

***A NEW AUTHORITARIANISM.  
CORRELATIONS IN THE POLITICAL THEORY OBSERVABLE IN THE  
GOVERNMENT IN NICARAGUA.***

***UN NUEVO AUTORITARISMO.  
CORRELACIONES EN LA TEORÍA POLÍTICA OBSERVABLES EN EL  
GOBIERNO EN NICARAGUA***

Camilo Andrés Vargas Machado  
ORCID: 0000-0003-0993-358X  
Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia  
[camilo.vargasma@campusucc.edu.co](mailto:camilo.vargasma@campusucc.edu.co)  
Colombia

Julie Armenta Calderón  
ORCID: 0000-0003-2561-2364  
Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia  
[julie.armenta@campusucc.edu.co](mailto:julie.armenta@campusucc.edu.co)  
Colombia

Salvador Cazzato Dávila  
ORCID: 0000-0003-3255-6700  
Universidad de Zulia  
[salvadorcazzato@gmail.com](mailto:salvadorcazzato@gmail.com)  
Venezuela

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24265/voxxuris.2024.v42n1.10>

Recibido: 17 de enero de 2023.

Aceptado: 11 de julio de 2023.

## **SUMMARY**

- Introduction.
- Authoritarian and totalitarian government conventions.
- Traits of authoritarian regimes.
- Differences in Latin American authoritarianisms.
- Managing a new kind of authoritarianism.
- Reluctances and approaches to authoritarian consolidation.
- Inclinations for a new authoritarianism.
- Conclusions.
- References.

## **ABSTRACT**

This paper is the final product of investigation that seeks to found the discussion on the transformation of democracy to emerging authoritarianism in Latin-American. In which the contributions of three specific authors were correlated: J, Linz; C, Lesgart and O'Donnell, who offer their own concepts on the typologies of determined political governance, as can be seen in the representation of the case of the Republic of Nicaragua, and the

actions undertaken by its main political actors. In this sense, it emerged from the use of analysis and descriptive methods typical of political science, that there are new authoritarianisms in the Latin-American States, which will not dissipate, since, according of evidence, on contrary; these will be consolidated. Well, authoritarian regimes have eroded the democratic bases of the initial political system, which served them as means to gain access to political power, as can be seen in the case study, since initially it was based on the mechanisms of citizen participation, to later deviate from the proportions of a democracy, giving rise to personalistic, arbitrary and radical positions that redefine the ruler as a leader with an authoritarian inclination, where public liberties, right to dissent and to express political positions are limited.

## **KEYWORDS**

authoritarianism, governance, totalitarian regime, totalitarian regime, democracy.

## **RESUMEN**

Este documento es el producto final de una investigación que buscó fundar la discusión sobre la transformación de la democracia al autoritarismo emergente en el contexto

latinoamericano. Donde se correlacionaron las contribuciones de tres autores específicos: J. Linz; C. Lesgart y O'Donnell. Que brindan los conceptos propios sobre las tipologías de gobernanzas políticas, como se puede observar en la representación del caso de República de Nicaragua, y las acciones acometidas por sus actores políticos principales. En este sentido, emergió a partir de la utilización de los métodos de análisis y descriptivos propios de la ciencia política, el que existen nuevos autoritarismos en los Estados latinoamericanos, los cuales no se disiparan, ya que, de acuerdo con la evidencia, al contrario; estos se consolidaran. Pues los regímenes autoritarios han erosionado las bases democráticas del sistema político inicial, que les valió como medio para acceder al poder político, como se aprecia en el caso de estudio, pues en un inicio se fundó en los mecanismos de participación ciudadana, para luego apartarse de proporciones democráticas, dando lugar a posiciones personalistas, arbitrarias y radicales, redefiniendo al gobernante como un Líder con inclinación autoritaria, limitando las libertades públicas, el derecho a disentir y a expresar posiciones políticas.

### **PALABRAS CLAVES**

autoritarismo, gobernanza, régimen totalitario, régimen totalitario, democracia.

### **INTRODUCTION**

In the first place, it is cardinal to establish what is an authoritarian regime?, which from the thought of Juan Linz -one of the central authors of this document-, is determined as a political system with four characteristics that are: not having responsible political pluralism limited; not having an elaborate ideology; not to make an intense or vast political mobilization; and the fact that one of the Chiefs and/or a small political group exercises power (1996, págs. 19-20). In this sense, we must add that at certain moments of their development, authoritarian regimes develop a political mobilization and that the exercise of power will have legally defined limits, but also predictable ones (Vargas, 2019). In such a way that an authoritarian regime, from the thought of Juan Linz, refers to a political system in which power is concentrated in the hands of one or more leaders or a small political group. These leaders exercise absolute control over political decisions and state institutions, without real political competition or effective opposition (Geddes, 2004). From which it is significant to note that J. Linz recognizes

that at certain stages of their development, authoritarian mechanisms may experience moments of intense political mobilization and that the exercise of power may have legally defined limits (Linz, 1990). However, these characteristics do not alter the authoritarian essence of the regime, since political control continues to be concentrated in the hands of a leader or small group and there is no true political pluralism or responsible political competition (Linz, 1978).

Within this axiom, it should be noted that in the context in which the authoritarian political system is produced, the dividing line between State and Society can be demarcated, against which J. Linz himself has established a specific typology for regimes with these autocratic characteristics, being five main and two secondaries. In this sense, the first will be: 1) The military bureaucratic authoritarian regime; 2) The authoritarian regime of organic states; 3) The post-democratic authoritarian regime of mobilization; 4) The post-independence mobilization authoritarian regime; 5) The post-totalitarian authoritarian regime. While in the characteristics for the secondary typology the following are mentioned: 1) The regime of imperfect totalitarianism and, 2) The regime of racial democracy (1996, pág. 96).

In this order of ideas, in the opposite sense, it is significant to clarify what a democracy is in general terms for this author, who affirms that from this orbit the power to form political parties and that in turn the voters can, through the free and transparent participation (direct or indirect), periodically electing all elected officials. Which is clearly expressed by J. Linz, when explaining that in a democratic regime there is the freedom to create political parties, to hold honest and free elections formally established regularly, where also none of the possible political positions are excluded from responsibility before the electorate, either directly or indirectly (1996, pág. 17).

As observed in the words of J. Linz, three conditions must be met to affirm that there is a democratic system in a State: 1) The freedom to create political parties; 2) The regular holding of free and fair elections; 3) The effectiveness of the voters in the election of all political offices. From which it can be deduced that these are directly related to the concept of delegative democracy: proposed by O'Donnell, referenced by thinkers A. Chaguaceda and M. Puerta -in context- asserts that delegative

democracies result in serious economic damage and social crisis, in a context where four characteristic elements come together: the crisis of democratic representation; social fragmentation; deinstitutionalization; and social fragmentation (2015). Based on the aforementioned concepts, from the perspective of the two mentioned authors and adding the approach of Cecilia Lesgart and David Collier, the conceptualization of the authoritarian political system, the democratic system and political personalism located in Latin America will be deepened (Diamond & Morlino, 2004).

### **AUTHORITARIAN AND TOTALITARIAN GOVERNMENT CONVENTIONS**

According to what has been said, the term authoritarianism has been a connoted specialized category and of fundamental use for the German political scientist -now deceased- Juan Linz, who since the 1960s characterized this concept. Being one of his starting points the criticism of Francoism, for a period that he himself lived in the Iberian Country. As is well known, Francoism as a dictatorial regime had its own features in its bowels, a situation that Linz studied, from which he reasoned in depth the differences with other authoritarian regimes of the time, for which reason he argued that Francisco Franco was, his own European political experience and of a different origin than Chinese communism, Soviet Stalinism or fascism in decline, paraphrasing it (Linz & Stepan, 1978).

Thus, Linz and Stepan did not classify authoritarian regimes with specific surnames, but rather expressly authoritarian situations, so the author did not lose track of the circumstances (1978, pp. 219-220), but was sharpening his critical lens on politics, establishing certainties with comparative studies well known to scholars of political science. His comparisons that are classic -if you will- were always in search of terms to adopt and insert to understand, as well as to explain the different authoritarian political situations, destined for the laudable political analyzes of his time. His vision also pointed out that these situations were procurers of some aspects, prerogatives or pre-established requirements that allowed him to operationalize said regimes that he pointed out, these contributions, aspects or theoretical-operative prerogatives of both Linz (1996, pp. 221-264), O'Donnell (1997, pp. 287-304) from Lesgart (2020, pp. 341-358) and other

thinkers, who contributed their approaches to the development of the concept.

### **TRAITS OF AUTHORITARIAN REGIMES**

Analyzing the current Latin American context, one of the problems of growing authoritarianism in the region lies not only in the accurate repression of freedoms as a central characteristic, nor in the fact that it is a regime contrary to the well-known precepts of political systems. democratic, nor to the different oppressive forms that these protagonists and leaders adopted or disguised, with which they would print their own stamp of governing, earning the stigma of an authoritarian dictatorship (Bassols & Mendoza, *Gobernanza*, págs. 272-273). Rather, from the sociological-historical perspective, viewed from a time continuum, these regimes tend to change their form during their rule. Its essence may remain intact, but the forms adopted are particularly varied, so that repression -strong or not- entails the dissonances of the voices and wills not shared with the biased criteria of the autocratic protagonist are biased according to the collaborative analytical approach.

From this orientation, in order to be considered an authoritarian system, some minimum requirements are required for its operation, which indispensably depends on essential internal rules that empower them in the political arena, which entails the degradation of the rules of the democratic board. From where it is affirmed that their nuclear essences are not deformed, since contemporary authoritarianisms are now a distinctive alloy that is consolidated or reinforced punctually through institutional coercion or particular political personalities that energize contemporary politics. Said alloy is contained in that governability or despicable democratic forms of governing, it is here when one of the authors previously analyzed on the subject of delegative democracy is introduced, who is the Argentine Guillermo O'Donnell; Regarding these regimes, the underlying rules are not fickle, and at the same time they are necessary prerogatives for an authoritarian political system to sustain itself, function, or begin its political expansion without contracting it (1997). Therefore, a delegative democracy will always have a well-formulated curriculum, with defined premises, precepts and practices, which have been cataloged and weighed by this Argentine author.

In contrast, C, Lesgart mentions that this categorization runs through Latin America, although with surprising forms of access to political power, but that fully express the analysis of its peculiarities. In this orientation, Ella tells us about a series of varied authoritarianisms because they have oppressive forms that J. Linz also detected previously. These oppressive forms -of authoritarianism- can include forms of government (States or authoritarian bureaucratic regime, military regimes, dictatorships, new authoritarianism) like many others, which are not in parentheses (2020, pp. 357-358). Therefore, Lesgart specifically expresses those authoritarian regimes, therefore, they are a modern voice that refers to a repressive and oppressive way of exercising political power, without resorting to temporarily available concepts such as totalitarianism in the past. and fascism. But neither does it fall into categories that characterize a certain type of personalism and its expansion to a form of exercise of political power, like the classic figures of tyranny and tyrant, dictatorship and dictator, despotism and despots. That is to say, that with the category of authoritarianism the political system can be understood, which wants to build a certain typology that comes from the daily personality of the ruler, from where the approach of the state or system is formulated (2020, págs. 355-356).

For this reason, it can be said from Linz that the political change of a regime is a distinction that resizes that Argentina that Cecilia Lesgart perceives, considering that, for her, a distinctive analytical dimension is first needed that is capable of describing the different ways of exercising political power as pointed out by the second author. Because authoritarianism and totalitarianism are autocratic forms of the exercise of political power, and Linz distinguished their characteristics, sometimes ambiguous. But Lesgart relies on this, and points out how in totalitarianism the differentiation between the State and (civil) society is erased, where the spaces of the public, and the private and intimate, of the state and of the apolitical public are not perceived. clearly without proper analysis. For both authors, authoritarianism has a heterogeneous and even plural base, but always being a totalitarian system, it presents an immovable monism of the individualist ambition of the regime leader.

In all cases, it is necessary to address authoritarianism as a political model, which creates a type of regime that degrades the

masses, limiting, repressively controlling and persecuting - if necessary - even eliminating specific groups and institutions that may oppose it. Totalitarianism also mobilizes the masses and, at the same time, penetrates and destroys pre-existing institutions and sociopolitical groups, creating new institutions that have no origin in civil society (Lesgart, 2020, pp. 353-354). These features are evident if we pay attention to the critical observations of both authors, on the characteristic military regimes -for example, of the Southern Cone during the seventies- called authoritarian regimes or new authoritarianisms according to Collier (1985), as well as indicated by O'Donnell (1972, 2008).

This is possible thanks to the approaches to contemporary comparative politics developed by both O'Donnell and Juan Linz and others in stages of the 1960s and 1970s, since the contributions of both cannot be ruled out due to the fact that they were made in less modern times. recent to the current date. Because in order to explain and dismantle the authoritarian or non-authoritarian contexts in Latin America, both thinkers offer keys and basic categories that were the product of the analysis of the emergence of autocratic periods and various authoritarian forms of government from the 1950s. Said autocratic political contexts they demand basic theoretical-conceptual tools of these, with the purpose of dismantling in an explanatory way the sui generis institutional and state development and functioning of the new governmental or governance systems from the 1970s.

As the concept of authoritarianism is inferred, it has evolved over time and has acquired different meanings in different historical and cultural contexts, therefore, according to what was mentioned from thought C, Lesgart, it can be argued that the author emphasizes the importance of understand authoritarianism as a complex and multidimensional concept (2020), because his conviction is that the intellectual left in the region has gone through various theoretical and political transformations over time and these changes have been influenced by historical contexts, social movements, political struggles and intellectual debates (2000). At the same time, for C, Lesgart, authoritarianism refers to a form of government or political system in which power is concentrated in the hands of a central authority, generally a leader or small group, and is exercised coercively and without the consent or significant participation

of the population. In an authoritarian system, political decisions and control over society are exercised unilaterally by the leader or group in power, without a clear separation of powers or protection of individual rights and freedoms (2020). For this reason, an authoritarian system is characterized by the lack of accountability mechanisms and the suppression of political opposition, where the leader or group in general has the power to exercise absolute control over government institutions, the media, and other sectors. society key (2008). According to which, political repression, censorship, violation of human rights and lack of civil liberties are common characteristics in authoritarian systems. Since, in an authoritarian system, decision-making is based on the will and interests of the elite in power, without considering the participation or consent of the population (2012). So political plurality, open debate and democratic competition are often limited or completely absent in these systems.

On the other hand, similarly, Guillermo O'Donnell, who was one of the most outstanding political scientists in the field of Latin American political science; recognized for his multidisciplinary approach and rigorous analysis of political systems (1986), especially in relation to authoritarian systems and democratization processes.

However, in relation to our categories of analysis, G, O'Donnell explored the interactions between the modernization process and the rise of authoritarian regimes in Latin America, arguing that economic and social development nonetheless led to democratization, and highlighted the importance of political elites and institutions in the configuration of authoritarian systems. Likewise, O'Donnell made important contributions to the study of political transitions and democratic consolidation (2010). But, he focused on the challenges and obstacles that countries face on their way to democracy, such as institutional weakness, lack of accountability, and the persistence of authoritarian practices (2021). Thus, he stressed the importance of citizen participation and the strengthening of civil society as fundamental elements for the construction and sustainability of democracy, for which he highlighted the role of social movements and non-governmental organizations in promoting accountability, accounts and political inclusion. In addition to this, O'Donnell also addressed the issue of inequality and poverty in Latin America

and its impact on political and social stability (O'Donnell, Quiroga, Acosta, Lazzetta, & Seminara, 1998). Exploring the ways in which socioeconomic inequality can create tensions and conflicts in political systems and policies to address these problems. What generated an important contribution from his ideas about the transition processes to democracy, through the development of the concept's micro democracy and delegative democracy (O'Donnell, Quiroga, & Iazzetta, Democracia delegativa, 2011). For this reason, unlike J, Linz and C, Lesgart; O'Donnell has examined the phenomenon of authoritarianism from the perspective of the authoritarian bureaucracy. In his work on bureaucratic authoritarianism (1988), where authoritarian regimes in Latin America are explored, finding that they are characterized by the domination of a powerful, but also repressive state bureaucracy.

In accordance with the aforementioned, a table is presented below showing the positions that each of the three authors Juan Linz, Cecilia Lesgart and Guillermo Alberto O'Donnell propose and show according to all of the above, all of the above commented, and from what they say about authoritarianism and authoritarian systems, in three different positions, like this:

**Table No.1. Comparison of the authors Juan Linz, Cecilia Lesgart and Guillermo Alberto O'Donnell.**

	Juan Linz	Cecilia Lesgart	Guillermo O'donnell
Similarities	- Study of authoritarianism	- Focus on contemporary authoritarianism	- Analysis of Latin American authoritarianism
Differences	- Focus more focused on authoritarianism in Europe	- Broader focus that includes Latin America	- Focus more focused on the Latin American context
Theory	- Theory of transitions to democracy	- No specific theory mentioned	-Competitive authoritarianism theory
Contributed concepts	- Transitions to democracy	-Contemporary authoritarianism	-Competitive authoritarianism
Birth and death	-Born in 1927 and died in 2013	-Born in 1970 - in good health	-Born in 1936 and died in 2011
Period	- Second half of the 20th century	- Currently in development	- Second half of the 20th century

Source: Self made.

As can be seen in the previous table, the previous table presents a comparison between the three authors: Juan Linz, Cecilia Lesgart and

Guillermo Alberto O'Donnell, in relation to their positions on authoritarianism and authoritarian systems. The table consists of three columns for each author and five rows that address different aspects. The first row highlights the similarities between the three authors, since it is highlighted that they all share an approach in the study of authoritarianism and authoritarian systems. In addition, all have made relevant theoretical contributions in the field of political science and have carried out comparative case analyses. In the second row, the differences between the authors are exhibited, that each author uses specific theoretical and methodological approaches in his work, which implies differences in their study approaches and areas of emphasis within the field of authoritarianism (Schmitter & Lynn, 1991). According to what J has shown, Linz is recognized for his theory of transitions and democratic consolidation and has worked on concepts such as authoritarianism, totalitarianism, authoritarian regimes and democratic transitions. he has worked extensively on the study of authoritarianism and has developed related concepts. Although a specific definition is not provided in the above box, Linz has addressed authoritarianism as a political system in which power is concentrated in a leader or small group, without effective control mechanisms and without respect for individual rights and liberties. Linz has also analyzed authoritarian mechanisms and has studied transitions from authoritarianism to democracy.

On the other hand, G, O'Donnell has generated theories on authoritarian bureaucracy, delegative democracy and political transitions, having also developed concepts related to authoritarian bureaucracy, delegative democracy and the comparative analysis of authoritarian systems. he has made important contributions to the study of authoritarianism and has developed related concepts. Although a specific definition is not provided in the box above, O'Donnell has addressed authoritarianism as a political system characterized by the concentration of power in one leader or group, the absence of effective checks and balances, and the suppression of freedoms. and individual rights. O'Donnell has also analyzed authoritarian bureaucracy and delegative democracy as specific forms of authoritarianism.

Cecilia Lesgart, it is noted that she has also worked in the field of authoritarianism and authoritarian systems, but her approach and her

definition of authoritarianism differ from the other two authors. The introduction presents the term "authoritarianism" as a fundamental concept in comparative politics since the 1960s. It was used by Juan Linz to characterize Francoism in Spain and differentiate it from other European and Soviet political experiences. Throughout history, the concept of authoritarianism has been associated with oppressive forms of exercise of political power, such as dictatorships and military regimes.

In Latin America, the interest in studying the surprising forms of access to political power and the oppressive forms of exercise of power has led to the consolidation of the concept of authoritarianism. It has been used to analyze coups, military regimes and dictatorships in the region. However, in recent years new approaches have emerged that seek to distinguish authoritarianism from other forms of government. Terms such as "competitive authoritarianism", "electoral authoritarianism" and "authoritarian electoral regimes" have been introduced to describe contemporary political situations in which authoritarianism is combined with electoral processes (Maxwell, 2018).

### DIFFERENCES IN LATIN AMERICAN AUTHORITARIANISMS

From the perspective developed, this section shows a margin of the importance that resides in the first two American thinkers already mentioned, since the new authoritarianisms had already been warned by both J, Linz and O'Donnell, but with the passage of time, authoritarian cases have suffered, first, from institutional ruptures and ad hoc characteristics, which will allow their rulers to gradually demobilize the massive sectors of Latin American civil societies. And, secondly, these are clearly exposed by A, Chaguaceda and A, Caldera (2016). In this way, it is worth highlighting an aside, where A, Chaguaceda managed to summarize the basic and practical precepts of a delegative democracy that tends to be a markedly authoritarian political regime; thus neither O'Donnell nor Lesgart are eligible for systematic study. Indeed, from this reflection, the authoritarian political experiences compiled by the literature of O'Donnell and Linz and many others, guide us through the thematic transit, assumed by Lesgart, who asserts with conviction that these are associated with the different national forms in each State of the

oppressive exercise of political power (2020, p. 350). In this way, he goes further in his critical review of the dissonant and compartmentalized opposition of the pendular thinkers of the Cold War who coordinated their premises on the axes of the authoritarianism/democracy binomial, understood as indissoluble opposites from almost all points of view (Borgonovi & Silva, 2016).

For this reason, here is one of Cecilia Lesgart's contributions when she points out that this axis argument blurs the theoretical productions of third wave political science, and the pompous global resurgence of democracy (Huntington, 1991; Diamond & Plattner, nineteen ninety six). cited by Lesgart, 2020 p.355), evidently discrediting -by antonym- authoritarian systems or those contrary to the mentioned resurgence. For the rest, it is opportune to point out that the phenomenon of the erosion of democracies in Latin America is not a recent historical fact, but permanent forms that are typical of its development. This undeniable erosion highlights conceptual notions and distinctions of certain authoritarianisms in Latin America that have governed under oppressive forms of exercise of political power (civil, military or civic-military dictatorships), and with surprising forms of access to political power, as in the case of coups (Lesgart, 2020, p. 351). Indeed, one of her contributions will revolve around a type of authoritarianism that orbits, which is based on elements indicated by O'Donnell (1972, 2009), where C, Lesgart indicates that, since the late nineties and up to the present, authoritarianism does not necessarily arise from the force of a military coup, because military intervention or action by military forces is not required today (Lesgart, 2020, p. 351). Undoubtedly, it is necessary to examine the respective authoritarian systems in more detail, since the apparently contradictory combination between the emergence of authoritarian political forms and the holding of periodic open elections, outlines us on an electoral authoritarianism, or authoritarian electoral regimes, or competitive autocracies (Schedler, 2004; Diamond, 2004; Levitsky & Way, 2004; Corrales, 2006; Frantz, 2018). This is how they reveal it and O'Donnell himself with the category of delegative democracy.

Therefore, the examination of the different pre-characterized systems makes it necessary to delimit how diversification is shown in terms of the classification of hard regimes, which

are effectively *sui generis* political models because, on occasions, they do not respond to local theories or explanations contained in political science. Although it is true, one of the theoretical arguments is that some models present hybrid or combinatory political forms that move away from the central canons of a traditional democratic system. It should be noted that, simply or complexly, certain regimes are supported by institutionally democratic forms or methods (for example, the holding of free and direct elections sponsored by agents who figure in political power at the time, but who can imperatively be classified within of a liberal democratization), which is perfectly feasible from O'Donnell's analytical argument. For this author, authoritarianisms are configured because they do not fully comply with the combinatory formula of the basic premises of what is understood by democracy; and is understood by her. Thus, a democracy is understood as a government elected by the people through open and competitive elections -perhaps not always free or fair- but where the liberal component of the rule of law, the separation of powers and individual liberties are not corroded (Zakaria, 2007 referenced by Lesgart).

In this way, when affirming that there are orbital regimes in the democratic, this thinker has not ceded any validity, since there are still rulers who have masked or distorted this formula of traditional and institutional premises guided by Zakaria, which are maintained under the formalities of a democracy without being, really. Likewise, it is appropriate to register the case of the Republic of Nicaragua, in Central America. Where presidential elections were formally organized and held on November 7, 2021, ominously supporting this characteristic model of a hypothetical democracy for him and his way of governing (Chaguaceda N. A., 2020). As far as she is concerned, it is no coincidence that Daniel Ortega and his wife hold elections with the absence of the main agents or loyal opponents, feeding -in order to comply- within the systemic formality of the democratic orbit, its inconsistency lies in the analytical criteria from the factual because those who openly opposed that Sandinista revolution were imprisoned, execrated, disappeared or exiled and could not contend (Fernández, 2022). In fact, for many foreign diplomacies, D, Ortega is a thematic contingency that has provoked resounding rejections of democratic foreign policies, whether of the European Union or

the United States. Therefore, D, Ortega means a political contingency to what a democracy borrowed from Zakaria represents. Although it is clear that Daniel Ortega did not reach the presidency by forceful military action as authoritarianism is traditionally conceived. So, the case of Nicaragua, at present, challenges us to understand its political dynamics with an adequate analytical approach of what are the democratic characteristics of a regime. Given that the superficial characterization of what is conceptualized as authoritarianism must be overcome, the full understanding of a problem around the limits of presidential power is also sought, even more so when political scientists have neglected the edges of complexity. of political phenomena such as that of Nicaragua that represents the personalization of political power, observing a concentration of political power in the person of the leader (Soriano de García-Pelayo, 1996, pp. 48-49).

In such a way that, a political personalism like the one presented in the figure of Ortega exercises, for example, necessary controls or mechanisms over the executive power or the rest of them, until reaching the essential concentration of power through institutional submission, in the national media or the Judiciary, to mention some works of control or political subjection generally framed in a delegative democracy (Moreira, Raus, & Gómez, 2008, p. 247). This could be the case. Thus, the fact that electoral processes are carried out often does not ensure that the essential codes or premises of a democracy are not affected. Therefore, the periodic holding of formally democratic elections does not always motivate their real representation, since it can become the ramification of a democracy in a state of erosion in the words of J, Linz. Therefore, elections can be fraudulent or manipulated in an apparently competitive process, even in a double count system or with the presence of international observers (1996, p. 223).

This is how a democracy in permanent or critical erosion can be part of a furtive authoritarian denomination, as O'Donnell, Schmitter and Whitehead have already argued. (1988), authors who began an analytical effort to systematize the various forms of authoritarian domination that have occurred in different geographies. Orientation from which they theorized about explanations at a casuistic level. For although certain authoritarian denominations border on political forms described as a series of

new authoritarianisms (Collier, 1985), in reality they retain many of the features of the authoritarianism that appeared in Europe in the third and fourth decade of the previous century, which coincides with O'Donnell's position, with the difference that I call them subtypes of authoritarianism. Thus, it can be observed that these are dominant authoritarian denominations or forms according to the typology of analytical criteria with which they are delimited; it is not attached to a formal normative denomination or definition in the democratic sphere. Consequently, these new democratic forms, instead of supporting a true democratization process as Manuel Garretón would express it, misrepresent or misrepresent under the description of particular political forms, as presented in the specific case: the Nicaraguan Country. Although at the same time, these specific political forms represent a particular type of governance (2011, pp. 34-35) that does not endorse or contain the conceptual premise of a representative, participatory and liberal democracy, regardless of how it is approached.

All in all, the political behavior of Ortega and his wife Rosario Murillo distorts the features of the democratic nucleus, approaching more to an authoritarian domination, since its forms are opposite and contrast with the aforementioned features of the well-known liberal democracies. Likewise, their political methods of imprisoning opponents, around the time of elections, really belie institutional support for inclusive suffrage or the interdependence of civil liberties (Schumpeter, 1983; Dahl, 1989). It should be noted that all the authors -including Shumpeter- consider that the possibilities, impossibilities and difficulties of following a two-way path: authoritarianism or political democratization, present the concept of transition, which acquires gradual elements of processes that oscillate on one side. the other. to another. However, the difference in the aforementioned is that according to J. Schumpeter and R. Dahl, they considered the possibilities of a coup d'état, and instead J. Linz raised the rupture of the political regime or the rupture of democracy.

Just as, sometime later, O'Donnell, Schmitter and Whitehead carried out a detailed political study of thirteen cases, in two different geographies, verifying five situations in Europe and eight in Latin America, where these three authors verified that not always validating the denominations of what could be the new authoritarianisms (1988). This is particularly

so because they are also specific forms of governance (Bassols & Mendoza, 2011), since not all authoritarian regimes always have the decisive presence of the legitimate Armed Forces of a State, or of the military as a central actor; while some are defined by the hegemony of a political party, and several are personalist. Which is the same as stated by C, Lesgart (2020, pp. 350-351). That is why, in the exercise of political power -paraphrasing O'Donnell- the modes of political organization can have subtypes of authoritarianism, which can involve too many denominations used such as: military populism, despotism, personalized dictatorships, military autocracies, etc. many others (2008).

In an accessory way, the case of Nicaragua with the culmination of the electoral process in 2021, demonstrated the emerging displacement of contingent processes that are aimed at generating the new denominations, which later became authoritarian dominations, which is what really happened, regardless of whether it is focused in one way or another, which is related to what was stated by O'Donnell, Schmitter & Whitehead (1988), and Lesgart (2020). Where this last author rightly points out that a new reflection has emerged on political forms that are not fully democratic or authoritarian, in such a way that they are presented and are hybrid forms using a term proposed by Overy (2006). In the same way, to talk about the Central American C political regimes, Lesgart uses this term (Lesgart, 2020, pp. 351-352), and to explain the expansion with the so-called authoritarian enclaves, which is a concept taken from Garretón (1988), also agreeing that these enclaves are generated for certain periods. Thus, according to what has been mentioned, we can affirm that the proposed idea allows us to affirm that there are transitory transition periods that have residues clearly proposed to become institutionalized political regimes in another way, or delegative democracies (Lesgart, 2020). Therefore, the theorizing about the nuclear inflection of the limited Nicaraguan political dynamics up to this point is sustainable.

### **MANAGING A NEW KIND OF AUTHORITARIANISM**

This section will answer the question of whether, according to the classification constructed by O'Donnell and Lesgart, the case of the Republic of Nicaragua in Central America can be classified as a new type of authoritarianism.

This hypothesis wants to express in the first place that both O'Donnell and Lesgart point out that democracies intrinsically and occasionally can exhaust the democratic systems that they have built and that are formally established, which are not subtypes, neither old nor new like Lesgart. points out, but that, through comparative politics, ensures that electoral and/or competitive authoritarianisms emerge (Lesgart, 2020, pp. 361-362). Since, in these subtypes where the periodic holding of elections and the presence of certain parties reflect the turning point of the new authoritarianism, particular and ad hoc. Consequently, the following eight paragraphs will explain the points that determine this relationship.

Therefore, first of all, there is an emerging hybridization of political changes within the regimes that claim to be democratic, the mixture of their political governance leads to the frequent holding of elections that do not always guarantee individual rights and/or civil liberties. Said political mix enables reflections of a theoretical and conceptual nature that C, Lesgart abbreviates into conceptual networks of eight types such as: semi or pseudo democracy; virtual democracy; electoral democracy; partly free democracy; semi-authoritarianism; soft authoritarianism; electoral authoritarianism; competitive authoritarianism (Lesgart, 2020, pp. 361-362).

In any case, secondly, when indicating the different variables around the term democracy, the variations adjusted to the categories indicated or registered by the author are denotative; Based on Diamond (2004), she points out how there are democratic electoral regimes, authoritarian electoral regimes or electoral authoritarianism, which occupies our scientific attention when referring to the identity difficulties found between democratic systems and the elective processes of their rulers. , hence the permanent adjectives of both democracies and authoritarianism contribute to the tirade of political science researchers so far (2004).

Here the third point is presented, so that the Nicaraguan political system is pigeonholed or moves within the identification of what an ad hoc democracy is, which is a neo-authoritarianism or also called new authoritarianism, in correlation with the carrying out of processes adjusted elections. to the contextual conditions of the ruling party. Thus, this statement is found in a variety of variables exposed by Lesgart (2020), Diamond (2004), among others. Well, in recent years the State of Nicaragua and its rulers have carried out universal suffrage with

a secret ballot for all people with the right to vote, accompanied by periodic elections that support the regime within a political democracy, but there is no democratization. But, on the contrary, there has not been or has been promoted organizational freedom within the political system of Daniel Ortega. Because most unions and union movements have been restricted, unless they are experts in government interests. Furthermore, there is currently no free competition between political parties sympathetic to or politically opposed to the Nicaraguan regime headed by the president. Since, in this last-mentioned election, there are known numbers of arrests of opponents of it or political parties disqualified by the State electoral body (OEA, 2021).

However, as a fourth point we can mention that in the Nicaraguan case there is no real and adequate separation of the political powers of the State such as the Judicial or the electoral, which was not imposed by its leaders on duty, year after year, until to the current state of things. The mere fact that the Nicaraguan judicial body has captured, prosecuted and sentenced political actors opposed to President Daniel Ortega (in the last five years) is a negative indicator of the response. Therefore, the necessary sovereignty is not granted to individuals so that the democratic character stands out, obviously not. Which brings us to the fifth point, which is that in reality in Nicaragua the civil liberties of the individuals that make up the political society of the Nation and the State are not respected. What comes to be another negative point that contradicts what is understood by democracy, but that gives rise to and accounts for a type or subtype of authoritarianism. Let us explain that, with characteristic results such as these, a non-democratic regime or political system is designed, because and because it breaks the chain of democratic election (Cadena, 2004), therefore, the necessary links in the chain of a true electoral democracy are not met in the case studied. In other words, if it is assumed that the last electoral process in the State of Nicaragua sought the presidential succession, for example, that chain of democratic elections is broken from above. This can be called electoral authoritarianism or a semi-authoritarian political regime.

Succinctly, it remains to mention in the sixth point that due to the reach of the parliamentary level in the case of the leader Daniel Ortega and the State of Nicaragua, the popular parliamentary

representation has been decreasing and very reduced, since it is worth mentioning the importance represented in it expresses the plurality of representative voices of the people and is a space for the audibility of minorities (Lesgart, 2020, p. 362). In other words, in Nicaragua, the numerous minorities opposed to the ruling party were silenced, banned or censored, many others were persecuted or captured for their political activity and some were imprisoned for the crime of treason (Díaz, 2010, p. 704).

For its part, in reference to the seventh point, on the dimension related to the actions of social organizations and non-governmental organizations, whose access, mobility and right of reply or complaint do not enjoy the independence, ease of competition or popular sovereignty that they should enjoy is almost non-existent if one examines the roles of the executive, judicial and electoral branches. If attention is paid to the plan and the role that the media and social networks play in the issue of genuine freedom of expression, the scenario is further complicated as the former have been banned, censored, closed and vilified., the journalistic union has been the object of this mechanical scheme of political and repressive actions, against the national media led for a long time by Daniel Ortega and his wife Rosario Murillo (El País, 2021). Precisely on this particular situation, the professional Carlos Martínez de la Cerda, testified as a journalist, of the coercive experiences at the beginning of November of last year, at the time when the presidential elections were held, which were called and labeled of being a farce, after President Daniel Ortega imprisoned dozens of opponents of his government and potential presidential candidates. In addition, added to this, the independent press has seen in recent months how attacks against it have increased with raids on newsrooms, harassment and persecution of journalists through laws that seek to silence critical voices. In such a way that, according to known data, there are currently more than one hundred and fifty political prisoners in the country, among them the sports journalist Miguel Mendoza, or also Miguel Mora, former director of the television channel “100% Noticias.” who had become an opposition candidate; and Juan Lorenzo Holmann Chamorro, general manager of the newspaper “La Prensa” (El País, 2021). For this reason it can be affirmed that since the previous year in Nicaragua there has been a systematic

attack on all possible opposition leaders, and on the media, which to a certain extent was decisive in the elections of November 7, 2021, to dismantle and destroy the press Just as there are dozens of journalists in exile as a result of this and many of them in the country under surveillance or with their activity highly restricted for different reasons (Martínez de la Cerda cited by Lorena Arroyo, 2021).

Finally, as an eighth point, regarding the use of social networks through information and communication technologies, they have been surrounded, besieged in relation to their main functions and competencies for which they were promoted, their rights have been cut off liberties in their negative expression about the management or responsibilities of the official government is a clandestine and counterrevolutionary task to their desire to perpetuate themselves in power. That is to say, it is not really fortuitous that this series of undeniable facts are indications or indicators of the permanence of an authoritarian or perhaps semi-authoritarian political regime without overshadowing or tarnishing the repressive mechanisms through which the autocratic personalism of Daniel Ortega dissipates essential nuclei and guidelines of a system that tends to be democratic or that gives way to a process of democratization.

### **RELUCTANCES AND APPROACHES TO AUTHORITARIAN CONSOLIDATION**

Given this context and at that historical moment for Nicaragua, the lack of premises and specific canons in democracies is evident, which is why experts such as Octavio Pescador in media such as CNN en Español, in the program “Choque de Opiniones” establish how in the case of Daniel Ortega, deprives the freedom through the State media of all those who express themselves badly about him and his government, since dissent in Nicaragua is not viewed favorably by them, precisely because the vision is closed and obtuse when declaring the marked features of ideological ideology. polarization that this Central American country is going through (2021). Therefore, as O, Pescador affirms, the authoritarian regime of Nicaragua will seek to persecute and silence by the means at its disposal those who speak ill of the government and the government leader, as well as his management, being classified as enemies, which is truly different from the considerations given to a political adversary, as

is often the case in governments that abide by democratic rules. Where, although dissenting voices and opinions contrary to the government cannot be expressed, neither can it be affirmed and interpreted that there is a war in progress. Where at the same time we can add that Ortega and his wife have stripped the figure of his new authoritarianism of an essentially democratic character, therefore, these two; president and vice president, they subscribe to being actors or figures that polarize, which brings the type of: either you are with me or you are against me. What limits us is the teacher from the California region (Pescador, Octavio, 2021).

In any case, the States of Law and the Social and Democratic States of Law in Latin America must primarily consider the perverse interference in Human Rights in regimes such as the Nicaraguan one. Where even today, the media are being permanently attacked, as is the case of the Country’s newspapers, which gives authoritarian nuances like those that are reflected in this Nation. In this sense, this type of regime builds a political enemy that is necessary, so if that political enemy is not present, it is invented, but it must always exist to feed a degree of ideological polarization that intoxicates the ability to tolerate dissent. the voices and criteria that go against the interests of those who are enthroned, such as the aforementioned media and people who use social networks for these purposes.

In the same way, not only in developing countries, but also in first world countries, there are recent classic cases of semi-democratic governments that feed ideological polarization in a plurality of ways, as can be seen in the political phenomenon of Donald Trump or the claims and actions to judge him regarding the notorious attack on the United States Capitol in January of the year (2021). On this detail, it can be noted that politics is emotional, and sometimes lacks substantive ideas adopted through visceral positions that turn their backs on political rationality, which is why some political leaders are often branded as circus clowns. in the political arena Once again, and in relation to the attack and looting of the Capitol of a so-called first world nation, it is no less important that it could even be interpreted as an attempted coup d’état that turned U.S. policy upside down United (S, Canton on CNN in Spanish, 2021).

But, above all, at no time is it intended to make comparisons between the two American

political events, but rather to underline the deeply rooted role that social networks have in current politics, essential due to the emotional and subjective aspect that prevails in historical milestones or facts that define a historical process of a Country (S, Cantón on CNN in Spanish, 2021), since the emotional is what prevails in social networks, the dissemination of propaganda, categories and emotional discourses on platforms through communication technologies information and communication, will be increasingly a determining element in politics. For this reason, likewise, this research variable in current politics focuses on the ramifications of social networks that have yet to be thoroughly examined, as in the case of the aforementioned assault on the United States Capitol in 2021, as well as on the demonstrable restrictions that are imposed. in that. they have been imposed from the government power occupied by President Daniel Ortega.

Therefore, some experts such as the Chilean Rodrigo Gil assert that the political complexities of the modern world go so far as to say that it is actually a welfare state based on the diversities of polarization, which intersects levels of connected processes as the unprecedented fact. of the assault on the capitol; or also from the comfort of social networks assumed by social sectors or Nicaraguan individuals (Gil on CNN is Spanish, 2021). Since communicational political situations that veto the functions for which they were given accentuate the pendulum of polarization of the political wills that set the course of a nation, whose rank has not been respected by the words and actions of the main agent of Nicaragua, according to because you cannot lose the center of democracy, which allows you to restore or restore the forces of tolerance criteria so necessary in any category of a democratic regime.

Given that it is probable that we are facing a novel and highly dangerous scenario in the political sphere when the depth and background of the proposals and ideas exposed in the phenomenon of social networks during political processes are addressed through the analytical method. In which digital phenomena have changed perspective where there are no content or concrete ideas to offer the new (Gil on CNN is Spanish, 2021). Well, although we are witnessing a constant transformation of political phenomena located in the permanent changes of the digitization of modern politics, we are also witnessing a different and novel scenario: the

trivialization of value messages and background content that guide educationally, anyone who is observing or looking at the screen of your personal device or television.

To conclude, the network of adjectives with which authoritarian regimes in Latin America can be classified is surprising, not only because it connotes and captures the features of the new authoritarianisms according to J, Linz and another range of authors, but also because it represents reengineering or reconstructed repowering. of regimes with formalities of electoral calls and other brief characteristics of democracies and semi-democracies.

In this sense, coincidentally both J, Linz, O'Donnell and Lesgart offer a spectrum of elements of analysis and connections that cannot be collected here, but which, nevertheless, point out rays of light to explain the complex approach of political regimes such as the Nicaraguan. On the one hand, the constant electoral processes, open consultations, calls to official social movements are part of certain elements. On the other hand, the ineffective separation of constitutive powers of the State, the arbitrary detention and capture of those who opposed or launched into the presidential political arena last year, the veto and closure of political communication spaces that oppose or issue critical judgments. against the peculiar governance of Ortega and his wife, the formulation and promotion of positions that orbit and are ideologically polarized with reference to the axes of the governance of the day he championed (Bataillon, Gilles, 2019, pp. 1-3).

Given that the adoption of retrograde (pendular) positions by Nicaraguan "Sandinismo" in the sense of: he who is not with me is against me, translates as my enemy, which are just some of the connections and variables of political dynamics who are complexly involved and change their social greenness to the astonished look of some, to the impassive and satisfied look of others in the face of the latest eventualities that have come together in the Central American territory dominated by this so-called "Sandinista" Nicaraguan revolutionary leader.

## **INCLINATIONS FOR A NEW AUTHORITARIANISM**

The "Sandinista" Daniel Ortega has demonstrated with forceful facts the development of guidelines for a Delegative Democracy linked to actions and reactions of authoritarian bases that declined or injured the

democratic characteristics that barely remained in Nicaragua. Recently, various media outlets have expressed that this way of governing is arbitrary and, above all, a violation of human rights, and above all of political rights. Like the five mayors that passed into the hands of the Nicaraguan opposition by popular vote, they were democratically and arbitrarily assumed by councilors from President Daniel Ortega's party, who in turn appointed new official mayors. Therefore, the aggrieved denounced restrictions and violation of rights and guarantees when there were four months to go before the municipal elections (AFP, 2022).

In that order, it is known that the occupied municipal governments belong to the municipalities of "El Cuá", "San Sebastián de Yalí" and "Santa María de Pantasma", jurisdiction of "Jinotega" (north); in addition to "Murra", in the department of "Nueva Segovia" (north); and "El Almendro", in "Río San Juan" (south) (AFP, 2022). Given that their authoritarian forms of government account for the abuses committed against Nicaraguan democracy, it is clear that these mayors were removed from their posts and replaced by force by five capable mayors placed at the discretion of the central government. Thus, four months after the municipal elections (November 6, 2021), the regime arbitrarily occupied five opposition mayoralties that were in the hands of the "Ciudadanos por la Libertad political" party, who publicly denounced these events (AFP, 2022). Thus, it can be clearly inferred that the political regime goes from a delegative character to a discretionary and autocratic exercise, hardening its anti-democratic position, in the case of a neo-authoritarianism.

By the way, the Nicaraguan newspaper "La Prensa" refers to how between 2008 and 2012 thirty-three mayors were dismissed by this same political actor (2016), which suggests that it was and is a novel political practice, recent in its political credit. former. This in terms of the political dynamics that are taking place in Nicaragua, and although its arbitrary relationship with the Catholic Church also has edges that deny effective democratic governance by the revolutionary ex-guerrilla. Because the Catholic Church, only through certain political actors, contradicts and opposes the marked authoritarianism that is increasingly accentuated in this country. Being that here the accusations of the sociologist Oscar René Vargas are obvious when he declared how the autocratic regime wants to exile Bishop

Rolando Álvarez. Then, the Nicaraguan regime pursues a negotiation with the Vatican or with the Nicaraguan Episcopate that will culminate in the exile of Bishop Rolando Álvarez, a critic of Daniel Ortega and who is detained by state authorities (Vargas, Oscar, 2022).

As mentioned so far, it is a repressive campaign whose ultimate goal is to negotiate with the Vatican, given that since August 25, 2021 Monsignor Álvarez has been detained together with five priests and six laymen in the Episcopal Palace, which is located besieged by Special Forces of the Nicaraguan Police. Since, for the police, these people were accused of having the purpose of destabilizing the Nicaraguan State (Deutsche Welle, 2022).

## CONCLUSIONS

The transitions between democracy and autocratic modalities and mechanisms are present with scientific clarity in the development of this article, where three authors were taken who offer us fundamental guidelines and premises on how a delegative democracy works -O'Donnell's conception- since it can modify to become a personalist regime with consolidated authoritarian traits. In such a way that the regimes in Latin America have had their own descriptions that make them particular. And the case of Nicaragua and its leader Daniel Ortega are not exempt from this framework of polyetiological affirmation. Indeed, the New Authoritarianisms are also renewed with the passage of the XXI century; without leaving aside the conceptual contributions such as those of Delegative Democracy or those of semi-authoritarian regimes that can be replaced or subjected to reengineering in the political sphere.

In short, Daniel Ortega and his controversial political leadership in the last two decades represent part of the substrata and substantial edges of the emergence of a type of governance worthy of being analytically refocused, if you will, with these assumed characteristics and mechanisms. by the Nicaraguan president. Where we face indistinct scenarios, despite the repressive and coercive undertakings against those who become enemies and traitors to the revolution and the homeland, with which Augusto Sandino dreamed, at the beginning of the "Sandinista" revolutionary movement.

Based on what has been said, it is possible to argue that Nicaragua has experienced an increase in authoritarianism under the government of

Daniel Ortega, since, although it is important to consider that the model of authoritarianism can vary in its form and degree in different contexts, there are several aspects that suggest the presence of a new type of authoritarianism in Nicaragua. Well yes, a limitation of political pluralism is observed, where the opposition faces significant restrictions and measures have been implemented to weaken it. This includes actions such as manipulation of the electoral system, control of key institutions and the repression of dissent. Therefore, a lack of an elaborate ideology can be identified. Although the Nicaraguan government calls itself socialist, its approach appears to be more pragmatic and oriented toward staying in power than promoting a coherent ideology. In which, the Nicaraguan government has used political mobilization tactics to maintain support and control over the population, including the use of propaganda, co-optation of social groups, and the promotion of an image of charismatic leadership. So, you can see a concentration of power in the hands of Daniel Ortega and his close circle. This is manifested in the control of the executive, legislative and judicial powers, as well as in the manipulation of control and accountability mechanisms. While a more detailed and exhaustive analysis is necessary to fully understand the nature of authoritarianism in Nicaragua, the elements suggest the existence of a new type of authoritarianism in the country. This new type of authoritarianism is characterized by the combination of traditional elements of authoritarianism with strategies adapted to contemporary challenges and contexts.

Lastly, it was verified that the social sectors such as the Catholic Church, as well as the social and civil actors of the Mayor's Offices that disagree and repudiate the mechanisms of that autocratic ruling party, will allow the regime to be less and less libertarian and less guaranteeing. of the principles of autonomy and democratic sovereignty that protect or should protect the women and men who individually make up the social strata of a democratic country; It is here where the intellectual contributions of Linz, O'Donnell and Lesgart deserve a reflective approach that can be analyzed, in order to have the ability to explain and understand the complex processes that contradict each other in a delegative democracy with each popular election. The systemic system is more like a political system that transgresses the minimum guarantees that a democracy itself should have.

## INFORMATION SOURCES

### Bibliographical sources

Bassols, M., & Mendoza, C. (2011). *Gobernanza Teoría y prácticas colectivas*. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa.

Bassols, M., & Mendoza, C. (s.f.). *Gobernanza*.

Borgonovi, & Silva, L. (2016). *Ligereza pesada: la poética del conflicto en el diseño estructural de João Vilanova Artigas y Carlos Cascaldi*. ETH Zúrich.

Cadena, J. (2004). *Transiciones a la democracia: visiones críticas*. Universidad Autónoma de México.

Chaguaceda, A., & Caldera, A. (2016). *Democracia en América Latina y el Ideal Utópico y las Realidades políticas*. Editorial Fontamara.

Collier, D. (1985). *El Nuevo Autoritarismo en América Latina*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Dahl, R. (2005). *Poliarquia: Participação e Oposição. Colección "Clássicos"*. Editora da Universidade de São Paulo.

Diamond, L. (2004). *Elecciones sin democracia. A propósito de los regímenes híbridos*. Estudios Políticos.

Díaz, L. A. (2010). *Nicaragua: gobiernos, gobernantes y genealogías*. Federación Internacional de Contadores.

Fernández, G. (2022). *Algunos elementos para comprender mejor lo que ocurre en Nicaragua*. CLACSO, JSTOR.

Linz, J. (1996). *El quiebre de las democracias*. Alianza Editorial.

Linz, J., & Stepan, A. (1978). *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. John Hopkins University Baltimore USA.

Moreira, C., Raus, D., & Gómez, J. (2008). *La nueva política en América Latina: rupturas y continuidades*. Edición Trilce.

O'Donnell, G. (2008). *Tensiones en el Estado burocrático-autoritario y la cuestión de la democracia*. Prometeo.

- O'Donnell, Schmitter, P. C., & Whitehead, L. (1988). *Transiciones Desde los Gobiernos Autoritarios*. Paidós.
- O'Donnell, G. (1972). *Modernización y autoritarismo*. Paidós.
- O'Donnell, G. (1997). *Contrapuntos. Ensayos escogidos sobre autoritarismo y democratización. ¿Democracia delegativa?*. Paidós.
- O'Donnell, G. (2010). *Democracia, agencia y estado: teoría con intención comparativa*. Prometeo.
- O'Donnell, G. (2021). *El estado burocrático autoritario 1966-1973. Triunfos, derrotas y crisis*. Traverse City, Independently published.
- O'Donnell, G., & Schmitter, P. (1986). *Tentative conclusions about uncertain democracies*. Prensa de la Universidad Johns Hopkins.
- O'Donnell, G., Quiroga, H., Acosta, R., Lazzetta, O., & Seminara, E. (1998). *Hacia un nuevo consenso democrático*. Homo Sapiens Ed.
- Overy, R. (2006). *Dictadores*. Tusquets.
- Schumpeter, J. (1950). *Historia de las teorías económicas*. Nueva sociedad.
- Soriano de García-Pelayo, G. (1996). *El personalismo político hispanoamericano del siglo XIX: proposiciones y criterios metodológicos para su estudio*. Monte Ávila Editores.
- Newspaper sources**
- AFP. (2022). Cinco alcaldías ocupadas. *AFP Associated Press Managua*. 1-3.
- Bataillon, G. (2019). Claude Lefort, pensador de lo político. *Revista Nueva Sociedad*. 281, 1-10.
- Chaguaceda, A., & Puerta, M. (2015). Quo Vadis Venezuela: De la democracia delegativa al autoritarismo del Siglo XXI. *Revista Mexicana de Análisis Político y Administración Pública*. 161-188.
- Chaguaceda, N. (2020). Autoritarismo, política local y participación ciudadana en Latinoamérica: miradas cruzadas a los casos de Nicaragua y Venezuela. *América Latina Hoy*, 113-133.
- Diamond, L., & Morlino, L. (2004). La calidad de la democracia: una visión general. *Diario de la democracia*, 20-31.
- El País. (3 de Noviembre de 2021). Encarcelamiento de candidatos opositores en Nicaragua. Periodico El País, pág. 3.
- Garretón, M. (1988). Problems of democracy in Latin America: on the processes of transition and consolidation. *International Journal*. 43 (3), 357-377.
- Geddes, B. (2004). Authoritarian breakdown." Manuscript. Department of Political Science, UCLA (2004). Department of Political Science, UCLA.
- Lesgart, C. (2000). El tránsito teórico de la izquierda intelectual en el Cono Sur de América Latina. *Revista internacional de filosofía política*, 19-41.
- Lesgart, C. (2008). Ciencia política en Argentina: Trazos históricos e historiográficos en perspectiva comparada. *Revista legislativa de estudios sociales y de opinión pública*, 227-268.
- Lesgart, C. (2012). Las metáforas y los conceptos: Ensayo en honor a Guillermo O'Donnell. *Temas y Debates*, 49-58.
- Lesgart, C. (2020). Autoritarismo. Historia y problemas de un concepto contemporáneo fundamental. *Revista Perfiles latinoamericanos. Revista: Perfiles latinoamericanos*. 55.
- Linz, J. (1978). Una interpretación de los regímenes autoritario. *Papers: revista de sociología*, 11-26.
- Linz, J. (1990). *Transiciones a la democracia*. New Haven, Connecticut: Universidad de Yale.
- Maxwell, C. (2018). Dar sentido al autoritarismo competitivo: Lecciones de los Andes. *Política y Sociedad Latinoamericana*, 1-22.
- O'Donnell, G., Quiroga, H., & Iazzetta, O. (2011). *Democracia delegativa*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo. *Revista POSTData: Revista de Reflexión y Análisis Político*, 17(1), 213-215.
- Schmitter, P., & Lynn, T. (1991). Qué es la democracia... y qué no es. *Diario de la democracia*, 75-88.
- Vargas, M. C. (2019). La construcción del sentido común por parte del Gobierno Nacional de Colombia favorecedor del proceso de paz con las Farc-ep (2012-2016). *Universidad Católica de Colombia*.

## Electronic sources

AFP. (2022). Portal informativo.

Arroyo, L. (2021). De Nicaragua a El Salvador: los ataques a la prensa oscurecen cada vez más las democracias en la región. <https://elpais.com/internacional/2021-11-03/los-ataques-a>.

Cantón, S. (2021). CNN en español, Programa Choque de Opiniones.

CIDH. (2021). La CIDH expresa su preocupación por la reforma a la Ley Electoral aprobada en Nicaragua y llama al Estado a garantizar elecciones libres y justas. Más derechos mas gente. <https://www.oas.org/pt/CIDH/jsForm/?File=/es/cidh/prensa/comunicados/2021/122.asp>

CIDH. (2021). La CIDH expresa su preocupación por la reforma a la Ley Electoral aprobada en Nicaragua y llama al Estado a garantizar elecciones libres y justas. Más derechos mas gente. <https://www.oas.org/pt/CIDH/jsForm/?File=/es/cidh/prensa/comunicados/2021/122.asp>

CNN en Español. (2021). Regresa “Choque de opiniones” analizando el momento político de Trump. <https://cnnespanol.cnn.com/video/pandemia-coronavirus-choque-opiniones-politica-trump-elecciones-eeuu-choque-de-opiniones-show-cnne/>

CNN. (2021). Exministro habla del fraude y la abstención en Nicaragua. <https://cnnespanol.cnn.com/tag/elecciones-nicaragua/>

CNN. (2021). Minuto a minuto: elecciones presidenciales en Nicaragua son calificadas de “farsa”. <https://cnnespanol.cnn.com/2021/11/07/elecciones-presidenciales-en-nicaragua-minuto-a-minuto-daniel-ortega/>

Deutsche Welle. (6 de Agosto de 2022). Nicaragua: investigan a obispo por “ejecutar actos de odio”. pág. 2. <https://www.dw.com/es/nicaragua-polic%C3%ADa-investiga-a-obispo-%C3%A1lvarez-por-ejecutar-actos-de-odio/a-62728692>

El país (2021). La pareja tóxica que domina Nicaragua: historia de Daniel Ortega y Rosario Murillo. <https://elpais.com/ideas/2021-12-12/la-pareja-toxica-que-domina-nicaragua-historia-de-daniel-ortega-y-rosario-murillo.html>

Gil, R. (2021). CNN en español, Programa Choque de Opiniones.

Infobae (2022). El régimen de Daniel Ortega quiere exiliar al obispo nicaragüense Ronaldo Álvarez. <https://www.infobae.com/america/america-latina/2022/08/10/denuncian-que-el-regimen-de-daniel-ortega-quiere-exiliar-al-obispo-nicaraguense-rolando-alvarez/>

Infobae (2022). El régimen de Daniel Ortega quiere exiliar al obispo nicaragüense Ronaldo Álvarez. <https://www.infobae.com/america/america-latina/2022/08/10/denuncian-que-el-regimen-de-daniel-ortega-quiere-exiliar-al-obispo-nicaraguense-rolando-alvarez/>

La prensa (2016). Ortega ha destituido 33 ediles desde el 2008. <https://www.laprensani.com/2016/01/21/politica/1972954-ortega-ha-destituido-33-ediles-desde-el-2008>

Pescador, O. (2021). CNN Programa Choque de Opiniones.

Pescador, Octavio. (2021). Brazilian lawmakers debate Rousseff's fate. <https://www.octaviopescador.com/>