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# Introduction

In this paper, we investigate the impact of left-leaning durable populism in Latin America on liberal democracy institutions. We define liberal democracy as a system of institutions that safeguard individual and minority rights against state tyranny or majority rule. The media, policy networks, and academic literature have argued that populism poses a threat to liberal democracy institutions (Casas-Zamora, 2023; Houle & Kenny, 2018; Ludwig, 2022). Our focus is on left-leaning populist regimes, as they have been more prevalent in the region during the early 21st century compared to right-wing populism.

For instance, in Venezuela, Hugo Chávez gained nearly absolute power through two constitutional reforms, abolished term limits, and increased the number of Supreme Court judges from 20 to 32. Canova Gonzáles et al. (2014) analyzed approximately 45,000 court sentences, revealing an absence of government losses in virtually all cases. In Bolivia, the electoral court issued controversial rulings that enabled Evo Morales to run for a fourth term, despite facing term limits. Morales also excluded opposition participation in the constitutional drafting process and resorted to arresting, intimidating, or exiling other opponents based on fabricated allegations of fraud, corruption, or even genocide (Weyland, 2013). In Nicaragua, Daniel Ortega's government came to power by manipulating electoral rules (Pallais, 2009) and subsequently engaged in human rights violations during the repression of protests in 2018, as reported by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (*Nicaragua: Concentración Del Poder y Debilitamiento Del Estado de Derecho*, 2013).

These examples make it evident why populism is perceived as a threat to the republican institutions that serve as checks on democratically elected officials. However, institutional decay in Latin America is not exclusive to populist governments. Coup d’états, persecution of opposition leaders, and the control of state bureaucracy through patronage and corruption have been prevalent throughout Latin American history. This raises the question: would countries prone to electing populist leaders have experienced institutional decay even in the absence of a populist regime?

It is possible that the same underlying characteristics that attract populists are confounding factors influencing institutional decay. Although previous studies have addressed the impact of populism on institutions (Cachanosky & Padilla, 2020; Houle & Kenny, 2018), a potential concern is the lack of control for the fact that populists are more likely to emerge in countries with already weak institutions (Riker, 1982). Indeed, populists do not come to power randomly; they are drawn to notoriously weak institutional environments, enabling them to evade constraints and prolong their stay in power (Kaufman & Stallings, 1991). Therefore, to disentangle these effects and answer tourhe question, we need to examine what would have occurred in each country if a populist leader had not ascended to power.

To identify the causal effect of populism on institutions, we rely on the synthetic control method (SCM) (Abadie, 2021; Abadie et al., 2015; Abadie & Gardeazabal, 2003). This method involves constructing a plausible counterfactual scenario, which is a weighted average of countries sharing similar characteristics to the treated country. Our synthetic counterfactual reflects the weak institutional environment that attracts populists, but none of the donor countries included in the counterfactual actually experienced a populist episode like the ones observed in the treated countries. Consequently, we can estimate the causal effect of populism on liberal democracy institutions by calculating the difference between the synthetic counterfactual and the actual treated country following the populist episode.

Drawing on previous studies (Absher et al., 2020; Bastos et al., 2023; Cachanosky & Padilla, 2020), we focus on five representative episodes of populism: Néstor and Cristina Kirchner's tenure in Argentina (2003-2015); Evo Morales in Bolivia (2006-2019); Rafael Correa's presidency in Ecuador (2007-2016); Daniel Ortega's regime in Nicaragua (2007-present); and Hugo Chávez and Nicolás Maduro's leadership in Venezuela (1999-present). For each of these countries, we estimate a synthetic counterfactual for various indicators of institutional quality.

DISCUSS RESULTS

The structure of this article is as follows. Section II provides an overview of the literature on populism, with a particular emphasis on Latin America. Section III outlines our data and empirical strategy. Section IV presents our findings, while Section V discusses the robustness of our results. Finally, Section VI concludes.

# Causes and Effects of Populism

Our study examines left populism in 21st-century Latin America, adopting the definition proposed by Seligson (2007). According to Seligson, populism in the region involves the belief that institutions of classical liberal democracy, particularly legislatures and courts, are outdated, inefficient, and inconsistent with the true expression of “the people’s will” as interpreted by populist leaders. Populists often claim to represent the people and promise to carry out their will while isolating those who reject it. However, in practice, populism often disregards democratic guarantees such as civil liberties, free expression, and due process.[[1]](#footnote-2)

Contrary to a simplistic interpretation of populist discourse, which suggests that democracy improves by aligning with the will of the people, the reality is quite different. As Seligson (2007) emphasizes, the danger of populism lies in bypassing institutional check and balances. De la Torre (2016) argues that in an environment where institutions are discredited, populist leaders claim to embody the will of the people and override due process and democratic procedures. For instance, Chavez famously stated, “You are not going to reelect Chavez really, you are going to reelect yourselves. The people will reelect the people. Chavez is nothing but an instrument of the people” (quoted in Friedman, 2017). Despite their rhetorical promises, populists ultimately prioritize their own agendas – these regimes are also known for their extreme rent extraction.

However, the ability of Latin American populists to bypass the constraints of liberal democracy can be attributed to the weak institutional environment, which provides fertile ground for populism to thrive. Kaufman and Stallings (1991) argue that the rise of populism is associated with unstable coalitions that are characteristic of emerging democracies in Latin America. Moreover, besides coalition fragility, the institutional environment in the region promotes social conflict. Sachs (1990) posits that high inequality generates a demand for change, and populists capitalize on this by promising redistribution for the poor. This observation has led to various avenues of research. Sachs (1990) and Dornbusch and Edwards (1990) elucidate the macroeconomic policies of populists, which often lead to detrimental consequences at the end of the “populist cycle.” By neglecting the adverse effects of fiscal deficits and expansionary monetary policy, populists prioritize income redistribution at any cost, ultimately causing inflation and reducing real wages. As a result, Rodrik (2018, p. 196) contends that populism consists of “irresponsible, unsustainable policies that often end in disaster and hurt most the ordinary people they purportedly aim to help.”

Recent studies have attempted to quantify the effects of populist policies. Houle and Kenny (2018) analyze changes in post-tax Gini coefficients to investigate the impact of populism on income inequality, but find no evidence of greater redistribution efforts under populist governments compared to non-populist ones. Strobl et al. (2023) obtain similar results using a different empirical strategy. Funke et al. (2020) find that countries experience a 10 percent lower income per capita relative to the counterfactual in the 15 years following a populist government. This finding aligns with the results of Cachanosky and Padilla (2020).

Our study is similar in nature to the works of Grier and Maynard (2016) and Absher et al. (2020), as we examine the effects of populist governments in Latin America using a synthetic control approach. While the former study focuses solely on the impact of Hugo Chavez’s regime in Venezuela, the latter expands the analysis to include Bolivia, Ecuador, and Nicaragua. Both studies find that, on average, populist governments significantly impact income levels (except for dollarized Ecuador). They also explore potential effects on child mortality and inequality, as populists tend to prioritize these “social” outcomes over economic growth. However, neither study investigates the effects on institutional outcomes.

In contrast, Houle and Kenny (2018) explore the impact of populism on democratic institutions using various measures. Their sample includes 19 Latin American countries from 1982 to 2012, comprising 15 populist governments of both left- and right-wing orientations. Their findings indicate that populist governments are associated with a reduction in all measures of democratic constraints, while having no effect on voter turnout. Cachanosky and Padilla (2019) also observe institutional and economic decline following left-leaning populist governments in the 21st century, focusing on indicators such as GDP per capita, economic freedom, freedom of the press, and governance. However, these studies do not fully address the endogeneity problem discussed earlier.

Our study addresses these gaps in the existing literature and offers important contributions. While previous studies predominantly focus on economic outcomes, our research explores the institutional impact of populism. Considering that institutions play a crucial role in long-term growth (Rodrik et al., 2004), our study provides potential mechanisms to explain the poor economic outcomes during populist regimes and it long-run negative effects on economic activity. Furthermore, since constitutional-level institutions are more resistant to change, we can better understand why these effects endure following populist regimes.

# Selection of Left-Leaning Populist Regimes

As mentioned above, we look at five iconic and representative cases of Latin American left-leaning populist regimes. Our selection of populist regimes is consistent with recent literature. Some studies may focus on some countries and other studies on other countries. Yet, these five cases are commonly identified as populist regimes in the literature. Our selection is also consistent with V-Dem’s populism index as well as typical policies carried by these political movements (Table 1).

Table 1. Left-Leaning Populist regimes in Latin America

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Argentina | Bolivia | Ecuador | Nicaragua | Venezuela |
| Presidential terms | 2003-2015 | 2006-2019 | 2007-2017 | 2007-2020 | 1999-2020 |
| V-Party populism index (avg.) | 0.83 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 0.69 | 0.99 |
| Constitutional reforms | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Attacks on judicial independence | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Expropriation / Nationalization | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Sources: V-Dem and Absher, Grier, and Grier (2020, p. 789). | | | | | |

Additionally, these countries represent long-lasting regimes (at least a decade), which includes enough time to capture institutional effects of populist governments. These are also politically powerful regimes. Except for Argentina, all other four regimes were able to reform their national constitutions.[[2]](#footnote-3) All of them carried on expropriations or nationalizations as well as attacks on judiciary independence.

# Empirical Method and Results

## Empirical Strategy

Our empirical methodology follows the approach used by Absher, et al. (2020). Firstly, we conduct a SCM for each country. We utilize the same donor pool in each SCM. However, we select the predictor variables to minimize the pre-treatment root mean square prediction error (RMSPE) for each country. For each country we look at 10 years before and after the left-leaning populist regime takes office.

To mitigate potential overfitting, we limit our donor pool to 27 countries. Our donor pool is similar to previous SCM studies conducted in Latin America (Absher et al., 2020; Cachanosky et al., 2023; Grier & Maynard, 2016; Spruk, 2019). The donor pool includes Latin American countries that are comparable to the countries with a populist regime but have not experienced a populist shock. Additionally, we include comparable countries from other regions to account for potential spill-over and loop effects from the populist regimes to other Latin American countries. It is important to note that, in all five SCM estimations, Latin American countries are given higher weighting than non-Latin American countries (see Table 2).

Table 2. Synthetic weights for each country

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Donor | Argentina | Bolivia | Ecuador | Nicaragua | Venezuela |
| Algeria | - | - | 0.027 | 0.119 | - |
| Australia | - | - | - | - | - |
| Austria | 0.238 | - | - | - | - |
| Belgium | - | - | - | - | - |
| Brazil | 0.546 | - | 0.072 | - | 0.147 |
| Canada | - | 0.158 | - | - | - |
| Chile | - | - | - | - | - |
| Colombia | 0.073 | - | 0.519 | 0.881 | - |
| Costa Rica | - | - | - | - | 0.448 |
| Denmark | - | - | - | - | - |
| France | - | - | - | - | - |
| Germany | - | - | - | - | - |
| Guatemala | - | - | - | - | - |
| Italy | - | 0.199 | 0.015 | - | - |
| Japan | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mexico | - | - | - | - | - |
| Netherlands | - | - | 0.091 | - | - |
| Nigeria | 0.144 | - | - | - | 0.196 |
| Paraguay | - | 0.644 | 0.169 | - | - |
| Peru | - | - | - | - | 0.089 |
| Portugal | - | - | - | - | - |
| Spain | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sweden | - | - | - | - | - |
| Thailand | - | - | 0.106 | - | - |
| Turkey | - | - | - | - | - |
| United Kingdom | - | - | - | - | - |
| Uruguay | - | - | - | - | 0.121 |
| Latin America | 0.619 | 0.644 | 0.760 | 0.881 | 0.805 |
| Non-Latin America | 0.381 | 0.356 | 0.240 | 0.119 | 0.195 |
| RMSPE | 0.774 |  |  |  |  |

Our independent variable is the Liberal Democracy index provided by V-Dem, which ranges from 0 (low) to 1 (high). A lower value indicates weak protection of individual and minority rights against an authoritarian state, as well as a lack of limits on executive power. Similarly, a low index signifies weak constitutional protection of civil liberties, absence of the rule of law, and a lack of judicial independence.[[3]](#footnote-4) We posit that changes in the V-Dem index not only serve as a reliable measure of the institutional impact of populism but also reflect the desired institutional qualities necessary for achieving a prosperous civil society and sustainable long-term economic development.

To assess the statistical significance of our results, we employ standardized *p-values*. These *p-values* are calculated by conducting an in-place placebo tests and estimating the proportion of effects that are greater than or equal to the effect of the treated unit (Abadie et al., 2015, p. 500). To obtain a standardized *p-value*, we divide each country's treatment effect by its pre-treatment RMSPE (Galiani & Quistorff, 2017). A standardized *p-value* assigns different weights to donors based on the quality of their fit. Intuitively, countries with poor fits are expected to yield larger effects than those with a good fit, which would amplify *p-value* estimation making them too conservative. Furthermore, we rescale all V-Dem indices from a range of 0-to-1 to a range of 0-to-100.

Our donor variables are predictors of the V-Dem Liberal Democracy Index, either because they are one of their components or because they correlate due to measuring related qualities.

Table 3. Predictor variables and sources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Predictor variable | Source |
| Electoral democracy index | V-Dem |
| Freedom of expression | V-Dem |
| Public sector corrupt charges | V-Dem |
| Government attack on the judiciary | V-Dem |
| Clientelism index | V-Dem |
| Presidentialism index | V-Dem |
| Voice and accountability | World Governance Indicators |
| Rule of law | World Governance Indicators |
| Control of corruption | World Governance Indicators |
| Corruption | International Country Risk Guide |
| Economic freedom of the world (EFW) | Fraser Institute |
| PolityV | Center for Systemic Peace |

## Average Results

We will first present our average results. To obtain these results, we begin by centering all independent SCM findings on the year when a populist regime assumes government. Next, we calculate the average SCM estimation and the average V-Dem Liberal Democracy Index. The difference between these two averages represents the average effect.

The average results are of significant institutional importance. In the range of 0 to 100, the difference between the average V-Dem Liberal Democracy Index and its synthetic counterfactual amounts to 25. This indicates a substantial impact of left-leaning populism on liberal democracy institutions. Notably, this impact is not only significant but also long-lasting. Over a span of nine consecutive years, the institutions of a liberal democracy experience a rapid deterioration.

There are two noteworthy characteristics to highlight. Firstly, on average, populist regimes emerge in countries with a value just below 54, exhibiting a slight upward trend. Secondly, the SCM estimates indicate an increase in the index, approaching a value of 60. Instead of witnessing a sharp decline in their liberal democracy institutions, our left-leaning populist countries should have experienced a positive effect with a 10-point increase in the V-Dem Liberal Democracy Index.

Figure 1. Institutional impact of Left-Leaning populism, average results

## Individual Results

### Argentina

BRIEF DISCUSSION ABOUT POPULIST GOVERNMENT IN ARGENTINA

Table 4. Predictor balance: Argentina

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Predictors | Treated | Synthetic |
| WGI: Voice and Accountability | 0.35 | 0.34 |
| WGI: Rule of Law | -0.25 | 0.06 |
| V-Dem: Electoral Democracy Index | 0.83 | 0.75 |
| V-Dem: Freedom of Expression | 0.94 | 0.89 |
| V-Dem: Clientelism Index | 0.46 | 0.43 |
| EFW | 6.84 | 6.16 |
| Liberal democracy index (1994) | 63.00 | 62.76 |
| Liberal democracy index (1997) | 62.50 | 62.76 |
| Liberal democracy index (1998) | 62.80 | 62.91 |
| Liberal democracy index (2002) | 65.90 | 66.67 |

Figure 2. Synthetic control: Argentina
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Table 5. Post-treatment effects and standardized p-values: Argentina

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Effect | Standardized p-value |
| 2003 | -1.1229 | .3704 |
| 2004 | -0.9602 | .4074 |
| 2005 | -1.7520 | .3333 |
| 2006 | -3.4377 | .2222 |
| 2007 | -4.0200 | .1111 |
| 2008 | -5.2922 | .0740 |
| 2009 | -6.5380 | .0740 |
| 2010 | -7.5213 | .0740 |
| 2011 | -10.0502 | .0000 |
| 2012 | -9.8959 | .0000 |

### Bolivia

BRIEF DISCUSSION ABOUT POPULIST GOVERNMENT IN BOLIVIA

Table 6. Predictor balance: Bolivia

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Predictors | Treated | Synthetic |
| V-Dem: Electoral democracy index | 0.75 | 0.65 |
| V-Dem: Presidentialism index | 0.31 | 0.23 |
| ICRG: Corruption | 2.69 | 2.56 |
| PolityV | 8.80 | 8.14 |
| Liberal democracy index (1998) | 52.60 | 52.40 |
| Liberal democracy index (2000) | 53.00 | 52.68 |
| Liberal democracy index (2002) | 51.50 | 52.37 |
| Liberal democracy index (2004) | 54.90 | 55.09 |

Figure 3. Synthetic control: Bolivia
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Table 7. Post-treatment effects and standardized p-values: Bolivia

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Effect | Standardized p-value |
| 2005 | -0.6112 | .6296 |
| 2006 | -8.3304 | .0370 |
| 2007 | -9.6000 | .0370 |
| 2008 | -12.6708 | .0000 |
| 2009 | -15.0504 | .0000 |
| 2010 | -18.2648 | .0000 |
| 2011 | -17.9904 | .0000 |
| 2012 | -17.3004 | .0000 |
| 2013 | -13.1412 | .0370 |
| 2014 | -14.6372 | .0370 |

### Ecuador

BRIEF DISCUSSION ABOUT POPULIST GOVERNMENT IN ECUADOR

Table 8. Predictor balance: Ecuador

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Predictors | Treated | Synthetic |
| V-Dem: Government attacks on the judiciary | 0.61 | 0.66 |
| ICRG: Corruption | 2.88 | 2.46 |
| PolityV | 7.00 | 7.27 |
| EFW | 6.09 | 6.56 |
| Liberal democracy index (1997) | 47.20 | 46.86 |
| Liberal democracy index (2002) | 46.80 | 47.07 |
| Liberal democracy index (2003) | 47.90 | 47.57 |
| Liberal democracy index (2006) | 46.60 | 47.10 |

Figure 4. Synthetic control: Ecuador

A screenshot of a graph

Description automatically generated

Table 9. Post-treatment effects and standardized p-values: Ecuador

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Effect | Standardized p-value |
| 2007 | -6.0345 | 0.0000 |
| 2008 | -15.5436 | 0.0000 |
| 2009 | -17.7037 | 0.0000 |
| 2010 | -20.9570 | 0.0000 |
| 2011 | -23.4837 | 0.0000 |
| 2012 | -23.7772 | 0.0000 |
| 2013 | -25.6975 | 0.0000 |
| 2014 | -24.2148 | 0.0000 |
| 2015 | -23.9617 | 0.0000 |
| 2016 | -23.3454 | 0.0000 |

### Nicaragua

BRIEF DISCUSSION ABOUT POPULIST GOVERNMENT IN NICARAGUA

Table 10. Predictor balance: Nicaragua

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Predictors | Treated | Synthetic |
| WGI: Voice and accountability | -0.02 | -0.47 |
| WGI: Control of corruption | -0.65 | -0.37 |
| V-Dem: Freedom of expression | 0.88 | 0.73 |
| V-Dem: Government attacks on the judiciary | -0.63 | -0.59 |
| PolityV | 8.00 | 5.93 |
| Liberal democracy index (1996) | 45.80 | 39.94 |
| Liberal democracy index (2001) | 37.70 | 39.11 |
| Liberal democracy index (2002) | 38.20 | 38.84 |
| Liberal democracy index (2004) | 37.80 | 39.41 |

Figure 5. Synthetic control: Nicaragua
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Table 11. Post-treatment effects and standardized p-values: Nicaragua

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Effect | Standardized p-value |
| 2006 | -7.8672 | .1481 |
| 2007 | -19.4264 | .0000 |
| 2008 | -21.2368 | .0370 |
| 2009 | -22.1240 | .0370 |
| 2010 | -25.5888 | .0370 |
| 2011 | -29.4280 | .0370 |
| 2012 | -32.9152 | .0370 |
| 2013 | -36.1152 | .0370 |
| 2014 | -36.8384 | .0370 |
| 2015 | -37.0512 | .0370 |

### Venezuela

Table 12. Predictor balance: Venezuela

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Predictors | Treated | Synthetic |
| WGI: Voice and accountability | 0.01 | 0.34 |
| V-Dem: Freedom of expression | 0.90 | 0.85 |
| V-Dem: Public sector corrupt charges | -5.53 | 0.06 |
| ICRG: Corruption | 3.00 | 3.77 |
| PolityV | 8.36 | 5.95 |
| EFW | 5.15 | 5.79 |
| Liberal democracy index (1988) | 59.10 | 58.61 |
| Liberal democracy index (1991) | 62.60 | 62.86 |
| Liberal democracy index (1994) | 60.70 | 60.66 |
| Liberal democracy index (1997) | 60.90 | 61.11 |

Figure 6. Synthetic control: Venezuela
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Table 13. Post-treatment effects and standardized p-values: Venezuela

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Effect | Standardized p-value |
| 1998 | -18.5353 | .0000 |
| 1999 | -35.1260 | .0000 |
| 2000 | -40.6369 | .0000 |
| 2001 | -44.3190 | .0000 |
| 2002 | -44.7635 | .0000 |
| 2003 | -47.3576 | .0000 |
| 2004 | -51.2047 | .0000 |
| 2005 | -52.3614 | .0000 |
| 2006 | -52.7712 | .0000 |
| 2007 | -53.7754 | .0000 |

# Conclusions

# References

1. Abadie, A. (2021). Using Synthetic Controls: Feasibility, Data Requirements, and Methodological Aspects. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *59*(2), 391–425. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20191450
2. Abadie, A., Diamond, A., & Hainmueller, J. (2015). Comparative Politics and the Synthetic Control Method. *American Journal of Political Science*, *59*(2), 495–510. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12116
3. Abadie, A., & Gardeazabal, J. (2003). The Economic Cost of Conflict: A Case Study of the Basque Country. *The American Economic Review*, *93*(1), 113–132.
4. Absher, S., Grier, K., & Grier, R. (2020). The Economic Consequences of Durable Left-Populist Regimes in Latin America. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *177*, 787–817. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2020.07.001
5. Abts, K., & Rummens, S. (2007). Populism versus Democracy. *Political Studies*, *55*(2), 405–424. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00657.x
6. Bastos, J. P., Cachanosky, N., & Faintich, T. (2023). *Macroeconomic Populism in the 21st Century: Revisiting Dornbusch and Edwards* [Preprint]. SSRN. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4445116
7. Cachanosky, N., Ocampo, E., Hernández, K., & Ramseur, J. (2023). Synthetic Control Analysis of Ecuador’s Dollarization. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3678055
8. Cachanosky, N., & Padilla, A. (2019). Latin American Populism in the 21st Century. *The Independent Review*, *24*(2), 209–266. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3147096
9. Cachanosky, N., & Padilla, A. (2020). A Panel Data Analysis of Latin American Populism. *Constitutional Political Economy*, *31*(3), 329–343. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10602-020-09302-w
10. Canova Gonzáles, A., Herrera Orellana, L., Rodríguez, R., & Graterol, G. (2014). *El TSJ al Servicio de la Revolución*. Editorial Galipan.
11. Casas-Zamora, K. (2023). Look at Latin America. This is How Democracies Die. *The New York Times*.
12. de la Torre, C. (2013). In the Name of the People: Democratization, Popular Organizations, and Populism in Venezuela, Bolivia, and Ecuador. *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, *95*, 27–48.
13. de la Torre, C. (2016). Populism and the Politics of the Extraordinary in Latin America. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, *21*(2), 121–139. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2016.1150137
14. de la Torre, C. (2017). Populism and Nationalism in Latin America. *Javnost - The Public*, *24*(4), 375–390. https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2017.1330731
15. Dornbusch, R., & Edwards, S. (1990). Macroeconomic Populism. *Journal of Development Economics*, *32*(2), 247–277.
16. Dornbusch, R., & Edwards, S. (Eds.). (1992). *The Macroeconomics of Populism in Latin America*. University of Chicago Press.
17. Doyle, D. (2011). The Legitimacy of Political Institutions: Explaining Contemporary Populism in Latin America. *Comparative Political Studies*, *44*(11), 1447–1473.
18. Edwards, S. (2010). *Left Behind: Latin America and the False Promise of Populism*. Chicago University Press.
19. Friedman, U. (2017, June 4). How Populism Helped Wreck Venezuela. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2017/06/venezuela-populism-fail/525321/
20. Funke, M., Schularick, Moritz, & Trebesch, C. (2020). *Populism Leaders and the Economy* (No. 15405; CEPR Discussion Paper). Center for Economic and Policy Research.
21. Galiani, S., & Quistorff, B. (2017). The synth\_runner Package: Utilities to Automate Synthetic Control Estimation Using Synth. *The Stata Journal*, *17*(4), 834–849.
22. Grier, K., & Maynard, N. (2016). The Economic Consequences of Hugo Chavez: A Synthetic Control Analysis. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *125*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2015.12.011
23. Houle, C., & Kenny, P. D. (2018). The Political and Economic Consequences of Populist Rule in Latin America. *Government and Opposition*, *53*(2), 256–287. https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2016.25
24. Kaufman, R. R., & Stallings, B. (1991). The Political Economy of Latin American Populism. In *The Macroeconomics of Populism in Latin America* (pp. 15–43). University of Chicago Press.
25. Laclau, E. (2005). *On Populist Reason*. Verso.
26. Lawson, R., Grier, K., & Absher, S. (2019). You say you want a (Rose) Revolution? The effects of Georgia’s 2004 market reforms. *Economics of Transition and Institutional Change*, *27*(1), 301–323. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecot.12205
27. Ludwig, J. (2022). *Can Democracy in Latin America Survive the Populist Temptation?* (Democracy Talks). George W. Bush Presidential Center. https://www.bushcenter.org/publications/can-democracy-in-latin-america-survive-the-populist-temptation
28. Magness, P. W., & Makovi, M. (2023). The Mainstreaming of Marx: Measuring the Effect of the Russian Revolution on Karl Marx’s Influence. *Journal of Political Economy*, *131*(6), 1507–1545. https://doi.org/10.1086/722933
29. Mudde, C. (2004). The Populist Zeitgeist. *Government and Opposition*, *39*(4), 541–563. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-7053.2004.00135.x
30. Mudde, C. (2007). *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*.
31. *Nicaragua: Concentración del Poder y Debilitamiento del Estado de Derecho* (Technical Report). (2013). CIDH.
32. Ocampo, E. (2019). *The Economic Analysis of Populism: A Selective Review of the Literature* (Documentos de Trabajo). UCEMA.
33. Pallais, E. (2009). Rule of Law in Nicaragua: The Consequences of Governing by “El Pacto.” *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1440944
34. Riker, W. H. (1982). *Liberalism Against Populism: A Confrontation Between the Theory of Democracy and the Theory of Social Choice* (Issue 1988). Waveland Pr Inc.
35. Rode, M., & Revuelta, J. (2015). The Wild Bunch! An empirical note on populism and economic institutions. *Economics of Governance*, *16*(1), 73–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10101-014-0154-5
36. Rodrik, D. (2018). Is Populism Necessarily Bad Economics? *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, *108*(May), 196–199. https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20181122
37. Rodrik, D., Subramanian, A., & Trebbi, F. (2004). Institutions Rule: The Primacy of Institutions Over Geography and Integration in Economic Development. *Journal of Economic Growth*, *9*(2), 131–165. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOEG.0000031425.72248.85
38. Sachs, J. D. (1990). Social Conflict and Populist Policies in Latin America. In R. Brunetta & C. Dell’Aringa (Eds.), *Labour Relations and Economic Performance* (pp. 137–169).
39. Seligson, M. A. (2007). The Rise of Populism and the Left in Latin America. *Journal of Democracy*, *18*(3), 81–95. https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2007.0057
40. Spruk, R. (2019). The Rise and Fall of Argentina. *Latin American Economic Review*, *28*(16), 16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40503-019-0076-2
41. Strobl, M., Sáenz De Viteri, A., Rode, M., & Bjørnskov, C. (2023). Populism and inequality: Does reality match the populist rhetoric? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *207*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2023.01.010
42. Weyland, K. (2013). Latin America’s Authoritarian Drift. *Journal of Democracy*, *24*(3), 18–32.

1. Other definitions certainly exist, but they tend to focus on specific features of populists, such as their rhetoric (de la Torre, 2013; Laclau, 2005), its economic paradigm (Dornbusch & Edwards, 1992; Edwards, 2010; Ocampo, 2019; Rode & Revuelta, 2015; Sachs, 1990), or its political and ideological features (Abts & Rummens, 2007; de la Torre, 2016, 2017; Doyle, 2011). In special, the economic definitions are certainly complementary as the populists in our sample could easily be defined as “macroeconomic populists" as well (Bastos et al., 2023; Dornbusch & Edwards, 1990). We follow Seligson (2007) because it focuses on the institutional effects of populists. Another broader definition (though not necessarily intended for Latin America) is that of Mudde (2004, 2007). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Cristina Kirchner failed to reform the constitution since she did not have enough representation in Cogress to move forward a proposal. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. V-Dem’s codebook (v13 – March 2023), defines its liberal democracy index as follows: “The liberal principle of democracy emphasizes the importance of protecting individual and minority rights against the tyranny of the state and the tyranny of the majority. The liberal model takes a "negative" view of political power insofar as it judges the quality of democracy by the limits placed on government. This is achieved by constitutionally protected civil liberties, strong rule of law, an independent judiciary, and effective checks and balances that, together, limit the exercise of executive power” (p. 45). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)