HUMAN RIGHTS

THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY IN LATIN AMERICA

Lisa J. Barczak
Tulane University

SUGGESTED TIME: One classroom period

EQUIPMENT NEEDED: Slide projector, copier, VCR if desired

APPLICABILITY: World Governments, World History, Current Events

OBJECTIVE: The student will be able to discuss the Latin American military's influence onnational politics.

LEVEL: HIGH SCHOOL
Source: *Latin America—Land of Diversity.* Roger Thayer Stone Center for Latin American Studies, Tulane University (New Orleans) and The Tinker Foundation, Inc.

KEY CONCEPTS/VOCABULARY

Caudillo:	A "strong man," often with military training; a man of daring and charisma who ruled an area, a town or a nation by demanding loyalty and enforcing his own personal laws with violence when necessary.
Civil Liberties:	Rights which characterize fair treatment of individuals and groups and freedom from government intervention, for example theright to assemble or freedom of speech.
Desaparecido:	A person who is kidnapped or killed by government or military officials because of his or her political beliefs or those of his or her relatives. Literally the term means "disappeared." In English it is also used as a verb, as in "Many people were disappeared by the military government."
Institutionalized Military Government:	A government in which nearly all political offices and organizations are occupied and controlled by active military personnel.
Personalistic Military Government:	A government in which the military, usually one military general, takes control of the presidency. The other government offices may still remain in the hands of civilian collaborators.
Professional-ization:	A process by which military officers acquire academic and leadership training.
Purge:	To remove a person from office because he or she is viewed as corrupt or as a traitor.

THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY IN LATIN AMERICA

The military in Latin America has many faces: that of a soldier, a policeman, a professor, a financial advisor, an economic minister, a president, a judge, a jailor, a criminal. It has taken these occupations upon itself in addition to its official mission and primary responsibility of protecting the country. This is the most striking characteristic of the Latin American militaries--they overstep their bounds.

The principal reason why they overstep their bounds is to dominate the politics of their nation. In some cases, such as in present-day Ecuador, the military exerts a strong influence on the politicians to continue generously funding the army. In other countries, such as Brazil in 1964, the military <u>became</u> the government. In still other countries, the commander of the armed forces took over as president of the nation, as Augusto Pinochet did in Chile in 1973. By heavily influencing or by actually controlling the politics of their countries, Latin American militaries frequently assume roles which reach far beyond protecting their countries from invasion.

The most drastic example of military forces assuming many non-military roles is called an <u>institutionalized military government</u>. In this type of government nearly all political offices and organizations are occupied and controlled by active military personnel. In short, the military becomes the political system. In this type of system, the military seeks to justify its presence in politics with elaborate ideologies, and it maintains strong ties with established elites, businessmen and the Catholic Church.

An example of an institutionalized military government was Brazil from 1964 to 1982. In 1964 a coordinated contingent of army officers deposed the civilian president and took over the country. General Humberto Castello Branco became president, and over the next several years military personnel <u>purged</u> the political institutions of civilians and assumed responsibility for most aspects of government--from urban planning to economic ministries to education. Military people worked as government accountants, professors, and newspaper censors. The Brazilian military's justification for its unprecedented expansion into politics was that civilians had mismanaged the country and were to blame for the economic failures of the nation. The military maintained that civilians were incapable of governing the country and unable to oversee its economic recovery. The army command believed that only the military could save Brazil. Although the military tried to attain a sustained,

strong economic recovery, the military government was no more effective than the civilian government it had replaced. This contributed to the return to democracy in Brazil in 1982. Virtually the same description can be applied to the military government in Argentina from 1976-83.

Another manifestation of military influence in politics is when a military person, usually an army general, takes over the office of president. A general gets military supporters to depose the civilian president, and then he assumes the presidency. When a government is headed by an active military person who takes office by force, the government is said to be a personalistic military government. Unlike an institutionalized military government where many political offices are held by active military personnel, in a personalistic military government few political offices are held by the military. The military leader uses the army as a means to back up his authority, but he has civilians do most political jobs. False elections may be held to help justify the rule of the military officer, and he will try to attract some support from the masses. Examples of personalistic military governments are those of General Getulio Vargas of Brazil (1930-45 and 1951-53), General Juan Peron of Argentina (1946-54 and 1973-74), Augusto Pinochet of Chile (whose regime began in 1973 and who was still in power at this writing, although a new civilian president has been elected and is scheduled to be inaugurated soon), and General Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua (1967-79).

While there are some differences between personalistic military governments and institutionalized military governments, there are also several characteristics common to both: their goals and their actions. Often a military government justifies its existence by saying it has certain goals, one of which is to protect the country from communist threats. The military claims that communists are infiltrating the country and stirring up unrest, so a strong military response and presence is warranted. An example would be Pinochet in Chile. Another goal of military regimes is to rid the government of corrupt officials. To this end, the military will purge those it feels are of questionable loyalty or who have misappropriated funds; often this becomes a pretense for eliminating those who disagree with the policies of the military. Another goal of the military is to remove "inept" civilian politicians and provide a strong, stable government. And a final goal of military governments is to modernize the nation and guide it to economic growth. In general, while military regimes have had some success in achieving modernization and economic growth, the benefits accrued mainly to the elites, not to the general populace. By supporting such a formula, the

military maintains the status quo and also protects its influential role in society.

The methods for achieving these goals are often questionable or even openly brutal. Civil liberties receive little respect when the military exerts substantial influence over the political realm. In order to protect their position, military governments routinely suspend the right to free speech and the freedom of the media: newspapers, magazines, radio, and television. The military also suspends the right to assemble and the right to form or join labor or trade unions and political parties, the right to trial, etc. They have little, if any, tolerance for dissent or opposition, and have resorted to spying, kidnapping, jailing, torture and even murder to silence those they deem "undesirable" or to scare people into complying with the military's wishes. And as the military assumes the roles of police, jailor, jury, and judge, there is no one to challenge its actions.

The lack of respect for civil liberties is characteristic of most military governments, whether institutionalized or personalistic. For example, under the institutionalized military governments in both Argentina (1976-83) and Brazil (1964-82), nearly all aspects of life came under military scrutiny, and those opposed to the military policies were threatened, jailed, desaparecido, tortured, and murdered. Also, in personalistic military governments, as in Chile under Pinochet, in Nicaragua under the Somozas, in the Dominican Republic under Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, and in Panama under General Manuel Noriega, opposition was quashed. Dissidents were threatened, and sometimes a person would be beaten, disfigured or murdered to serve as an "example" to discourage others from voicing their opinions.

Why is it that the military has such a pervasive role in Latin American politics? People suggest many reasons: some historic, some cultural, some social. If one considers the historic reasons, one can see a long tradition of military forces in Latin America. The Native Americans, such as the Incas, were renowned for their military prowess, often conquering other indigenous groups militarily to gain political and economic advantages. Warriors of these societies were held in high esteem and were included in the higher social echelons. Many of the Europeans who arrived in the 16th century, were trained fighting men; they came to help "pacify" the New World and gain riches for themselves. There ensued many armed conflicts, and in the end the Europeans militarily defeated the indigenous civilizations, such as the Aztec and the Inca. Following the conquest, the Spanish army constituted the military presence in Latin

America, and later, creole armies were the major military component in the New World.

During the 1800s, the independence period, men from both the upper and lower classes joined the colonial rebels to fight Spanish royal forces. When the colonies finally gained independence and formed governments of their own, civilian politicians were divided over many issues and thus appeared to be accomplishing very little. In some countries civil war broke out. (See Unit #7) This apparent lack of control led military leaders to lose confidence in the ability of civilians to govern.

The military's lack of faith in politics and civilian leaders in the 19th century continued and worsened during the early 20th century, which lead to a decided upturn in military intervention in politics. The military blamed the problems of the nations and failures of the economies on the politicians. They increasingly lost faith in the ability of politicians to solve problems or to lead nations in a strong, competent manner. This lack of faith in civilians, it is important to note, coincided with an era of professionalization of the Latin American military under the guidance of European and North American military advisors. The combination of little faith in civilians and the military's increased self-confidence due to professionalization and education led the officers to view themselves as the best and often the only choice as competent national leaders. While the intent of the European and North American military training was to keep the military out of politics, its effect was the opposite. Thus, the military influence in Latin America goes back hundreds of years and continues into the present--from the Indians to the colonists to the independence soldiers to the modern military.

Some people feel that another reason for the strong influence of the military in Latin American politics is what these analysts perceive as a "cultural tradition" of bowing to the caudillo, the strong man, and letting him make all the decisions and worry about all the problems. Caudillos were men of daring and charisma who ruled by demanding loyalty and enforcing their own personal laws with violence when necessary (See Unit #7). They would often take charge in a region or a nation when they thought the civilian political leaders were not doing the job correctly. Some people believe that Latin Americans were satisfied with letting someone else run things and that they were not interested in having a say in policies. However, while certainly the caudillo was often a formidable leader, to say that the Latin American populace would rather let someone else handle things with no voice of its own in policy is not

borne out by many historical factors. For instance, the formation of trade unions to voice workers' concerns, the formation of political parties to represent certain sectors of society (businessmen, peasants, teachers), and the demands for elections in many Latin American countries indicate that the people do indeed have a culture which reflects their wishes to participate in government.

Aside from the historical tradition and cultural factors, people point to social factors to explain the inordinately strong influence of the military in Latin American politics. Many people from the lower classes saw and continue to see the military as a means to improve their social and economic position. Since the 1940s, the military in some countries has also proved to be a means of gaining an education, which further promotes enlistment.

The influence of the military in politics is probably a combination of historical, cultural and social factors. The long tradition of military presence has created a large organization with many supporters. These supporters wish to see their interests protected. The elites have often supported the military and vice versa in an attempt to maintain the status quo. If they feel military intervention in politics will help, they support it, as long as elite interests are protected and stability maintained. Latin Americans (like other people) wish to have a stable government, and at times they may have seen caudillos or military people as the only ones who could provide that stability. Also, the economic and social attractiveness of joining the army and receiving a regular salary and education may have enlisted the loyalties of people from the lower class.

Because of this long history of a strong military presence, some people believe that the military has become a permanent feature of Latin American politics. What this view overlooks is the examples of Latin American countries where democracy without military influence has been common. For example, Chile, before General Augusto Pinochet, had nearly 150 years of strong democratic rule. Also, Costa Rica is a model Latin American democracy which abolished its military in 1948.

Since 1980, the role of the military has been receding. Most notable are the return to more democratic governments and the occurrence of free elections in Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and Nicaragua. Other countries, like El Salvador and Guatemala, appear to be moving towards a democracy and perhaps the military will respect civilian rule. In 1990 Chile had presidential elections, and for the first time since 1973 dictator General Augusto Pinochet is not in

direct control of the government. In addition, Panama in 1989 saw the ouster of General Manuel Noriega from the presidency.

The role of the military in Latin America has been one of an organization which takes more responsibility upon itself than it was intended to do. The militaries often decided to run the political aspects of their nations, but judging from the long-term economic and social conditions of their countries under military rule, they were not able to govern more effectively than the civilians they were so fond of criticizing. Many would agree that a strong, educated military presence is desireable, but only if it is loyal to the civilian government and honor-bound to stay within its intended limits of defending the nation from outside aggressors.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Ten slides and descriptions.

Charles R. Connolly. "Foreign Aid for the 1990s: Democracy." Christian Science Monitor (July 13, 1989): 19.

DISCUSSION TOPICS

1. Would you prefer to live in a nation which is ruled by the military or ruled by elected officials? Why? What are some "advantages" of military rule?

2. In what ways are the U.S. military and the Latin American military alike? How do they differ?

3. Do you think military officers are the people best qualified to make decisions on economic policies? On social policies? Why?

4. Why would the military come to the conclusion that it would be best that it stay out of politics?

5. What could the people of a nation do to ensure that the armed forces did not try to enter politics?

ACTIVITIES

1. Have students read the subject overview and review key concepts\vocabulary as homework the night before class. In class, review the article with the students utilizing the slides and discussion topics included in the packet. Once reviewed, administer the recommended quiz.

2. Bring in an issue of a national newspaper. If you were the official censor working for a military government, which articles or parts of articles would you prohibit? Put an X through them. Why did you choose to censor those items? If the general public never got to read those items, how would that affect their view of their nation and the rest of the world?

3. Watch the video Returning to Chile (see citation under Supplemental Audio-Visual Materials) and write an essay. How did Pinochet's military takeover affect the families interviewed in this video? Who are the children in the beginning of the video? How do they feel about returning to Chile? Why did they and their families leave? What kinds of actions did the government police take against the

demonstrators? Why were they demonstrating? What did they hope to gain for the people? How would you feel if your parents were taken away by the government? How would you and your brothers and sisters live? What could you do to get your parents back? What would you think of the government?

4. Read "The Small Box of Matches," from Alicia Partnoy's The Little School: Tales of Disappearance and Survival in Argentina. Have each student go home, find a small match box and one item to put in it. Have them explain why they chose that item. Have the students think about how Alicia must have felt, and how they would feel if they had been in her place with their match box.

5. Have the students read "Foreign Aid for the 1990s" (included in this unit). Ask the students to pretend they are members of the House of Representatives chairing the committee deciding on how much of the foreign aid money should be spent to help foster democracy. Which countries need help? Ask the students how they will determine if the money given to these countries is really helping to promote democracy.

6. At the time this course was completed, Augusto Pinochet was still in control of the military in Chile. A civilian president had been elected but not yet inaugurated. Have students update the unit by researching what has happened in Chile. Who is in power? What has happened to Pinochet? If there is indeed a new government, what is it like? How does the transition of power in Chile compare to the end of the other military regimes mentioned in the unit?

7. The film "The Official Story" (La historia oficial), available for rental from most video stores, is an excellent portrayal both of the phenomenon of "disappearance" under the Argentine dictatorship and of a woman's political awakening. After viewing and discussing the film, have students write one of the following:

A. A letter from Alicia to Gabi, explaining her adoption. If you were Alicia, would you tell your daughter the truth about who her parents were? How would you explain your husband's actions?

B. A letter from Gabi to Alicia, written once Gabi is old enough to understand the situation. How would she

feel? Would she blame Alicia? Roberto? Her real grandmother? If you were Gabi, would you want to continue living with Alicia and Roberto, or would you choose to go live with your grandmother? What factors would influence your decision?

RECOMMENDED QUIZ

1. Define caudillo.

2. In the last 20 years has the Latin American military spent more time fighting foreign countries or getting involved in their countries' politics?

3. Name two goals of a military government.

4. How does a military government usually react to opposition?

5. Name two civil liberties which are likely to be violated under a military government.

6. Name one possible reason why the Latin American militaries have intervened in politics so often.

7. Why would a Latin American from the lower classes want to join the army?

8. Why would someone from the Latin American elites support a military regime?

9. Name two countries which were under military rule in the early 1970s and have recently returned to a more democratic system.

10. Define institutionalized military government.

RECOMMENDED QUIZ: TEACHER'S KEY

1. See definition, p. 2.

2. It has spent much more time interfering in the politics of the respective countries and dealing with what it has seen as internal threats, i.e. communists.

3. Any two of the following:
   a. defend against the communist threat
   b. achieve modernization
   c. promote economic growth
   d. purge corrupt people from the government
   e. maintain political stability

4. It often reacts harshly, to the point of arresting, disappearing, jailing, torturing or murdering those who oppose it. In some instances, minimal opposition will be tolerated.

5. Any two of the following:
   a. freedom of speech
   b. freedom of assembly
   c. freedom of the press
   d. freedom to form and join labor movements or political parties.

6. Any of the following:
   a. historical tradition
   b. tradition of the caudillo
   c. protection of its interests
   d. taking advantage of weak, unstable civilian rule
   e. national security - the fear of the "communist threat."

7. Because the lower classes may see the military as a means of upward social mobility, better pay and better education.

8. The elites see the army as an organization which can protect their interests and maintain the status quo.

9. Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Nicaragua, or Panama.

10. A government in which nearly all political offices and organizations are occupied and controlled by active military personnel. Also, see pages 3 and 4.

ADDITIONAL READING LIST

Schlesinger, Stephan C. and Stephan Kinzer. Bitter Fruit: The untold story of the American coup in Guatemala. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1982.

Amado, Jorge. The Violent Land. Translated from the Portuguese by Samuel Putnam. New York: Avon, 1979.

de Jenkins, Lyll Becerra. Honorable Prison. New York: Penguin, 1989.

Loveman, Brian and Thomas Davies., eds. The Politics of Antipolitics: the military in Latin America. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.

Partnoy, Alicia. The Little School: Tales of Disappearance and Survival in Argentina. Pittsburgh: Cleiss Press, 1986.

SUPPLEMENTAL AUDIO-VISUAL MATERIALS

The City and the Dogs (La ciudad y los perros). Based on the novel by Mario Vargas Llosa. Four angry cadets, who have formed an inner circle in an attempt to beat the system and ward off the boredom and stifling confinement of the military academy, set off a chain of events that starts with theft and leads to murder and suicide. In Spanish with English subtitles. Video. 135 mins. This film may be too intense for some students. Instructors are advised to preview the film before classroom showing. World Video.

Returning to Chile. An emotionally moving account of the adjustments and problems facing Chilean youths returning to Chile after many years in exile with their parents. In Spanish with English subtitles. Video. 28 mins. The Cinema Guild.

The Official Story. Stars Norma Aleandro and Hector Alterio. Alicia, the sheltered wife of a wealthy businessman, discovers that her adopted daughter may be a "desaparecida", stolen from a young couple who were disappeared after being imprisoned for political reasons. Winner of the Academy Award for Best Foreign film 1985. In Spanish with English subtitles. Video. 112 mins. Available in most local video rental shops nationwide.

Paraguay: The Forgotten Dictatorship. Analyzes the power struggle within General Stroessner's party, documents human rights abuses, and examimes the development of opposition forces within Paraguay. In English. Video. 27 mins. The Cinema Guild.

Christian Science Monitor, July 13, 1989.

Foreign Aid for the 1990s: Democracy

By Charles R. Connolly

As someone said recently, "The genie is out of the bottle." With the turnarounds in Chile and Paraguay, and despite the setback in Panama, virtually every country in this hemisphere now uses or is moving toward some form of democracy. But the institutions of democracy in these countries don't work very well.

Under the "Democratic Initiatives" program, the United States Agency for International Development (AID) is starting to provide technical assistance and training to the people who man these institutions. The theory is simple: Democracy is a technology, like agriculture, with principles and practices which can be recorded, improved, replicated, and taught. Democracies work through democratic institutions – the executive, the legislative, the judiciary, and the electoral system. These institutions can be transplanted to evolve in forms fitting each individual environment.

Some 20 years ago AID began the creation of democracy-oriented study and training centers in several universities in the US, and since then has assisted in the founding and growth of numerous faculties, think tanks, and private voluntary organizations working across the democracy spectrum. These organizations are prepared to offer training in how a congress works: national budget decisions, the analysis and drafting of legislation, administrative oversight, and the other functions assigned to each congress by each country's constitution.

Latin American legislatures have a lot of problems. There is a crippling lack of information and the operational skills that legislation requires. Labor law is prepared without consultation with labor groups. Environmental legislation is drawn up in a scientific vacuum.

In a South American country an *"expediente"* – the official archive containing the background data, debate, and final passage of a law – is lost. Another country's legislature reviews, debates, and enacts a law already passed in an earlier session.

Similar anecdotes came out of every capital. What also comes out is a universal desire for these democracies, and their legislatures, to work. Citizens of all stripe and congressmen of all parties acknowledge the problem and want improvement. AID is offering low-key, low-cost assistance to this end.

Legislatures can be helped in many ways: AID will draw on US and Latin American scholars and consultants to offer seminars and short-term instruction in-country; US universities will offer longer-term study for career staffers, ranging up to graduate degrees in legislative administration; organizations such as the Center for Democracy, a private think tank, will set up face-to-face contacts between Latin American and US legislators, staffs, and political party managers. And AID will finance any other activity that leads toward the overall goal of improving operational efficiency and effectiveness.

The program will focus on the mechanisms and workings of democratic institutions.

An example of how it might work: In mid-1988, a two-day "Seminar on Contemporary Models of Parliamentary Support" was conducted in Chile by the State University of New York (SUNY) and the Catholic University of Valparaiso, with private support from the Andes Foundation, the Fulbright Commission, and IBM.

Seminar participants from across the Chilean political scene met with practicing politicians, academic advisors, and SUNY alumni from Brazil, Costa Rica, and the US. Chile's plebiscite four months later, in October 1988, set the stage for congressional elections scheduled in December 1989. The Catholic University of Valparaiso and SUNY are following through by setting up a "Legislative Research and Assistance Center" in Valparaiso to provide non-partisan research, training, and advisory services to the incipient Chilean congress. This model might be copied elsewhere.

In Guatemala, perhaps 1,000 candidates may present themselves for election in 1990 to 100 seats. A brief orientation for all 1,000 in the basic concepts of what a congress should do would leave 100 winners aware of the complexities of the job ahead, and 900 losers with some understanding and sympathy for the new office-holders.

And in Paraguay, which for years has had one political party, a new president is talking about democracy and competing parties. If our diplomats can swing it, nonpartisan technical assistance offered to all takers might lead to real multi-party competition in the elections several years from now.

This certainly smacks of meddling in the internal affairs of friendly nations, but political meddling by certified meddlers is an honored trade. If AID – an economic assistance agency – makes a false step on this turf, it will face the combined wrath of two governments – its own and that of the host country. With this in mind, the Democratic Initiatives program will focus exclusively on the mechanisms and workings of democratic institutions, keeping a distance from issues and decisions.

Democratic Initiatives is an unusual foreign aid proposition, and there are obstacles. Economic problems bring the threat of violent disruption; every country has its protectors of the nondemocratic status quo; our embassies are properly concerned about maintaining the best possible relations; US congressional overseers are put off by the long wait for results, and the AID bureaucracy can be counted on to complicate matters. Yet the timing is right. Democracy is ascendant in this hemisphere, and an initiative that in the past Latins would have viewed as intellectually repugnant and politically unacceptable is welcome today

■ *Charles R. Connolly spent 18 years working for AID in Central America and Paraguay. He presently lives in Coconut Grove, Fla.*

THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY IN LATIN AMERICA

UNIT #11

A GUIDE TO ACCOMPANYING SLIDES

1. San Diego as military hero. The role of the military in Latin America has been a pervasive one, with the military supporting the business sectors, traditional landowning families, and the Catholic Church. These groups, in turn, support the military. This saint in a small altar in a church is dressed like a military officer. San Diego was also a "fighting" saint as he aided the Spanish in their efforts to reconquer Spain from the Moors in the 12th-15th centuries. (Courtesy of Judith Hancock Sandoval from the Latin American Library, Photographic Archive, Tulane University).

2. Statue to General Simon Bolivar. Military men like Bolivar--the Liberator--are regarded as heroes, which contributes to an explanation of the influence of the military in Latin America. (Courtesy of Ronit Weingarden).

3. Army in main plaza with cannons, San Jose, Costa Rica. Here a group of soldiers gathers in the town plaza and prepares to leave for duty in the late 1800s. (Courtesy of H.L. Hoffenberg from the Latin American Library, Photographic Archive, Tulane University).

4. Hotels and apartment buildings along Copacabana Beach, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Often wealthy elites, like those who own these posh hotels, will support military governments which generally pledge to maintain the status quo, thus protecting elite interests. (Courtesy of John Guidry).

5. Pigs rooting around in garbage. Many areas in Latin America are poverty-stricken, like this neighborhood in La Paz, Bolivia. Young men from areas like this sometimes view service in the military as means of bettering their economic condition. (Courtesy of Ann Butwell).

6. Military tank in Cuba. When the military wants to see a change in governmental leadership, it can use equipment like these tanks to enforce its wishes. (Courtesy of Georgia Kilpatrick).

SLIDES ARE IN THE FULL CURRICULUM (A LARGE GREEN BINDER), FROM WHICH THIS UNIT WAS TAKEN

LEVEL: HIGH SCHOOL

Source: *Latin America—Land of Diversity.* Roger Thayer Stone Center for Latin American Studies, Tulane University (New Orleans) and The Tinker Foundation, Inc.

7. A junta in El Salvador, March 1980. Whether or not governmental leaders are ousted by force, active military officers often assume high leadership roles, as in this military junta in El Salvador. (Courtesy of the Latin American Library, Photographic Archive, Tulane University).

8. Contra with grenade launcher. Changes in government, such as the Nicaraguan Revolution, can lead to guerilla warfare. Often a government is not supported by some part of the population. These people may choose to wage a war against the government, fighting from the hills if they have to. Here is a contra soldier with machine gun and grenade launcher who fought the Sandinistas. (Courtesy of David Leeson from the Latin American Library, Photographic Archive, Tulane University).

9. House riddled with bullet holes. Opposition to a military government is rarely tolerated, and armed conflict may be the result. The military has often responded by terrorizing, kidnapping and even murdering people. Note the bullet holes in the wall of this house at the Plaza de la Parroquia, Nicaragua. (Courtesy of Latin American Library, Photographic Archive, Tulane University).

10. Offices of a Nicaraguan newspaper. Civil liberties, such as freedom of the press and the right to assemble, receive little respect in military governments. Here is <u>La Prensa</u>, a newspaper in Nicaragua which was heavily censored under both Somoza and Ortega, military governments of the right and the left respectively. (Courtesy of Bret Gustafson).