations, wealthy individuals, and business corporations. According to a study by University of Pennsylvania professor James McGann (2008), their salaries reach rather high levels, here are some examples: (All salary figures are from 2008).

THINK TANK/NGO	DIRECTED BY	SALARY
The Brookings Institution	Led since 2002 by Strobe Talbott	\$ 425,000
The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	Led since 1997 by Jessica Tuchman Mathews, former head of the World Resources Institute. (Environmental Think tank)	\$ 542,155
The Council on Foreign Relations	Led since 2003 by Richard Haass	\$ 664,000
The Rand Corporation	Led by James Thomson	\$ 554,727
The Heritage Foundation	Led since 1977 by Ed Feulner	\$ 947,999

Singer (2010), in his article “Factories to Call Our Own”, asserts that Think tanks have a quiet power that government either lacks or is unwilling to use. Besides, they help set policy agendas and bridge the gap between knowledge and power, according to James G. McGann (2008).

A good example of the role of the Think tanks is the U.S. government; “when President Reagan took office in 1981, he quickly gave every member of his cabinet a 1,100-page book from the Heritage Foundation, ‘Mandate for Leadership’ or Mandate for Change (Hass, 2002, 7) that provided an outline for conservative principles he wished to enact. Of its 2,000 recommendations, roughly sixty per cent came to fruition -which is why Mr Reagan’s tenure was sixty per cent successful. Just days after the 2008 election, a massive 704-page outline of a possible agenda for newly elected Barack Obama was released; the yearlong effort, which resulted in the book Change for America: A Progressive Blueprint for the 44th president, helped the Obama administration jump-start its agenda as it came to Washington in early 2009” (Singer, 2010).

For a more detailed description of the profile and the strategy of Think tanks, and also an assessment of their influence in the United States and Canada see Abelson’s “Do Think Tanks Matter?: Assessing the Impact of Public Policy Institutes” (2002a), also Abelson’s & Carberry’s “Following Suit or Falling Behind?: A Comparative Analysis of Think Tanks in Canada and the United States” (1998).

Besides filling the gap between knowledge and power, according to Singer (2010), Think tanks are a sort of recruiting network and farm team for government; thousands of *talents* arrive to work as interns in Washington. “Following his election in 1976, Jimmy Carter staffed his administration with numerous individuals from the Brookings Institution and the Council on Foreign Relations. Four years later, Ronald Reagan turned to other Think tanks to serve as his brain trust. During two terms in office, he drew on 150 individuals from Heritage, the Hoover Institution, and the American Enterprise Institute (AEI). The Bush administration (2001-2009) has followed a similar pattern in staffing the upper echelons of its foreign policy apparatus. Within the State Department, senior officials with Think tank backgrounds include the Undersecretary for Global Affairs, Paula Dobriansky, previously senior vice-president and director of the Council on Foreign

Relations' Washington office; the Undersecretary for Arms Control and International Security, John R. Bolton, formerly vice-president of AEI; the Assistant Secretary for East Asia and the Pacific, James Kelly, previously president of the Pacific Forum of CSIS (Honolulu); and the Assistant Secretary-designate for International Organization Affairs, Kim Holmes, formerly vice-president at the Heritage Foundation” (Haass, 2002, 7).

According to Singer (2010), these organisations are filled with people who either have been or want to be in government or both. More than sixty per cent of the assistant secretaries at the State Department came out of Think tanks. Now the question is if these people eventually come to be one way or another part of the government, either inside as employees; secretaries, assistants or interns, or outside as advisors, or as independent organisations whose main focus is human rights, humanitarian work or the promotion of humanitarian aid, or whatever their activities may be, whom do they answer to? What is their orientation? What principles do they defend? What interests do they care for?

It should be stated that “Think tanks are, non-profit, non-partisan (which does not mean non-ideological), research-oriented institutes among whose primary objectives is to influence public opinion and public policy” (Abelson, 2002b, 10), whose private funding comes from foundations, corporations and other non-state actors such as other NGOs and donors each obviously with their own goals in mind. In 2010, “philanthropist” and financier, George Soros, gave a challenge grant of US\$ 100 million to Human Rights Watch (Steinberg, 2010), some details about the relationship among Soros, Human Rights Watch Bolivia and Evo Morales administration will be mentioned later.

Hady Amr (quoted by Singer, 2010) says that think tanks are actually an “activist lobby entity that cooks up schemes that are secretly woven into government plans.” Now, the obvious question is: what those secretly woven plans might be? Or rather whose plans they might be? Needless to say that an employee takes care for their boss’s interests –boss should be understood, literally, as the one who pays the employee’s salary. And what if the boss does not belong to the party which is in government? What if the boss does not even belong to the country where those secretly woven plans are intended to be developed?

Since Think tanks rarely have an explicit and specifically identifiable constituency whom they represent in the eyes of the policy makers, Think tanks' often hidden role is considered as a weapon in the modern corporate political arsenal, as Dan Morgan's (2000) article reads *Think tank or Hired Gun?*; "there has always been something worrisome about the wise man who seeks to advise the king" (Smith J., 1993, xvii).

In the last twenty years the role of Think tanks has become increasingly geared toward partisanship and political activism. In the year 2001, the Cuba's permanent Representative to the U.N. (United Nations) officially complained, proof were submitted, of the politically motivated, interventionist activities an NGO carried out against his Government (U.N. Committee on NGOs, 25.05.2001). Foreign influences in several countries all over the world including South America can be found in Naomi Klein's "The Shock Doctrine" (2007), coincidentally and much more specifically, Petras (1997) describes how foreign interventionism has been carried out through Think tanks and NGOs in some South American countries.

In the early hours of 1 March 2008 Colombian forces launched Operation Phoenix, an assault on a jungle camp of the country's largest insurgent group, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). The operation killed one of the group's leading members - Luis Edgar Devía Silva, better known as 'Raúl Reyes' – and discovered recorded material (records of e-mails and other documents) apparently belonged to Luis Edgar Devía Silva (aka, "Raúl Reyes"), head of FARC's International Committee (COMINTER). The operation plunged Colombia's diplomatic relations with Venezuela and Ecuador into crisis - not only because the camp had been located almost 2 km inside the latter's territory but also because it revealed, according to the Reyes emails, the FARC has used the MCB (Bolivarian Continental Movement) and other mechanisms to set up 700 nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) across Latin America. The MCB directly funds much of its activities with drug money (Farah and Hirst, 2011).

In Chile under the Pinochet dictatorship between 1973 and 1989, the NGOs played an important role denouncing human rights violations, preparing studies critical of the neo-liberal model and sustaining soup kitchens and other poverty programs. They almost threatened to overthrow the dictatorship to the extent that they expressed an ideology; although they were oriented toward “democracy” and “development with equity.” Later on the NGOs turned from supporting the social movements to collaborating with the new government. The NGOs professionals became government ministers; “two of its chief researchers (from social movements) became government ministers” (Petras, 1997, 21). Petras also cites Brazil, El Salvador and Bolivia as good examples of NGOs / Think tanks involvement in politics.

Petras’s assertions are not far from reality, in fact, in Bolivia we have got some good examples. The late Ana María Romero (activist, writer, journalist, and former Human Rights Ombudswoman) became part of Morales’s government. In fact, Ana María Romero became president of the Senate (2010) representing the MAS. As well as that, Sacha Llorenti a former president of a well-known NGO “APDHB – *Asamblea Permanente de Derechos Humanos de Bolivia*” (Permanent Assembly for Human Rights in Bolivia), a civilian, non-partisan, non-confessional and democratic platform for individuals and organizations dedicated to the advancement of human rights, which is closely related to Human Rights Foundation, Human Rights Watch among other NGOs –Llorenti admitted having held meetings with them; after being an activist of human rights, Sacha Llorenti became minister of the MAS government just as it happened with some Think tanks, NGO members and activists in different countries such as Chile.

Since APDHB has had connections with Human Rights Foundation, Human Rights Watch among other institutions, it may be interesting to point out that George Soros, who gave a challenge grant of US\$ 100 million to Human Rights Watch, by means of his NGOs, may have been involved in some ‘uprisings’ around the world similar to the ones that took place in Bolivia in the early 2000s (Trifkovic, 2004). APDHB is closely linked to Human Rights Foundation and Human Rights Watch, NGO’s closely related to Soros, among others. By means of his NGOs, Soros might have been involved in the 1992 “Black Wednesday” when the English pound fell by 12 per cent and the English economy was

badly hit, and of course, Soros earned US\$ 1 billion in one day. In the same year, he may have also been involved in the serious devaluation of the Italian lira, and he might have also “lent a hand in bankrupting Argentina.” As well as that, Soros got involved with Gorbachev (former U.S.S.R. president), the Perestroika (restructuring), and the dissolution of the Soviet Union with the social, political and economic consequences (Butler, 2002).

Soros’s peculiar moral values, political views, and ideological preferences are clearly expressed in his own words in an interview with the Swiss weekly L'hebdo in May 1993: "I speculate on discrepancy between the reality and the public image of this reality, until a correctional mechanism occurs, which approaches these two" (cited in Trifkovic, 2004, 14-17). Besides, Soros is highly concerned with interests in promoting abortion, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender rights. Moreover, the Soros Foundation's primary stated goal is to "democratise the education system" by instituting curriculum reforms, for instance, in Russia, Soros' associates exercise great control over the selection of textbooks for Russian schools. According to a press release by the Gaidar Youth Library, financial support from the Open Society Institute provided it with computers, videocassettes, and CD's, all of which made "special training" for the children of "underprivileged people."

Moreover, Glogoczowski (2011) suggests that Soros may be linked to “*Gazeta Wyborcza*”, journal that in 1989 paved the way for the *Solidarity* (popular political party) electoral victory in Poland, the TV station “Markiza”, which, in 1998 helped to remove the Meciar’s government (Slovakia), the famous “Radio B-92” which played a substantial role in anti-Milosevic’s student riots in 1996/7 (Belgrade). Finally, "racism" is Soros's regular obsession, although he admitted dealing in such business and he is proud of having won US\$ 1 billion in one day, it is very difficult to find evidence of his activities and his connections with NGOs around the world, even his offshore Quantum Fund is legally headquartered in Curacao, beyond any kind of supervision (Trifkovic, 2004).

In spite of the endless debate about which organizations are the *true* Think tanks and which are not, or which are NGOs, since they are usually categorised as non-state actors, “they can claim to have created an immense amount of change that has reshaped the U.S. and the world” (Singer, 2010).

1.3.9. The Advocacy Work of NGOs

Now that we are dealing with power, persuasion and politics, since Think tanks/NGOs have got the capacity to influence politics and/or politicians, could they also influence people, that is, ‘common’ citizens, people who are not usually involved into what politics is? How could they reach them? If that is the case, to what extent they can influence or persuade them? And how can they get in contact with the people? If they want to persuade or create some sort of attitude among people, it is necessary to be in constant contact with them; then, what kind of activity do NGOs perform in order to have *access* to the people?

Many NGO’s or NGDOs (non-government development organisations) as they are known in Spain, have been listed and categorised under certain labels: African Association of Political Science (AAPS), Americas Development Foundation (ADF), American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), Association for Nonviolence, Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, Centre for International Cooperation, Centre for International Strategy, Technology, and Policy (CISTP), and many more which are spread all over the world (International Guide, December 1996).

It must be pointed out that, because of their essence as non-governmental organisation, their definition is not an easy task, in fact “it is even more complex, trying to capture differences from grassroots organizations (GROs), grassroots support organizations (GRSOs), GRO networks and GRSO networks” (Fisher J., 1998, 4) or which are ‘just’ NGOs. Even “their description as voluntary organisations, associational organisations, community based organisations, civil society organisations or charitable organisations are all in use to largely refer to the same actors” (Tvedt, 1998, 12).

In spite of the role of helping civil society in different areas, NGOs are “nominally private, non-profit agencies that act as intermediaries between international financial donors and local residents and whose function is to implement projects favouring the so-called popular sectors” (Boulding, 2007, 10). It is not defined what kind of orientation they respond to, whether political, social or any other. Besides, there is not a clear cut about what NGOs should be doing over what they actually are doing. Dechalert in a 1999 paper,

based on McCarthy and Zald theories (1987), argues that NGOs, when economic and / or social tensions reach a crisis point, become one way or another involved in the protest movement, “there are three possible ways to classify them: as the supporter, as the partner, or as the main actor” (Dechalert, 1999, 22).

NGOs work at local, provincial and regional levels; although most of them with specific purposes, such as to work on rural development (indigenous NGOs) or to pursue issues relating to the environment, health, human rights, etc. According to Covey (1995) NGOs are the ones who organise the protest on behalf of the poor. The involvement of NGOs in cattle-raising groups, community forest campaigns, revolving loan fund groups, alternative agriculture advocates, rural development, campaigning for the rights of people with HIV/AIDS, does not seem to be all they do, or at least they do something more than what they say.

In Thailand, according to Dechalert (1999), during the period of crisis, NGOs, besides helping the civil society, created and spread the need to search for a strategy of social change and emphasised the importance of building a ‘civil society.’ Gradually large masses of individuals began to develop the idea that, under the existing social order, “they were only ‘in’ but not really ‘of’ the society” (Heberle, 1995, 58), that “they, as victims, had become poorer while the rich had become richer. They were forced into a corner. They are the losers while the rich are always the winners” (Dechalert, 1999, 15). They had been treated unjustly and did not have a full stake in their society, thus, they found no alternative but to fight for their rights and their families’; protests, marches, riots, and rallies were the result of the growth of popular discontent alongside the increasing feeling of resentment amongst the poor.

This study in Thailand has been chosen because of the similarities that can be found with what happened in Bolivia in the early 2000s; not only the violence of the events but also the discourse coming from the social movements. For a more detailed description of how these institutions / organisations (NGOs) work and operate, see Salamon’s & Helmut’s “The Emerging Non-profit Sector: An Overview” (1996). A bit more on where the money that supports those NGOs comes from and where it goes can be found in Smith Brian’s “More Than Altruism: The Politics of Private Foreign Aid” (1990).

Since the number of NGOs has increased enormously in the last decades, their help, activities, influence, or whatever it can be called has increased as well, not only in Europe and Asia but also in South America, and Bolivia is no exception. According to official information in Bolivia there are many NGOs working in different areas of the civil society:

Diakonia	Swedish organisation that lends Money with low interest rates
C.E.B.I.A.E	NGO focused on research and education
CENPROTAC	NGO concerned on the promotion of art and culture
CETHA “EMBOROZU”	NGO concerned on technical education and agricultural production
COMAI PACHAMAMA	NGO addressed to help women from rural areas from all Bolivia
SOS	Children's Villages that provide shelter and education to homeless and orphan children
CARE Bolivia	NGO that helps the poorest people and families from Bolivia
Fe y Alegría	NGO mainly addressed to help in the area of education

(These and many others are officially registered in the *Ministerio de Educación y Culturas, Bolivia*).

During and after the 1980’s Bolivian crisis, lots of NGOs were created; most of them were directed toward addressing social problems. The aid provided by The World Bank, European, and U.S. governments was directed to the *Fondo Social de Emergencia* (Emergency Social Fund), which channelled funds to NGOs to implement its program. “The funds [NGOs had to handle] were not insignificant: in 1990 foreign aid totalled \$ 738 million” (Petras, 1997, 19).

Although there is not much literature about NGOs and their real activities in Bolivia, there are some studies made by Gill, Boulding and others concerning and revealing the activities of some NGOs in Bolivia. In her book “Teetering on the Rim”, Gill (2000) focuses her analysis from an ethnographic point of view, she describes "the complexity of

local experience and the ways in which pain, loss, and desperation shape daily life" (Gill, 2000, 185) in El Alto (La Paz adjoining neighbour). She sees that city both a site of "struggle" and a form of domination shaping "social relationships of inequality" (Ibid: 2000; 20), where collective mobilisation against unjust capitalist practices seems, in her words, extremely difficult (Ibid, 200, 183). Gill's position basically is a critique of neo-liberalism as an on-going process of social dislocations and cultural conflicts which reflects her choices for the description of the problem, critique that resembles Naomi Klein's "The Shock Doctrine" (2007). Gill (2000) devotes chapters seven and eight of her book to the description of the role of NGOs in Bolivia, especially in El Alto.

Conversely, Boulding (2007) goes much further. She tries to explain the political effect of NGOs in developing democracies. She argues that NGOs have systematic effects on politics: participation and voting behaviour. She also shows relationships among NGOs, voter turnout and political protest. Besides, she claims that NGOs help incumbents by providing services; paradoxically they also hurt incumbents by facilitating opposition, depending on the size of the jurisdiction. In spite of the validity or not of her hypothesis, what is clear is that NGOs do play a political role.

What some NGOs really do in Bolivia? Diakonia, one of the largest of the Swedish frame organisations, besides lending money with low interest rates has been working with *Centro de Promoción de la Mujer 'Gregoria Apaza'* (CPMGA) – a well-established NGO- which owns a radio station "*Pachamama*" (805 AM and 106.9 FM), radio station that during the 2003 Bolivian political crisis (The Gas war) "was instrumental in organising the protests by broadcasting plans to coordinate the days, marches and demonstrations" (Boulding, 2007, 2).

Two Bolivian democratic presidents were overthrown by the commonly called "social movements." Therefore, the series of events can be seen as evidence of the potentially de-stabilising effects of NGOs through civil society. In spite of the conventional conception that NGOs in the developing world tend to boost participation of all kinds, "most NGOs are engaged in activities that build social capital, particularly for underserved or previously excluded groups of citizens" (Boulding, 2007, 6).

Besides, Boulding's findings proved something else; NGOs are likely to encourage unconventional means of participation such as demonstrations and protests in addition to more conventional forms such as voting. Boulding "presents a picture of NGOs as highly political entities" (Boulding, 2007, 14); they have systematic and substantial effects on the local political systems in which they operate. "More interestingly, the effects that they have -whether they tend to encourage participation through voting or street protests, whether they tend to be a force for change, or a force for the *status quo*- depend critically on the context in which they are working, the activities they are involved in, and the nature of the communities they are targeting" (Boulding, 2007, 14).

According to Boulding (2007), there are two conditions which allow NGOs to become involved and facilitate protest; first the NGOs projects focus on community development, capacity building, or participatory governance programs, and second when they provide a significant influx of previously unavailable resources. As an outcome of her study she sees NGOs not as neutral service providers, but as part of the political landscape, affecting change through both intentional and unintentional mechanisms and popular protest.

Much more specifically, Clarke (1998) in chapter three of his book concludes that NGOs can even bring down authoritarian regimes; besides, "they also offer a base for civil resistance to oppressive political systems" (Boulding, 2007, 21). Therefore, it can rightfully be said that they may even bring down any government. What happened in Bolivia in the early 2000s is the best example; two democratic presidents were overthrown by the commonly called "social movements," activities that might well have been prepared and fostered by NGOs.

Moreover, there is also evidence about the involvement of Think tanks and/or NGOs in politics; for example Flavio Clavijo -former mayor of El Alto- "viewed NGOs as a power base for his political rivals, particularly those in the *Movimiento Bolivia Libre*, political party which was long criticised because of its links with NGOs and their funding. He believed NGOs directors in El Alto also used foreign aid for personal enrichment (Gill, 2000, 153). Besides political differences and opinions, or the level of influence according to the size of the area NGOs are working in, referring to a municipality or a circumscription,

or the weak or strong results in boosting voter turnout (one of Boulding's hypothesis), "NGOs have several surprising and systematic political effects in Bolivia" (Boulding, 2007, 170). By all accounts, "NGOs (non-governmental organisations) played a key role in mobilising people for these protests [the water war and the gas war], both directly and indirectly" (Ibid, 2007, 2).

On the whole NGOs besides providing small business training, supporting women's or indigenous rights, providing health care, education, or building houses, they are involved and in constant interaction with the civil society they are working with, fact that gives them the necessary time and contact to generate some sort of influence. Moreover, after the water war in Cochabamba, the main spokesperson of that big social movement, Oscar Olivera was awarded a US\$ 125,000 prize for "**environmental action**" by The Goldman Institute 2001, an international NGO (The Goldman Institute 2001: The Goldman Environmental Prize) –see local press and most news agencies also. As it has been written above, about Think Tanks, NGOs as non-governmental organisations, they ought to have certain orientation or ideology. Besides, they ought to respond to someone, the donor? Therefore, whose interests they respond to can be summarised in Brown et al's "Who Gives, Who Receives, and Who Wins" (2008).

1.4 Uprisings Around the World

In a country well governed, poverty is something to be ashamed of.

In a country badly governed, wealth is something to be ashamed of.

-Kǒng Qiū, (Confucius)-

The protests, violence and social unrest (the Gas war and the Water war) that have been commented in a previous section, unfortunately are not isolated events. Among the most common means of violence we have war and revolution. Since wars are usually caused by differences among countries, revolutions, on the other hand, are caused by oppression, mistreatment, slavery, etc. which usually take place within a country.

Along history all over the world, in almost every society, there have always been differences between northerners and southerners, the highlanders vs. the lowlanders, the "people" vs. the elite, the rich vs. the poor, and so forth. The latter has been a common

factor in the early history of most countries and the world itself. For instance, according to The Bible the Israelites had been oppressed by the Egyptians until a leader, Moses, was chosen by the Lord. Moses, following the Lord's plan, freed his people (Exodus 1-40, The Holy Bible).

As well as that, by 74 B.C. slavery in Rome was at its highest level. In 73 B.C. after being sold as a slave, Spartacus, and two Gallic gladiators led a riot. Starting with only seventy-four men, Spartacus built an army of 60,000 soldiers and controlled the southern Italian territory. He defeated nine Roman armies and kept Rome at bay for two years before he was defeated. After his final battle, 6,000 of his followers were captured and crucified along Rome's main southern highway (Strauss, 2009). In late medieval Europe, Africa and all over the world we can find examples of oppression, slavery and unfair governmental attitudes which resulted in the uprising of people.

There has been a plethora of revolts around the world, as Cohn (2008) details, “*the people without underpants* who brought down the government of Bologna in 1289; a successful *tax revolt of weavers*, fullers, and other artisans in Tournai in 1307; a revolt claimed to have involved 40,000 serfs (certainly exaggerated) from over twenty-two named villages around 1338, who refused their duties to the dean and canons of Notre-Dame of Laon, resulting in nine men being executed and many women branded on their cheeks; a *Jacquerie* that slaughtered noblemen, ladies, and their servants in the region of Toulouse 1364 and went unpunished despite the crown's efforts; a riot in Viterbo in 1367, sparked by the washing of the Cardinal's pretty little dog (cagnolino) in a Communal drinking fountain, which ended in a bloodbath of foreign dignitaries; the wave of antipapal revolts in 1375 and 1376 that swept from Milan to Naples, replacing seigniorial regimes with guild-based popular governments; the Roman crowds' riot that pressured the College of Cardinals into electing an Italian Pope in April 1378; a vineyard labourer who gave political speeches over a five- or six- year stretch, criticising the town council's works and administration and rousing his fellow workers and artisans (petit people) in Châlons-en-Champagne to attempt the overthrow of government and embark on reforms in the second decade of the fifteenth century” (Cohn, 2008, 1-2). Most countries in their time had to go through such stages, the Taiping Rebellion –China (1850-1864), for instance, accounted 20,000,000 casualties, the

circumstances and the time vary, however, most of them took place during their beginnings as republics. Below follows a review of some of those uprisings.

1.4.1 The Great Revolt of 1381

“In 14th Century England life sucked for all but a very few people. You worked hard and were paid little if you were freeborn and nothing if you were not. You had no rights at all. Anything you grew or built or invented belonged either to the king or the pope. Malnutrition was a way of life, and if you were caught hunting on land that belonged to an aristocrat you could be beaten or executed. The penalty for criticising the church was that your lower lip would be cut off. And if you did it again, you had another lip, didn't you?” (Johnson, 1999), “and for the third offence the offender's tongue would be cut out” (Robinson, 1989, 5).

By the 1300s when the Black Death hit Europe and England, the population of England had gone from 4M to 2.5M. The fact is that “the plague came to England on ships landing at ports in Dorset and spread from there; within two years, it had killed off an estimated thirty-five to forty per cent of the population of Europe and Britain” (Robinson, 1989, 3). Therefore, such mortality raised the price of labour on detriment of the landowners' profits. In addition, the country had been involved in the “insensate desire of the nation to persevere in the struggle [the war against France] when all the conditions under which it was waged had ceased to be favourable” (Oman, 2001, 7). The war was a series of separate conflicts between the Kingdom of England and the Kingdom of France and their allies which lasted from 1337 to 1453, well known as *The Hundred Years' War* (Curry, 2002).

Consequently, the social and economic conditions of the country affected the Englishmen. Both the rural and the urban community were discontented. On the one hand, in order to help the landowners the Parliament passed the ‘Statute of Labourers’ of 1351 which, among other things fixed wages at pre-plague levels; “branding with hot irons and outlawry were among the supplementary sanctions which they added to the original terrors of the law of 1351” (Oman, 2001, 8). Whether such punishments were often put in practice

or not “their very existence was enough to madden the peasants” (Ibid, 2001, 11) who on the other hand felt that they had no rights.

“What is clear is that the early years of Richard II’s reign were ones of acute political malaise, [...] during the ten years before 1381 England experienced almost all the evils that could befall a polity ruled by a system of hereditary monarchy” (Dobson, 1970, 20). Besides, about two decades before, there had been some precedents, for instance, in convulsed France, French peasants rose in a revolt known as the *Jacquerie* (Spielvogel, 2012, 348) and the “little-known peasant movement involving at least forty villages in Wiltshire, Hampshire, Surrey, Sussex, and Devon. It seems to have come to a head and died away four years before the great revolt of 1381” (Faith, 1987, 43), event that took place in the very same England.

When the English situation was growing worse and worse because of the above mentioned events, “various ministers had been appearing before Parliament at short intervals to report again and again the loss of some new patch of England’s dwindling dominion beyond the seas, to confess that they could not even keep the South Coast safe from piratical descents of French corsairs, or guarantee the Northumbrian border from the raiding Scot, or even maintain law and order in the inward heart of the realm” (Oman, 2001, 7). Therefore, in order to carry on the French war at all costs they were forced to ask for heavier and yet heavier taxation.

“The exceptionally old king, Edward III, had been succeeded by his young grandson, Richard II, aged ten: [who was not] physically capable of relieving the tension created by faction within the higher nobility and disillusion among the county knights and provincial burgesses” (Dobson, 1970, 20). John of Gaunt, who unofficially was at the head of the kingdom because the king was still too young, imposed a new tax, the Poll (head) Tax, which was to cover the cost of the war. “The first attempt to collect the poll tax does not seem to have met with an organised local resistance, [however], the king’s council, conscious of massive tax evasion, inaugurated a series of complicate attempts to compel full payment of the levy” (Ibid, 1970, 22).

Suddenly, discontent spread all over the country, some people who did not pay the new tax were to be mulcted, and then the rural labourers of England rose in insurrection and marched on London. An explosion of popular wrath occurred on a scale. The Poll-tax itself was too heavy for the poorest classes made of journeymen and apprentices, there was also a lower and more miserable stratum of unskilled labour, always living on the verge of starvation, whose situation could not have been worse.

The outbreak started in Kent and Essex and headed to London, their target were local jurors, chiefs of justice, burgesses, unpopular landlords, lawyers, unjust judges, foreigners, etc. Some were slain, some were beat to death, some were stoned to death, and some were dragged into the street and beheaded. On their way, the angry mob broke open some prisons and let loose the captives, the rioters also sacked houses and castles –houses of several ‘suspects’ were also broken open and sacked. Whenever they found books and legal documents they were taken into the streets and burnt in bonfires.

Some years before the uprising however, “a group of disgruntled priests of the lower clergy had travelled the towns preaching against the riches and corruption of the church” (Robinson, 1989, xii). Among them was John Wycliffe, who, besides preaching church reform, started the translation of the Vulgate Bible into English for the people to access. Wycliffe also argued that there was no scriptural mention of a Pope (Ibid, 1989, 14), perhaps with the intention of questioning the Pope’s authority. Moreover, John Ball, whom the French chronicler Jean Froissart called the ‘mad priest of Kent,’ preached against class and privilege, and also demanded agrarian reform.

“Since 1360 Ball and the others disgruntled priests had roamed central and southeastern England; preaching doctrines of equality of rights and the redistribution or common ownership of property. Ball was arrested by church authorities a number of times, and finally he was excommunicated” (Ibid, 1989, 15); that is why he was in prison at the time of the revolt. As they marched to London several leaders appeared: John Hales, Alan Threder, William Hawke, John Ferrour, Jack Straw, and John Ball, who had to be released from prison. Ball was an itinerant preacher and a well-known agitator along with Wycliffe and others who joined the *great* leader and spokesperson of the mob, Wat Tyler; it is no

surprise that the revolt is also called *Wat Tyler's Rebellion* (Oman, 2001). Although much has been said about the role Tyler played during the uprising, little is known about himself.

Historians from that time tried to explain the rebellion as the work of Satan, or the result of an outbreak of sheer insanity on the part of the labouring classes; “a storm that arose out of a mere nothing, an ignorant riot against a harsh and unpopular tax, such as had not often been seen before. But this storm assumed vast dimensions, spread over the whole horizon, swept down on the countryside with the violence of a typhoon, threatened universal destruction, and then suddenly passed away almost as inexplicably as it had arisen” (Ibid, 2001, 6).

Of course, the revolt ended after some meetings and agreements between King Richard II and Wat Tyler, -“the boy-King” granted almost anything the insurgents demanded. Thirty clerks drew up the charters, after the first meeting. However, the mob seeking for vengeance, they wanted the head of the ministers whom they regarded as traitors, killed some ministers and the Archbishop Sudbury. “The heads of all the four victims were mounted on pikes and borne round the city and they were then set over the gate of London Bridge” (Ibid, 2001, 48). During the final meeting Tyler might have tried to stab the Mayor of London, William Walworth, with a dagger. Some say he just drew a dagger; the fact is that because of the threat, “the Mayor drew his cutlass, and struck back. After that, one of the King's household drew his sword, and ran Watt two or three times through the body, mortally wounding him” (Oman, 2001, 200-203). Later on, most of the rioters were chased, some were imprisoned, and some were beheaded without being granted a jury or a formal trial. Perhaps that is the reason why Alastair Dunn (2004) calls it a failed revolution.

1.4.2 The Indian Mutiny Of 1857

By 1857 India was a Great Britain's colony, when the Indian soldiers mutinied, most Hindus, who were badly treated by the British, joined the mutiny. The official version of the origin of the mutiny is that the cartridges served out to the troops had been greased with cow and pig lard that Sepoys, Indian soldiers serving under British East India Company, in biting or handling the cartridges before putting them into their rifles, incurred in a pollution,

thus, causing offence to Hindu and Muslim soldiers respectively; cows are sacred to Hindus and pigs are anathema to Muslims.

Although the root cause of the revolt seems to be the 'greased cartridges', "there are several other explanations and they are so various and wide-ranging, involving religious, social, economic, and military oppressions" (Gilliat, 1914, 25). Since the early 1800s The East India Company had to deal with *dacoity*, or banditry of which the so-called thugs emerged (of Indian origin, *thagi* meaning 'to deceive'). The banditry was paralleled by another and more serious law and order problem, the *Pindaris*, bandits who raided whole villages on horseback; they were mostly unemployed mercenary cavalymen who had served in the armies before being disbanded. In fact, there was a widespread of peasant rebellions since the early years of British rule in India.

Banerjee (1980) details a series of uprisings which took place in India during the British colony. The *Sannyasi* rebellion - the hungry peasants of Bengal and Bihar, victims of a terrible famine (1770), rose in revolt against the East India Company. The rebellion continued till the beginning of the 19th century. The *chieftans'* uprising of peasant rebels spread all over South India in 1800, it lasted almost two years; the challenging for the British was so serious that they had to bring soldiers from different areas, even from England to stop the rebellion. Ho tribal peasants of *Chhotanagpur* in Bihar, in 1820, rebelled against the *zamindars* and the Rajah of *Porahat* who with the help of the British ruthlessly crushed the Ho uprising, however, the area remained a centre of turbulent uprisings throughout the 19th century. The *Oraons*, a tribal community, rebelled in 1820, 1832, 1890. The Wahabi uprising in Bengal under the leadership of the famous Titu Meer took place in 1831. One of the most notable uprisings, considered a source for future agrarian struggles was the Santhal uprising in 1855. Bengali and other traders and merchants convinced the Indian peasants to buy goods on credit that later on they had to pay back with interests that increased year by year, eventually peasants were compelled to give up everything and many were reduced to bond-slave. About 10,000 rebels perished in the unequal fight between peasants armed with bows and arrows on the one side and soldiers equipped with firearms, on the other.

Moreover, the Indian empire had to face internal struggles for power. As a monarchy there was a system of succession based on ancient dynastic traditions. Since Kings usually had several wives, they had several heirs, as well. Therefore, the several princes had their expectations to the throne. Sometimes the King intrigued “to set aside the succession of the heir-apparent in behalf of the favourite son” (Kaye & Malleon, 1892, 7). The struggle for power and the unjust supersession led to extremes, for instance, “on the 10 July, 1856, Prince Fakir-ud-dín [one who was expecting the succession] suddenly died; it was more than suspected that he had been poisoned” (Ibid, 1892, 20).

By 1857, The East India Company, in charge of the territory, created the impression that the early nineteenth century was a period of slow but progressive improvement for India, but the truth was far from this. In fact, the early nineteenth century was a period of profound economic depression which was tried to be compensated with an increase of land taxes. According to Bates (2007) European systems of courts were established, systems that were quite unfamiliar to Indian natives whose rights to the land were frequently denied and they were expelled from large areas of forest that were taken over by the government. Even relatively prosperous landowners in Central India were against tax increases and oppressive court proceedings which had deprived some of them from land.

On the other hand, Zachariah (2007) asserts that the British tried to foster solidarity between Hindus and Muslims by putting them in the same regiments, thereby trying to create unity between two antagonistic races. They also changed the recruitment system by bringing recruits from a wide cross section of the population –being in the army gave the Hindus a higher rank of power. Brahmins’ and Rajputs’ villagers in this region were accustomed to the income derived from sending recruits to the army. Although their incomes were only seven rupees a month (less than fourteen shillings), the money saved gave them a feeling of some importance; “for, as a rule, the two things which the natives of India value most are money and power” (Gilliat, 1914, 22).

After the allowances were removed, soldiers used to receive the extra money for fighting beyond their frontiers, and the refusal of the *Sepoys* to use the greased cartridges, “men were publicly degraded, their badges and medals, records of long and faithful service in the past, were torn off, their uniforms stripped from them, and heavy irons were riveted

on to their limbs” (SurrIDGE, 1909, 254). Corporal punishment was practised amongst the native army, a degrading punishment sometimes considered absolutely and imperatively necessary by the British. Therefore, “their comrades' unhappy fate had fired the *Sepoys'* blood; they thirsted for immediate vengeance” (Ibid, 1909, 255).

Perhaps due to their traditions Hindus were despised by the British—followers of Goddess Kali used to sacrifice a male child every Friday evening (Haight, 1990). Besides, according to Kuah (2003) Indians were considered barbarians, perhaps because of the human sacrifices they practiced -even in 2000s there were news about human sacrifices in India (Dhariwal, 2006; Miller, 2013). Moreover, the *thagi* or *thuggee*, “gangs acting in the name of the Goddess Kali, ritually murdered by strangulation unsuspecting travellers on the roads, there was the female infanticide, and also the sati, in which the Hindu widow committed suicide by throwing herself into the flames of her husband’s funeral pyre “as an act of marital fidelity” (Fremont-Barnes, 2007, 16).

As it has been mentioned in the previous paragraph, the crimes that have been committed by Hindus within India were so monstrous and the number of victims so enormous that, according to Dash (2006) they assumed the stature of bogeyman. In spite of the fact that their motives may have been distorted and far greater stress was placed on their religion, and their devotion to Kali, the Hindu goddess of destruction, it was more than enough reason for the British to consider the Indians barbarians. A more detailed description of such Hindu crimes can be found in Dash’s *Thug: The True Story Of India's Murderous Cult* (2006).

Moreover, Zachariah (2007) says that, besides being called barbarians, Indians were considered vagabonds and ill-conditioned men, wine drinkers and men who spent their time in debauchery and dissipation, men floating without profession or occupation on the surface of society. Consequently, it is obvious to think there was a widespread feeling of resentment among the Indian people by the 19th century India. The greased cartridges just triggered all that had been kept inside Indian people.

When the rebellion started, “mutineers poured into the European settlement and slaughtered any Europeans or Indian Christians; whole families, men, women, children and

servants, were killed on sight” (GBE – INDIA 2005 Briefing Book, 7). Most of the Europeans living in Delhi were murdered (also cited in Kuah. 2003). In Cawnpore, “the three hundred and fifty men of the garrison were murdered near the Ganges River, and the one hundred twenty-five women and children were imprisoned in the city. A little more than a week later, the women and children were also killed; their bodies were thrown into a well. The architect of the ‘Cawnpore Massacre,’ as it came to be known, was the Nana Sahib” (Streets, 2001, 90).

“That night pandemonium reigned. It seemed as if all the devils in hell had broken loose in Meerut. The miserable white residents were dragged from their hiding-places, chased and chivvied along the streets, and barbarously mutilated and slain. Neither age nor sex was spared” (SurrIDGE, 1909, 256). “Little infants were torn in pieces, other children were stabbed and thrown into the river and schoolgirls were burnt to death” (Ibid, 1909, 265). Perhaps, that is the reason why the blind old King of Delhi, when he was asked about the events, remarked, "I don't know; I suppose my people gave themselves up to the devil" (Ibid, 1909, 248).

The British and the East India Company restored their rule in India after a nine-month bloody campaign. As retaliation, the Emperor's three sons, Mizra Moghul, Mizra Khizr Sultan and Mizra Abu Bakr along with the mutineers were executed. According to Kuah (2003), there was a mass hanging of civilians; whole villages were hanged for some real or imagined sympathy for the mutineers. Convicted mutineers were lashed to the muzzles of cannons and had a round shot fired through their body, Indians called this punishment *the devil's wind*. The fight against the British colonisation in Asia, the unfair treatment from the British and the struggle of the natives was expressed by Salgari's “Sandokan: The Tiger of Malaysia” or the Tiger of Mompracem [1883] (2005). Although legend and fantasy might have been combined according to some critics, on his side Gerlich (1998) among others, however, asserts that there is evidence that reality lies behind (at least) some of the events that surrounded the conflict between natives and the British settlers; how the natives unequally fought the unjust British rule. And there remains the legend of a native hero, Sandokan, who lost his home, family and position due to the intrusion of the British, and fought them as a pirate.

1.4.3 The Russian Revolution

By the summer of 1891 South-east Russia had to face a starvation era. There were no crops because of the severe winter, besides the long dry summer –a hundred days without rain-, wells and ponds dried up, and cattle died by the roadsides. The famine area spread from the Ural Mountains to Ukraine. The peasants who remained in their huts lived on “hunger bread,” some fled wherever they could. Besides, cholera and typhus struck, killing half a million people by the end of 1892 (Figes, 2014, 7).

Unfortunately the government did not do much about it. On the contrary, in order to force the peasants to sell the little grain produced, the government increased taxes on consumer goods, in order to fulfil their foreign contracts for exporting grain under the slogan “we may not eat enough, but we will export” (Figes, 2014, 8).

Perhaps those antecedents might have led to think that the Russian Revolution was a workers and peasants revolution who rose up against the Tsar. However, the October Revolution –Russian revolution- might not have been what it seemed. Through time and even in the Russian or Soviet school system it has been described as the worst or bloodiest revolution in their history where peasants and workers rose up and deposed the Tsar. Researchers have endlessly insisted that the October revolution was a worker’s revolt (Malia, 1997)¹. Reed and the very same Trotsky claim that it was a popular revolt, the latter wrote (1932): “In a society that is seized by revolution, classes are in conflict” (Trotsky, 1932, 20), therefore, “the point is that society does not change its institutions as need arises, the way a mechanic changes his instruments. On the contrary, society actually takes the institutions which hang upon it as given once for all” (Trotsky, 1932, 20).

The revolution, where people rose in arms against their Tsar, has been described and explained from different perspectives. Kochan, Reed, Malia and others agree that Bloody Sunday (1905), was the beginning of the end of the Tsarist autocracy regime and the regime finally collapsed during the October Revolution. The bloody event was the massacre which took place when workers marched to the Winter Palace to make the Tsar a petition and

¹Martin Malia, co-author of “Le livre noir du communisme,” wrote the foreword to the English edition of the book under the title “The Black Book of Communism.”

were shot down by the Imperial Guard (Wade, 2000, 13). Although the number of casualties varies, this event remains in history as *the Bloody Sunday* which, according to Kochan (1967), signalled the start of the 1905 Russian revolution and ended up in the 1917 revolution.

Throughout his book, Kowalski (1997) describes the revolution as the greatest event in human history, where the Tsarist monarchy was overthrown by the workers who took full control of power. Around the Bolsheviks or Bolsheviki or Bolshevists (faction within the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party), who in their time made radical and ideological changes to their social and political system.

The nineteenth century Russia has to be explained through the crisis they lived, there were poor working conditions and there were divisions within the government itself. And the social and political crisis might have been accentuated by two important events: a) after the death of Tsar Alexander III, Nicholai II, an ill-prepared Tsar, assumed power (1894) as emperor and Tsar of all the Russias, when the situation demanded a vigorous leadership to steer Russia through turbulent times (Wade, 2000, 1-2), and b) the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party splits into two factions (1903): Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, minority and majority, respectively (Swain, 2014, xviii).

In order to stop the revolution that had started in 1905 after *Bloody Sunday*, Tsar Nicholai II issued the October Manifesto; promising civil liberties and an elected parliament, Duma, a parliament which soon produced an anti-government majority. The social unrest declined temporarily due to their involvement in the First World War which is considered the aftermath of the Revolution (Fitzpatrick, 2008, 32); however, the negative results of the war increased the social unrest and the internal divisions, aggravated by the plots against the imperial family (Pipes, 1991, 269).

The struggle for power within the ruling class was evident. By 1916, Tsar Nicholai II and his wife Tsarina Alexandra depended on Grigori Yefimovich Rasputin (Monk Rasputin) because he was the only one who seemed to heal their son, Prince Alexei, who suffered from haemophilia. Moreover, they also depended on Rasputin in state matters. Although Rasputin was depicted as such, he was not mad, or monk, or saint. However, he

apparently had psychic powers, and healing abilities. He also seemed to know he was going to be killed (Moynahan, 1999, 275). Either way, Russian nobles killed Rasputin out of fear of the considerable power and influence he had in political affairs. Almost two months later the February Revolution started (Volkogonov, 1994, xx).

By 1917, the disastrous campaign in World War I had left Russia in an even more critical situation; there were constant demonstrations against the war and demanding better working conditions, workers in Petrograd (St. Petersburg) and Moscow were striking and rioting for higher food rations. The social and political situation was so critical that the Tsar ineffectually sought to put down the workers by force and dissolve the Duma.

On the 23 February, the women's festival day turned into a protest, exasperated women workers went into the streets to protest against food shortage (Read Christopher, 1996, 23), men joined them and political and social activists encouraged the crowd so that in a couple of days there was a general strike. When the police and military were ordered to intervene, some mutinied or joined the demonstrators. There were lootings and riots all over the city, fights broke out and the whole city of St. Petersburg was in chaos. So great was the social unrest that the Tsar was forced to abdicate his throne when he was away from the capital visiting troops on the World War I front. The following day his brother refused to accept the throne. A little later, the royal family were taken to Ekaterinburg imprisoned by the revolutionaries (on 17 July, 1918 when the Bolsheviks were in power, they were all shot to death).

For a much more detailed description of the conspiracy that led to the brutal murder of the Russian Imperial family, see Rappaport's "The Last Days of the Romanovs: Tragedy at Ekaterinburg" (2009), or a full narration of the previous days of their death starting on how the royal family were led into a basement room where they were shot and then bayoneted to death; from the official records of eye witnesses Wilton and Telberg; former Minister of Justice of the Russian Government at OMSK and Special Russian Correspondent for The Times, London, respectively, see "The Last Days of the Romanovs" (1920).

After Nicholas II abdication, the Duma appointed a provisional government headed by Prince Lvov and included Milyukov and Kerensky. Lvov, likewise, under too much pressure and unable to handle the critical situation had to resign in favour of his Minister of Justice, Alexander Kerensky. Since the war campaign against Germany was getting worse, Kornilov, Supreme Commander of the Russian Army, demanded the resignation of the Cabinet and the surrender of all military and civil authority to the Commander in Chief. Kerensky's response was the dismissing of Kornilov from office, fact that might have made Kornilov and some other military members turn to the Bolsheviks' side, which was decisive during the "storming of the Winter Palace."

In spite of their good intentions, according to Wade (2000) the government called for general amnesty, civil liberties, and a Constituent Assembly. However, the unwillingness and inability of the precarious, provisional new Government to end the war contributed greatly to its decline in popularity. Meanwhile, the unstable social and political situation of Russia gave way to the return of Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, a.k.a. Lenin. Lenin, the several years he was in exile, had been campaigning against the Russian monarchism and then against the provisional government as well. Vladimir might have used no less than 150 pseudonyms in his writings; he also changed addresses, used false passports and false national identities. He finally became known as 'Lenin' in place of Tulin and Ilyin which he had used most frequently hitherto.

In order to understand Lenin's political behaviour, it seems necessary to know some facts of his life. For instance, the two events which seem to have determined Lenin's life and ideology were the death of his father (1886), Ilya Nikolaevich Ulyanov, of a brain haemorrhage when Vladimir was 16. His father's death turned his behaviour erratic and confrontational, and afterwards made him renounce his belief in God (Fischer, 2001). And the second event was the death of his elder brother Aleksandr (1887), who was executed (hanged) for the conspiracy to kill Tsar Alexander III (Read, 2005).

Perhaps because of Lenin's overtly position to withdraw Russia from the war, German authorities facilitated Lenin's passage back via a 'sealed train': three months before the revolution Trotsky had been arrested and Lenin had gone into hiding (Trotsky, 1932). His welcomed arrival was far from uniting Russia, on the contrary, his radical ideas –

published in the Pravda and known as his April Thesis- condemned the government and incited people to take power. Medvedev (1989) and the very same Trotsky (1932) agree that Lenin could not get much support from the Soviets so he turned to the military where he found some discontent; situation that Trotsky and Lenin skilfully used in their favour during the storming of the Winter Palace.

The Storming Of The Winter Palace

The discontent among the military for being expelled from the government, the massive losses and humiliating defeats during the war and Lenin's demand that Russia should exit the war immediately made Lenin receive growing support from the Russian armed forces. Besides, Lenin and the Bolsheviks had been developing a propaganda campaign among the Russian troops serving on the front and throughout Russia under the slogan: end the war, all land to the peasants and all power to the soviets (councils); campaign that gave them certain amount of support in the main cities (Trotsky, 1932).

The storming of the Winter Palace, although it was the climax of the revolution, was rather a bloodless military affair where a small unit of military cadets offered no resistance to about 300 revolutionary soldiers who 'stormed' the palace (Courtois et al, 1997). The Bolsheviks with military support besieged the palace when Kerensky and most of his ministers were gathered. Due to the imminent danger Kerensky made his way out in a car provided by the British and American embassies, the car had an American flag which helped his way through the crowd. Although official reports say that the car carried the American flag because it was the U.S decision, Trotsky (1932, 1284) says that it was Kerensky himself who ordered to use the American flag.

What the rest of the members of the government had to go through, during the last about four hours; from ten o'clock p.m. (24 October) to 2:10 (25 October), was sheer agony. All political leaders were summoned to the palace in the afternoon. Shortly after six the palace was besieged, political leaders expressed their sympathy by telephone; there were promises of help from outside but reinforcements never arrived. A blank shot from the cruiser Aurora signalled they would target the palace at any time; two destroyers were patrolling the river showing they had full control.

“The insurrection looked at that moment like a military manoeuvre in the grand style” (Trotsky, 1932, 1292); that is why Malia (1997), Medvedev (1989), and Figs (1996) assert it was a coup rather than a popular insurrection. An ultimatum from the besiegers arrived. The besiegers demanded them to surrender and disarm, otherwise fire would be opened from the guns of the fortress and the ships of war, and they were given twenty minutes for reflection (Trotsky, 1932, 1295).

On the other hand, the besieged were told that the bicycle battalion was on their way but they did not arrive, either. Suddenly a report came announcing that the junkers (rank for a volunteer at military service; soldiers) had left their weapons in the entrance and were going home because they had had received orders. Later a light of hope appeared when the Women’s Battalion announced their intention to make a sortie; minutes later they were informed that the sortie was a failure. According to Trotsky (1932), there was nothing to talk about, nothing to hope for. The ministers disagreed with each other and with themselves. Some sat still in a kind of stupor, others automatically paced up and down the floor. Later, a telephone call was received, announcing that the public men, the merchantry and the citizens, with the clergy at their head were towards the palace in order to defend their government. The news raised everybody’s spirits; however the joy did not last long. Minutes later two grenades made explosion inside the palace, two sailors managed to come into the palace, although they were arrested, it showed how easy it was to enter the palace; and the promised help never arrived.

At the same time, a note was delivered to the Aurora: “open fire on the palace immediately”. In spite of the note, they decided to wait fifteen more minutes before opening fire. In less than ten minutes, a courier arrived straight from the Winter Palace: the palace is taken! The few cadets in charge of the palace did not offer much resistance; the members of the Provisional Government were put under arrest in the name of the Military Revolutionary Committee. There was not bloodshed, the revolutionaries entered through the front door, only some people were shooting in the air as a warning.

Although some authors say that there was an exchange of fire and there were about a hundred casualties on either side, according to Trotsky (1932) and Reed (1977) nobody was injured and almost everything they found in the palace was catalogued. What raises doubts

about their statements is that the whole movement was engineered by the same Trotsky; perhaps that is why he wrote that. And Reed, an eye witness, was a sort of “unofficial” member of the Bolsheviks; in 1913 he also helped organise a silk workers’ strike in Paterson, and after he died (1920), he was buried in the Red Square, in the heroes’ Grave (Ten Days That Shook the World back cover).

On the other hand, however, Figes (1996) writes about a shadow of doubt about the events, he does not write about any exchange of fire or casualties, albeit there might have been a looting of the palace. The mob might have not only ransacked the palace, there might have been executions, rapes and looting of the riches of the palace. The fact is that everything went out of control, not only in the city of Petrograd but also inside the palace itself, thus the Bolsheviks had to impose martial law on Petrograd because of the chaos. The Palace was pillaged and devastated from top to bottom, Priceless pictures were ripped from their frames, and boxes of rare plates and china were shattered. Most books, documents and manuscripts, the library of Alexander III, were burnt and destroyed (The Guardian, 1917). And it was not until the New Year that the city returned to some order with the biggest hangover in history (Figes, 1996) because the largest wine cellar ever known to history was found in the basement.

The Russian Civil War

The October revolution, which ended with the storming of the Winter Palace, did not bring peace to convulsed Russia: once in power the Bolsheviks party changed its name to “the Communist Party.” The Bolsheviks signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, between Germany and Russia, which took Russia out of the World War I. They also changed the capital of Russia from St. Petersburg to Moscow, and they substituted the older Julian calendar with the Gregorian calendar, consequently the storming of the Winter Palace date changed from 25 October to 6 November which explains why there are different dates of the events (some authors write about the November Revolution and some write about the October revolution when they refer to the same event).

Because of the political chaos, some regions decided to declare their independence; Ukraine proclaimed independent, Czechoslovak legion mutinied against the Bolshevik

government. The Bolsheviks dismissed the elected Constitutional Assembly at gunpoint and banned all kinds of opposition politics which included opposition newspapers (Mawdsley, 2002). The terms of peace with Germany were denounced as unacceptable and the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries (S.R.'s) split, a faction left the government; the very same Trotsky left the negotiations.

From then on most protests and demonstrations were repressed; in some the Bolsheviks opened fire. The Bolsheviks created their own secret police, the Ch-ka (Fitzpatrick, 2008, 72), which brutally repressed any counter-revolutionary activity, that attitude marked the return to a despotic rule, this time at the hands of the Bolsheviks. However, the little support the Bolsheviks had, led to the "Russian Civil War" which lasted until 1921. The fighting between the red army "the reds", and "the whites", Tsarist, liberals, *Mensheviks* and all who were against the *Bolsheviks*, is considered the beginning of the "red terror."

Since the *whites* were composed of different organisations: the Tsarists, who wanted to keep the Russian empire, the SR's, who wanted a popular government, for instance, they all had different political purposes and ideals, fact which made them disunited and less effective, and the ruthlessness of the Bolsheviks, on the other side, -the families of army officials were kept hostages in order to keep their loyalty- (Werth, 1997) gave the victory to the latter; a new chapter of the Russian history had begun.

The Red Terror

Once the Bolsheviks won the civil war, in 1922 they changed the name of the country to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.). Unfortunately, Reed, who depicted the Bolsheviks as "heroes" in his book *Ten Days That Shook the World* (1977), did not have the chance to see what the Bolsheviks really did once they had full control and how they managed to maintain that control.

Although some people might think that espionage belongs only to science fiction literature and filmography (Ian Flemings' James Bond is a classic example), it has played a very important role in key world events: the role of spies and saboteurs helped to determine the outcome of the World War I on land, at sea, and on the diplomatic front (Richelson,

1997). In World War II, the "black magic" of U.S. and British code breakers and their role during the Cold War was determinant.

Some of the first recorded evidence, not necessarily the first ones, comes from the late 1800s. By 1873, the British had established an Intelligence branch. On their side, after the disastrous 1870 war campaign with Germany, France established a Statistical and Military Reconnaissance Section meant to collect intelligence from the German troops, later known as the Service de Renseignement with agents in Berlin, Vienna, Dresden, Leipzig, Frankfurt, Cologne and Mannheim. On their side, the Russian Tsarist regime had their own intelligence establishment. However, it was meant to the local monitoring of the opponents to the Tsarist regime, unlike the German intelligence system which had seventy-five agents and informants operating in Russia (Richelson, 1997), perhaps that is why Russia lost so much during the war with Germany.

After the Russian Civil War the Bolsheviks took the espionage activity to its highest level. The Bolsheviks created the Ch-ka, their own secret police, meant to repress any counter-revolutionary activity. The All Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counter-Revolution, Sabotage and Speculation (the Russian acronym VCHEKA) had regional branches called Ch-kas, eventually the entire organisation was simply known as the Cheka. The Cheka, initially led by Feliks Dzerzhinsky (the Iron Feliks), were granted permission to execute, if necessary, anyone suspected of counter-revolutionary or anti-Bolshevik activities; they also arrested and executed people who they regarded to be Bourgeoisie (Richelson, 1997). The acronym later transformed into OGPU, the NKVD, and finally turned into the KGB (Figs, 1996).

By mid-1918 there were 38 Chekas, and by the end of the same year the 365 Uyezd-level Chekas throughout Russia had Dzerzhinsky at the head. However, it was after Lenin's death (1924) that the real terror started, when a triumvirate defeated Trotsky in the struggle for power; Kamenev, Zinoviev, and Stalin, soon they would discover that the latter would hold the real power. According to the same Dzerzhinsky, by the end of 1924, they had a 1300-person Foreign Department; a network of information (and) intelligence agencies in all the largest centres of Europe and North America.

Much can be said about the following years. Mass terror and fear were instilled by the Cheka among Russian citizens. Agents were placed everywhere; people could be arrested at stations, restaurants, theatres, in grocery stores, or in other seemingly innocuous settings. There were agents even inside military units. They had the right to arrest or kill anyone whose private property was valued at over 10,000 rubles (Russian currency), and anyone who was suspected of not supporting the Soviet government (Solzhenitsyn, 1985).

There had been various waves of arrests, in 1929/30 15 million peasants disappeared; there was a terrifying campaign against the peasantry because most of them refused to sell their grain, by force, to the state in order to control inflation (Ibid, 1985). There is also evidence that suggests the famine or the “Extermination by hunger” (“Holodomor” in Ukrainian) Russia went through might have been caused not only by natural factors but also by man-made and bad economic policies.

Werth (1997), in the section “*Un Etat contre son peuple*” (*Le livre noir du communisme*), asserts that the economic policies pursued by Lenin, which meant the massive seizures of food and supplies from the peasantry, eventually led to the terrible famine of 1921; five million people died. Lenin’s policy was “the cleansing of the Russian land of any harmful insects, swindler-fleas, wealthy bugs and so on”; [in August 1918, he declared] “merciless war against these kulaks! Death to them!” (Volkogonov, 1994, 49-50) (*kulaks* is a Russian term which was used to designate wealthy peasant farmers). That policy was shared by his successor Stalin; who in his time led the exploitation of the peasantry to the 1932-1933 famine as a punishment for their resistance to the new Soviet agrarian policies (collectivization).

The fact is that thousands of Ukrainian families died for opposing the Bolsheviks or for simply belonging to the wrong class—for being *kulaks*. Although some scholars might disagree to which extent the destruction of the Ukrainian peasantry was premeditated on the part of Ioseb Besarionidze Jugashvili, Stalin, the millions of deaths remain there as evidence.

New information and evidence show that the Russian revolution was not, as many people might suppose, a well organised revolt in which Tsar Nicholas II was overthrown.

As the eye witness (Reed) admits, rather it can be considered a series of events that might have gone out of control. Since the start of the Revolution, led by the Bolsheviks, the casualties increased; therefore, different figures can be found. Some say that once the Russian civil war started, the Bolsheviks murdered any Whites they found – more than 7000 people were executed. Figs (1996) cites an event when, during a session of the Sovnarkom, Lenin wrote a note to Dzerzhinsky asking how many counter-revolutionaries they had in prison, the reply was about 1500 – after placing a cross by the figure Lenin gave it back to the Cheka boss; that night 1500 Moscow prisoners were shot dead by Dzerzhinsky's orders.

The numbers of victims, during the Russian Revolution, have been labelled under different names as well: Genocide, Politicide, Democide, Classicide, Mass killing, etc. Perhaps that is the reason there are different figures: Pipes (1995) "A concise history of the Russian Revolution" accounts 9 million deaths between 1917-1922; Dyadkin (1983) "Unnatural Deaths in the U.S.S.R.: 1928-1954" wrote 34 to 49 million deaths under Stalin; Courtois et al (1997) "Le Livre Noir du Communism" sum up 20 million deaths during soviet government; Solzhenitsyn (1985) "Gulag Archipelago" estimates 60 million deaths under soviet regime; Aleksandr Yakovlev estimates 35 million, etc.

Much more loathsome details can be accounted. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the opening and the access to secret and classified documents is gradually revealing new and shocking details about what really happened during the Russian revolution and the red terror. In the meantime, perhaps it is enough to mention the setting of labour camps, the massive deportations, the exploitation of the peasantry and the requisition of their crops by military detachments, the man-made famine in Ukraine, the implementation of discriminatory voucher systems, preventing the transport of food from and into Ukrainian villages, the massive seizures of food and supplies from the peasantry, etc. The brutality and excess of the Russian revolution followed by the atrocities carried out by the Bolsheviks (revolutionary forces) might have exceeded even the worst of the Tsars' oppressions; which led to the most controversial comparison: Hitler's death toll (25M) and Stalin's (20M). "*The death from hunger of the child of a Ukrainian peasant is equivalent to the death of a Jewish child in the Warsaw Ghetto.*"- Stéphane Courtois (1997).

1.4.4 The French Revolution

*“...Friends, enemies, of all parties, ages, ranks,
Head after head, and never heads enough
for those that bade them fall.”*

- William Wordsworth

In 1976 the Americans celebrated two hundred years of the independence of the thirteen colonies; they obtained their independence from Great Britain by winning a war. In the case of France, in 1989, they celebrated the bicentennial of the French Revolution; however, a nagging question arises, what were they really celebrating? The French revolution has been the subject of several studies and from several perspectives as well. Although France went through a series of revolutions, The French Revolution officially started in 1789 and ended in 1799, when Napoleon came into scene, and therefore, the cause for the Revolution cannot be singled out.

By the late 1700s France was essentially a rural society, distributed in about 38.000 rural communities or parishes. “They also spoke Occitan and its variants, Flemish, German, Catalan, Celtic languages, and even the French language had its variations around *L’Ile-de-France*” (McPhee, 2002, 3). At the same time, they were in the midst of an economic crisis which dates back to the mid-1600s when “Louis XIV spent over \$ 100 million to build the Versailles Palace in 1661” (Dunlop, 1999, 109); *Le Roi Soleil* (the Sun king) succeeded his father at the age of four and a half becoming the king of 19 million French (Ibid, 1999, 3).

Although *Le Roi Solei* tried to take France to a new era by introducing several changes, however, money was lavished on magnificent and pretentious buildings. As well as that, France had to face several wars; War of Devolution (1667-68) against the Spanish Netherlands, later on, France was also involved in the War of Polish Succession (1733-38), the War of Austrian Succession (1740-48) and the Seven Years' War (1756-63) (Marston, 2001), besides, in the 1770s, France involvement in the U.S. independence war left the country in a serious economic crisis.

The aftermath of the French Revolution is a France with poverty all over the country, unfair living conditions for the common people, luxurious facilities for the nobles, etc. And all this entangled with dramatic and romantic stories such as the three (four) brave men

who undertook a mission which consisted in retrieving the Queen's diamond stud from her lover (in England), right in time for the upcoming ball, where the Queen was required to wear the stud. And of course, they make it just in time to save the Queen's honour. Or the sad story of a man, who spent about forty years of his life in several prisons including the Bastille (a French fortress used as prison); man who had to wear a mask and whose name should not be uttered, soldiers were ready to shoot him or anyone who unmasked the prisoner, even jailors were not allowed to see his face nor talk to him, although they should treat him with extreme courtesy. Several stories were created around him based on several authors as well, Marge Piercy, Pagnol or Jung, among others. However, the most reliable sources are the records kept by Lieutenant Etienne du Junca, an official of the Bastille during the time the unknown prisoner was kept there, and Voltaire's "*Le siecle de Louis XIV*" (1753) and also Voltaire's "*Dictionnaire Philosophique*" (1789) who suggests that the prisoner might have been a sibling of king Louis XIV; Voltaire was also a prisoner at the Bastille by then. The stories were skilfully arranged into best sellers by Alexandre Dumas "*Les Trois Mousquetaires*" [1844] (1898) and "*L'Homme au Masque de Fer*" [1839-1840] (2010), respectively. And also the story of a man who was thought to be dead, instead he had spent around eighteen years in "*La Bastille*." When his daughter learnt he was alive, she tried to make arrangements to bring him back to England in a time when both France and England were undergoing a period of social upheaval that eventually ended up with the storming of *La Bastille* when the French Revolution broke out in all its fury; "A Tale Of Two Cities" (Charles Dickens, [1859] 1983).

Whether a story, a history, a historical story, a story based on history, or a story set in a historical period, there is evidence that, at least, part those events took place in France, where there were deep social inequalities. Besides, some authors cite Dickens's "The tale Of Two Cities" as the best description of the eighteenth-century France.

Since the Middle Ages, there had been a three-class system in France; the clergy, the nobility and the peasantry –no room for social climbing. Kings gave birth to kings, paupers gave birth to paupers. "The population of France in the late eighteenth century was about 26,000.000, of these about 21,000.000 lived by farming" (Hibbert, 1999, 29). The nobility and clergy represented only 3 per cent of the French population, and they decided the

policies that governed the entire country. Some people might think that those differences were the cause of the popular uprising, in fact, Lefebvre's "The Coming of the French Revolution" (2005) argues that the cause of the Revolution was the rise of the bourgeoisie; Alexis de Tocqueville's "The Ancien Régime and the French Revolution" (1856); Alfred Cobban's "The Social Interpretation of the French Revolution" (1999), assert that the revolution had specific social origins.

However, most authors agree that almost a century of warfare, and mismanagement led France to almost bankruptcy—"France's participation in the War of American Independence involved the expenditure of about 2,000 million *livres*" (Hibbert, 1999, 36). Besides, soaring food prices and the heavy taxation imposed might have fuelled people's anger. Taxes formed a somewhat complicated system: taxes that were farmed; direct taxes; the *gabelle*; feudal and ecclesiastical taxes (Johnston, 1910, 29-30), *capitation* and *vingtièmes* among others. Of course, the clergy and the nobility were exempted from many of them. For a more detailed description of the tax system at that time, although some figures may vary compared to other authors, see Neely (2008, 7).

The statement made by an unknown writer that "The French revolution was basically twenty per cent uprisings, thirty per cent arguing, and fifty per cent beheading and killing (no offense intended)" may make a lot of sense if we see that the importance of the capture of the Bastille, for instance, was "vastly exaggerated by early writers on the subject" (Johnston, 1910, v), or the accentuation of the political and social aspects of the French Revolution. Rather, riots that broke out in Paris and all over France were "due to food scarcity and financial problems" (Ibid, 1910, 25).

Tobias Smollett, English novelist, "was even more appalled by the sight of the peasants he encountered travelling across France; they had the appearance more of 'ravenous scarecrows' than of human beings" (Hibbert, 1999, 30). So great was the poverty and the financial crisis that on 2 May, 1789, facing an almost unbearable economic situation, King Louis XVI was forced to call to a meeting of the Estates-General, "that had not met since 1614, to deal with the endemic problems that France confronted" (Frey & Frey, 2004, 3). Besides the social unrest, France had to face divisions within the ruling class; "sharp as distinctions were between certain jealous families of the *noblesse d'épée*,

the *noblesse de robe* and the *noblesse de court*” (Hibbert, 1999, 33). After more than a month of disagreements, within the Estates-General, about the organisation, for instance, they could not agree whether to vote by head or by block; no real advances were made.

On 20 June, 1789, the commoners were locked out of the meeting room; the official version said that arrangements were being made for the King’s speech, but the commoners and part of the lower Clergy (the Third State) felt excluded from the meeting place (Frey & Frey, 2004); albeit according to Jordan (2010) it was just a ‘misunderstanding’. And thus, the Third State met in a tennis court and made the “*Serment du jeu de paume*” (the Tennis Court Oath) -*jeu de paume* is a tennis like game which was played in-doors- and swore not to disband until a new constitution was established, and that is precisely what they did.

The Storming of the Bastille

'O liberté, que de crimes on commet en ton nom!'

Madame Roland (Marie-Jeanne Phlippon Roland) (1754 – 1793)

To make thing worse, when the National Assembly intended to appoint a committee to draft a constitution, the national Assembly proclaimed itself the Constituent National Assembly, with the power and authority to decree laws, and thus the King was compelled to officially accept their suggestions; therefore, the monarchy effectively lost influence over the direction of the events, from then on.

In Paris a standing committee and a citizen’s militia were formed, at the same time as riots spread in the city and the countryside. When Necker –a skilful banker appointed as Finance Minister by Louis XVI -tried to solve France’s economical deficit by borrowing money instead of taxation. Necker, actually, in order to attract investors, published his *Compte Rendu au Roi sur les finances de la nation*, “where he offered generous rates of interest, and turned the 46,000,000 *livres* deficit into a surplus of 10,000,000” (Hibbert, 1999, 37). Whether fictitious, fraudulent or not, it was immediately rejected by the King’s other Ministers, whose pressure caused the dismissal of Necker (Ibid, 1999, 37), fact that might have fuelled people’s anger because he was appreciated, in spite of being a foreigner.

Under these circumstances came the 14 July, Bastille Day, date which is now commemorated every year with a grand military parade along the Champs-Elysees, fireworks and public dances throughout France. Although, according to Morris (2013) the storming of the Bastille was seized following a bloody gunfire, the fact is that the angry mob first attacked the *Invalides* fortress where they obtained 30,000 muskets, and headed towards the old royal fortress of Bastille, which was at one time both a prison and a fortress, in search of ammunition. They might have done that because during the night the rumour ran that the King's troops were advancing, and the people were also afraid of the presence of foreign troops in the streets of Paris, they feared an Austrian invasion, and they were anxious to arm themselves.

Although some Post-Revolution artwork depict the storming of the Bastille as an epic battle, most authors agree that during the storming of the Bastille, there were just seven prisoners inside, besides, "the governor of the fortress finally agreed to let the mob in and ordered his troops not to fire" (Frey & Frey, 2004, 4), as well as that some say that the firing had been going on for more than three hours. Rumours, hunger, discontent, anger or whatever emotions were fostered within the mob, they obtained arms, 30,000 muskets, maybe more, they may have taken possession of twelve pieces of cannon, and a mortar among others (Kropotkin, 1927).

The terror

The middle classes of Paris were themselves seized with terror on seeing these masses of armed men in the streets. Besides, disobedience arrived every day from different parts of the kingdom, "there were popular disturbances all over France, the Deputies to the States General were all well aware that the country appeared to be dissolving into anarchy" (Doyle, 1999, 166). By 10th August, 1792, the Paris Mob besieged and attacked the *Tuileries* (a palace), Paris women rose in protest and nothing could stop the mob; the working man had become a fighting man, armed with muskets or picks. "There were riots in *Brittany*, *Burgundy*, *Béarn*, and *Provence*, violent demonstrations in *Pau* and *Rennes*. In *Dauphiné* there were clashes between troops and the townspeople of *Grenoble*. In Paris there was fighting in the streets and an effigy of *Brienne* was burnt before the cheering crowds" (Hibbert, 1999, 40).

Nothing seemed to stop the angry mob, not even the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen* (The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen) (Neely, 2008, 85) nor the Abolition of feudal rights and privileges. And there came the “September Massacre” which ended up with the execution of the king, nine months later Marie-Antoinette followed the same fate (Frey & Frey, 2004). The massacre, known as *the September Massacre*, began on September 2, 1792 and lasted around five days, the city was described as a scene of bloodshed and violence, “we believe the account will not be exaggerated when we state it at TWELVE THOUSAND PERSONS” (London Times, 1792, page 1).

Perhaps it all began when twenty-four priests, when being transported to a prison, were quickly and grotesquely killed by a mob of angry citizens in Paris, then in *Bicetre*, 162 prisoners were killed, “43 of them were under eighteen years of age” (Schama, 1992, 635). In the Carmelite Convent, the 220 priests “were handed out of the door by two into the *Rue Vaugerard*, where their throats were cut. Their bodies were fixed on pikes and exhibited to the wretched victims who were next to suffer” [the same fate] (London Times, 1792, page 1).

“When the mob went to the prison *de la Force*, where the Royal attendants were chiefly confined, the Princess De Lamballe went down on her knees to implore a suspension of her fate, although this was at first granted, a second mob more ferocious than the first, forced her apartment, and decapitated her —previous to her death, her thighs were cut across, and her bowels and heart torn from her, and for two days her mangled body was dragged through the streets” (London Times, 1792, page 1). Cleves (2009), however, asserts that the Princess was reportedly gang-raped and her breasts were cut off, and her decapitated head was paraded in front of the queen’s window. The same happened to the Archbishop of Arles and the Vicar of St. Ferrol, whose bodies “were taken as trophies of *victory* and *justice* (the author’s emphasis). Their trunkless heads and mangled bodies were carried about the streets on pikes in regular calvacade [cavalcade]. At the *Palais Royal*, the procession stopped and these lifeless victims were made the mockery of the mob” (London Times: 1792, page 1).

Consternation spread across the world at the news of dead bodies piled high in front of the *Châtelet* or the woman who was asked to “shout '*Vive la nation!*, and after her refusal was forced to climb up on a pile of corpses where one of the killers grabbed her, tore away her dress, and ripped open her stomach” (Restif de la Bretonne, 1960, 247, 248). Although the “number of active killers who took part in the September massacre was only about one hundred and fifty” (Ibid, 1960, 248), “those who were not on the spot, can have no idea of the slaughter or the cruelties that happened on that day because such wanton and disgraceful excesses have no precedent in the history of mankind. [...] Are these the Rights of Man? Is this the LIBERTY of Human Nature?” (London Times, 1792, page 1); unfortunately, the real “terror” was yet to come.

Robespierre and the reign of terror of the Jacobins

“Not being able to fortify justice, they have justified force.”—Pascal

- Twenty-two impoverished women, many of them widows, convicted for forwarding “the designs of the fanatics, aristocrats, priests and other agents of England,” guillotined.
- Nine private soldiers convicted of “picking their own eyes with pins, and becoming by this cowardly artifice unable to bear arms,” guillotined
- Jean Baptist Henry, aged eighteen, journeyman tailor, convicted of “sawing down a tree of liberty,” guillotined
- Henrietta Frances de Marboeuf, aged fifty-five, convicted of hoping for the arrival in Paris of the Austrian and Prussian armies and of hoarding provisions for them, guillotined
- Francis Bertrand, aged thirty-seven, convicted of producing “sour wine injurious to the health of citizens,” guillotined.
- Mary Angelica Plaisant, another seamstress, guillotined for exclaiming, “A fig for the nation!”

The names above and the reasons why they were condemned to death are provided by Scurr (2007, 2).

The atrocities committed during the “reign of terror” cannot be separated from Maximilien François Marie Isidore de Robespierre, a lawyer, who “offered no compromises or accommodations and prided himself on his rectitude” (Jordan, 1985, 2). At the same time he “saw himself as the first of what might be thought a new race of men; a man wholly and absolutely devoted to revolution” (Ibid, 1985, 3). He believed that he was the first of the species. He himself did a good deal “to encourage and even suggest this perception. He was self-conscious about his political role, and this awareness shaped all his utterances” (Ibid, 1985, 3). “He spoke much, and often, and always in public, about himself” (Ibid, 1985, 4); he spoke of himself as “a living martyr, a phrase that echoed what was said of those thrown into the horrendous prisons of the monarchy” (Ibid, 1985, 4).

In spite of the controversies, some call Robespierre a hero, and some call him a madman, the fact is that in Arras, his hometown, “the sense that Robespierre is someone to be ashamed of goes back a long way” (Scurr, 2007, 10). For over two hundred years there seems to have been an “impenetrable curtain” over all that had passed in the local Assembly that elected Robespierre, as it was suggested by Jean Baptiste Dauchez, one of his contemporaries.

Robespierre was the most outstanding character during the Revolution, once he was voted into the Committee of Public safety, a series of laws were drafted meant to legitimise their actions; the “Law of General Maximum” or the “Law of suspects” (Scurr, 2007), a law which gave the revolutionaries (called *sans-culottes* that made up the committee and the citizen’s militia) wide powers to arrest ‘suspects’ of being counter-revolutionaries. Moreover, those were laws which could be easily twisted to affect just about everyone in the nation.

The Convention also passed the Decree on Emergency Government which suspended peacetime rights and legal safeguards and allowed the government to employ coercion and violence; and the militias went about the country requisitioning supplies for

the armies and to root out counter-revolutionaries (Linton, 2006). With those “legal tools,” in the next eleven months, about 300,000 suspects (enemies of the Revolution) were arrested and thousands of them executed by guillotine; in the orgy of bloodshed Robespierre was able to eliminate many of his political opponents. However, almost a year later, Robespierre himself was executed in the guillotine as well. For a more detailed description of Robespierre’s overt or covert actions during the French Revolution, see Otto Scott’s “Robespierre: The Voice of Virtue,” (1974); Stanley Loomis’s “Paris in the Terror,” (1964); and Ruth Scurr’s “Fatal Purity,” 2007).

The revolutionaries were mostly urban workers, the *sans-culottes* as they came to be known, “who in turn saw popular violence as a political right” (Linton, 2006, par 9). *Sans-culottes* (without *culottes*) is a term used to distinguish themselves from the French nobility who wore silk knee breeches (*culottes*), rather, the revolutionaries wore long trousers (*pantalons*), short-skirted coats (*carmagnoles*), and red caps to symbolise liberty; “the term *sans-culottes* is a sort of neologism with all its social implications” (Sonenscher, 2008, 5).

Perhaps what really matters about the *sans-culottes* in the revolution is how they behaved; they were involved in the smashing of royal tombs, they besieged some cities, and they expelled the *Girondins* (another political group that fought for power during the time of the French Revolution) from the national convention, they also, several times, invaded the Convention to exert pressure on the deputies (Linton, 2006, also Scurr, 2007).

The *Jacobins*, rather than a political party, was a group who called themselves the ‘Society of Friends of the Constitution’ commonly dubbed the Jacobin Club because its sessions were held in a former convent of the Dominicans, who were known in Paris as *Jacobins* (Frey & Frey, 2004, 6, see also the Encyclopaedia Britannica).

The fact is that the *sans-culottes* put the *Jacobins* in power, perhaps because Robespierre became a sort of spokesman for them. But the price of that support was the blood-letting, and the terror was legal, having been voted for by the Convention (Linton, 2006, par 14). The death toll varies a lot because some scholars refer to the ones who died by the guillotine, some to the ones who died in summary executions, and some others include the ones who died fighting, and so forth. Besides, only the most important prisoners

appeared before the Revolutionary Tribunal. As well as that, most of the executions were carried out in the regions of revolt, and many more people were murdered without formal sentences imposed in a court of law. In provinces, small scaffolds rose in marketplaces for the execution of “traitors.” Some died in overcrowded and unsanitary prisons awaiting trial, while others died in the civil wars and federalist revolts, and their deaths remain unrecorded.

The irony

What has been reviewed above might be considered just a sample of the atrocities committed during the French Revolution; however, at this stage it is worth asking what could have turned a group of loyal subjects into a bloodthirsty mob? Was it a reformation movement that devolved or evolved into a full-fledged revolution? Did the Revolution achieve its goals or it just degenerated into a chaotic bloodbath?

The French Revolution started with the promise of "*Liberté, Égalité, et Fraternité*", (Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity), however, during the revolution itself none of them were practised nor respected. Besides, the revolutionaries promised a new and better government, but the revolution ended in a coup led by Napoleon Bonaparte. Hence, France entered a fifteen-year period of military rule; Napoleon established himself as first consul, with dictatorial powers, and later on as emperor (Soboul, 1984).

Robespierre made his political career a short time before the Revolution, he gained a reputation for defending the poorest of society and he earned the nickname "the incorruptible" for his adherence to strict moral values. He became popular with the people for his attacks on the French monarchy and his advocacy for democratic reforms, and he “sided consistently with the victimised and fiercely opposed the death penalty” (Scurr, 2007, 5-6). However, he successfully argued for the execution of the king and continued to encourage the crowds to rise up against the aristocracy. He called for purges and executions, and he made summary executions the order of the day (Scurr, 2007). He saw and fought the revolution as a “struggle to the death between the revolution and the counter-revolution; *them* and *us*, virtue and vice” (Jordan, 1985, 2). Robespierre may have

also believed that in order to defend the Revolution against those who would destroy it, the shedding of blood was justified (Linton, 2006, par 11).

On the other hand, the King's "desire was to be respected and loved by his people" (Hibbert, 1999, 29), therefore, he tried to impose a new economic and administrative reform that entailed a new taxation system which would "fall most heavily upon the privileged orders" (Ibid, 1999, 37). However, the populace did away with the kingship. The angry mob rose in defence of the *parlements* and the nobles, but the nobles, the *parlements* and the magistrates "came together to block the Government's attempt to impose equality of taxation" (Ibid, 1999, 40) which either way might have benefited the peasants and the poor people.

By the time when the Estates General were summoned, and peasants rose up, they were demanding King Louis XVI food and fair treatment. According to Wenborn (2009) they had no intention of dethroning the King, let alone executing him. "None wished to do away with the monarchy altogether or questioned the King's rights" (Hibbert, 1999, 45). However, the King ended up in the guillotine.

The whole revolutionary movement was somehow inspired by the enlightenment ideas and writings; "a remarkable number of the writers themselves were nobles" (Doyle, 1999, 111), e.g. Montesquieu (*Spirit of the Laws*), Voltaire (*Century of Louis XIV, Le Siècle de Louis XIV, Candide*), Diderot and others (*Encyclopédie*), Rousseau (*Emile; Social Contract*), Condorcet, d'Holbach, Jaucourt or the very same Camille Desmoulins, all nobles, men of power, wealth or influence. Paradoxically, the nobles and the wealth were the first victims of the French Revolution; the *Philosophes* were members of the Second Estate, and their writings inspired the destruction of the system that they benefited from.

Within the political area, the *Girondins* and the *Jacobins* had both the same political principles. They both were left-wing. They sat on the left side of the Convention and shared many of the same radical republican convictions, in opposition to the Moderates, who sat on the right side (wing); and thus the terms 'left wing' and 'right wing' were introduced into political parlance (Wenborn, 2009; Frey & Frey, 2004). The *Jacobins* were much more brutally efficient in setting up a war government (Linton, 2006, par 12). Neither *Girondins*

nor *Jacobins* were officially political parties. The fact is that the *Jacobins* split and the more conservative group organised the *Feuillants* Club that included de *Girondins* (Furet & Ozouf, 1989, 343). However, most of its leaders were executed during the Revolution by the *Jacobins*, most accused of being *Girondin* or *Feuillant*, or counter-revolutionary; they killed their own.

The French Revolution was, from the very beginning, a controversial event, and it has continued to be controversial (Neely, 2008, xvi). Even the dates in most books seem to be confusing; it is no surprise to find time references such as: the days of *germinal*, *prairial*, and *vendémiaire* (Hibbert, 1999), or the days of *thermidor* (22-28 July 1794), or the *Thermidorian* reaction (Neely, 2008, 221). It is because when the *Jacobins* took power they established a series of radical measures; they eradicated Christianity, they changed the calendar -days and months were given different names, they established ten-day weeks (Neely, 2008, 197), among other changes. In their attempt to remove all religious and royalist influences from the calendar, they designed and imposed a new one inspired in nature mainly. Thus the months were Vendémiaire (vintage), Brumaire (mist), Frimaire (frost), and so forth. Each year had 12 equal months of 30 days, plus 5 or 6 special holidays. Each month had three ‘weeks’, each week, 10 days (Shaw, 2011), even days of the week were re-named: thus they were cauliflower, bees-wax, truffle, etc. (McPhee, 2002, 218). For a more detailed description of how the calendar was changed as well as the system of weights and measures, see James Monaco’s “French Revolutionary Calendar” (1982) or Matthew Shaw’s “Time and the French Revolution: The Republican Calendar, 1789-Year XIV” (2011).

1.4.5 The revolts in short

Most countries all over the world, as we have seen, have undergone uprisings that changed their history, and all of them deserve a detailed study. In spite of the atrocities in the uprisings described above, it was interesting to notice the participation of some ‘activists’, so as to call them. During the Indian mutiny, for instance, we have: Maniram Dewan, Piyali Barua, Rani Lakshmi Bai and Nana Sahib, the latter played a pivotal role during the mutiny but “as mysterious as the birth of Nana Sahib was his withdrawal from the scene” (Evening News, 1931, p 5).

Before 'The Great Revolt of 1381' (England), when the Statute of Labourers of 1351 was issued (Haught, 1990), which was "used to harass the lower orders" (Jones, 2009, 15), villagers started employing lawyers and instructed them to apply for "exemplifications" of Doomesday, a book in which several rights of the peasants were recognised. How they learnt about the book? How they obtained copies of them? Maybe instigators or activists, the fact is that based on those documents that "reported on the state of the village at the time of the Norman Conquest" (Jones, 2009, 17), they started demanding their freedom from all number of lordly claims.

As well as that, during the Great revolt of 1381 (England), we can also find several 'activists' such as John Hales, Alan Threder, William Hawke, John Ferroure, Jack Straw, John Wycliffe, John Ball, 'the mad priest of Kent', a well-known agitator or Wat Tyler. Justice (1994) believes the rebels shaped Wycliffe's teachings, throughout his book he focused on John Wycliffe and his influence in England, and how Wycliffe saw the poor as the foundational pillars of society. Besides, John Ball's letters "offer dramatic examples of the literature of popular protest" (Green, 1992, 180). As well as that, it should be considered that many 14th century English citizens could not read and let alone have access to that written material, therefore some 'activists' should have done that job.

Previous to the Russian Revolution, several activists took part in the development of the events: Alexandra Mikhailovna, helped to deliver illegal writings to revolutionaries (Kollontai, 1984); Olga Shapir, writer and a revolutionary; Vera Figner, involved in the successful attempt to assassinate Tsar Alexander II (Ruthchild, 2010), more names of activists can be found in (Fitzpatrick & Slezkine, 2000). During the Revolution itself, the very same John Reed, who wrote the book "Ten days that shook the world" (see bibliography), went to Russia as a writer and turned out to be a foreign activist who was also involved in demonstrations.

Moreover, something similar happened during the French Revolution, which was considered as an 'example' by other countries such as Russia (The former Soviet Union), "under the walls of the kremlin, a monument to Robespierre was erected several months after the October revolution; the decree was signed by Lenin, who describes Robespierre as a Bolshevik *avant la letter*" (Jordan, 1985, 2), the French Revolution was preceded by the

writings of the philosophes of the enlightenment: Montesquieu, Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau, Condorcet, d'Holbach, Jaucourt or the very same Camille Desmoulins. During the revolution itself, there were some activists such as Jacques-Louis David or Jean-Paul Marat or Claude Fauchet; besides, their activity was complemented by the work of some pamphleteers.

Since the populace did not have the intention of dethroning King Louis XVI (Wenborn: 2009), the question, what could have turned a group of loyal subjects into a bloodthirsty mob, still remains. Scholars such as Neely (2008) argue that nobody knew that the revolution was going to occur. Nobody expected it". "The way it began was a surprise, and the way it was developed was even greater surprise" (Neely, 2008, xiv). "Never was any such event so inevitable yet so completely unforeseen" (Alexis de Tocqueville, 1856). However, was it really unforeseen? Below there are some details about the Revolution which should be taken into consideration.

- In England, "the peasants rose in rebellion as soon as the 'news' of the brigands (people who usually lived in gangs and lived by pillage and robbery) reached them. The Great Fear announced by riders from a nearby town, was that brigands, hired by the nobility, were coming to destroy the crop about to be harvest, starve the peasants, and thus subdue the countryside and destroy the revolution, -some swore they had seen these murderous bands [...]. A few imaginative rumourmongers produced dubious but official-looking documents for their illiterate auditors that, they insisted, deputised the peasants to fight the brigands. No brigands ever appeared, but the countryside rose in rebellion anyway" (Jordan, 2010, 179).
- The attack on the *Tuileries* palace, during the French Revolution, that virtually overthrew the monarchy on August 10, 1792, "was sparked by a rumour that the king, now a virtual prisoner in Paris, was again preparing to capture the capital" (Ibid, 2010, 180). Already during the night the rumour ran that the King's troops were advancing from the side of the *Barrière du Trône* (Kropotkin, 1927).

- In the above brief description of the French Revolution, in the first week of the September 1792 massacre, it might have sounded a bit odd that the mob stormed several prisons. The ghastly massacre of prisoners which “killed about fourteen hundred prisoners (some authors say sixteen hundred) and went on for several days, was fired by rumour-provoked fear that the prisoners might escape and murder the defenceless Parisians, whose menfolk were leaving for the front to defend the Country from the Prussian invasion” (Jordan, 2010, 180). Needless to say the Prussian invasion was a rumour, as well (Ibid, 2010, 180).

- In France, according to (Hibbert, 1999) nearly all the schools were in the hands of the Church. The Church “also controlled most sources of information, [...] since it had taken upon itself the responsibilities of censorship. For those who could not read, the clergy were the means by which Government decrees and intentions became known” (Ibid, 1999, 31). “Most of the clergy, particularly those of the humbler orders, were neither corrupt nor unfeeling, nor even harshly intolerant of religious dissent” (Ibid, 1999, 31). Therefore “the charges made against the Church by the *philosophes* of the Enlightenment were often unjust” (Ibid, 1999, 31). However, when “news reached Paris that the Prussian army had invaded France and was advancing quickly toward the capital, [...] rumours circulated that the Prussians would find ready support from Parisians who secretly opposed the Revolution, especially refractory priests” (Restif de la Bretonne, 1960, 247-248). Perhaps that is why some...many priests were burnt alive “while the mob were singing and dancing round the fire” (London Times, 1792, page 2).

- By the end of the 1700s, it was rumoured that Louis XVI stepped on the flag of France. “It was also rumoured not only that the king was impotent but also that the Queen sought her pleasures elsewhere, both with men and with women” (Hibbert, 1999, 22; also Neely, 2008, 37). However, who might have created and spread those rumours among the mob? Jacques-Louis David was famous for being the propaganda artist of the revolutionaries; Jean-Paul Marat ran a newspaper “*L’ami du peuple*” (The Friend of the People), he might have led the storming of several

prisons and the killing of 1600 prisoners, and urged in his newspaper that if the blood of a few hundred nobles was the cost of liberty and equality, then the guillotine must fall. Claude Fauchet, a revolutionary bishop, might have been one of the leaders of the storming of the Bastille, etc.

- The revolutionary violence –of the French revolution- reverted to lynching and massacre ended with Robespierre’s fall, which might have been caused by a rumour –a parliamentary conspiracy- that “he was planning to marry the dead king’s daughter (the future Duchesse d’Angoulême; the only surviving member of the royal family who remained in France) and declare himself king” (Jordan, 2010, 181). After being arrested, he tried to commit suicide, unable to speak because he had wounded his jaw he finally was guillotined.

“For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword”

(Matthew 26:52, The Holy Bible)

The Libelles

The spreading of the *philosophes*’ ideas during the French Revolution, for instance in January 1789, Abbé Sieyès wrote “Qu’est-ce que le Tiers État” (What is the Third Estate?) -a message addressed to the King- or the Enlightenment ideas must have been in the hands of some writers. However, how did they manage to reach the common people? Since radio was not yet invented, most authors accept the presence of the “*Libelles*” (pamphlets) as the means of communication.

Burrows (2006) asserts that émigré newspapers and *libelles* not only enjoyed commercial success, but influenced public opinion. He also provides names of *libellists*, and their *modus operandi*. The *libelles* were meant not only to undermine the power of the monarchy but also to profit from them. Pamphlets (*libelles*) not only satirised the monarchy or the French government, this *media* also might have made the royalty appear less sacred, and therefore caused, or at least facilitated, the attack on the French monarchy in the Revolution itself.

Darnton (1971) is very precise when he asserts that these *libellistes* (pamphleteers) were very effective, and their scandalous writings eroded the foundations of the Old Regime of France, helping to pave the way towards the Revolution; slander, a nasty business, by destroying reputations it has often helped to delegitimise regimes and bring down governments (Darnton: 2010). Much more specifically, Burrows (2006) argues that the authors of these pamphlets, the *libellistes*, blackmailed the French government, Nobles, or the Royal family, because they were forced to buy all the pamphlets in order to prevent their being sold and their being read. As an example of that, Burrows cites the cross-dressing Chevalier d'Eon, a *libellist*, who blackmailed the French government over the publication of secret diplomatic correspondence.

Although many *libellistes* (pamphleteers) were established in England, they managed to send and distribute their publications in France. Moreover, the *libelles* and the theories and writings of the *philosophes* were disseminated throughout France by some lodges as well (Hibbert, 1999, 42).

For a more detailed description on how the *libellistes* (pamphleteers) worked, see Robert Darnton's "The High Enlightenment and the Low-Life of Literature in Pre-Revolutionary France" (1971); Robert Darnton's "The Devil in the Holy Water, or the Art of Slander from Louis XIV to Napoleon" (2010); Simon Burrows's "Blackmail, Scandal, and Revolution: London's French *libellistes*" (2006); and Simon Burrows's "French Exile Journalism and European Politics, 1792-1814" (2000).

During the revision of some facts of the French revolution, a question has been posed: what could have turned a group of loyal subjects into a bloodthirsty mob? The question was meant to draw the reader's attention to some facts:

On 14 July, the mob, seeking weapons, headed to the Bastille and the governor of the fortress agreed to let the mob in and ordered his troop NOT to fire. The mob, however, "practising no such restraint, murdered six soldiers, the governor, and the mayor of Paris and later paraded their heads on pikes" (Frey & Frey, 2004, 4). Was it logical and necessary to do such a thing?

“On 5 October, a large crowd of women gathered around the Hôtel de Ville (City Hall) demanding cheap bread and marched 12 miles to Versailles. Both the king and the Assembly graciously received the women. The king, later that evening, accepted the Assembly’s decree”, however, early the next morning, the mob stormed the palace, “killed some of the bodyguards, paraded the bloody trophies on pikes, and surged up the steps toward the queen’s apartments” (Frey & Frey, 2004, 5). The mob did not wait to see the decrees or their connotations, they did not even wait for a reply; they returned and did their killings. Again, was it justified?

The whole movement, the French Revolution, were demanding fair treatment; the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen* (The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen) was issued, feudal rights and privileges were abolished, moreover, the king, eventually, tried to impose a new economic and administrative reform that entailed a new taxation system which would “fall most heavily upon the privileged orders” (Hibbert, 1999, 37). However, the peasants did not wait to see the positive or negative effects of the reforms and they rose in rebellion anyway.

The violence and the bloodshed that France lived, known as the “September Massacre” that accounted around twelve thousand casualties (London Times, 1792) might have been caused by about a hundred and fifty “active killers” (Restif de la Bretonne, 1960). Besides, it does not make much sense that people who were demanding bread, food, and just and fair treatment ended up beheading, raping, or burning people alive, unless there were some ‘instigators’ that led the mob to do what went far beyond their demands.

The bloody events, unfortunately, led to the ‘Terror’, the Jacobin government. “As the Terror became bureaucratized and seemingly insatiable, conspirators and traitors were unmasked and denunciations were common [some people made their careers doing that]; everyone was potentially a counterrevolutionary and/or a patriotic delator” (Jordan, 2010, 180). “The *Girondins*, the *Hèbertists*, the *Dantonists*, among other constructed, invented, or imagined plotters and conspirators, died on the scaffold” (Jordan, 2010, 181). Even the same revolutionary leaders ended up being victims of the Revolution they created. In the quest for the revolutionary power, George Jacques Danton, who had their differences with Robespierre, was eventually guillotined after being accused of fraud and counter-

revolutionary tendencies. The very same Camille Desmoulins was also a victim, who, while in prison, wrote “I dreamed of a republic that would be loved by the whole world. I could not have believed that men would be so cruel and so unjust” (Wenborn, 2009), whose head was chopped off by the guillotine.

The French Revolution stands not only for the timeless dream of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity but also as a terrible warning of how easily that dream can turn to a nightmare. “The old wounds are closed but unhealed, and national crisis often starts the bleeding” (Jordan, 1985, 2), and “scholars still argue about what actually happened [during the French Revolution], and why” (Wenborn, 2009).

The French Revolution not only produced the political upheaval that left France socially, economically, institutionally and politically altered. It had repercussions in not only the French government and society, but in all of Europe and even the rest of the world (Neely, 2008, xiii). Since it might have changed the world, almost everyone agrees that the French Revolution was a major force in shaping the modern world, but how it shaped it is another question.

CHAPTER II

2. A Brief History

2.1 Morales's Administration

As it has been said before, most countries underwent uprisings that somehow altered their political structures. In most countries those events marked the change from monarchies or dictatorships to democracies, for instance; however, not all of them took place in their early history as republics. It may even be more surprising when a turmoil, upheaval, unrest or uprising takes place within a well-established democratic republic and, somehow, alters the political and social aspects of a country. And that is precisely what makes us turn to Bolivia.

One of the events which put Bolivia in the eye of the world is the political turn the country has had since the *Movimiento al Socialismo* –MAS (political party) took power in 2006. Therefore, it would be worth analysing the series of events that might have led the MAS into its present political position; how the MAS came into the political arena in Bolivia.

The history of the MAS cannot be separated from its leader Juan Evo Morales Ayma, who by 1985 was the general secretary of a union of coca farmers and later elected executive secretary of the Tropics Federation in 1988 (Báez and De La Hoz, 2008). The first attempt to set up a new political movement was with the *Eje de Convergencia Patriótica* (ECP), however, the results of the participation of the coca growers in the 1993 election were disappointing. In 1995 Evo Morales amongst a united organisation of farmers, colonisers and indigenous people founded the *Assembly for the Sovereignty of the Peoples* (Sivak, 2010). After the 1997 elections in spite of having carried seventy per cent of the votes in his electoral district and won a seat in Congress, due to differences with Alejo Véliz, leader of A.S.P. Morales was expelled from A.S.P. and founded the I.P.S.P., *Instrumento Político Para la Soberanía de los Pueblos*” (Political Instrument for the Sovereignty of the Peoples).

For the next elections, Morales decided to run for political office in Bolivia but the Supreme Court again refused to recognize his political party, hence, he signed another political agreement with the leader of MAS-U, David Añez Pedraza, to assume the acronym and colours of that inactive organization. Thus, the new party became what is now known as M.A.S. –I.P.S.P. (commonly known as MAS); which now calls for the nationalization of industry, legalization of the coca leaf and fairer distribution of national resources.

During the governments of Hugo Banzer Suarez and Jorge Quiroga, the latter took over on an interim basis in 2001 due to Banzer's later fatal illness, who eventually died in 2002 (AFP: 6.05.2002, also EFE, ANSA, and most local press), the *Plan Dignidad* was developed with strong support of the U.S. government to counter the *scourge* of drugs. The plan was meant to eradicate the surplus production of coca leaf by force, however, coca growers and their leaders fiercely opposed to such eradication of coca fields. Military officers with police support were in charge of the eradication, they beset the Chapare (tropical area in Cochabamba) and the protest from coca growers and their leaders on one side and the reaction from the military officers on the other became so violent that several people died.

After the violent confrontation, Morales claimed that it was a massacre and he declared that peasants had the right to resist militarily against the troops who were said to be shooting at protesters trying to quell their protest; ten peasants including a child were killed. After that the bodies of four soldiers and one of their wives were found, after being declared missing, showing signs of having being tortured (AFP, 13.11.2000, also Amnesty International, 27.11.2000) when they, according to the government, attempted to close a coca market. Consequently, Morales was accused by his fellow congressmen of being the 'intellectual author' of the death of the police officers. Morales called the Chapare “war zone” (AFP, 29.10.2001), and his comments about armed resistance led congress to vote to have him expelled. The Congressional Ethics Commission declared that Morales had committed "serious inadequacies in the execution of his duties" (BBC Mundo, 24.01.2002, also educabolivia).

After the incident Morales resigned from the *Federación de Productores de Coca* (Coca Producers Union), however members and representatives of the six Federations of the Tropics endorsed him as their candidate for the next election. Surprisingly in the 2002 presidential election, Morales came in second place (source: CNE, November, 2007). He credited his victory in part to the “involvement” and comments made by the then U.S. ambassador to Bolivia, Manuel Rocha. The Ambassador literally warned, “I want to remind the Bolivian electorate that if you elect those who want Bolivia to become a major cocaine exporter again, this will endanger the future of U.S. assistance to Bolivia” (Perkins, 2007, 126; see most local and international press also).

2.1.1 The war over water as antecedent

By the end of the 90s, “the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) decided to make Bolivia a laboratory for their own modern experiments in global economics and coerced the Bolivian government into selling or leasing its public enterprises into corporate hands” (Shultz, 2003b, 265). The national airline, the railroad, the telecommunications system, the hydrocarbon industry and the electric company one by one were sold or leased often with disastrous results, for instance, “the Chilean purchaser of the railroad dismantled it for parts and shut it down” (Shultz, 2003b, 265). The government did the same with the public water system in Cochabamba, the third largest city of Bolivia. “World Bank officials told Bolivia’s president that \$ 600 million in debt relief was dependent on putting Cochabamba’s water system into private hands” (Schultz, 2003a, 35). Weeks after taking over, Bechtel –company which the government leased off Cochabamba’s water until the year 2039 with a contract that gave control over hundreds of rural irrigation systems and community wells, projects paid for and built by local people without government help- “hit local families with rate increases of up to 200 per cent and sometimes higher” (Varghese, 2003, 8).

Outraged urban and rural people from different institutions gathered to fight that “privatisation”, they organised under the name of *La Coordinadora* and having Oscar Olivera as one of its most representative leaders. After months of useless negotiations, persecution of the leaders of the *Coordinadora*, even their temporal imprisonment; blockades, riots, several deaths and a general strike under the slogan “The Water Is Ours

Damnit!”, they made Bechtel officials leave the country. Besides, after “a bloody and weeklong popular protest the people of Bolivia [Cochabamba] managed to ensure that the contract was nullified in April 2000” (Ibid, 2003, 9)

2.1.2 The war over gas

By the year 2002, when Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada took office, after winning the general elections with his political party M.N.R, had to face and deal with the critical social and economic situation of the country; the economic growth had plunged from 4.8% to 0.6%, besides the fiscal deficit was running at 8%. After the first year of government the social crisis increased, and the demands from different social sectors became louder and louder. The indigenous farmers with their leader Felipe Quispe, Roberto de la Cruz, representing urban workers from El Alto mainly, Jaime Solares from the C.O.B., *Central Obrera Boliviana* (Bolivian Central Union) and Evo Morales for the coca growers joined together and founded “The People’s High Command” (*El Estado Mayor del Pueblo*) (El Diario: 20.01.2003) with the intention to fight the government policies.

Perhaps what triggered the social revolt was the government intention to export natural gas to the United States and Mexico by multinational companies through Chile; in spite of the people’s strong opposition (rancour still runs high against Chile, a neighbouring country, since Bolivia lost its coastal territory in the late 19th century War of the Pacific). The revolt began with a blockade by the Aymara farmers of the Altiplano, led by Felipe Quispe. The repression by the government left seven dead people which angered several other sectors; an indefinite general strike was declared and the coca growers led by Evo Morales joined the protest.

However, the outburst focused in El Alto where the neighbourhood councils following the general strike blocked all the roads from and to El Alto. The access to the International airport was blocked; the protesters took control of the access of the Senkata’s gas and gasoline deposit. Several people died when the government tried to regain control over the gasoline deposit; and the revolt spread throughout the city (González, 2007, 133; see also most local and international press).

As the protests increased, thousands of people especially from El Alto marched to La Paz. Some police stations were set on fire on their way, and the protest was not only against the exportation of natural gas, they now demanded the resignation of Sánchez de Lozada (El Diario, 15.10.2003; La Razón, 15.10.2003; and most local and international press.

The pressure from the social movements was too great that the president offered his resignation in an emergency session of Congress after a month of increasingly violent clashes between army and demonstrators that left more than 80 dead people, and the outrageous standoff between the police -who were on a strike demanding a pay rise- and army units which were called to protect the presidential palace because of the police strike. The event suddenly ended in violence and deaths in Plaza Murillo (La Paz main square) right in front of the government palace and the congress building. The square literally became a battle field (La Razón, 03.12.2003). For a more detailed description of the events, the reader might want to see the local press and also the OEA (*Organización de Estados Americanos*) report (May, 2003).

Since the 1940s, inside Bolivia, a strong centralist state to date, some regions (departments) began to economically prosper, which came along with demands for autonomy; the struggle for autonomy or federalism goes back more than a century. However, the conflict in Bolivia over demands for autonomy became stronger alongside the social demands and the critical political situation in the early 2000s; consequently, the social and political situation became unbearable.

Although Vice President Carlos Mesa sworn in as the head of state (El Diario, 18.10.2003), it neither stopped all those demands nor the critical situation as a whole. Evo Morales and his coca growers continued their protests and blockades followed by other sectors. The protests threatened the stability of the country, which led to Mesa's resignation; Mesa accused Evo Morales –the coca growers' union representative and Abel Mamani –representative of El Alto neighbourhood councils- for the critical situation.

After Mesa's resignation, the chief justice of the Supreme Court, Eduardo Rodríguez Veltzé, was appointed as president. But peace was still far from being reached, Morales and their supporters continued their revolt activity by means of riots and blockades, thus

Eduardo Rodriguez and the congress decided to move up the 2007 general elections to December 2005 (El País, 07.07.2005; see also Reuters; BBC Mundo; and most local and international press).

2.1.3 Morales's first presidential term: 2006 - 2009

After the congress decision to move up the general elections, Evo Morales declared they were the prime political force in the country and that they were ready to rule Bolivia. Preliminary polls showed a surprising three-way tie among Jorge Quiroga from the party PODEMOS, Samuel Doria Medina from the party UN and Evo Morales from MAS-IPSP. In fact Morales's assertion was not far from reality, with the left-wing ideologist Alvaro Garcia Linera as his running mate for the presidential elections, the MAS-IPSP won the December 2005 general elections.

On 21 January, 2006, Morales – known as Bolivia's first-ever indigenous president-attended an indigenous spiritual ceremony at the archaeological site of *Tiawanacu* (Bolpress, 22.01.2006, see also most local press). In the symbolic ceremony he was crowned as *Apu Mallku Aymara* (Aymara Supreme Leader), albeit the following day he officially received power during a congress session. Evo Morales' first presidential term had begun with lots of expectancies and at the same time uncertainty about the future.

One of the first controversies caused by Morales's administration was the surprising announcement of their intention to nationalise the Bolivian hydrocarbons assets. In fact, military troops were sent to occupy fifty-six gas installations simultaneously (El Diario, 02.05.2006; El Clarín, 02.05.2006; see also AP, ANSA, DPA y EFE and most local press). New contracts were signed with all the foreign energy firms which gave the country majority ownership and revenues over the second largest South American reserve of natural gas field.

On the other hand, the organisation of the Bolivian Constituent Assembly, one of the campaign promises made by all parties, created another controversy. Many people with no experience and without knowledge on legislation were appointed, suggestions and demands from different social sectors arose, some (departments) asked for autonomy, and some asked for bigger budgets, some institutions even wanted free ID cards.

However, in spite of having won the elections the MAS did not have full control over the congress yet, that is, the senate was still in control of the opposition parties; which prevented them from doing their freewill.

2.1.4 Morales's second presidential term: 2009 – present

Although referendums are not something new in Bolivia, there were some along the history of the country, the last referendum steered the form of Bolivia's government. During Morales's first presidential term because of the political differences that there were amongst the different political parties and the excessive tension in both chambers, the Senate managed to pass a recall referendum bill. In fact, the senate was still in control of the opposition.

Apparently the intention was to remove Morales from office, assuming that most people were in disagreement with his administration; however the plan, if that was, backfired because more than two third of voters voted to keep Morales in office (source: vice-presidencia, also I.A.L.P., 2008), besides some local governors (*prefectos*) belonging to opposition parties were removed.

In the 2005 general elections, Morales was elected president with 53.7 per cent of the popular vote, however by means of the new constitution drafted by his loyalists, new elections were called. In the 2009 elections Morales won with a landslide majority of about sixty-four per cent (Bolpress, 06.12.2009, see also local press and most news agencies) and continued to his second term of presidency.

When Evo Morales won the 2009 elections, he did not only gain a second term in office, he also obtained a majority of representatives in both the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate. Now Morales and the MAS have the two thirds of votes in both chambers which allows them to pass any bill and to make any decision they want.

2.1.5 The M.A.S.-I.P.S.P. (Morales's) current Administration

Much can be said about the MAS, Karin Monasterios, Ervé Do Alto and Pablo Stefanoni in their book "*Reinventando la nación en Bolivia*" (2007) assert that the MAS represent a wide national and popular identity that articulates: the long term memory (**anti-**

colonialist), a mid-term memory (**nationalist-revolutionary**) and a short term memory (**anti-neoliberal**). They also say that from this idea of **Indian** nationalism emerge the MAS and its leader Evo Morales. However, historical facts have shown that after the 1952 revolution many movements had emerged, among them was that of the miners. In the 80s after the so called “re-localisation,” miners had been displaced from their working areas; many of them were forced to migrate and some of them ended up in the Chapare - Cochabamba’s tropical area- and eventually became coca growers. And their appearance into the political arena was due to the defence of the eradication of illegal coca leaf, used as a precursor of cocaine; forbidden drug which is penalised in most countries of the world.

One thing which cannot be denied is that originally the movement was a series of riots, blockades and protests against coca leaf eradication which gradually incorporated new items into their agenda; arguing that they have been discriminated against for being *campesinos* (peasants), that coca leaf was part of their culture, that it was a legacy from their ancestors, and so forth. As time went by they claimed for mother earth’s rights, decolonisation, liberation from the *empire*, dignity, sovereignty, nationalisation of natural resources, and industrialisation of natural gas, among others which originally were not part of their agenda.

2.1.6 Domestic policy

The Constituent Assembly

Since Evo Morales and the MAS took office one of the people’s most required claims, and the MAS’s most ambitious project in this direction, the reform of the National Constitution of the State through the establishment of a Constituent Assembly, was achieved. With lots of expectations at the beginning, controversies during the process and many doubts about the outcomes, the assembly drafted a new constitution. Although the assembly seems to be an achievement of Bolivian people, its conformation deprived from representation to most political parties which are considered as opposition.

Political parties are fundamental for the functioning of today’s democracies, “without political parties, a modern representative democracy is not conceivable”

(Hofmeister & Grabow, 2011, 8), and Bolivia's democracy is no exception. Since 1985 the neo-liberalism policies and the often political-electoral standoff gave way to 'pacted democracy' or gentlemen's agreements amongst the main party leaders. Those agreements led to having governments that were not supported by strong political parties; rather they were underpinned by several parties with demands of their own. Those agreements and alliances made the corresponding presidents unable to govern. The best example is the 1989 general elections where the third voted candidate, Jaime Paz Zamora, came to be president (Campero, 1992, also see most local press). Therefore this situation turned into the collapse of the *traditional* Bolivian party system.

However, paradoxically, "parties have always been in effect the main source of the problem of governance in Bolivia, and at the same time the only real source of any potential solution" (Gamarra and Malloy, 1995, 421). Therefore the result of that political crisis among the traditional political parties empowered the MAS which obtained enough representation in the Assembly, and hence they could pass any article.

In fact, the assembly members were elected along political party lines. This procedure, an orchestrated movement or not, consolidated the MAS power of decision within the Assembly. Besides, inside the Assembly the two thirds of votes to pass articles was not accepted by the MAS representatives, since they had relative majority. After the twelve months, deadline had to be changed because the members of the assembly could not get to an agreement since the very beginning. In spite of the demands, accusations, denunciations of illegalities, and so forth, during the whole process, without most members of the main opposition parties, outside of town and inside army barracks (Bassi & Evans, 2007; see full details in local press), and under heavy police and military guard the new constitution was drafted.

Finally, when the congress was supposed to vote the new constitution (by two thirds), a threatening atmosphere was created by the "social movements"-thousands of MAS supporters- that surrounded the congress to prevent opposition senators from attending and voting. Furthermore, it was called a coup to democracy because

opposition congressmen were neither allowed in or out, congress members in session were unable to leave and they were forced to sleep in the building. The new constitution was “agreed” under pressure. A fully detailed description of the events, controversies, irregularities, and the illegal procedures that were followed by the Constituent Assembly can be found in Estenssoro (2009), as well as that in most local and international press also).

Education Reform-History

The Bolivian educational system has undergone several reforms in the last decades; changes were made in order to improve the quality and equity of the education. In the colonial era, education was limited to children of elite families, later on universal and compulsory primary education was called. In the early 1900s few public schools were opened, most of them meant to urban elites. Although in 1947 the first attempt to end illiteracy was made, it was after the 1952 revolution that a foundation for a new public education system was laid.

The 1992 Bolivian education reform brought some changes such as: teachers training, curriculum development, bilingual and intercultural education (Contreras and Talavera, 2005). The campaign for the education reform ranged from posters and billboards with slogans such as *Our diversity is our strength*, to bilingual textbooks and story books that featured native people wearing traditional indigenous clothing.

In 1994, in order to fulfil local needs, the reform decentralised educational funding, and formalised intercultural bilingual education. Most of the changes included the division of the educational system; sometimes five years of primary school, three years of intermediate and four years of secondary; sometimes six years of primary school and six of secondary, etc. Although in 1973 during the *de facto* government of Banzer, in the last two year cycle students were supposed to have the option to specialise in some technical fields, the teaching of technical fields has never been implemented neither in public schools nor in private schools, the school system has remained the same in most public and private schools with very few

exceptions, such as the “Amerinst” (American Institute) which up to now provides a rather different education system.

The MAS Education Policy

Since Evo Morales took office, under the label of “politics of change”, his policy focused on the constitution and the education system. After having been in office only a few months and following a method elaborated by IPLAC (*Instituto Pedagógico Latinoamericano y Caribeño*) with a strong support of Cuba and Venezuela, the MAS government initiated the education campaign “*yo si puedo*” (YES, I CAN) in order to eradicate illiteracy (source: *Plan Iberoamericano de Alfabetización*).

The new education bill, proposed by the MAS –there is a very strong relationship between the New Constitution and the new education reform- states that the education is (should be): “decolonisational, liberating, anti-imperialist, anti-globalisational, revolutionary and transforming the economic, social, cultural, political and ideological structures; directed towards self-determination, reaffirmation of the villages, the original indigenous nations, Afro-Bolivians and the other cultural expressions of the Bolivian multinational state” (*Nueva ley de la Educación Boliviana*, 2010: Cap. 1, Art. 1,2). Based on those principles the MAS government is imposing the *Avelino Siñani-Elizardo Perez* bill (hereafter ASEP).

Although some people might think the ASEP is a creation of the MAS (Evo Morales’s government), the fact is that between 1931 and 1938 during the government of Jose Luis Tejada Sorzano, Elizardo Perez from the government and Avelino Siñani representing the indigenous people signed an agreement which started the “*Warisata* School”, the first Bolivian indigenous school. By 1939 this indigenous school system increased in number over the Andean territory and spread to some other countries in South America, the Warisata Teachers Training School was created because of the demand of teachers. However, after the government of German Busch, apparently due to political reasons, the schools were dismantled and in Casarabe (1940) around three hundred students died when they opposed to the

closing of the school. They were accused of developing communist ideas, that event ended this project (Mejía, 2004).

The increasingly severe exploitation and marginalization of the indigenous population were the motivation behind the “*Warisata: La Escuela-Ayllu*” (original name), which proposed the creation of a national model of productive education; this model was based on five principles: liberation, community organization and production, the re-assessment of the cultural identity, solidarity and reciprocity.

The current ASEP (Avelino Siñani- Elizardo Perez) education bill proposes a revolutionary, decolonising education with emphasis on productive skills, community involvement, and indigenous language, culture, and knowledge which does not differ much from the 1930s original. The MAS have added lots of ideological items emphasising words such as plurinational, inter-culturalism, decolonising, etc. making a specific political and ideological commitment to an intercultural, bilingual focus, launching a debate and raising awareness about a multicultural, multilingual and multiregional state, indigenous rights and others. The proposal is fundamentally fostering participation of the people as the immediate protagonists of the implementation of the plan. For a more detailed description of the characteristics and history of this school, see Perez’s “*Warisata: la Escuela-Ayllu*” (1962), “*Revista Indígena Ajayu*” (2013), also the ASEP bill.

The MAS government through the ASEP bill blame teachers and the current education system for the very high drop-out rate throughout the public education system. They assert that in rural areas many children do not advance beyond second or third grade because of the current education system. They also say that Bolivia began as a system controlled by the colonial power designed to systematically control indigenous populations. According to the government there has been a vague reform, a misconception of intercultural and bilingual education meant for rural schools only.

On the other hand, they also assert that because of the lack of competence and commitment from teachers, students seem to be victims of an oppressive, mono-

lingual and mono-cultural education. Students just learn to listen and repeat the teachers' truth, rather than discuss and think critically. These and several other details can be found in Arnal et al's "*Haciendo la Reforma*" (1996) and in the justification of most of the material issued by the *Ministerio de Educación* concerning the educational reform. These assertions can also be found in the material provided by PROFOCOM (Programa de Formación Complementaria para Maestros). PROFOCOM is a program of studies for Bolivian regular teachers.

Policy on Communication

Since the very beginning of Morales's administration, the area of communication has been of great concern. In fact, during the first two years of the MAS government Bs 190 million has been spent on the area. As well as that, US\$ 1.5 M. coming from Venezuelan aid was also invested in communication. That amount of money was invested in setting up perhaps the largest communication network in Bolivia; Red Patria Nueva. That communication network involves radio stations in rural areas as well as in the capital cities. Besides radio stations, there are also a series of printed issues such as 'Cambio' that are distributed throughout the nation. Moreover, during 2008, channel 7, official channel, spent more than Bs 53.3 million, and for the year 2009 the official channel was going to receive a budget of Bs 65.9 million (El Deber, 7.01.2009).

On the other hand, in the communication area, in the year 2014 the Tupac Katari, first Bolivian satellite started to operate. The US\$ 300 million satellite created lots of expectancies. The Bolivian government borrowed the money from China (BBC News, 02.04.2014); China also built and launched the satellite.

Economy-History

When Bolivia returned to the democracy system in the early eighties, the country had to face its worst economic crisis. During the U.D.P. (*Unidad Democrática y Popular*) government (1982-1985), following a sort of populism policy, the country's economy had to face a critical situation.

According to Morales (1986) the crisis of the Bolivian left in the mid-eighties was perhaps the most spectacular of those of Latin America over the course of the decade. As well as that, Jeffrey Sachs (2000) believed that by his calculations at the time it was about the seventh most extreme hyperinflation [in history]. In fact, besides the generalised crises most South American countries had to face in the 80s, the U.D.P. inherited much of the economic crisis from the previous military dictatorships that after several coups had to retreat to the barracks due to the severe economic deterioration. “By 1982, the foreign debt had grown to US\$ 3.8 billion, and in 1984-85 inflation tagged as high as 20,000 per cent, one of the highest rates the world has ever seen. As the currency collapsed, GDP dropped from US\$ 5.99 billion to US\$ 4.79. When the government realised that its debt exceeded export income they suspended service payments and limited payments to twenty-five per cent of export incomes” (Kohl and Farthing, 2006, 62-70).

At the same time, “coca production in the Chapare and the Yungas skyrocketed in the 1980s when the demand for cocaine soared in northern countries” (Farthing & Kohl, 2010; Morales, 1986, 11). As the prices of Bolivia’s prime commodity exports fell, the only sector of the economy that thrived was coca-cocaine production, which at one point equalled about ninety per cent of legal exports (de Franco and Godoy, 1992).

After winning the elections, on 29 August 1985, three weeks after Victor Paz Estenssoro’s inauguration the 21.060 decree was unveiled; a policy of severe orthodox adjustments which stopped Bolivia’s hyperinflation. This decree “signals the start of shock therapy” (Yergin & Stanislaw, 2002, 422). In Fact, Yergin & Stanislaw catalogued it as one of the most important events in the history of world economy. “The Bolivia’s hyperinflation in 1984-1985 [...] was one of the most dramatic inflations in world history and one of the only hyperinflations that did not result from the dislocations of war or revolution. At its peak the monthly inflation rate reached 182.8 per cent and lasted 18 months, between April 1984 and September 1985, recording 25,000 per cent per year” (Dem et al, 2001, 13).

In addition, Bolivia's vulnerable economy has swung in world commodity prices. For instance the price of tin -one of the main items Bolivia has traditionally exported- plummeted in the early eighties, the price of crude oil was below US\$ 10 per barrel by mid-eighties. It is worth mentioning that during the MAS government oil prices peaked at US\$ 147.30 per barrel (July 2008).

The MAS policy on economy

After Sanchez de Lozada's resignation, the Congress passed a law that added a thirty-two per cent tax on production which meant that a re-negotiation of contracts with the state was necessary. Instead, Evo Morales signed a decree stating that all hydrocarbons and natural gas reserves were to be nationalised giving the state ownership, possession and total and absolute control. Gradually, most of the enterprises that had been "capitalised" were "re-nationalised" which included Entel, LAB, Vinto- the main metal processing plant, among others. What matters the most is that just after Morales's nationalisation of hydrocarbon assets, the prices peaked the highest level ever, as it was mentioned above, fact that virtually multiplied the state incomes following the same arithmetic relationship because the price of natural gas is linked to the price of oil.

With such increase in the incomes, the MAS followed a leftist policy. Leftist governments in Latin America have tended to re-distribute wealth by means of increasing social spendings. In the short run, it has usually been a good thing; however, it has negatively affected the accounts balances in the long run. It must be pointed out that the MAS's first written document about the theoretical conceptualization of the New Economic Social Communitarian and Productive Model undertaken by his administration was published in September, 2011 (after almost six years of government, in fact during the MAS second presidential term). Following a new form of populism, their influence on social welfare has been reflected in a series of social bonuses, which can be considered as the most important aspect of their policy, because most of the time Morales is concerned in playing football after the inauguration of football fields, events that are broadcast by the official television channel (channel 7).

Bono Juancito Pinto

Although the idea came from a group of children – once a year some children play at being the politicians who rule the country, in 2006 Evo Morales government created the “bono Juancito Pinto.” The 200 bolivianos (30 dollar) grant is meant to prevent students from dropping out of schools; the Bs 200 is delivered once a year. In 2001, when the vice president described the importance of this social policy, he asserted that the bursary is a result of the nationalisation of the hydrocarbons.

Bono Juana Azurduy

In addition to three months paid maternity leave, employer-subsidized dairy product allowance, reduced schedules for breastfeeding during the first year of a child’s life, free births in public hospitals among other benefits Bolivian mothers have long enjoyed, the MAS administration established the *bono Juana Azurduy*. The government assert that this stipend is one of the Morales administration’s most successful initiatives. Mothers receive up to Bs 1.825 over a period of thirty-three months, about Bs 100 every two months. This paper, *Opinión*, says that the bonus has benefited more than 700.000 children and around 500.000 mothers. Besides, according to the program’s director, Erick Arnéz, the bonus has helped to reduce chronic malnutrition, as well as early infant mortality [sic] (*Opinión*, 01.09.2012). On the other hand a report of the Chamber of Deputies states that the bonus has benefited 383.242 mothers (Cámara de Diputados, 2013).

Renta Dignidad

A subsidy for all Bolivians over 65 was created by Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada during his first government. In 1996, the universal, annual old-age benefit, the BONOSOL was created, which though small would have an immense impact on the rural elderly, the most marginalised sector of Bolivia's indigenous population.

During Morales’s administration and with the revenues of the hydrocarbons, the name BONOSOL was changed to *renta dignidad* (dignity pension). The amount was increased to Bs 2.400, for elders who receive no income from the State and Bs 1.800 for those who receive some. Full details about the way of distribution, the conditions, the beneficiaries, and the requirements for being beneficiary of all

bonuses, grants, allowances, which are delivered by the government, can be found in the *Gaceta Oficial del Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia* available on the government's web page (<http://www.gacetaoficialdebolivia.gob.bo/>).

2.1.7 Foreign Policy

After Evo Morales won the general elections (2005), he spent a couple of weeks visiting different countries in search of political and economic support. His itinerary reflected his intention to strengthen bonds with governments and social movements in Latin America and a clear "anti-imperialist" attitude. The MAS and Evo Morales's foreign policy can be roughly divided between the one led by the United States and the other which involves the rest of the world.

Evo Morales at the U.N. General Assembly (2006)

Evo Morales made a rather dramatic presentation at the assembly; with a coca leaf in his hand, he claimed that the coca leaf is green not white like cocaine, that "coca-leaf production [erradication] is equivalent to zero *Quechuas*, zero *Aymaras*, zero *Mojeños*, zero *Chiquitanos* (all of them Bolivian ethnic groups, however the current government policy refers to them as nations or cultures). "We are an underdeveloped country with economic problems resulting from the pillage of our natural resources. We are here today to begin to regain our dignity and the dignity of our country" (Morales: speech delivered at the U.N. General Assembly: September 19, 2006).

Evo Morales's relations in South America

Since the MAS won the 2005 general elections, Evo Morales started a tour around the world in search of support and help from different countries. Right after the elections, after knowing their victory, he went to Cuba and Venezuela and signed some cooperation agreements with Fidel Castro and Hugo Chavez, presidents of Cuba and Venezuela respectively. In fact, since 2005 Morales has kept a very close relation with both countries. Many Venezuelan and Cuban doctors have been working in Bolivia; hospitals have been installed. Cuban and Venezuelan advisors have been working with Morales's government up to now (2013).

After the US government cut the duty-free exports (BBC Mundo, 24.10.2008; Notimex, 01.11.2008), Venezuela promised to cover Bolivia's textile exports which had been sold to the U.S. until then. Although this agreement was supposed to improve the incomes of small Bolivian manufacturers, the fact is that many of those small factories, especially the ones that used to operate in El Alto, have been closed and all the employees have been dismissed. "Though foreign investment flows to Bolivia are relatively low, any negative impact on the economy could be significant because the size of the Bolivian economy is [very] small" (Villarreal, 2011, 7)

Argentina and Brazil

The relationship with Argentina and Brazil has been a commercial one. By the year 2005 Bolivia exported nearly 1.7 million cubic metres of gas a day, they expected 16.6 in 2009 and 27.7 by 2010. It should be made clear that before taking office, Evo Morales and MAS strongly disagreed the selling of gas, instead they claimed immediate industrialisation of gas and natural resources, however, all they have done is increase the selling, as the following headline reads: "Bolivia agrees to sell more gas to Argentina under an 'interruptible' contract" (MercoPress; 19.07.2012).

Europe and Asia

The MAS also developed relations with some other countries; for the exploitation of the Mutun iron ore reserves, they signed an agreement with India's Jindal Steel and Power, a project worth US\$ 2.1 billion. However, up to now, there have only been good intentions and the project itself has not started yet. Although the project was announced with a great fanfare, in July 2012 the "negotiations broke down and the Bolivian government took some high-handed measures including ordering of the arrest of key Jindal employees, who managed to leave the country in time. Now the matter is under arbitration" (Gateway House, 2013).

Evo Morales also met Lybian leader colonel Muammar al-Gaddafi; they expressed intentions of cooperation, in fact they announced US\$ 80 million in investments. The latest news throughout the world (October 20, 2011) announced Gaddafi's death, of course no investment had been made until then.

Morales has tried to establish close relations with Iran. Iran showed interest in the areas of health, hydrocarbons and agriculture. Uranium and lithium also were of interest for Iran. In fact with South Korean cooperation, in 2014 the first li-ion batteries made-in-Bolivia have been produced (La Patria, 28.02.2014). However, it is not clear where or what market Bolivia is intending to cover with that new production or how much the revenues of that production will be, or rather how large that production is going to be.

Morales's first attempt to establish relations with Russia was the intention to purchase a small batch of helicopters. By 2009, when Morales met Russian president Dmitri Medvedev in Moscow, various agreements were signed pertaining military ties, energy and mining activities.

Vietnam and China among other countries have been part of Morales's agenda, countries he wanted to establish relations with in order to get mutual benefits.

Evo Morales and the U.S.A.

On saying "*Kausachuncoca!*" (Long live coca) and "*Huaiñuchumyanquis!*" (Down with Yankees), Evo Morales supportive crowd cheered him when he was endorsed as the 2002 MAS presidential candidate. Perhaps Evo Morales administration's most outstanding characteristic has been the attitude towards The United States. Evo Morales outspoken position against The United States became evident when the 1008 law called for the eradication, over time, of all excess of coca. Perhaps because the "coca cero" plan was run with the strong support of the US-DEA; before being elected Evo Morales called, former US president, Bush, terrorist (Sni, 2005), see also most News Agencies and local newspapers) because, in Morales words, Bush and the U.S.A. have been military acting within foreign countries.

Once Evo Morales took office, under the slogan of dignity and sovereignty, his policy reflected his prejudice against the U.S.A. In September, 2008, Morales declared Philip Goldberg, US ambassador to Bolivia, *persona non-grata* and demanded him to leave the country (Friedman-Rudovsky: 11.09.2008), see also

most local press and News Agencies). In November the same year, Morales ordered US-DEA agents leave the country. Early the same year USAID programs were expelled from Chapare and Evo Morales threatened with the completely expelling of the USAID program from Bolivia. Several reasons, which “justify” that attitude, have been expressed by Evo Morales and his government. Morales’s reasons and their logic and validity will be considered afterwards.

2.2 The discourse of the MAS

In a previous section, the role of NGOs has been described, as well as the effect of power, people’s language behaviour, persuasion and framing, and how they can be expressed in the area of politics. In this ever changing world many new things are coming up every day and thus changing our perspective; for instance, according to Martzloff (1991) even until the seventeenth century many people in China still believed the earth was flat. Although any other thing than universal suffrage or co-education seem to be unthinkable nowadays, not so long ago things were a little different. Some colleges started allowing women and men together by the late 1800s. Famous universities such as Princeton University and Yale University became co-educational in 1969; Harvard University afforded women the opportunity to learn side-by-side with men in the classroom in 1972 (Rudolph, 1990).

Controversies aside, the Gradual Abolition Act of 1780, Washington’s ban on slavery 1789, Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, the Thirteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution (Lusane, 2011) nor even the Declaration of the Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World 1920 (Rodriguez Junius, 2011) could make negroes be treated as humans. In spite of the constant struggle for equality, the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the work and death of many activists such as the United States black pastor Wyatt Tee Walker, Malcolm Little also known as Hajj Malik El-Shabazz well known as Malcolm X -according to the autopsy report Malcolm X's body had 21 gunshot wounds to his chest (Marable, 2011), or the death of the Baptist minister and activist, Martin Luther King Jr., 1968, not even the most optimistic would have thought that in 2009 a black, negro, nigger or whatever they may call him, Barack Obama, would have become president of the United States of America.

As well as that, a bit more than a decade ago few people in Bolivia, perhaps no one, would have believed that a peasant, a *llama* herder, would have become the first indigenous president in Bolivia's history. Much has been said about Evo Morales, his way of talking and what he says. Rodriguez A. (2011) published a collection of a series of Evo Morales's statements or misstatements in his book *Evadas*. Although such kind of publication is not something new; Weisberg (2001) published George W. Bush's slip of the tongue statements, and Dampier & Walton (2006) also wrote something similar about Prince Phillippe, nevertheless, most of what Morales says, misstatements, cannot be considered a slip of the tongue, a gaffe, a banter, or just a lapsus linguae, as it will be seen afterwards.

Although the MAS as a party have got several representatives who in different political areas express what can be called their "ideology", most of what they say have got several things in common. MAS politicians such as the vice president Alvaro Garcia, Juan Ramon de la Quintana (current minister), David Choquehuanca (chancellor), Sacha Llorentti (former minister), Gabriela Montaño (current president of the senate) or even Hugo Salviatierra (former Minister) usually address to their audiences in different ways, however, in spite of the way they are uttered, most of the topics they usually talk about, remain the same. Since Evo Morales is the one who usually delivers long speeches, let us see what he says.

Morales, according to the vice-president Garcia Linera, has been 20 times awarded the title *Doctor Honoris Causa* (El Deber: 01.07.2011). Morales was also named "World Hero of Mother Earth" by U.N. General Assembly (Munckton, 2009; see also the Latin American Herald Tribune, 2010; and most local press and News Agencies). The Emily Found for a Better World on their web page included a short biography of Evo Morales under the headline "Heroes for a Better World." Morales also has been depicted almost as a hero by Sivak (2010) (Sivak is an Argentinean journalist). Jonathan Glennie (research fellow of O.D.I –Overseas Development Institute- and The Guardian journalist) considers Morales an example to be followed. Besides, other praising books and articles about Evo Morales have been written by writers such as Pablo Stefanoni and others.

Adjectives such as courageous or hero have been used to describe Morales; Gauguin's attitude (1892) was also considered courageous when he decided to leave

everything behind and dwell on an almost primitive island. The fact is that Gauguin was suffering from eczema, malaria, rotting teeth, a liver ruined by years of heavy drinking, and syphilis, -he may also have attempted suicide by drinking arsenic- and perhaps he was mentally unstable (Mathews, 2001), therefore words like *courageous* or *hero* sometimes should not be taken literally.

Without considering how *funny* some of Evo Morales's misstatements are, because some are out of context, some are illogical and some might come from a complete lack of knowledge of the subject matter, what does he say in his speeches? Is there any recurrent word, phrase or topic? Whom does he intend to reach (touch) with them? Is there any purpose for uttering them? Or is it just a matter of rhetoric? Whatever the answers to these questions might be and in order to avoid misunderstandings, especially amongst people who do not know much about Morales or do not usually hear him speak, it must be stated that what follows comes from the current Bolivian President, Evo Morales Ayma (2013), which will be subject to analysis and interpretation.

In some fragments of the text, the [*sic*] note has been added because of the extreme lack of sense, lack of coherence, the illogicality of the idea expressed or the misconception of what real facts are, or just a wrong relationship of cause and effect which is taken as an assertion. As well as that, in some sections, quotation marks have been used to highlight Morales's assertions. Moreover, since this is an academic text, some arrangements have been made in order that the ideas are expressed logically and the sentences be, somehow, grammatically acceptable. It should be noted as well that it is Morales who delivers longer speeches, unlike the other members of the MAS who usually speak a few minutes.

On the other hand, Morales speeches have been collected along his government, since 2005 until the current year 2013 which includes his September-2012 speech where he asserted that "having relations with the U.S.A. is a TURD" (A.P., 12.10.2012; the Salt Lake tribune, 12.10.1012; and most international press). Since this is an academic paper with academic purposes, and because of the length, only two of Morales's addresses have been transcribed in full as samples, see annex B. Besides, the topics found in Morales addresses have been catalogued into some categories; those categories and their respective

percentages of recurrence, those figures support the following sections, were summarised in a table, see annex A.

Morales speeches that were subject to analysis and interpretation are the following.

1. Inaugural speech delivered at the Congress - La Paz, 22 January, 2006
2. 65th Session: United Nations – 23 September, 2010
3. Inaugural speech (Morales's second term)
(22 January, 2010)
4. Speech delivered at Leganés, Spain – 13 September, 2009)
5. Speech delivered at the enactment of the Bolivian New Constitution
(La Paz, 7 February, 2009)
6. Speech delivered at the Río+20 Summit - Friday 29 June, 2012
7. Speech delivered at Jardín Hidalgo, Coyoacán – 21 February, 2010
8. Speech delivered for the 186th Anniversary of Bolivian independence
(Sucre, 6 August, 2011)
9. Speech delivered because of the day of Bolivia's maritime claim
(29 April, 2011)
10. Speech delivered at Climate Change (Cambio Climático)
(Cochabamba, Tiquipaya-Bolivia, 20 April, 2010)
11. Speech delivered the previous day of his official possession
(Tiahuanacu, 21 January, 2006)
12. Speech delivered at Foro Humanista-La Paz, 2007

2.2.1 Recurrent Topics in Morales's Speeches

“Who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.”

-Orwell

History

Morales has got a quality which cannot be denied, albeit most of what he says does not make much sense, he can keep talking hours and hours without any script. After analysing what he says in his speeches, it was interesting to find out that in his speeches, that is, the opportunities when he has to address to huge audiences –officially or unofficially, he always refers to the audiences as “brothers and sisters” (an Andean tradition or custom). In about seventy-six per cent of his speeches (see annex A), he speaks about the history of Bolivia and South America, how we have been oppressed for 500 years, how we have fought for freedom for 500 years, how we, Bolivian indigenous people, have resisted the oppressors.

Morales reminds the audience about the indigenous leaders' constant struggle. He asserts that we (the MAS and their followers) are the follow up of Tupac Katari's revolution². Morales claims that Katari's rebellion has lasted for 500 years and that his indigenous brothers' demands are still alive for 500 years. He says that they, the indigenous people, have started to fight for equality and have resisted the looting of the natural resources. In Morales's words the indigenous people have fought for 500 years and they have defended their territory; the uprising against the looting of the natural resources has always been led by the indigenous people. The long struggle of our ancestors started in the 1700, 1600, perhaps in 1492.

²Julian Apaza Nina, a.k.a.Tupac Katari was a leader in the rebellions of indigenous people of Bolivia against the Spanish Empire in the early 1780's, after being betrayed by Tomás Inkalipe, he was captured and sentenced to die; his body was dismembered, his head was exhibited in La Paz main square, his chest and heart were shown in La Ceja-El Alto –a place now called “Corazon de Jesús”-, his right hand was taken to Achacachi, his left hand to Ayo Ayo, and both his legs to Chulumani (Quispe: 1990)

Colonialism

“We all know the Indians were colonised by the Europeans, but every colonised Indian has been colonised by the Indian reaction to colonisation”

-Sherman Alexie-

Another commonly used topic is “colonialism”, although it has been mentioned in about sixty-one per cent of Morales’s speeches (see annex A), in some of his addresses he mentioned it more than twenty times. In Morales’s words, he has reached the conclusion that we, Bolivians, have inherited corruption, nepotism, and bureaucracy among other ‘evils’ from a colonial state [sic]. He says that Bolivia is one of the poorest countries in South America, that all citizens are not equal, because of colonialism. According to Morales all the social / popular uprisings were against the colonial state Bolivia had since the foundation of the republic.

In 2005 Morales said “we arrived here (to power in Bolivia) to repair the historic damage, to repair 500 years of damage.” In the Bolivian military, you are never going to find an Indigenous surname and that is the referent of the presence of colonialism. Morales speaks of internal and external colonialism, he assures that their new constitution will permanently remove the current colonial state. He compels his peasant brothers not to forget the colonial heritage and the constant struggle of their ancestors to free themselves from colonialism.

On the other hand, Morales demands that developed countries should decolonise the atmosphere which should be distributed equally among all countries and according to their population [sic]. The looting of natural resources by the colonialism of developed countries makes them turn their obligations to protect nature to undeveloped and developing countries whereas they, developed countries, are still commercially destroying the environment. Perhaps Morales was talking about the Carbon Credits which are meant to control the Greenhouse effect; a Carbon Credit is a sort of certificate or permit that allows the holder to emit one tone of carbon dioxide or a similar mass of another greenhouse gas. The use of Carbon Credits was formalised by the Kyoto Protocol (1997), besides there are some specialised markets for those Credits.

US AND THEM

They are evil

“Evil isn’t the real threat to the world. Stupidity is just as destructive as Evil, maybe more so, and it’s a hell of a lot more common”

— Jim Butcher

Morales’s speeches usually involve several topics, aside from the main one –it can be an inauguration, possession, anniversary, etc. In about ninety-two per cent of his addresses he clearly makes the distinction between “US” and “THEM”. In his address for the enactment of their new constitution (2009) he mentioned it eleven times, and during his inauguration speech, he mentioned it sixteen times (see annex A). The distinction is usually clear; we are “good” and they are “evil”, we do the “right thing” and they do the “wrong thing”, we are “right” and they are “wrong”. In this distinction, anyone who is not a “campesino” (Aymara or *Quechua* peasant) or who is somewhat different belongs to “THEM.”

Morales usually complains that westerners and people from Europe just came to plunder our natural resources. The IMF (International Monetary Fund) and the World Bank imposed plundering policies to third world countries, Bolivia among them. He affirms that we, Bolivians, are better off without them. He seems to be dead against developed countries. He says that developed countries have failed in international conventions such as Copenhagen and it was a triumph for the peoples [*sic*].

In Morales’s words developed countries’ damage to the world is so great that it cannot be paid. We should not follow the way of developed countries [perhaps referring to the irrational exploitation of natural resources] because it is destroying planet earth. Morales asserts that medicine provided by western countries causes more damage than benefits; since this medicine heals one thing, it hurts two other things. In some of his speeches he quoted his own experience: once after he had taken Alka-Seltzer, he felt worse, -although sometimes he says that “when we have a head-ache we usually take Alka-Seltzer which rather than healing causes a stomach-ache- therefore he concludes that western countries only bring poison [*sic*].

When he talks about Bolivia, it seems he cannot help remembering the regional division; those from the east “*campesinos*”, the region with the most important natural resources (land, gas, petroleum, forests, water, etc.) and those from the west “*kollas*” - where there are the Indigenous concentrations of the *Aymaras* and *Quechuas*. The rich classes in the east, the Indigenous peoples in the west and the ones from the valleys were considered beasts of burden [*sic*].

Morales also asserts that when they came to power, they –the MAS- discovered that most of Bolivian natural resources had been granted to international companies or even to some local oligarchies and they also discovered that there still remains the plundering attitude among most civil servants [*sic*]. Morales usually questions that since the foundation of the republic, Bolivian natural resources have not been industrialised and Bolivia has just been exporting raw material [*sic*]³. Besides western countries, foreign institutions such as the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund and all foreigners, Morales blames all other local political actors, politicians, political parties and all former governments for not having done any good thing for the “*campesinos*” (Bolivian peasants), conversely, they privatised basic utilities such as water.

Morales is even harder when he talks about former governments, other politicians and anyone who is not a peasant, in fact, he asserts that only the peasants have truly fought for the freedom of the country. Besides, he says that any other who had participation in the movements for freedom, have had their own motives, even the creoles, who one way or another have been involved in the fight, had their own interests which were the profits they were after.

Morales says that politicians should live for politics, not from politics. He casually remembers in most of his speeches how politics was when he first became a congressman; he saw no agreements for democracy, rather what he saw was political agreements for corruption, agreements for embezzlement of public funds and the secret expenditure, all that money was used to kill and steal [*sic*]. In Morales words, all traditional political parties

³(It is worth noting here that when Carlos Mesa, former Bolivian president, intended to increase the amount of natural gas exported to Brazil, Morales and his followers caused riots demanding immediate industrialisation. In fact, during Morales’s government, the volume of exported gas has several times been increased)

—save the MAS, of course- are corrupt, politicians sold themselves in the parliament, they did their own business with the companies and they usually took turns in power, one after the other.

In Morales words, all previous governments used to charge ten times as much for some services they provided; he sometimes quotes as an example the disencumbrance (the legal clearing of titles). Since Bolivia has been qualified in the second worst place in terms of corruption, it was because of the politicians who were in the government in the past; now that they are in power his view of Bolivia is quite different as we shall see later. Morales admits some deficiencies in his government. For instance, he accepts they have had problems with YPFB⁴ (*Yacimientos Petroliferos Fiscales Bolivianos*), Bolivian main and only oil company, although he immediately blames the rightist press, the opposition political parties, the *Prefectos* (local governors). Sometimes, especially when he is in the eastern side of Bolivia, he remarks that he is not accusing all of them, that it is not the majority, that it is only some of them, some journalist, some oligarchs or some families or some civic authorities or political authorities.

We are the good ones

“People who claim that they're evil are usually no worse than the rest of us... It's people who claim that they're good, or any way better than the rest of us that you have to be wary of.”

— Gregory Maguire

Morales usually remembers that in the past, when people migrated to America, *our* ancestors never expelled them nor treated them unfairly because they used to live in peace and harmony with nature and everybody. Morales claims that all the “evil” things we can see now have been brought from abroad and started with the Spanish colonisation. In his addresses, Morales makes sure to state that envy, discrimination, racism, corruption, looting, mismanagement, etc. took place in the past. After he took office, there is equality and social justice.

⁴Former Y.P.F.B. president Santos Ramirez, accused of corruption, was sent to prison and there are more accusations against current president Carlos Villegas; both members of the MAS (El Deber; 27 Jan 2012).

Before taking office Morales remarked that “we, the *Aymaras* and *Quechuas* are not rancorous.” In his words the indigenous peoples are humanity’s last moral reservoir and the whole human race can benefit from the wisdom of the world’s indigenous peoples who understand that we must live in harmony with nature. The indigenous cultures are cultures of dialogue and of life, not cultures of death and war.

Whenever the indigenous people are involved in a sort of protest, demand or demonstration, during and against his government, he does not blame his indigenous brothers and sisters, he asserts that their leaders are being used and manipulated by the “others” [THEM] (the empire, the rightists, the oligarchs, the rich, the *q’aras*⁵, etc.). Once Morales knew they were going to take over, his message was that they were going to rule by means of reason, reason of the poor, reason of the “*campesinos*” (peasants) which are the majority of Bolivian society. He asserted that their new socio-political system would respect all Bolivian citizens equally and it would eradicate colonialism and imperialism and would assure peace among the peoples and mother earth.

Besides, they would show the “others” [THEM] how to rule with honesty and responsibility, he told the congress opposition members not to worry because they would not bulldoze anyone or anything in the parliament. The scorn, disdain, contemptuousness and hatred they have suffered would not be practiced against their political rivals. They would not expel anyone from parliament (as Morales himself was) because they are not vengeful or rancorous.

Morales stated that there would be no nepotism and no blackmail in his government; Morales claims he is not like the “others” [THEM] who held power in the past, who involved several members of their families in the government in order to let them benefit from the profits of a “good” position, because they have put an end to that. They, *Aymaras* and *Quechuas*, are not cultures that deal in lying and foul play which is fought with truthfulness. He also asked his fellow parliamentarians not to learn such things from the “others” [THEM] who held power in the past.

⁵The term *q’ara* belongs to a Bolivian vernacular language, Aymara, which literally means bare or naked, and is used derogatorily by Bolivian indigenous people to refer to white skin people or the like.

Either talking about “THEM or “US”, because he always mixes up his words and thoughts, the comparative difference is always present. For instance, when he says “the indigenous peoples are the moral reservoir of the humanity,” he implies that there is no moral in the “others”, when he says “we, the *Aymaras* and *Quechuas*, are not rancorous” he implies that the “others” are, when he says that “indigenous peoples understand that we must live in harmony with nature” he implies that the “others” do not. Or when he says that they, *Aymaras* and *Quechuas*, are not a culture that deals in lying and foul play which is fought with truthfulness, he implies that they are truthful and play fair whilst the “others” deal in lies and play foul.

Ownership

I told my mother-in-law that my house was her house, and she said, "Get the hell off my property."

- Joan Rivers

The ownership and the rights of the indigenous people to the land and natural resources may have not been mentioned as often as other topics were; it can be found in about forty-six per cent of his speeches; in Leganés - Spain (13-09-09) Morales mentioned it six times (see annex A). When Morales talks about Bolivian natives, few times he mentions *mojeños*, *chiquitanos*, *yuracarés* or *chipayas*; he usually speaks of the *Aymaras* and *Quechuas*, however, he makes sure to overstate their absolute ownership over Bolivian vast land and natural resources. He says he is sure that the Bolivian indigenous movements, like their ancestors, want the natural resources back in their hands and in the hands of the State and because of that it is a must for the government to get those concessions back for their peasant indigenous brothers, because their ancestors fought to defend this land, this territory, the natural resources and the rights of the indigenous peoples.

Now they, the MAS, are still fighting for their rights to be respected. In the past, politics was restricted to some elites, however now Bolivian people have got the right not only to vote for their authorities but also to decide about the policies which involve the whole society, rights which did not exist before they came to power [*sic*]. Moreover, he claims that it is precisely their constitution which guarantees that, besides, it guarantees all public and private and individual rights. Morales usually emphasises that they are fighting

for equality, dignity and justice for the peoples, rights which were denied before. All the nationalisations that they have done so far were justified, because not only the companies and enterprises but also the natural resources involved belonged to the Bolivian people.

Neoliberalism

“The search for someone to blame is always successful”

- Robert Half

In spite of the fact that Morales makes a direct or indirect reference to neoliberalism in just about sixty-one per cent of his speeches; eight times he made allusion to the topic in his 2006 inaugural speech (see annex A). It may not be necessary to be an analyst to see that every country has got its problems and Bolivia is no exception but Morales seems to find the blame of each and every problem and fault in neoliberalism and capitalism. Here is what he says about neoliberalism.

Morales declared that the second worst enemy Bolivia had was neoliberalism. Unemployment and corruption went rampant all over the country due to the neoliberal economic model which was imposed by all former governments. Many children are still dying especially in the rural areas, many people have been forced to migrate- many went to Europe in search of a way to earn their living- because of neoliberalism.

Morales emphasises that we must do away with neoliberalism because it is not suitable for our country, we must end up more than twenty years of neoliberalism. In the past we fought against military dictatorships, now we must fight against any neoliberal regime. Morales also warned that people should forget about any individual or group demands because now the country as a whole comes first.

Morales vehemently recalls that the wrong policies, the plundering of natural resources, the privatisation of basic services were the result of neoliberal policies. As he likes to talk about the past, he condemns the existence of ‘latifundia’, that is to say, pieces of property covering large land areas that were worked by slaves. In Morales words latifundia still exists because of powerful groups created by neoliberalism. He claims it is unjust that near Titicaca Lake some families have got less than ¼ of hectare of land (one hectare is 0.01 square kilometre) whilst in the South of Bolivia, farmers have got fifty

hectares of land per each cow. From his point of view, that unequal distribution of land is the effect of neoliberalism. He says that now that they, the MAS, are in power, they are going to change that.

Morales says that there was a constant struggle against previous economic policies which greatly damaged all Bolivians. During the military dictatorships and the neoliberal stage we had in Bolivia, the “glorious” *Central Obrera Boliviana* (Bolivia’s main union of labourers) and the “famous” *Federación Sindical de Trabajadores Mineros de Bolivia* (Bolivia’s union of miners) constantly fought for their social and economic demands. However, now that the MAS are in power, he says he has kindly asked them not to be tools of neoliberalism.

Whenever there are protests, complaints or demands against the current government (the MAS) he says it is because union leaders are being used by neoliberal politicians or it is the right wing that is conspiring against them (the MAS government). He also claims that they have defeated neoliberals who are still immersed in some institutions like the National Electoral Court, C.N.E. (*Corte Nacional Electoral*), institution which did not easily let the MAS participate in some previous elections because they did not fulfil all the requirements. Despite his overwhelming victory on December 18, he also repeated his charge against the National Electoral Court for, according to Morales, allegedly allowing MAS voters to be turned away from the polls. He also chastised the media, which was sometimes critical of him during the campaign. He complained that the media attacked him prior to the election, labelling them, Morales and the MAS, as terrorists [*sic*].

Capitalism

“Under capitalism, man exploits man. Under communism, it's just the opposite”

-John Kenneth Galbraith

Capitalism is among the most frequently mentioned topics in Morales speeches. It is present in about sixty-nine per cent of his addresses. In the conference on climate change in Tiquipaya (Cochabamba - Bolivia; 2010) he mentioned it twenty-three times, during the *Foro Humanista* (La Paz - Bolivia; 2007) he mentioned it ten times (see annex A). Morales overtly declares that he is an anti-capitalist president as well as his government. He also

declares that he knows what sort of psychosis capitalism brings [sic] and how it is destroying mother earth; therefore he concludes that capitalism is the first and worst enemy of humanity. As usual, he comes to the conclusion that capitalism kidnaps mother earth to loot her natural resources, to exploit her sons and daughters only to poison her rivers and lakes. He reminds his brothers and sisters of the world that capitalism means inanition and inequality; it means the destruction of planet earth.

Morales makes his own definition of Capitalism, to begin with; “the gathering of capital in individual hands,” of course, he does not mention that “it is an economic, political and social system based on private ownership of property, business and industry, and directed towards making the greatest possible profits for successful organizations and people” (The Cambridge Dictionary, 2010).

In order to plough the earth, indigenous peoples ask the earth for permission but Capitalism subjugates mother earth and destroys the environment; that is why savage / wild capitalism is the first enemy of humanity. Besides, he says that it is our duty to change such economic models which are oriented to the looting of the natural resources, to the unequal distribution of the natural resources and the unequal distribution of the profits coming from the exploitation of the natural resources.

In Morales words, ambientalism or the carbon market are just lucrative businesses that commoditise nature. Global warming or the greenhouse effect are not the only crisis we have to deal with, there are also energy crisis, food crisis, financial crisis and more. Hitherto the effects of climate crisis have been debated, but not the cause which is Capitalism, all this means a systemic crisis of capitalism itself [sic]. Morales asserts that the origin of all crisis is the “exaggerated accumulation of capital in far too few hands, it is the permanent removal of natural resources and the commercialisation of mother earth”; therefore he concludes that the origins come from the economic model of Capitalism.

Morales claims that it is not acceptable that in this new millennium Capitalism becomes the industry of death, that Capitalism be the instrument of deep economic inequalities. “We are convinced that the accumulation of capital in few hands is not the answer to the poor people of the world,” Morales asserts. It is not acceptable that some

families or some transnational corporations are still accumulating capital in few hands having as a result the looting of natural resources and the exploitation of mankind; and when their businesses go wrong they create ways of subjection, domination or re-colonisation. We do not need plundering instruments which allow the permanent looting of our natural resources.

In Morales words, social peace cannot exist if economic inequalities, created by Capitalism, still remain, and Capitalism means irrational development, policies of unlimited industrialisation which are destroying the environment. For Morales, living better is the exploitation of human beings, it is egotism and individualism and it is the plundering of natural resources (Morales and the MAS propose “living well” instead of “living better”).

Morales also asserts that there is no solidarity, complementarity nor reciprocity in capitalism unlike in our cultures. For the Occident and for Capitalism this way of life is despised and hated, and in order to fight this way of life, Capitalism creates troubles and invents wars; war against drug trafficking or war against terrorism, just because they do not respect this way of life which defends life itself. Because of Capitalism, some people, some secretaries do not want to use the earthenware plates; they do not even want to eat *quinua* (sometimes written as *quinoa*, it is a grain-like crop grown in the Andean area, especially for its edible seeds). In Morales words the Occident demonised the *quinua*, they say it is the food of the “*indios*” and now some of our brothers do not want to eat *quinua* because it has been criminalised, how is it possible that the Occident wants to penalise our *quinua*⁶.

Morales compels the audience that we have to review everything that capitalism has done. We have to solve problems of life and humanity, the problems that planet earth faces today, and this means ending Capitalism. When Morales talks about the environmental problems and climate change, he asserts that the cause is the capitalist system. The gradual melting of the snow that covers mountains such as Chacaltaya, a snow covered mountain at

⁶The F.A.O. and The United Nations General Assembly declared 2013 the international year of the quinoa, and Morales himself was to be at the very act. The Global Launch of the International Year of Quinoa was cancelled because of Hurricane Sandy. (First Report of the Resolutions Committee, Thirty-seventh Session; Rome, 25 June - 2 July 2011)

around forty-five kilometres from La Paz city, is the result of the development of capitalist models and the exaggerated industrialisation of “some” western countries.

Sometimes when Morales talks about cocaine, he says that he is convinced that cocaine and drug trafficking are inventions of the United States [sic] with the intention of creating a war against drugs, a war against drug trafficking, because Capitalism lives from war. For Capitalism water, land, ancient cultures, justice and ethics are just businesses; people are worth for which they have, not for which they are. Since Capitalism seeks for the greatest profits possible, promoting an unlimited growth in a finite planet, it is the source of asymmetries and inequalities in the whole world where more than 2.800 million people live on less than two dollars a day.

For Capitalism human beings are just consumers and labour force. That is why the indigenous peoples are the only ones who have got the right, the ethics and the moral to say that the main enemy of mother earth is Capitalism [sic]. At the end of several of his addresses, Morales usually challenges the audience: esteemed ambassadors, we have two paths: to save capitalism or to save life and Mother Earth. However, when he is addressing to some local or South American audiences he advises them: let us not be agents of Capitalism and imperialism. When Morales is talking to Bolivian people, he usually says: we have two paths *Pachamama* (mother earth) or Capitalism, “our planet is ill due to the capitalist system, let us save mother earth from Capitalism”, “brothers and sisters, we are conscious that we only have two paths; *Pachamama* or death”, “down with Capitalism”, or he just says “Die Capitalism.”

The Empire

“Imperialism or globalization - I don't have to care what it's called to hate it”

-Bill Ayers

It must be pointed out that in about ninety-two per cent of his speeches (see annex A), Morales makes allusion to the Empire when he refers to the United States, and sometimes he refers to the United States as the North, the Western or the Occident. In his intervention, at the “*Cambio Climático* Conference” in Tiquipaya, Cochabamba – Bolivia, (20.04.10),

Morales mentioned this topic eleven times and during the “*Foro Humanista*” (La Paz, Bolivia: 2007), he mentioned it ten times (see annex A).

Morales overtly declares that we must eradicate Capitalism and the Empire, we are better off without them. Wherever Capitalism and Imperialism are present there will be no democracy neither development, therefore there will not be social justice or peace. In his words, it is not acceptable the chasing and expulsion of migrants who are forced to migrate due to economic problems, climate change or natural disasters.

Morales criticises Obama’s and the U.S. decertification policy (Obama is the U.S. current president), because, in his opinion, countries which do not belong to the capitalism ideology will be decertified. As usual he reaches the conclusion that anti-imperialists and anti-capitalists countries will never be certified by the U S. government, besides he demanded Obama to comply with the Kyoto protocol. He also affirms that their fight against terrorism, or against drug trafficking is just an excuse, the same excuse that industrialised countries use to get involved in other countries internal affairs to take over their natural resources in order to solve their own economic crises.

The D.E.A. (U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration) deals with drug trafficking with political interests, in Morales view. They are used to involve anyone in drugs and drug trafficking, according to their interests: political parties, union leaders, politicians and political leaders, fact which is internationally proved [sic], according to Morales.

There are many transnational companies, under the subvention of their own countries that produce genetically modified food, that food produced by western countries is not healthy unlike food produced by our countries, where we plough the earth with respect. This teaching, that was a cultural legacy from our ancestors, is being eradicated by western countries’ policies. Most products brought from western countries, Capitalism, the United States, specially clothing, after being detached they just contaminate the environment.

Social peace cannot exist if economic inequalities still remain, Morales argues. Where there are foreign military bases in countries or many continents, especially in Latin and South America there is not social or political stability; the presence of U.S. military bases provokes distrust among our people. He summons the social movements from Europe

and the whole world to eradicate the U.S. military bases, especially the ones in South America because wherever there is a U.S. military base (in South America) democracy and peace are not guaranteed, there are coup d'états instead.

“We were all victims of the U.S. military presence, in Bolivia and as victims we know what U.S. soldiers in different countries of South America do”; “U.S. military bases do not guarantee social peace, they do not guarantee democracy, they do not guarantee the integration of our countries and less of the people who organise themselves in pursuit of profound economic, social, and cultural structural changes.” Terrorists are not only dressed as civilians, they are also dressed in military uniform; invading another country with uniformed people is state terrorism. Moreover, to establish military bases in Latin America with the objective of political control, and where their military base is an empire, that’s not respect for democracy and that is what we have lived in South America. Morales is convinced that the U.S. Southern Command does not accept presidential nor governmental heads in Latin American countries seeking liberation.

In Latin America we want to live a new era in Morales opinion, if we want liberation, we should live without the United States. As well as in Bolivia, we are better off without the U.S. ambassador –referring to Philip S. Goldberg, former US ambassador to Bolivia who was expelled by Morales administration (2008). “We defended our own interests, fortunately, we are living different times, times of change, and this is a third millennium which belongs to the peoples, not to the empire.” That is why we have permanently fought against the empire interventionism.

Morales usually says that the economic support coming from U.S. taxpayers through USAID (United States Agency for International Development) was used for political purposes and for corruption. He says that he is convinced that Bolivian people are anti-imperialists and anti-capitalists. He affirms that their new constitution expresses Bolivian people’s feelings. He claims that his constitution expresses the constant fight against colonialism, against neo-liberalism, and fundamentally against imperialism. In Morales’s words, only the peoples’ and the social movements’ wisdom were able to identify, defeat the foreign agents, and were able to defeat the U.S. imperialism in Bolivia [sic].

Self-abasement

“You cannot continue to victimize someone else just because you yourself were a victim once—there has to be a limit”

— Edward W. Said

Finally and last but not least, the topic “self-abasement” has been mentioned in approximately ninety-two per cent of Morales’s addresses (see annex A); during the inaugural speech (La Paz, January 2006) it was mentioned twenty-two times, in Leganés (Spain, 13-09-09) Morales mentioned it seventeen times, and in his address for Bolivia’s 186 anniversary (Sucre, Bolivia; 2011), he mentioned it eighteen times (see annex A).

Although Morales usually talks without any knowledge of the subject matter and he relies on his own assertions, most of the time he talks about enemies, either local or foreign he is always seeing enemies. The enemies Morales sees are not just enemies. First of all those are enemies who try to damage Morales’s image, who try to hurt him physically, and also who try to damage him politically by putting stumbling blocks on the road. Besides, they are enemies of the popular government, enemies of the indigenous movement, and they are enemies of the Bolivian people as a whole. In spite of his tendency to mix everything, here is what Morales says.

Ghosts from the past

After remembering all the sufferings the indigenous movements have gone through since the coming of the Spaniards, Morales says that he feels like crying. Indigenous leaders had to walk long distances, thousands of kilometres, to be recognised as authorities by the Viceroy in Buenos Aires. And when the indigenous people, *Aymaras* and *Quechuas*, organised themselves in order to face those humiliations, they were chased, and when Spaniards could not find them, they used to burn their houses, their fields and they even mutilated their cattle in order to scare them, to frighten them, to intimidate them, in order to teach them a lesson. Later on, they plucked their eyes, cut off their tongues and their hands to those who somehow had learnt to read and write.

Recalling that Tupac Katari suffered that in his own flesh, in 2009 when Morales enacted the Bolivian new constitution, he read the sentence to death of Katari. Katari had

besieged La Paz city and after being defeated was tortured and torn by his extremities into four pieces, pulled by horses. It was a way to intimidate, to scare, to teach a lesson to the indigenous people who fought for their freedom. These indigenous people have always been humiliated, marginalised, hated, despised, and condemned to extinction. The *Aymaras* and *Quechuas* were not allowed to learn to read or write, whenever some learnt to write, their hands were mutilated.

Even now when we go to Europe, we are called illegal, in the past when Europeans and Spaniards came to South America, our ancestors never called them illegal. Everyone has got the right to live in any part of the world. The thinking of indigenous peoples is not of exclusion. Morales talks about the experiences of the *Aymaras* and the *Quechuas* from the highlands and the valleys in Bolivia, of how they welcome people in, but not exclude people; this is the sector that has been discriminated against.

In 1825, miles and millions of *Aymaras* and *Quechuas* fought for the independence of Bolivia, however, none of them were part of the foundation of the new country; these people have never been accepted as human beings. There have been at least eighteen amendments to the constitution until now, but the labourers, the social movements, the indigenous people and the patriots from the cities did not have the right or the chance to be part of those changes. Only the oligarchies made the amendments according to their own interests.

Before 1952 or 1953 women and the indigenous people did not have the right to vote; they did not pay taxes and could not read or write were the excuses (the national revolution of 1952 is considered one of the most significant socio-political events in Bolivia and South America during the twentieth century; the country's largest tin mines were nationalised and peasants gradually started to be incorporated into national life). That is why the indigenous people demand to re-found Bolivia. On behalf of our ancestors we have to change our history, we have to stop the looting of our natural resources; we have to stop the hatred, the humiliation, the discrimination and the scorn. Forty or fifty years ago our ancestors did not have the right to be in the main squares of the main cities; Plaza San Francisco or Plaza Murillo in La Paz, and they did not even have the right to walk on the pavement of the main streets.

Current ghosts

Morales claims that in the eighties, when he arrived in Chapare (the tropical area of Cochabamba), when union leaders demanded deep changes from the government, politicians used to say that peasants and indigenous people did not have the right to do politics and their political demands could not be taken into account. They used to say that politics in the Chapare was the axe and the machete, and in the *altiplano* (the high plateau in the western area of Bolivia) politics was the pick and the shovel.

In the sixties and seventies, many union leaders were accused of being communists and there were persecutions and massacres in the mining sector, some people had to leave the country; some ended up in Europe to save their lives. In the eighties and nineties, union leaders were accused of drug trafficking. Since the eleventh of September (2001), we (Morales and his followers) have been accused of being terrorists. They used to say that Evo Morales (himself) was the “Bin Laden” of the Andes, and the coca growers were the “Talibans.” They have constantly born persecutions and interventions civil or military in order to dissipate the rebellion but the rebellion movements were not in vain. We should never forget the dismembrance -torn into four pieces by the extremities- of many indigenous brothers, men and women, the many ways they tried to scare, to intimidate the indigenous people who fought for their freedom.

“We, the indigenous people, are the majority yet the poorest; they are the minority yet the richest.” There were uprisings against the ones who tried to subjugate and dominate us, against who tried to loot our natural resources, against who tried to isolate us, against who discriminated the indigenous people. Until the late 1990s there were almost no indigenous politicians because they have been discriminated against, we did not have the right. Not only until 2003, with the price of our blood had we obtained the binding referendum. Now with our votes we can elect deputies, senators, vice-president and president. With our votes we elect the mayors and the representatives to the city councils, as well [sic].

After the 2002 and 2005 elections, Morales demanded that the members of the C.N.E. (*Corte Nacional Electoral*) should be purged by the people when he addressed to international organisations such as the O.E.A. (*Organización de Estados Americanos*) and

the other observers, because it is proved that things have been illegally handled during the election processes. Some members of the C.N.E. committed a crime against democracy in Morales view.

On the other hand, Morales also publicly denounced the mass media; he mentioned UNITEL (local TV channel) and some female journalists amongst others that, in his view, campaigned against him. According to him they constantly demonised the social movements; they have been subjected to journalists and the mass media by a media terrorism that treated them as if they were animals or savages.

When the MAS took office, Morales stated that a new history of Bolivia would begin; they would look for equality, justice, equity and peace with social justice. He said that he noticed that in the cities not all people despised and hated the indigenous movements. Their government, under the slogan “Bolivia changes,” was committed to ending the colonialism, racism and exclusion that many of our people have suffered for many centuries because they have been excluded for over 500 years, and exploited in many cases; but now their rights would be fully respected. He asserted that their government would end the discrimination, the xenophobia, the hatred and the disdain that the indigenous people historically have suffered.

Morales position against the “*media luna*”, (Santa Cruz, Beni Pando, Tarija and Sucre) departments of the eastern part of Bolivia, is very clear. He condemns the existence of latifundia and slavery that, in his words, exists in Santa Cruz. He claims that it is unacceptable that over there, farmers have got fifty hectares per each cow, whereas in the southern area indigenous people have not got even ¼ hectare. People in Santa Cruz should refrain from keeping the indigenous people as slaves; in Morales’s words, they have freed a hundred and fifty families from landowners and their slavery until now. But there are concessionaires who are still exploiting our brothers.

Morales believes that it is not acceptable that now, in the twenty-first century, when in Europe even dogs have got passports, many people in the rural areas, especially, do not know when or where they were born; there are people who do not have ID cards. Once Morales quoted that when they found his father’s ID card and decided to celebrate his

birthday, Morales's father burst into tears because that date of birth was invented; he did not know when he was born.

On the other hand, Morales feels that some universities teach discrimination against indigenous people –referring to the confrontation the MAS followers had in Sucre (2007). When the indigenous people would claim for Constituent Assembly some people did not accept that [sic]. He could not understand how some university professors and students went to the streets to spit on the indigenous families. He is convinced that as long as there is racism and discrimination there will never be social peace, defence of life and defence of humanity. Unfortunately there are remains of those people enemy of the indigenous people.

Along time neoliberals made some [political] reforms in-doors, among themselves. Those groups, those political parties which represent the traitors and neoliberals are still trying to stop this process of change but they could not, they cannot and they will not be able because it is the **conscience** (the author's emphasis) of the Bolivian people that will defeat the traitors. Morales asserts that 34 years ago, his mother did not have the right to walk through public spaces, on pavements and public squares. And even now there are some fascist and racist sectors in Santa Cruz who do not want indigenous people enter into their fairgrounds; and that is happening nowadays.

Foreign ghosts

It was the I.M.F. (International Monetary Fund) and their imposed policies which caused an immense number of deaths and wounded, and their policies caused much hunger in Bolivia. "Our brothers, who go to the North and Europe in search of a job, are chased, expelled and discriminated against." He feels that they are being marginalised and excluded by the U.S. State Department; Bolivia has been decertified because it is an anti-capitalist country. He says he does not care about it because it does not affect his country. Even presidents who are anti-capitalists are accused of being, totalitarians, authoritarians and dictators. Every time the social movements recovered democracy, foreign agents have used the several governments to keep oppressing the Bolivian people. In the year 2002, Bolivian congress not only took Morales parliamentary immunity, but also expelled him from

Congress, in his words it was a command from the U.S. embassy carried out by Jorge Quiroga, former Bolivian president, and his ministers.

When Morales refers to the United States, as he usually does, he says he cannot believe that a black president can exact so much ‘vengeance’ on an Indian president, referring to U.S. current president Barack Obama. Because our grandparents and our populations, black and indigenous, have been excluded, marginalised, and humiliated. Obama is one who’s been discriminated against and is discriminating against another who’s been discriminated against; one oppressed who is oppressing another oppressed. So much blackmail we had experienced before, and now we are being subject to US\$ 3 million blackmail [*sic*]. What they do is have their revenge, and they try to intimidate; one who has been subjugated, one whose family has been subjugated to discrimination, is now president; how is it possible that he can discriminate against another movement that has been discriminated against?

2.2.2 Morales’s current situation

“I envy paranoids; they actually feel people are paying attention to them.”

- Susan Sontag

For Morales this is a new time for people who dream about a new world, a new life that goes along equality and dignity in all the countries of Latin America. We have long resisted and fought against all forms of subjugation. As an Indigenous leader from Bolivia, he says that he knows what exclusion looks like. Morales usually compels his peasant brothers and sisters not to forget how they, leaders, are still being treated. They should not forget that we have been called reds, communists, drug dealers, and terrorists.

They have borne so much lying, slander, so much humiliation, but against the humiliation and in the most unlikely way, they are there, in the government today. Since they have been oppressed for 500 years, it is time for the indigenous people to take over the power for 500 years; the most discriminated and the most outcast. The ruling class, the neoliberals, the traitors of the C.O.B. (*Central Obrera Boliviana*) used to say that politics for the peasant was the axe and the machete or the pick and the shovel, they used to say that we did not have the right to do politics.

Morales wonders, since they have been accused of being terrorists, communists, drug dealers, in 2002 he was accused of being the Andean Bin Laden and the coca growers were the Talibans, how someone accused of being an indigenous, “*indio*”, drug dealer, communist, terrorist, someone accused of subversiveness can be a president. He says that they have been called everything. They have been called animals; Manuel Rocha, former U.S. ambassador to Bolivia, once called Morales the Andean Taliban. In spite of that, he is president now.

Morales asserts that as a president, he has to work hard to defend himself because he has always been attacked. As usual, the mass media is always trying to make him say “things,” consequently he would be forced to make mistakes which they can use against him. Morales does not forget and always mentions that in 2002 he was expelled from congress and he was accused of being an assassin, a drug dealer and a terrorist. He accepted to be president aware of the risks; he was previously tortured, confined, processed, accused of being Bin Laden, accused of being a drug dealer, a murderer, a terrorist, and many other things, but he says he does not care.

He assures he suffered in his own flesh the uniformed military intervention of the United States within Bolivian territory. Based on lies and slander their enemies try to humiliate them, “in March last year (2005) in that very square, Murillo square (La Paz main square, right in front of the government palace) they wanted to hang Evo Morales, they wanted to dismember Evo Morales, as Tupac Katari once was [sic].

As a president he says it is very hard to bear the behaviour of the right wing, because many times groups of neoliberals, the fascist right wing and the racists have tried to remove him from power. First they said “this poor little Indian is not going to last long in power”, but as time went by they got worried and started to scheme plans to remove Morales from office. In 2008, they called for a ‘recall referendum’; he accepted the challenge and won the referendum.

At the General Assembly of the United Nations (September 23, 2009) he literally stated: “I want you all to know, presidential brothers, that last year there was a coup attempt in Bolivia. Thankfully, because of the forces of organised union and the international

community, especially from UNASUR (*Unión de Naciones Suramericanas*), the coup was civilly halted without the use of military force. The coup failed to succeed.” But there are still private entrepreneurs who are hiding their products and are speculating with them; it is impressive, how they want to harm Morales’s image. They raise the prices of their products; they give money to the owners of the public transportation to go on strikes. They can do that the whole year because what they want is to weaken the government (Morales’s). “Maybe some local oligarchs may want to have a Pinochet ⁷ (former Chilean dictator) in Bolivia, but I feel and I am sure there will never be a Pinochet in Bolivia.”

Morales is sure that he has got evidence of some civil institutions’ strategies, such as the *Comité Civico pro Santa Cruz* (civil committee that works for the development of the area), destined to overthrow “*the indio*” (Morales himself) and his government. There is no use looking for support at the military barracks, they are helplessly trying to economically boycott, to create an economic plot, because they are implementing an economic war. In Morales’s words, Bolivian people know how some groups have constantly tried to take Morales out from the palace, how some groups have permanently tried to kill him [sic].

According to Morales, the ones who do not share their ideological principles want to wear out the image of the “*indio*” and as a result they want this process to fail; they want to wear the image of Evo Morales. Morales says that he does not care, as a single citizen, as a union leader, nor as a president. It does not affect his family environment or his union environment; he does not feel affected politically or economically because this process does not belong to Evo Morales, it belongs to the social and indigenous movements.

Some time ago Morales was not allowed to enter Santa Cruz, one of the eastern departments of Bolivia; belonging to the commonly called “*media luna*”, but now they do not allow the “*wiphala*” (a chequered indigenous flag) in their territory, however he says he does not care about it because such attitudes are meant to cause harm, they want to harm Evo Morales’s image, they want to harm the Bolivian people. Besides, Morales does not

⁷Augusto Pinochet, Chilean dictator (1973 – 1990), his years in power were marked by inflation, poverty and the ruthless repression of opposition leaders. Dinges charts the secret agreement—“Operation Condor”—between dictatorships in Uruguay, Bolivia, Paraguay, Argentina, and Chile to cooperate in the kidnapping, torture, and assassination of supposed opponents to their respective regimes in South America, North America, and Europe. (Dinges: 2005)

understand how and why some local authorities can make Evo Morales-effigies to kick them, to spit on them, and burn them afterwards. Therefore he reaches the conclusion that one of the worst enemies of humanity is racism and individualism; as long as there is racism and individualism there will never be social peace and equality, Morales claims.

Morales's government

Once in power, Morales promised they would not do, to their political rivals, what they have done; the hatred, the disdain or the expelling from congress. In this new millennium there would never be dismemberings or hangings. This is a historical struggle for vindications; they were going to end with all kinds of punishment policies because it was time to search for equality and dignity. They would end all kinds of inequalities; they would end the discrimination and the oppression the *Aymaras* and *Quechuas* have been subjected to. There would never be four “*prefectos*” (local governors) or four “*civicos*” (leaders of civil organisations) who can dismember this country as they did with Tupac Katari.

Morales asserts that in the past the indigenous people were killed with bullets, now they have tried to kill them with lies. There was a dirty war against them, all based on lies, but they failed. They have borne all kinds of insults and accusations which even came from members of the church. Even the vice president personality was demonised by the mass-media, especially UNITEL (local TV channel), before being candidate he was considered a good political analyst, but once he was candidate he was called terrorist.

After the first and the second year of government, Morales's discourse claimed that Bolivia is now a country of dignity; he says that Bolivia has stopped being an indigenous country and it is no longer a beggar country. Morales asserts that because of the new laws that they have drafted they have ended corruption, they have ended the discrimination, they have ended racism, xenophobia among other evils. He assures that everyone's rights are now fully respected. He says that Garcia Linera, current vice president, is not afraid of being next to an indigenous person (Morales himself). Especially after the enactment of their new constitution, he says that now people accept the ones who wear *guardatojos* (hard hats; mining safety helmets), the ones who wear “*lluchus*” (wool-knit hats worn by Andean

indigenous people) because we are now a plurinational state [sic]. He says that his mission has been accomplished, that now they can take him from the palace or they can even kill him, it does not matter because the county has been re-founded; now there is equality and social justice in Bolivia.

CHAPTER III

3. ANALYSIS

Based on the principles of Critical discourse Analysis, what has been reviewed so far, the use of language itself, how it is used in the world of politics, and the data collected from the discourse of Morales and the MAS, even the historical events, has been subject of analysis under the following procedures:

3.1 Methodology

Since this study is concerned with not only the description but also the explanation of a phenomenon that has taken place in Bolivia, it is based on a phenomenological approach (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994, 3). Focused on understanding the meaning events have (Patton, 1991) and grounded in a philosophical position widely considered 'interpretivist', this study is concerned with how events in society are interpreted, understood, experienced, produced and constituted (Mason, 2002). All in all, it derives its theoretical underpinnings from Pragmatism and symbolic interactionism.

Unlike other types of studies, this kind of research is not limited by a set of postulates that one way or another restricts the scope of the study to demonstrate certain theory or hypothesis. Likewise, because of the characteristics of the study it is not possible to anticipate every possible question, research question (questions), rather, there are questions which arise from the precise context in which the research is done (Mason, 2002, 5), and of course they guide the development of the research: all this takes place along the study.

Data Collection

Concerning the data collection, it proved to be unobtrusive because the study is based on written transcription sources. Therefore, data was not altered in any way, neither the informant was influenced. Besides, anyone can verify the authenticity of the data because it is available in the media: newspapers, radio stations, and some are even available in internet as video recordings. As well as that there are also some books that collect most of Morales's addresses, which might be very useful.

Since this kind of study does not usually rely on a theory or hypothesis to test, on the contrary, the analysis begins as soon as the first bit of data is collected. The background of the study which is taken as a frame work, the data collection and analysis are interrelated processes, thus, the analysis is done throughout the study itself (Corbin & Strauss, 1990, 6). Several questions and relations emerged along the study, which not only guided but also induced to make sorts of cross-relationships; process known as 'progressive focusing' (Lacey, 1970). Most of them, in the end, proved to be relevant to the study itself.

Based on the above, several of Morales's addresses were collected, based on random and availability. Although most of the media usually publish fragments of the speeches or they concentrate on certain topic, this study takes the whole addresses in order to contextualise the messages delivered.

Analysis

Since an inductive analysis, grounded theory and comparative analysis were practiced from the very beginning (which is broadly interpretivist), because they allow to go beyond mere facts and surface appearances, the analysis was meant to find what underlies the discourse itself. The constant analysis permitted the classification of some concepts and categories that constituted basic units of analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 1990, 9) which came to be the basis of the study. And the constant comparative analysis led to find not only some similarities but also some analogies that have been labelled as 'striking similarities.'

Conclusions

Finally, the conclusions of the whole study are divided into two sections: one that comes from the analysis of the discourse of Evo Morales; the written transcription of his addresses, and the other that comes as by-product of the relationships led by the critical discourse analysis and its implications, because the analysis is based on constant comparison (Corbin & Strauss: 1990, 9). As the concepts, relationships and findings showed to be systematically related, rather than isolated sections which might need to be related, the study is presented as a whole text. The presentation of the text shows that most perhaps all the elements, the text is made of, are woven throughout the text of publication (Corbin & Strauss, 1990, 18).

Psychometricians try to measure it.

Experimentalists try to control it.

Interviewers ask questions about it.

Observers watch it.

Participant-observers do it.

Statisticians count it.

Evaluators value it.

Qualitative inquirers find meaning in it.

(Patton, 2002, 1)

3.2 Analysis

As it has been suggested earlier, in the world of politics, many new *gadgets* are being invented / discovered every day. In 1930, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, (commonly called “Mahatma”, a Sanskrit term meaning “great soul”), organised a peaceful march to the sea in protest for the high unjust taxation of salt. His campaign of non-violent protest against British rule in India, though he was arrested, eventually led to India’s independence (Rollason, 2008). After that, peaceful rallies and hunger strikes were commonly used, whenever there were employer-employee or government-citizens conflicts not only in India but also in many countries of the world.

When a strategy, technique, devise, mechanism, or whatever it is called, becomes fruitful, it is spread and it is usually followed suit in other places. A clear example is that the 1996 U.S. general election was not won by William Jefferson Blythe III Clinton but by “Bill” Clinton which was replicated when “Goni” won the general elections in Bolivia. Since then, for the following Bolivian general and municipal elections, several candidates tried to use the same formula; they used a short form of their names or nick names, and thus we had “Rony”, “Chichi”, or “Tuto” as candidates.

The political arena has lately shown several changes in the world, and in South America; the rise of the late Hugo Chavez in Venezuela, Ollanta Humala in Peru, Rafael Correa in Ecuador, Luis Inacio “Lula” da Silva in Brazil, or Evo Morales in Bolivia, that one way or another belong to a certain political orientation. Globally, the rising of such

candidates is not something new; in the last decades, the “pink tide” movement has been noticed all over the world. Although they all belong to different socio-political contexts, it was a surprise and quite a political change in their respective countries. For instance, it was a surprise the landslide victory of a peasant, a *llama* herder, Evo Morales. However, was it Morales’s personality that won the election? Was it his governmental plan that won the election? Was it his novelty as a politician? Was it his political behaviour? Or was it his emotive speeches? Or was it the topics he usually talks about?

History

In order to understand Morales’s discourse, in a previous section, an attempt has been made to gather, what Morales says in his speeches, into some categories. One of those categories is the history of indigenous people in Bolivia and South America. Morales usually speaks about the oppression of 500 years, the fight for freedom for 500 years, the defence of the territory for 500 years, how indigenous leaders have been treated or mistreated for 500 years; he usually mentions the dismembering of Tupac Katari.

Talking about past events, people usually recall past events such as “how pleasurable their last vacation was –five years ago”, or “how they enjoyed their 5th or 10th high school reunion”, and “base their forecasts on those memories, thus, people are likely to consider the intensity and duration of the pleasure they will derive from these events” (Wilson et al., 2003, 421- 422).

On the other hand, however, since people use their memories of past experiences to predict their future ones -there is a good deal of evidence for an impact bias in predictions about emotional reactions to future events (e.g., Buehler & MacFarland, 2001; Robinson et al, 2013). However, what happens if those experiences were not pleasurable at all. “The pain itself is not stored in memory and then retrieved in its original form. It is sufficient to recall that an experience was painful” (Wilson et al, 2003, 423). After recalling a painful or sad event, people “might experience some form of emotional outcry: panic, fear, shock, anger, sadness or grief” (Heaps, 2009, 2) depending on the kind of event.

Therefore, since Morales is constantly reminding Bolivian indigenous people that their ancestors were mistreated, humiliated, oppressed, mutilated, deprived from their basic

rights and so forth, it can be considered highly possible that, besides being uncomfortable, and even prompt a temporary return to some uncomfortable, intrusive experiences, people might develop a feeling of anger.

The state of being mad -annoyance, exasperation, ire, hatred, rage or anger- is a usual reaction triggered by something and it is usually focused on something or someone, as well. Then, another logical question arises, how can the offspring of being mad can be intentionally directed towards something? Is Morales's discourse guiding that feeling of anger and hatred towards something or someone? In order to answer these questions, let us remember what Morales says about the empire, neo-liberalism, capitalism, racism, and colonialism.

Empire

“Wherever Capitalism and Imperialism are present, there will be no democracy neither development, therefore, there will not be social justice nor peace”, is what Morales declares. When he says Capitalism, the Empire, the Occident, or the North, he overtly refers to the U.S.A. In his opinion, countries which do not belong to the capitalism ideology will always be decertified.

Besides, Morales says that the fight against terrorism or against drug trafficking are just excuses (of the U.S.A.), the same excuses that industrialised countries use to get involved in other countries' internal affairs to take over their natural resources in order to solve their own economic crises. Morales, in his apophantic assertions, says the D.E.A. (U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration) deals with drug trafficking with political interests. They are used to involve anyone in drugs and drug trafficking, according to their interests: political parties, union leaders, politicians and political leaders, fact that is internationally proved [*sic*].

Capitalism

Morales says that he knows what sort of psychosis capitalism brings and how it is destroying mother earth; therefore he concludes that capitalism is the first and worst enemy of humanity. In his words, for Capitalism water, land, ancient cultures, justice and ethics

are just a matter of business. There is no solidarity, complementarity nor reciprocity in capitalism unlike in our cultures, for the Occident and for Capitalism this way of life is despised and hated, and in order to fight this way of life, Capitalism creates troubles and invents wars; war against drug trafficking or war against terrorism, just because they do not respect this way of life.

Morales also assures that Capitalism demonised the *quinua*. He says that they call it the food of the “*indios*” (Andean peasants). He believes that “now some of our brothers do not want to eat *quinua* because it has been criminalised” [sic]. Morales also asserts that the Occident wants to penalise the *quinua*. Moreover, in Morales perception Capitalism spreads its arms over the world by means of their policy; Neo-liberalism.

Neo-liberalism

Unemployment and corruption was spread all over Bolivia due to the neo-liberal economic model which was imposed by all former governments, according to Morales. He usually recalls that the wrong policies, the plundering of natural resources, the privatisation of basic services were the result of neo-liberal policies. Likewise, the unequal distribution of land (there has never been land distribution), the existence of ‘latifundia’ and slavery (only one family lived almost in slavery), and the presence of powerful groups were created by neo-liberalism. This political model, brought from abroad, like medicine, food, clothes and many products coming from abroad, is considered by Morales as the presence of Colonialism (that political model, Neo-liberalism, implemented by Victor Paz Estenssoro, stopped Bolivia’s 1980’s hyperinflation—designed and monitored by Jeffrey Sachs).

Colonialism

For Morales’s nihilism, even the atmosphere has been colonized. The looting of natural resources from the earth, mother earth, by the colonialism of developed countries makes them turn their obligations to protect nature to undeveloped and developing countries, along with most products brought from abroad, this is what he calls external colonialism.

Morales also speaks of internal colonialism, in his words, colonialism is the cause of all “evils” that there are in Bolivian society. Bolivia is one of the poorest countries in South America because of colonialism. In Morales words, Bolivia has inherited corruption, nepotism, bureaucracy among other ‘evils’ from colonialism. There is inequality among citizens because of colonialism, the few or non-existence of native surnames in the military is a sign of colonialism. He also asserts that all the uprisings, there were in the past, were against the colonial state.

Racism

When Morales was expelled from the Bolivian congress, he claimed that it was a matter of racism. He claimed that he was expelled because of his indigenous origin. He did not say that it was because he urged his people to resist militarily the eradication of illegal coca leaf. He did not say that he was expelled because members of the federation, he was and still is representative, tortured and murdered officials who were eradicating those illegal plantations. Besides, after the events that took place in Sucre during the Constituent Assembly, he said it was because of racism.

Some people might rightfully say that those events: colonialism, the mistreatment of the natives, the dismembering of Katari, etc., took place centuries ago and they belong to the past. How is it that they can be up-to-date? How can they be determining factors nowadays? Einstein (1920) clearly expressed the relativity of time; the difference between the more precise and more nebulous measures of time is, in part, the difference between objective and subjective time estimated. An hour lasts 60 minutes for everyone, but “one person’s short time can be another person’s long time; the subjective experience of time” (Alicke & Sedikides, 2011, 112).

The minute slice of time that is actually “right now” is not what people typically mean when they refer to the present. People create and extend the present by assimilating past and future instances into it, as they please. Thus, “the temporal duration of the word present expands or shrinks” (Ibid, 2011, 113). “This ambiguity about the present helps make subjective time a very useful tool” (Ibid, 2011, 113).

On the other hand, in-group and out-group, what Heidegger (1962) defines as livings-in, and livings-with, have got their differences in perceptions of the temporal distance of historical events. In-group members sometimes consider historical atrocities committed by the OTHERS to have implications for their own social identities, “even if the atrocities were committed before they were born” (Alicke & Sedikides, 2011, 117). Therefore, “people’s subjective chronology of events differs systematically from calendar time” (Ibid, 2011, 114).

It certainly is true that Bolivian living conditions are not the best; now the question is why Morales blames Colonialism, Imperialism, neo-liberalism, etc. because according to his words everything and everyone seems to be against Bolivia. Many people know how the story of the apple in the Garden of Eden goes; Adam blames Eve, Eve blames the serpent, and God blames the three of them...that is how the blame game begins. In Alicke’s & Sedikides’s words (2011) it is more fundamental than the creation story; it is evolutionary. In order to get a real picture, let us imagine that someone gets out of bed at 3 a.m. to get a snack from the refrigerator, just as he arrives at the refrigerator in the dark he stubs his toe hard; in swift response he kicks the refrigerator door. That is blaming; as essential, ‘adaptive, reflexive, as primitive’ strategy (Ibid, 2011).

Although many religious leaders and therapists urge people to “forgive and forget”, however, without considering whether it is correct or not, to blame someone else, or how or why people do that -the moral behind the blamer- people tend to blame it on someone else, or at least try to avoid the responsibility for their actions.

“Moral reasoning does not cause moral judgement; rather, moral reasoning is usually a *post hoc* construction, generated after a judgement has been reached” (Haidt, 2001, 814). That is why it is common to hear people use the passive voice, for instance, instead of the active voice. Thus, it is common to hear, ‘it has been damaged’ instead of ‘I damaged it,’ or ‘it has been broken’ instead of ‘I broke it.’ Alicke (2011), in some of his articles and throughout his book, states that without considering the context or the moral evaluation, people usually deem someone or something bad or wrong. Besides, humans are so steadfast in blaming others. Blaming is a very natural thing to do, especially when strong emotions are involved; people blame first and ask questions later (Alicke & Sedikides, 2011).

Unlike common reasoning and logic that suggest that people should base their moral judgement on rational assessment. According to Neergaard (2001), Princeton University researchers found that a key to moral judgements is emotion, not logical or analytical reasoning. When things go wrong, some basic instincts and emotions which “have a place in the native constitution of the human mind” (McDougall, 1926, 65) are activated in order to protect ourselves. Guided by this self defence mechanism, already described by Freud in 1915, human beings routinely overestimate themselves as better than they actually are (self-enhancement) and work hard to maintain that illusion (self-protection) (Alicke & Sedikides, 2011). Therefore, of course, they find someone else to blame for every weakness, failure or even for their shortcomings; it must be pointed out that not all blamers have to be dysfunctional nor have a narcissistic personality disorder, it is just “a process that operates as part of a psychological immune system that is engaged when individuals experience self-threats” (Ibid, 2011, 130).

Based on the above concepts and theories, it can rightfully be said that Morales is showing very primitive human reactions. Besides, most of what he says is guided by external perceptions. In many of his assertions, he does not show neither moral nor logical reasoning because he blames capitalism, the empire, foreigners, the rightists, the oligarchs, the media, etc.

Unfortunately, Morales not only blames the Occident, Neo-liberalism, Capitalism, etc., he also asserts that only the indigenous people, natives, *Aymaras* and *Quechuas* mainly, have got the moral and wisdom to judge them, that only the indigenous people can see between what is right and what is wrong. In Morales words indigenous peoples had almost perfect societies. Since Morales is always comparing the natives or indigenous societies to modern societies, European societies, the north, the occident, the empire, or industrialised countries, in this way, he subtly or overtly -depending on how it is seen- Morales draws the line between ‘US and THEM’.

Us and them

"Certainly, then, envy is the worst sin there is. For truly, all other sins are sometime against only one special virtue; but truly, envy is against all virtues and against all goodnesses."

Geoffrey Chaucer - The Parson's Tale

Once the feeling of anger has been awakened due to the remembrance of past wrong doings or mistreatment, and the evil of colonialism has been "exposed", what comes next? How are these emotions handled or fostered? How is the blaming intention oriented?

Heidegger (1962) defined; humans are livings-in, and livings-with. Humans are their living in the world with others. Since there is not a person, a specific group of people, or political party to blame, it would be easier to separate "US" from the rest "THEM." According to Morales's point of view, anyone who is not a "*campesino*" (Aymara or *Quechua* peasant) or who is somewhat different belongs to "them", which includes the "*q'aras*" (white skin people), the rich, the landowners, rightists, oligarchs, etc.

Thus far, it has been described how a feeling of hatred or anger is fostered and how sharply two categories have been created within Bolivian society: US and THEM. Moreover, it has also been stated who, in Morales's words, is the one to blame "THEM" for all the different factors that have placed Bolivia as one of the poorest countries in South America.

Morales is even more specific when he criticises people from the southern areas of the country; Santa Cruz, Beni, Pando, Tarija and Sucre, commonly known as "*media luna*" -departments that overtly opposed to Morales and the MAS campaign. Morales claims there is an unjust distribution of land, since, in the *altiplano* (high plateau), *Campesinos* (peasants) have less than ¼ of hectare of land, in the *oriente* (eastern regions of the country) the landowners have got fifty hectares of land per each cow in detriment of the peasants. In spite of the fact that the peasants in the west asked for those small fields, whereas, the entrepreneurs, in the east, asked for (or bought) enough land to raise cattle and grow their crops, enough not only for themselves but also for exportation.

To draw the line between “US” and “THEM” is a topic which has been analysed from different perspectives; among the most outstanding ones we have Wodak and van Dijk, who, in several of their papers and books, argue that there lies the notion of power and inequality behind the concept of ‘US and THEM.’

On the other hand, Moshman (2007) considers the same concept as a phase or pre-stage to genocide, at certain point both positions overlap because both are related to power and dominance. Moshman, however, seems to be a bit more radical, when he asserts that genocide is a matter of identity, their acts are perpetrated “by individuals acting collectively on behalf of what they perceive to be their own group, US, against what they perceive to be a different group, THEM, even if their perceptions of the victim group are wildly inaccurate” (Moshman, 2007, 116).

Since Morales claims that there is an unjust distribution of land when there was no distribution of land, moreover, the fact that entrepreneurs in the eastern side of the country have got 50 hectares of land per each cow does not deprive the peasants of the west of any land at all. Consequently, to say that the difference is in detriment of the peasants does not make any sense. It can easily be detected Morales’s wrong perception and interpretation of the reality. No matter how wildly inaccurate Morales’s assertions are, this is the message he usually delivers; “people view contradictory information through the prism of their ideology, placing greater scrutiny on information inconsistent with prior beliefs” (Alicke & Sedikides, 2011, 129).

From this brief review, the idea of “US and THEM” seems to grow into: they have what we do not; they have got money (they are rich), we have not (we are poor); they have got large fields, we have got small ones; they have got a big production of crops, we have not; they export their products, we do not, and so forth. Morales’s expression “we, the indigenous people are the majority yet the poorest; they are the minority yet the richest,” shows the constant envy of other people’s achievements or possessions.

Love, hate and envy, among other primitive emotions are the common drives of human behaviour; they are clearly expressed in *the theory of envy* which accounts for the above notion of “US and THEM,” explained in terms of envy. Love and hate work to

ensure survival; “love and envy provide the scaffolding in which meaning arises” (Ninivaggi, 2010, 18). Along with other emotions, envy helps to shape and guide personal experience and interpersonal engagements in the social environment; it is considered the mind’s hidden module. This theory explains how an individual idiosyncratically perceives their emotional and cognitive relation to others “THEM”, the object of envy or the “object of desire” (jealousy) (Ibid, 2010, 5).

Envy is characterised by feelings of inferiority, longing, resentment, and disapproval of the emotion. On the other hand, jealousy is characterised by fear of loss, distrust, anxiety, and anger (Parrot and Smith, 1993). Though clearly embedded, they are described in terms of a dichotomy or conflict metaphor: ego-id, good-bad, love-hate, as part of human emotions (Hiles, 2007).

Therefore, what can be expected when it is the very same president of Bolivia who, in every opportunity he has to address to the people, blames the others “THEM” for every weakness the country has, for every ‘stepping stone’ his government has to face. Morales even blames THEM, the others, for natural disasters. After the Chile earthquake (2010) he said that it was Mother Nature who was angry because of bad policies of neo-liberalism. Morales goes far beyond that when he asserts that the north, the empire, or industrialised countries only bring poison. After the 2011 judicial elections Morales claimed that they had defeated the right wing –of course he did not mention that invalid and blank votes accounted for nearly sixty per cent (A.P., 17.10.2011, also La Razón, 26.08.2012), more examples of such illogical assertions can be found in Rodriguez A. (2011).

As a result, Morales discourse is clearly oriented to the fostering of certain emotions among the population: hate, jealousy, envy, among others. Many of his assertions do not show much accuracy; they only show one perspective of reality. Besides, the distinction between US and THEM is meant to show that the others (THEM) are not only wrong, but also bad. Morales is always implying that the others (THEM) are selfish and destructive not only with US, but also with nature itself.

Thus far, we have seen how Evo Morales’s discourse is oriented to foster or awaken some emotions among people and how they are directed, now the question is: how does

Morales fit in that scenario? Is there any strategy he uses about himself? In order to try to answer these questions, let us see what he says about himself.

Self-abasement

Casually or not, Morales usually refers to past events; when he publicly remembers how indigenous people were chased and humiliated, how their houses and fields were burnt, how their cattle were mutilated in order to scare them, to frighten them, to intimidate them, in order to teach them a lesson. When he remembers those events, he says that he feels like crying, moreover, he compels his indigenous brothers not to forget the dismemberment of their ancestors. Later on, they plucked their eyes, cut off their tongues and their hands to those who somehow had learnt to read and write. In his words, the *Aymaras* and *Quechuas* were not allowed to learn, to read or write. These indigenous people have always been humiliated, marginalised, hated, despised, and condemned to extinction; they have never been accepted as human beings [sic]. Because before 1952 or 1953 women and the indigenous people did not have the right to vote, he usually implies there are still hatred, humiliation, discrimination and scorn against indigenous people, which must be stopped.

On the other hand, since Morales usually refers to the U.S.A., he seems so sure that a black president (Barack Obama) holds so much vengeance against an Indian president (himself), despite both populations, black people and indigenous people, have always been excluded, marginalised and humiliated. Besides, when Bolivian congress took Morales parliamentary immunity and expelled him from congress (2002), he asserts, he is probably sure, it was a command from the U.S. embassy.

Morales also sees local enemies, since he became a congressman, politicians, in his words, used to say that peasants and indigenous people did not have the right to do politics; politics for them was the axe and the machete or the pick and the shovel. Additionally, union leaders (Morales was and still is) were accused of drug trafficking. Since the eleventh of September (2001), they have been accused of being terrorists. They used to say that Evo Morales (himself) was the “Bin Laden” of the Andes, and the coca growers were the “Talibans.”

In Morales words, they have constantly born persecutions and interventions civil or military in order to dissipate their rebellion. He usually denounces the media; UNITEL (local TV channel) and some female journalists, amongst others, that, in Morales view, campaigned against him. According to Morales, they constantly demonised the social movements; they treated them as if they were animals or savages.

Morales talks about the discrimination, the xenophobia, the hatred and the disdain indigenous people historically have suffered, he always includes himself, of course. He also asserts that people, in the cities, despise and hate the indigenous movements, albeit occasionally he says it is only ‘some’ people who despise the indigenous movements. Because of that he assures that there is still racism and exclusion that indigenous people have suffered for many centuries because they have been excluded for over 500 years.

Concerning the word “racism”, Morales says that some universities teach discrimination against indigenous people because professors and university students went to the streets to spit on the indigenous families (the political confrontation between the MAS followers, mostly indigenous people, against local citizens who were demanding the consideration of Sucre’s full capital status in the Constituent Assembly, 2007); he is convinced that that attitude means racism and discrimination.

In any case, during the sessions of the constituent assembly which were taking place in Sucre, Bolivia’s official capital, its president, Silvia Lazarte, was called “*chola ignorante*” (*chola* is a local term used to refer to a woman dressed in *pollera*, a skirt-like piece of clothing worn by Andean indigenous women), because she did not want to listen to local people who were demanding the consideration of Sucre’s full capital status within the Assembly. The fact is that the same vice-president Garcia Linera declared that she was insulted, that all Bolivian women were insulted, that it was an unjustifiable and unacceptable expression of racism. “*Chola*” is the feminine of *cholo*, term which designates a “mestizo”, a person having European and indigenous origin (R.A.E.), therefore it is not an insult, and being ignorant, not having knowledge of something, is not an insult either. From then on, most demands, complaints, or critics against members of the government are considered by themselves as racism. Moreover, the incident itself, rather than discrimination, racism, or whatever adjective is used to describe it, the difference(s)

between Sucre citizens, who wanted to include their demand –full Capital Status- into the Constituent Assembly agenda; they were not against the Constituent Assembly, and MAS supporters or militants, must be considered in its real dimension as a political issue.

When Morales talks about himself, as he usually does, he asserts that he knows what exclusion looks like, because they have been called *reds*, *communists*, *drug dealers*, and *terrorists*; they have borne so much lying, slander, and so much humiliation. He calls himself “*indio*”, albeit he says that “they” call him in such a way. He says that indigenous people have always been the most discriminated and the most outcast. He says that he was accused of being an indigenous, “*indio*”, drug dealer, communist, terrorist, he was accused of subversiveness, that they, Morales and his followers, have been called animals. Morales also claims that they have borne all kinds of insults and accusations even from members of the church.

Morales always remembers that he was expelled from congress (2002), because he was accused of being an assassin, a drug dealer, a terrorist and a murderer. He asserts that he suffered in his own flesh the uniformed military intervention of the United States within Bolivian territory. Based on lies and slander their enemies have always tried to humiliate them and Morales himself. He quite often repeats that in Murillo square, they wanted to hang Evo Morales (2005); he says that they wanted to dismember Evo Morales, as Tupac Katari was [sic].

Moreover, Morales identifies groups of neoliberals, the fascist right wing, and the racists as the ones who have tried to overthrow him from power; he asserts that they call him “poor little Indian.” He declares that it is unbelievable and he does not understand why some local authorities, during demonstrations, can make Evo Morales- effigies to kick them, to spit on them, and burn them afterwards. Just to make things clear, in the last four decades, most Bolivian presidents had to see the same thing about themselves, -protesters made effigies of the corresponding presidents or even ministers and burnt them during their demonstrations- why would Morales be the exception?

During an international speech Morales declared that there was a coup attempt in Bolivia, which was civilly halted, destined to overthrow the *indio* (Morales himself); there

was a strike in Santa Cruz that Morales and the MAS representatives called a coup attempt. Besides, after most C.O.B. strikes, the union leaders are called coup plotters. He also said that some groups have permanently tried to kill him. Thus far, no real attempts of killing him have been exposed.

Following this pattern of behaviour, “tantrums are the result of high energy and low ability to use words to get needs or wants met” (Fetsch and Jacobson, 2007), concept shared by Dorman & Dorman (2002), who state that tantrums are brought on by anger when children’s desires are not met or their need for independence is interrupted. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that some, perhaps many, children obtain what they want by means of tantrums. Adults, however, since social rules do not allow them having tantrums (to express their anger by lying on the floor, kicking, screaming, and occasionally holding their breath), need to scheme some other ‘techniques’ in order to meet their desires; a humble or a ‘cocky’ attitude may work wonders in certain occasions.

Human emotions have been classified, analysed, and categorised from different perspectives, Bhatia (2004) assigns some instincts their respective emotions. Self-deprecation, having humility as its ‘positive pole’ and self-abasement as its ‘negative pole’, is closely related to the dichotomy self-assertion and self-abasement and their corresponding emotions: elation and subjection. The instinct of self-abasement, as the opposite of self-assertion, is accompanied by the emotion of subjection or submission. It is generally manifested in the presence of people who are superior to us; “children, who are helpless, ignorant and dependent, usually manifest this tendency in the presence of parents and teachers who are stronger, wiser and bigger” (Ibid, 2004, 158). However, adults may use it as a tool in order to manipulate others. Perhaps Vilar (1971) provides a gruesome example of the use of self-abasement as a means to have someone do something.

Self-abasement, self-deprecation, and debasement have been considered *tools* that some people use to manipulate others. According to Braiker (2004), although some people are easier targets than others, nobody is completely invulnerable to manipulation; people from varied backgrounds, with disparate personalities, of wide age ranges, and all levels of economic, educational, and social status. Evo Morales and the members of the MAS have always been trying to show how badly all previous governments did when they were in

power and how good they are doing in the government, as Braiker (2004) says: manipulators need to maintain control over others is frequently manifested by a need to “be right” and to make others “wrong.” Since it seems that we are dealing with manipulators, how do they operate? What are the methods they use, and what tactics do they use?

Morales describes himself, as an honest and humble politician. Once in power he reduced a percentage of his salary, and because of that some members of his government did the same. Besides, he claims that he works for the benefit of the Bolivian population. Manipulative people “often represent themselves as concerned about others, as unselfish and altruistic” (Braiker, 2004, 55). In fact these kinds of people “believe themselves good, kind, fair-minded, honest, and generous people” (Ibid, 2004, 55). Skilled or trained manipulators often cover or disguise their motives from others, and their agendas are frequently hidden and their purposes disguised.

Manipulators may even lie to themselves about their true underlying motives, fact that makes “the lies they tell more believable or credible” (Ibid, 2004, 51-52). According to Braiker (2004) manipulators operate out of three principal motives: (1) they need to advance their own purposes at virtually any cost to others, (2) they have strong needs to attain feelings of power and superiority in relationships with other people, and (3) they want and need to feel in control (Ibid, 2004, 54, 55, 56).

They usually say that they are doing something for your own good—or they tell you something because they care enough to be “totally honest” and they say that they have your very best interests at heart. “They need all the power that is around to get” (Ibid, 2004, 56)- in 2007 Hugo Salvatierra, former MAS’s minister, admitted at Panamericana (local radio station), that they (the MAS) were in the government to get the power in each and every position; political and social. As well as that, unions, in many institutions, are taken over by MAS representatives. Even the same the C.O.B. is threatened to be controlled by a sector that identifies with the MAS and the government policies. Some members of the C.O.B. overtly declared their intention to re-found and re-organise the union arguing that the C.O.B. is going against the MAS process of change (El Deber, 11.05.2013, Economía Bolivia, 24.05.2013).

Whenever Morales and his party have differences with other political actors, he looks very stubborn and usually looks angry, it seems that only one person can be right—and that must be him and the other(s) necessarily becomes wrong, perhaps it is because these kind of people, manipulators, “typically are low on empathy—or lack the capacity altogether to feel as others feel” (Braiker, 2004, 59); “they most likely are incapable of empathy altogether” (Ibid, 2004, 53).

One of the manipulator’s most effective tactics is to make you think that they are not manipulating, they will do whatever is necessary to disabuse you of even your slightest suspicions, let alone your outright accusations or confrontations. According to psychological studies “skilled manipulators are adept at making their accusers (or anyone who even suggests that they may be manipulating) feel guilty and ill-mannered for even questioning their motives” (Ibid, 2004, 62).

Consequently an obvious question arises, why do some people behave in such a way? that is, they even lie to themselves. From a psychological point of view, this kind of people look at the world in a different way, they usually see the world in general in black and white; their view is that either you play or you get played. They see no other way that relationships operate; a relationship between equals, for example, is beyond their understanding and comprehension.

In other words, “there are only two roles in relationships—you are either manipulated (the victim), or you are the manipulator (in their view, the one in power and control)” (Ibid, 2004, 62). There are winners and losers; in a two-sided relationship someone must win, and someone must lose. It is not complicated math; their view is that life is a dog-eat-dog game where each person must do what is necessary to advance their own personal needs even if it is at the expense of others, “this behaviour is justified because they believe that other people will do the same to them” (Ibid, 2004, 70).

Morales usually threatens that who are not with him are against him or against the country, who does not support his agenda supports the neo-liberals, who does not help him, wants to return to the past, who does not support him, wants Goni back (Goni is the short for Gonzalo [Sanchez de Lozada], former Bolivian president). Buss et al. (1987) give a

clear account of such behaviour which activates one (or both) of two principal human drives: gain (or reward) and loss (or avoidance); the two engines that drive the manipulation. In psychological terms, that attitude instigates certain behaviour from you, or tries to stop you from doing something with the promise of a net gain and/or the threat of a net loss.

Moreover, Morales usually threatens that the ones who oppose or criticise his government or himself want to return to the past. He asserts that they want to sell Bolivian enterprises as it happened in the past. Morales says that the ones who criticise his government or himself want to return to the critical stages Bolivia lived in the past, or they want to return to the dictatorship period we had in Bolivia.

However, Morales attitude goes even beyond that, he asserts that the “others,” THEM, are always trying to overthrow him from power; at an international conference he declared that there was a coup attempt against his government. Besides, he always says that they are trying to kill him. In 2006 he asserted that “they” wanted to dismember him right in front of the government palace. The author of this study might have missed something during this research, but no real evidence has been found that even one of Morales’s hairs has been pulled, literally.

Morales also says that he has not gone to university, and he feels happy about it (EFE, 26.04.2012). He also says that he was a *llama* herder, he calls himself “*indio*” (term used derogatorily to refer to a peasant), and he asserts that he has been treated like an animal, among other things. Perhaps the explanation to such attitude can be found in the theory of self-abasement.

In certain situations it is common to hear some women say: “if I were a man, I would do that”, “I am not as strong as you [men] are”, “we, women, are weak”, and so forth. Braiker (2004) and Vilar (1971) agree that self-abasement is a tactic used by some people, women especially, to manipulate others, men. Women tend to be submissive as a way of manipulating or getting others to take care of them (Braiker, 2004, 94) rising to the level of emotional blackmail. Emotional blackmail is a powerful form of manipulation in which

people close to us threaten, either directly or indirectly, to punish us if we do not comply or do what they want.

Our blackmailers make it nearly impossible to see how they are manipulating us, because they lay down a thick fog that obscures their actions. We would fight back if we could, but they ensure that we literally cannot see what is happening to us. For a more detailed analysis of how it works see the above mentioned authors and also Forward's "Emotional Blackmail: When the People in Your Life Use Fear, Obligation and Guilt To Manipulate You" (2001).

After spending more than 30 days in Chile, the three Bolivian soldiers who crossed the border carrying fire weapons were honoured and promoted, they were welcomed as heroes (La Razón, 04.03.2013). Being honoured and promoted does not make much sense, unless crossing a border carrying fire weapons and being in prison are the merits. Or the Bolivian miner who spent more than two months inside a mine that collapsed in Chile. After the dramatic rescue, Evo Morales offered him a new house and a new job with a US\$ 1000 salary (A.P., 18.10.2010), just because he was a victim of an accident. Therefore, this attitude, to play the victim, can be summarised in Zur's words (1994): the victim stance is a powerful one. The victim is always morally right, neither responsible nor accountable, and forever entitled to sympathy.

As a result of the brief analysis, Morales falls into the scope of the typical manipulator. He depicts himself as humble, caring, altruistic, etc. On the other hand, he is always saying how badly he is being treated. He assures, he might be quite sure, that they (THEM) are always plotting against his government and himself. He repeats that they call him *indio*. He asserts that he has always suffered discrimination, xenophobia, hatred, disdain, (there are many other similar words he uses) because he is an indigenous person, of course he suggests that it is a matter of racism, as well.

After the incident in Sucre during the Constituent Assembly when Silvia Lazarte, president of the Assembly, was called *chola ignorante*, the MAS, Morales, even the vice president said that all Bolivian women were insulted. Besides, when Morales was expelled from congress, he claimed that it was an aggression against the the Aymaras, Quechuas and

the Bolivian working class (La Red 21, 25.01.2002, see also local press), he also said that he would die for the indigenous people. Of course he did not mention that he was expelled from congress because members of the coca growers union, Morales was and still is representative, kidnapped, tortured and murdered some officials who were eradicating illegal coca leaf.

Therefore, Morales usually plays the role of the victim. He describes himself as the one who has always been mistreated, who has always been insulted and discriminated because of his indigenous origins. When someone, anyone criticises his government or himself he says it is because he is an indigenous; even when he was expelled from congress, he says that it was because he is an indigenous (not because he suggested armed resistance against the police and the military). With that attitude he is always trying to manipulate his audience, Bolivian people and indigenous people in particular.

Outcomes

Since Critical Discourse Analysis allows us to explore every possible dimension on the object of study, some other elements emerged during the whole process. That is, when analysing Evo Morales and the MAS discourse, some other details related to the topic aroused, which led to a sort of cross analysis. These elements are included in this study because they proved to be related to and somehow help to explain the coming to power of Evo Morales and the MAS and their political behaviour.

If hate has been instilled among Bolivian population; Morales has been telling the people how their ancestors were mistreated, humiliated, killed, chased and deprived from their basic rights, let alone the dismembering of the indigenous leaders, it would not be a surprise Bolivian people's reaction against the U.S., the D.E.A., the U.S. ambassador, or USAID; although Morales expelled the U.S. ambassador, the social movements urged the expelling of the D.E.A. and USAID.

Most Bolivian people and perhaps the whole world were shaken by the events in Cochabamba, the "water war." Under the slogan "The Water is Ours Damnit!" lots of people went into the streets, causing riots. The images were clear; hate was spread among people, although many of them did not belong to any political party. And the second event

that was even more shocking was the ‘gas war’. The review of the various newspapers articles and television video recordings shows conclusive evidence. Although people were against the selling of gas through Chile because of the historical differences between Bolivia and Chile; the war of 1879, hate was the driving force behind those movements.

However the popular unrest, the “gas war,” ended up demanding the resignation of Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada, who was president then. Sanchez de Lozada had to leave not only the presidential house, but also had to leave the country, whose fate would have been uncertain had he stayed. History taught us what happened to Gualberto Villarroel (1946). He was hurled from a balcony; the mob then hung the body from a lamp post in a public square facing the palace (United Press, 22.07.1946). The fact is that excesses had been committed by the government, four leaders were killed and 10 rebels were sentenced in Oruro (Mesa, 1997). Nonetheless, it was rumoured that Villarroel had fascist and Nazism sympathies (Ibid, 1997).

The psychological perspectives also help us to understand that if such feelings and emotions are instilled among the populace, which consequently generate some corresponding attitudes and behaviours, all this should result in a sort of rejection of everything and everyone, “THEM”, who, they feel or perceive, does not belong to their own group “US”.

As psychologists argue, love, hate, anger, etc., one way or another may result in certain behaviour, the feelings and emotions that create certain attitudes do not focus on specific individuals, but also they are generalised among members of the group at large, THEM. Moreover, Morales emphasis on US and THEM does not only draw the line between indigenous people and European people. THEM involves ANYONE who is somehow different from the peasants, not only physically or racially unfortunately, because he also involves members of certain regions within Bolivia, the ‘media luna’, the ‘rich’, and almost anyone who does not agree with the MAS, as we have previously seen; they are wrong, we are right; they have got large fields, we have got small ones; they produce crops for export, we do not; they are rich we are poor, etc., Morales also compared Bolivia to apartheid-era South Africa.

Therefore, if we consider that the human behaviour is driven by two basic emotions 'Eros' and 'Thanatos' (Freud, 1922a), fact that also coincides with Solzhenitsyn's quote who said that "the line between good and evil passes right through every human heart." Besides, if we accept that certain emotions can be instilled among the populace, such as hate, vengeance or envy which just need certain events to trigger them, the political change we have seen lately in Bolivia and most of the MAS behaviour might make sense.

Perhaps the explanation of how it all works can be found in the "Schema Theory." This theory is commonly used in education and psycholinguistics, for instance, in the teaching-learning process reading involves the process of "relating new knowledge to the old knowledge" (Falk, 1973, 338). "Meaning is not only 'in' the word, sentence, or passage, as it is usually conceived, rather it is the reader / listener, who gives meaning by associating what they read to what they already know about the subject or topic" (Carrel et al, 2000, 73) they are concerned with.

For a more detailed description of this theory in the education field, see Anderson et al. "The Reading Group: An experimental Investigation of a Labyrinth" (1983); Bamford's & Day's "Extensive Reading: What is it? Why bother?" (1997); or Falk's "Linguistics and Language: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications" (1973). The basic concept perhaps dates back to Kant [1781] (2011) who asserts that new information: concepts, ideas can have meaning only when they can be related to something the individual already knows.

Simply put, the schema theory states that all knowledge is organized into units. Within these units of knowledge, or schemata, is stored information; which might be called our past 'experience.' On the other hand, we have also seen that we usually make predictions of future events based on our experiences, that is the information we have stored or schemata (See Envy Theory in a previous section, for a more detailed explanation). Therefore our actions; expressions of affection, empathy, hate, or even jealousy should be driven by those stored units of knowledge. Besides, Kant [1763] (1992) also argues that the morality of an action is a function of the internal forces that motivate one to act.

Consequently we can say that it is highly possible that if people, the angry mobs, in the several uprisings described in a previous section which include the events that took place in Bolivia in the early 2000s, turned violent against certain members of the society, they might have, somehow, stored and outgrew some, if not many, aggressive, enraged, or just awkward feelings against their targets. We have also seen that the stored schemata can be real or just perceived, moreover the chronological distance of those, real or perceived events is relative, that is, they might have taken place near or far in time or they might have never happened.

Besides, in order to create or develop that sort of schemata, time is required. As it has been said Morales could not have been doing such a task, because as he usually says, he was guarding his herd of *llamas*, playing in a band and playing football. Therefore, someone else must have done that activity. That is precisely what led to the review of some uprisings around the world.

The force behind the uprisings

The shocking events that have been seen in Bolivia in the early 2000s: the water war and the gas war, that somehow preceded the coming to power of the Evo Morales and the MAS, led to review some uprisings in the world. Paradoxically, the historical review of the uprisings showed some common factors not only amongst most of them but also factors that might explain the origins of the water war and the gas war.

The development or fostering of certain emotions, as it has been seen, is the result of an activity or process. Schemata is not created just like that, it requires time. In most of the uprisings it was the result of the activity of some instigators or activists who, besides ‘instigating’ might have taken an active role during the events themselves. Nana Sahib, during the Indian Mutiny, John Wycliffe, or John Ball (called by Froissart "the mad priest of Kent") during the great revolt of 1381, or John Reed during the Russian Revolution, or Jean Paul Marat during the French Revolution are some examples. Some of them had been ‘working’ with the people before the uprisings took place. They might have helped to pave the way towards the uprisings or revolutions.

Perhaps the reader might be thinking what happened in Bolivia in the last years, not only the coming to power of Morales and the MAS, but also during the ‘water war’ and the ‘gas war,’ events that preceded the coming to power of Evo Morales and the MAS. As we have seen ideas, theories, and even rumours, if they are skilfully ‘taught’ and spread, can be stored as schemata; therefore they just need any incident to ‘trigger’ them, besides the work of some activists.

Nowadays we do not have roving preachers like John Ball in 1381 nor do pamphleteers (*libellists*) like during the French Revolution. However, we still have some lodges, and a bit more sophisticated means like radio stations, or NGOs. Around the eighties NGOs started to work openly in Bolivia, especially in the outskirts of the main cities, in the countryside, and in El Alto; Gill (2000) and Boulding (2007) amongst others confirm their activity and involvement in politics. As we have seen in a previous section, their activities have been focused on helping people in need, some of them provide them food, shelter, training and also education. Since they are catalogued as non-profit organisations, they are exempt of control.

Besides, we have also seen that there are records that a radio station that is run by an NGO played a role of coordinator during the ‘gas war.’ As well as that, the “Democracy Centre” (NGO), has globally been working in Cochabamba, “to advance human rights through a combination of investigation and reporting, training citizens in the art of public advocacy, and organizing international citizen campaign” (source: The Democracy Centre webpage), sometime before the ‘water war’ took place.

On the other hand, Boulding (2007) showed that there is a relationship between the activity of NGOs and voter turnout and popular protest. Moreover, According to Dechalert (1999) “there are three possible ways to classify them: as the supporter, as the partner, or as the main actor in popular protests.” Therefore, it is highly possible that ‘some’ NGOs might have been preparing the ground for the radical political change that has taken place in Bolivia.

Moreover, we have also seen how those organisations operate in different countries of the world, and how the Spin doctors, Think tanks, and members of NGOs end up being part

of the new governments. Bolivia is no exception, the late Ana Maria Romero and Sacha Llorenti are the best examples; the latter is the former Minister of government. Sacha Llorenti is former president of Bolivia's Permanent Assembly for Human Rights (*Asamblea Permanente de Derechos Humanos*), closely linked to Human Rights Watch, NGO that has George Soros as its main donor. Llorenti was appointed as ambassador to the UN (La Razón, 05.09.2012) in spite of being accused of ordering the use of brutal force against a pacific indigenous march.

If that were the case, that some institutions had been subtly instilling such emotions along with their cooperation, it might be highly possible that the populace just needed someone, anyone, who should say the right words to trigger those feelings and emotions. As Sigmund Freud quote goes: “Unexpressed emotions will never die. They are buried alive and will come forth later in uglier ways,” therefore, it would not be a surprise the ‘water war’ and the ‘gas war’ took place or even worse it would not be a surprise that people had behaved the way they did during those events.

The reader might be thinking if the above arguments somehow explain the antecedents or the way the MAS came to power, how can it be explained the massive support they get from Bolivian population? When something has been planned for a while, and the right advisors are at hand, everything becomes logic. Dealing with large populations is not something new; for instance, Gustav Le Bon gave an account of the French revolution from the perspective of mass psychology and collective paranoia. Le Bon [1895] (2002) talks about the irrational and unpredictable nature of crowds; Moscovici (2010) suggests that the individuals making up a crowd are less intelligent and creative than when they are alone. Crowds are usually led by someone, a leader, “for him, they sacrifice their clear interests, their manifest needs, their very lives. The leader orders his horde of followers to wreak immense destruction, to carry out unimaginable crimes, and they obey him without demur” (Moscovici: 2010; 1).

Much more can be found, besides the authors mentioned, about the role, behaviour and the relationship between leaders and the crowds in Canetti’s “Crowds and Power” [1962] (2000); De Tarde’s “L’opinion et la foule” [1901] (2006); Freud’s “Group Psychology and The Analysis of The Ego” (1922b); and Le Bon’s “Psychologie Des

Foules” [1963] (2011). Should the reader want to know more insight about how the ego and the unconscious are expressed collectively in crowds, then they should read Jung’s “The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious,” Volume 9 (1990). Perhaps they might want to know how easily the masses have been led astray, along history, Mackay’s “Extraordinary Popular Delusions” [1841] (2003); or how the individual feels carried by the ‘mood’ of the mass, as if by an invisible force, Simmel’s “Fundamental Problems of Sociology” (1909). As interesting as the above mentioned authors, we can also see how imitation becomes a social bond and explains crowd behaviour, as a kind of somnambulism; imitation is compared to a hypnotic process. Even when we think that we act individually and originally, we often merely imitate the actions of others, De Tarde’s “Law of Imitation” (1903).

3.3 Analogies

Besides what has been mentioned above, some other similarities between Morales government and behaviour and others have been found. To begin with, it would be interesting to point out some characteristics of Evo Morales and the MAS government. However, to discern whether they have been planned or not, seems to be a rather hard task, because of the reaction of the MAS members when they are asked about it. In spite of that, those ‘characteristics’ seem to be the blending of ‘idiosyncrasy’ and the follow up of a script, of course more evidence would be needed to make such assertion. Either way, in the meantime, they may be called ‘striking’ similarities.

1. According to Jordan (1985) during the French Revolution, for instance, Robespierre used to speak a lot about himself; he described himself as a man absolutely devoted to his task. He prided himself on his rectitude and of being incorruptible. He sided consistently with the poor and victimised (Scurr, 2007). He acted as a sort of spokesman of the Jacobins, the victimised and the poor.

Morales speaks a lot about himself, since he became a candidate, he has claimed he would defend the *campesinos* (peasants) and the poor. He is always quoting his own experiences; he asserts that there is no corruption in his government, that they, indigenous people, are not rancorous people. Besides, he is

always playing the victim. He claims that ‘they’ are always trying to kill him, that the United States, the right wing, even the Church are always plotting against his government and himself. He is always denouncing conspiracies against his government and himself. He also says that ‘they’ call him *poor little Indian*. Any movement against Morales’s government is considered by them as a conspiracy or a coup d’état attempt. The civic strikes and the C.O.B. (*Central Obrera Boliviana*) strikes are called by Morales and members of his government as ‘*golpistas*’ (coup plotting attempts). Even when he got ill, he said he was suspicious that he was poisoned.

2. As we have seen, in a previous section, during the French revolution, the Jacobins eradicated Christianity, the Clergy was accused of plotting and conspiracy against the Revolution; that is why many priests were decapitated and burnt alive, although the charges made against the Church were often unjust (Hibbert, 1999, 31).

From the very beginning of their government, Morales himself and his administration have been attacking the Clergy. Morales accused the Clergy of conspiracy against his government. Soon after they took over, they proposed a new educational reform that would remove religious instruction from schools. Moreover, the then Minister of Education, Felix Patzi declared that the Catholicism would no longer be the official religion taught at schools and that it would be replaced by a class on indigenous languages (Los Tiempos, 11.07.2006). Besides his constant criticism about the Church, Morales himself declared that “the Catholic Church was a symbol of European colonialism [...] and that it should disappear from Bolivia” (C.N.N., 24.06.2006). Although ‘religion’ as a subject is still being taught, the content has been changed because education in Bolivia is now secular and pluralistic, and *Aymara*, a vernacular language, is already being taught.

*“Look at these young men and boys! What material! With them
I can make a new world.”* (Hitler: Nuremberg, 1933)

3. During the Nazi Germany, Hitler was clearly concerned with a reshaping of values, in his words “the whole method of instruction in secondary and higher schools is just so much nonsense. Instead of receiving a sound basic education, the student

finds his head filled with a mass of useless learning, and in the end is still ill-equipped to face life” (Pine, 2010, 14). Hitler’s contempt for schoolteachers was equally great, once he said he endured schoolmasters. He dismissed his own schoolteachers with much disdain; he described one of his teachers as a ‘congenital idiot’ and asserted that he ‘could not bear the sight of him’ (Ibid, 2010, 14).

Besides, education in Germany became much more ideologically driven during the Nazi years. Essays became not much more than a rewriting of propaganda handouts, for instance, the theme of an essay set for school leavers was the educational value of the Reich Labour Service. “Many subjects within the school curriculum were used to expound Nazi ideology [...] which focused on political socialisation in schools, including the key themes of anti-Bolshevism, the creation of Nazi myths and heroes, as well as the forging of the ‘national community’” (Pine, 2010, 2), fully developed in chapter three. Their reforms focused mainly on *Staatsbürgerkunde* (civics), and *Arbeitsunterricht* (work instruction) as a subject was introduced (Ibid, 2010, 10).

Moreover, Hitler believed that teachers “were absolute tyrants, they had no sympathy with youth; their one object was to stuff our brains and to turn us into erudite apes like themselves” (Ibid, 2010, 13). It is unsurprising, therefore, that he sought to produce a different ‘breed’ (the author’s emphasis) of teachers. For this purpose the *Nationalsozialistischer Lehrerbund*, National Socialist Teachers’ League (NSLB) was formed (Ibid, 2010, 14). They ran courses for teachers and set up special training on National Socialism, and the reading of *Mein Kampf* (book written by Hitler, where he expressed most of his ideology and his view of life) was compulsory. Of course, the radical removal of standard educational practices that were replaced by coloured political views of the world, in the long run, declined the academic standards.

In several of his addresses, sometimes he also quotes his own experience at school, for instance, when he failed a year and his father had to pay to avoid Morales grade retention. Morales himself demands the teaching of the deeds of the national heroes; he says students should learn about Tupac Katari, Bartolina Sisa,

among other national heroes. Besides Morales demands that school students should learn about ancient traditions, such as how his ancestors used to plough the earth, or how they were socially organised.

Likewise, the content of several subjects is constantly being changed, for instance, in religion students should also learn about local traditions, such as the worship of *Pachamama*. Besides, new textbooks are provided for teachers to work with. Moreover, based on four drives: *ser, saber, hacer y decidir* (to be, to know, to do, and to decide) the government provides the basic areas within which teachers should develop the contents of their corresponding subjects, among them we have *Cosmos y Pensamiento* (Cosmos and thought), *Vida, Tierra y Territorio* (Life, Earth and Territory) (source: Planes y Programas, Ministerio de Educación y Culturas, also available online (www.minedu.gob.bo)).

As well as that the MAS Educational reform –Ley Elizardo Perez-Abelino Siñani- proposes ‘work instruction,’ that is, students at school should be trained in any trade, such as carpentry, mechanics, farming, etc., according to the region they belong to –as we have seen, the MAS educational reform was originally proposed almost a century ago and most of the contents remain the same.

Just like in Nazi Germany, Morales government is demanding from teachers a University degree; they are compelling all teachers to do special courses, PROFOCOM (*Programa de Formación Complementaria para Maestros*), promising labour stability and a University degree, which, according to them, will be a compulsory requirement for keeping the position. More and detailed information about it is available on the *Ministerio de Educación* web page (www.minedu.gob.bo), link PROFOCOM.

Of course, not only in the school curriculum but also in the contents of the teachers training courses, PROFOCOM, the key word is decolonisation. As well as that, every four years teachers are to take an exam which allows them, if they pass, to change their category, they also get a pay rise. As part of the exam, now teachers have to write a sort of essay on the advantages of “*educacion /evaluación*

comunitaria productiva” (Productive Community Education / Evaluation), the kind of education proposed by the MAS government, more details about their requirements can be found in the above web-page.

4. Among the characteristics of totalitarian regimes Pauley (2003) mentions the monopoly of the communications media as well as over the educational systems. Enough evidence has been shown above about the MAS involvement in the educational system. On the other hand, concerning communications, in the year 2014 the Tupac Katari, first Bolivian satellite started to operate. The US\$ 300 million satellite created lots of expectancies, the government promised cheaper and better communications. The satellite was paid with money that the Bolivian government borrowed from China (BBC News, 02.04.2014). However, previous to the purchase of the satellite, Morales and the MAS government issued new laws on communication. The government, the indigenous people and the ‘social movements’ now have control over two thirds of the media, audio-visual media (BBC Mundo, 29.7.2011; see also Cambio). Consequently some radio stations had to change the frequency the broadcast, some others were given some time to stop their activities.

On the other hand, the review of the French Revolution showed some other similarities:

5. The Jacobins, once in power and in order to stay there, resorted to all the available means at their hands, ranging from violence to even judicial prosecutions. “In January 1790, Necker obtained an order of arrest against Marat, [who ran a newspaper: L’ami du people] fearing a popular outbreak, they despatched both infantry and cavalry to arrest the people [who worked there]; his printing press was smashed, and Marat, at the high-tide of the Revolution, was forced to take refuge in England” (Kropotkin, [1909] 1927, 220-222). Let alone during the Russian Revolution political opponents and people who did not agree with the government’s policies were sent to forced labour camps (The Gulag Archipelago) or to Siberia.

Since the MAS took over, besides their critics to mayors and governors who belonged to the other political parties, they started judicial prosecutions. José Luis Paredes, Mario Cossío, Manfred Reyes Villa, Leopoldo Fernández (heads of local governments and mayors), among others have been subject to accusations of

different kinds (Cambio, 01.09.2013, also Red Patria Nueva); although most of them went into hiding abroad, the latter remained in Bolivia and was sentenced to prison. Most of them had to take refuge abroad, and the last example is Senator Roger Pinto who after spending more than a year inside the Brazilian embassy, had to flee to Brazil, undercover. Although his requirement for political asylum was granted by the corresponding embassy, Morales's government refused to accept it (La Razón, 26.8.2013).

Finally, 80 (EIGHTY) prosecutions have been started against Juan del Granado (El Día, 21.02.2013), former mayor of La Paz city and candidate for the coming Bolivian general elections, and leader of the M.S.M. (*Movimiento Sin Miedo*), Without Fear Movement, a political party which intends to run for the coming Bolivian general elections.

6. In all fascist and totalitarian governments the individual was subordinated to the group, fact that reminds us that Morales suggested his followers and the Bolivian population as a whole that they should forget about local and sectorial demands, that, now the country as a whole comes first. Perhaps Morales and the MAS are much more radical than that because they do not admit free-thinking people within the government and their political party. Morales himself asserted that “free-thinking people are free-opponents” (Los Tiempos, 17.06.2013; also Red Patria Nueva). Similarly, Garcia Linera, vice-president, compelled the free-thinking people to leave their party (Correo del Sur, 11.10.2013; also B.P.A.).
7. Besides, it was also interesting to remember that when a Prince conquers or takes over a country or a region, “in order to exercise full control, he should ruin them or settle the region or send colonies” (Machiavelli, [1515] 2009, 13).

In 2009, right before the elections, Morales's government sent about 700 peasants to colonise certain area in Pando (a department in the north-east of Bolivia), enough people that made up a circumscription whose votes eventually gave the official party (the MAS) one more representative (Los Tiempos, 30.07.2009; also ANF, 10.08.2009).

Noticeable was the space devote to the French revolution. It is no coincidence, because the very same vice-president Garcia Linera, in several occasions and interviews called himself and Morales, the last Jacobin and Robespierre respectively. This is also expressed in the preface on one of his books “La Potencia Plebeya, Acción Colectiva e Identidades Indigenas Obreras y populares en Bolivia” (2009).

After the fall of Robespierre and consequently the fall of the *Jacobins*, their ‘spirit’ reappeared in an altered form later on in 1871, in the Paris **Commune**, no wonder Garcia Linera and his friends formed a ‘group’ called **COMUNA**. More details on how the Jacobin Clubs operated before their fall and how they reappeared in the political scenario can be found in Woloch’s “Jacobin legacy; the democratic movement under the Directory” (1970), Kennedy’s “The Jacobin Clubs in the French Revolution: The First Years” (1982), and also The Columbia Encyclopedia (2012).

Although the French Revolution has been considered the ‘Great Revolution,’ the inspiration or example for several uprisings and revolutions, as it has been said, it was inspired by the ideas of the *philosophes* of the Enlightenment. In fact in its ideals we can find the values which underpin today’s liberal democracies, however, in the excesses of the Revolution we can also find a forerunner of the great totalitarian repressions.

According to several authors, the French Revolution was influenced by the ‘revolutionary’ ideas of the philosophes of the Enlightenment, Rousseau, Voltaire, David Hume, Locke, etc. who, besides questioning and attacking the existing institutions both Church and the State, proposed liberty, equality, sovereignty, obedience to the law; the law-and-order societies (Kropotkin, [1909] 1927). Those ideas proposed that science would explain almost everything, ideas that gave a view of the universe where God and Nature were one; Deism.

However, the Enlightenment also gave way to authoritarian, totalitarian and despotic governments; Mussolini’s Fascism, Hitler’s Nazism, Franco’s Fascism, etc. Orwell, for instance, in his books “Animal Farm” (1945) and “Nineteen eighty-four” [1949] (2003), describes those brutal dictatorships of totalitarian governments.

On the other hand, Steiner (1971) seems to be more radical when he asserts that the Enlightenment had opened a vortex which the modern totalitarian state filled. When he refers to the Enlightenment, he calls it the “myth of the nineteenth century” or the “imagined garden of liberal culture,” that the “crust of high civility covered deep fissures of social exploitation; that bourgeois sexual ethics were a veneer, masking a great area of turbulent hypocrisy” (Steiner, 1971, 5-6).

Finally, since the last paragraphs have been devoted to ‘totalitarianism’, it seems to be necessary to see how it has been defined, of course, without prejudice to any further comparison to Morales’s government the readers may want to make.

Surprisingly, advocates of the term totalitarianism stress: (1) the extraordinary powers of the leader; (2) the importance of an exclusionist ideology; (3) the existence of a single mass party; (4) a secret police prepared to use terror [or the use of any MEANS] to eradicate all domestic opposition; (5) a monopoly of the communications media as well as over the educational systems; (6) a determination to change basic social, artistic, and literary values; and (7) an insistence that the welfare of the state be placed above the welfare of its citizens (Pauley, 2003, 1).

Most totalitarian governments seem to be the result of similar circumstances. Since the previous rulers, monarchs, diplomats or any elites were in disgrace plus the serious crises their corresponding countries were facing, “the recently enfranchised masses were eager to accept the leadership of one of their own,” [and the] “impact of the totalitarian dictators had on the world is all the more remarkable considering their humble beginnings” (Pauley, 2003, 48); Service (2005) sees Stalin as an uneducated political administrator. For instance, knowing what we know now, we might think that it does not make sense that German people followed Hitler. Perhaps it was the crisis Germany went through; they needed a real leader and “Hitler promised everyone everything. He was just the “right” person for that particular time. If times had been different, he would not have risen to power in all likelihood” (Susanna K. Hutcheson made this comment when she presented her translation of *Mein Kampf*).

As it has been said earlier, what has been highlighted in this brief study is just a sample. Much more details and ‘similarities’ can be found and analysed, for instance the following relationships: “*Muela del Diablo*,” editorial that publishes most of Garcia Linera’s books, Garcia Linera is Bolivia’s current vice-president. Most of his books are also sponsored by “Comuna,” a ‘group’ that has Garcia Linera, Luis Tapia, Raúl Prada and Raquel Gutiérrez as its main members, (source: Massimo Modonesi from UNAM). U.N.A.M. (*Universidad Autónoma de México*) where Garcia Linera did his university studies (source: *Vicepresidencia del Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia* –official web page), and Garcia Linera’s books are also sponsored by CLACSO (*Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales*). Besides, should the reader be interested in the books and articles about Morales, Garcia Linera, the rise of indigenous people and such topics, it will be interesting to notice the repetition of some names, authors. Below there is a sample of publications; authors and editorials of the following titles have been highlighted.

“Can Organizational Forms Affect the Identity of Social Movements?: The Case of the Bolivian MAS-IPSP,” **Do Alto, Hervé, 2006**

“Défis d'un gouvernement issu des luttes sociales,” **Do Alto, Hervé, 2006**

“La Emergencia del Nacionalismo Plebeyo,” **Stefanoni, Pablo, Clacso, 2003**

“Evo Morales, de la coca al Palacio: una nueva oportunidad para la izquierda indígena,” **Stefanoni, Pablo y Do Alto, Hervé, Malatesta, 2006**

“Movimientos sociales, Movimiento Societal y los No Lugares de la Política,” *Muela del Diablo*, **Tapia, Luis, 2002**

“El MAS-IPSP Boliviano, entre movimiento social y partido político” (Bolivian MAS-IPSP, Halfway Between a Social Movement and a Political Party), **Do Alto, Hervé, 2008**

“La revolución de Evo Morales: de la coca al palacio,” **Stefanoni, Pablo; Do Alto, Hervé, 2006**

“Reinventando la Nación en Bolivia: Movimientos Sociales, Estado y Poscolonialidad,” **Monasterios, Karin; Stefanoni, Pablo; Do Alto, Hervé, Clacso, 2007**

“Un Partido Campesino en el Poder,” **Do Alto, Hervé, 2011**

“Del entusiasmo al desconcierto: La mirada de la izquierda europea sobre América Latina y el temor al populismo,” **Do Alto, Hervé, 2008**

“Jefazo. Retrato íntimo de Evo Morales,” **Martín Sivak, 2008**

“Nueva Constitución en Bolivia tendrá amplio respaldo,” **Martín Sivak, (n.d.)**

“Mutaciones del campo político en Bolivia,” Molina, Fernando; Romero, Salvador; Zegada, María Teresa; **Do Alto, Hervé, 2011**

“Bolivia: memoria, insurgencia y movimientos sociales,” Svampa, Maristella; **Stefanoni, Pablo; Do Alto, Hervé;** Puente, Florencia; Longa, Francisco; **García Linera, Álvaro; Tapia, Luis, Clacso, 2007**

“Territorios, identidades y acción colectiva. Un ensayo sobre los movimientos sociales contemporáneos en Bolivia.”**Linera, Alvaro Garcia; Stefanoni, Pablo.** Revista Ciencias Sociales, Quito, n.23

“Bolivia at the Abyss,” **Schultz, Jim: the Democracy Centre, 2008**

Needless to say that Hervé Do Alto and Pablo Stefanoni co-authored several books and articles, that Stefanoni is closely linked to UNAM, that they also co-authored with Garcia Linera and Luis Tapia, that several of their publications have been sponsored by Clacso, and if not much has been mentioned about Jim Schultz, perhaps it is enough to say that he belongs to the Democracy Centre, NGO that started working in Cochabamba, Bolivia some time before the “water war” took place. It would also be interesting to see who the members of The Democracy Centre are and whom they are related to.

CHAPTER IV

4. CONCLUSIONS

The development of studies on Critical Discourse Analysis pioneered mainly by van Dijk and Wodak has given a quite new perspective on the area; from quantitative analyses which were usually based on the use and the frequency of occurrence of certain words or expressions to the study of what the use of language really means, not only the performative action –fully detailed by Austin (1962) but also what underlies discourse. Echoing the words of Dasenbrock (2001), who asserts that Derrida, Foucault and Althusser share the same idea.

Dasenbrock (2001) argues that there is one more element to be taken into account, besides the ones proposed by Jacobson, in the analysis of language, *intention* or *intentionality*; “discourse is constituted by individual authors whose ‘intentions’ matter and count” (Dasenbrock, 2001, 123). With this new perspective Critical Discourse Analysis allows us to delve into the intention or intentionality that lies behind discourse.

This was precisely the purpose of this study; to try to uncover what lies behind the discourse of the MAS, political party which is now in power in Bolivia. As it has been explained, the rise of the MAS and its leader Evo Morales has been quite a surprise compared to the commonly called “traditional” political parties such as: M.N.R., A.D.N., M.I.R., and the others which one way or another had a background. Several of them had once or twice been in power and they were somehow organised. However, it is even more surprising the massive support that Morales and the MAS have got from Bolivian population, support that might keep Evo Morales in power one more term or who knows how long.

The main goal of this study was to scan the political discourse for some elements which underlie the MAS discourse and the political context that surrounds this rather new party that might somehow give them the advantage they have. The analysis of the political behaviour of Evo Morales and the MAS has shown that they have followed the same pattern. That is, the discourse used during the political campaign for the 2005 Bolivian

general elections (by the MAS-IPSP) has remained the same until now, the moment these conclusions are being written (November, 2013).

What Morales says in his speeches, in a previous section, have been arranged into some groups, topics or categories. Amongst the most outstanding and recurrent topics Morales usually talks about, we have: The colonial period, Colonialism, Capitalism, Us and Them, Neoliberalism, Self-abasement and The Empire; sometimes referred as the North, The U.S.A or the Occident.

Since Critical Discourse Analysis allows us to investigate a topic and let the meaning emerge from the object of study, therefore, the main goal of this study, “What lies behind the political discourse of the MAS,” was achieved because the interpretation of the analysis of the discourse of Evo Morales and the MAS has shown that there is something which underlies their discourse; there is an intentionality. The analysis can roughly be divided into two parts: the effects of the discourse itself, on the one hand, and the outcomes that appeared during the process of the study, on the other.

1. The study and analysis of Morales’s discourse, although it has been compared to other politicians’ gaffes and lapsus linguae, has showed that his utterances have got an intention. Moreover, Morales’s utterances do have some effect in some sectors of the audience; effect that is enhanced by the constant repetition of them.
2. Some of the topics Morales usually talks about are meant to awaken certain emotions among popular sectors of Bolivian population: hate, anger, jealousy, among others.
3. The awakened emotions are focused, by Morales’s discourse, on specific targets: Neoliberalism, Capitalism, The Empire (United States, the North, the Western or the Occident) amongst others.
4. The repetition of certain topics in Morales discourse is oriented to deepen the division between US and THEM. Unfortunately, whenever someone, anyone criticises the MAS policies or his, Morales labels them as member of the right wing, oligarch, lackey of the Empire, etc., in other words THEM.

5. As Morales is constantly calling himself *indio*, he asserts that the others (THEM) call him that way, he is constantly playing the role of the victim. He asserts that most strikes are coup attempts. Morales goes beyond that when he says that not only strikes but also demonstrations against his government are plotted by the U.S.A., the right wing, the oligarchs, the rich, etc, in other words THEM.
6. Morales's behaviour falls into the scope of the typical manipulator; since he is always threatening the audience to unconditionally support his policy or to return to previous governments. Morales always refers to Sanchez de Lozada's government and the privatisation of enterprises and the looting of natural resources as the other option, compared to his.

On the other hand, since another main objective was:

To analyse some other elements that might, somehow, be related to the Discourse of Evo Morales and the MAS.

As it has been stated in the purposes of the study, the development of the study itself led to unveil some characteristics, analogies, and relationships that somehow help to understand, perhaps explain, the problem of the study. This objective was also achieved by means of the corresponding analysis under the label of outcomes.

1. In the uprisings that have been analysed, there was a common factor: there was a previous activity among the populace. Roving preachers, pamphleteers and activists paved the way to the uprisings.

Since the MAS is a rather new political party, and their activities began basically as a union of coca growers, they were concerned about the defence, as they call it, of the eradication of illegal coca leaf, therefore, someone else must have done the previous activity. Fact that leads to the activity of NGOs, there are many such institutions operating all over the world and in Bolivia as well. Their activity, bibliography supports this assumption, can influence politics. Besides influencing voter turnout, their activity also influences social protest. When social tensions reach a crisis point, they are involved in the protest movement as the supporter, the partner, or as the main actor (Dechalert, 1999, 22).

On the other hand, there is evidence of NGOs activity in El Alto, Gill (2000) and Boulding (2007): a popular sector that played a key role during the gas war.

2. Another objective was achieved by reviewing some historical events concerning the French Revolution, for instance. The comparative analysis showed some similarities between Evo Morales's behaviour and Robespierre's; perhaps that is why, in some web pages Morales was dubbed "Evospierre." Robespierre talked a lot about himself and he prided of his honesty and rectitude. He depicted himself as a man devoted to defend the poor; needless to say that Morales says almost the same about himself.
3. During the French Revolution, most opponents were chased, imprisoned, and many were executed; guillotined.

In Morales government, many political leaders that belong to the opposition have been subject to several legal accusations. Most of them had to escape abroad and remain in hiding; Leopoldo Fernandez stayed in Bolivia and he was sentenced to prison.

Another main objective of the study was:

To demonstrate whether there are similarities or not in the discourse and the political background of the MAS compared to some other revolts.

This objective was achieved due to the comparison of the MAS policy and the *Jacobins* during the French Revolution and also the Nazi Germany.

4. The *Jacobins* and the *Sans Culottes* during the French Revolution eradicated Christianity; priests were murdered and burnt alive.

The MAS government and Morales himself attacked the church since the very beginning of their government. Morales usually says that members of the church insulted him, he also says that the church is plotting against his government.

5. During the Nazi Germany, the government's policy was oriented to impose radical changes. They focused on education; they imposed a new system of education which was according to their own ideology.

The MAS and Morales view on education is very similar to the Nazi Germany. Morales calls the current educational system colonising. They are imposing the ASEP which intends to change the whole education system. They call it productive education and they want students to learn some trades at secondary school among other changes such as the change of the content of subjects. At UPEA (Universidad Pública de El Alto) Cosmovisión Andina as a subject is already being taught. In the primary and secondary school system for the 2014 school year Cosmovisión Andina has been included as a subject, as well (see the Ministerio de Educación web page).

6. The bibliography reviewed concerning Evo Morales and the MAS showed some coincidences. Many books and articles related to indigenismo, rights of indigenous people, the defence of indigenous people, the MAS and Evo Morales have been published, edited or sponsored by almost the same organisations. Among the editorial and sponsors we have Muela del Diablo (Bolivia), Clacso (international) and UNAM (Mexico), as well as that some common authors are Pablo Stefanoni, Hervé Do Alto, Karin Monasterios, Martín Sivak, and Jim Schultz. It is just necessary to google one of those names or the topics to verify that relationship.

In short, the main objective of this study was achieved because it was found that there is an intention or intentionality that underlies the discourse of Evo Morales and the MAS. By means of their discourse, certain emotions are not only being awakened and fostered among some sectors of the Bolivian population, but also their discourse is meant to trigger those emotions which must have previously been instilled within certain sectors of Bolivian population. Besides, those emotions are oriented toward specific targets. Their discourse is also meant to draw and accentuate the division between US and THEM. Moreover, that division labels anyone as THEM, anyone who somehow thinks or criticises Morales and the MAS

policy. Finally, Morales political behaviour fits the role of the manipulator who threatens with a net gain or a net loss, or by means of self-abasement, who is always playing the victim in order to get unconditional support.

In spite of what some readers might think, most of what has been written above, perhaps all, is not something new, rather, everything is at hand of everyone; “the truth is out there.” We just need to tie up all the loose ends. And the purpose of this study, unlike others will not end up claiming, if not begging, for more research. The idea is just to make the reader think about the events and facts, and perhaps to make them aware or to suggest them to see, from a different perspective, what has been happening in the Bolivian political arena; there are two sides to everything.

REFERENCES

- Abelson, D. E. (2002a). *Do Think Tanks Matter?: Assessing the Impact of Public Policy Institutes*. Québec, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Abelson, D. E. (2002b) (Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Western Ontario). *Think Tanks and U.S. Foreign Policy: An Historical Perspective*. In *Journal of the U.S. Department of State, U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda*. The U.S.A. November 2002, Volume 7, Number 3, 1-47.
- Abelson, D. E. and Carberry, C. M. (1998). *Following Suit or Falling Behind? A Comparative Analysis of Think Tanks in Canada and the United States*. Québec, Canada: Canadian Journal of Political Science, vol. 31, no. 3, 525-555.
- A.F.P. (Agence France-Press) (Monday, 13 November, 2000). *Encuentran a militares asesinados por cocaleros en Bolivia*.
- A.F.P. (Agence France-Press) (Monday, 29 October, 2001). *Aumenta la tensión en Chapare por siembra de hoja de coca*.
- A.F.P. (Agence France-Press) (Monday, 6 May, 2002). *Murió Hugo Banzer, el dictador boliviano reciclado en demócrata*.
- A.N.F. (Agencia de Noticias Fides) (10 de Agosto, 2009). *MTS [Movimiento Sin Tierra] acusa al Gobierno de instrumentalizar traslado de campesinos*.
- Alicke, M. D. and Sedikides, C. (2011). *Handbook of Self-enhancement and Self-protection*. New York, U.S.A.: The Guildford Press.
- Allport, G. W. (1950). *A psychological approach to the study of love and hate*. In P. A. Sorokin (Ed.) *Explorations in altruistic love and behaviour*. Boston, U.S.A. (pp. 145–164). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Althusser, L. P. (1971). *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. In Althusser (ed.), *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.

- Amnesty International Report (27 November, 2000). *Bolivia: Further information on Fear for safety/Ill-treatment/Medical concern.*
- Anderson, R. C.; Mason, J. and Shirey, L. (1983). *The Reading Group: An experimental Investigation of a Labyrinth.* Illinois, U.S.A.: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, supported by the National Institute of Education under Contract No. US-NIE-C-400-76-0116.
- A.P. (Associated Press) (18 de Octubre, 2010). *Carlos Mamani acepta oferta de Evo Morales y regresa a Bolivia.*
- A.P. (Associated Press) (17 October, 2011). *Elecciones judiciales en Bolivia: 60 % de los votos son nulos o blancos.*
- A.P. (Associated Press) (12 October, 2012). *Morales: Relations with U.S. 'like a turd.'*
- Aristotle (1992). *Nature and the Polis.* Politics, Book 1, section 1253a 2-3, in Saunders *The Politics.* Translated by Thomas Alan Sinclair and first published in 1962. London, England: Penguin Books, Published by the Penguin Group.
- Arnal, E.; Caparrós, R. and Getino, E. (1996). *Haciendo la reforma.* La Paz, Bolivia: Santillana. Aula XXI; 1996, p. 28.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words: The William James lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955.* Great Britain, Oxford. At Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press.
- Azab Powell, B. (27 October, 2003). Framing the issues: UC Berkeley professor George Lakoff tells how conservatives use language to dominate politics. UC Berkely News: News Centre.
- B.P.A., Bolivia Prensa Agencia de Noticias (11 Octubre, 2013). *García Linera cierra las puertas del MAS a los "librepensantes."*
- Báez, L. and De La Hoz, P. (2008). *Evo, Espuma de Plata.* La Paz, La Habana: Ediciones Plaza.

- Bakhtin, M. M. (2004). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Texas, U.S.A.: University of Texas Press.
- Bakunin, M. (1991). In Bourdieu, Pierre (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Originally published under the title *Ce que parler veut dire*, translated by Gino Raymond and Mathew Adamson. Printed in the U.S.A.: Polity Press.
- Bamford, J. and Day, R. R. (1997). *Extensive reading: What is it? Why Bother?* The Language Teacher, 21 (5), 6-8, 12.
- Banerjee, S. (1980). *In the Wake of Naxalbari: a history of the Naxalite movement in India*. 1st Sahitya Samsad, Kolkata ed. Calcutta, India: Subarnarekha.
- Bassi, B. & Evans, R. (Friday, 30 November, 2007). *Bolivia: Right-wing violence as draft constitution approved*. Green left weekly.
- Bates, C. (2007). *Mutiny at the Margins*. London, U.K.: Routledge, Edinburgh University.
- BBC Mundo, (Thursday, 24 January, 2002). *Cocalero expulsado del Congreso*.
- BBC Mundo, (24 de Octubre, 2008). *EE.UU. eliminará a Bolivia de ATPDEA*.
- BBC Mundo, (Viernes, 29 de julio de 2011). *Bolivia: el estado aumenta el control sobre los medios*.
- BBC News, (2 April, 2014). *First Bolivian telecom satellite enters service*.
- Bell, D. (2001). *The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties, with a new essay The Resumption of History in the New Century*. Originally published by The Free Press, 1965. New York, U.S.A.: Second printing, Harvard University Press.
- Bhatia, H. R. (2004). *Elements of Educational Psychology*. Twentieth impression, 2004. India: Orient Longman Private Limited.
- Bierce, A. (1911). *The Devil's Dictionary*. Originally published as *The Cynic's Word Book*, 1906; copyright expired. The Project Gutenberg.

- Bolpress, (22 January, 2006). *Te Deum en Tiwanaku*.
- Bolpress, (06 Diciembre, 2009). *Evo Morales gana la elección en Bolivia*.
- Boulding, C. E. (2007). *Protest, Voting and Political Change: The Effects of NGOs on Politics in Developing Democracies*. San Diego-California, U.S.A.: University of California, San Diego.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Originally published under the title *Ce que parler veut dire*, translated by Gino Raymond and Mathew Adamson. Printed in the U.S.A.: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production*. United Kingdom: First Published by Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Braiker, Harriet B. (2004). *Who's Pulling Your Strings?* New York, U.S.A.: McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, D. S.; Brown, J. C. and Desposato, S. W. (2008). *Who Gives, Who Receives, and Who Wins?: Transforming Capital Into Political Change Through Nongovernmental Organizations*. *Comparative Political Studies*, January 2008 vol. 41 no. 1, 24-47.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Some Universals in Language Usage*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Buehler, R. and McFarland, C. (2011). *Intensity Bias in Affective Forecasting: The Role of Temporal Focus*. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*: November 2011 vol. 37 no. 11 1480-1493.
- Burr, V. (2003). *Social Constructionism*. Second Edition. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Burrows, S. (2000). *French Exile Journalism and European Politics, 1792-1814*. Rochester-New York, U.S.A.: Suffolk; Royal Historical Society.
- Burrows, S. (2006). *Blackmail, Scandal and Revolution: London's French Libellistes, 1758-92*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

- Buss, D. M.; Gomes, M.; Higgins, D. S. and Lauterbach, K. (1987). *Tactics of manipulation*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 52, No 6:1219-29.
- Butler, V. (September, 2002). *George Soros – Mr. Lucifer*. Fresno-California, the U.S.A.: Free Republic; The Russian Conservative.
- Cámara de Diputados (2013). *El bono Juana Azurduy beneficia a 383.242 madres en Bolivia*. Cámara de Diputados, Asamblea Legislativa Plurinacional.
- CAMBIO (Periódico del Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia), 01 de Septiembre de 2013. *Millonarios cargos contra neoliberales*.
- Cambridge Dictionary, 2010
- C.N.E. Corte Nacional Electoral (Noviembre, 2007). *Boletín Estadístico*. Año III, N° 7.
- C.N.N. (Cable News Network), 24 June, 2006. *La Iglesia Católica es un símbolo del colonialismo europeo y por la tanto debe desaparecer de Bolivia*.
- Campero, A. M. (1992). *Jaime Paz Zamora. El pragmático que venció al idealista*. Nueva Sociedad Nro.118 MARZO- ABRIL 1992, pp. 80-88.
- Canetti, E. [1962] (2000). *Crowds and Power*. Translated from the German by Carol Stewart, originally published by Gollancz, 1962. London, England: New Edition Phoenix.
- Carrell, P. L.; Devine, J. and Eskey, D. E. (2000). *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading*. Ninth printing. The United Kingdom: Series editors Michel H. Long and Jack C. Richards, Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Carter, P. (2004). *The Road to Abu Ghraib: The biggest scandal of the Bush administration began at the top*. Washington, U.S.A.: The Washington Monthly, November, 2004.

- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. First Published in the U.S.A.: Convergence (Praeger Publishers).
- Choque, Roberto (2008). *Sucedió en 1921: Sublevación y masacre de Jesús de Machaca*. Revista Pukara, N° 29, del 7 de marzo al 7 de abril de 2008.
- Clarke, G. (1998). *The Politics of NGOs in South-East Asia: Participation and Protest in the Philippines*. London, England: Routledge.
- Cleves, R. H. (2009). *The Reign Of Terror in America: Visions of Violence from Anti-Jacobinism to Antislavery*. Originally published in 1975. New York, U.S.A.: Cambridge University Press.
- Cobban, A. (1999). *The Social Interpretation of the French Revolution*. First published in 1964. Second Edition. The United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohn, S. K. (2008). *Lust For Liberty: The Politics For Social Revolt in Medieval Europe, 1200 – 1425*. Originally published in 2006. The United States of America: Harvard University Press.
- Columbia Encyclopedia, the (6th edition, 2012) Columbia University Press.
- Contreras, M and Talavera, M. L. (2005). *Examen parcial: La Reforma Educativa boliviana 1992-2002*. La Paz, Bolivia: PIEB.
- Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. (1990). *Grounded Theory Research: Procedures, Canons, and Evaluative Criteria*. Qualitative Sociology, Vol. 13, No.1, 1990, 3-21.
- Correo del Sur (11 Octubre, 2013). *García Linera dice que los libre pensantes pueden irse del MAS*.
- Courtois, S.; Werth, N.; Panné, J.; Paczkowski, A.; Bartosek, K. and Margolin, J-L. (1997). *Le livre noir du communisme: Crimes, Terreur, Répression*. Paris, France : Editions Robert Laffont S.A.

- Covey, J. (1995). *Accountability and Effectiveness in NGO Policy Alliances*. In M. Edwards and D. Hulme (eds.) *Beyond the Magic Bullet: NGO Performance and Accountability in the Post Cold-War World.* London, England: Earthscan, and West Hartford: Kumarian Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. California, USA. SAGE publications, Inc.
- Curry, A. (2002). *The Hundred Years' War*. Oxford, Great Britain: Osprey Publishing.
- Dampier, P. and Walton, A. (2006). *Duke of Hazard: The Wit and Wisdom of Prince Philip*. Later re-issued as "Prince Philip: Wise Words and Golden Gaffes," with illustrations by Richard Jolley, 2012. United Kingdom: Book Guild Ltd.
- Darnton, R. (1971). *The High Enlightenment and the Low-Life of Literature in Pre-Revolutionary France*. In *Past & Present*, No. 51 (May, 1971), pp. 81-115. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford journals, Oxford University Press.
- Darnton, R. (2010). *The Devil in the Holy Water, or the Art of Slander from Louis XIV to Napoleon*. Pennsylvania, U.S.A.: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dasenbrock, R. W. (2001). *Truth and Consequences: Intentions, Conventions, and the New Thematics*. Printed in the United States of America: Published by the Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Dash, M. (2006). *Thug: The True Story Of India's Murderous Cult*. London, Great Britain: Mackays of Chatham plc.
- Davitz, J. R. (1969). *The Language of Emotions*. London, England: London Academic Press.
- de Franco, M and Godoy, R (1992). *The economic consequences of cocaine production in Bolivia: Historical, local, and macroeconomic perspectives*. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 24(2):375–406.

- Dechalert, P. (1999). *NGOs: Advocacy and Popular Protest*. London, England: CVO International Working Paper Number 6. 1-36. London School of Economics Centre for Voluntary Organisation.
- Dem, A.; Mihailovici, G. and Gao, H. (April, 2001). *Inflation and Hyperinflation on the 20th Century: Causes and Patterns*. U.S.A.: Columbia University Press: School of International and Public Affairs.
- Dennis Jr., Edward S. G. (1993). *Siege in Waco - the Handling of the Branch Davidian Stand-off*. Printed in the U.S.A., U.S. Department of Justice Evaluation of the Handling of the Branch Davidian Stand-off in Waco, Texas: February 28 to April 19, 1993.
- De Tarde, G. [1901] (2006). *L'opinion et la foule*. Originally published in 1901 by Félix Alcan. Paris, France: Elibron Classics, Adamant Media Corporation.
- De Tarde, G. (1903). *Law of Imitation*. Original title "Les Lois de l'Imitation," Translated from the second French edition by Elsie Clews Parsons. New York, U.S.A.: Henry Holt and Company.
- De Tocqueville, A. (1856). *Ancien Régime and the French Revolution*. Translated by John Bonner. New York, U.S.A.: Harper & Brothers, Publishers.
- Dhariwal, N. (12 April, 2006). *Horror of India's child sacrifice*. BBC News.
- Dickens, C. [1859] (1983). *A Tale Of Two Cities*. First published in Everyman's Library in 1906; last re-printed in 1983. Great Britain: Biddles Ltd, Guildford, Surrey for J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.
- Dickens, C. [1849-1850] (2004). *David Copperfield*. May 1849–November 1850: serial publication by Bradbury and Evans. New York, The U.S.A.: Dover Giant Thrift Editions.
- Dinges, J. (2005). *The Condor Years: How Pinochet and His Allies Brought Terrorism to Three Continents*. New York, U.S.A.: The New Press.

- Dobson, R. B. (1970). *The Peasants' Revolt of 1381*. London, Great Britain: Macmillan St Martin's Press.
- Dorman, C. and Dorman, H. G. (2002). *The Social Toddler: Promoting Positive Behaviour*. The United Kingdom: Richmond Publishing.
- Doyle, W. (1999). *Origins of the French Revolution*. Third edition. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Dumas, A. [1844] (1898). *Les Trois Mousquetaires*. London, England: Macmillan and Co., Limited.
- Dumas, A. [1839-1840] (2010). *L'Homme au Masque de Fer*. Originally published by Cambridge University Press in 1915. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Dunlop, I. (1999). *Louis XIV*. New York, U.S.A.: St. Martin's Press.
- Dunn, A. (2004). *The Peasants' Revolt: England's Failed Revolution of 1381*. Second edition. Gloucestershire, U.K.: Tempus Publishing Limited.
- Dyadkin, I. G. (1983). *Unnatural Deaths in the U.S.S.R.: 1928-1954*. New Brunswick, New Jersey, U.S.A.: Transaction, Inc.
- Ebiringa, C. I. (2013). *The Power of Language, Communication and Social Order*. In Iroegbu Patrick E. "The KPIM of Social Order: A Season of Inquiry, Meaning and Significance in the Modern World." The United States of America: Edited by George Uzoma Ukagba; Des O. Obi and Iks J. Nwankwor, Xlibris Corporation, Father Pantaleon Foundation.
- Economía Bolivia (24 de Mayo, 2013). *Mil campesinos del Conalcam partirán desde Potosí a La Paz para refundar la C.O.B.*
- educabolivia (Bolivian government official magazine published online).
- EFE, Agencia de Noticias, España (26 Abril, 2012). *Evo Morales: "Estoy feliz de no haber ido a la Universidad."*

Einstein, A. (1920). *Relativity: The Special and General Theory*. Translated by Robert W. Lawson. New York, U.S.A.: Henry Holt, 1920.

Ekman, P. (1992). *Facial expression and emotion*. The U.S.A., *American Psychologist*, 48, 384-392.

El Clarín (2 de Mayo, 2006). *Evo Morales nacionalizó por decreto el gas y el petróleo*.

El Deber (7 de Enero de 2009). *En dos años, Gobierno gastó Bs 190 millones en medios*.

El Deber (01 July, 2011). Santa Cruz. *Evo Morales tiene 20 doctorados Honoris Causa desde 2006*. A statement made by Bolivian vice-president Alvaro Garcia Linera.

El Deber (27 de Enero de 2012). *Sentencian a 12 años de prisión a Santos Ramírez*.

El Deber (11 de Mayo de 2013). *El diálogo se congela y la tensión se mantiene: Afines al M.A.S. buscan refundar la C.O.B.*

El Día (21 de Febrero, 2013). Montevideo, Uruguay. *Activan 80 juicios contra Juan del Granado, del MSM*.

El Diario (20 de Enero, 2003). Política: *Conforman "estado mayor del pueblo boliviano."*

El Diario (Miercoles, 15 de Octubre, 2003). *Bolivianos tienen derecho a pedir renuncia de Presidente*.

El Diario (Sábado, 18 de Octubre, 2003). *Carlos Mesa: No me serviré de la Nación*.

El Diario (02 de Enero, 2006). *Estado recupera control absoluto de hidrocarburos*.

El País (Jueves, 07 de Julio de 2005). Madrid, España. *El Congreso de Bolivia adelanta las elecciones al 4 de diciembre*.

Encyclopædia Britannica (11thed.). Cambridge University Press.

- Errejón, Í. y Canelas, M. (n.d.). *¿La Patria de los indios o los indios por la Patria? Un análisis discursivo de las articulaciones de la identidad política “oficialista” en Bolivia.*
- Estenssoro, R. (2009). *El debate por el poder: Las causas del desentendimiento en la Asamblea Constituyente.* La Paz-Bolivia: financiada por el Proyecto Causas Estructurales del Conflicto y la Falta de Entendimiento entre Bolivianos, PNUD-BOL /53442, ejecutado por la Fundación Boliviana para la Democracia Multipartidaria (fBDM).
- Evening News (January, Tuesday 27, 1931). *Unresolved Riddles That Still Puzzle Authorities Here and Abroad.* Tonawanda, New York, U.S.A.
- Fabian, S. (2009). *Education in Nazi Germany.* Copyrighted Helper.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical Study of Language,* England: Longman Group Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (1996). *Language and Power.* New York, U.S.A., Longman Inc.
- Fairclough, N. [1992] (2003). *Discourse and Social Change,* United Kingdom: Polity Press.
- Faith, R. (1987). *The ‘Great Rumour’ of 1377 and Peasant Ideology* in Hilton, R. H. and Aston, T. H., (editors) *The English Rising of 1381.* Originally published in 1984 by The Past and Present Society. The Edinburgh Building. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Falk, J. S. (1973). *Linguistics and Language; A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications,* Lexington-Massachusetts, U.S.A.: Xerox College Pub.
- FAO Conference (2011). First Report of the Resolutions Committee: *Proposal by the Government of Bolivia for an International Year of Quinoa.* FAO, Thirty-seventh Session; (Rome, 25 June - 2 July 2011) C 2011/INF/18 Rev.1.

- Farah, D. and Hirst, J. D. (01 December, 2011). *The FARC's New Boss*. The International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), Americas Quarterly.
- Farthing, L. and Kohl, B. (2010). *Latin American Perspectives- Social Control: Bolivia's New Approach to Coca Reduction*. LATIN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES, Issue 173, Vol. 37, No. 4, July 2010 197-213.
- Félix, Gloria Alicia C. (2007). *De La Resistencia A La Toma Del Poder: El Discurso De Evo Morales Ante El Congreso*. Perspectivas, São Paulo, v. 32, p. 183-201, jul./dez. 2007.
- Fetsch, R.J. & Jacobson, B. (April, 2007). *Children's Anger and Tantrums*. United States, Issue no. 10.248, pp.1-3.
- Figes, O. (1996). *A people's tragedy*. Cambridge, U.K.: Published by Jonathan Cape.
- Figes, O. (2014). *Revolutionary Russia, 1891-1991: A History*. New York, U.S.A.: Metropolitan Books: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.
- Fischer, L. (2001). *The Life of Lenin*. Originally published in 1964 by Weidenfeld & Nicholson. London, U.K.: Phoenix Press.
- Fisher, J. (1998). *Nongovernments: NGOs and the Political Development of the Third World*. West Hartford, CT, Connecticut, U.S.A.: Kumarian Press.
- Fitness, J.; and Fletcher, G. J. O. (1993). *Love, hate, anger, and jealousy in close relationships: A prototype and cognitive appraisal analysis*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 65(5), 942-958, Nov 1993.
- Fitzpatrick, S. and Slezkine, Y. (2000). *In the Shadow of Revolution: Life stories of Russian Women from 1917 to the Second World War*. Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Princeton University Press.
- Fitzpatrick, S. (2008). *The Russian Revolution*. New York, U.S.A.: Oxford University Press Inc.

- Forward, S. (2001). *Emotional Blackmail: When the People in Your Life Use Fear, Obligation and Guilt To Manipulate You*. New York, U.S.A.: (Published in 1997 by HarperCollins Publishers), Reprinted in Quill 2001.
- Foucault, M. (1971). *L'ordre du discours*. Paris, France: Gallimard.
- Fremont-Barnes, G. (2007). *The Indian Mutiny 1857-58*. Oxford, the United Kingdom: Osprey Publishing.
- Freud, S. (1922a). *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. London, England: The International Psycho-analytical Press.
- Freud, S. (1922b). *Group Psychology and The Analysis of The Ego*. Authorised translation by James Strachey. London, England: The International Psycho-analytical Press.
- Frey, L. S. and Frey, M. I. (2004). *The French Revolution*. Printed in the U.S.A.: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Friedman-Rudovsky, J. (Thursday, 11 September, 2008). *Bolivia to Expel US Ambassador*. Time World.
- Furet, F. and Ozouf, M. (1989). *A Critical Dictionary of the French Revolution*. First published in 1988 as *Dictionnaire Critique de la Révolution Française*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge-Massachusetts, London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Gaceta Oficial de Bolivia (2010). Ley N° 070. Nueva ley de la educación boliviana: Ley Avelino Siñani-Elizardo Perez (ASEP).
- Gamara, E. A. and Malloy, J. M. (1995). *The Patrimonial Dynamics of Party Politics in Bolivia*. In Scully, Timothy R., "Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America." Stanford, California, U.S.A.: Stanford University Press.

- Garcia Linera, A. (2009). *La Potencia Plebeya, Acción Colectiva e Identidades Indigenas Obreras y populares en Bolivia*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Prometeo Libros y Clacso. Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- Gateway House (19 July, 2013). *Lessons from Jindal's Bolivian failure*. India: Gateway House, Indian Council on Global Relations.
- GBE – INDIA: *Briefing Book*, 2005.
- Gergen, K. (2001). *Social Construction in Context*. London, Great Britain. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Gergen, M. and Gergen, K. J. (2003). *Social Construction: A Reader*. London, Great Britain: SAGE Publications Ltd, Printed and Bound by Athenaeum Press, Gateshead.
- Gerlich, B.M. (1998). *Sandokan of Malludu: The Historical Background of a Novel Cycle set in Borneo by the Italian Author Emilio Salgari*. Persee, Scientific Magazine, Vol. 55, N°55, pp.29-41.
- Gill, L. (2000). *Teetering on the Rim: Global Restructuring, Daily Life, and the Armed Retreat of the Bolivian State*. Printed in the United States of America: Columbia University Press.
- Gilliat, E. (1914). *Heroes of the Indian Mutiny*. London, England: Seeley, Service & Company Limited.
- Glogoczowski, Marek (2011). *George Soros' International School of Youth Corruption*. Forum des résistants européens (samedi, 06 août 2011). Originally delivered at the EU(RO)-skeptical Youth Camp held at Ljubljana, Slovenia, Sept. 26-27, 2001.
- González, P. J. (2007). *Bolivia: la construcción de un país indígena*. Barcelona, España: Icaria editorial s.a.

- Gramsci, A. (1921-1926). *Selections from Political Writings*. In Bourdieu, Pierre, (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Originally published under the title *Ce que parler veut dire*, translated by Gino Raymond and Mathew Adamson. Printed in the U.S.A.: Polity Press.
- Green, R. F. (1992). *John Ball's Letters*. In "Chaucer's England: Literature in Historical Context." Minneapolis, U.S.A.: ed. Barbara Hanawalt, University of Minneapolis Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol.3, Speech Acts, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan. New York, U.S.A.: Academic Press, 41-58.
- Grice, H. P. (1991). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Fourth printing. London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Grunberger, R. (1971). *A Social History of the Third Reich*. Great Britain: Weidenfeld & Nicolson
- Guardian, The (27 December, 1917). *How the Bolsheviks took the Winter Palace*. The United Kingdom: The Guardian (eyewitness account of the storming of the Winter Palace).
- Haass, R. N. (2002). (Director of Policy and Planning: U.S. Department of State) *Think Tanks and U.S. Foreign Policy: A Policy-Maker's Perspective*. In Journal of the U.S. Department of State, U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda, November 2002, Volume 7, Number 3. 1-47.
- Haidt, J. (2001). *The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment*. Psychological review, Vol 108, N° 4, 814-834, The U.S.A.: The American Psychological Association.
- Haught, J. A. (1990). *Holy Horrors: An Illustrated History of Religious Murder and Madness*. New York, U.S.A.: Prometheus books.

- Heaps, R. A. (2009). *Understanding & Coping with Painful, Traumatic, or Hurtful Events*. Washington, D.C., U.S.A.: International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies.
- Heberle, R. (1995). *Social Movements and Social Order*. In Lyman, S.M. (eds.) "Social Movements: Critiques, Concepts, Case-Studies." London, England: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time*. Translated from the German "Sein und Zeit" by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York, U.S.A.: Harper & Row, Publishers, Incorporated.
- Hersh, S. M. (10 May, 2004). *Annals of National Security: Torture at Abu Ghraib*. In Mason, David S., (2010) *The End of the American Century*. New York, U.S.A., Published by The Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. (originally published in The New Yorker, 2004).
- Hibbert, C. (1999). *The Days of the French Revolution*. Printed in the U.S.A.: Morrow Quill paperbacks, Quill Reissue.
- Hibbing, J. R. and Theiss-Morse, E. (2003). *Stealth Democracy: Americans' Beliefs About How Government Should Work*. First published in 2002 and reprinted in 2003. The United Kingdom: Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Hiemer, E. (1938). *Der Giftpilz*. (Toadstool) Well known as "The Poisonous Mushroom." Published by Julius Streicher and probably re-issued by "Friends of Europe" in London in 1938.
- Hiles, D. (2007). *Psychoanalytic Theory and Transpersonal Practice*. The United Kingdom: Centre for Counselling and Psychotherapy.
- Hofmeister, W. and Grabow, K. (2011). *Political Parties: Functions and Organisation in Democratic Societies*. Singapore: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung.

- Holstein, J. A. and Miller, G. (editors) (2007). *Reconsidering Social Constructionism: Debates in Social Problems Theory*. First published in 1993. New Jersey, U.S.A.: Transaction Publishers.
- Holy Bible, the, King James version, 2000.
- I.A.L.P. (Informe de la Asamblea Legislativa Plurinacional), 2008.
- International Guide to NGO (December, 1996). *Activities in Conflict Prevention and Resolution*.
- Jakobson, R. O. (1958). *Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics*. In *Style in language* (1930), Wiley. New York: Ed. Sebeok, Thomas.
- Johnston, R. M. (1910). *The French Revolution: A Short History*. Second printing. New York, U.S.A.: Henry Holt and Company.
- Jones, D. (2009). *Summer of Blood: The Peasants' Revolt of 1381*. London, Great Britain: Harper Press.
- Johnson, R. T. (1999). *A review of John J. Robinson's (1989) "Born in Blood."* Copyrighted 1999 – 2011, Phoenixmasonry, Inc.
- Jordan, D. P. (1985). *The Revolutionary Career of Maximilien Robespierre*. Chicago, U.S.A.: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jordan, D. P. (2010). *Rumour, Fear, and Paranoia in the French Revolution*. In *The Fundamentalist Mindset: Psychological Perspectives on Religion, Violence, and History*. Edited by Charles B. Strozier, David M. Terman, James W. Jones, Katherine A. Boyd. New York, U.S.A.: Oxford University Press.
- Joseph, J. E. (2006). *Language and Politics*. Edinburgh Textbooks in Applied Linguistics Series. Edinburgh, U.K.: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Journal of the U.S. Department of State, U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda, November 2002, Volume 7, Number 3, 1-47.

- Jung, C. G. (1990). *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Volume 9, (Second edition [1968] “Über die Archetypen des Kollektiven Unbewussten” Translated by R.F.C. Hull). Tenth printing. U.S.A.: Princeton University Press.
- Justice, S. (1994). *Writing and Rebellion: England in 1381*. Berkeley CA, U.S.A.: University of California Press.
- Kant, I. [1781] (2011). *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by J.M.D. Meiklejohn. Printed in the U.S.A.: Re-issued by Pacific Publishing Studio.
- Kant, I. [1763] (1992). *Negative Magnitudes*. In *Kant's Theoretical Philosophy, 1755-1770*. Printed in the U.S.A.: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaye, J. W. and Malleon, G. B. (1892). *History of the Indian mutiny of 1857-8*. Volume II, Second Edition, not in copyright. London, England: W. H. Allen & Co., Ltd.
- Kennedy, M. L. (1982). *The Jacobin Clubs in the French Revolution: The First Years*. Princeton, New Jersey, the United States: Princeton University Press.
- Klein, N. (6 March, 2010). *Chile and the Free-Market Fundamentalists*. Great Britain: Allen Lane, Clays Ltd, St Ives plc.
- Klein, N. (2007). *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. U.S.A.: Penguin Books, Metropolitan Books, Henry Holt and Company.
- Kochan, L. (1967). *Russia in Revolution: 1890-1918*. Originally published by Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1966. New York: U.S.A.: New American Library.
- Kohl, B. and Farthing, L. C. (2006). *Impasse in Bolivia: Neoliberal Hegemony and Popular Resistance*. London, U.K.: First Published by Zed books Ltd.
- Kollontai, A. (1984). *Introduction to The Social Basis of the Women's Question*. In *Alexandra Kollontai: Selected Articles and Speeches*. Moscow: edited by Cynthia Carlile, Progress Publishers.

- Kowalski, R. (1997). *The Russian Revolution: 1917-1921*. London, England: Routledge.
- Kropotkin, P. [1909] (1927). *The Great French Revolution 1789–1793*. Original work published in 1909, translated from the French by N. F. Dryhurst. New York, U.S.A.: Vanguard Printings.
- Kuah, D. (2003). *Epic of Race: The Indian Mutiny, 1857*. Singapore: University Scholars Programme, National University of Singapore.
- Lacey, C. (1970). *Hightown Grammar*. Manchester, Great Britain: Manchester University Press.
- La Patria (28 de Febrero, 2014). *Bolivia inicia la industrialización del litio*.
- La Razón (05 de Septiembre, 2012). *El ex-ministro Sacha Llorenti jura como embajador ante la ONU*.
- La Razón (03 de Diciembre, 2003). *La guerra de febrero*.
- La Razón (26 de Agosto, 2012). *Elecciones Judiciales de 2011: La interpelación silenciosa del voto blanco y nulo*.
- La Razón, A7 (15 de Octubre, 2003). *El Alto Cumple Una Semana de Paro Cívico Continuado*.
- La Razón (04 de Marzo, 2013). *Soldados detenidos en Chile son ascendidos y condecorados*.
- La Razón (26 de Agosto, 2013). *Canciller de Brasil renuncia tras la fuga del senador Roger Pinto*.
- La Red 21 (25 de Enero de 2002). *Expulsado del Congreso y "dispuesto a morir" por los indígenas bolivianos*.
- LaKoff, G. (2002). *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Printed in the U.S.A.: University of Chicago Press.

LaKoff, G. (2009). *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. In Kirp (2009) *The Sandbox Investment: The Preschool Movement and Kids-First Politics*. The United States Of America: Harvard University Press.

Latin American Herald Tribune, (15 November, 2010). *Morales Named "World Hero of Mother Earth" by UN General Assembly*.

Le Bon, G. [1895] (2002). *The Crowd: A Study of The Popular Mind*. Originally published in 1895. New York, U.S.A.: Dover Publications, Inc., New York.

Le Bon, G. [1963] (2011). *Psychologie Des Foules.* 8e edition. Paris, France: Presses Universitaires de France.

Lefebvre, G. (2005). *The Coming of the French Revolution*. Originally published in 1939, in French, under the title *Quatre-vingt-neuf*. Translated by R. R. Palmer. New Jersey, U.S.A.: Princeton University Press.

Lessa, I. (2006). *Discursive Struggles within Social Welfare: Restaging Teen Motherhood*. Great Britain: British Journal of Social Work, (February 2006) 36 (2): 283-298.

Linedecker, C. L. (1993). *Massacre at Waco: The Shocking True Story of Cult Leader David Koresh and the Branch Davidians*. Printed in the United States of America: St. Martin's Paperbacks.

Linton, M. (2006). *Robespierre and the Terror*. History Today: Volume: 56, Issue: 8.

Lock, A. and Strong, T. (2010). *Social Constructionism: Sources and Stirrings in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

London Times (Monday, 10 September, 1792). *France: The September Massacres*.

Loomis, S. (1964). *Paris in the Terror: June 1793 - July 1794*. Philadelphia and New York, U.S.A.: J. B. Lippincott.

Los Tiempos (11 de Julio, 2006). *El ministro Patzi insiste en abolir enseñanza religiosa*.

- Los Tiempos (7 de Enero, 2009). *En dos años, Gobierno gastó Bs 190 millones en medios.*
- Los Tiempos (17 de Junio, 2013). *Morales: Opositores dentro del Gobierno sólo quieren figurar en la prensa.*
- Los Tiempos (30 de Julio, 2009). *Gobierno ratifica traslado de gente a Pando y Beni.*
- Lusane, C. (2011). *The Black History of the White House.* San Francisco, C.A., U.S.A.: Open Media Series, City Lights Books.
- Machiavelli, N. [1515] (2009). *The Prince.* Translated by W. K. Marriott. First published in 1906 by Prohyptikon Value Classics. Toronto, Canada: Prohyptikon Publishing Inc.
- Mackay, C. [1841] (2003). *Extraordinary Popular Delusions.* Originally published by Richard Bentley, London, 1841, under the title *Memoires of Extraordinary Popular Delusions.* New York, U.S.A.: Dover Publications Inc.
- Malia, M. (1997) Foreword to *The Black Book of Communism.* English edition of *Le livre noire du communisme.*
- Marable, M. (2011). *Malcolm X: A Life of Reinvention.* Printed in the U.S.A.: Viking Penguin Books, a member of Penguin Group Inc.
- Marston, D. (2001). *The Seven Years' War.* Great Britain: Osprey Publishing.
- Martzloff, J-C. (1991). *Time and Space in the Encounter between China and Europe during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.* Paris, France: Hugot Foundation of the Collège de France.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching.* Second edition 2002. Trowbridge- Wiltshire, Great Britain: Cromwell Press Limited.
- Mathews, N. M. (2001). *Paul Gauguin: An Erotic Life.* New Haven-London, U.K.: Yale University Press.

- Mawdsley, E. (2002). *The Russian Civil War*. Edinburgh, U.K.: Birlinn Limited.
- Maykut, P. and Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning Qualitative Research: A Philosophic and Practical Guide*. London, England: Falmer Press.
- McClelland, D. C. and Burnham, D. H. (2003). *Power is the Great Motivator (Harvard Business Review Classics)*. Originally published in 1976. Boston-Massachusetts, U.S.A.: Harvard Business School Press.
- McDougall, W. (1926). *An Introduction to Social Psychology*. Boston, U.S.A.: John W. Luce & Co.
- McGann, J. (2008). *The Global 'Go-To Think Tanks' The Leading Public Policy Research Organization In The World*. Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA, U.S.A.: Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program International Relations Program University of Pennsylvania.
- McPhee, P. (2002). *The French Revolution: 1789-1799*. New York, U.S.A.: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Medvedev, R.A. (1989). *Let History Judge: The Origins and Consequences of Stalinism*. (Originally published in 1969) Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Mejía, Y. (2004). *Warisata el modelo de ayllu: Sistematización de Warisata Escuela-Ayllu, 1931-1940*. La Paz: UMSA.
- Melville, H. [1888-1891] (1992). *Billy Budd*. Begun in November 1888, left unfinished at his death in 1891, and published in 1924. New York, the U.S.A.: Tom Doherty Associates, LLC.
- Mendizabal, E. (2009a). Think tanks and political parties in Latin America. Lima, Peru: I.D.E.A. (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance), and O.D.I. (Overseas Development Institute).

- Mendizabal, E. (2009b). *Thinking Politics: Think tanks and Political Parties in Latin America*. Lima, Peru: I.D.E.A. (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance), and O.D.I. (Overseas Development Institute).
- MercoPress (South Atlantic News Agency) (Thursday, 19 July, 2012). *Bolivia agrees to sell more gas to Argentina under an 'interruptible' contract*.
- Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary (10th ed.). (1993). Springfield, MA, U.S.A.: Merriam-Webster.
- Mesa, C. D. (1997). *Historia de Bolivia*. La Paz, Bolivia: Editorial Gisbert.
- Miller, Daniel (11 October 2013). *Indian father kills his eight-month-old son with an axe to appease Hindu goddess of destruction and rebirth*. UK Mail.
- Monaco, J. (1982). *French Revolutionary Calendar*. New York, U.S.A.: Set in Trump Medieval by Expertel, Inc., printed and bound by George Edwards & Son.
- Monasterios, K.; Stefanoni, P.; Do Alto, H. (2007). *Reinventando la nación en Bolivia: Movimientos sociales, Estado y poscolonialidad*. La Paz-Bolivia: Ediciones Cooperativas, CLACSO –Plural.
- Moore, C. (1995). *Davidian Massacre: Disturbing Questions About Waco Which Must Be Answered*. U.S.A.; Published as a mass market paperback by Gun Owners Foundation and Legacy Communications.
- Morales, J. A. (1986). *Crisis y política económica en Bolivia de 1982 a 1985*. La Paz, Bolivia: IISEC.
- Morgan, D. (13 February, 2000). *Think Tank Or Hired Gun?* Washington, U.S.A.: The Washington Post, also published in the Sun Sentinel, 13 February, 2000.
- Morris, T. (12 July, 2013). *Commemorating The Storming Of The Bastille On July 14, 1789*. California, U.S.A.: Santa Monica Mirror Archives.

- Moscovici, S. (2010). *The Age Of The Crowd: A Historical Treatise On Mass Psychology*. (First issued in 1981) New York, U.S.A.: Cambridge University Press.
- Moshman, D. (2007). *Us and Them: Identity and Genocide*. Nebraska, U.S.A.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. *Identity. An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 7(2), 115-135.
- Moynahan, B. (1999). *Rasputin: The Saint Who Sinned*. Originally published in 1997 by Random House. New York, the U.S.A.: Da Capo Press-Random House.
- Munckton, S. (2009). *Morales named 'World Hero of Mother Earth.'* Australia: The Green Left Weekly.
- Neely, S. (2008). *A Concise History of the French Revolution*. The United Kingdom: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Neergaard, L. (Friday, 14 September, 2001). *Emotion Key in Making Tough Moral Decisions*. Sec. 8A. Missouri, the U.S.A.: The Associated Press, Southeast Missourian.
- Neiderman, A. (1990). *The Devil's Advocate*. New York, U.S.A.: Pocket Books, a division of Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Ninivaggi, F. J. (2010). *Envy Theory: Perspectives on the Psychology of Envy*. The United Kingdom: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Notimex, Agencia De Noticias Del Estado Mexicano (1 de noviembre de 2008). *Aguardan bolivianos con expectación el fin de la ATPDEA*.
- OEA–Organización de Estados Americanos (May, 2003). *Informe de la Organización de los Estados Americanos (OEA) Sobre los Hechos de Febrero del 2003 en Bolivia*.
- Oman, C. [1906] (2001). *The Great Revolt of 1381*. Ontario, Canada: Batoche Books, Kitchener.
- Opinión (01 Septiembre, 2012). *Gobierno garantiza pago del bono Juana Azurduy*.

- Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal Farm*. Printed in the United States of America: Text copyright by Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Orwell, G. (1996). *Politics and the English Language*. First published: Horizon. — GB, London. — April, 1946, in Cohen, Mitchell and Fermon, Nicole. *Princeton Readings in Political Thought: Essential Texts since Plato, 591-600*. New Jersey, U.S.A.: Published by Princeton University Press.
- Orwell, G. [1949] (2003). *Nineteen eighty-four*. London, England: Clays Ltd. St. Ives plc. Copyright by Erick Blair, Penguin Books.
- Parrott, W. G. and Smith, R. H. (June, 1993). *Distinguishing the experiences of envy and jealousy*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 64(6), 906-920.
- Patton, M. Q. (1991). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. California, U.S.A.: Sage Publications.
- Pauley, B. F. (2003). *Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini: Totalitarianism in the Twentieth Century*. Wheeling, Illinois, U.S.A.: Harlan Davidson, Inc, University Of Central Florida.
- Pérez, E. (1962). *Warisata: la Escuela-Ayllu*. La Paz, Bolivia: Gráfica E. Burillo.
- Perkins, J. (2007). *The Secret History of the American Empire: Economic Hit Men, Jackals, and the Truth About Global Corruption*. New York, U.S.A.: Dutton, First Printing Published by Penguin Group (U.S.A.) Inc.
- Petras, J. (07 December, 1997). *Imperialism and NGOs in Latin America*. *Monthly Review magazine*, Volume 49, p10-27.
- Pine, L. (2010). *Education in Nazi Germany*. The United Kingdom, Berg English Edition. The U.K.: the MPG Books Group.

- Pinter, H. (2005). *Art, Truth and Politics*. Harold Pinter's Nobel Lecture (pre-recorded and shown on video on 7 December 2005, in Börssalen at the Swedish Academy in Stockholm: The Nobel Foundation 2005.
- Pipes, R. (1991). *The Russian Revolution*. New York, U.S.A.: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, Inc. (originally published by Alfred A. Knopf, 1990).
- Pipes, R. (1995). *A concise history of the Russian Revolution*. New York, U.S.A.: Vintage books: A Division of Random House, Inc.
- Plan Iberoamericano de Alfabetización y Educación Básica de Personas Adultas Informe de Bolivia; Ministerio de Educación y Culturas (n.d.).
- Porter, Keith. *The Role of Think Tanks and NGOs: Who Makes U.S. Foreign Policy?*
- Quispe, F. (1990). *Tupac Katari Vive y Vuelve...Carajo*. Ed. Ofensiva Roja.
- Rappaport, H. (2009). *The Last Days of the Romanovs: Tragedy at Ekaterinburg*. New York, U.S.A.: St. Martin's Press.
- Read, Ch. (1996). *From Tsar To Soviets: The Russian People and their Revolution, 1917-21*. London. U.K.: UCL Press, University College London Press, an imprint of The Taylor & Francis Group.
- Read, Ch. (2005). *Lenin: A Revolutionary Life*. United Kingdom: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Reed, J. (1977). *Ten days that shook the world*. Originally published in England by the Communist Party of Great Britain, 1926. London, England: Clays Ltd. St Yves plc.
- Regelsk, T. A. (December 2003). *Ideology as Reflexive or Reflective?* In Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education; The refereed scholarly journal of the Mayday Group, Volume 2, No. 2, 1-11.
- Report of The Conference of FAO, Thirty-seventh Session, Rome, 25 June - 2 July 2011.

- Restif de la Bretonne, N-E. (1960). *Les nuits de Paris, ou, Le spectateur nocturne*. Originally published in 1793. Paris, France: Hachette.
- Revista Indígena Ajayu (28 February, 2013). *Warisata, la escuela Ayllu*. Coquimbo, Chile: Fernando Huanacuni Mamani is quoted as a source.
- Richelson, J. T. (1997). *A Century of Spies*. Originally published in 1955. U.S.A.: Oxford University Press (544).
- Robinson, J. J. (1989). *Born in Blood*. New York, U.S.A.: M. Evans and Company, Inc, The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
- Robinson, Michael D.; Watkins, Edward R. E and Harmon-Jones, E. (2013). *Handbook of Cognition and Emotion*. New York, the U.S.A.: Guilford Press.
- Rodriguez Peña, A. (2011). *Evadas*. Santa Cruz, Bolivia: Edición Independiente.
- Rodriguez, J. (2011). *Slavery in the Modern World: A History of Political, Social, and Economic Oppression*. Santa Barbara-California, U.S.A.: ABC – CLIO, LLC.
- Rollason, J. (2008). *Gandhi*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American College and University*. Athens-Georgia, U.S.A.: Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Ruthchild, R. G. (2010). *Equality and Revolution: Women's Rights in the Russian Empire, 1905-1917*. Pennsylvania, U.S.A.: Jonathan Harris, Editor, University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Sachs, J. (2000). *The Effects of Bolivia's Hyperinflation*. An Interview with Commanding Heights. Also published in Yergin & Stanislaw (2002). "The Commanding Heights: The Battle for the World Economy." New York, the U.S.A.: Touchstone, Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Salamon, L. M. and Helmut, K. A. (1996). *The Emerging Nonprofit Sector: An Overview*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press. (Re-issued by

the Centre for Civil Society Studies, Institute for Policy Studies, Johns Hopkins University, 1998).

Salgari, E. (2005). *Sandokan: The Tiger of Mompracem*. Also known as The Tiger of Malaysia, serialized in the Italian newspaper “La Nuova Arena” in 1883-4, first published in book form in 1900. Mexico D.F.; Editorial Lectorum, S.A. de C.V., 2001, Re-issued in 2005.

Salt Lake Tribune, the (12.10.1012). *Morales: Relations with U.S. ‘like a turd.’* Salt lake City, the U.S.A.

Schama, S. (1992). *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution*. New York, U.S.A.: Alfred A. Knopf.

Scheeres, J. (2011). *A Thousand Lives: The Untold Story of Jonestown*. New York, U.S.A.: Free Press.

Scott, Otto J. (1974). *Robespierre: The Voice of Virtue.*” New York, U.S.A.: Mason & Lipscomb.

Scurr, R. (2007). *Fatal Purity*. New York, U.S.A.: Owl books, Henry Holt and Company

Service, R. (2005). *Stalin: A Biography*. London, U.K.: Pan Books, an imprint of Pan Macmillan Ltd (first published in 2004 by Pan Books).

Shakespeare, W. [1604] (1993). *Othello: The Moor of Venice*. Edited by Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine, written in or before 1604 and first put into print in 1622 by Thomas Walkley. New York, the U.S.A.: Washington Square Press, The Folger Shakespeare Library.

Shaw, M. (2011). *Time and the French Revolution: The Republican Calendar, 1789,-Year XIV*. Great Britain: A Royal Historical Society Publication, Published by The Boydell Press.

Shultz, J. (January / February 2003a). Privatization in the Americas, *Bolivia: The water war widens*. In NACLA Report on the Americas, Vol. XXXVI, N° 4, 34-36.

- Shultz, J. (2003b). *The Water is Ours Damn it*. In *We Are Everywhere: The Irresistible Rise of Global Anti-capitalism*. (The texts in this book are copyleft). The United Kingdom: First published by Verso the imprint of New Left Books, Printed in the UK by Bath Press.
- Simmel, G. (November, 1909). *Fundamental Problems of Sociology*. American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 15, Issue 3, (289-320).
- Sinclair, M. (2011). *Power, Politics and Persuasion*. In People Dynamics Learning Inc.
- Singer, P.W. (13 August, 2010). *Factories to Call Our Own*. In the Washingtonian.
- Sivak, M. (2010). *Evo Morales: The extraordinary rise of the first indigenous president of Bolivia*. First published in Argentina as *Jefazo, Retrato Intimo de Evo Morales*. New York, U.S.A.: Palgrave Macmillan, St Martin's Press LLC, N. Y.
- Smith, Brian H. (1990). *More Than Altruism: The Politics of Private Foreign Aid*. Princeton-New Jersey, U.S.A.: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, J. A. (1993). *The Idea brokers: Think Tanks and the Rise of the New Policy Elite*. New York, U.S.A.: The Free Press.
- Sni, Telam (29 December, 2005). *Bolivia Rings in New Year with Son of Chavez*. Watching America.
- Soboul, A. (1984). *The French revolution, 1787 -99: From the storming of the Bastille to Napoleon*. Originally published in 1965 under the title *La Révolution Française*. Translated by Alan Forrest and Colin Jones. California. California, U.S.A.: University of California Press.
- Solzhenitsyn, A. (1985). *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918-1956*. Translated from the Russian by Thomas P. Whitney and Harry Willetts. New York, U.S.A.: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.

- Sonenscher, M. (2008). *Sans-Culottes: An Eighteenth-Century Emblem in the French Revolution*. New Jersey, U.S.A.: Published by Princeton University Press.
- Sontag, S. (2004, 23 May). *Regarding The Torture Of Others*. New York, U.S.A.: The New York Times – Magazine.
- Spielvogel, J. J. (2012). *Western Civilization*. Eighth edition. Boston, Massachusetts, The U.S.A.: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, Cengage Advantage Books.
- Steinberg, G. (12 September, 2010). *Selling out to Soros*. New York, U.S.A.: New York Post.
- Steiner, G. (1971). *In Bluebeard's Castle: Some Notes Towards the Redefinition of Culture*. New Haven, United States of America: Courier Companies, Inc., Yale University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. and Sternberg, K. (2008). *The Nature of Hate*. New York, U.S.A.: Cambridge University Press.
- Stone, D. (2000). *Think Tank Transnationalisation and Non-Profit Analysis, Advice and Advocacy*. Great Britain: Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL.
- Strauss, B. (2009). *The Spartacus War: The Revolt of the Gladiators*. New York, U.S.A.: Simon & Shuster.
- Streets, H. (2001). *The Rebellion of 1857: Origins, Consequences, and Themes*. North Carolina, U.S.A.: Journal of Pedagogy, Volume I, No. 1, Winter 2001, 85-103.
- Struk, J. (2004). *Photographing the Holocaust: Interpretations of the evidence*. New York, U.S.A.: Palgrave Macmillan, a division of St. Martin's Press.
- SurrIDGE, V. (1909). *Romance of Empire: India*. London, England: Published by T. C. & E. C. Jack.

- Swain, G. (2014). *Trotsky and The Russian Revolution*. New York, U.S.A.: Routledge, an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group.
- Takahashi, H.; Kato, M.; Matsuura, M.; Mobbs, D.; Suhara, T.; and Okubo, Y. (2009). *When Your Gain Is My Pain and Your Pain Is My Gain: Neural Correlates of Envy and Schadenfreude*. *Science* 13 February 2009: Vol. 323 no. 5916 pp. 937-939 DOI: 10.1126/science.1165604.
- Times News Service, The (15 March, 1979). *Copy of the Jonestown Massacre Tape Obtained by The New York Times*.
- Toomey, M. (1999). *The Power of Language*. In *Preventing Hostility and Violence by Teaching Accountability and Fairness*, 2000. Copyright 1999-2012, Liberation Psychology.
- Trifkovic, S. (2004). *George Soros, Postmodern Villain*. U.S.A., In *Chronicles*, February 2004, pp. 14-17.
- Trotsky, L. (1932). *History of the Russian Revolution*. Translated by Max Eastman. Michigan, U.S.A.: Vol. One, Published by the University Press of Michigan.
- Tvedt, T. (1998). *Angels of Mercy or Development Diplomats?: NGOs & Foreign Aid*. England: Africa World Press, Inc. Published in England by James Currey Ltd.
- United Nations Committee on NGOs (25 May, 2001) 29th Meeting (AM), Press Release NGO/432.
- United Press, (22 July, 1946) in *The Washington Post*. *Rebels Slay President, Seize Power in Bolivia: Villarroel's Body Strung From Post Like Duce's*.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2002). *Political discourse and political cognition*. In Chilton, Paul Anthony and Schäffner, Christina, *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins B.V.

- Varghese, S. (2003). *Water Services Under The World Trade Organisation*. Minnesota, U.S.A.: Senior Program Associate, Water Project.
- Vicepresidencia de la República – Unidad de Información para la Participación Ciudadana.
Resultados Electorales: Referéndum Revocatorio 2008.
- Vilar, E. (1971). *Der dressierte Mann*. Re-issued in 2005, translated by Eva Borneman under the English title *The Manipulated Man*. New York, U.S.A.: Pinter & Martin Ltd.
- Vilkki, L. (2006). *Politeness, face and Facework: Current issues*. Turku, Finland, SKY: Journal of Linguistics, Special Supplement, vol. 2006/19, pp. 322-332.
- Villarreal, M. Angeles (April 14, 2011). *ATPDA Renewal: Background and Issues*. (Villarreal is a specialist in International Trade and Finance) Congressional Research Service, RS22548.
- Volkogonov, D. (1994). *LENIN: A New Biography*. Translated by Harold Shukman. New York, U.S.A.: The Free Press.
- Voltaire (Francois Marie Arouet) (1753). *Le Siècle de Louis XIV*. Editions La Bibliothèque Digitale.
- Voltaire (Francois Marie Arouet) (1789). *Dictionnaire Philosophique*. Editions La Bibliothèque Digitale.
- Wade, R. A. (2000). *The Russian Revolution, 1917*. Cambridge, The United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge, the United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Weisberg, J. (2001). *George W. Bushisms: The Slate Book of The Accidental Wit and Wisdom of Our Forty-third President*. New York, U.S.A.: FIRESIDE.
- Wenborn, N. (November, 2009). *The French Revolution –In a Nutshell*. Naxos Audiobooks (first published 1st January, 2009).

- Werth, N. (1997). *Un Etat contre son peuple: Violences, repressions, terreurs en Union Sovietique*. In Courtois et al, (1997) *Le Livre Noir Du Communisme* (1-250). Paris, France: Editions Robert Laffont S.A.
- Wilson, Timothy D.; Meyers, J. and Gilbert, Daniel T. (December 2003). *How Happy Was I: A Retrospective Impact Bias*. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, U.S.A.: *Social Cognition*: Volume 21, Number 6, pp. 421-446.
- Wilton, R. and Telberg, G. G. (1920). *The Last Days of the Romanovs*. New York, U.S.A.: George H. Doran Company.
- Wodak, R. (2002). *Fragmented Identities: Redefining and reconceptualising national identity*. In Chilton, Paul Anthony and Schäffner, Christina *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins B.V.
- Woloch, I. (1970). *Jacobin legacy; the democratic movement under the Directory*. Princeton, New Jersey, the United States: Princeton University Press.
- Yergin, D. and Stanislaw J. (2002). *The Commanding Heights: The Battle for the World Economy*. New York, U.S.A.: Touchstone & PBS -Public Broadcasting Service.
- Zachariah, B. (2007). *New Perspectives on the Indian Uprising of 1857*. Edinburgh, the United Kingdom: Edinburgh University.
- Zigon, J. (2008). *Morality: An Anthropological Perspective*. The United Kingdom: First published by Berg Editorial offices.
- Zimbardo, P. (2007). *The Lucifer Effect*. New York, U.S.A.: The Random House Publishing Group, a division of Random House, Inc.
- Zur, O. (1994). *The Psychology of Victimhood: Rethinking 'Don't Blame the Victim'*. *Journal of Couple Therapy*, 4 (3/4), 15-36.: Haworth Press, Inc.

ANNEX A

CATEGORIES AND FREQUENCY

	EVENT	HIST	COL	SELF	OWN	RITS	US/	NEO	CAP	VEN	EMP
1	POSESION - La Paz, 22 de enero de 2006	6	2	22	2		16	8	1	1	
2	65 Periodo NU 23-09- 2010	1		8			6		2		4
3	Posesión - 22 de enero de 2010	2	5	10	1		5	1		1	6
4	Discurso- Leganés (13-09-09)	3		17		6	5	1	3		4
5	Nueva CPE - La Paz 7- 02 - 2009	3	3	13		1	11	1			3
6	Cumbre Río+20/ Viernes 29 de junio	1							4		2
7	Jardín Hidalgo, Coyoacán 21-02-2010	2	1	11	1		2		1	1	4
8	186 Aniversario- Sucre, 6 de agosto de 2011	9	7	18	1	1	5	1	2	1	3
9	Día Reiv. Marítima-29 de abril de 2011	1		3	1		2				1
10	Climático Tiquipaya 20 de abril de 2010		1	9			9		23		11
11	Tiahuanacu, 21 de enero de 2006	2	3	4	1	3	6	2	2		2
12	Chapare		1	13			7	2			1
13	Foro Humanista-La Paz, 2007			16			4	3	10		10
	Total	30	23	144	7	11	78	19	48	4	51
										Total	415
	% of recurrence	76.9	61.5	92.3	46.1	30.7	92.3	61.5	69.2	15.3	92.3
	Out of/415	7.2	5.5	34.6	1.6	2.6	18.7	4.7	11.5	0.9	12.2
	EVENT	HIST	COL	SELF	OWN	RITS	US/	NEO	CAP	VEN	EMP

HIST: History

COL: Colonialism

SELF: Self-abasement

OWN: Ownership

RITS: Rights

US: Us and Them

NEO: Neoliberalism

CAP: Capitalism

VEN: Vengeance

EMP: Empire

ANNEX B

**DISCURSO DE S.E. DON EVO MORALES AYMA
PRESIDENTE DEL ESTADO PLURINACIONAL DE BOLIVIA
EN OCASIÓN DEL DEBATE GENERAL DEL 64º PERIODO DE SESIONES DE
LA ASAMBLEA GENERAL DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

23 de Septiembre de 2009

**SOURCE: MISIÓN PERMANENTE DEL ESTADO PLURINACIONAL DE BOLIVIA
ANTE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

**Sino defendemos los derechos de la Madre Tierra
de nada servirá defender los derechos humanos**

Muchas gracias, señor Presidente de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas, saludo a los hermanos colegas presidentes, a las distintas delegaciones en este foro mundial.

Estamos nuevamente reunidos en las Naciones Unidas para compartir preocupaciones, problemas y experiencias de cómo servir a nuestros pueblos en todo el mundo.

Esta mañana atentamente escuche las intervenciones empezando por la del Secretario de las Naciones Unidas. En todas las intervenciones hay enormes coincidencias sobre problemas como la crisis financiera, la crisis del medio ambiente, problemas de la estabilidad y la institucionalidad de las democracias en algunos países. Hay algunos planteamientos como el del Secretario General de las Naciones Unidas que pedía unidad de los Presidentes y unidad de las Naciones Unidas. Comparto perfectamente que es importante unirnos los Gobiernos para atender las demandas de nuestros pueblos, para resolver esta crisis, yo diría en mi país, impuestas desde arriba y afuera.

Unidad de las Naciones Unidas por la igualdad de nuestros pueblos, unidad por la dignidad, unidad sobre todo para resolver las profundas diferencias económicas, esas profundas asimetrías de un continente a otro continente, de una familia a otra familia o de un país a otro país, pero unidad en el marco de la complementariedad para resolver las demandas de nuestros pueblos.

Está en debate permanente la crisis financiera, el cambio climático, los problemas de la democracia y también se suma la crisis alimentaria, la crisis energética, saludo algunas intervenciones donde tocan y enfocan el origen de esta crisis. La mayoría de los Presidentes, en la mayoría de las intervenciones, solamente hablan de los efectos y no de las causas. Yo quiero ser muy sincero con ustedes. El origen de estas crisis es la exagerada

acumulación del capital en pocas manos, es el saqueo permanente de los recursos naturales, es la mercantilización de la Madre Tierra. Este origen viene de un sistema y un modelo económico que es el capitalismo. Si no hablamos la verdad ante nuestros pueblos, sobre el origen de esta crisis, seguramente vamos a engañarnos entre nosotros, a la comunidad internacional y a nuestros pueblos que esperan mucho de sus Presidentes, de sus Gobiernos y de esta clase de foros.

Si bien planteamos y buscamos paz, de acuerdo a nuestra experiencia vivida, no puede haber paz social si hay desigualdades económicas, peor todavía cuando hay bases militares en algunos países. En muchos continentes y en especial en Latinoamérica o en Sudamérica, como podemos hablar cuando las bases militares de Estados Unidos son los que provocan y crean desconfianza en los pueblos.

Quiero contarles brevemente: he sido víctima de las bases militares en mi país antes de que asumamos la presidencia, antes de que los movimientos sociales sean actores en un nuevo país, con igualdad, con justicia social. Todos fuimos víctimas de la presencia militar de Estados Unidos en Bolivia y como víctimas sabemos que hacen los uniformados de Estados Unidos en los distintos países de Sudamérica. Cuando hay una base militar de Estados Unidos especialmente en Latinoamérica, no conozco cual será el comportamiento en Europa o en otros continentes, pero en Latinoamérica las bases militares no garantizan la paz social, no garantizan la democracia, no garantizan la integración de nuestros países y menos de los pueblos que se organizan en pos de transformaciones profundas en lo estructural y en lo económico, en lo social y en lo cultural. Ahí tenemos Honduras, si hay una base militar de Estados Unidos en Honduras ¿por qué esa base militar no garantiza la democracia? Saludo la valentía de nuestro colega el presidente de Honduras Zelaya resistiendo pacíficamente la recuperación de la democracia. Mi respeto y admiración junto a su pueblo tan rebelde en defensa de la democracia. Qué bueno sería que las Naciones Unidas, mi pedido presidente de la Asamblea de esta gran organización mundial, apruebe una resolución donde se dé un ultimátum para que la dictadura en Honduras abandone y que Zelaya vuelva a ser presidente. Es el único presidente reconocido en todo el mundo.

Estoy convencido que el comando sur de Estados Unidos no aceptan países a la cabeza de presidentes y gobiernos que busquen su liberación en Latinoamérica. A mí me comentaron

algunos compañeros, hermanos que soportaron las dictaduras en Bolivia y Latinoamérica, que solo no hay golpe de estado en Estados Unidos porque no hay una Embajada de Estados Unidos en Estados Unidos. Quiero que sepan hermanos presidentes que el año pasado también hubo intento de un golpe de estado en Bolivia. Gracias a la fuerza sindical y la participación de la comunidad internacional especialmente de UNASUR paramos ese golpe de estado civil no militar en mi país. En septiembre, como en estos días fracasó el golpe de estado. Por eso estamos convencidos que las bases militares no garantizan ni democracia, ni integración, ni paz social.

También está en debate el tema de cambio climático. Quiero aprovechar esta oportunidad para proponer algunos temas que son muy importantes para el bien de todos quienes habitamos en esta Madre Tierra. Para el movimiento indígena la Madre Tierra, el planeta tierra es algo sagrado. Para quienes vivimos en armonía con la Madre Tierra y no solamente en armonía con el ser humano, la Madre Tierra da vida, agua, recursos naturales, oxígeno. Aquí todos plantearon el bienestar de nuestros pueblos. Quiero decirles que si hablamos, si luchamos y trabajamos por el bienestar de nuestros pueblos primero hay que garantizar el bienestar de la Madre Tierra. Si no garantizamos el bienestar de la madre tierra es imposible garantizar el bienestar de nuestros pueblos que viven en este planeta tierra. He llegado a la conclusión que la Madre Tierra o el Planeta Tierra, va existir sin la vida humana, pero la vida humana no puede existir sin el Planeta Tierra, sin la Madre Tierra. Después de escuchar muchas intervenciones he llegado a la conclusión que en este nuevo siglo XXI, va ser más importante defender el derecho de la Madre Tierra que defender los derechos humanos. Si no defendemos los derechos de la Madre Tierra de nada servirá defender los derechos humanos. Estoy dispuesto a debatir este concepto y tarde o temprano nos van a dar la razón porque es importante defender el derecho de la Madre Tierra. Como está en debate el cambio climático, queremos proponer a ustedes queridos presidentes y delegados de distintos países a los hermanos que nos escuchan en todo el mundo, nuestra propuesta muy sencilla basado en tres puntos:

Primero: Los países desarrollados tienen que reconocer y pagar la deuda climática que tienen con toda la humanidad y el planeta tierra.

Segundo: es necesario crear un Tribunal de Justicia Climática que juzgue y sancione a quienes no cumplen con sus compromisos y a quienes continúan destruyendo el planeta tierra. No tenemos una estructura que puede cuantificar los daños que hacen algunos países, algunas transnacionales. Es importante crear queridos presidentes, delegaciones crear este Tribunal de Justicia Climática, y

Tercero: es una de las propuestas recogidas sobre todo de los movimientos campesinos indígenas, la necesidad de que las naciones elaboren una Declaración de los Derechos de la Madre Tierra que incluya el derecho a la vida, el derecho a la regeneración de su biocapacidad, el derecho de una vida limpia y el derecho a la armonía y al equilibrio de todos y todo.

Ojala estas propuestas puedan ser tomadas en cuenta para debatir en Copenhague. Esperamos que Copenhague sea una gran solución a mediano y largo plazo sobre los graves problemas que soportamos en los distintos países del mundo.

También quiero aprovechar recogiendo algunas propuestas de algunos presidentes. Si queremos cambiar el mundo primero tenemos que cambiar las Naciones Unidas. Si queremos cambiar en nuestros países buscando la igualdad, la dignidad de nuestros compatriotas porque no primero cambiar la estructura que tiene las Naciones Unidas. Creo que hay muchas coincidencias. Escuchando a muchos presidentes necesitamos una verdadera democratización de las Naciones Unidas y del Consejo de Seguridad. Para eso planteamos lo siguiente:

Los miembros permanentes y eternos del Consejo de Seguridad así como su derecho a veto deben ser eliminados. No es posible que en pleno siglo XXI sigamos con prácticas vitalicias y totalitarias de la época de las monarquías. Todos los países debemos tener los mismos derechos en Naciones Unidas.

Quienes se autoproclaman como líderes de la democracia deben renunciar a sus privilegios y aceptar la verdadera democratización del Consejo de Seguridad. Seamos responsables con la democracia y empecemos a democratizar a las Naciones Unidas.

Para terminar esta pequeña intervención, no quiero abusar del tiempo, bajo esa disciplina que nos enseñan nuestros pueblos, lamento decirles algunas verdades. Seguramente al gobierno de los Estados Unidos puede molestarle, pero también mucha confianza en el presidente Obama. Saludo que el Presidente Obama cierre la prisión en Guantánamo. Es un avance y felicitamos, pero no solamente puede cerrar la prisión de Guantánamo, sino tiene que acabar con el bloqueo económico a Cuba. Este es un pedido respetuoso al Presidente y al pueblo de Estados Unidos.

En Bolivia y Latinoamérica, Estados Unidos concede algunas preferencias arancelarias. En la gestión del ex presidente Bush nos quitaron esas preferencias arancelarias, acusándonos de que no hay allí lucha contra el narcotráfico, de que no hay lucha contra la pobreza. Yo sabía que eran decisiones políticas. Pero nunca el ex presidente Bush observó las normas bolivianas y menos la Constitución Política del Estado boliviano. Ahora, en este nuevo gobierno del señor Obama, hay documentos donde observan la Constitución Política del Estado boliviano. Quiero que sepan que esta observación la hacen al artículo 561 de la Nueva Constitución Política Estado Boliviano sobre la propiedad privada que por primera vez en 183 años de vida republicana el pueblo boliviano la ha aprobado con su voto. Me parece una abierta intromisión del gobierno de Estados Unidos a la Constitución que no acepto y rechazo rotundamente.

Nosotros no queremos relaciones diplomáticas de intromisión sino relaciones diplomáticas de cooperación, de inversión. La Nueva Constitución Política del Estado de Bolivia garantiza la propiedad privada, garantiza la propiedad estatal, pero fundamentalmente, por primera vez, garantiza la propiedad colectiva, las asociaciones, las cooperativas, las tierras comunitarias del movimiento indígena originario. Además de eso me acusa y textualmente dice: “los actuales desafíos incluyen la aceptación explícita e incentivo de la producción de la hoja de coca en los niveles más altos del gobierno boliviano”. Es decir yo fomento los cultivos de coca. Quiero que sepan que una cosa es la hoja de coca, la plantación de la hoja de coca, otra cosa es la cocaína. No defendemos la cocaína, vamos a combatir la cocaína. Nuestra propuesta es cero de cocaína. Pero tampoco puede haber libre cultivo de la hoja de coca. Ésta en su estado natural es beneficioso, es saludable para la vida humana. Ustedes saben que estamos en campaña para despenalizar el consumo tradicional de la hoja de coca.

Garantizo nunca habrá libre cultivo de hoja de coca, ni tampoco cero de hoja de coca, pero si cero de cocaína. No es posible que me diga que yo incentivo la plantación de hoja de coca en Bolivia. Es falso. Lo más preocupante, ustedes saben que yo vengo de la lucha sindical, de una lucha social, he sido dirigente sindical pero también presidente momentáneamente. En este documento se dice que el gobierno puede disolver los sindicatos mediante decreto administrativo. No pueden decirme que busco acabar con los sindicatos porque la fuerza de este gobierno de Evo Morales son las fuerzas sociales y sindicales. Como puede ser que mientras yo compro sedes sindicales, construyo sedes sindicales, doto de moviidades a los sindicatos, obreros y originarios me acusen de querer acabar con ellos. Yo puedo estar seguro que tal vez el Presidente Obama no conoce este documento y éstos tal vez vienen del Departamento de Estado de los Estados Unidos. A veces, los presidentes queremos cambiar, pero es difícil cambiar esa estructura que tienen los estados. Entiendo perfectamente, después de leer profundamente este documento. En Latinoamérica los llamados afro-bolivianos, los llamados indios, indígenas son los sectores más discriminados de la sociedad. En términos populares nos dicen negros, indios. No puedo entender que un negro discriminado, un negro excluido, discrimine o excluya a otro indio. De verdad, es una enorme preocupación lo que vivimos. Ojala estos errores históricos puedan ser corregidos, no solo para el bien del Presidente de los bolivianos sino y también por la buena imagen de los pueblos como Estados Unidos. Entiendo perfectamente que a veces no es fácil cambiar esas estructuras y tal vez operan en contra de nuestros pueblos.

Finalmente, para terminar queridos Presidentes, señor Presidente de la Asamblea, en Bolivia para resolver algunas demandas históricas, como la demanda de retorno al mar, quiero expresar que dos pueblos, dos hermanas repúblicas, Chile y Bolivia, estamos construyendo una confianza mutua para resolver el tema del mar. Tengo esperanza de resolver este problema a nivel bilateral y si no se resuelve, sería importante la intervención de la comunidad internacional. Para resolver cualquier problema es importante la confianza. Pero no solamente termina ahí, sino que hay que dar pasos importantes.

Hermanos, hermanas muchas gracias por haberme escuchado, quiero seguir compartiendo con ustedes sus vivencias, sus propuestas, sus preocupaciones para el bien de toda la humanidad en su conjunto

Muchísimas gracias

Tiahuanacu, 21 de enero de 2006

PALABRAS DEL PRESIDENTE ELECTO DE BOLIVIA, EVO MORALES AYMA

Muchísimas gracias por todo el apoyo que me dieron en la campaña, hermanas y hermanos, los aymaras, los quechuas, los mojeños.

Les decía, hermanas y hermanos de las provincias del departamento de La Paz, de los departamentos de Bolivia, de los países de Latinoamérica y de todo el mundo, hoy día empieza un nuevo año para los pueblos originarios del mundo, una nueva vida en que buscamos igualdad y justicia, una nueva era, un nuevo milenio para todos los pueblos del mundo, desde acá Tiahuanacu, desde acá La Paz, Bolivia.

Muy emocionado, convencido que sólo con la fuerza del pueblo, con la unidad del pueblo vamos a acabar con el estado colonial y con el modelo neoliberal.

Este compromiso, en lo más sagrado de Tiahuanacu, este compromiso para defender a los bolivianos, para defender al pueblo indígena originaria, no solamente de Bolivia, como anoche nos dieron la tarea, defender a los pueblos indígenas de América, antes llamada Abya yala.

Pero los resultados, el apoyo de todos ustedes, quiero decirles un compromiso serio y responsable, no de Evo Morales, sino por todos los bolivianos, por todos los latinoamericanos, necesitamos la fuerza del pueblo para doblar la mano al imperio.

Pero también quiero decirles, con mucho respeto a nuestras autoridades originarias, a nuestras organizaciones, a nuestros amautas, a controlarme, si no puedo avanzar empújenme ustedes, hermanas y hermanos.

A corregirme permanentemente, es posible que pueda equivocarme, puedo equivocarme, podemos equivocarnos, pero jamás traicionar la lucha del pueblo boliviano y la lucha de la liberación de los pueblos de Latinoamérica.

El triunfo del 18 de diciembre no es el triunfo de Evo Morales, es el triunfo de todos los bolivianos, es el triunfo de la democracia, es el triunfo, como una excepción, de una revolución democrática y cultural en Bolivia.

Pero también quiero decirles, muchos hermanos profesionales, intelectuales, clase media, se incorporaron al instrumento político de la liberación, hoy instrumento político del pueblo.

Quiero decirles que yo, de esa gente, de esos profesionales intelectuales de la clase media me siento orgulloso como Aymara, pero también les pido a los hermanos de la clase media, de la clase profesional, intelectual, empresarial, que ustedes también deben sentirse orgullosos de estos pueblos indígenas originarios.

Buscar una unidad de todos los sectores, respetando la diversidad, respetando lo diferente que somos, todos tenemos derecho a la vida, pero si hablamos de Bolivia los pueblos Aymaras, Quechuas, Mojeños, Chapacos, Vallunos, Chiquitanos, Yuracarés, Chipayas, Muratos son dueños absolutos de esta enorme tierra, y a sus dueños, las promesas hay que recordarlas para recordar el problema económico social de nuestra Bolivia.

Hermanas y hermanos, sorprendido de esta gran concentración tan voluntaria, tan espontánea. Ni Evo ni Alvaro no han puesto ni un boliviano para que la gente pueda concentrarse, y ésta es la conciencia del pueblo boliviano.

Y las prebendas en Bolivia ya no van, acá el instrumento político ha puesto en balanza dos poderes: el poder de la prebenda, el poder económico y el poder de la conciencia. Felizmente y gracias a la madre tierra, gracias a nuestro Dios, decir gracias a mis padres, la conciencia ganó las elecciones, y ahora la conciencia del pueblo va a cambiar nuestra historia, hermanas y hermanos.

Por eso, por invitación de ustedes, por iniciativa de nuestras autoridades originarias, un saludo especial revolucionario a los ponchos rojos, a los hermanos jilakatas, a los mallkus, a los jilirimallkus, a las mamatallas, muchas gracias autoridades originarias por realizar este acto tan originario nuestro, que me invitan a comprometerme para gobernar bien.

Sólo quiero decirles desde este lugar sagrado, con ayuda de ustedes hermanos y hermanas, Quechuas, Aymaras, Guaraníes, queremos enseñar a gobernar con honestidad, con responsabilidad para cambiar la situación económica del pueblo boliviano

Tenemos ya una responsabilidad cerca, que es la Asamblea Constituyente. Para la prensa internacional, para los invitados de la comunidad internacional, el año 1825 cuando se

fundó Bolivia, después de que muchos, o miles o millones de Aymaras, de Quechuas, de Guaraníes participaron en la lucha por la independencia, ellos no participaron en la fundación de Bolivia; se marginó la participación de los pueblos indígenas originarios en la fundación de Bolivia en el año 1825, por eso los pueblos indígenas originarios reclaman refundar Bolivia mediante la Asamblea Constituyente

Quiero pedirle al nuevo Parlamento Nacional, que hasta los días febrero o marzo debe aprobarse la ley de convocatoria para la Asamblea Constituyente.

Una ley de convocatoria para la Asamblea Constituyente para garantizar la elección de Constituyente el 2 de julio de este año, y el día 6 de agosto en la capital histórica de fundación de Bolivia, Sucre Chuquisaca, instalaremos la Asamblea Constituyente para acabar con el Estado colonial.

Quiero pedirles hermanas y hermanos, unidad, unidad sobre todas las cosas. Ustedes han visto anoche el movimiento indígena de toda América concentrado en Bolivia, saludándonos, emitiendo resoluciones de apoyo, de fortaleza a este movimiento político que quiere cambiar nuestra historia, y no solamente los movimientos sociales de América, o de Europa, o del Asia. Ustedes han visto hermanas y hermanos, este movimiento político levantó en alto a Bolivia, a nuestro país en toda la comunidad internacional.

Han visto también ustedes hermanas y hermanos, no estamos solos a nivel mundial, gobiernos, presidentes apoyan a Bolivia y a este gobierno apoyan. Compañeras y compañeros, no debemos sentirnos solos.

Estamos en tiempos de triunfos, estamos en tiempos de cambio, y por eso reclamo nuevamente, queremos unidad.

Quiero decir con mucho respeto, a los dirigentes, ex dirigentes, al hermano Felipe Quispe, convoco a unirnos todos para seguir avanzando hacia adelante, hermanas y hermanos.

A todos los dirigentes, ex dirigentes, a nombre de nuestros antepasados, comportarnos, unirnos porque llegó la hora de cambiar esa mala historia de saqueo a nuestros recursos naturales, de discriminación, de humillación, de odio, de desprecio. Los Aymaras y

Quechuas no somos rencorosos, y si hemos ganado ahora, no es para vengarse con nadie, no es para someter a alguien, sólo reclamamos unidad, igualdad, hermanas y hermanos.

Hermanas y hermanos, nuevamente quiero decir acá, que esa campaña internacional que empezaron nuestros dirigentes de América, la campaña llamada 500 años de resistencia indígena y popular, el '88, '89, espero no equivocarme, el '92, acaba los 500 años de resistencia de los pueblos indígenas de América contra políticas, contra el colonialismo interno.

Después de reflexionar y escuchar a los hermanos indígenas que se reunieron ayer, y están acá seguramente muchos, a esos hermanos indígenas de América que están presentes, que están allá, un saludo, saludemos con un voto de aplauso a los hermanos indígenas de toda América, que están presentes acá.

Y quiero decirles a ellos, a ustedes hermanas y hermanos: de la resistencia a la toma del poder. Se acabó sólo resistir por resistir. Hemos visto que organizados y unidos con los movimientos sociales de las ciudades, del campo, combinando la conciencia social, con la capacidad intelectual es posible derrotar democráticamente los intereses externos. Eso pasó en Bolivia.

Por eso quiero decirles a los hermanos de América, de todo el mundo: unidos y organizados cambiaremos políticas económicas que no resuelven la situación económica de las mayorías nacionales. A esta altura nos hemos convencido que concentrar el capital en pocas manos no es ninguna solución para la humanidad; el concentrar el capital en pocas manos no es la solución para los pobres del mundo.

Por eso tenemos la obligación de cambiar esos problemas económicos de privatización, de subasta. Eso tiene que terminar, y estamos empezando acá juntos. Todos de América, movimientos sociales, queremos seguir avanzando, avanzando para liberar nuestra Bolivia, liberar nuestra América, esa lucha que nos dejó Túpac Katari sigue, hermanas y hermanos, y continuaremos hasta recuperar el territorio, la lucha que dejó Che Guevara, vamos a cumplir nosotros, hermanas y hermanos, así que podemos recordar de muchos líderes indígenas de la clase media que se organizaron para recuperar los recursos naturales.

Hermanas y hermanos, una emoción, nunca hemos estado acostumbrados a estar en esta clase de concentraciones. Ese momento cuando salí allá entendí que realmente el pueblo va organizándose y va movilizándose.

Esta gran concentración, este lugar, compararía con la Plaza de la Revolución de Cuba. Cuando salí de allá miles de compañeros concentrados; en Bolivia nunca había visto, una cosa son las concentraciones de campaña, otra cosa son actos de apoyo de fortaleza. Esta concentración es totalmente diferente, por eso agradecer, primero, a nombre del Movimiento Al Socialismo, segundo, a nombre de la bancada del MAS, y sobre todo a nombre de los pueblos indígenas originarios.

Muchas gracias hermanas y hermanos; esta lucha no se para, esta lucha no termina, en el mundo gobiernan los ricos o gobiernan los pobres. Tenemos la obligación y la tarea de crear conciencia en el mundo entero para que las mayorías nacionales, los pobres del mundo, conduzcan su país para cambiar la situación económica de su país, y desde acá impulsaremos que los pobres también tenemos derecho a gobernarnos, y en Bolivia los pueblos indígenas también tenemos derecho a ser presidentes.

Por eso, hermanas y hermanos, gracias al voto de ustedes, primeros en la historia boliviana, Aymaras, Quechuas, Mojeños, somos presidentes, no solamente Evo es el presidente, hermanas y hermanos.

Muchísimas gracias.