

Changing Political and Economic Ideologies within Nicaragua

Abigail McSwain
Interdisciplinary-International Studies
The University of North Carolina Asheville
One University Heights
Asheville, North Carolina 28804 USA

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Sonia Kapur

Abstract

Historical and international influences have structured economic and political ideological developments throughout Latin American history. Particularly, the role of developed countries holding an ascendant position within the realm of global politics have been instrumental in the changing ideological values of smaller and less developed nations. Initially, cross national policies and trade agreements are often assessed to be of primary economic and developmental benefit for the smaller countries in which they are implemented. However, as examined by the realists, international relationships are often predisposed to one's own national interests which inherently offset the balance of power between states. Within the framework of realism, a literature review and historical analysis were conducted to support the finding that major powers were involved within Nicaragua in return for ally ship, monetary exchange, and trade. This involvement hindered true economic and political development due to the establishment of an international system which was easily abused due to a lack of centralized political authority. The major influential powers identified within this paper include the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Other minor powers, identified as Honduras and Cuba, were utilized by the major powers to push a political and economic agenda due to their close proximity to Nicaragua. The political and economic ideologies historically pressured upon Nicaragua in return for ally ship, monetary exchange, and trade has forced the small Latin American Country into a constant state of political and economic hardship.

1. Background

Global outward influences have historically resided heavily on the small Latin American country of Nicaragua. Uniquely colonized by both the British and the Spanish, the majority of Nicaragua's population has remained heavily composed of mestizos throughout the centuries, despite their declared independence in 1838 (Parker et al. 2019). Mestizos, characterized by their mixed descent, come in many cultural combinations though are predominantly comprised of Spanish and indigenous varieties. The historical oversaturation of mestizos, in comparison to purely indigenous inhabitants, established a dominant sense of nationalistic ideologies which commonly excluded native populations¹. Indigenous residents of Nicaragua, typically residing in coastal regions and referred to as costeños, lacked citizenship rights up until the 1987 multicultural citizenship reforms¹⁰. Prior to the reforms, the region of Nicaragua underwent major political and economic ideological transformations as other notable nations developed an interest in various regions of Latin America.

The geographical location of Nicaragua and Panama originally captured the attention of the United States and other global powers during the mid-1800s due to their position residing within a proposed trans-isthmian canal trade route. During this time, various global leaders sought after a means to transport goods between the Atlantic and Pacific coastal regions in a timely and cost efficient manner. Upon much deliberation and considerations to international developments, the United States officially proposed a plan to construct a canal traveling through Panama. Shortly after Panama's independence, the United States negotiated the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, which ultimately granted the United States the rights to a 10-mile wide strip of land in exchange for annual payments and ensured protection of

Panama's newly declared independence¹⁷. Shortly after their obtainment of the Panama Canal Zone, the United States began drafting Marine troops and establishing military bases throughout other vicinal Latin American countries. Nicaragua received their first establishment of Marines under the Taft administration in 1909, whom of which were ordered to institute the underpinnings of a political system which aligned with the United States and would provide a means of governing and commercial support over the canal¹⁸.

Nicaraguan President, José Santos Zelaya, presented himself as an influential member of the Democratic Party who maintained staunch political and social support since his election in 1893. Throughout his presidency, Zelaya had made various attempts to establish canals and international trade relationships in efforts to hasten Nicaragua's economic development⁷. With greater substantial economic means, Zelaya intended to extend the government's authority over the Mosquito Coast, following his long-term objective to nationalize Nicaragua's borders and politically unify and distinguish the country⁷. Zelaya's plans to establish a means of international trade were suddenly thwarted upon the United States unanticipated decision to construct a canal through Panama instead of Nicaragua. Zelaya's discontentment towards the United States, alongside rumors of a competing Japanese canal through Nicaragua, was soon met with a governing military presence, which were introduced to ensure political placation during the canal's development. Zelaya's nonconformity to the United States, under the fear that their occupation would dominate economically and divide Nicaragua's eastern coast, lead to political disunity and the widespread loss of fundamental bureaucratic support. Following substantial political controversy, both domestically and internationally, Zelya opted to step down from his position as President in 1909 and was succeeded by José Madriz.

Nicaragua's following president, Adolfo Díaz Recinos, was later elected in 1911 and recognized for his mildly conservative values¹⁸. Upon his election, the United States Marines backed out of Nicaragua and left behind a newly established and trained legation guard¹⁸. Following the absence of direct authority under the United States, individuals of contrasting political views became increasingly polarized and eventually developed rival governmental regimes¹⁸. Prompted by the reemergence of political discourse in 1926, the United States Marines were stationed within Nicaragua and encouraged to disarm the recently established liberal and conservative militias. Over a period of six months, the United States Marines negotiated a deal with all but one left-winged front, which was led by General Augusto César Sandino¹⁸. During their occupation in Nicaragua, the United States acquired an influx of criticism from a multitude of Latin American countries regarding their constant involvement in foreign governments and political systems. Tensions amongst citizens within the United States also arose due to increasing concerns in reference to national security. The sustained pressure to withdraw military troops from Nicaragua was addressed with the establishment of the Good Neighbor Policy in 1933, which emphasized the utilization of cooperation and trade restrictions over military force within Latin America. Upon their dismissal, and the recent presidential election of Juan Bautista Sacasa of the Democratic Party as the new President of Nicaragua, the United States Marines developed and left behind a military-trained Nacional Guardia¹⁸. The following year, the United States appointed commander of the Nacional Guardia, Anastasio Somoza García, assassinated Augusto César Sandino and his top commanders shortly after a staged dinner with President Sacasa. Three years later, in 1937, General Somoza was elected president, which gave way to the 44 year-long dictatorship held by him and his family.

Somoza's dictatorship was gradually met with societal discontentment as time progressed and citizens earned for a change in leadership. With political tensions rising, the search for a means to challenge the Somoza regime in a militarized manner became increasingly favored. Gathering inspiration from various Cuban guerrilla organizations, a politically socialist faction by the name of Front de Libération Nationale, or FLN, was developed in 1961. The name of the faction was later updated to the Sandinista National Liberation Front, or FSLN, in order to incorporate the legacy of rebel General Agusto César Sandino. Gradual support gained from the middle class and co-opting members of high society allowed the FSLN to obtain substantial political influence and become nationally recognized (Puig, 2018). The noticeable shift in socio-political ideologies extracted a negative response from the Somoza's, which lead to the abuse of power through the Nacional Guardia and the assassination of an anti-Somoza journalist, Pedro Joaquín Chamorro Cardenal (Puig, 2018). Repressive tendencies displayed by the Somoza government only further distanced Nicaraguans and relegated a mass of new supporters to the FSLN, furthering their ability to create alliances. During this time, the United States Carter administration was widely criticized for their inconsistent and unstrategic involvement within Nicaragua. An example of one such inconsistency involved the termination of United States-granted financial aid in 1977, which was followed by the reestablishment of military aid in 1978². The expansive nature of the FSLN in combination with an inconsistent and relatively hands-off version of the United States, lead to a mass governmental revolution in July of 1979 (Puig, 2018). This event, referred to as the Sandinista Revolution, took place within Nicaragua's capital of Managua and resulted in the Nacional Guardia's defeat along with the forceful removal of Anastasio Somoza from governmental power.

Socialist leader of the FSLN, Daniel Ortega, quickly gained a powerful adversary with the newly elected President of the United States, Ronald Reagan. The resulting establishment of United States funded political aggression

campaigns, which supplied funding and militarized weapons to Honduras, forced Ortega to declare a state of emergency and seek outside diplomatic support (Puig, 2018). The Soviet Union's past involvement in Latin America, particularly regarding their financial and militarized support of Cuba during the Cuban Rebellion, attracted the attention of Sandinistas government officials. Retaining rough nuclear parity with the United States, the Soviet Union delved into expanding their global relations and thus welcomed the shared support of the FSLN¹². In 1980, Nicaragua and the Soviet Union settled upon a mutual support agreement which preceded the direct transfer of no-cost armaments and military equipment¹². The Sandinista regime had also granted economic, scientific, technical, and cultural assets to the Soviet Union, Cuba, East Germany, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia, who comprised the Soviet bloc division of labor¹². In exchange, the Sandinistas had access to various Cuban proletarian resources and were permitted Soviet leader-ensured state security¹².

The following decade, spanning from 1979 to 1990, became referred to as the Nicaraguan Revolution, which represented a low-intensity war effort that was strategically fought by the United States and Honduran Contras in opposition to the Sandinista Popular Army and Cuba⁶. In 1984, Daniel Ortega was officially elected as the president of Nicaragua and began restoring the nation's constitution. The Nicaraguan Constitution of 1987 framed liberal-democratic ideologies and notably granted multicultural citizenship rights to indigenous people. The Ortega administration, which failed to establish a significant means of foreign exchange, was greatly weakened financially by the United States' embargo imposed onto the country in 1985⁶. Former supporters of the FSLN began to withdraw political and economic support for the ongoing war efforts in regards to growing concerns over economic and social prosperity⁶. Refusing to discontinue warfare, the Sandinista regime was pressured by the United States and other economically and politically involved nations to develop a more Westernized system of democracy which would impede the government's ability to overlook the needs and demands of the people⁶. Elections held in 1990 officially concluded war efforts when Violeta Barrios de Chamorro, a member of the National Opposition Union, established an electoral victory over Daniel Ortega and the FSLN⁶.

Chamorro, the wife and widow of Pedro Joaquín Chamorro Cardenal, gathered praise from the United States in relation to her center-right political ideologies and the perceived national rejection of authoritarian rule¹³. However, despite her success in the election, Chamorro received heavy amounts of domestic criticism regarding her efforts to reinsert Nicaragua back into the highly capitalist international economic system⁶. Chamorro's additional attempts to reinstate property rights as a means of public enterprise, despite high poverty levels, resulted in the internal instability of Nicaragua's economic system and the widespread loss of public support⁹. Capitalizing on Chamorro's decline, Ortega and the FSLN prepared for the 1996 Presidential elections by undergoing organizational and ideological changes that were based on anticipated societal demands¹⁴. Once again, Ortega lost in the elections to his opponent, José Arnoldo Alemán Lacayo, a traditionalist and liberal member of the Constitutional Liberal Party. The following years under the Alemán administration were filled with various instances of corruption and political bribery, in which Alemán was officially convicted for in 2003¹³. During this time, the FSLN gave up attempts to mobilize grassroots members and focused on clearing the accusations made against Ortega's past paramilitary relationship with Alemán⁵.

A settlement with Alemán, known as the Pact, succeeded Ortega's victory in the Managua municipal elections of 2000. The agreement represented a non-aggressive dynamic through compromise which encompassed two-party control of state institutions, the reform of electoral law, and the restriction for political representation¹³. Ideological reforms to the FSLN were later established in 2002, which predominantly emphasized the centralization of power by the secretary-general and discipline¹³. The subsequent 2002 Presidential elections, in which Ortega ran against liberal party candidate Enrique Bolanos, represented another disappointment and political defeat for the FSLN. During Bolanos's Presidency, Nicaragua fell victim to an economic recession, which prompted the negotiation of a trade deal with the United States in efforts to establish a means of reliable foreign exchange. The United States' free-trade agreement (FTA) was authorized in 2005, reducing barriers to imports and exports while also creating a stable and transparent trade and investment environment. To ensure an accessible means for international trade, Bolano's proposed a plan to construct a new ship canal which would connect the Pacific and Atlantic oceans. However, the results issued by the 2006 election postponed further deliberations of the canal.

The 2006 Presidential election marked the FSLN's return to government under the political and economic authority of Daniel Ortega¹³. Ortega's wife, Rosario Murillo, was appointed a leading role within the cabinet since she possessed an insubstantial political, and therefore non-controversial, background in the realm of politics. During his presidential term, Ortega chiefly focused on the integration of public policies that would alleviate poverty and permit free access to public education and health care. Having been successful so-far in his mission to combat poverty, Ortega was re-elected during the 2011 elections. Adjustments to the Nicaraguan constitution were made in 2014, which abolished presidential term limits and allowed for the perpetual establishment of political regimes (Constitute, 2019). Ortega's opposition disapproved of this development as it was thought to represent a viable threat to the fragile democracy of

Nicaragua. Despite widespread disapproval, the constitution was amended and Ortega proceeded to serve his third consecutive presidential term in 2016 alongside newly appointed vice-president Murillo.

Social security reforms, passed by the National Assembly of Nicaragua in 2018, resulted in an increase of payroll taxes by 0.75 percent with the reduction of benefits and payouts pensioners receive by 5 percent⁴. The resulting disproportionality between tax rates and social security benefits sparked societal outcry in the form of public protests. The protests, held in the streets of Managua during April of 2018, served as the largest political uprising since the end of the civil war in 1990 and resulted in three civilian fatalities and multiple detainments⁴. Within 24 hours, Ortega had issued a media blackout, targeting five major independent T.V. channels, to restrict media coverage and the possible spread of violent and politically charged protests throughout Nicaragua. The censorship was lifted five days later due to pressures enforced by the Catholic Church, opposition groups, and the Superior Council of Private Enterprise (COSEP)⁴. The Nicaraguan Army responded to the confrontations between protestors and police during May of 2018, releasing a statement which called for the cessation of violence and the support of national dialogue. Undeterred by the Army's statement, Nicaraguan citizens continued to protest and demand for early elections and international intervention⁴. In June of 2018, the United States Emissary proceeded to hold peace talks with Nicaraguan officials, opposition groups, and the Catholic Church. Soon after, the United States Department released a statement in support of early elections. An Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) representative traveled to Nicaragua in June to administer peace talks and reported at least 212 deaths since the beginning of the crisis. The following day, the United States Embassy demanded the return of loaned police vehicles that were accused of being used to violently suppress the citizens of Nicaragua⁴. An IACHR expert group returned to Nicaragua in July and was followed by the United States Treasury Department decision to implement sanctions on three Nicaraguans in relation to human rights violations. An ambassador, appointed by United States President Trump, was appointed to reside and govern Nicaragua's current political situation and serve as a representative of the Organization of American States democracy for peace initiative (OAS). By late July of 2018, the Office of the Press Secretary of the United States issued a lengthy statement which introduced political sanctions and promised to hold guilty Ortega regime officials responsible for their actions. The United States had also granted Nicaragua \$1.5 million in aid directed toward their support for freedom and democracy within the region. Since the Office of the Press Secretary statement was released, violent protests have tempered and societal dissatisfaction with the government and their oppressive tendencies remain.

2. Theoretical Framework

The theory of political realism, as defined by Hans J. Morgenthau, is a theory of international relations that emphasizes the centrality of national interest⁸. Embedded within his theory, Morgenthau denies that states should follow either sub-national or supra-national interests and argues that they should not attempt to reshape the world in terms of international politics⁸. Alfred A. Knopf further built on Morgenthau's theory of realism with his establishment of six distinct principles of political realism¹¹. The six proposed principles of political realism include 1) politics are governed by objective laws with roots in human nature, 2) the concept of interest is defined in terms of power, 3) the concept that interest defined as power is an objective category which is universally valid but not fixed in nature, 4) political realism is aware of the moral significance of political action, 5) political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern them as unique, and 6) political realism maintains the autonomy of the political sphere. The definitions of political realism, as described by Morgenthau and Knopf, are embedded within this research paper and used to illustrate how greater international powers have injected their ideological values upon the Latin American country of Nicaragua. The theory of political realism is also employed to describe how other less influential countries were utilized in a strategic manner to shape and reconstruct nearby nations to a similar degree as their larger and more influential counterparts.

3. Methodology

To properly analyze the condition of Nicaragua's changing political and economic ideological shifts within this paper, a variety of scholarly articles were contextually studied and applied as a mode of textual analysis. These articles, which have been collected from scholarly databases such as JSTOR, Google Scholar, ProQuest, and Science Direct, were utilized as forms of exploratory and descriptive research. Others articles, in relation to the developments in relatively recent events, were collected from various global news websites and newspapers uncovered through Google News Searches. During the collection process, approximately 25 articles were officially selected based on their direct

relevance to Nicaragua and its developing ideologies between the late 1970's and 2018. Database searches included key words such as Nicaragua, Globalization, Democratic Socialism, Dictatorship, Revolution, Political Ideologies, Governmental Ideologies, Contra War, Sandinista Revolution, FSLN, Social Security, and Governmental Reform. Searches for news articles were made through the 'News' search bar on Google, ProQuest, and JSTOR, which included keywords such as Nicaragua, Governmental Policy, Protests, Reforms, Mediation, Military, Mestizo, Journalists, Social Security, and Assassination.

Articles were eliminated based on their direct relevance to the topic of developing economic and political ideologies in a historical and international context relating to the Latin American country of Nicaragua. Articles including comparative case studies of Nicaragua in relation to other countries outside of Latin and North America with no evidence of political or economic influence between the two countries were the first to be eliminated. Other articles, whose language could be deemed as politically charged or as having an underlying agenda were also removed from the research list. Articles were determined to fit this category if they included derogatory or complimentary words that obviously labeled certain governmental or political regimes, practices, or involvements as overly negative or positive. Lastly, articles which were written or published in the early 1980's were also eliminated due to their close proximity to the Sandinista Revolution, which would most likely indicate the conditioning of underlying biases hidden within the article.

The news articles collected in this paper were also thoroughly analyzed for bias and chosen based on the extent of justifiable information contained within their reporting. A justifiable recording was determined to contain one or more of the following traits: an eyewitness account, video or photographic evidence, official governmental documents, and quantifiable data. News reports based or released in Nicaragua following the media blackout in April of 2018 were avoided due to the possibility of corruption or significant governmental influence over the extent and portrayal of the content reported. News articles originating from the United States, Honduras, former republics of the Soviet Union, or Cuba were also eliminated based on their own histories of supporting an international political agenda which commonly tended to favor their own agendas more heavily than it would the nation being directly affected.

Upon narrowing down the collected research, a couple of trends were indicated and the articles were organized into one of three categories. These categories included international influences, historical influences, and ideological shifts. Articles that discussed the global involvement or the presence of a direct international influence regarding the economic or political system of Nicaragua were automatically placed into the international influence category. Articles which focused primarily on the history of Nicaragua and its revolutionary governmental reforms were directly placed within the historical influences category. Lastly, articles that were based on events which occurred in Nicaragua prior to major political and economic shifts, or those which displayed an obvious transition in national economic or political belief, were deemed to fit the ideological shift category.

From this point, the articles were contextually analyzed to discover any additional trends or indicators which would directly explain and answer the question of how historical and international influences have structured political and economic ideological changes within Nicaragua. These trends commonly involved themes such as trade, monetary exchange, ally ship, oppression, corruption, nationalism, economic dysfunction, military/militia enforcement, and governmental assassinations.

4. Findings

Within a fifty year time span, Nicaragua has undergone two major political and economic ideological shifts that can be attributed to various historical and international factors. The ideological shifts within this paper have been identified as 1) the transition from a capitalist dictatorship to a socialistic democracy during the Nicaraguan Revolution, and 2) the recent inconsistencies between government and societal ideologies. Historical factors resulting in such ideological transitions have included trends such as mestizo nationalism, corruption, and governmental dysfunction. International factors associated with ideological change include trends involved with trade, monetary exchange, military/militia enforcement, and ally ship. The United States of America and the Soviet Union are both regarded as the major international influencers of economic and social ideological transitions within Nicaragua. Neighboring countries, such as Honduras and Cuba, are considered to serve as minor international influences under the understanding that they were strategically utilized by the United States and the Soviet Union to indirectly push and enforce their political and economic agenda. The egocentric economic and political involvement of multiple authoritative nations in accordance with Nicaragua's deep-rooted political and economic contentions, has led Nicaragua into a continuous cycle of economic insecurity and governmental reform.

4.1 International Factors

The global powers of the United States of America and the Soviet Union have long fought over the governmental control and political support of Latin America. The desirable traits of Latin America, such as their abundance of resources and prime geographical location for trade and foreign exchange, have proven to hinder their ability to progress as independently operated nations. Nicaragua, a small country south of Honduras, has an extended history of international involvement and foreign control. The consistent funding and economic support provided by other nations in exchange for trade rights and ally ship has resulted in Nicaragua's inability to dismantle their dependency on other neighboring countries. Nicaragua's small size and lack of global influence pairs unfavorably with their highly nationalistic ideologies, which call for minimal foreign control and political involvement. The United States, fully aware of Nicaragua's long standing socialist ideologies, continues to involve themselves politically while pushing capitalistic values. The Soviet Union, eager to expand their political influence, established a relationship with Nicaragua but consistently failed to assist their establishment of a foreign exchange system. The United States and the Soviet Union are both implicated of over engagement in the political and economic systems of Nicaragua in a manner that gradually disturbs the overall wellbeing of the nation.

4.1.1 the United States of America and Honduras

The inception of United States involvement in Nicaragua began during the late 19th century with the proposal of a trans-isthmian canal. The canal, which would provide an efficient means to ship goods between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, was projected to cut through either the Central American Republic of Nicaragua or the Panama province of Colombia. Treaties constructed by the United States were designed to grant all management, construction, and property rights to the United States in exchange for annual annuities. The unforeseen decision by the United States to construct a canal in the newly independent nation of Panama, despite Nicaragua's eagerness to open their markets, resulted in their early resentment toward the United States and proposal to construct a competing canal with Japanese assistance. Concern regarding the state of international amiability as well as the possibility of cross-national trade competition during the establishment of the Panama Canal motivated the United States to release military troops across Latin America. These troops were encouraged to support and introduce capitalist ideologies while disputing the idea of decolonization. The installation of widespread capitalist ideologies, which emphasized private enterprise and international trade, was schemed to populate the Panama Canal and institute a dependable flow of traffic and revenue.

The United States military involvement within Nicaragua introduced an antagonistic set of political and economic ideologies which weakened the current governmental regime and caused widespread political polarization. At the time of the United States military occupation, Nicaragua was under the control of a presidential dictatorship which valued political liberalism, anti-imperialism, and nationalistic ideologies. Political liberalism in Nicaragua reiterated equal civil liberties under the consent of the government while nationalistic and anti-imperialist values connoted the objection of colonial expansion and endorsement of national interests. The disestablishment of Nicaragua's liberal dictatorship was followed by the construction of a United States legation guard whose purpose was to govern over Nicaragua and subdue radical ideologies in the absence of the United States' military presence. However, without international military enforcement, the contrasting political ideologies within Nicaragua became increasingly polarized and fermented the cultivation of domestic militias.

The violence derived from political restlessness within Nicaragua prompted further instances of United States intervention which resulted in the formation of a United States trained and appointed Nacional Guardia. The strategic establishment of the Nacional Guardia, which acted in defense of Nicaragua's government, allowed the United States to remove themselves militarily during the enactment of the Good Neighbor Policy, while still maintaining political influence over the country. Shortly thereafter, the United States' strategy proved successful following Nicaragua's election of a capitalistic president. The dictatorship which ensued consistently gained political approval and support from the United States, up until the year of the Nicaraguan Revolution in which the Nacional Guardia was used to oppress Nicaraguan citizens. Despite the violence that had erupted between Nicaragua's military and its people, the United States did not send their own troops until after the official overthrow of government.

The socialist takeover of Nicaragua by the Sandinistas resulted in the United States support and funding of the Contra rebel group in Honduras. The Contras, who were in strong opposition to the Sandinista regime, were sent to engage in a low intensity war effort as directed by the United States. The United States' calculated decision to combat the Sandinistas in a gradual yet destructive manner, alongside the establishment of an embargo, cultivated the economic and financial downfall of Nicaragua and their eventual bankruptcy. Following the Nicaraguan Revolution, the United States maintained their relationship with Honduras and introduced military bases across the country to

counter Soviet influence¹⁵. The United States' relationship with Honduras allowed them to continue their nearby militaristic presence and political influence through the use of an international liaison.

Nearly two decades after the Nicaraguan Revolution, the United States' established trade relationships with Nicaragua under the United States and Latin American Free Trade Agreement. Another decade later marked the introduction of Social Security Reforms, resulting in violent protests and the development of paramilitaries. This time, the United States' involvement focused more heavily on diplomatic solutions, rather than militaristic influence, for the sake of ensuring the prosperity of trade rights in Latin America. Nicaragua's compliance with international requests, such as the return of loaned vehicles, gave reason for the United States to continue to withhold direct intervention despite pleas for international intervention from Nicaraguan citizens.

4.1.2 the Soviet Union and Cuba

The Soviet Union and Cuba have served as major ideological influencers to Nicaragua's changing political and economic values. The two countries first established diplomatic relations during the early 1960s and throughout the Cold War, in which the Soviet Union and Cuba had signed trade agreements and exchanged mutual political support. The Cuban Revolution, which took place during the late 1960s and received Soviet funding, opposed their current dictatorship through the utilization of guerrilla warfare, which represented highly nationalistic and anti-imperialist ideologies¹⁹. The construction of the FSLN and paramilitaries in Nicaragua was primarily based upon the foundation of those which were founded in Cuba.

During the time of the Nicaraguan Revolution, the Soviet Union and the United States were at arms in regards to their nuclear abilities. With both countries attempting to expand their influence on Latin America, the Soviet Union turned to Nicaragua and offered economic and militaristic funding to financially support the FSLN²⁴. The Soviet Union continued to transfer no-cost armaments and military equipment to the Sandinista government as they fought against Honduras and the economic policies of the United States. The Sandinistas ally ship with the Soviet Union granted them access to various resources within the Soviet bloc division of labor, which helped sustain Nicaragua's militias during the revolution but did not grant them any significant means of foreign exchange. Without the financial capabilities to sustain their own socialistic ideologies, Nicaragua was thwarted into a state of economic hardship and political confusion.

Soviet relations within Nicaragua continued throughout their new socialistic democracy, though the accord was purely political and did little to benefit Nicaragua's economy. The Social Security Reforms of 2018, prompted significant internal and external animosities toward the increasingly authoritarian tendencies of the FSLN's reemergence into power. During this time, the Cuban government reinstated support for the Nicaraguan government and their political and economic reforms.

5. References

1. Baltodano, Bruno Martin. "Constructing a Multi-Ethnic State: Challenges to Nationalism and Political Autonomy in the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua." Order No. 3732747, Washington State University, 2015, <http://search.proquest.com.wncln.wncln.org/docview/1729128457?accountid=8388> (accessed November 11, 2019).
2. Bernard Nietschmann, Thomas W. Walker, eds. "Nicaragua," Encyclopedia Britannica, November 06, 2019, <https://www.britannica.com/place/Nicaragua>.
3. Cottam, Martha L. "The Carter Administration's Policy Toward Nicaragua: Images, Goals, and Tactics." *Political Science Quarterly* 107, no. 1 (Spring, 1992): 123, <http://search.proquest.com.wncln.wncln.org/docview/208303006?accountid=8388> (accessed November 11, 2019).
4. Elizabeth Gonzalez. "A Timeline of Nicaragua's Crisis," Americas Society / Council of the Americas, July 03, 2018, <https://www.as-coa.org/articles/timeline-nicaraguas-crisis>.
5. Everingham, Mark. "Neoliberalism in a New Democracy: Elite Politics and State Reform in Nicaragua." *The Journal of Developing Areas* 32, no. 2 (1998): 237-64. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy177.nclive.org/stable/4192756>.
6. Gary Prevost and Harry E. Vanden, *The Undermining of the Sandinista Revolution*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc, 1999.
7. Gismondi, Michael and Jeremy Mouat. ""LA ENOJOSA CUESTIÓN DE EMERY": THE EMERY CLAIM IN NICARAGUA AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY, C. 1880-1910." *The Americas* 65, no. 3 (01,

2009): 375-409,295, <http://0-search.proquest.com.wncln.wncln.org/docview/209599210?accountid=8388> (accessed November 11, 2019).

8. Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Fifth Edition, Revised, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf), 1978, pp. 4-15

9. HENIGHAN, STEPHEN. "Nicaraguan History after 1990." In *Sandino's Nation: Ernesto Cardenal and Sergio Ramírez Writing Nicaragua, 1940-2012*, 426-42. McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy177.nclive.org/stable/j.ctt6wpx26.15>.

10. Hooker, Juliet. "'Beloved Enemies': Race and Official Mestizo Nationalism in Nicaragua." *Latin American Research Review* 40, no. 3 (2005): 14-39. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3662820>.

11. JERVIS, ROBERT. "Hans Morgenthau, Realism, and the Scientific Study of International Politics." *Social Research* 61, no. 4 (1994): 853-76. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy177.nclive.org/stable/40971063>.

12. Leiken, Robert S. "Fantasies and Facts: The Soviet Union and Nicaragua." *Current History (Pre-1986)* 83, no. 000495 (10, 1984): 314, <http://0-search.proquest.com.wncln.wncln.org/docview/202927812?accountid=8388> (accessed November 11, 2019).

13. Martí I Puig, Salvador, and Claire Wright. "The Adaptation of the FSLN: Daniel Ortega's Leadership and Democracy in Nicaragua." *Latin American Politics and Society* 52, no. 4 (2010): 79-106. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy177.nclive.org/stable/40925837>.

14. Martí I Puig, Salvador "The Sandinista Revolution and the FSLN". *Latin American Studies*, <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766581/obo-9780199766581-0194.xml> (accessed 11 Nov. 2019).

15. Meyer, Peter J. "HONDURAS: BACKGROUND AND U.S. RELATIONS." *Current Politics and Economics of South and Central America* 11, no. 4 (2018): 463-507, <http://0-search.proquest.com.wncln.wncln.org/docview/2273147801?accountid=8388> (accessed November 11, 2019).

16. Nicaragua's Constitution of 1987 with Amendments through 2014, *Constitute Project*, 2019.

17. Office of the Historian. *Building the Panama Canal, 1903-1914*. 2016, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1899-1913/panama-canal>.

18. Peace, Roger. "U.S.-Nicaragua Relations, the Sandinista Revolution, and the Contra War." In *A Call to Conscience: The AntiContra War Campaign*, 7-28. University of Massachusetts Press, 2012. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy177.nclive.org/stable/j.ctt5vk5r1.7>.

19. Prevost, Gary. "Cuba and Nicaragua: A Special Relationship?" *Latin American Perspectives* 17, no. 3 (1990): 120-37. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2633815>.

20. Silva, Victor Alfonso. "THE HISTORY OF THE NICARAGUAN SOCIAL SECURITY INSTITUTE/ AN ANALYSIS OF PATH DEPENDENCY." Master's Thesis, Georgetown University, 2015.

21. Stein, Andrew J. "The Consequences of the Nicaraguan Revolution for Political Tolerance: Explaining Differences among the Mass Public, Catholic Priests, and Secular Elites." *Comparative Politics* 30, no. 3 (1998): 335-53. doi:10.2307/421990.

22. Suchlicki, Jaime. "Soviet Policy in Latin America: Implications for the United States." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 29, no. 1 (1987): 25-46. doi:10.2307/165638.

23. "The Sandinista Revolution and the FSLN". In obo in *Latin American Studies*, <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766581/obo-9780199766581-0194.xml> (accessed 11 Nov. 2019).

24. Valenta, Jiri. "Nicaragua: Soviet-Cuban Pawn or Non-Aligned Country?" *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 27, no. 3 (1985): 163-75. doi:10.2307/165605.