

I will take the Alan McPherson's "Anti-Americanism in Latin-America and the Caribbean. "False Populism" or Coming Full Circle?" reading and cast a link between it and the chapter "Freedom to Choose" from Joseph E. Stiglitz's *Globalization and Its Discontents*. The main purpose is to demonstrate that the recent anti-neoliberal governments in Latin America are, indeed, the culminating phase of a "full circle" that had its last straw in the Washington Consensus' measures handed over to the region.

In "Anti-Americanism in Latin-America and the Caribbean. "False Populism" or Coming Full Circle?" McPherson propounds the existence of a cycle that explains the changes in the strategies within Latin American anti-Americanism through the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The cycle is arranged into three stages, each of which responds to a nation-state model. Such models shape the possibilities of active opposition to America and America's activity in the region. The first stage is represented by "marginal non-state actors" (McPherson 2007, 51) organized to attack the institutions built by U.S. intervention around the 1920s. In the case of the second stage, in the 1950s, elite state actors are the propellers of a social revolution against corrupt dictatorships that indirectly undermine U.S. influence. In the current decade the model in question is that of a state ruled by actors who come "from the interior plains" (McPherson 2007, 65): the socially marginalized. This is the reason why they "[identify their] state with the fortunes of the traditionally marginalized." (McPherson 2007, 68). This last stage's state, according to McPherson, upholds a resolute anti-American attitude as a response to the American-crafted neo-liberalism as well as globalization. Though the principal representatives such as Hugo Chávez are "guilty of over-heated rhetoric" (McPherson 2007, 68), they are successfully taking control of the state resources and turning them against powerful U.S. interests in their countries.

Joseph Stiglitz's chapter explains how the employment of the Washington Consensus works in the developing countries. Based on its three fundamental pillars –fiscal austerity, privatization and market liberalization- the author demonstrates, first, that such a program is not what developing countries need to grow and, second, that it's not developing as such, namely, as a consensus: the recipients don't have *freedom to choose*. The text stands up for most neo-liberal policies that the Washington Consensus aims to promote. However, it opposes the way they were implemented in the 80s in poor countries, that is to say, as ends. For Stiglitz those poor nations must make use of these policies as means to achieve "significant efficiency gains" (Stiglitz 2002, 53) –it's not clear if with this the author means development, economic growth, or otherwise. Nonetheless the thread suggests is referred to an economic and social development.- Additionally, this policies should be applied in a restrained, slow manner –through "sequencing and pacing" (Stiglitz 2002, 73)- for them to produce any benefit.

As questioned from Stiglitz's title and suggested all along McPherson's article the Consensus was created by economists through the International Money Fund to be implemented –if not imposed- in the developing countries in Latin America, one could say, as an experiment. Without the "sequencing and pacing" of the three anchors of the WC, plus the encouragement of foreign investment, poor legal systems and market-regulating institutions, which is the case of most of the Consensus' countries, national industries are now incapable of competing with foreign corporations, a reason for bankruptcy and more unemployment. It's not very difficult to understand why Stiglitz –and the third stage governments- states that insisting on the liberalization of the market is an act of hypocrisy. These agreements are quite unfair for poor countries, as they are, in the general run of things, signed by corrupt governments. It could be argued that such policies are directed towards enrichment but not development, nations' growth nor the relief of poverty.