THE TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY IN IBERIA

THE TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY IN IBERIA:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS
OF
DEMOCRATIC GENESIS

By

KEVIN FAWCETT, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

September 1989

MASTER OF ARTS (1989) McMASTER UNIVERSITY
(Political Science) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Transition to Democracy in Iberia:
A Comparative Analysis of Democratic Genesis

AUTHOR: Kevin Fawcett, B.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Michael Stein

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 245

ABSTRACT

In the mid-seventies Spain and Portugal, along with Greece, witnessed the transformation of their political systems from long term authoritarian rule to pluralistic democracies. Since that time several other countries have gone through similar transitions. This thesis attempts to deal with some of the questions raised by this apparent trend towards democratization. Specifically, an attempt will be made to discover which factors are most reponsible for the transition from an authoritarian political system to a liberal democracy. In order to examine this question, a comparative study of the Spanish and Portuguese cases will be undertaken.

By examining this question, this thesis delves into an area of comparative politics where there has been relatively little theorizing. Political scientists have tended to be more concerned with what sustains an already functioning democracy rather than attempting to explain what causes the transition to democracy. Of the few theories developed, Dankwart Rustow's sequential theory of democratic transition appears to offer the most useful framework, but is inadequate insofar as his framework is merely skeletal. This thesis will attempt to build upon Rustow's theory by rejecting those parts of his theory which are unsatisfactory, as well as attempting to fill in the gaps caused by his vagueness.

Since Rustow's framework is concerned with political developments over a long period of a country's history, this thesis will use a historical approach to the Iberian cases, and will examine political events in these two countries from the beginning of this century. It will be shown that the behaviour and attitudes of the political elites in the two countries were shaped by their historical experience. Spain's elites adopted a preference for compromise due to the extreme violence of the Spanish Civil War, while the Portuguese transition exhibited a great deal more conflict due to the absence of a historical tragedy equivalent to the Spanish Civil War.

On the basis of an examination of the transitions, it will be contended that democracy emerges because of the decision of political elites to put aside their differences and work towards the installation of democracy. Thus, the thesis takes issue with the common perception that democracy emerges because of a popular uprising. In neither case is mass pressure more than a minor factor. But here the cases diverge. In Spain the elites are conditioned to compromise because of historical experience, a balance of forces, a desire to become a part of Europe and a preference for democratic values. In contrast, democracy was achieved with difficulty in Portugal because the impulse to compromise was missing due to the absence of these conditions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give special thanks to my thesis supervisor, Professor Michael Stein, not only for his guidance and advice throughout the production of this thesis, but also for his extra assistance during the final phase. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Professor Henry Jacek and Profesor William Chandler, for their time and consideration.

Of course, I must thank my parents, both for their vital role in bringing me to a place where I was able to undertake this project, and for their assistance and support over the last year. Finally, I give special thanks to Elise, whose support helped me to quell my anxieties during the final throes of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

For a quarter century after the Second World War, Western Europe, from the northern tip of Scandinavia to France's southern borders along the Pyrenees, witnessed essentially stable, democratic regimes. During the same period of time, the countries of Southern Europe have been ruled by authoritarian regimes or unstable democracies. Of the countries of Southern Europe, the two on the Iberian peninsula featured the most stable authoritarian regimes. By the end of the sixties these regimes had between them been in existence for a total of seventy three years, and their continued existence seemed quite likely. Thus, two seemingly anachronistic regimes continued to exist in Western Europe, where democratic regimes were the rule. However, in the mid-seventies both countries saw the dismantling of their long-term dictatorships, and the installation of democratic regimes similar to those in the rest of Western Europe.

In Portugal, between 1932 and 1968, Antonio de Oliveira Salazar attempted to establish a state-corporatist system. With Salazar's death in 1969, the regime stumbled on for five more years under Marcello Caetano before a military coup deposed the Salazarist regime. After two years of turmoil, in which the transition to democracy seemed unlikely, a liberal democracy emerged. In Spain, a regime-led transition to pluralistic democracy occurred within two years

of the death of Francisco Franco in 1975. Thus, in both countries on the Iberian peninsula, long term authoritarian rule ended at approximately the same time, and has been successfully replaced by pluralist democracies, each of which has now witnessed nearly a decade and a half of stable democratic rule.

Furthermore, the transitions in Iberia occurred at relatively the same time as the transformation in Greece, and they have been followed by democratic transitions in Latin American countries such as Argentina, Peru and Brazil, and a process of greater democratization in countries such as South Korea, the Philippines, Hungary, Poland and even the Soviet Union. This trend suggests that a study of recent transitions to democracy is overdue. There has been little exploration of this area as most democratic systems have been studied in order to determine what sustains them. Since the most frequently studied political theorists have tended to reside in Western countries, their interests have usually been focussed upon democratic stability. As well, data are more readily available in Western countries, and this makes them far easier to study. Furthermore, since democratic political regimes have been imposed on some of the world's current democracies by outside forces, such as colonization or occupation, the causes of democratization in these cases is obvious. But, with the vast majority of the world's nations continuing to be governed by non-democratic regimes, the

question of what leads to an internal transformation to democracy remains of utmost importance. Since Spain and Portugal, along with Greece, appear to have been the first examples of the recent trend towards democratization, these two countries provide an excellent opportunity to probe the causes of the emergence of democratic political systems. The purpose of this thesis will be to determine which of the various factors, such as class structure, economic structure, mass political culture, elite behaviour and attitudes, elite accomodation, institutions, and international pressure, are most important in generating democratic transition.

Spain and Portugal are particularly appropriate for this study since they share many similarities. Most importantly they share somewhat similar cultures. Pridham suggests that the cultures of all Southern European countries resemble each other enough to make these countries appropriate for comparative study.[1] Indeed it is quite conceivable that Portugal, instead of attaining separate statehood, could have become simply a regional nationality within Spain, just like Catalonia and the Basque region. In any case, despite the fact that Portugal established its independence in the 17th century, the countries remain alike in many respects, as we shall see below. Thus, by comparing Spain and Portugal, two countries with similar cultures, the cultural variable can be controlled to some extent, making comparison easier.

First, the political cultures of the two Iberian countries have been shaped by somewhat similar historical backgrounds. Once great colonial powers, both countries have seen their international standing drastically diminished. The memory of their past greatness has weighed heavily upon modern leaders, whose records have been unfairly compared to the accomplishments of the past. A desire to reclaim former greatness is one factor which helps to explain both how the dictatorships came into being and how they maintained power for so long. This was especially the case in Portugal, where Salazar attempted to hold on to overseas possessions long after other European imperialists had relinquished theirs.

As well, both countries have lacked a history of democratic government. Their constitutional monarchies of the nineteenth century featured manipulated election results and little respect on the part of monarchs for parliamentary rule. Both countries had a brief experience with republican regimes, which were characterized by unstable governments and political violence. Spain's Second Republic resulted in total breakdown, and led directly to the extremely bloody Civil War. Thus, the people of Iberia had experienced nothing to endear them to democratic rule. Indeed, they associated democracy with disorder, instability and violence. Their history has also demonstrated to them that pursuing their interests without regard for compromise, which was the cultural pattern during their respective republics, has led

to disaster.

One of the major sources of conflict during the republics was the confrontation between supporters of the Catholic Church and anti-clerics. Both countries have been dominated by the Catholic Church. It was a major pillar of the authoritarian regimes, and the withdrawal of its support was one of the important developments leading to the breakdown of the dictatorships.

The populations of the two countries have also experienced a fair degree of attitudinal transformation. Education levels increased during the time of the dictatorships, while the influx of tourists combined with the migration of workers to other European countries has meant that the population has been exposed to political ideas previously little known on the peninsula.

Despite these similarities, there is one major cultural difference which could still have important implications for the future of democracy in Spain. Portugal is a culturally homogenous nation. In contrast, Spain is culturally diverse, with a high degree of ethnic consciousness in the Basque region, Catalonia, and Galicia, and with each region having a language differing significantly from Castilian.[2] One of the major causes of the right-wing backlash against the Republic was the efforts of these regions to gain autonomy. The Franco years saw a virulent repression of ethnic aspirations, resulting in

terrorism in the Basque lands. The democratic regime is still attempting to deal with regional demands for autonomy, and although it has met some of these demands, democracy continues to be threatened by the possibility of a military reaction to terrorism.

Cultural changes have occurred in tandem with, and perhaps because of, the high degree of economic development which has occurred on the peninsula. At the beginning of the authoritarian regimes, both countries had relatively underdeveloped, agrarian economies. Since, the 1920s and 30s, both countries have become increasingly industrialized, although Portugal compares poorly with Spain, since Portugal remains at levels of development comparable to the most advanced countries of the Third World.[3]

With industrialization, both countries have become increasingly urbanized, although Portugal lags far behind Spain. In Spain, the number of people living in large urban centres has increased from 57% in 1960 to 70% in 1975. In contrast, Portugal's level of urbanization was still only 29% in 1975, although 19.2% of the Portuguese live in Lisbon.[4] As well, the composition of the labour force had changed drastically. The proportion of the labour force employed in agriculture has fallen from 42% to 26% in Spain, and from 44% to 33% in Portugal, during the period from 1960 to 1975.[5]

Thus, although both countries underwent economic development, in absolute terms Portugal remains

underdeveloped. This fact, suggests that the contemporaneous transitions in the two countries may have been merely coincidental. In support of this notion that democracy evolved through different processes in the two countries is the fact that each country achieved democracy in a totally different way. In Portugal a faction of the army, the MFA, staged a coup due to dissatisfaction with the conduct of the war being waged against liberation movements in the African colonies. But, this coup did not lead directly to democracy. Instead, various factions within the MFA were involved in a two year struggle for power. The movement had become radicalized and two of the factions favoured a socialist revolution. The installation of a democratic regime was never a certainty, and the extremists acquiesced only when it was evident that they had insufficient support in either the military or the population.

By contrast, Spain's transformation occurred not through revolution, but through reform initiated from within the authoritarian regime. Spain's conversion to democracy was characterized by negotiation between the prime minister, Adolfo Suarez, the democratic opposition including the communists, and the supporters of Franco's regime. Compared to Portugal's passage, Spain's appears to have been smooth and well directed by the leaders of the state. Spain seems to have been transformed by purposeful calculation, and with an overarching desire to establish democracy. In contrast,

democracy in Portugal is an event that almost did not happen. Civil war or a left-wing military dictatorship were genuine possibilities.

Indeed, the most striking contrast between the two countries is the behaviour of their respective elites. In Spain, the leaders of both the regime and the opposition appeared ready to compromise and act in a consociational[6] manner in order to effect the transformation of the regime, whereas the Portuguese leaders seemed bent upon achieving their own political agendas, particularly social revolution, in spite of the possible consequences for the nascent democracy established following the coup.

Theories seeking to explain the genesis of democracy are rare, but one in particular which is useful in illustrating how the behaviour of elites is crucial is the sequential explanation of Dankwart Rustow.[7] Rustow saw the transition to democracy as occurring in four separate and necessary phases. 1) A background condition, which he considered to be national unity, 2) the preparatory phase, which required a prolonged and inconclusive political struggle, 3) the decision phase, in which political leaders accept the existence of diversity within unity, and 4) the habituation phase, in which positive results reinforce the political leaders' decision and thus the system's viability.

Rustow's framework will form an initial basis in this thesis for examining democratic transition in Iberia,

although in itself the theory is merely skeletal. Since Rustow made little effort to provide a comprehensive framework, in order to embellish on and apply his ideas, it will be necessary to delve into other possible explanations. The preparatory phase covers a lengthy time period, and many variables could be responsible for the eventual crises for the regimes. These variables will be examined not only to determine their role in the preparatory phase, but also to determine whether they have any merit as a primary causal factor. However, Rustow's genetic theory of democratic transition is clearly not uni-variate, and the thrust of this study will be to develop a multi-variate explanation of democratic transition.

Thus, it will first be necessary to examine socio-economic explanations, such as Lipset's. It hypothesizes that economic development, as indicated by indices such as industrialization, urbanization and education, is important in sustaining democracy, and therefore, by extension, is a key to the emergence of democracy.

Related to this notion is the proposition that changes in class structure, brought about by economic development, are responsible for increasing political struggle. Moore suggests that agrarian class structure is important in determining whether a country becomes dictatorial or democratic.[8] Poulantzas has seen it in terms of inner conflicts within the ruling class, which result in a

struggle between one faction which favours liberalization and one which supports the status quo.[9]

Alternatively, many have suggested that the increase in tourism and the communication of democratic ideas from migrant guest workers back to their families in Spain and Portugal, resulted in the diffusion of liberal ideas throughout Iberia. This suggests that the acquisition of a political culture more conducive to democracy may have been responsible for the transformation. For this reason, an examination of the culture literature, especially the work of Almond and Verba, will also be indispensable.

As well, given that the decision phase deals with the cooperative behaviour of elites, it is obviously important to examine literature dealing with the politics of accommodation, especially Lijphart's notion of consociation. In a similar vein it will be important to look at some theories of coalition formation. Finally, with the addition of other more general theories of democracy, the theoretical outline of this thesis will be complete. The importance of the decision phase may ultimately focus attention upon elite accommodation and behaviour. However, the thesis will generally utilize an eclectic mix of factors in interpreting the developments which led to democratic transition.

Thus Chapter Two will attempt to synthesize explanations of the stability of democracy and Rustow's effort to provide a theory explaining the emergence of

democracy. An attempt will be made here to develop a framework for examining the recent political developments in Spain and Portugal in the subsequent chapters. Although an effort will be undertaken in this chapter to explore various theoretical explanations of democracy's emergence and possibly provide a synthesis, the remainder of the thesis will not attempt merely to confirm or refute such a theoretical synthesis. Subsequent chapters will be fairly comprehensive, in line with the notion that a combination of factors is ultimately responsible for the transition from authoritarian to democratic political systems.

Chapter Three will follow the general framework, attempting to cover Rustow's background condition and preparatory phase. Because political attitudes tend to be acquired with at least some reference to historical experience, it will be necessary to cover a broad expanse of modern Iberian history. Both countries witnessed attempts to operate democratic systems from the early 19th century onwards. These unsuccessful experiences with democracy have had a major impact on the attitudes of both the masses and elites towards democracy. As well, it will be necessary to examine the origins, functioning and breakdown of the dictatorships, which are all important in explaining why democracy ultimately emerged and why it emerged when it did. This chapter will also be important in examining some of the societal factors, such as socio-economic development, class

structure, mass culture and as well as international factors, which are important because they provided either an inducement or a deterrent to elites when considering whether to pursue a democratic transition.

Generally the chapter will assume a chronological sequence. However, to provide additional clarity, the first section of the chapter will examine the question of national unity, as suggested by Rustow's background pre-condition, up to the period of transition. The chapter will follow developments until the end of the sixties, which, somewhat arbitrarily, can be considered roughly the end of the preparatory phase.

Chapter Four will deal with the decision phase. Given that it focuses on the decision of the country's regime and opposition leaders, the chapter will concentrate on the beliefs and behaviour of elites. Moreover an effort will be made to demonstrate that other explanations of the transition are less adequate. The chapter will cover the time period from the late sixties until that point in which the democratic regimes were constitutionally installed in the late seventies. No effort will be made to deal with the habituation phase in this thesis, since this process continues at present, and there is no evidence to suggest that this phase is ever really completed in any country.

The final chapter will evaluate the two cases and attempt to determine which factors are most responsible for

the decision of each country's elites to put aside their differences and work towards the establishment of democracy. There is clearly a difference between the two countries in this respect. Spain's leaders made the decision far more easily than Portugal's. Indeed, democracy was threatened in Portugal by the lack of consensus, as demonstrated by the effort of some to bring about a social revolution. Thus, the ultimate question to be answered is, what explains this difference in attitude among the two sets of elites, which in Spain led peacefully to democracy, but in Portugal could have quite easily led to a new dictatorship?

ENDNOTES

[1]Geoffery Pridham, "Comparative Perspectives on the New Mediterranean Democracies", West European Politics, Vol. 7 No. 2 , (April 1984).

[2]Because of Castile's domination of the Spanish state, the Castilian dialect has become the standard form of Spanish. The languages of Catalonia, the Basque region and Galicia are not mere dialects.

[3]In 1972, Spain's per capita GNP was $1210, which placed Spain on the brink of being considered a developed economy. By contrast Portugal's GNP stood at $780. At similar levels of per capita income as Portugal were Third World countries such as Jamaica, Chile, Uruguay, Mexico and Lebanon. World Bank, World Bank Atlas, (1974), p. 7.

[4]In 1975, the average proportion of the population living in urban areas in the industrialized world was 76%. World Bank World Development Report, (Washington, 1978), p. 102.

[5]The comparable proportion in industrialized countries was 11%. Ibid., p. 102.

[6]Lijphart developed the concept of consociationalism, which will be dealt with in Chapter two. Briefly it describes the activity of political elites in socially divided societies who act with over-arching concern for the political well being of the nation rather than in their own interests.

[7]Dankwart Rustow, "Transitions to Democracy", Comparative Politics, Volume 2, (April 1970).

[8]Barrington Moore, Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966)

[9]Nicos Poulantzas, Crisis of the Dictatorships, (London: N.L.B., 1976)

CHAPTER 2

COMPETING THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO DEMOCRATIC TRANSITION

In the past, the interests of democratic theorists have not been focussed upon the genesis of democracy. In part this reflects ethno-centrism. Since most theorists were from Anglo-American or Western European countries which had long been democratic, their interest was naturally concerned with long-functioning democracies. Beyond this. the transition to democracy almost seemed to be a natural progression of modernization. Since the transition to democracy seemed an almost automatic process, one did not feel compelled to study it.

In the early sixties this viewpoint was reinforced by the birth of many new democracies, as many nations gaining their independence had democratic systems imposed upon them by the colonial countries. When most of the newly independent nations saw their democratic regimes quickly collapsing, the interest of most democratic theorists once again became focussed upon Western Europe and the United States. In an attempt to explain why Third World democracies could not be maintained, political scientists tried to discover what sustained the apparently stable democracies in the West. Given the dominant behaviouralist paradigm of

those years, it was only natural that a variety of socioeconomic factors were used to explain why democracy prevailed in these countries. At the same time little effort was made to explain the emergence of democracy. Since most democracies had evolved out of monarchical regimes at least a half a century earlier, or had had democracy imposed upon them after foreign conquest, the evolution of democracy in these countries was largely ignored, and instead the reasons for continued stability became the focal point. What little explanation of democratic emergence there was tended to flow from explanations of democratic stability. It was thought that the factors responsible for the functioning of stable democracy would also be necessary for the emergence of democracy.

In the mid-seventies, an earlier trend which saw the reduction in the size of the democratic world appeared to have been reversed. In Spain and Portugal, long term authoritarian regimes were replaced by regimes emulating those in the rest of Western Europe, while at the same time the Greek military dictatorship was also brought to an end. Since the early eighties, a similar trend has been evident in such countries of Latin America as Argentina and Brazil. For this reason, interest in the recent genesis of democracy is beginning to grow.

However, the old theories of democratic stability no

longer seem adequate in explaining the emergence of democracy. Even prior to the apparent democratization trend, some theorists questioned the "temptation to make functional theories do double duty as genetic theories".[1] Thus, Dankwart Rustow wondered openly why theories explaining the stability of functioning democracies would also be able to explain the genesis of democracy in previously non-democratic countries. He himself offered an alternative so-called "sequential theory" to explain democratic genesis. However, Rustow's theory appears to do little more than provide a useful framework, and continues to be skeletal in itself. As will be demonstrated later in this chapter, Rustow leaves many important questions unanswered. His framework needs to be filled in and applied before it will provide much in the way of general explanation. Since the time of Rustow's exhortation, little work has been done in developing genetic theory, but interest seems to be growing, and the work of Schmitter and O'Donnell[2], among others, has provided further conceptual clarification.

Although Rustow was undoubtedly correct in rejecting the use of "functional" theories as the sole explanation of democracy's formation, he may also be shortsighted in ignoring the variables these theories suggest. It is thus the purpose of this chapter to fill in Rustow's framework in order to provide it with some explanatory power. Without a

doubt some of the factors responsible for the stability of functioning democracies will be useful in filling in some of the gaps in Rustow's theory. Accordingly, this chapter will first examine the functional theories of democratic transition to see if they have any value in themselves in explaining the emergence of democracy. This will be followed by an examination of Rustow's theory and theories developed subsequently. Hopefully the end result of this exercise will be a synthesis of democratic stability theories as well as other theories which will provide a more comprehensive framework for analyzing the Spanish and Portuguese cases.

Before moving to the substance of this chapter, it is first necessary to deal with the definition of democracy. The absence of a clear definition could lead to difficulties in following the argument presented here, since it must be shown that at a most fundamental level Spain and Portugal have indeed made the transition.

Most theorists seem to agree that the key defining concept of democracy is that decision makers are held accountable through the use of free competitive elections. Powell, for example, defines democracy as a system in which "citizens are able to organize and vote in competitive elections and national political leaders are held accountable through electoral means".[3] Similarly, Levine depicts democracy as "a natural political system characterized by

free and open elections, choice between competing slates of leaders in genuine competition, protection of civil liberties, and relatively low barriers to participation".[4]

Implicit in these definitions is the notion of compromise and the acceptance of a tacit pact between political elites. To avoid coercion and violence in the decision-making process, elites agree to relinquish some or temporarily all of their power or potential power in order to preserve civil peace and provide for citizen participation. In effect they put the perpetuation of the system above their own political agenda. This holds even for those who insist that democracy is a collection of natural rights, for surely they are not natural rights, since they exist only if those who control the means of coercion agree to them or are forced to accept them.

Given these definitions of democracy it is evident that Spain and Portugal have made the transition to democracy. In both countries political structures similar to those in Western Europe now exist. A plurality of political parties compete in competitive elections at fixed intervals for control of the dominant policy-making institutions. It is also worth noting that all major political forces have "agreed" to the institution of a democratic system, with the sole exception of the Basque terrorists in Spain.

It is not necessary to deal with some of the

normative considerations of democracy. For example, Levine suggests that Schmitter and O'Donnell and others in Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Prospects for Democracy, bemoan the limited degree of democratic transition in the countries they study.[5] They lament that a more comprehensive form of democracy, beyond mere political democracy[6], has been bargained away by elites in their efforts to achieve a pluralistic and competitive political system. In so doing, they appear to conclude that "democracies emerge out of mutual fear among opponents rather than as the deliberate outcome of concerted commitments"[7]

Thus, the Transitions authors downplay the accomplishments of the Iberian transitions, while at the same time ignoring the appeal of democratic values. However, this does not mean that analysis which treats the political changes in Spain and Portugal as merely one stage in the democratization process is misguided. One can treat this transition as the first step, and a necessary one at that, in the process heading towards a more socially and economically egalitarian democracy. Given this framework, one is then looking at the causes of this first step in the democratization process. By accepting this outlook, one can put aside Marxist concerns that the Iberian transitions have failed to establish genuine democracies.

Having dealt with some of the definitional problems,

it is now appropriate to examine the theories of democratic stability. Democratic theorists of the 1960s were interested in explanations of what sustained democracy in already democratic countries. They sought to explain how one could account for observable differences in stability among democracies.[8] As Rustow pointed out, the question asked was "not how a democratic system comes into existence but rather how a democracy assumed to be in existence, can best preserve or enhance its health and stability".[9] It was simply assumed that those factors responsible for the maintenance of stable democracy were also responsible for the emergence of democracy. This chapter will explore in detail three functional theories: Lipset's economic development explanation, Almond and Verba's political culture explanation, and Eckstein's political culture explanation, based on the congruence of authority patterns. Other democratic stability theories will be looked at in less detail, or will be used to supplement Lipset, Eckstein, and Almond and Verba.

SOCIOECONOMIC EXPLANATIONS

Seymour Lipset attempted to explain the stability of democracies using the level of economic development as the explanatory variable. Lipset hypothesized that the more "well to do" a nation the greater the chances that it will sustain democracy.[10]

Lipset used indices of economic development, such as wealth, industrialization, urbanization, and education, as his independent variables, and tested these against countries which he had classified as more or less democratic in the Anglo-Saxon world, Europe and Latin America. Lipset was able to demonstrate a positive correlation between average wealth, the degree of industrialization and level of education, and the existence of a stable democratic regime. Even when comparing Latin American democracies and non-democracies their was a difference.

In explaining his findings, Lipset theorized that a high degree of economic development and wealth contributes to the satisfaction of citizens, who are thus less likely to press their demands upon the government. As well, education serves as a useful tool in broadening people's outlooks, helping them to understand the need for "norms of tolerance", restrains them from "adhering to extremist doctrines", and increases the ability of people to make "rational electoral choices". Finally a higher degree of economic development defuses the class struggle.

Lipset however, qualifies his findings by admitting that "a premature democracy may be maintained through universal literacy or autonomous private organizations".[11] Thus, a "premature democracy", one in which the socio-economic conditions favourable to its continued existence are absent,

can also be maintained. Therefore, Lipset refrains from being too deterministic, since he feels that under certain special conditions a particular political form can continue to exist even if more general conditions are unfavourable to that existence.

Nevertheless, Lipset does suggest that overall socio-economic factors are most responsible for the stability of democratic regimes. Indeed, he claims that a high level of education is almost certainly a necessary, although not a sufficient, condition for sustaining democracy. In applying Lipset's theory to the emergence of democracy, one would simply theorize that when a country reached a certain level of socio-economic development it would then be ready to transform to democracy. Furthermore, the social changes provided by economic development would also provide some pressure for democratization.

Lipset's explanations found a high degree of support in the early sixties, and the variables he looked at continue to be of great interest to political scientists up to the present. For example, Powell, writing in 1982, looked at socio-economic variables, such as modernization, social cleavages, and economic inequality, in his study of contemporary democracies.[12] However, these studies continue to look at socio-economic factors in terms of the maintenance of democratic regimes, and not in terms of democratic

transition.

One exception to this rule was Robert Dahl's study of transition, Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition. Dahl suggests that "the higher the socio-economic level of a country, the more likely it is to have a competitive political regime". Although Dahl posits this relationship, he does allow that many "crucial questions regarding the nature and strenth of the relation are unanswered"[13].

Dahl cautiously suggests that there may be a socio-economic threshold beyond which the transformation to democracy becomes much more likely;

> there exists a threshold, perhaps in the range of $700-800 GNP per capita (1957 US dollars) above which the chances of polyarchy are so high that any further increase in per capita GNP cannot affect the outcome in any significant way.[14]

Dahl does not seem to be suggesting a deterministic relationship, however he certainly seems to suggest that the relationship is probabilistic. However, he also points out numerous deviant cases, such as the U.S., Australia, Canada and New Zealand in the 19th century, and many contemporary anomalies such as the U.S.S.R., G.D.R., and some Latin American countries.[15]

As well, Dahl points out that the causal direction is unclear. It is unclear whether socio-economic development leads to democracy, or whether democracy provides the basis for socio-economic development, or whether both are caused by

something else. Evidently Dahl eventually has too many problems with socio-economic level as a simple and one directional explanatory variable, for he finally concludes that socio-economic development appears to be neither a necessary nor sufficient condition.[16] Instead he merely posits that there appears to be some relationship.

Dahl's sentiments are echoed by other theorists. Schmitter asserts that the transition from authoritarian to democratic regimes is "not merely a matter of economic development or societal complexity".[17] As well, Rustow points out that while Lipset may have demonstrated a correlation, correlation does not establish causation.[18]

Others have had difficulty establishing a correlation between some socio-economic variables and political indices of stability. Powell found little empirical relationship between either the durability of the chief executive or the frequency of executive control of the legislature and the degree of economic development and modernization.[19] As well, he discovered that differences in income distribution, an indication of a higher level of socio-economic development, are not a significant factor, once other environmental variables are controlled.[20] However, despite these empirical discrepancies, Powell does not reject the level of socio-economic development as a predictor of democratic stability, because overall he feels the evidence appears to support his

initial contention that there is a relationship. He fails to establish whether the relationship is causal or not.

One final criticism levelled at Lipset is that his analysis all but ignores politics and political actors. Lipset treats politics as a dependent variable and not "as an initiator or causer of change".[21] This criticism overstates Lipset's position, since Lipset also states that the stability of democracy depends upon the effectiveness and legitimacy of the political system.[22] Nevertheless, it is certainly true that Lipset fails to accord any autonomous role to political actors, and treats them as mostly captive of the socio-economic situation which prevails within their country.

While the preceding criticisms are for the most part valid and decidedly argue against socio-economic level as a sole factor determining the timing of democratic transition, there is also little doubt that there is some sort of relationship. When one looks around the world it seems that most democracies occur in countries which are highly developed. And while it is true that what may cause democratic stability will not necessarily be a factor in the birth of democracy, theoretically it seems plausible that a higher level of socio-economic development makes the transition to democracy more possible. With development it

becomes increasingly difficult for political actors to maintain a non-democratic system, since development imposes constraints upon actors making democracy more attractive, while authoritarian rule becomes increasingly difficult to maintain. Economic development entails industrialization, which brings with it trade unions and labour conflict. As well, the level of education and the amount of information increases making new ideas and greater skills available to more people. Conflicts, once easily repressed, become more frequent and difficult to manage, and the actors must make a conscious choice of what type of system would be best for both their own interests and those of their country.

One way in which this mechanism works is the expectation that a higher level of socio-economic development makes democracy more workable. Stability theorists suggest that more developed nations have more wealth with which to meet citizen demands, and thus tensions are reduced and democracy becomes much more tenable.[23] While obviously a positive factor for democratic stability, how can this contribute to democratic transition? In a country with a greater reserve of both current and future resources, political actors can make more credible promises, to entice the unwilling to join the forces in favour of democracy, which helps to lead to the imposition of a democratic regime. As well, political actors will likely realize that a higher

level of development means that democracy can more easily be maintained, and given higher expectations of success, democracy will thus be more attractive.

Dahl parallels this view to some extent when he refers to the decreasing economic inequality evident in countries with a higher degree of economic development.[24] Dahl claims that extreme inequalities in important political resources decline, and while this does not produce political equality it does produce greater parity. When extreme socio-economic inequalities exist, extreme inequalities in political resources also exist. With political resources concentrated in the hands of a few it makes a hegemonic regime much more likely. When one controls the majority of resources one is not likely to make the compromises necessary for democracy to operate. As others acquire some political resources, they gain the ability to make power holders negotiate. When they have acquired enough power, they can force power holders to negotiate about the form of the regime.

Even if unable to force negotiation over the form of the regime, a more equal distribution of political resources leads to the development of "systems of negotiation and bargaining parallel or in opposition to hierarchical arrangements"[25], presumably in the area of labour relations. This would provide pressure to extend these systems of

bargaining to the political arena, as well as providing experience in more democratic arrangements.

Also, as political resources become dispersed, uncertainty increases. With increased uncertainty, political actors are more likely to be unsure of both their own strength and the strength of their adversaries. Under such conditions they are more likely to be willing to negotiate.

Finally, as Dahl also points out, a country with a higher level of socio-economic development is also likely to have higher levels of literacy, education, and communication.[26] Obviously these factors are highly correlated with a political culture conducive to democracy, however, it is also evident that these characteristics help to disperse political resources. This is where mass mobilization can be brought into the equation. The ability to gain the support of the masses and the ability to engage them in mass demonstrations of strength is important in convincing one's adversaries of the importance of negotiation. Spontaneous mass demonstrations are also important, but they are not always inherently democratic. Nevertheless, mass unrest is important in strengthening the bargaining position of those who wish to transform a regime into a democratic system, as well as deflating the confidence of those who hold power in an authoritarian regime. Obviously factors such as literacy, education and communication make it much more

likely that the masses will be involved in politics and thus that they will both directly and indirectly create pressure for the regime to change.

One final aspect of the socio-economic level should be mentioned. Some writers treat the transition to democracy as serving a function of enhancing the operation of a modern capitalist economy. They assert that highly industrialized societies need multiple sources of information and it is claimed that democracy best serves the need for these increased sources of information.[27] However, there seems to be little evidence to support the contention that capitalism requires democracy. The market system supposedly serves as a mechanism for providing all the information necessary for the functioning of a capitalist economy. As well, there are many examples of capitalist economies which have done well despite the absence of democracy; examples such as Nazi Germany, South Korea, Taiwan and Singapore.

So, despite the fact that democracy does not in any meaningful sense serve a function in enhancing the operation of a capitalist economy, socio-economic factors obviously play some role in the transition to democracy. However, these factors certainly do not appear to be determining, although they most certainly provide a constraint to the authoritarian leaders.

CULTURAL EXPLANATIONS

In contrast Almond and Verba largely ignore economic variables and instead concentrate on cultural variables. They hypothesize that "a democratic form of participatory political system requires a political culture consistent with it".[28] Specifically they state that a "civic culture" is necessary for a democracy to be sustainable.

A "civic culture" is a mixed culture which combines elements of modern and traditional culture. It contains a large number of individuals who belong to a participant political culture, who are oriented towards both the input and output sides of government and are thus oriented towards an "activist role of the self in the polity". But the civic culture also contains those who do not participate in the political system and are oriented towards only output aspects - the subject political culture - and those who have little orientation towards the political system - the parochial political culture. One weakness of Almond and Verba's theory is that they do not appear to provide any guidelines towards the appropriate blend or balance of these cultural types.

The civic culture is thus "a pluralistic culture based on communication and persuasion, a culture of consensus and diversity, a culture that permitted change but moderated it".[29] The civic culture provides the best culture within which to maintain both the active-influential role of

democratic citizens, while at the same time allowing governmental elites the power necessary to make important decisions. The participant element of the culture provides people who will make demands upon power-holders, and thus helps the system to maintain legitimacy, both by providing communication to government about citizen's needs, and by demonstrating that citizens have an ability to participate. At the same time subject and parochial elements do not participate and thus the system does not become overloaded.

Political culture is transmitted by a complex process through socialization in many social institutions - family, peer group, school, workplace, as well as in the political system itself.[30] Thus, the major part of the development of a participant culture occurs within a democratic polity itself. Almond and Verba contend that the civic culture developed gradually in the West. Through attrition a greater proportion of people became participants without replacing those of a subject or parochial orientation. Therefore, as a certain proportion of a country's culture became oriented towards participation it became more likely that its political structure would be democratic.

Although Almond and Verba suggest that there is a civic culture which contains an optimal proportion of participants, and that not only is there a lower limit at which democracy becomes unstable but as well an upper limit

on participants, our concern is only with the lower level, since it is inconceivable that a polity could reach the upper limit without first transforming to democracy. Thus, we need only look at the process whereby citizens with a subject orientation are transformed into participants.

It is quite evident that theoretically a civic culture should enhance the survivability of an existing democracy. Citizen participation and governmental accountability contribute greatly to a feeling of legitimacy and thus help to reduce disorder.[31] Dahl notes that "a moderately educated people with a generous supply of newspapers does not require a highly industrialized or urbanized society".[32] In other words given the proper political culture, democracy can be sustained even when other positive factors are absent. Therefore, it seems evident that a political culture which is supportive of democracy directly leads to greater democratic stability.

However, the major question here is how this relates to the transition to democracy? As Rustow points out, Almond and Verba fail to distinguish whether civic culture is a cause or effect of democracy.[33] It would seem that culture is more of an effect of democracy, for a democratic culture has be learned somehow, and that process could take place only with great difficulty from within an authoritarian regime. This view is reinforced by Pridham, who contends that a

democratic transition is not complete until a democratic political culture has been established.[34] In other words, the transformation to a democratic political structure must be accomplished prior to attempts to build a democratic political culture. Therefore, the notion that a civic culture slowly becomes established in a country, and the pressure of this culture forces a transition, appears to be flawed if one takes this as the sole variable.

However, there is also little doubt that for a transition to democracy to be possible there must be some willingness for people to participate, as well as some degree of positive sentiments towards a democratic system. Citizens who feel disposed to participate are more likely to be involved in mass demonstrations against authoritarian regimes and elites, which will place pressure upon elites. And a desire or at least acceptance of democracy among elites is of utmost importance.

It is obvious that at least some political elites must have come to believe that democracy is the most legitimate alternative to autocratic rule, in order for a transition to begin. The question then becomes: How do people, both elites and masses, come to change their belief in authoritarian rule to one of democratic rule? Dahl mentions this issue, when he laments that the investigation of political culture, because it tends to be static, has led

to a neglect in the sources of changes in beliefs.[35] He states that the processes which lead to changes in beliefs are at least as important as the study of processes, like socialization, which leads to a stability in beliefs. At an individual level he maintains that actors will acquire a particular belief depending upon:

> 1) The amount to which the actor is exposed to the belief, which in turn
> a) requires that the belief has been formulated and diffused to the actor's environment; and
> b) depends on the amount of influence that the bearers of the belief exert on the processes of socialization.
> 2) The relative prestige of the belief, which depends on, a) the personal prestige of its advocates and antagonists and b) the successes and failures of the people, organizations, and institutions that symbolize the belief.
> 3) The extent to which the new belief is consistent with the actor's perceptions of reality, as these are shaped by, a) the actor's present beliefs; and
> b) the actor's experiences.[36]

Thus an actor's beliefs are shaped by a combination of positive and negative experiences.

In investigating how beliefs change, one should therefore first examine the external sources which contribute to the growth of positive feelings towards democracy. Even in the most tightly censored authoritarian regimes information revealing the benefits of democracy is certain to seep through. Radio and television broadcasts, foreign newspapers and magazines all have a way of making their way through a regime's repressive apparatus. As well, countries like Spain and Portugal often find it necessary to throw their borders

open to foreign tourists as a way of improving economic performance, and thus expose their citizens to foreign ideas.

Besides picking up new ideas by foreign infusion, citizens also receive new ideas from foreign travel, which no regime can completely stop. Many nations allow their citizens to work abroad and some degree of emigration is alway likely. Either way, news of democratic systems is communicated to those citizens who remain behind. Opposition elites in authoritarian systems are especially subject to exposure to democracy, since they are often exiled to democratic countries where they become persuaded of democracy's superiority.

Conversely, a citizen's negative experience with an authoritarian regime can lead to a longing for change. When this is combined with a positive input concerning democratic regimes, it leads to a desire for transformation to democracy. This is even more the case for elites, since they are more frequently exposed to the political system and would tend to have more vivid and frustrating experiences. Linz and Stepan, although speaking of the breakdown of democratic regimes, talk about the effect that the "efficacy and effectiveness" of government can have on political beliefs.[37] Thus, if a citizen experiences low levels of satisfaction with different governments within a regime, ultimately the regime itself is likely to lose its legitimacy for her, and

another regime type is likely to form the core of her beliefs. Linz and Stepan add: "a legitimate government is one considered to be the least evil of the forms of government"[38]

As Dahl relates, belief formation through negative experience takes place within the context of the historical path taken by a country to the present, which in turn "helps to determine the successes and failures that symbolize a belief".[39] Thus, a country's history, real or mythical, is instrumental in establishing beliefs. If democracy has historically failed, then a belief in the appeal of democracy is unlikely. However, a violent history is likely to lead to a desire for non-violent methods in dealing with cleavages, and consequently a desire for democracy.

Barrington Moore also mentions the importance of the growth of certain beliefs. He states that the "most important aspect was the growth of the notion of the immunity of certain groups and persons from the power of the ruler, along with the conception of the right of resistance to unjust authority".[41] He asserts that these beliefs arose out of particular social arrangements, and thus through an internal mechanism. Given that these attitudes arose internally, and not through any international diffusion of ideas, Moore's concept would seem to have more place in explaining 19th, and early 20th, century democratic transitions. Furthermore, the modern centralized authoritarian regime has a much wider array of repressive and propagandistic devices with which to

stifle the ideas which Moore saw as resulting from social structure.

In summary, the role that culture plays in democratic transition is considerable. At the very least political elites need to be oriented towards democracy and citizen participation. However, it is also clear that a civic culture does not form prior to the emergence of democracy and thus it cannot be the primary cause of democratic transition.

Harry Eckstein's theory of stable democracy is somewhat similar, in that cultural variables once again play the key role. But for Eckstein "a government will tend to be stable if its authority pattern is congruent with the other authority patterns of the society of which it is a part".[42] Eckstein assumed that all institutions in society have authority patterns, which help institutions to function properly. It is difficult to argue with this assumption, since most institutions need to make decisions. Given the size of most institutions it is almost impossible for decisions to be made by consensus, and thus some sort of authority pattern is required to establish how decisions are to be made. The government obviously also has a pattern of authority. Where there is an incongruence between the authority patterns of the government and society, strain is produced among the members of society. Strain produces anomie

which is potentially dangerous to the stability of any pattern of government.

Eckstein did not claim that it was necessary to have exact congruence between government and societal authority patterns: he only claimed that those institutions which were closest to government had to most clearly resemble governmental authority patterns, while those institutions at some distance had to show a marked departure from the "fundamentally appropriate patterns for the sake of imitating the governmental patterns".[43] In other words, even though certain institutions have an authority pattern which is appropriate for the nature of that institution, this pattern should be abandoned in order to emulate government patterns in order to strengthen the societal basis of democracy.

Presumably one could expect democratic transformation to occur in those countries where the institutions closest to the government (and Eckstein apparently means institutions such as political parties, business organizations and trade unions) begin to exhibit democratic authority patterns. The government must either transform itself to remain congruent with those institutions, or instability will result and the government will be subject to being overthrown. In applying Eckstein's theory to transition to democracy from authoritarian rule, the process thus works in an opposite direction than described in the stability process above. In

countries that are already democratic institutions emulate the government, whereas in transforming nations the institutions adopt democratic patterns first.

Two further points which Eckstein makes are particularly applicable to Spain and Portugal; both involve the role that a dominant Catholic Church plays in creating instability in democratic countries.[44] First of all Catholicism is supposed to make for ideological intransigence in politics. Due to the fact that it is highly dogmatic, it is supposed to lead to strong feelings on the part of its supporters and detractors, which spill over into other areas of politics. Secondly, the Church is highly authoritarian in structure and thus is likely to lead to a preference for authoritarian government. As well, since the Church also predominates over and directs certain other social institutions, such as schools and families, it is likely to have a rather large influence over the authority patterns that such institutions have. Thus, the diminishing of Church influence over society should provide an opportunity for democratic patterns to become established.

However, apart from the relevance that Catholicism may hold for democratic transitions, Eckstein's theory seems to hold little explanatory power when it comes to democratic genesis. To be sure, democratic authority patterns would be useful in maintaining democracy, since they would reinforce a

belief in democracy. However, it is difficult to see how non-governmental institutions could adopt democratic authority patterns prior to the transformation of an authoritarian regime. Firstly, non-governmental institutions only tend to democratize in response to regime change. These institutions tend to emulate the authority patterns of their government. Eckstein does not deal with the origins or changes in institutional authority patterns, so it is not known how he would deal with this issue. As well, many institutions, particularly those such as parties and unions, are illegal under authoritarian rule and therefore have few opportunities to establish democratic authority patterns. These organizations are often forced to operate clandestinely. Under such conditions it is hazardous to open up lines of communication, or to provide for meaningful discussion in decision making, since this would lead to disclosure of the organization's membership and make the government's oppression easier. There is therefore a tendency for clandestine organizations to maintain hierarchical, secretive, authority patterns. Organizations in exile may be able to establish democratic patterns, but this does not affect the mass of the people and so would not be significant. Thus, one would expect that the establishment of democratic authority patterns in non-governmental institutions would follow the transformation to democracy.

One final factor mentioned by democratic stability theorists is the structure of a country's party system. Specifically, a party system which contains a small number of parties largely located near the centre of the political spectrum, and with a strong commitment to democracy is expected to bring a great deal more stability to democracy.[45]

Consequently, an authoritarian system would be expected to be heading in the direction of democracy when its parties and proto-parties become less fragmented and soften their ideological positions. Of course, parties do not always exist legally within authoritarian systems, but some do operate illegally. One would expect that such organizations should coalesce into democratic front organizations if democratic transition is to occur. Through such pacts, fragmentation is reduced and parties are able to put aside some of their ideological differences and develop a common commitment to a democratic regime. This argument parallels that in Dodd's work on coalitions in parliamentary systems. Dodd disputes the notion that only two-party systems with majority government provide stability for democratic regimes.[46] Instead he shows that multi-party systems which are conducive to the formation of durable coalitions are almost as stable. Thus, it would seem that during democratic transitions the emerging parties need to behave in a manner similar to that of parties within multi-party parliamentary

systems.

In general the democratic stability theories do not provide an adequate explanation of the causes for democratic transitions. However, it may still be worthwhile to attempt to use stability theories to explain regime transition, since it makes sense to claim that the conditions necessary for the preservation of a functioning democracy are also those which are needed in order to bring it into existence. However this approach must be qualified. Some of the conditions which are necessary for the stability of democracy cannot possibly exist until democracy actually exists. Creating and sustaining a system require quite different conditions. Rustow uses two examples to demonstrate this. Military dictatorships originate in secret plotting and armed revolt, but perpetuate themselves by using massive publicity. As well, according to Weber, charismatic leaders establish a claim to legitimacy by performing seeming miracles, but preserve it through routinization.[47]

This leads to the question of causality. Are those conditions which are evident in stable democracies the cause of stability or are they the result of democracy? Economic development may not lead to democracy; instead it may be the case that economic development best takes place within democracy. As for the cultural factors, one can question how democratic values can be learned in a non-democratic society.

It is also worth noting that while these conditions may be both necessary and sufficient in considering democratic stability, they may also be insufficient in terms of transition to democracy. Casanova notes that industrialization leads to changes in urbanization, wealth, mass education, communication, class structure, civic culture and psychological attitudes, which may lead to the potential for democratization, but these do not make the evolution of democracy inevitable.[48] Other conditions may be necessary in order to push a society towards democracy.

It may be useful to think of the problem in the same terms as Przeworski. He distinguishes between macro-oriented studies, which study objective conditions much like the stability theorists do, while micro-oriented studies "emphasize the strategic behaviour of political actors embedded in concrete historical conditions".[48] He sees a place for both types of studies, but cautions that the objective conditions, such as the stage of economic development or social structure, should not be seen as determinants but rather as constraints imposed upon, or as conducive conditions influencing political actors within a concrete historical situation.

Levine cautions against moving too far away from the functional theories. He asserts that some of the conditions necessary for stability will also be present during

transition. He requests that the "study of transitions to democracy be rooted in considerations of democracy's own characteristic motivations, organizational resources and operative patterns of leadership and legitimacy".[50] What Levine envisions is the study of transitions which takes into account the motivations which lead elites to work towards democracy, and the objective conditions which shape their ability to do this. Therefore, the exercise of the remainder of this chapter will be to take the stability explanations, materializing as conditions or affecting the ability of elites to realize their objectives, as well as other factors, and fit them into Rustow's conceptual framework.

RUSTOW'S SEQUENTIAL FRAMEWORK

Rustow saw democracy as evolving sequentially through four distinct phases.[51] Each phase is necessary and the process cannot proceed until the previous phase is completed.

The first phase is what Rustow calls the background condition: the vast majority must recognize the nation as the legitimate political unit. According to Rustow, no minimal level of economic development or social differentiation is necessary. However the achievement of national unity is not sufficient to initiate transition, which requires a lengthy preparatory phase followed by the decision phase. While Rustow may be correct here, it is hard to imagine democracy continuing to exist without minimal economic development

unless competent leadership exists. It would be difficult to support Rustow fully here, however, national unity would seem to be a necessary condition.

Other theorists support Rustow's contention that national unity is necessary before democracy can begin to evolve.[52] The problems in post-colonial Africa provide the best evidence in support of this contention. The reason why democratic transition is difficult prior to the formation of unity on the national issues is that when national issues remain unresolved they form the predominant cleavage within a territory. This cleavage is often of such intensity that it keeps political actors from being able to compromise over the form that a regime should take. Thus cultural conditions which prevent the softening of ethnic cleavages can provide constraints which prevent the coalition formation necessary for democracy.

The next stage is the preparatory phase, which is set off by a prolonged and inconclusive political struggle, in which the combatants represent well-entrenched forces fighting over issues which are meaningful to them. Rustow's theory is weak here, because he does not describe what sorts of issues are important. He only states that the issues will differ from country to country. Certainly whatever the issues, and the installation of a democratic regime need not be the predominant issue, one side in the struggle must

favour democracy, because it is difficult to conceive of democracy arising out of a struggle between two anti-democratic forces. The struggle arises with the emergence of a new elite, and society polarizes between the two sides of the struggle.

It seems evident that there must be some sort of struggle in order for transition to take place. Political struggle provides the impetus for political transition. As well, it seems plausible that society must polarize into two camps since this would help to eliminate fragmentation. Also, it would seem necessary that at least one side in the conflict should adopt a platform for a democratic regime. However, Rustow appears to be quite vague on this point. A number of questions remain unanswered. For example, what sort of issues will arise which will cause the struggle of the preparatory phase?, what social groups will battle in the preparatory phase? and what kind of struggle is most conducive for the emergence of democracy?

Political struggles within political systems are always present. Without struggle there would be no impetus for political change. However, there must be some optimal level of struggle which will result in a democratic transformation. Many struggles are too localized or trivial for them to result in transformation. Democratic transition would necessarily need struggle which is close to being national in

character. But struggle cannot to be too intense or political actors would find it too difficult to bury their differences and compromise to bring about democracy.

Therefore, one of the key points is that the struggle should not be too intense. Dahl points out that there are some conflicts which a competitive political system cannot manage easily and may not be able to handle at all;

> Because conflicts among ethnic and religious subcultures are so easily seen as threats to one's most fundamental self, opponents are readily transformed into a malign and inhuman "they", whose menace stimulates and justifies the violence and savagery that have been the common response of in-group to out-group among all mankind.[53]

Similarly, Linz and Stepan argue that political leaders with a strong commitment to ideology are least able to give foremost consideration to the persistence of institutions.[54] Lipset echoes these sentiments when he refers to the necessity of moderating the "intensity of partisan battle" as one of the keys to successful democracy.[55]

Thus, it seems that some struggles are too intense to allow for the compromise which is necessary for democracy. These conflicts would seem to be those which are based upon ideological issues, whereas socio-economic issues, such as the relative distribution of income, may be less intense, or at least more conducive to negotiation.

What makes socio-economic issues easier to resolve than ideological issues is the fact that ideological battles,

such as religious cleavages, may involve zero-sum situations. Conversely, on socio-economic issues one side can be given compensation without taking everything from their adversaries. This conveniently fits into the socio-economic development argument, since as nations develop economically, cleavages tend to congeal around socio-economic issues, while ideological issues become less important. Therefore, as countries achieve a higher level of economic development the chances of democracy's emergence should improve.

Nicos Poulantzas has speculated that a socio-economic cleavage could be responsible for the transition to bourgeois democracy.[56] Poulantzas theorized about the transition to democracy in countries which are dependent within the international economy, but which are not under-developed. This dependence involves industrialization under the aegis of foreign capital. He contends that this development gives rise to a new faction of the bourgeoisie, the domestic bourgeoisie, which feels restricted by foreign control of capital. They are opposed by the ruling faction, the comprador bourgeoisie, who are completely captured by foreign capital. Poulantzas sees this struggle as an attempt by one faction of capital to renegotiate the terms of power within the ruling class. The domestic bourgeoisie apparently favours a democratic regime form for changing the terms of power, since it allows for a better representation of each of the

factions within the regime. It is not their goal to establish a hegemony over the ruling class, but merely to be represented more fairly. This leads to the question of why one faction of the bourgeoisie should seek hegemony while the other does not? The validity of Poulantzas's theory will be dealt with empirically, however it is sufficent to note that the struggle of which he speaks occurs between two class factions which do not have any essential differences.

Another theorist who speaks of the transition to democracy in terms of class structure is Barrington Moore.[57] Moore saw three routes to the modern world: bourgeois revolution, fascism and communism. The routes are largely determined by attitudes which result from the social structure of feudal society. Bourgeois revolution requires a balance between the crown and the landed aristocracy, and a turn towards commercial agriculture which does not result in a coalition between aristocratic and bourgeois forces against the peasants. In contrast, fascism appears where there is no transformation to commercial agriculture, but where feudal agriculture remains. Also, an informal coalition between the landed aristocracy and the emerging bourgeoisie occurs. A centralized state is established and initiates a revolution from above. A major problem with Moore's analysis is that the internal social structure is much too deterministic. It allows little room for external factors, such as the

diffusion of democratic ideas from foreign sources, or the autonomous actions of political actors. It may also have little applicability for countries like Spain where the social structure differs substantially from region to region, or Portugal where there are major differences in social structure between the north and the south. Also, while Moore's theory may have had some explanatory power in the 18th and 19th century, it would seem to explain little in the changed conditions of the 20th century, especially in Iberia, where true feudalism is probably non-existent. Finally, Moore says little about the factors which lead to the transformation from authoritarian rule to democracy.

It would be appropriate at this point to comment on the role of classes in the transformation to democracy. The class struggle could develop into the prolonged political struggle that Rustow argues prepares the way for democracy. Traditionally Marxism has stated that bourgeois democracy occurs as a result of the struggle between the aristocratic and bourgeois classes, as the bourgeois classes attempt to match their increasing economic power with proportional political power. They see a democratic political structure as the appropriate means of achieving this goal. Given that the bourgeois class usually has a substantial share of the power in a modern authoritarian state, this analysis seems to bear little relevance for our analysis.

Nevertheless, class struggle can provide some of the impetus for the transformation to democracy. When the working class, whether directed by its leadership, or autonomously, develops a preference for democracy, its protest can provide a great deal of pressure upon the authoritarian leaders. Class consciousness gives the working class added strength in its struggle. This fortifies its leadership, giving it greater ability to negotiate for democracy. However, the class struggle must be muted. An intransigent position on the part of the working class leadership could lead to a stalemate, and it is essential that the proletarian leadership develop some sort of coalition with some sections of the middle class for democracy to succeed. Thus, the class struggle, if strong, yet not too intense or ideologically defined, can generate the political struggle which Rustow feels is necessary.

Returning to a discussion of the requirements of Rustow's political struggle, it has been noted that at least one side in the struggle should adopt a democratic outlook. This seems self-evident and needs no further comment except to note that it is through the cultural factors and the variables which affect belief that such an outlook will be developed.

Finally, Rustow's speculation that the struggle should be bi-polar seems to consistent with the ideas of many

party system theorists. Bi-polarity means that the polity is becoming less fragmented, and a less fragmented polity makes the bargaining position of each side clearer. In these conditions of increased clarity, negotiation becomes easier.

According to Rustow, democracy emerges in the decision phase, when a conscious decision is made by the elites involved in the struggle to bury their differences and accept the existence of diversity in unity. Essentially, they decide that a peaceful decision-making process is more important than continued efforts to emerge victorious on the issue over which they are fighting. Democracy emerges when elites feel it is necessary to establish a decision making apparatus which will avoid violent outcomes which could destroy the nation. Thus, democracy does not flow automatically from the background and preparatory conditions, but instead depends on the actions of elites.

This is the key point, that the decision to implement a democratic system is made by elites. Although the masses can have some influence, the decision of the leaders is the determining factor. This concentration upon elites is appropriate because as Dahl points out;

> activists are more likely than other people 1) to have moderately elaborate systems of political beliefs. 2) to be guided in their actions by their political beliefs. 3) and to have more influence on political events, including events that affect the stability or transformation of regimes.[58]

Thus elites with disproportionate influence and stronger and more coherent beliefs are most likely by their bargaining to transcend a period of instability and give the society the direction that it needs. Mass uprisings are less effective in this respect. The impetus for democratic transformation lies in the hands of political leaders, for without them anti-regime demonstrations lack direction.

This is not to say that the masses or mass uprisings, have no part to play. The masses have an impact through the linkages that organizations create between leaders and followers. As Levine puts it, "Leaders must be able to bring their followers along or pacts will be insufficient".[59]

Also, the number of followers an elite member has and his ability to mobilize them for a particular purpose is a key component of his political resources. When the elite representative is involved in negotiating a pact with other elites, his relation to his followers affects his ability to bargain, because this affects calculations of both his own and his opponents' strength. When mass demonstrations are spontaneous, they can still have an impact upon authoritarian regimes. A series of demonstrations has the effect of making the regime look weak, which can weaken the internal unity of the regime, as well as encouraging the leaders who are in favour of democracy. Nevertheless, the masses play a secondary role in democratic transition, especially since it

must be remembered that the masses are not necessarily democratic. As Levine points out, popular mobilization occurs during the breakdown of democracy as well.[60]

Among the political elites are the state actors, and it is useful to point out that they can play an instrumental role in the transition to democracy. Often it is the actors within the state apparatus itself which take the leading role. If so disposed, they can call on the machinery of the state, or at least those sections loyal to them, to help in the move towards democracy. As the bureaucracy grows, the state often becomes more pragmatic, and therefore more willing to negotiate about the regime form. Thus, it is often elites within the state apparatus that provide the leadership, due to external pressures, in a move towards democracy.

If political leaders are the ones that make the decision and provide the direction during the transition, what is it that leads them to make these decisions? In part it is due to a change in many such leaders' beliefs. Due to the factors outlined earlier, such as exposure to the positive aspects of democratic regimes, historical political experiences, and negative feelings towards the present regime, leaders come to change their beliefs and adopt attitudes consistent with democracy. In particular the performance of the authoritarian state provides feedback for

both the elites and their followers.

However, even when leaders agree upon the form of the regime, they may have wide differences on other issues. As well, they may find it difficult to trust people who had previously been their bitter enemies. For this reason, certain pacts must be agreed to, which will allow a large enough coalition to form to permit a democratic transition. As Riker asserts, "politics involves most frequently conscious decision-making, and when groups are larger than two persons it is a process of forming coalitions".[61]

According to Riker, who used game theory, coalitions will form which are just large enough to ensure they will win, and no larger.[62] In a typical parliamentary situation a minimum winning coalition requires just over fifty percent, however, a coalition attempting to transform a regime would need to be much larger than this.[63] It would not need to be a complete consensus, but if any major groups were excluded, the chances of building democracy would be limited. Probably, any groups which could command a meaningful portion of a future electorate, as well as those groups who possessed signigicant coercive forces would have to be included.

According to Dodd, the capacity to form winning coalitions depends on the "bargaining conditions, which (include) a) information certainty and, b) the a priori willingness of parties to bargain".[64] And the higher the

degree of these conditions the larger the probability that a minimum winning coalition will form. It is up to those involved in the coalition-forming process to determine what resources each group commands, and to establish what coalitions are possible. If leaders determine that they cannot achieve their goals without violence or instability, they may be willing to establish a democratic system if they are strongly opposed to those conditions.

Opposition to violence and instability are two factors which would make a leader willing to bargain. This outlook develops from the historical experiences of a country. A bloody past makes leaders more willing to bargain. As well, the threat of defeat or annihilation should the leader engage in all out struggle and lose is another factor which would make him willing to compromise.[65] This does not mean that under such conditions groups will always be willing to bargain. If one group feels that it has enough strength to compel another group to back down without a struggle, then the leader of the weaker group may be willing to compromise, while the leader of the stronger group may not. Thus, a rough parity of forces may be necessary for peaceful transition.

Also, it is necessary that some limited pacts be established early on in the bargaining process. Dahl emphasizes that it is important that mutual guarantees and mutual trust be established.[66] Obviously, it is difficult to

build up trust among groups in authoritarian systems, however, the establishment of limited pacts can help to establish trust. For example, if the promise of an amnesty of political prisoners is carried out in return for some reduction in struggle, then trust begins to be built. However, often leaders are required to take a leap of faith, and it is at such times that daring leadership can make the difference.

In order for democracy to prevail, it is obviously necessary for most elites to agree to its implementation. This occurs through bargaining, which naturally depends on a leader's initial willingness to bargain. It is here where some of Lijphart's ideas fit in most appropriately. Arend Lijphart studied The Netherlands and other small hetereogeneous democracies, and discovered that democracy was maintained despite the existence of noncompatible sub-cultures. In these countries "subcultural cleavages and tendencies towards immobilism and instability are deliberately turned into more stable systems by the leaders of the major subcultures"[67], and such systems are called consociational democracies. Lijphart's consociationalism bears a close resemblance to Rustow's decision phase, since in both cases elites make a conscious decision to ignore their differences, in one case to maintain a democratic system, while in the other case to create one.

Thus, the leaders of feuding subcultures recognize the potentially destructive outcome of a continuing struggle between their followers. They thus take steps to overcome these differences at an elite level. Lijphart claims that the search for cooperation is more urgent if there has been the actual occurrence of conflict in the past. The other pre-requisites for consociational democracy are the ability of leaders to recognize the dangers of a continuing fragmented system, a commitment to system maintenance, an ability to overcome subcultural cleavages at the elite level, and an ability to forge appropriate solutions for the demands of the subcultures.[68] It is obvious that similar pre-requisites are also necessary for the transfer to democracy to occur in a highly fragmented authoritarian system, as it reaches a critical point in the preparatory phase. There must be an overarching willingness on the part of the elites to downplay their own agendas in order to achieve a democratic system.

It should also be mentioned that international conditions can enter into the equation. International tensions are often the decisive factor which drains the strength of the authoritarian regime, or gives strength to the pro-democratic forces. Groups directly receive support and resources from foreign sources. However, it is international pressures such as foreign conflicts in which the regime may be involved, or economic pressures, such as

the desirability of becoming involved in international economic systems which can have the largest impact. International considerations can often make the difference, but it is difficult to account for them theoretically. Most often these factors are not predictable, and thus take on a random character. Nevertheless, it is possible to say that international factors can have an important impact, and that regimes which are inclined to be involved internationally will be affected more than those which are not.

This leads to Rustow's final phase; the habituation phase. Following the establishment of democratic institutions, citizens, including elites, receive feedback, such as the peaceful resolution of conflicts, reinforcing their decision, and thus feel even more comfortable with democracy. This is the phase in which democracy is consolidated. Dahl seems to agree with this notion when he states that "the achievements of polyarchies serve to give the concept of polyarchy prestige".[69] However, this thesis will have little to say about the habituation phase, since it can be a long process, and one that may never be completely finished. As a result, the habituation phase would begin to involve some of the same problems that democratic stability theorists attempt to tackle.

SUMMARY

In summary, the democratic stability theorists, using

socio-economic and cultural explanations, cannot adequately account for the transformation to democracy. This is not surprising, because this was never their intention, but others have attempted to apply their findings to explain transition. Rustow warned against this, and developed his own sequential theory to explain democratic transition. But he failed to fill in many details. It has been the purpose of this chapter to fill in some of those details.

Rustow first posited that a country would need to go through a background phase in which the question of the ethnic makeup of the political unit was more or less decided. Once this condition was completed, the polity would then move into the preparatory phase, in which a long inconclusive political struggle would ensue.

The argument of this chapter has been that this struggle should culminate in a crisis for the authoritarian regime, and this crisis results in people questioning what sort of political system is appropriate for the present conditions that exist both within and outside of the country. The crisis does not imply that democracy is inevitable. Instead, democracy is but one of several options available to the elite decision makers. Democracy is not the only possible option, but in cases where democracy emerges, it is deemed to be the option with both the greatest chance of success and with the most desirable outcome.

Thus, the factor most responsible for the transition to democracy is the decision of the country's regime and opposition leaders to begin the negotiation process towards the establishment of a democratic system. Transition is therefore, not chiefly caused by mass pressure generated by economic development or changes in political culture. Rather democracy materializes when the leaders of the regime and pro-democratic forces achieve a rough consensus on the allure of democracy. Accordingly, democracy results when leaders begin to act in a consociational manner in bringing about its creation.

Consequently, the preparatory phase is the time period which lays the foundations for a crisis for the regime. It is also a period which conditions the attitudes of the political elite and results in their preference for democracy.

A number of factors can be responsible for the development of a regime crisis. International factors, such as an unpopular foreign conflict, a systemic economic crisis, or changes in trading patterns, can cause discontent resulting in opposition to the regime. Industrialization results in an increasingly militant labour movement, which can disrupt the labour peace preferred by authoritarian regimes. Labour strife can spill over into the political arena, and the possibility of a coalition of labour and

opposition political groups links labour to the democratic option, while strengthening the position of the democratic opposition. These are probably the two most important determinants, but other factors can also have some impact.

A higher level of education and increased exposure to democratic ideas can result in an elite or mass political culture more conducive to democracy. When this results in some degree of mass mobilization in favour of democracy, it can lead to a crisis for the regime.

The preparatory phase also brings about changes in the attitudes of the country's leaders. Certain occurrences are more likely to make leaders pragmatic and willing to negotiate than others. A history of violence is most important in creating a preference among elites for negotiated settlements rather than coercive struggles. If the issues, aside from the issue of regime-form, are socio-economic, rather than ideological cleavages, such as those of a clerical/anti-clerical or republican/monarchy nature, then negotiation takes place with a greater chance of success. Ideological issues tend to be zero-sum and are thus less conducive to compromise. As the struggle becomes more bi-polar due to the convergence of pro-democratic forces, a balance is achieved. Since, neither side is likely to be able to force the other to back down, an added impulse to negotiate is produced by a balance of forces. A decline in

ideological fervour on the part of the regime and opposition groups also leads to an increase in pragmatism which is likely to mean that leaders will consider a democratic solution to the crisis.

Finally, factors which increase the appeal of democracy are important in achieving an elite consensus for transition. Internationally, a desire to become a member of military alliances or to acquire the benefits of belonging to an international trade regime can influence leaders in their preference for democracy. As well, to receive economic or technical aid from Western countries it is usually helpful to have democratic political systems. Negative experiences with the authoritarian regime will also have some impact in convincing regime-members that a change in political systems is desirable; as will the positive aspects of foreign democracies.

Given favourable conditions during the preparatory phase, regime leaders and opposition leaders will come to the conclusion that a negotiated transition to democracy is necessary. Ultimately it is a few determining factors which lead to this decision, such as past historical experiences, positive and negative experiences with democracy, different experiences with authoritarian rule and the authoritarian state, mass pressure and international pressure, which lead to the decision to implement democracy.

ENDNOTES

[1]Dankwart Rustow, "Transitions to Democracy" Comparative Politics, Volume 2, April 1970, p. 341.

[2]The chief contribution of these theorists is to suggest that intermediary associational factors are important. However, much of the volume is merely descriptive, and the authors do not attempt to devise a general theory, nor do they state how associations fit into the sequence of transition. Thus, they tend to merely clarify concepts rather than attempt to develop theory. Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe Schmitter and Lawrence Whitehead eds. Transitions From Authoritarian Rule, (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press 1986)

[3]G. Bingham Powell, Contemporary Democracies, (Cambridge:Harvard University Press, 1982), p. 1.

[4]Daniel Levine, "Paradigm Lost: Dependence to Democracy" World Politics, Vol. XL, No. 3, (April 1988), p. 383.

[5]Ibid., p. 379. Schmitter and O'Donnell seem to feel that a genuine democracy extends democratic values past the political sphere, and into the economic and social spheres.

[6]By political democracy, I mean a political system in which social and economic inequality persist, and the system is based on equality of opportunity and the extension of political rights, such as voting and freedom of speech.

[7]Ibid., p. 379.

[8]Leon Hurwitz, "Democratic Political Stability", Comparative Political Studies, Volume 4, No. 4, (Jan. 1972).

[9]Rustow, "Transitions", p. 339.

[10]Seymour Lipset, Political Man , (Garden City N.J.: Anchor Books, 1959). Lipset does not use sophisticated statistics in evaluating his data. Nevertheless, the data appears to validate his contentions.

[11] Lipset does not give any examples of a pre-mature democracy. Presumably he meant countries like India, which have lagged far behind the economic development of the West. Lipset in Eckstein and Apter, eds., Comparative Politics: A Reader, (London: Collier-MacMillan Ltd., 1963) p. 199.

[12]Powell, Contemporary Democracies, p. 30.

[13]Robert Dahl, Polyarchy, Participation and Opposition (New Haven: Yale University Press: 1982), p. 64.

[14]Dahl bases this threshold upon data presented in tabular form in his work. He does not use sophisticated statistics to establish whether his threshold is statistically significantly.Ibid., p. 67.

[15]Ibid., p. 70.

[16]Ibid., p. 71.

[17] Schmitter in O'Donnell, Scmitter and Whitehead Transitions, p. 6.

[18] Rustow, "Transitions" p. 342.

[19]Powell, Contemporary Democracies, p. 39.

[20]Ibid., p. 53.

[21]Gabriel Almond in Almond, Flanagan and Mandt eds. Crisis, Choice and Change, (Boston: Little &Brown, 1973) p. 3.

[22]Lipset, Political Man , p. 64.

[23]Powell, Contemporary Democracies, p. 35.

[24]Dahl, Polyarchy, pp. 77-86.

[25]Ibid., p. 77.

[26]Ibid., p. 74.

[27]Geoffery Pridham, "Comparative Perspectives on the New Mediterranian Democracies: A Model of Regime Transformation", West European Politics, Volume 7, No. 2, (April 1984), p. 21.

[28]Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, Civic Culture, (Boston: Little & Brown, 1963)

[29]Ibid., p. 6.

[30]Ibid., p. 366.

[31]Powell, Contemporary Democracies, p. 28.

[32]Dahl, Polyarchy, p. 75.

[33]Rustow, "Transitions" p. 342.

[34]Pridham, "Comparative Perspectives", p. 12.

[35]Dahl, Polyarchy, p. 167.

[36]Ibid., p. 185.

[37]Juan Linz and Albert Stepan, The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes, (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1978) p. 18.

[38]Ibid., p. 18.

[39]Dahl, Polyarchy, p. 186.

[40]Lipset, Political Man , p. 57.

[41]Barrington Moore, Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), p. 415.

[42]Harry Eckstein, Division and Cohesion in a Democracy, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966)

[43] Ibid., p. 239.

[44]Ibid., p. 271.

[45]Powell, Contemporary Democracies, pp. 74-173.

[46]Lawrence Dodd, Coalitions in Parliamentary Government, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), p. 10.

[47]Rustow, "Transitions", p. 341.

[48]Jose Casanova, "Modernization and Democracy: Reflections on Spain´s Transition to Democracy", Social Research, Volume 50, No. 4, (Winter 1983), p. 936.

[49] Przeworski, in O´Donnell, Schmitter, and Whitehead, Transitions From Authoritarian, pp. 47-48.

[50]Levine, "Paradigm Lost", p. 377.

[51]Rustow, "Transitions",

[52]For example, Moore Social Origins p. 438., Almond, Flanagan and Mandt, Crisis, p. 3.

[53]Dahl, Polyarchy, p. 108.

[54]Linz and Stepan, Breakdown, p. 53.

[55]Lipset, Political Man, p. 71.

[56]Nicos Poulantzas, Crisis of the Dictatorships (London: N.L.B., 1976)

[57]Moore, Social Origins

[58]Dahl, Polyarchy, p. 128.

[59]Levine, "Paradigm Lost", p. 390.

[60]Ibid., p. 384.

[61]William Riker, The Theory of Political Coalitions, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), p. 12.

[62]Ibid., p. 47.

[63]Almond, Flanagan and Mandt, Crisis, p. 71.

[64]Dodd, Coalitions, p. 18.

[65]Almond, Flanagan and Mandt, Crisis, p. 72.

[66]Dahl, Polyarchy, p. 151.

[67]Arend Lijphart, "Typologies of Democratic Systems", Comparative Political Studies, Vol. 1, No. 1, (April 1968), p. 20.

[68]Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[69]Dahl, Polyarchies, p. 173.

CHAPTER 3

HISTORICAL VARIABLES OF THE PREPARATORY PHASE

Among the countries of Europe, few have a history as violent or unstable as those of Spain and Portugal. The Republican period in both Spain and Portugal was intensely violent and unstable, and fueled by deep seated cleavages. As a result of the destructiveness of the Republican periods, the dictatorships had a natural base of support among those who favoured order and national unity. Thus, it is important to examine Spain and Portugal's history from the beginning of this century in order to understand why the first attempts at democracy failed and why the dictatorships were able to last for such a long period of time; this is the task of the present chapter.

The chapter corresponds to two phases of Rustow's transition theory. In the first section of the chapter, the background condition will be examined in both Spain and Portugal. The question of national unity will be dealt with up until the time of transition since Rustow believed that a sufficient degree of national unity was necessary before a country could begin the transition to democracy. Since Spain has made the transition, it would appear that there exists a sufficient degree of national unity, yet separatist terrorism continues to threaten the existence of democracy. Because

this question tends to complicate the general problem, it will be dealt with outside of the chronological framework of the rest of the chapter. Although this is a somewhat artificial division it should help to provide clarity.

Rustow did not however, define the degree of unity necessary. The preceding chapter attempted to bring some clarity to this concept, and it was stated that ethnic cleavages are too severe to allow for the compromise necessary for democracy.

The question of whether both countries have fulfilled the background condition of national unity is easily answered in the case of Portugal but remains highly contentious in Spain's case. Indeed the regional question is probably the most serious threat to the consolidation of democracy in Spain. However, it must still be determined whether a high enough degree of national unity has been established to allow for a meaningful attempt at democratic transition.

The next section of the chapter will look at Rustow's preparatory phase. We will begin by looking at the period just before the institution of republics in both countries: in Portugal the First Republic was installed in 1910, lasting sixteen years; in Spain the Second Republic came into existence in 1931, lasting just five years before dissolving into the Civil War. The republican periods in both countries are important in explaining the longevity of the dictatorships and the dormancy of the democratic opposition. Thus this chapter will attempt to explain why so little

struggle occurred in either country, and why Franco and Salazar were able to rule with so little difficulty until the late fifties.

In the sixties, for the first time in two decades, these countries witnessed the stirring of serious opposition to authoritarian rule. As the decade proceeded, the political struggle, as envisioned by Rustow, became increasingly more bi-polar, and the forces favourable to democracy continued to gain strength. This is less true in Portugal; however, even there, the struggle manifested itself in increased strike action and student protest. The preparatory phase will take us right up to 1969, when both long-time dictatorships appeared to be entering a period of crisis.

In Portugal, Salazar's debilitating stroke forced the President to remove him as prime minister and appoint Caetano as his successor. Similarly, in Spain, a hunting accident reminded Franco of his own mortality, forcing him to name Prince Juan Carlos as his successor in 1969. Franco remained head of state, but handed the actual functioning of government over to Admiral Carraro Blanco. Thus, by 1969, the two men who had masterfully managed the forces supporting the dictatorships were either totally, or partially, removed from the apex of power. As well, the two leaders had served as important legitimizing symbols for their regimes. With their diminishing role in the leadership of the regime, the question of the future form of the regime became increasingly

urgent in both countries. Thus, 1969 marks the point where the preparatory phase ends and the decision phase begins, although this date is somewhat arbitrary, since the struggle of the preparatory phase continues into the decision phase.

THE BACKGROUND CONDITION: NATIONAL UNITY

Rustow stated that the background condition for democracy was national unity. The question of exactly what territory and what ethnic groups actually belonged to the nation had to be solved before any serious attempt could be made at establishing democracy.

This has been clearly accomplished in the case of Portugal. The official independence of Portugal was proclaimed with the sanction of Pope Alexander III in 1179.[1] Portugal remained independent until the efforts of Count-Duke Olivares, head minister under Philip IV in Spain, to unite Iberia. This resulted in Portugal's annexation by Spain in 1580, an annexation which was to last until Portugal regained its independence in 1640.[2] Since, that time Portugal has retained its independence, and the borders between the two countries of the Iberian peninsula have been set . Thus, the question of the existence of the Portuguese nation was effectively answered over three hundred years ago. By the time Castile had finished her reconquest of Moslem territory, "Portugal was firmly glued together with a common pride, common purpose and common loyalties".[3] Thus, Castile could not continue the unification of the Iberian peninsula because

a Portuguese nation existed which would not accept Castilian domination, as the rest of the peninsula would.

Indeed, the fear of Portugal's domination by Castile has been one of the major glues holding the nation together. The Spanish threat has been constant from 1640 to 1975, and talk of an Iberian federation was even present during the Second Spanish Republic. Given the immediacy of that threat, Portugal's leaders have managed to contain any centrifugal tendencies. As a result, Portugal is one of the most homogenous nations in Europe. In contrast to Spain, there are few regional tendencies and the country is characterized by only one language, one religion, and one ethnic group. Thus, Portugal has clearly fulfilled the background condition, since it is clear that no groups question its right to exist as a nation-state, or demand the inclusion of any of mainland Portugal's area within its territory. For this reason, Portugal's transition to democracy was not made more difficult by ethnic cleavages.

This is definitely not the case with Spain. In Spain, like many of the countries of western Europe, small kingdoms retained much of their power into the 19th century, however, there were no Spanish Bismarcks or Garibaldis to forge a united Spanish nation-state. In the 16th and 17th centuries Spain consisted of

> half a dozen kingdoms, each with its own administration, its own laws and cortes living side by side. The only political link between them was the King, and his power, wherever individual rights or local liberties were

> concerned, was very limited. The cement that held them together was the Church.[4]

Castile dominated the monarchy, but other regions remained fairly independent. With the formation of the centralized state in the 18th century, the present boundaries of Spain were established, and thus the precedence of the Spanish state's rule over some of her dissenting regions was established at that time.

Jaurequi maintains that the formation of the Spanish state, unlike other European states, was "tardy and deficient" and thus Spain did not attain the degree of integration necessary for an "authentic modern national state".[5] Although the Spanish state became centralized earlier than states such as Germany and Italy, this centralization occurred at a far more superficial level. Castile had control over certain matters such as national defense, and all regions maintained a loyalty to the Castilian monarch. However, at a cultural level the populations of the regions maintained their distinctiveness, and pan-Spanish nationalism has never been able to subsume regional identification as has happened in Germany or Italy. Thus, Spain entered the 20th century without solving the national problem, and many of the problems of the early attempts at democracy were due to this issue. Regional identification has tended to increase over time[6], and as a result regional movements exist in Catalonia, the Basque country, Galicia, Andalucia, and Valencia. Much of this

feeling is a legacy from the former independence of these kingdoms, and extends to the heart of Castile itself. Even in Leon, regional identification remains as demonstrated by the slogan "Leon no es Espana, Espana es Leon".[7]

However, these separate regions did not become independent because there has often been a common threat or concept holding Spain together. Gerald Brenan saw Spain as a nation that existed only "when under the influence of some powerful idea or impulse".[8] From the Moors to Napoleon, the Spanish have often faced an external threat which is greater than their own internal differences. As well, concepts such as Spain as the defender of Catholicism or the civilizer of America, have provided a common bond greater than regional distinctions.

Nevertheless, despite these sporadic and brief experiences of unity, Spain has generally witnessed great disunity. During the Federal Republic of 1873, all except one of the cities of the South East, from Sevilla to Valencia, declared themselves free ports and free from central authority.[9] Centrifugal forces tend to appear in Spain whenever there is any indication of weakness in Madrid, or the disappearance of a central rallying concept. This fact underscores two major themes of Spanish nationalism.

First of all there is the dominance of Castile. The Kingdom of Castile came to be the dominant political institution of the Spanish state. Spain's rulers and soldiers

tended to come from Castile. On the other hand, commerce and culture was often left to the Catalans and the Basque. As a result, Spanish separatism has been fueled by the fact that Madrid, pursuing the international political expansion of Spain, which required a centralized state and unity, has often been neglectful of the requirements of economic growth of the industrialists of Barcelona and Bilbao.

However, there are also genuine national sentiments in these regions fueled by a deep-rooted and distinct cultural identity. This separate cultural identity, especially in Catalonia, the Basque Provinces and Galicia, "is based on a regional language and a unique historical experience".[10] This has resulted in the necessity of a balanced approach to nationalism in Madrid. "If too much force is applied at the centre, the provinces revolt and proclaim their independence; if too little, they withdraw into themselves and practice passive resistance".[11]

Unfortunately this balance has too often been missing in Spanish politics. One dimension of nationalism in Spain allows for the devolution of power to the periphery, but not if the action threatens the state.[12] Usually any efforts at devolution have been interpreted as weakness in Madrid, and the regional governments have subsequently pressed their demands too far for some of the ardent nationalists in Madrid. This has fueled a backlash in the capital resulting in a movement to reinstall a strict centralized state. For

example, the granting of autonomy to Catalonia and the Basque provinces by the government during the Second Republic was a major rallying point for the forces supporting Franco, which led to the Civil War. Thus, early attempts at democracy were partially derailed by the threat to Spanish unity that democracy implied.

This sentiment is a major factor placing the armed forces on the right in Spain. The army has always seen itself as the defender of national unity in Spain; when democratic governments have allowed autonomy in peripheral regions, it has been forced to side with anti-democratic forces.[13]

Thus, there is little doubt that strong regional sentiments exist within Spain, and these are countered by forces adverse to regional autonomy in Madrid. But, is this regionalism strong enough to prevent the implementation of democracy in Spain? Several times in the past democracy has foundered partially because of this issue. However, there are a number of countries in the world, such as Canada, Belgium or Switzerland, where democracy has prevailed despite the existence of strong regional identities. Seemingly, democracy and regionalism are not inconsistent where regional movements are obliged to stop short of separatism and central governments are willing to provide a sufficient degree of autonomy. Thus, the background condition should not be seen as an absolute necessity, but rather the political unit must be unified sufficiently to allow for the compromise necessary

in a democracy.

Traditionally, the strongest regional sentiments have occurred in Catalonia. Originally a part of Southern France, during the Middle Ages, "it acquired an active, enterprising character and European outlook very different from that of the semi-pastoral interior".[14] Catalan is a language distinct from Spanish, and Catalonia has developed a distinctive culture. Catalan nationalists came to identify with the Left during the Republic and the Civil War, and as a result Franco was especially virulent in repressing the Catalan language.

Present day Catalan nationalism was reborn in the 1950s.[15] Emerging in reaction to Franco's repression of the language, it has grown into a movement stressing autonomy, not independence. The violence of turn-of-the-century Catalan nationalism is almost non-existent at present. Chief among their grievances, shared with the Basques, is a feeling that their standard of living is lowered because of their relationship with the Spanish state. Unlike in other countries with regional cleavages, where anti-central state sentiment is generally fueled by economic backwardness, Catalonia and the Basque provinces are the most prosperous regions in Spain. As a result, they pay a disproportionately high share of taxes and recieve a lower share of government expenditures.[16] However, economic grievances are more easily negotiable, so that Catalan's grievances should be solvable.

This is certainly less the case in the Basque

country, known as Euskadi to its most radical proponents. The Basque provinces retained their own laws well into the 19th century, but lost them as a result of their support of Carlos in the Carlist Wars. Arising in the late 19th century, Basque nationalism was originally a conservative, peasant movement, partially a reaction to modernization.[17] The language, Euskara, had been rejected as a literary language by the Basque intelligentsia, and was not then a rallying point for nationalists. During the fifties attempts were made to revive the language, but still only a minority of Basques actually use it.

However, during Franco's dictatorship the Basque were fervently repressed. Use of Euskara was severely restricted. Basque nationalism moved to the left, especially with the formation of ETA[18], in the 1950s. Basque nationalism, as expounded by ETA, sees Euskadi not as an disadvantaged region within Spain, but as a nation occupied by a foreign state.[19] Thus, ETA has resorted to terrorism, resulting in 68 deaths in 1978, and 70 in 1979.[20] ETA commands significant support among the Basque population, as demonstrated by pro-ETA rallies in 1976, which drew 80,000 in San Sebastian and 100,000 in Bilbao.[21] ETA terrorism thus poses the major threat to the consolidation of Spanish democracy. In both Catalonia and The Basque provinces the resurgence of nationalism has been the result of Franco's efforts to repress regional sentiments. As a result, democracy has been

seen by many nationalists as a means of negotiating a more autonomous position for some of Spain's regions. As well, one would expect that with the passing of Franco's repressive tendencies tensions will be lowered to a point that democracy becomes feasible.

Post-Franco governments have generally been favourable to regional autonomy. As part of the constitution, autonomy statutes and regional legislatures have been brought into existence, but much of the transfer of power from Madrid to the regions has yet to occur.[22] In part, this results from a "fear that an overgenerous law on autonomy might cause military intervention".[23] Nevertheless, the democratic regime appears to sincerely intend to answer the regional grievances and this has done a lot to defuse separatist sentiments.

Independence is not really favoured by a large segment of the population, except in Euskadi. The referendum on the autonomy statute received around 90% support. However, separatism remains strong in Euskadi. A 1979 survey found 32% in favour of independence, compared to 25% for autonomy and 22% for federalism. In Catalonia the comparable numbers were, 15%, 41% and 16% respectively.[24] Also, support for regional parties continues to be very strong[25], resulting in greater fragmentation of the party system at the national level.

However, even in Euskadi, far less than a majority of the population supports independence. This seems to indicate that regional demands manifest themselves primarily as a call

for autonomy, not independence. The terrorism of ETA remains a major problem and could lead to a cycle of violence, which could feed support for independence. But there is a good chance that ETA will eventually be isolated, and moderate demands can be met by greater autonomy.

It is not clear whether Spain has yet achieved a high enough degree of unity for democracy to prevail. Certainly the precedent has been set for the inclusion of all of Spain's regions within a Spanish state. As well, a great deal of co-operation from regional elites was necessary to achieve the transition of the seventies. The democratic regime appears to be making a genuine attempt at establishing regional autonomy, while most regional parties demand autonomy rather than separation. This suggests that a sufficient degree of national unity has been achieved for a meaningful attempt at the establishment of democracy.

THE PREPARATORY PHASE

The mid-seventies transition to democracy was not the first attempt at democracy in either Spain or Portugal. Both had experienced farcical constitutional monarchies[26] which satisfied few supporters of democracy. As well, prior to the installation of Franco and Salazar's, dictatorships Spain experimented with two Republics while Portugal tried one. In both cases the Republican experience was extremely instable in terms of government durablity and efficiency. In both countries, Republican periods experienced severe cleavages

and much violence. In both cases, the legacy of violence and disorder provided an alternative which helped to perpetuate the dictatorships, as well as making future elites more willing to compromise. Thus, it is important to look at these periods, as they provide useful insights into why democracy failed at that time, and why it has had more success recently.

The first efforts to democratize the Iberian monarchies occurred early in the 19th century. The Spanish First Republic lasted from only 1868 to 1875, before collapsing before counter-revolutionary forces, reacting to the extremist federalist constitution.[27] Following the demise of the First Republic, a two party system was instituted from above, featuring an artificial rotation in power. In 1871, a similar rotational party system was established in Portugal.[28] This system was maintained by managing elections in rural ridings. The artificial nature of the constitutional monarchies led to a great deal of dissatisfaction since they did not really address the concerns of anyone but the monarch. As a result, the constitutional monarchies were discredited while republicans became increasingly radical. In Portugal, the monarchy's decreasing level of legitimacy, resulted in the assassination of King Carlos in 1908.[29] Carlos's successor lasted but two years, as the monarchy was overthrown in October 1910. In Spain, the constitutional monarchy did not lead directly to the Second Republic.

Instead, the years 1917 to 1923 witnessed great instability: there were ten governments and two acute crises; war in Morocco, and labour war in Barcelona.[30] The constitutional monarchy fell, as the Second Republic would, to the call for a strongman to end the instability and disorder.

Although King Alfonso remained head of state, Primo de Rivera instituted a dictatorship, with the backing of the army, in an attempt to restore unity and order. Primo had some sympathy for labour, and thus sought, and partially received, the collaboration of the socialists. The chief consequence of his dictatorship was the squeezing out of the moderate liberal right.[31] He also formed his own party, the Union Patriotica, which was to be a model for the authoritarian Falange. Thus, Primo's dictatorship helped to destroy the centre in Spanish politics and was a basis for the extremism of forces during the Republic.

As Primo's dictatorship became increasingly unpopular, the King also lost his legitimacy due to his support for Primo. "Increasing opposition from the left and the "abstention" of the right in the face of the dictator's difficulties, combined with the failure of his constitutional schemes, doomed the regime".[32] After the fall of Primo, Alfonso decided to test popular sentiment in municipal elections. The elections of April 1931 resulted in triumph for the Socialist/Republican bloc in large towns, and with little support from the army or upper classes, Alfonso fled.

Thus, the Republic was born, primarily by the deflation of all support for the Monarchy.

The Republics

In the beginning, the Republic received support from all groups except the anarchists and the Carlists, who remained monarchists. This was largely due to the fact that the previous regime's ineffectiveness had discredited monarchical systems in general; the resulting deflation in power led to a widespread desire to experiment with a republic. However, Spain had undergone great social change and the Republic faced demands from those subject to these social changes. Between 1910 and 1930 the agricultural population of Spain fell by 20%, and through the process of urbanization, resulted in a swelled working class. The working class doubled in Barcelona in the twenties, while Madrid's working class grew to 70% by 1930.[33] The agricultural population remained large though, and in the south they were landless and particularly poor. The agricultural workers had little to lose and thus formed a radical core of anarchist support in the south. Ultimately the governments of the Republic were unable to satisfy either the socialist or the anarchist's demands for a more equitable distribution of income, land reform, and a larger share of power for labourers. As a result the political forces existing during the Republic became increasingly radicalized.

Indeed, by the end of the Republic, Spain seemed to

be evenly divided between the forces of left and right, and neither side was willing to compromise. The left was led for most of the Republic by the Left-Republicans, and their leader Azana, however pressure from the more radical left caused Azana to adopt increasingly radical rhetoric. At first the Republicans were allied with the Socialists(PSOE)[34]. The PSOE originally fought primarily for replacement of the monarchy with a republic, but became increasingly Marxist, in contrast to their reformist roots, due to the strength of the more radical anarchists. This led to the breakdown of the alliance.[35] The PSOE itself was extremely fragmented. Reformist socialists followed Besteiro, while those who supported labour militancy because they had become impatient with the lack of reform during the Republic, clustered around trade union leader Caballero, and in between was Prieto, a revolutionary Marxist, who pragmatically supported the republican alliance because he felt that the country was not yet ready for socialist revolution.[36] The Left was further fragmented by the split of the communists(PCE), from the PSOE, after they unsuccessfully attempted to obtain PSOE support for the Russian Revolution. The final group on the left were the Anarchists, whose trade union(CNT), grew from virtually nothing to 1,600,000 members by 1936.[37] The Anarchists had little use for bourgeois democracy, and this combined with their extreme hatred of the Church, and their tolerance for criminal elements,[38] resulted in an

intransigent group willing to resort to violence. Thus, the left was characterized by extreme fragmentation. Even the Popular Front, the successful election tactic of 1936, fell apart after the election. As well, the growth in popular support for the extreme elements of the left caused all of the left to become increasingly radical.

The same sort of process occurred on the right. The right had been unorganized at the beginning of the Republic. Made up of traditionalists, social Catholics, liberal Catholics, and Alfonsine monarchists, no coherent party of the right existed.[39] This changed in 1933 when Gil Robles formed a nation-wide political movement, known as CEDA,[40] which proved successful in winning the elections later that year. Robles preached strong government, but not dictatorship. However, the left often misinterpreted his rhetoric as a prelude to fascism, and Robles' interest in NAZI electoral tactics did not help to dispel their fear.[41] Although he did not dispel the fears of the left, Robles language was too moderate for the right. He lost control to such figures as Calvo Sotelo, who stated that the right would be justified in rising if the Popular Front won the election.[42] As well, the extreme right was becoming increasingly influential. The Falange Espanol had been formed by Primo de Rivera's son Jose Antonio in October 1933.[43] The Falange was based upon the principles of order, discipline and Spanish nationalism. They drew inspiration from

Mussolini's Italy and desired a corporatist economic system, which would represent the workers better than capitalism. These priniciples led many to label the Falange fascist, a label which it often deserved. Primo's name added prestige to the movement and although it remained small it took on an importance larger than its numbers. Jose Antonio preached non-violence, but he was unable to control the membership, and by the end of the Republic the Falange had become the militia of the right. Thus, the right had become as radical as the left, and almost as fragmented, as demonstrated by the almost equal harassment of the Falange and the left, as the Robles government attempted to appear even-handed in its treatment of extremists.

Spain was divided into two uncompromising and yet internally fragmented camps. According to Linz this was due to four major crises:

> 1) a crisis of participation- the incapacity to integrate its workers and rural proletariat into political life; 2) a crisis of national integration, different from the one achieved under Castilian hegemony; 3) a crisis provoked by the secularism of intellectuals and anti-clericalism of the workers confronting an established church with considerable inluence in large sectors of the middle class and the countryside; 4) the general European economic crisis, compounded by a backward economy confronted with rising expectations of the masses.[44]

Of these, the most divisive and fanatical cleavage was the clerical one. For the bourgeois left, the Church was a useful scapegoat, while the workers felt that the Church had abandoned them. For Azana republicanism equalled anti-

clericalism, and he could never accept Robles as a republican depending on Catholic votes.[45] The Church was equally set against the republicans. A Church catechism asked "What kind of sin is Liberalism? - It is a most grievous sin against faith."[46] Fanaticism increased on both sides and left no room for compromise. Among virtually all of the major forces there was a limited commitment to democracy and tolerance, and for this reason the Republic plunged into an irreversible crisis.

Also affected by these cleavages was the army. The army had a long tradition of intervention in Spanish politics, but had lost its desire after its support of the Primo dictatorship. The army first became aroused over the passing of the Catalan autonomy statute, but it had other grievances over pay and structure, and concerns about the growing working class revolutionary movements.[47] As the Republic became more unstable, and regional demands increased, the army came to see itself in its traditional role as protector of Spanish order and unity, and thus felt justified in planning for intervention.

The Portuguese Republic was less broad based than the Spanish and certainly less ideologically fragmented. The left was much weaker due to the small number of industrial workers. Even so there were 518 strikes during the Republic,[48] a source of concern for many on the right. Republicanism was a minority movement in Portugal, its strength was in the lower middle classes and labourers of

Lisbon, while the rest of the country remained apathetic.[49] Thus, most of the struggle which occurred took place among the political elite, especially among the highly fragmented republicans, in Lisbon and Porto.

As in Spain, the major cleavage concerned the role of the Church in society. The republicans were fervently anti-clerical, and this brought about a reaction by the Catholic right. This reaction manifested itself in two distinct groupings. Neither was a mass movement. The CADC social and study group, of which Salazar became secretary, was more moderate but still disliked democracy and parliamentary rule.[50] The other more radical group was the Integralism Lusitano, which pushed for the clerical-corporatist social order as defined by the Church.[51] Although, the Portuguese Republic was less ideologically fragmented than the second Spanish Republic, governments lasted for a shorter period of time, and many changes that occurred were accompanied by significant bloodshed.

Another major force in Portuguese politics was the armed forces. Traditionally the final arbiter of Portuguese politics, the army had been the decisive factor in the transition from a monarchy to a democratic republic. Within five years the army successfully intervened, and installed a new government. A new concept of militarism appeared, which saw the army as the most important institution in society, and as the force to bring about national revival.[52] The last

13 months of the Republic saw four coup attempts by the army, including the last successful one of May 1926. By this time the army had gained a great deal of support due to a diffusion of the new militarism in the face of a instable, inefficient democracy.

In both countries the cleavage-ridden societies attempted to implement democracy at economically inopportune times. The Spanish Republic needed to increase wages without increasing unemployment, while at the same time carrying out agrarian reform, a task almost impossible to carry out during the depression.[53] For its part, the Portuguese Republic faced high inflation, a devaluating escudo, foreign debt problems, and high budgetary deficits.[54]

In Portugal, as in Spain, "the religious question had become the most important political issue and was inextricably intertwined with the question of regime".[55] The Republicans, because the Church had collaborated with the Monarchy in the old constitutional monarchy, blamed Portugal´s ills on the Church and had rallied around this issue, while those opposed to the Republic felt that they needed to defend the Church. This was exacerbated by harsh anti-clerical legislation introduced in 1910 and 1911, which among other things, prohibited worship outside of church buildings and religious education in schools. The anti-clerical stance of the Republicans alienated a portion of the population which may have otherwise supported the Republic.[56]

As in Spain, the clerical issue was far too intense for either side to compromise.

However, Portugal differed from Spain because in Portugal the Republic had a limited social base. Portugal had not undergone the social change Spain had. Thus, life continued much as it had always done in the rural areas, where the peasants remained essentially apolitical. The working class continued to be small and politics remained restricted to the elite. This meant that the Republic had few defenders and this probably saved Portugal from a civil war similar to Spain's. Political mobilization was limited by the suffrage, which included only literate males.[57] Working class support was destroyed further by the Republican government's repression of the labour movement. When the army overthrew the Republic there was no mass uprising attempting to save it, as happened in Spain.

Republican forces compounded their problems by internal squabbling. Early in the Republic the dominant republican party the PRP, divided into three separate parties, the largest the Democratic, and two more moderate parties the Unionists and the Evolutionists.[58] The fragmentation of the PRP was a factor which helped to convince a young Salazar that parliamentary democracy was not appropriate for Portugal. Fragmentation not only caused disillusionment; it also meant that the republican side was not able to meet the challenges of its detractors.

In Portugal, fragmentation was less ideologically based than in Spain. Instead it seemed to be due to the fact that politics were far more personalized than in Spain. Robinson speaks of a characteristic of Portuguese political culture which he calls Sebastianism, which is the search for a messianic leader to solve Portugal's problems.[59] The leaders of the Republic seemed to have cast themselves as the new Sebastian, and fragmentation was often due to the scramble for this honour.

The bitterness of the clerical cleavage, the fragmentation of the PRP, and the involvement of the armed forces all led to a Republic that did not function very democratically. Changes of government occurred as much through violence as through the ballot box. In power, the dominant Democrats acted to repress the opposition and frequently failed to protect the rights promised in their democratic rhetoric. Many supporters of the Republic became disillusioned because the Democrats remained constantly in power due to corrupt practices. The Republic fell into a pattern of electoral manipulation and coup attempts.

The Republic lost the support of the Church, the army and the landed oligarchy almost from the beginning.[60] The inefficiency, violence and corruption of the Republic drained away much of its support. It was finally overthrown in a bloodless coup in May 1926, by military officers who had intricately planned the coup. The press in Lisbon showed

strong support for the coup. Opposition parties saw an opportunity to gain power, while the public had grown tired of the instability and approved of the bloodless nature of the coup.[61] Thus, when the Republic fell, a disillusioned country offered little defense.

However, the most characteristic feature of the Republic was the violence and instability. The Portuguese Republic was one of history's most unstable regimes. In 15 years and 8 months there were 45 governments. In Congress, deputies and senators carried pistols, there were fights and duel challenges in the aisles and foyers, and political leaders required armed guards.[62] The violence extended to the streets: during the Republic 4000-5000 people were killed, while thousands more were injured. It was quite understandable then, that by the end of the Republic, order had become the key word.

While the Republic fell easily in Portugal, this was not the case in Spain, due to the much greater political mobilization and the existence of an entrenched class struggle. Spain had undergone a great deal more social change than Portugal, and for this reason a much larger, and more highly politicized working class existed. This resulted in a large segment of the population which was not prepared to return to a reactionary regime. Thus, there was a great deal more support for the Republic in Spain than in Portugal, where the Republic fell as a result of power deflation.

The Spanish Second Republic displayed as much instability as in Portugal; there were 18 governments in just over 5 years. As in Portugal, the interests of the political actors were allowed to have priority over the maintenance of the system. Elites acted in a confrontational rather than a consociational manner. The Civil War was precipitated by the assassination of Calvo Sotello, by leftists, on July 13th 1936. In reaction the uprising of the right was moved up to July 18th, and the Civil War began.

However, the beginning of the Civil War had been preceded by the growing mistrust of the left and right. The right began to see the leftward drift of both the left political elite and the proletariat, a drift they felt powerless to stop. Caballero's paper, "Claridad", pronounced daily the imminence of revolution, which terrified the right and prepared the atmosphere for a military rising.[63]

For their part, the non-anarchist left not only feared the Falange, which had proclaimed the appropriateness of the use of violence when it was justified, but also the more moderate CEDA. The left's fear was exacerbated by the example of Germany, Italy and Austria, where socialists were slaughtered following the seizure of power by the extreme right.[64] In 1934, the Socialists resorted to armed revolution when CEDA entered the government. The resulting revolution among Asturias miners, with reports of atrocities on both sides, increased the levels of fear dramatically. On the eve

of the final election Caballero matched Sotelo's threat, and promised a leftist uprising should the right win the election.[65] So, all the major forces in Spain had proclaimed that their own political agenda came before the preservation of democracy in Spain, an occurrence similar to Portugal's.

For Spain the disorder and violence of the Republic merely foreshadowed the Civil War. Still, Robles spoke of the disorder of the Republic, which saw "160 churches destroyed; 269 people killed; 43 newspaper offices sacked; and 146 bomb explosions".[66] The concern of the right increased as Spain slid closer to social revolution, which actually broke out in the months of July and August 1936. The right rallied around a call for order. They remembered "a golden age of civil peace under the rule of the 'iron surgeon', Primo de Rivera".[67] The right soon found their new Primo: General Francisco Franco.

The Republican periods in both Spain and Portugal led to a cultural legacy which was to affect the form of their political regimes for decades to come. The spectre of disorder and violence served as a reminder to the population that democracy was unworkable in their countries. Faced with a choice between authoritarian rule, and disorder most people supported the dictatorships. This collective historical memory kept the majority of the population from questioning the legitimacy of the dictatorships and was the major factor giving each country's dictators the space necessary to manage

the ruling coalitions.

The Republics also display that when struggle is fragmented, and political elites are unwilling to put aside their differences to support democracy, that democracy is extremely unlikely to last. The major cleavage during the Republics was the clerical issue, an issue over which neither side was willing to compromise. In Spain, there were class-based parties which were more interested in improving the position of the working class than preserving a democratic regime. Thus the Republic experienced a type of politics which was too intense for compromise. With the softening of these cleavages in later years, political elites became more willing to compromise and thus make democracy more likely.

The Spanish Civil War

However, both countries were to experience years of dictatorship before the cleavages were to diminish, and for Spain, the tragedy of the Civil War was still to come. Despite the fact that Portugal did not experience a civil war, the period following the collapse of the two republics reflected a major similarity in the two countries. In the immediate post-republic years, a leader was to emerge in both countries, who used his accomplishments to establish his legitimacy, and used adroit political skills to manage the forces supporting their dictatorships. The Civil War had the additional effect of further diminishing the strength of the left in Spain, which made stable dictatorship possible, a

task less necessary with the small and unmobilized Portuguese left.

Throughout the Civil War the pro-Republican forces remained fragmented, and this was evident from the very beginning. The social revolution feared by the right was triggered by the military's uprising. The workers were by necessity armed, and were largely responsible for preventing the immediate collapse of the Republic.[68] In many places in the Republican zones, this gave the workers legitimate authority, and as a result true social revolution took place. However, the political elite of the left considered this revolution to be divisive and a hindrance to the civil war effort, so they acted to quell the revolution. Early in the civil war the enthusiasm of the workers was key, however later, the efforts of the Republic were hindered by the alienation of the masses from the non-anarchist political leadership.[69] For their part the anarchists were slow to join in the Republican coalition because of their support for the revolution, which the Republican leadership sought to quell.

Among the parties of the left, the communists(PCE) were the ones that most fervently opposed the revolution. Although they stated that this position was for the sake of the war effort, the PCE, because the workers belonged predominantly to either a socialist or anarchist union, was isolated from the revolution and its only hope of obtaining power was through the Republican state apparatus; as well it

was receiving Soviet direction to that effect.[70]

Indeed, the rise of the PCE was to become the fundamental occurrence on the Republican side. The PCE grew from only 3,000 members at the end of 1935 to 200,000 by January 1937. By 1939 it had become the predominant party of the Republican forces. The strength of the PCE was its "organization, ruthlessness and its impeccable revolutionary credentials, which allowed it to 'save the bourgeoisie' without appearing as counter-revolutionary"[71], as well as being the conduit of vital Soviet arms.

However, the rise of the PCE was to alienate many of the supporters of the Republic. The Soviet connection was an obvious source of alienation. Although the Republic counted on Soviet arms, it was obvious that the PCE was following the Comintern's line in proposing a popular front.[72]

The Communist tactics, intended to unify and direct the Republican war effort, were appropriate considering that unity is necessary for effective fighting. However, these tactics were ruinous because of the PCE's "determination to use the Popular Front for the ends of their own party and the Soviet Union".[73] At times it seemed more important for the PCE to gain control of the Popular Front than to defeat the Nationalists. They ruthlessly attacked their opponents within the Popular Front, and this left a legacy of mistrust felt towards the PCE by the other forces within the anti-Franco opposition for years to come. This fragmentation of the

opposition was a large factor in explaining Franco's longevity. As well, the dominance and behaviour of the PCE within the Popular Front helped to confirm Franco's claim that the Nationalists led a crusade against communism.

For its part, the right did not begin the Civil War any more unified than the left. The Nationalists seemed to be taking on a fascist tinge, but the fascist element was always tempered by the fact that the army led the uprising.[74] The Falange had never been really strong, and its importance in Franco's regime was never due to its own strength. On the verge of disappearing in 1936, it allowed Franco to usurp its "symbols, style and ideals", because it would no longer have to worry about finances or militants.[75]

Franco adopted the Falange as the state's "party", not because he supported fascism, but because "it became clear that some sort of political doctrine was necessary, both to mobilize the civilian population and to provide a viable framework for government".[76] Facing the popularly mobilized forces of the Republic, Franco needed something to exhort the population within the Nationalist zone, which the old discredited right was unable to do. Thus, Franco set out to adopt the ideals of the Falange, at that time seemingly the force of the future, as the ideology of the Nationalists.

The Falangist ideology not only mobilized domestic support, it also helped to obtain international aid. Without the contributions of the Germans and Italians it was likely

that the Republicans would gain control within a few weeks.[77] By adopting the ideals of the Falange, Franco was more easily able to obtain German and Italian help.

The Falange was but one of the forces that came together to secure the victory by the Nationalists. Indeed, it was the Civil War which established the forces which would share power in Franco's dictatorship. And it was Franco's greatest achievement to unite the forces of the right, and emerge victorious in the Civil War. By uniting the Falange, the Alfonsine and Carlist monarchists, the army, the Church, and the economic elite, Franco was able to achieve what the Popular Front could not, and this combined with his ultimate military victory, proved enough to provide him with a great deal of legitimacy after the war.

Franco originally drew upon his position in the army to gain his position in Nationalist Spain. "Franco's prestige, his military power and his seniority made him the inevitable choice as commander-in-chief, but he was also made head of state by his military peers".[78] The primary goal for the Nationalists, in contrast to the Popular Front, was victory in the war, thus it was natural for them to look for a leader to centralize power.

The major technique Franco used to centralize power was to balance the forces that backed his regime, in combination with the use of repression or ostracism of all those who would not accept his leadership.[79] In instituting

the Falange as the state party, Franco displayed his talent for balancing forces. The Falange lost its social radicalism, in return for control of labour and propaganda, while the Carlists lost their immediate hopes for a restoration in return for the protection of traditional symbols and their religion.[80] Franco managed the monarchists by maintaining the possibility of restoration, but placing it at some distance in the future. He also had the blessing of the Church, to whom the Republic was antithetical, and it helped provide Franco with the support of the Catholic middle class.[81] Franco's first ministry, in January 1938, reflected this balance; it had three generals, one Carlist, two Falangists and two technocrats. Franco was to use this technique to maintain power throughout his regime, however during the war it achieved the unity necessary for victory, a quality lacking on the Republican side. As well, it provided Franco with a substantial success with which to consolidate and legitimate his personal rule.

The Civil War was also to have an effect on the post-war political culture, making the people more willing to accept Franco's regime in order to avoid violence and instability. As Linz puts it; "the memory of the Civil War and its aftermath is the basic background from which contemporary Spanish politics has to be understood. Half the population: i.e. those who lived through the Civil War - (nourished) a deep desire: never again".[82] There are no

reliable figures on how many were killed during the war, but estimates of those executed beyond battle casualties range from 100,000 to 400,000.[83] An estimate of the number of political prisoners held in 1939, places that figure at 271,139.[84] Thus, the war etched in the collective memories of Spaniards the notion that any attempt at opposition would lead to great suffering.

The Dictatorships

While Portugal did not suffer the extreme misery of the Spanish Civil War, its political elite did go through a somewhat comparable upheaval during the Republic and the early post-Republic years. Indeed, Portugal avoided a civil war because its population was largely unmobilized.

However, a similar process occurred in Portugal as in Spain, in that a man emerged who claimed legitimate authority due to his success in solving a difficult problem. Franco had been able to unify the right and win the civil war in Spain, while Salazar by solving some of Portugal's immediate financial problems and offering a viable blueprint for Portugal's future, had performed an equivalent "miracle". Based on his accomplishments Salazar was premier by 1932.

Between 1926 and 1928 Portugal was ruled by various military leaders. However, political unrest continued, and the economy was experiencing severe difficulties, resulting in a decline in the credibility of the military.[85] As a result, General Carmona appointed Salazar finance minister in

April 1928, as an attempt to replace incompetent military officials with an able technocrat.

Salazar was able to produce a surplus in the first year, despite the fact that the budget had traditionally shown a deficit, and was able to continue this practice in ensuing years. He was also able to bring inflation under control. "After his early success in handling Portugal's finances Salazar become the "indispensable man", and the soldiers, recognizing their technical incompetence to govern, were content to follow him."[86] As well, Salazar seemed to provide a secure, orderly future with his "New State", based upon the principles of state-corporatism, which he was beginning to reveal by 1930. Thus, like Franco, Salazar proved able to solve some of his country's major problems, while at the same time promising a more stable, orderly and prosperous future. From these notions he derived his authority.

Meanwhile, in Spain, with the victory of the Nationalists in the Civil War, Franco set about creating a regime which reflected the victorious forces. Much has been written about the "families" which supported Franco's regime. The families were the groups which perceived a loss of their position under the Republic and had conspired to destroy it. They included, Catholics, monarchists, soldiers, Falangists, technocrats and capitalists.[87] Franco's prowess in balancing these groups, ensured the longevity of his regime, however,

the families were also united by a fear that any disunity would result in a renewed civil war, and by the common bond that the post-war repression, and its possible retribution, brought. Soler, who attempted to explain the dictatorship from a class approach, has questioned Franco's role as the producer of this balance, and instead sees him as a mere product.[88] However, there is little doubt that on occasion it was Franco's manipulation that re-equilibrated the regime.

Franco was able to balance the supporters of his regime by giving "economics to the Bank, military affairs to the Army, moral life and much of education to the Church, subsidies to the monarchists, foreign affairs to Catholic Action, lip-service to the Carlists, tentative security to the middle classes, rhetoric and employment to the party, and job tenure and promises to the workers".[89] Thus, Franco was able to give each group what concerned it most, without impinging on the top priorities of the other forces. As well, he maintained a certain degree of uncertainty to keep them off balance, making sharp turns in policy or personnel when any one group became too powerful. Therefore, most families remained too weak to dominate the regime, while mutual suspicion kept any two groups from uniting against the others. It was Franco's ability to balance and accomodate the interests of the elites which formed the ruling coalition which explained the durability of his regime.

Similarly, Salazar received support from, and

balanced, forces resembling those in Spain. Support for Salazar's regime came from "sections of the middle class, what remained of the upper class, the Church, the military, business and industry, and large landowners".[90] Salazar's regime has been described as a "Bonapartist and autocratic regime, with a rather delicate balance of classes and political forces in which an individual dictator, by skill and force of personality, to say nothing of a broad gamut of authoritarian controls, found ample room for maneuver and manipulation".[91] Salazar managed these groups in much the same way Franco did, however, he faced the additional problem that the Army and the Church remained largely outside of his "corporatist" political system.

As mentioned earlier, Salazar was able to maintain the support of the army due to both their lack of confidence in governing, as well, as Salazar's record as a financial genius, and his generous budgetary allocations. Nevertheless, the army remained an independent source of power. The secret police, the PIDE, were never allowed to infilitrate the army as they did elsewhere.[92] As a result, most of the threats to Salazar's rule came from coup attempts initiated by sections of the military. As well, during the relatively free presidential elections, most challengers to Salazar's candidates were military men. However, Salazar was able to survive the military's opposition, even though ultimately the military was to overthrow his regime. Indeed, it is a

testament to both Franco and Salazar's political skills that without their presence their regimes were destined to crumble within a relatively short time.

However, despite Franco and Salazar's political skills, their regimes were originally consolidated with the help of strong ideologies. In Spain the New State was established on the basis of the Falangist ideology and "the Falange permeated every level of day to day existence".[93] The early laws in Spain pointed to a totalitarian state, with the abolition of parties and the creation of a single movement, the creation of auxilliary groups and control of the press.[94] The Falange became the dominant voice within the movement, and was charged with the socio-political aspects of Franco's plan for the protection of the victorious groups. However, while the Falange's quasi-fascist, corporatist ideology was to provide early legitimation and support for the regime, it was soon to become subservient. Faced with a clash between the interests of the regime and its own interests, the Falange invariable bowed to Franco's wishes.[95]

The downfall of the Falange and its ideology began as soon as the Allies began to win the Second World War. Much of its appeal had been due to its posing as the apparent ideology of the future, and with fascism on the wane internationally, it lost much of its appeal in Spain as well. Pragmatically, Franco realized that his regime would be isolated in the post-war world, so he began to remove some of

the fascist trappings; there were only two Falange members in the cabinet by 1945.[96]

With the onset of the Cold War, the Falange's anti-communist credentials provided it with a brief respite, but the transformation of Franco's regime from an ideologically party-based dictatorship to a pragmatic authoritarian system was never really reversed. With the decline of ideology the regime had only Franco's charisma and political skill and its administrative competence to lean upon. Thus it could not appeal to an ideology once Franco had died and the regime's future was in question.

A similar process was to take place in Portugal. Indeed, Salazar had established more corporatist institutions. Thus, the corporatist skeleton was more fully erected in Portugal than in Spain. Wiarda claims that Portugal had for the most part become corporatist.[97] Portugal became officially corporatist with the constitution of 1932, and many of the grass root organizations had been established by 1936. However, the pinnacle of the corporatist system, the corporations, in which business and labour were to negotiate their differences, were not established until 1956. As well, most of the corporatist institution were created from above; thus they never had the support of the people they were supposed to represent and this caused them to be ineffective. The corporatist system became a means of controlling the working class, since the corporatist regulatory agencies

often ignored violations made by business.[98] As well, both the Church and the army, despite having seats in the corporate chamber, were independent of the corporatist system. Thus, as Opello[99] contends, it would seem that Portugal never had a truly corporatist system.

As in Spain, Salazar had erected a fascist veneer to legitimate his rule. He created a single party, the National Union, and auxilliary organizations among the young, and women, and allowed the creation of the Legion, a potential party militia. However, ideology suffered the same fate in Portugal as in Spain. The defeat of the Axis forces in the war slowed corporatist development, and while an attempt was made to revive corporatism in the mid-fifties, it was a spent force by the end of the decade. Thus, both regimes were ideological at their birth, but became increasingly less so, and so neither of the regimes enjoyed the legitimation offered by a vital ideology.

As a result, the regimes came to concentrate on their effectiveness in developing the economy as one of the major sources of legitimacy. In Spain, the economy at the end of the Civil War was at 1914 levels. Franco set out on a policy of autarky[100]. This was partially a matter of necessity; Spain was internationally isolated, especially after the Second World War.

However, autarky proved to be a failure. By 1954, Spain´s economy remained at the levels of 1931. By the end of

the forties, inflation, labour discontent, and the pressure for industry resulted in calls for an end to autarky.[101] Many in Spain realized that economic development required outside help, and that Spain must open up to the international economy. Until the Cold War, the regime was isolated because of its ideology, but the Cold War made it possible to establish contacts with the West without dramatically changing its nature. The economy began to open up in the mid-fifties, but it was only in 1958 that it became the predominant policy. The new direction was instigated by the technocrats of the Opus Dei[102], and required a more pluralistic regime and a freer collective bargaining process. This will be dealt with in greater detail later.

Portugal did not undergo economic development, or improve international economic ties, to the same extent as Spain. Salazar was suspicious of foreign investment[103], and he also avoided industrial development for fear of the development of the class struggle.[104] Salazar could afford to be less concerned about economic development than Franco. The Portuguese population was not politically mobilized as the Spanish had been during the Republic, and thus they were less likely to pressure the regime for economic development in the short-run. The fact that economic pressures made the Spanish state more pragmatic and dependent on the economies of the West meant that Spanish elites were more open to a democratic option when the question of the regime's durability was

raised in the seventies.

Of course the regimes also relied on coercion to maintain power. Repression was directed not only at political opponents, but at the labour movement as well. Both Franco and Salazar believed that the class struggle must be terminated in order for social peace to prevail. Franco made strikes illegal in 1938. This law was stiffened by the State Security Act of 1941, which made strikes punishable by three to five years in prison.[105] In the absence of collective bargaining the state drew up an extensive range of regulations, and the class struggle was supposed to be worked out through the corporatist system. The repression of the labour force was successful for some 20 years, but large scale strikes and demonstrations re-emerged in 1956.[106] The regime's repression of the labour movement meant that a lot of the initial opposition to the regime was channelled as demands for normal collective bargaining, and thus the labour movement was to become the focus of opposition during the sixties.

Salazar also showed little reluctance to repress the labour movement. The Labour Statute of 1933 banned strikes and lockouts, and also attempted to restrict collective bargaining to the corporatist apparatus. However, corporatism soon became a means of repressing labour, and thus much of the protest in Portugal also occurred over labour matters, but not to the same extent as in Spain. The Portuguese

working class remained much smaller, and whereas in Spain collective bargaining became widespread in the sixties, this was not to happen in Portugal.

However, in both countries, the harshest repression was saved for political opponents of the regime. In Portugal the terror of the regime "conditioned the whole behaviour of millions of people and shaped the mind of each individual".[107] The secret police from 1933-45, the PVDE, received training from Germans and Italians, resorted to torture, and were somewhat arbitrary in their arrests. By 1945, when the PVDE became the PIDE, it had become a sophisticated, systematic repressive agency, which in its "operative methods was tantamount to a Neo-Inquisition".[108] The repressive apparatus in Portugal was completed with the application of strict censorship combined with indoctination within the schools. The repression continued at high levels until Caetano's liberalization in 1968.

The post-civil war repression in Spain, was, as already documented, much more vigilant than in Portugal. Essentially, all those who continued to live in Republican zones during the war were suspect.[109] At the end of the war half a million Spaniards were interned in concentration camps, while a further half a million were in exile. Thus, Franco had managed to crush the majority of the opposition. As in Portugal, coercion was complemented with censorship and propaganda.

As a result, the majority of the population in both countries became essentially apolitical. Spain became a nation of cinema addicts, and most Spaniards became immersed in the "culture of evasion", flocking to the cinema, music hall and "futbol" matches.[110] Portugal was also characterized by "widespread political apathy, an absence of politically informed citizens and a general propensity for equating all opposition with communist influence".[111] Political apathy resulted not only from fear of coercion, but also from weariness with disorder (especially in Spain), and the struggle for day to day survival during economic hard-times. With widespread apathy, the regimes were more easily able to control their populations, and to keep the opposition isolated. This apathy was to dissipate in Spain in the sixties, but only to the extent that workers began to struggle for basic labour rights.

A strong organized opposition was lacking in both countries. In Spain, guerilla activity, led by the PCE, was to continue until the end of the forties. Spirits were raised by the prospect of Allied intervention to topple Franco[112], but this failed to materialize when the West realized that Franco would make a valuable Cold War ally, and the spirit of the opposition was broken. Between 1950 and 1956, the only form of popular protest was street demonstrations caused by hunger.[113] One fateful occurrence among the opposition was PCE leader Santiago Carillo's decision to cease guerilla

activity, moderate party policy, and begin building bridges to the bourgeois opposition.[114] This position was key in allowing the elite accomodation that was necessary in Spain's peaceful transition to democracy. Thus, Spain witnessed no serious opposition until the mid-fifties, and it was the rise of the Opus Dei within the state apparatus, and the loosening of labour laws which was to lead to the re-awakening of the opposition in the sixties.

In Portugal, the opposition was neutralized in the thirties. What opposition remained came most frequently from the communists(PCP), who were ruthlessly repressed: by 1974 the 22 members of the PCP politburo had each spent an average of 14 years in jail.[115] Opposition groups in both countries found it difficult to make united efforts because of internal differences, and a connection with communists also made repression more drastic. Portuguese opposition was also encouraged by the prospects of an Allied victory, and the privation of the War years also led to discontent.

However, opposition in Portugal was diverted through the relatively free presidential elections. From 1949 on the opposition was allowed to operate freely for one month prior to the elections. Most of the opposition geared their activity to this period, but they did so with the tacit understanding that they would withdraw their candidate just prior to the election.[116] With no chance of overthrowing the regime the opposition was willing to accept this token

gesture from the government. The elections thus offered no threat to the regime while serving to release opposition tensions. In 1958 General Delgado challenged this arrangement and failed to withdraw his candidacy. He received around one third of the vote under dubious conditions, and direct presidential elections were from that point on abolished. Thus 1958 represents the re-awakening of serious opposition, and combined with the commencement of guerilla warfare in the colonies, signals the beginning of the decadence of the regime.

The late fifties marked a distinct change in direction for Spanish economic policy. During the sixties Spain was to experience an economic miracle which would transform "a predominantly agrarian and rural society" into a "predominantly industrial and urban one, with a solid industrial working class and a renewed middle class".[117] This was to lead to a great deal of social conflict, which was to have some impact on the political forces in Spain, in contrast with Portugal, where economic development was less evident.

Economic development in Spain was facilitated by a decision to open up Spain's economy, and integrate it more fully with that of Western Europe. The new policy coincided with the rise within the state of Opus Dei, technocrats who pushed for this policy as an answer to Franco's past economic failures.[118] The opening of the economy was characterized by

new foreign investment, the flow of Spanish workers to other West European countries, and the continuous expansion of tourism[119]. It also involved efforts by Spain to enter the EEC. Official negotiations began in 1962, and this provided further incentive for political liberalization to match that of other EEC members.

A policy of European integration required a freer labour market. Thus, new legislation on collective bargaining was introduced in 1958 to improve the functioning of the labour market, and to integrate the workforce more securely into the industrial system.[120] Formerly collective bargaining had theoretically taken place within the corporatist apparatus, but now, although regulated, it could take place outside of this apparatus. Strikes became legal if they dealt strictly with economic matters. By 1967 73% of workers were covered by collective agreements.[121] Many employers favoured collective bargaining, since agreements reached in this manner would be honoured, as opposed to state-imposed settlements which could lead to work disruptions. Since Spain was experiencing highly expansionary times, few employers wished to have any disruptions in production. Thus, the stage had been set, by the opening up of the economy, for increased labour conflict.

In contrast Portugal continued to be much more isolated. Salazar, due to his desire to preserve traditional Portuguese society and his fear of social conflict, remained

until the end ambivalent about industrialization and international economic integration.[122] For this reason, "Portugal missed out on, among other things, a period comparable to the Spanish decades of development in the 1950s and 1960s and the general European prosperity of the postwar period".[123] Growth in the Portuguese economy was good, averaging 7.8% during the sixties, but Portugal could not keep pace with other Southern European countries. While the Portuguese per capita GNP had been approximately equal to the Spanish GNP in 1960, by 1970 it was only about two thirds of Spain's.[124] So, Portugal remained below the threshold established to define a developed nation, with a far smaller working class than in Spain, and thus Portugal experienced a much lower level of social conflict.

Culturally, both Spain and Portugal were opened up to new ideas. Most frequently this occurred through the influence of citizens working abroad and through tourism. Migration from Portugal occurred at such an alarming rate that the population fell by 180,000 in the sixties, while there were more than one million Portuguese citizens in France alone.[125] In 1964, Spain experienced the migration of over 550,000, with close to 300,000 moving abroad.[126] The communication of these individuals with friends and family back home, spread the word that democratic countries were both economically and politically better off. As well, more prosperous tourists flooded into the two countries, leaving

behind the impression of their greater wealth and democratic ideas. For example, in 1966, Spain played host to 17 million tourists.[127] This is not to say that the masses were mobilized. Many remained apolitical. For example, a 1969 poll revealed that 78% of young Spaniards had no interest in politics.[128] Nevertheless, both countries were exposed to new ideas to a greater extent than at any point since the beginning of the dictatorships.

These ideas also became integrated into some sections within the "families" supporting Franco's regime, and to a much lesser extent this also occurred in Portugal. By the late sixties the "families" supporting Franco were beginning to break apart. At the end of the fifties the Opus Dei technocrats began their ascent, which would place them in a predominant position by 1963. The members of the Opus Dei were neutral ideologically and were more interested in pragmatic solutions to Spain's problems. Thus, their ascent represented a de-ideologization of the bureaucracy.[129] Franco, not only sought the technical prowess of this group, but was also using them to counter-balance the ideologues within the Falange.

Simultaneous with the rise of the Opus Dei, was the decline of the Movimiento, and within that movement the Falange. The principles of the Movimiento seemed increasingly archaic, and thus it became meaningless, as regime families concluded that their futures lay outside of the movement.[130]

The 1958 Law on the Principles of the National Movement dropped all fascist-trappings and radical socio-economic statements, indicating that the Falangist ideology was dead. In 1967 the party was constitutionalized, but it received no revitalization or liberalization, and thus the organization remained lifeless.[131] Thus, the sixties were characterized by the complete de-ideologization of the regime and the rise of pragmatic technocrats. The nature of the state had changed, and left many of the technocrats open to the more dramatic changes of the seventies. Stripped of any vitality, the Movimiento remained the only legal political organization, serving through its monopoly to keep other political associations from arising.

The regime also saw the loss of support from some of the other "families". The Church witnessed a generational split, which saw it move from unswerving support for the regime to a more independent position.[132] Many in the Church became sympathetic to the labour movement, as shown by an anti-government position taken by bishops during discussion of the 1963 Trade Union Act. The Church was able to take such positions in opposition to the regime because nobody could question its ultimate loyalty.[133] However, certain factions within the Church were even more radical. Such groups as the HOAC and the JOC were closer to what is now known as liberation theology, and were divided from other Church groups by their direct support of labour action and

cooperation with communists.[134] By the end of the sixties the regime could no longer count on the unwavering support of the Church.

The bourgeoisie demonstrated similar divisions. Many businessmen had established connections with their European and American counterparts, and through these connections had concluded "that a more democratic structure of state and society could not but encourage financial progress".[135] And as alluded to earlier, many businessmen who had benefitted previously from working class repression now felt that such tactics were now counter-productive.

Finally, even the Army, still the ultimate pillar of the regime, was experiencing internal differences. Among the young officers there arose a new ideology of professionalism, which encouraged them to support the pragmatic efforts of the Opus Dei. In opposition were the old Generals, with their memories of the bitterness of the Civil War, still staunch supporters of a strictly authoritarian state.[136]

While Franco's regime witnessed many cracks in many of its pillars, Salazar's regime, which had never been as internally fragmented, remained somewhat stronger, although stagnant. Ultimately it was the desertion of the predominant pillar, the Army, which was to lead to the regime's downfall.

Within the Church, some of the younger activists found the regime's repressive policies in the social and political spheres unacceptable. A few cracks appeared in

Church-state relations with the rise of Pope John and Vatican II.[137] But the Church did not, as in Spain, "assume a critical role and create groups or movements which might have forced improvements in the regime".[138]

The bureaucracy witnessed a similar tendency to that in Spain, in that it became more technocratic and pragmatic and less ideological.[139] Yet it did not grow so pragmatic as to introduce reforms which were to any extent like the continuing influence, but even after his death reform remained nominal.

For its part the Army had always been the major source of opposition. Not only did it provide opposition presidential candidates, but it was also the author of ten conspiracies between 1945 and 1970.[140] Following the defeat of General Delgado in 1958, military conspiracies were planned in 1959, 1961, and 1962, leading to the assasination of Delgado in 1965. However, ultimately the major opposition in the Army arose because of the regime's reluctance to give up its African colonies.

The colonial empire had always been an integral part of the New State. For a nation with a wounded pride, it provided prestige and international status far greater than a small economically backward nation could expect. Portugal's exploits of the past, covered over the poverty of the present, and allowed the regime to divert attention from domestic problems.[141] Economic motives were not important.

Trade with the colonies fell from 43% of Portugal's total to 25% between 1960 and 1969. Intertwined with the concept of the New State as much as it was, the concept of the colonial empire could no more be tampered with than the form of the regime itself.

As time went on, the Army in Africa came to feel estranged from the sentiments of those in Portugal. As well, the necessities of war brought social cleavage into the Army. Middle ranking officers were caught between entrenched senior officers and less than reliable subordinates. Finally, conscription brought politicized university students into the officer corps.[142] Therefore, the sixties brought increasing disaffection within some sections of the army, which would culminate in the overthrow of the regime in the seventies. But, despite this crucial division in the Army, Portugal's regime remained much more united than Spain's, a fact which would make the opposition less apparent in Portugal.

While the regime in Spain was beginning to show signs of weakness, it remained essentially stable due to the lack of a united, effective opposition. Between 1948 and 1968, over 150 clandestine organizations had been set up in Spain.[143] The moderate opposition was still reluctant to cooperate with the communists, while the semi-opposition within the regime were unwilling to make any contact with the opposition.[144] Thus, the anti-Franco forces remained as divided as they had during the Civil War.

Without an effective opposition, most of the protest during the sixties took place under the aegis of the labour movement. In 1962 and 1964 grassroots strikes broke out across the north. The strikes were strictly economic, but the structures that ran the strikes showed that unified labour action was possible.[145]

The success of this action was to encourage the nascent Comisiones Obreros(Workers Commisions)(CO), which were beginning to emerge due to the growth of the working class, the encouragement of radical Catholic groups, and the absence of the exiled UGT and CNT leadership.[146] In the early sixties the COs tended to be of a temporary nature, disappearing as soon as they had achieved their specific goals. However, by 1966 they were becoming more permanent, and they ran in the Sindical Organization elections, picking up considerable support. As the COs became more politicized and radical, they brought about their own repression, and the liberalization of the regime was aborted.[147] Nevertheless, protest against Franco's regime was now focussed through the labour movement, and in the absence of an effective political opposition they carried the struggle against Franco. As well, their democratic form was certain to have some impression upon workers.

As for the political opposition, the forces of the moderate opposition had met in Munich in 1962. The meeting of Monarchists, Christian Democrats, Social Democrats, and

Basque and Catalan nationalists had been the first discussion between groups in Spain and those in exile since the war.[148] However, the moderate opposition was appeased by the liberalization of 1962-1966, and thus, they offered little support or leadership to those opposed to Franco in Spain.

On the left, the PSOE remained a shadow of its former self. It had little support among the proletariat or in the universities.[149] The PSOE only began to regain strength when Felipe Gonzalez became leader in the seventies, and its strong showing in the first post-Franco elections came as a surprise. The left continued to be dominated by the PCE. Still, despite their organization, the PCE was slow to take on the leadership of the more militant working class. Nevertheless, many of the younger generation were not aware of the PCE's war-time activities, all they knew was that the PCE was most active in opposing Franco.[150] The PCE was therefore becoming a more attractive alternative. As mentioned earlier, PCE leader, Carillo, had taken a Eurocommunist position, and was actively seeking a broad anti-Franco alliance. The moderate opposition was not yet ready to trust the PCE due to their Civil War experience, but this Eurocommunist position was to become extremely important in the seventies. However, this position caused fragmentation on the left. In the mid-sixties their were no less than ten splinter communist groups opposed to this stance.

Thus, the opposition in Spain remained fragmented

during the sixties, and was unable to mount any effective opposition within Spain. Social turmoil was apparent; however, the lack of leadership meant that the labour movement remained effectively directionless.

The Salazar regime, although showing a complete lack of dynamism, faced even less opposition than did Franco. The moderate opposition did gain some ground up until 1968. However, their concerns were not directed towards regime change, but rather concerned the performance of the economy and the policy towards the African colonies.[151] The moderate opposition helped to induce Caetano to introduce limited reform in 1968, but they were no threat to the regime.

On the left, the socialist's leader, Mario Soares, was still in exile and the Socialist Party was still in an embryonic form. The major force continued to be the PCP, but in the sixties it was racked by schisms, due to the fact that many of its younger members thought that its leader, Cunhal, was too Stalinist.[152] In the sixties the PCP provided little effective opposition: it remained ineffective and subject to extreme persecution.

There was, as in Spain, some student activity. Students first organized in 1962, and their was sporadic police-student confrontations for the rest of the decade. Much of this protest was concerned with the war in Africa[153] and many of the protesters were to have some influence within the army as conscripts.

Therefore, there was little effective anti-Salazar opposition in Portugal during the sixties, but the army was becoming increasingly opposed to Salazar's reluctance to give up the colonies. The opposition had previously geared its activity towards the presidential elections. When these were abolished following Delgado's nearly successful challenge, it was as if the opposition was lost for some time in search of new tactics. The opposition remained fragmented, as in Spain, but unlike the Spanish case, the labour movement had not become so militant in Portugal, and so by the late sixties, the social upheaval evident in Spain, was much less evident in Portugal.

SUMMARY

In summary, by the end of the sixties the regimes in both Spain and Portugal were entering a period of crisis. The primary reason for the durability of the dictatorships had been the ability of Franco and Salazar to balance and accomodate the interests of the various components of the ruling coalition. In achieving this level of elite accomodation they were aided by the fact that the citizens of their respective countries were largely apolitical, and thus they were able to rule with little mass protest. The masses were docile as a result of the collective memory of the violence and instability of previous democratic periods, and because the regimes maintained a high degree of repression. During this period the opposition was weak and fragmented.

Thus, until the late sixties Franco and Salazar ruled with relative ease.

However, by the late sixties cracks were beginning to appear in the foundations of the regimes. The primary cause for crisis was the impending mortality of both Franco and Salazar. Both commanded the respect of their ruling coalitions and the majority of the population. There were no apparent successors standing in the wings, and it was questionable whether anyone could claim the legitimacy that either of them posessed. Even with their presence the regime families were suffering an increasing number of defections. In Spain, the Church and business were divided over alternatives, the Falange was fading in importance, while the army and bureaucracy were becoming increasingly pragmatic. While Salazar was having more success at holding the coalition together, the major pillar of his regime, the army, was beginning to have some doubts about continuing the colonial wars, which would eventually put them in opposition to the regime.

The regimes had originally found legitimacy through both the leadership of Franco and Salazar and the utilization of semi-fascist, corporatist ideology. However, over the years ideology had become nothing more than a facade. Without an ideology to mobilize support the regimes continued to depend upon a personality cult to sustain them, but they added the promise of economic growth. This growth entailed

some degree of European integration, and this led to the liberalization of labour relations; resulting in increasing labour tension, especially in Spain. The pressure for Europeanization also directly led to pressure for democratization. As well, economic development led to a society which had been exposed to democratic values. Many within the elite were beginning to seriously consider the attraction of these values.

Consequently, the regimes faced both a crisis in leadership and a crumbling ruling coalition, at the same time as the population was becoming somewhat restless. With weak opposition leadership, the regimes could continue without fear of a popular uprising, but the dictatorships did face the possiblity that labour militancy could spill over into political turmoil in the future.

Therefore, as the sixties came to a close the long-term dictatorships were facing a question of their continued vitality. They were in crisis, but this does not mean that democracy was inevitable. There were several solutions to the crisis and parliamentary democracy was but one of them. In Spain, the regime eventually decided that democracy was the solution, but, in Portugal the regime remained undecided about a solution to the crisis and was overthrown by disgruntled army officers. Thus, the decision in Portugal came following the coup, when the alternative to democracy was not the Salazarist regime but socialist revolution.

ENDNOTES

[1]Dan Stanislawski, The Individuality of Portugal (Austin: University of Texas, 1959), p. 169.

[2] H. V. Livermore, A New History of Portugal, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), p.170.

[3] Stanislawski, Individuality, p. 185.

[4] Gerald Brenan, The Spanish Labyrynth, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943), p. 39.

[5] Gurutz Jaurequi, "National Identity and Political Violence in the Basque Country", European Journal of Political Research, Vol. 14, No. 5-6, (1986), p. 588.

[6] Regional identification in Spain is more strongly felt in this century than in the 20th century, which seems to be contrary to the general European trend. Much of the credit for this resurgence in regional sentiment can be attributed to the repressive policies of the Franco regime, which attempted to impose Castilian culture upon all parts of Spain.

[7]Leon is not Spain, Spain is Leon: indicating that the strength of the Spanish state lies in the strength of Leon. The Leonese are proud of their heritage, and like to point out that Leon had Kings before Castille had laws.

[8]Brenan, Labyrynth, p. 12.

[9] Ibid, p. 24.

[10]The regional languages in Spain are truly distinct languages and not mere dialects. The Basque language, Euskara, is not related to any other European language. Catalan, spoken in Catalonia is about midway between French and Spanish. While Gallego, spoken in Galicia, resembles Portuguese more than Spanish. Raymond Carr, Modern Spain, 1875-1980, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 61.

[11] Brenan, Labyrynth, p. viii.

[12]Xavier Arbos, "Central Versus Perpheral Nationalism in Building Democracy: The Case of Spain", Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism, Vol. XIV, No. 1, (Spring 1987), p. 144.

[13]Carr, Modern Spain, p. 84.

[14]Brenan, Labyrynth, p. 25.

[15]Beate Kohler, Political Forces in Spain, Portugal and Greece, (London: Butterworth, 1982), p. 61.

[16]However, the Catalans and Basque do not articulate their grievances as an economic demand for reduced taxes. They have also received the benefits that Castilian military prowess brought, through greater security and the opening up of colonial markets. However, they have tended to resent the Castialian attempt to impose a "Spanish" culture upon them. Their grievance is therefore essentially cultural. Robert Clark, "Language and Politics in Spain's Basque Country", West European Politics, Vol. 4, No. 1, (Jan. 1981), p. 87.

[17]Carr, Modern Spain, p. 67.

[18]ETA is the Euskadi Ta Askatasuna, which means Basque Homeland and Freedom.

[19]Euskadi has never existed as an independent entity, although the nominally Basque province of Navarre existed as an independent Kingdom until the 16th century. Nevertheless, the Basque were allowed to maintain certain unique feudal privileges until the end of the 19th century. Thus, ETA's conception of nationhood is not based upon any historical precedent of independence. Jaurequi, "National Identity", p. 588.

[20]Jose Maravall, The Transition to Democracy in Spain, (London: Croom Helm, 1982), p. 154.

[21]In subsequent years ETA's support has begun to subside. In 1981 a demonstration in reaction to an unprovoked ETA execution attracted 300,000 across the Basque provinces. ETA's practice of execution has begun to look bad compared to the Spanish state's abolition of the death penalty. Paul Preston, The Triumph of Democracy in Spain, (London: Methuen, 1986), p. 105.

[22]Thomas Lancaster, "Comparative Nationalism, the Basques in Spain and France", European Journal of Political Research, Vol. 15, No. 5, (1987), p. 567.

[23]Kohler, Political Forces, p. 65.

[24]Arbos, "Central Versus Peripheral", p. 153.

[25]Maravall, Transition to Democracy, p. 50., Four national parties obtained 32% of the total vote in Euskadi, and 53% in Catalonia.

[26]The constitutions gave legislative power to each country's

respective Cortes (legislature), but in practice the monarch continued to exercise arbitrary rule. Suffrage was extremely limited, while elections were consistently manipulated.

[27]The constitution allowed any region virtual independence, which the armed forces could not accept. Carr, Modern Spain, p. 6.

[28]In both countries rural election returns were rigged so that the monarch could decide which party would be in power. In emulation of British politics and in an attempt to achieve stability the two major parties in both countries were rotated in power. Livermore, History of Portugal, p. 297.

[29]For an excellent account of the breakdown of the monarchy see Douglas Wheeler, Republican Portugal, (Madison: University of Washington Press, 1978), pp 24-48.

[30]Carr, Modern Spain, p. 87.

[31]Schlomo Ben-Ami, "The Dictatorship of Primo de Rivera: A Political Reassessment", Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 12, No. 1, (January 1977), p. 65.

[32]Ibid., p. 79.

[33]Carr, Modern Spain, p. 45.

[34]Partido Socialista Obrero Espana - Spanish Socialist Workers Party.

[35]Paul Preston, "The Origins of the Socialist Schism in Spain, 1917-31", Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 12, No. 1, (Jan. 1977), p. 103.

[36]Edward Malefakis, "The Parties of the Left and the Second Republic", in Raymond Carr, ed., The Republic and The Civil War in Spain, (London: MacMillan & Co., 1971), p. 36.

[37]J. Romera Maura, "The Spanish Case", Government and Opposition, Vol. 5, No. 4, (Autumn 1970), p. 470.

[38]Brenan, Labyrynth, p. 251.

[39]Richard Robinson, "The Parties of the Right and The Republic", in Carr, The Republic and Civil War, p. 47.

[40]Confederacion Espanola de Derechas Autonomos, with 735,000 members it became Spain's largest party. Ibid., p. 57.

[41]As the Nazi's had done in Germany, CEDA drew up dockets on every voter, "giving particulars as to his opinions, where he worked and who could influence him". Brenan, Labyrynth, p. 268.

[42]Calvo Sotelo was a monarchist who had been a minister during Primo's dictatorship. He was therefore oriented towards authoritarian rather than democratic regimes. Robinson, "The Parties of the Right", p. 66.

[43]For an account of the early history of the Falange, see Stanley Payne, Falange: A History of Spanish Fascism, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961).

[44]There was a crisis of national integration because it appeared that the Republic was attempting to institute quasi-federal arrangements rather than the strict unitary system of previous monarchical regimes. Juan Linz, "From Falange to Movimiento-Organacion: The Spanish Single Party and the Franco Regime", in S. Huntington and C. Moore, eds., Authoritarian Politics in Modern Society, (New York: Basic Books, 1970), p. 130.

[45]Robinson, "The Parties of the Right", p. 60.

[46]Brenan, Labyrynth, p. 51.

[47]Stanley Payne, "The Army, the Republic, and the Outbreak of the Civil War", in Carr, ed., The Republic and Civil War, p. 80.

[48]Antonio de Figueiredo, Portugal: Fifty Years of Dictatorship, (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1976), p. 41.

[49]Portuguese peasants had a parochial political culture compared to the highly mobilized Spanish peasants, many of whom were Anarchists. Richard Robinson, Contemporary Portugal, (London: Allen & Unwin, 1979), p. 35.

[50]de Figueiredo, Fifty Years, p. 27.

[51]Thomas Bruneau, "Church and State in Portugal: Crises of Cross and Sword", Journal of Church and State, Vol. 18, No. 3, (Autumn 1976), p. 469.

[52]Wheeler, Republican Portugal, p. 173.

[53]Brenan, Spanish Labyrinth, p. 242.

[54]de Figueiredo, Fifty Years, p. 54.

[55]Richard Robinson, "The Religious Question and the Catholic

Revival in Portugal 1900-1930", Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 12, No. 2, (April 1977), p. 349.

[56]Wheeler, Republican Portugal, p. 68.

[57]The suffrage encompassed only 25% of the adult population. Robinson, "The Religious Question", p. 36.

[58]Wheeler, Republican Portugal, p. 86.

[59]Sebastianism refers to the popular myth that the quixotic King Sebastian, killed in battle in Morocco in 1578, would return as a saviour to restore Portugal's national prestige. Robinson, Contemporary Portugal, p.32.

[60]Douglas Wheeler, "Thaw in Portugal", Foreign Affairs, Vol. 48, No. 4, (July 1970), p. 770.

[61]Wheeler, Republican Portugal, p. 243.

[62]Ibid., p. 123.

[63]Brenan, Spanish Labyrinth, p. 305.

[64]Carr, Republic and Civil War, p.10.

[65]Robinson, "Parties of Right", p. 66.

[66]Raymond Carr, The Spanish Tragedy, (London: Weidenfeld-Nicolson, 1977), p.70.

[67]Harry Browne, Spain's Civil War, (Essex: Longman, 1983), p.305.

[68]Carr, Republic and Civil War, p.114.

[69]Browne, Civil War, p. 39.

[70]Carr, Spanish Tragedy, pp. 106-107.

[71]Carr, Republic and Civil War, p. 118.

[72]Bolloten, "The Parties of the Left and The Civil War", in Carr, ed. Republic and Civil War, p. 130.

[73]Carr, Spanish Tragedy, p. 176.

[74]Ibid., p. 63.

[75]Sheelagh Ellwood, Spanish Fascism in the Franco Era, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987), p. 96.

[76]Stanley Payne, Falange: A History of Spanish Fascism, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961), p. 148.

[77]Ibid, p. 117.

[78]Carr, Republic and Civil War, p. 121.

[79]Carr, Spanish Tragedy, p. 253.

[80]Carr, Republic and Civil War, p.122.

[81]Kenneth Medhurst, "The Political Presence of the Spanish Bureaucracy", Government and Opposition, Vol. 4, No. 2, (Spring 1968), p. 236.

[82]Juan Linz, "Opposition to and Under and Authoritarian Regime: The Case of Spain", in Robert Dahl ed., Regimes and Opposition, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), p. 181.

[83]Thomas estimates 50,000 on each side, Jackson 200,000 in war, and 200,000 between 1939-43. Carr, Spanish Tragedy, p.124.

[84]Paul Preston, The Triumph of Democracy in Spain, (London: Metheun, 1986), p. 4.

[85]Walter Opello, Portugal's Political Development, (Boulder: Westview Press, 1985), p. 53.

[86]Paul Lewis, "Salazar's Ministerial Elite, 1938-1969", Journal of Politics, Vol. 40, No. 3, (August 1978), p. 628.

[87]Preston, Triumph of Democracy, p. 5.

[88]Richard Soler, "The New Spain", New Left Review, No. 58, (Nov.-Dec. 1969), p. 9.

[89]Payne, Falange, p. 242.

[90]Wheeler, Republican Portugal, p. 251.

[91]Howard Wiarda, Corporatism and Development: The Portuguese Experience, (Amherst Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1977), p. 282.

[92]The PIDE had agents in almost all other institutions in society: universities, the corporate bodies, political organizations, etc., but none in the armed forces. Douglas Porch, The Portuguese Armed Forces and the Revolution, (London: Croom Helm, 1977), p. 23.

[93]Ellwood, Spanish Fascism, p.75.

[94]Manuel Ramirez, Espana, 1939-1975, (Barcelona: Guadarrama, 1978), p. 34.

[95]This the Falange did on at least four occasions; The Law of Succession (1947), Hispano-American Pact of Madrid (1953), Law of Fundamental Principles of the Movement (1956-58), and the process of selecting Franco's successor (1966-69). Ellwood, Spanish Fascism, p. 96.

[96]Payne, Falange, p. 240.

[97]Wiarda, Corporatism

[98]Robinson, Contemporary Portugal, p. 131.

[99]Opello, Portugal's Political Development.

[100]Carr, Modern Spain, p. 155.

[101]Preston, Triumph of Democracy, p. 6.

[102]The Opus Dei is a semi-secret Catholic organization which seeks to integrate Catholic principles into every day life. It operates its own university, and thus has produced a large number of skilled technocrats. They were pragmatic in their political and economic outlook.

[103]de Figueiredo, Fifty Years, p. 166.

[104]Tom Gallagher, "Controlled Repression in Salazar's Portugal", Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 14, No. 3, (July 1979), p. 393.

[105]International Labour Organization, "Report of the Study Group to Examine the Labour and Trade Union Situation in Spain", International Labour Organization Bulletin, Vol LII, No. 4, (1969), p. 220.

[106]Soler, "New Spain", p. 10.

[107]de Figueiredo, Fifty Years, p. 166.

[108]Ibid., p. 115.

[109]Sergio Vilar, Historia del Anti-Franquismo 1939-1975, (Barcelona: Plaza & Janes Editores, 1984), p.33.

[110]Carr, Modern Spain, p. 164.

[111]Wheeler, "Thaw in Portugal", p.772.

[112]The US government actually held discussions with opposition groups to establish this intervention's feasibilty. Vilar, Historia Anti-Franquismo, p. 54.

[113]Soler, "New Spain", p. 17.

[114]Carr, Spanish Tragedy, p. 279.

[115]Gallagher, "Controlled Repression", p. 393.

[116]Ibid., p. 390.

[117]Jose Maravall and Julian Santanovia, "Political Change in Spain and the Prospects For Democracy", in Guillermo O'Donnell, Phillipe Schmitter, and Lawrence Whitehead, eds., Transitions From Authoritarian Rule, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1986), p.74.

[118]Jon Amsden, Collective Bargaining and Class Conflict in Spain, (London: L.S.E., 1972), p. 49.

[119]I.L.O., "Report of the Study Group", p. 31.

[120]Amsden, Collective Bargaining, p. 62.

[121]I.L.O., "Report of the Study Group", p. 278.

[122]Wheeler, "Thaw in Portugal", p. 774.

[123]Wiarda, Corporatism, p. 334.

[124]Robinson, Contemporary Portugal, p. 144.

[125]de Figueiredo, Fifty Yearss, p. 182.

[126]Soler, "New Spain", p. 12.

[127]Ibid., p. 12.

[128]Jose Amodia, Franco's Political Legacy, (London: Allen Lane, 1977), p.35.

[129]Soler, "New Spain", p. 14.

[130]Preston, Triumph of Democracy, p. 8.

[131]Linz, "From Falange", p. 162.

[132]Enrique Tierno Galvan, "Student's Opposition in Spain", Government and Opposition, Vol. 1, No. 4, (Autumn 1966), p. 171.

[133]Linz, "Opposition... Authoritarian Regime", p. 238.

[134]Amsden, Collective Bargaining, p. 93.

[135]Tierno Galvan, "Student's Opposition", p. 472.

[136]Soler, "New Spain", pp. 13-14.

[137]Wiarda, Corporatism, p. 300.

[138]Bruneau, "Church and State", p.489.

[139]Lewis, "Salazar's Ministerial", p. 639.

[140]Opello, Portugal's Political Development, p.93.

[141]Porch, Portuguese Armed Forces, p. 13.

[142]Ibid, p. 31.

[143]Amodia, Franco's Political Legacy, p. 222.

[144]Linz, "Opposition...Authoritarian Regime", p. 229.

[145]Amsden, Collective Bargaining, p. 95.

[146]Linz, "Opposition... Authoritarian Regime", p. 233.

[147]Soler, "New Spain", p. 19.

[148]Ibid., p. 15.

[149]Ibid., p. 21.

[150]Amsden, Collective Bargaining, p. 90.

[151]Wheeler, "Thaw in Portugal", p. 772.

[152]Opello, Portugal's Political Development, p. 103.

[153]The colonial wars had a great effect upon society in mainland Portugal. By 1971 the war accounted for 45.9% of Portugal's national budget. There were 142,000 troops deployed in Africa: a huge drain of manpower for a country of only 8,000,000. The percentage of the adult population in the army was 11.2% in Portugal, compared to only 6.1% in the US at the same time. Thus, the wars not only disrupted the economy, but also presented a severe disruption in a young Portuguese citizen's life. Robinson, Contemporary Portugal, p. 126.

CHAPTER 4

THE DECISION PHASE: CONFRONTATION IN PORTUGAL: COMPROMISE IN SPAIN

As the sixties drew to a close, there was little indication that the regimes in Spain and Portugal were near their end. To be sure, the regimes had lost their dynamism, were stagnant and were increasingly unable to deal with their problems. However, both Salazar and Franco had previously been able to suppress an ineffective and highly fragmented opposition. The democratic opposition in both countries remained weak and divided. Despite the prospect of both Franco and Salazar's death, and the uncertainty of succession, both regimes were seen as essentially strong, and few observers expected them to collapse with the death of their creators.

Nevertheless, by the close of the seventies, both countries had undergone the transition to liberal democracy, and consolidation of democracy was well on its way to taking place. In Portugal the regime fell following a successful coup d'etat by disgruntled junior officers, but, the transition to democracy did not occur until after a highly conflictual flirtation with social revolution. For some time a liberal democratic regime appeared to be a highly unlikely outcome of the struggle between leftist factions within the military. However, the struggle in Portugal stopped just

short of civil war and a moderate faction of the military, dedicated more to democracy than social revolution, was able to lead the revolution in the direction of democracy. The communists and the far left, realizing that they could only impose their vision of Portuguese society after a highly unlikely victory in a bloody civil war, wisely accepted the installation of a liberal democratic regime.

In Spain, the regime was not smashed as in Portugal, but instead transformed itself through the legal mechanisms of the Franquist state. King Juan Carlos, Franco's successor as Head of State, along with Franquist state actors, especially Adolfo Suarez, managed to convince regime supporters to dissolve, or transform, regime institutions. As well, they began a process of negotiation with the leaders of the democratic opposition, and persuaded them to accept a state-led transition rather than the destruction of the Franquist state initially desired by the opposition. Thus, the Spanish regime was transformed with the agreement of all elite actors, with the exception of the Basque terrorists, whose violent actions constituted the major threat to a peaceful, state-led transition.

The transition in Spain took place through what Donald Share has called "transition through transaction"[1]; negotiation between elites representing the state and leaders of the opposition. Through negotiation, Spain's political elites came to the decision that their country could best be

governed by the rules of a democratic regime. Thus, Spain presents the best example of Dankwart Rustow's decision phase.

By contrast, the Portuguese case provides an example of an opportunity for democratic transition which was almost missed because its leaders reached the decision to accept democracy most reluctantly, and only after the effort made by the left to impose its own agenda upon Portuguese society had failed. Ultimately, democracy prevailed in Portugal, but a civil war or a left-wing military regime were also possibilities. Democracy prevailed because the left decided that they were not willing to use force, thus tacitly approving democratic rule, while the victorious moderate faction guaranteed that the communists and far left would not be excluded from a democratic regime, at the same time preserving a constitutional role for the military with the establishment of a revolutionary council.

Despite their differences, both cases seem to support Rustow's concept of a decision phase. This chapter will provide a look at the decision phase in both countries, and will attempt to prove that what occurred in Iberia during the mid-seventies was indeed Rustow's decision phase. The chapter will begin with the incapacitation of Salazar in Portugal, and his replacement with Caetano in 1968, while picking up in Spain with the nomination of Juan Carlos as Franco's successor in 1969. It will move through the final years of

the regimes, characterized by stagnation and futile attempts at liberalization in both countries. The chapter will then follow the transition to democracy in both countries, finishing with the completion of the constituent process in Portugal in 1976, and Spain in 1979.

FRANCO'S FINAL YEARS

In many ways the final years of Franco's regime witnessed swings in policy, similar to Caetano's government. Although Franco remained in control until the end, he increasingly delegated power, first to Admiral Carrero Blanco, and then following Carrero's assasination, to Carlos Arias Navarro. Arias, like Caetano, followed a path of limited liberalization followed by retrenchment designed to appease the right. Portugal differed because, unlike in Spain, the regime did not get a second chance to initiate reform. Caetano may have had an opportunity to transform Portugal, as Suarez would transform Spain, but in Portugal in 1968 the need was not as apparent, nor was Caetano as skilled.

The Spanish regime had the misfortune of facing its succession problem at the same time as an economic crisis. The world-wide recession resulted in Spain's facing a negative growth rate in the year of Franco's death. This had little effect upon the tendency for mass protest, since the regime was not generally blamed for the recession, but it did suggest to some members of the regime and the business

community that the authoritarian system could no longer sustain prosperity, and thus one of the main pillars of the regime became disaffected with authoritarian rule.

The Franco regime faced an additional pressure, which was much less prominent in Portugal. In Spain, terrorism, practiced by not only the members of extremist regional groups, but also disgruntled extremists of both the left and the right, became a major problem. States of emergency were declared in Euskadi on numerous occasions after 1968, and security forces acted like an army of occupation. ETA reacted with vengeance, and by 1976, 20 members of ETA and 60 policemen had been killed.[2] A left-wing terrorist group, FRAP[3], took up violent action against the regime, which resulted in indiscriminate reprisals by the government against leftists not connected to FRAP.

The wave of violence did not have the effect of making democracy more likely. It provided a challenge to the regime, but this challenge did not favour the transition to democracy. "The ability of the franquist-controlled media to portray terrorists as ´savages´; the regime´s ability to confound terrorism with democratic opposition, and the population´s abhorrence of violence all explain why acts of terrorism were usually counter-productive."[4] Terrorist acts had the effect of strengthening the resolve of the conservative elements within the regime, and helped them to appeal to public support in favour of "law and order".

Terrorism was ultimately the issue which strengthened the right, allowing them to scuttle Arias's limited reforms, and discrediting any efforts at merely liberalizing the regime.

In dealing with these problems Franco continued to build governments similar to the those that had achieved the economic miracles of the sixties. The Falange ideology, which had legitimized the regime in its formative years, continued to be de-emphasized as the Franco regime increasingly sought its legitimation "as an instrumental condition of economic development".[5] Franco used a 1969 scandal as a way of purging the remaining Falangists from the cabinet. The new government, led by Carrero Blanco, included 13 new ministers, all close to the technocratic Opus Dei member, Lopez Rodo. The cabinet was thoroughly technocratic, and its homogenous composition led to its designation as a mono-colour cabinet. Casanova argues that the nature of the post-1969 technocratic state was critical in Spain's transition. Lopez Rodo was instrumental in establishing a "legal-rational" basis for regime authority, which later led to the legal transformation of the regime. As well, the confirmation of the monarchy as successor to Franco, combined with technocracy, allowed for the de facto separation of state and regime, and in fact gave Suarez and Juan Carlos the room to manoever without destroying their credibility for either the opposition or the right[6]. Thus, the structure and style of the technocratic state facilitated a state-led transition based on the

decisions of the political elite.

However, the mono-colour cabinet did not in itself favour liberalization. Many observers claim that Carrero Blanco had the ability to prevent liberalization and maintain the regime in a strict authoritarian mold. He was allegedly the only member of the regime who could provide a link between the reactionary and moderate elements within the cabinet.[7] While Carrero's skills may have been amplified by hindsight, there is little doubt that the status quo lost all credibility with his assassination. Not only did the regime lose it potential messiah, but also the belief that liberalization could be indefinitely postponed.

Carrero also reversed the trend towards a freer society, as he heightened the level of repression. The 1970 trial of 16 Basque nationalists in Burgos resulted in 9 death sentences and 518 years in jail. The early seventies saw the virtual occupation of many universities, which became de facto battlegrounds, and in 1973 labour leaders were sentenced to over 150 years imprisonment.[8] The return to arbitrary repression, similar to the trend in Portugal, displayed a similar search for a solution to the impending regime crises.

It also reflected the collapse of the coalition of regime "families" which had supported the regimes. In Spain, Franco had gained a reputation as a shrewd politician capable of balancing the forces which supported him. However, the

technocrats had gained his favour, and their monopoly in the mono-colour cabinet destroyed that balance.[9] However, while the regime had lost the support of the Church, the Falange, and much of business, it still retained "the monopoly of the repressive apparatus, controlled the largest portion of the ideological apparatus, and could rely on a large part of the civil bureaucracy, as well as on an army recruited during the Civil War that was suspicious of democracy and firmly loyal to Franco".[10] Franco's regime while fragile, was clearly not likely to crumble. But the regime clearly faced a crisis. With the disintegration of the regime coalition the preponderant strength of the regime was disappearing, and thus the political forces in Spain were becoming more balanced; as Rustow's theory hypothesizes.

The business community had been staunch supporters of Franco for most of his rule. But their desire to interact with the developed Western economies, belief in the superiority of collective bargaining, and questioning of the continued viability of the regime had led many businessmen to distance themselves from support for the regime. A 1974 survey revealed that business owners and managers were more liberal than any other occupational group except students.[11] While business could no longer be counted on to support the regime, it also did not play much of a leadership role in the transition.

By the seventies the majority of the Church had

distanced itself from the regime, as shown by the 1971 Joint Assembly of Bishops and Priests, held in Madrid, which apologized for the Church's role in the Civil War, and called for the recognition of the standard democratic rights.[12] Many in the Church did play roles in leading resistance to the regime, but there were also bishops who were staunch defenders of the regime. In any case, the divided church could not continue to play the legitimizing role that it did when the Franco regime was initially portrayed as a crusader against God-less communists.

Another important legitimizing agent of the regime had been the Falange. It had long lost that role, but some in the party still looked to corporatist solutions. The victory of the technocrats displaced the Falangists, who began to distance themselves from the regime and sponsor projects of political liberalization.[13] The Falange thus became a source of political opposition, and it is significant that Adolfo Suarez had been president of the Movimiento prior to his appointment as Prime Minister.

While many of the regime families had become indifferent, or even opposed to the regime, its staunchest supporter remained the army. However, the army was not prepared to step into a political vacuum. The army was now largely apolitical, as demonstrated by its failure to act when Carrero was assassinated.[14] The Spanish army had demonstated over time that it was prepared to intervene

politically when its own institutional interests were under attack. Franco had always protected the army's interests, but his successor could not rely upon the army to defend a "stubborn or incompetent despot".[15] However, a section of the army dedicated to the defence of Franco's regime formed a loose group with other hard-liners, known as "the Bunker". It was the Bunker, suspicious of democracy, shocked by the rise of violence and Carrero's murder, and fearful that Spain would follow Portugal's path,[16] which most opposed Arias's reforms. Arias, fearful of a right-wing coup, attempted to appease the Bunker, and thus his minimal reforms were no longer acceptable to the liberalizers. A similar process in Portugal caused Caetano's reforms to be rejected.

Ultimately Arias had neither the ability nor the desire to oversee the transition to a truly democratic regime. He had been selected by Franco because he was a close friend, and because of his neutrality in the dispute between the technocrats and the Falangists.[17] He was ultimately dedicated to Franco and his regime, and saw "aperaturismo"[18] as a means of bringing disaffected Franquists back into the fold, and as a reasonable concession to those who thought that the regime could not solve Spain's problems.[19] Arias was encouraged by the growing number of Franquists who were now in opposition, including former ministers Manuel Fraga Iribarne and Jose Maria Areilza. Their rejection of his reforms ended any chance of their success.

Arias's reforms were concentrated upon an increased role for political associations (not parties) within the Franquist system. He managed to guide a new law on associations through the Cortes, but the associations were rejected by the opposition because they represented the same "restricted class pluralism"[20], that had long operated under Franco. In the event, the law was irrelevant because the Cortes refused to change the penal code, which considered associations illegal. Evidently, conservative members of the Cortes thought they had found a way to make it appear as those they were allowing reform while denying reform in reality. Thus, Arias's reforms failed, squeezed between the intransigence of the Bunker and the growing mobilization of the people opposed to limited reform. With this failure Arias, like Caetano, had undermined the possibility of limited reform. But in Spain the continued presence of Franco at this time gave the regime a second life and enough further strength to make a second more legitimate attempt at reform following Franco's death in November 1975.

During the final years of Franco's regime, his direct hold over political life had diminished, but there was no doubt that it was he who made the final decisions and kept the regime afloat. His death found Spain without a leader who could continue in his powerful position: Fraga, the most popular, had a small following and no independent source of power.[21] At this point, the Franco regime faced its most

profound crisis: the search for a successor who could command the legitimacy Franco had, and hold the ruling coalition together.

Juan Carlos became King and Head of State. He retained Arias as Prime Minister, and although the King did not seem to be committed to authoritarian rule, it was not clear that the regime was committed to democratization either. Arias's vague commitments to reform were combined with continued repression.

Arias' first post-Franco announcement, in January, vaguely promised reform, but disappointed reformers. By April he promised a referendum, followed by elections, but rejected the legalization of the PCE, dismantling the regime or a constituent assembly, all key demands of the opposition. He managed to have a bill passed that legalized political parties, but the Cortes withheld the constitutional amendment that would have made the law meaningful. At the same time, press censorship had practically disappeared, and political parties were able to organize openly.[22] But the regime continued to use repression occasionally to put down opposition demonstrations, and to restrict the activity of the PCE.

The performance of Arias in the period between Franco's death and his own resignation was erratic. He promised reform while allowing the police to ignore much opposition activity, but he continued to sanction the use of

repression. While Juan Carlos and liberal cabinet ministers advised reform, Arias feared the reaction of the right. Ultimately Arias retained his loyalty to Franco's memory and hesitated in implementing reform.[23] Finally, in July 1976, King Juan Carlos asked Arias to resign because of his inability or unwillingness to proceed quickly enough and his devotion to the memory of Franco rather than the King.[24]

When Juan Carlos assumed the reigns of power, little was known about his own preferences concerning the form of the regime. The succession debate had been highly contentious. Juan Carlos had emerged as the heir to Franco because of Franco's dislike of Juan Carlos's father, the legitimate heir to the throne, and because Juan Carlos had received political counsel from Franco. Franco thus believed that he could easily control him and count on the Prince to protect Francoism.[25] Juan Carlos's nomination had been a victory for the Opus Dei over the Falange. The Opus Dei hoped that the Prince would install a conservative monarchy in which the monarch would be bound by the principles of the Movimiento, with political leadership provided by Carrero Blanco.[26] Given this, it could be reasonably expected that Juan Carlos would protect the regime.

However, some of the King's early statements seem to hint that he would push ahead with reform, although his commitment to reform remained questionable. Early in his reign he had to appoint a new President of the Cortes, a

crucial decision if he was to guide liberal legislation through the assembly. His nominee, Torcuato Fernandez Miranda, was a disappointment for liberals, since he was clearly a conservative and a man of the regime. But, Juan Carlos knew he had to placate the right, and he was also aware that he could count on Fernandez Miranda's personal loyalty.[27] Juan Carlos also began to make statements which clearly undercut Arias's hesitant attempts at reform. In an April 26 Newsweek interview the King called Arias an absolute disaster[28]; thus Arias's position became increasingly untenable, and it was little surprise that he was forced to resign in July.

Even at this point it was unclear that Juan Carlos favoured democracy, but in retrospect it appears that he chose democracy as the most likely means of ensuring the survival of the monarchy as an institution. Juan Carlos could maintain an authoritarian monarchy only with the backing of the army. Unlike Franco, the monarchy had no legitimacy, and the army was not prepared to support an unpopular despot, whose overthrow would threaten their own position. Thus, had Juan Carlos depended upon the support of the army, the monarchy would have become superfluous, and subject to replacement by military rule. Juan Carlos chose democracy as a means of gaining legitimacy for a constitutional monarchy, and to guarantee its survival.[29] Clearly Juan Carlos realized that he lacked a base of support for the monarchy among the

population and in the army. This relates to Dahl's notion of political resources. The King had few resources to protect the monarchy as an institution, and he sought to gain support from reformist elites and the population by aligning the monarchy with democratic reform.

THE SPANISH OPPOSITION PRIOR TO TRANSITION

Despite the obvious crises of the regime, the organized opposition was unable to make much impact, and this is reflected in the fact that the transition was eventually state-led. Social conflict did increase, but the opposition leaders remained too fragmented to provide effective direction to their potential followers.

The chief type of popular pressure was labour conflict, manifesting itself through the growth of the labour movement. In 1970, 8.7 million working hours were lost to strikes. This increased to 14.5 million hours in 1975. Following Franco's death, strike activity claimed 156 million hours in 1976. This increase in labour activity certainly placed pressure upon the regime, but it must be remembered that it occurred at a time of economic crisis, and at a time when the regime was primarily concerned with political issues. Strikes tended to occur over strictly economic matters, and workers remained essentially apolitical: a 1973 survey revealed that only 12% of workers were "very or quite" interested in politics.[30] And, despite the fact that the regime tolerated the increase in strikes, they never paralyzed a key sector of the economy,

nor did the regime allow the establishment of links between the labour movement and the democratic opposition.[31]

For their part, the democratic parties of the opposition remained fundamentally fragmented and weak. The strongest, the PCE, had long ago adopted a moderate position, which had made its leader, Carillo, the foremost spokesman of Eurocommunism. However, his search for a broad alliance of anti-Franco forces had alienated the far left, while his condemnation of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia led to the departure of the Stalinists in 1969. Spanish communism was therefore highly fragmented.

The moderate left was similarly fragmented. Spain's oldest party, the PSOE, was divided between the exiles, including party leader Llopis, and those in the interior, led by Felipe Gonzalez. Gonzalez emerged victorious in 1972, but not without the departure of the disgruntled exiled wing. The PSOE was also in conflict with other socialist groups, especially the PSI[32], whose leader Enrique Tierno Galvan, a Madrid university professor, possessed a significant independent base of power.

The centre was divided into small groups concentrated around notable politicians. Christian democrats, who were expected to garner a lot of popular support, were divided between the followers of the dissafected Franquist, Ruiz Gimenez, and former CEDA leader and Second Republic P.M., Gil Robles. The opposition had still not learned the lesson of

the Second Republic: that it was necessary to be united to achieve democracy.

Nevertheless, the opposition did begin to come together as Franco's death approached. Optimism that the regime could be dismantled spurred the opposition to join forces. Events in Portugal, Greece, Italy and France, suggested that the forces of the left were on the side of history.[33] In 1974, encouraged by Franco's illness, the Junta Democratica, dominated by the PCE, but including Tierno Galvan's PSP, labour leaders, and the Carlists, was established in Paris. In response, the PSOE formed in 1975, the Plataforma de Convergencia Democratica, which included other socialists, christian democrats and Basque nationalists. However, moderate democratic forces remained suspicious of the PCE, a legacy of the PCE's behaviour during the Republic and the Civil War. So, despite a similarity in programs, the movements remained separate until after the death of Franco. With Franco's death, transition seemed increasingly possible, and that possibility finally brought most of the opposition together into the Coordinacion Democratica, known popularly as the Platajunta, in May 1976. The only major actor who did not join was Robles, who refused to forget the Second Republic, and would never cooperate with the PCE. For the first time the regime faced a united opposition, which although still weak, represented a formidable force, and presented a uniform, obvious

organization for the government to negotiate with. The political forces in Spain were thus becoming increasingly balanced.

CAETANO'S GOVERNMENT IN PORTUGAL

In 1968 Salazar suffered a stroke which rendered him incapable of governing, forcing the President to find someone to replace Salazar as Prime Minister. His choice was Marcello Caetano, who was said to be the obvious choice because "he was a practical politician, an able and proven administrator, and a man with obviously long experience in almost all civilian areas of the Portuguese system".[34] Caetano, had been a life-long servant of the Salazar regime, first obtaining a position in the Ministry of Finance in 1929. He had also been President of the U.N. and President of the Corporate Chamber, as well as deputy Prime Minister at the time of the corporative revival. However, he also had taken some steps to distance himself from the regime at this time, and thus he had an undeserved reputation for being relatively liberal. However, in the face of Portugal's economic and social problems, and the worsening situation in colonial Africa, and combined with the loss of legitimacy that Salazar's leadership had provided, Caetano presided over a feeble government incapable of either liberalization or solidification of the regime.

However, for a brief period liberalization seemed possible. With the announcement of Caetano's appointment,

many opponents of the regime hoped for a "Lisbon Spring". Caetano though, was not deeply devoted to the liberalization of Portugal. A condition of his selection was that the African colonies were to remain Portuguese, and ultimately Caetano was dedicated to preserving Salazar's quasi-corporatist system.[35] Nevertheless, Caetano faced a growing labour movement and intra-regime dissension, and realized that some liberalization was necessary. In recognition of this he made a few gestures designed to show his commitment to a less authoritarian regime. Both Mario Soares, a leading socialist, and the bishop of Oporto, were allowed to return to Portugal, after a number of years in exile. A few liberal candidates[36] were allowed to stand, and win, seats in the national assembly. As well, the name of the secret police was changed from the PIDE to the DGS, and some curtailment of its powers occurred. The liberalization was never significant, and in any case, by 1970 Caetano's liberal credentials were no longer credible.[37] In the end, Caetano could please no one. The right was extremely fearful of his limited efforts at reform, while these reforms satisfied few in the democratic opposition. Caetano became increasingly squeezed between the left and the right, and facing this pressure, his actions vacillated between reform and repression.

PORTUGAL'S OPPOSITION PRIOR TO THE TRANSITION

If Spain's opposition was considered weak, then prior to the coup, Portugal's opposition could be considered

relatively non-existent. To be sure, the Portuguese opposition, especially the labour movement, was growing. But, aside from the communists, there was no organization at all, and the Portuguese democratic movement remained in the embryonic stage the Spanish opposition had been in at the beginning of the sixties. It was not until after the coup, in reaction to the left's attemped seizure of power, that the opposition came together into an informal alliance that resembled the Platajunta in Spain.

One of Caetano's few liberalization gestures allowed for the transformation of the state run "sindicatos" into legitimate unions. Opposition groups swept the union elections, and this led to collective agreements in 1969, 1970, and 1971, and also allowed the PCP to infiltrate the labour movement.[38] The Communist-led union, Intersindical, was at first allowed to operate, but Caetano later forced it underground. However, strike activity increased and during 1973 at least 40 major strikes took place. According to Intersindical, in the first quarter of 1974, 500,000 workers in the Lisbon/Setabul area took part in strikes, approximately half of the work force.[39] Nevertheless, strike activity lagged far behind the experience in Spain, and the Portuguese labour movement was in the position the Spanish movement was in more than a decade previously. Furthermore, the labour movement played a small and indirect role in the overthrow of the Caetano regime. This further demonstrates

that popular pressure was a minor causal factor in the Iberian transitions.

The Portuguese opposition was limited almost exclusively to the PCP - Mario Soares did not even organize a socialist party until 1973 - and the PCP itself was fragmented over the question of relations with the CPSU. The PCP also remained ineffectual because it continued to be the object of inordinate repression. Therefore, even the PCP was weak, perhaps weaker than in the previous decade.[40] The Portuguese moderate opposition held a conference at Aveiro in the early seventies, but this resembled the Spanish opposition's conference at Munich in 1962: the PCP was excluded and no plan for collective action came out of the meeting. Indeed, the opposition seemed to sense their impotence, and appeared resigned to this position.[39]

THE END OF THE PORTUGUESE DICTATORSHIP

Despite the weakness of the opposition, Caetano was unable to consolidate the position of the regime. He had some liberal sympathies, and felt some pressure from the growing labour movement, but also faced the opposition of the right and an increasingly dismal war in Africa. Squeezed by forces on either side, Caetano did little. As a result, inertia ruled and Salazar's system functioned without any attempt to deal with its problems.[42] In a sense, Caetano lost an opportunity. The opposition was still weak, and there was a chance he could have been Portugal's Suarez, or

alternatively, Portugal's Carrero. But, Caetano seemed to be attempting to move in both directions at once, and thus he satisfied no one, becoming instead Portugal's Arias.

As well, Caetano proved incapable of administering Portugal's system as Salazar had. Salazar had always managed to contain inflation, but in 1971 prices rose faster than wages for the first time in many years.[43] As well, the war in Africa continued, with little prospect of Portugal's victory. Thus, Caetano had done little to endear his government to any segment of the population.

The greatest source of dissatisfaction with the regime were the colonial wars in Africa. Caetano had agreed to continue fighting the wars as one of the conditions of becoming prime minister. He also greatly feared the right, and could not even consider disentangling Portugal from its African empire. As a result, he continued Salazar's policy, despite the fact that it consumed 45% of the national budget, and alienated large sections of the population. His dedication to the war effort is shown by his request to the National Assemby for approval of the war policy, on March 5th 1974, at a point that he was already aware that a coup attempt was being planned.[44]

It was ultimately the futility of continuing the African wars that brought down the regime, and the event which precipitated the coup d'etat was Caetano's reaction to the publication of General Spinola's book, Portugal and the

Future. Spinola had gained his reputation in Guinea, where he was chief of military operations. His methods had won respect from middle officers, and he had come to the conclusion that the wars could not be won. Instead, he proposed negotiations, and some form of federal system for the empire. In response to the publication of the book, which had a major impact, Caetano removed Spinola and General Costa Gomes from their positions, in an effort to prevent a coup from the right. Their dismissal sparked the Armed Forces Movement to complete their coup preparations, and resulted in the successful coup of 25 April 1974.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the armed forces had become dissatisfied by the continued Portuguese presence in Africa. However, it was not until 1973 that this general discomfort was transformed into an organized movement. The movement was organized around career officers who had begun their careers in Portugal's military academy. The demands of war, and the accompanying lack of academy recruits had forced the army to rely increasingly on conscript officers. In attempting to entice the conscripts to become professional the army offered these conscripts a special six month course at the academy. This naturally enraged the regular officers who had had to complete the full four year program.[45] However, it was ultimately

> the gap between political commitments and the fighting determination of the guerillas and the indifference of their own superiors, combined with fears that the war could not in the long run end in anything but defeat,

> that turned disatisfaction with their own lot into political demands for a change in the political system of Portugal[46]

The Movement of Captains, which was later to become the Armed Forces Movement (MFA), first met in the south of Portugal, in September 1973. It was formed by disgruntled middle officers, who were upset by the army's denial of their opportunity to redress their professional grievances at the government sponsored Congress of Combatants.[47] Originally, the MFA was more-or-less apolitical. It was only after the coup that leftist officers gained control of the movement, but even then the majority of the officers were moderate. The MFA programme came to promote liberal democracy as the movement's political goal, but its revolutionary element was never more than a "wooly idealism, more akin to boy scouting than Marxist internationalism".[48]

By December the movement was discussing the overthrow of the regime. Despite the defeat of the coup option at this time, planning for the coup proceeded. With the dismissal of Spinola, the urgency caused by the regime's knowledge of their plotting,[49] combined with the fear that another faction might move, caused the MFA to plan the coup attempt for late March. However, some over-zealous units, in response to Spinola's dismissal, moved on March 12th, an attempt that was easily defeated. With Caetano confident that the coup had been defeated, the planning continued, and the well orchestrated coup attempt, intricately planned by Major Otelo

Carvalho, easily succeeded in overthrowing the regime on April 25th 1974.

The event which caused the Caetano/Salazar regime to fall was a military coup, inspired by discontent with the African wars. Thus, the regime collapsed due to a largely external problem. Other international factors had some influence on weakening the regime. Most importantly, Portugal's economy was now more integrated with Western Europe than it had previously been. This meant that the Portuguese economy was negatively affected by Europe's economic woes, and Caetano's popularity was lowered by Portugal's poor performance.[50] Pressure was also mounting for Portugal's application for EEC membership, which probably required a democratic regime. Companies such as CUF and Champlimaud were lobbying for Portugal's integration.[51] But, ultimately these economic issues were of little concern to the officers who led the coup, nor did they appreciably diminish the level of support for the regime.

When the coup attempt came in Portugal it succeeded with surprising ease. The regime could count on little support from its security agencies, or from within the armed forces, and almost none from the population. The regime crumbled within twenty four hours of the coup. This combined with spontaneous public support for the coup, reflects the almost total dissolution of the regime's social basis.[52] Quite simply, few people considered the regime worth fighting

for. Opello contends that the regime's quick collapse was due to the fact that neither Caetano or Salazar could solve the participation crisis: that is they could not provided an adequate means for mass participation in Portuguese politics. This accordingly left the regime highly vulnerable, as shown by its quick demise.[53] This argument suggests that an active role was played by the masses, seeking a greater role. This is clearly not the case. Mass pressure followed the coup; it did not cause it. If there was a participation crisis it existed only at an elite level.

The coup itself was exclusively a military creation. Clandestine parties of the left were not involved in the planning, and no plans were made for mass mobilization. The efficiency of the coup however, was crucial in convincing Caetano and his supporters of the rebel's strength. Compared to previous coup attempts, it was meticulously planned by Otelo Carvalho, who was unpredictably to play an integral part in future struggles. Given an evidently well-planned coup, and a lack of military or civilian support, Caetano had little choice but to surrender.

With the news of the coup, multitudes of joyous citizens gathered in the streets of Lisbon and Oporto. While not responsible for the coup, the action of the masses, in clear support of the army, made the coup irreversible.[54] However, this outpouring of popular sentiment was to continue and to have a profound effect upon events during the next two

years.

Although Caetano had no option but to surrender, he held out, with the intention of influencing Portugal's future as much as he could, considering his limited bargaining tools. Caetano was under siege in the Carmo barracks, but refused to negotiate with anyone but Spinola. He saw Spinola as someone with enough support, and the skills, to prevent disorder, while at the same time Spinola was conservative enough not to promote social revolution. Despite the siege Caetano was able to hang on until Spinola's arrival, at which point he agreed to surrender if Spinola was to take control. Spinola agreed to take power in the event that the MFA supported his leadership. Spinola was assured of this support and Caetano surrendered, and was later sent into Brazilian exile.[55]

PORTUGAL: FROM COUP TO DEMOCRACY

In any case, Spinola was the most likely choice as Portugal's new president. He was immensely popular within the armed forces, with his promises of pay raises, promotions and an end to the colonial wars. As well, his book had made him well known among the population. Besides, a vaccuum existed in Portuguese politics. Fifty years of dictatorship had prevented the development of experienced non-regime leaders.[56] At the time, Spinola appeared to be firmly entrenched, while the MFA seem small and powerless. But over the next six months, a power struggle was to ensue which

drove Spinola from power, while launching the MFA on its leftward drift.

In line with the MFA programme, Spinola promised to establish a democratic political system in Portugal. But in contrast to some of his colleagues, Spinola proposed to establish only a social democratic system, not a socialist one.[57] However, the greatest divergence between Spinola's views and those of the MFA occurred over de-colonization. The MFA favoured independence, while Spinola wanted only some sort of federalism. This drove a wedge between Spinola and a faction in the MFA, which only grew larger as the African wars continued disastrously. Spinola also alienated many of his potential supporters with his authoritarian streak and political ineptness.[58] As the division between Spinola and the MFA increased, Spinola could either make a bid for presidential power or ally himself with the MFA. Spinola chose the former option, and this put him on a collision course which ended in his ouster.

Spinola's first government was by necessity broad in its outlook. It included centrists, socialists and communists. Spinola did not want a disgruntled PCP in opposition, and also he expected that the PCP, given the labour ministry, could control the labour movement.[59] But by bringing the PCP and the Socialists(PS) into the government, Spinola hampered his manoeverability. His prime minister, Palma Carlos, was loyal, and attempted to increase Spinola's

power by proposing, in June, a direct presidential election. However, Palma Carlos was outmanouvered and the MFA rejected his proposal; the first victory for the MFA over Spinola.

Palma Carlos was forced to resign and the MFA would not accept Spinola's independent compromise candidates. The MFA, with the backing of the PCP and the PS, was able to impose Vasco Goncalves as prime minister upon Spinola. Goncalves was one of the moving spirits of the left-wing in the MFA, and was reportedly a clandestine member of the PCP, who had withdrawn from the 1959 coup attempt after hearing that the civilian communists were also withdrawing.[60] With Goncalves's appointment the division in the military was clear, and Spinola was on his way to being totally isolated. As well, the left-wing of the MFA had discovered it had a lot of power, and with this discovery it would move to attempt to impose its view of society upon Portugal.

Spinola did attempt to look to the moderate political parties for support. But the moderate political leaders were caught unaware by the coup. They had little time to organize before events in the military forced Spinola into a corner.[61] At the time of the coup the strongest moderate party, the PS, "was a name, a certain tradition of democratic socialism in Portugal, a link with the German SPD and the Socialist International, and a small group of cadres".[62] Furthermore, the PS briefly followed a policy of alliance with the PCP, through the CDE/MDP, and it was not until later that Soares

became the voice for parliamentary democracy. The other moderate parties did not even exist at the time of the coup. Both the PPD, formed around former liberal national assembly members, and the CDS, a right-wing party which coalesced around an even more conservative member of the regime, were fledgling parties, with few members, and followed the Portuguese tradition of parties based around notable elites.[63] Thus, Spinola could not rely upon any solid basis among moderate civilians to oppose the leftward drift of the MFA. Thus, there was not the balance of forces which theory suggests is necessary for a democratic transition.

The PCP had emerged as the strongest party following the coup, based upon its organization and reputation garnered by fifty years of clandestine activity. Nevertheless, Cunhal was largely unknown upon his arrival from Prague, and the PCP, unsure of its support and cautious to protect its legality, was forced to act with moderation.[64] Even so, the PCP moved to gain control of key sectors of society. The labour movement had been infiltrated in the early seventies. Now the PCP acted through their front organization the MDP, to seize municipal government, as well as taking command of the media through the occupation of newspapers and radio stations by communist-led workers.[65] Still, the PCP was less than confident about gaining power democratically. Thus, Cunhal detected that their best interests were served through an alliance with the increasingly powerful MFA.

For the MFA, the PCP served as a civilian organization which would increase their power base, while at the same time leftist officers found the PCP's ideology attractive.[66] Spinola had never really been the choice of radical officers and they felt as though circumstances had saddled them with a president who did not share their views. Goncalves' second provisional government witnessed the burgeoning power of the MFA. Soldiers occupied eight ministries compared to the one they held previously. Spinola was thus isolated within the government as well as in the MFA. Finally, the MFA placed the army beyond Spinola's control by setting up COPCON (Operational Command for the Continent), under Carvalho. Supposedly for internal security, COPCON gave the MFA an elite armed force to protect their position.[67]

In September 1974, Spinola finally moved to enhance his power. Along with the leader of the Portuguese Liberal party, Spinola appealed to the "silent majority", to gather at a huge rally in Lisbon on September 26th. Apparently they hoped that the rally would ignite a movement to dispose of the MFA.[68] However, fearing a right-wing coup, members of the PS, PCP, Intersindical and the far left erected barricades around Lisbon to prevent the rally. Spinola essentially held Carvalho and Goncalves under arrest and demanded that Carvalho command COPCON to dismantle the barricades. Sensing that Carvalho was being held against his will, COPCON

officers refused to give the order. Spinola realized he had lost and resigned, claiming he could not rule without the support of the armed forces or the civilian parties, which had been alienated by his authoritarian rule.[69] Thus, an alliance of the left and the MFA had successfully removed Spinola from the presidency, and indicated that they could now proceed more rapidly with social revolution. This reflected an apparent lack in the balance of forces.

Following Spinola's resignation General Costa Gomes became president. Costa Gomes was assumed to be a weak leader who could easily be manipulated by the leftists, led by Goncalves. He would later play an important role, but for now he did nothing to prevent the leftward movement of the MFA. Following the coup the MFA had demonstrated that it, not the parties, was the principal actor in Portuguese politics.[70] The MFA though, was not a homogenous radical left movement. There was still considerable moderate strength in the movement as shown by the defeat of Carvalho and other leftists in the MFA assembly elections. The radical's power was derived from their influence over the commanding heights. The MFA had been united to oust Spinola, and with his departure differences were beginning to emerge.[71] Nevertheless, the radicals' command of the leadership meant that by February 1975 the MFA appeared to be a thoroughly revolutionary movement.

Prior to this development the MFA had been able to

count on the PS for support. But by early 1975 the PS was starting to emerge as the predominant voice for moderation. Disputes emerged between the two over the proper role of the military in politics, since the PS thought civilian rule should emerge more rapidly, as well as over the pace of revolution. Furthermore the plebian left-wing officers considered the PS to be the party of the big-city bourgeoisie.[72] With a wedge driven between the MFA and the PS, Mario Soares began to emerge as the champion of parliamentary democracy.

The PS not only distanced itself from the MFA, it also terminated its alliance with the PCP. The PCP continued to act as a force for moderation and order, but it also continued its wholehearted support for the MFA. As the MFA realized that an opportunity for revolution actually existed, so did the communists, and thus the MFA/PCP tactical alliance became increasingly strong. The PCP was still forced to move slowly. Some leftist officers were increasingly discussing a system without parties, so the communists had to weaken the other parties without threatening their own existence.[73]

The PCP tried to gain total control of the civilian left through the labour movement. Early in 1975 they proposed that the labour movement be represented by only one union, Intersindical. The Socialists supported a pluralist movement. The MFA was able to accede to the PCP's wishes without losing control over the civilian party. Intersindical was given a

monopoly but with restrictions which gave the MFA, not Cunhal, control. The PCP remained clearly subordinate to the MFA.

As the movement moved left, and the promised March elections approached, rumours of an extremist coup, by left or right, began to circulate. Prompted by a rumour that 1500 rightists were about to be arrested, several officers and businessmen met on March 8th. Spinola was informed and a hastily planned coup attempt took place two days later. The coup attempt consisted of a feeble air attack upon a Lisbon barrack. It was easily defeated, prompting speculation that it was actually staged by the left as a pretext for a purge of moderate officers. Whether this was the case or not, it was certainly used by the MFA to strengthen the revolutionary left, as the jails were filled with officers supposedly sympathetic to Spinola.[74]

The March 11 coup attempt made the institutionalization of the MFA a foregone conclusion. The MFA now had the power to install itself in a more permanent position, and with the moderate faction emasculated it could abandon all moderation .[75] As well, the coup attempt ignited the popular movement as workers moved to occupy houses and work places.[76] The MFA, in danger of being surpassed by the far left, had to become more radical. March 11 marks the date when the leftist officers and the PCP began to regard the revolution as possible, and they began to see it as more

important than establishing a parliamentary democracy. Thus, an apparent predominance of coercive resources in the hands of the radical left, convinced those on the left that they could achieve power and install a socialist system in Portugal. For this reason, they felt little desire to compromise with moderate forces.

However, the MFA faced one major obstacle in their attempt to impose their vision of socialism upon Portugal. The MFA programme had promised elections within a year of the coup. Some within the movement argued that the elections should be postponed indefinitely, but most considered that they should take place out of a sense of honour.[77] Scheduled for March 25th, 14 parties were recognized on March 4th. Following the coup attempt though, the elections were postponed on a technicality,[78] to April 25th, the anniversary of the coup.

With the MFA at the apex of its power, and fears that the elections would be indefinitely postponed, the parties were forced to sign a pact with the MFA. The pact guaranteed the MFA a constitutional position until 1980, and although it allowed for parallel development of the parties and the MFA, it was clear that the MFA was to call the shots. For the parties the pact was the only way of saving the elections. The MFA, fearing that the elections would result in a majority for the non-revolutionary parties, wanted to negate the electoral results by guaranteeing themselves the leading

position in the constitutional process.[79] Furthermore, a majority vote for the parties signing the pact could be interpreted as majority support for the policies of the movement; legitimizing the role of the MFA.

The pact signed, the MFA embarked on an effort to either influence or discredit the elections. The Socialists were likely to win the election and were the major object of the officers' criticisms. The MFA also attempted to score a victory by campaigning with the notion that a blank ballot was a vote for the Movement.

The election thus became a struggle between the parties favouring a pluralistic social democracy, the PCP and other parties of the left, and the MFA. There were only four parties to the right of the PCP, the Monarchists, the CDS, the PPD and the favoured PS. Soares campaigned with much courage, emerging unprotected from crowds, and even appearing in the PCP "capital", Beja.[80] The PS had grown dramatically, were favoured to win, and that victory would propel Soares into a position of leadership over civilian groups which considered democracy more important than socialism. Both the PPD and the CDS had adopted socialist rhetoric, since they faced the real danger of being marginalized by accusations of fascism. The media was controlled by the PCP and the MFA and so the non-revolutionary parties faced an extremely difficult task.

Despite the obstables placed in the path to their

victory, the election results were clearly a victory for the moderate parties, and a defeat for both the PCP and the MFA. The PS received 37.9% of the vote, while the PPD and the CDS received 26.4% and 7.7% respectively. The PCP garnered 12.5% of the vote, while their allies the MDP/CDS achieved only 4.1%. Thus, pluralistic democracy, embodied in the moderate parties received 72% of the vote, a substantial majority. This was not only a defeat for the Communists, but also a defeat for the MFA. The MFA had hoped that blank ballots and abstentions would total over 50% and that this would give them the mandate to govern.[81] But with a 92% turnout and a miniscule number of blank ballots the MFA clearly did not have the support of the Portuguese people; most likely because the Portuguese population did not support revolution. Combined with support for the PCP and the MDP at 17%, and support for the far left scattered between eight parties, the largest at .8%, it was evident that the base for revolution was quite narrow. The elections not only gave the democratic parties " the legitimate claim that they commanded the support of the overwhelming majority of Portuguese, but also the courage to pit their massive civilian strength against the force of the soldier radicals".[82]

Moreover, the election results split the country in half. The left performed especially poorly in the North, where the PPD and the CDS found most of their support. The PCP found their support in their south and in Lisbon. Only

the PS did well everywhere and this established them as the only truly national party. The geographical division was to be important later on, since it provided the opposing forces with a territorial base for the struggle and emphasized the possibility of civil war.

Despite the effort of the MFA and the PCP to downplay the importance of the election results, this was clearly the turning point. The forces supporting revolutionary socialism would never again be as strong, since from this point on, it was obvious that they had insufficient support and could only impose their ideals upon the country by force. Nevertheless, they pushed the country to the brink of civil war in the pursuit of their goals, and would only acquiesce seven months later, when it became clear that they were also a small minority within the military.

If the election results alluded to the geographical division of the country, the summer of 1975 confirmed it. The peasants in the North, who tended to be small land-owners compared to the landless peasants of the South, reacted with fear to the land seizures in the South, which with the continuation of the revolution in Lisbon, threatened their land ownership. Scared into mutual collaboration, the North erupted in the summer, resulting in 49 PCP offices being destroyed in Central and Northern Portugal.[83] With this popular uprising the PCP and the leftist officers realized that the revolution had no base of support in the North, and

that their adversaries now had a territorial base for conducting a civil war.

The North was not the only part of the country where the revolution turned violent that summer. July saw huge demonstrations in Lisbon, which resulted in a degree of disruption. Except in the case of a threat to life, the armed forces seemed increasingly unwilling to stop the violence. It appeared that those in power could no longer maintain order or remain united. This was especially the case when leaders, such as Carvalho, returning from Cuba, made inflammatory statements, noting that it was now time to put the counter-revolutionaries in the Lisbon bullring.[84] By the summer of 1975 a revolution which had previously been peaceful seemed to be on the path to civil war.

The summer also saw the democratic forces coalesce around the leadership of Soares. The PS gained the upper hand through their election victory and Soares was able to use his leadership to build an anti-communist alliance, which included the Church, the non-communist parties, and even right-wing forces such as the MDLP. Soares' ability to build a broad-based coalition was crucial in convincing the leftist officers that they faced a formidable foe. As well, PS leadership was critical, because without it the non-revolutionary forces would have been led by the right and would have therefore been unacceptable to moderate officers.[85]

Socialist opposition culminated in their resignation from the government in July. The socialists were first angered by the seizure of their daily newspaper, the Republica, by leftist workers in May. When the MFA announced a complete programme for a revolutionary workers' state on July 9th, the PS quit the government the next day.[86] When the PPD followed suit, Goncalves could look only to the PCP and its allies to form a fifth provisional government. This left the communists isolated to face a united democratic opposition with demonstrable public support.

With little support for a fifth provisional government, Costa Gomes formed a three man ruling directory composed of himself, Goncalves and Carvalho. It was in fact a sham covering the deteriorating power of Goncalves. Indeed it was a ploy by Costa Gomes, by now disenchanted with Goncalves, to balance the waning power of the prime minister against the popular Carvalho, with his base of support in COPCON and the far left.[87]

The division within the troika highlighted the now apparent rifts within the MFA. Besides the pro-communist group led by Goncalves, and the group behind Carvalho, supported by COPCON and the far left, and expressing a sympathy for popular power, there was also a group of moderate officers. Led by Melo Antunes, they favoured a socialist system, but thought it should be implemented through a pluralistic democratic framework and in a much more

gradual manner.[88] With the breakup of the 4th provisional government, the radical programme of the MFA and the increasing degree of anarchy, some of these moderate officers decided to make a move.

To galvanize support behind their efforts, nine moderate officers, led by Antunes released a document on August 6th, which denounced Goncalves and called for socialist transformation within a parliamentary democracy. The Nine were soon able to gain the signatures of about 80% of the officers in the MFA, as well as securing the support of Soares. Through August their main goal was to remove Goncalves. The Nine negotiated with Carvalho, and while unable to achieve an overall common program, they were able to agree that Goncalves had to go.[89] With little support in the military and only the PCP as civilian supporters, Goncalves was enticed to resign in late August with the offer of the post of Chief of Staff. But the military would not accept his appointment and thus by early September Goncalves was removed completely from the power structure in Portugal.

The 6th provisional government took office on September 19th. With only five officers, it was a moderate cabinet dominated by the PS and the PPD. The prime minister, Admiral Azevedo, was initially opposed to the Nine, but his need of moderate support in addition to the opposition he faced from the PCP forced him to moderate his views, in line with those of the Nine.[90]

While the moderates clearly had control there remained a chance that the PCP and the left would make a grab for power. In anticipation of this possibility Antunes asked Colonel Ramalho Eanes to draw up a plan to counter any leftist putsch. The knowledge that the moderates were willing to take up arms against them may have been enough to dissuade Cunhal, and others on the left, from thinking seriously of a leftist coup.

While remaining in the government, the PCP was well aware that they were now completely isolated, and for this reason they began to foster an alliance with the far left. Nevertheless, "although the PCP was well-organized and a recognizable political force, it would never have attempted a take over. It knew the country very well and was well aware that it lacked the necessary popular support".[91] While the PCP generally encouraged revolutionary activity on the part of the far left there is little evidence that the communists felt that a left-wing coup could be successful. Thus, their lack of political resources convinced the Communists that it would be prudent to show restraint.

At any rate, the period between mid-September and the end of November was extremely chaotic. "There were massive strikes and demonstrations, disruption, political posturing and threats, and the formation of revolutionary cells - the SUVs - within the military".[92] Besides the general societal breakdown, there also occurred a loss of military discipline,

resulting in the necessity of appeals to soldiers to obey orders. The loss of respect for authority in the military combined with the factionalization of the MFA, the geographical division of Portugal between North and South, and the general disruption of society led to an increasing fear of civil war.

The right was alarmed by the appearance of revolutionary cells in the military along with reports that thousands of weapons were disappearing and being distributed to leftist civilians.[93] At the same time the left was becoming concerned by the increasing prominence of right-wing groups among the anti-communist coalition and they feared that their activity might soon be severely restricted. On both sides it was believed that whoever struck first would be defeated. So, the major tactic employed was to attempt to provoke the other side into making their move.[94] Ultimately it was a poorly organized section of the left that made a move and as predicted they were easily defeated.

The left was provoked into moving by the removal of Carvalho as the commander of the Lisbon region. The coup attempt itself was ill-planned and involved only a few disoriented units. Without even the Communist Party's support the coup was destined to fail. Even if the coup attempt of November 25th had succeeded the best the left-wing officers could have hoped for was a "Lisbon commune", which would have lasted for perhaps a month. In the end, "a reluctance to

confront fellow officers combined with a professional appreciation of the enormous disparity of firepower available to the two camps convinced most left-wing officers that their lives and their careers were simply not worth the sacrifice".[95] The PCP came to a similar conclusion, and Cunhal quickly disassociated the party from the attempt. With the defeat of the left within the military, and the negation of the PCP's desire for power, the moderates could now install a parliamentary republic. There has not since been a question of what sort of regime Portugal should have.

SPAIN'S NEGOTIATED TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY

In contrast to Portugal's twisted and uncertain road to democracy, Spain's transition came about relatively smoothly. This is not to say that the Spanish transition was an automatic or painless process. Indeed, there was more violence during the Spanish transition; from Franco's death to the 1977 election there were 67 deaths.[96] This reflects the fact that the extremists were in a more desperate position in Spain, since they could not hope to achieve their ends peacefully, as appeared possible to the far left in Portugal. Nevertheless, Spain's transition was more stable. It was led from above by members of the Franco regime, and whereas Portugal's period of transition saw six governments and an ever-changing cast of political actors, Spain's transition witnessed only one government and the same key actors in negotiation throughout.

The transition period was characterized by a three-sided struggle between those who, like Arias, favoured limited reform, those who sought full reform from above, as favoured by Suarez, and those who wished to produce a clean break from the regime, as preferred by the democratic opposition. In spite of this struggle the transition to democracy was to occur through negotiation between the leaders of these three forces. There was clearly pressure not only from below, but also from the international environment and the economic crisis. These pressures made democratization more desirable, but not inevitable. The regime could have attempted to sustain itself. Nevertheless, Adolfo Suarez and King Juan Carlos initiated a program of negotiation which led to the establishment of a parliamentary democracy in Spain.

While international factors may have had little impact upon the downfall of the Caetano regime (they would have more impact upon the subsequent struggle in Portugal), their influence was much greater in Spain. Many technocrats within the regime, as well as many industrialists, felt that EEC membership was crucial to Spain's continued prosperity. Membership entailed democratization, which meant that some businessmen came to be opposed to the regime, while liberal members of the cabinet used this as a reason for reform.

Symbolically many Spaniards, including younger elites, identified with Western Europe. "Europeismo became an almost mythical aspiration for large sectors of the Spanish

political elite".[97] An identification with Europe meant that many Spaniards also desired democracy. King Juan Carlos himself made clear his intention to make Spain part of Europe.[98] The desire for Europeanization was related to economic development which had increased communication between Spain and the rest of Europe. As a result, many in the Spanish political elite came to see the worth of the democratic values prevalent in the rest of Western Europe.

While these international pressures clearly made democratization a more attractive option, their importance should not be over-stated. Share argues that the importance of foreign capital in Spain has been overstated, therefore EEC membership was less necessary than often claimed. But regardless of the level of foreign capital in Spain, EEC membership would bring benefits to the Spanish economy, since both domestic and foreign capital should gain from exposure to a larger market. But while Franco was alive the regime showed little regard for international reaction to its repression. Europe reacted with demonstrations against Spain, after the Burgos trials in 1970 and the execution of five persons in 1975. However, Franco responded to these protests by organizing huge rallies within Spain.[99] So, although international factors were important, they were not crucial at this point in Spain.

At the time of the resignation of Arias it was not clear that King Juan Carlos would pursue democratization.

Furthermore, Juan Carlos had to appoint a new prime minister through the Council of the Realm, which remained unalterably supportive of Franco's regime. It was expected that Arielza, a voice for limited reform, would become the new prime minister, but with the help of Fernandez Miranda, Suarez's name appeared with two other Franco ministers among the list of three sent by the Council to the King. Apparently Fernandez Miranda worked diligently to convince the Council that Suarez was a man of the regime.[100] As it turned out Suarez was Juan Carlos's choice as the person who could lead the transition, but this was not immediately apparent to the opposition or the aperturistas. His nomination was seen as a return to Carrero and resulted in the resignation of Arielza, Fraga, and three other aperturista ministers.[101] Suarez therefore had an uphill battle in convincing the opposition of his sincerity, but his nomination also caused little alarm for the bunker. The fact that the right was not overly alarmed by the leadership of the King and Suarez reflects a factor which has been neglected by democratic theorists. The King provided a degree of institutional continuity, while Suarez provided continuity since he appeared to represent conservative views. Thus, the right was reassured that the post-Franco leadership would furnish a sufficient degree of continuity.

According to Share, Suarez and the King already had a carefully conceived program for democratic transition.[102]

They were convinced that they needed the support of three major political forces; on the right the military were key, as their support would offset the hostility of the hardliners; the democratic opposition would have to be convinced to drop their skepticism, while the Communists would have to be ostracized to retain the support of the military; finally reform-oriented members of the regime would have to be rallied behind Suarez. It is obvious that to achieve this program Suarez would have to embark upon a program of negotiation. Apparently he felt that this would help Spaniards to avoid what they feared most; a new civil war.[103] Events in Portugal also served to warn Spaniards that failure to effect reform could result in instability with the potential for civil war. Also, Suarez remained a conservative who wanted to preserve as many of the Francoist institutions, such as the monarchy, the army, and the civil service, as possible.[104] The surest way to retain these institutions in the post-Franco state was through negotiations. To initiate the process of negotiation, Suarez made an announcement soon after his appointment, in July 1976, that he was dedicated to the establishment of a democratic political system.

Because the state's program for reform was initiated by Suarez, a loyal member of the regime, the opposition initially rejected his calls for support and continued to push for a democratic rupture. The opposition demanded negotiation which would destroy all Franquist institutions,

so Suarez unilaterally began the transition process, but he kept the lines of communication open. By proceeding unilaterally Suarez strengthened his hand vis-a-vis the democratic opposition, and this ultimately forced them to accept a negotiated transition.

Suarez was also aware, due to survey information, that he had the support of the vast majority of the Spanish population. The evidence suggested that three quarters of the population supported a complete and unlimited democracy. Another survey indicated that 61% were in favour of gradual transition, while only 22% wanted rapid and radical change.[105]

Thus, Suarez had come to the conclusion that reform could not stop short of full democratization, and furthermore he realized that reform required the support of the democratic opposition. Finally, the necessity of a state-led transition was obvious, if Suarez was to avoid the obstinancy of the hard-liners. Suarez's astuteness in implementing these measures was demonstrated by his restraint in dealing with the terrorism of both the extreme left and right, which arose out of a desire to derail the reforms in the winter of 1977. Despite calls for a harsh reaction from the right, Suarez stood his ground and rejected appeals for military intervention.[106]

A number of Suarez's personality traits made him appropriate for his leadership role in the transition

process. Suarez was a technocrat, and thus pragmatic. Since he carried no ideological baggage he could more easily abandon the regime and embrace democracy. His generally conservative outlook prevented a hysterical reaction from the bunker. Since, he was too young to have experienced the civil war his commitment to the regime was only provisional, but he was not unaware of Spain's potential for explosive cleavages and he was prepared to negotiate from a position of moderation. Finally he was more cosmopolitan than his predecessors and therefore more open to foreign ideas such as liberal democracy.[107] Clearly Spain's economic development had produced a modern society, and consequently Suarez's generation was more attracted to democractic values which were prevalent in Western Europe.

Suarez was also in a position to take advantage of a number of favourable conditions. First of all, as a bureaucrat, Suarez could draw upon his bargaining experience. He also had the support of Juan Carlos, and all the respect the monarchy, as an institution restored by Franco, commanded. Suarez also had control over the state apparatus, and thus greater access to information than the democratic opposition. Finally, he was able to exploit the internal divisions of the opposition. Thus, Suarez had a preponderant advantage in political resources and was in a position suitable for successful negotiation within the context of the Spanish situation in the mid-seventies. By contrast the

Portuguese leaders were more concerned with the establishment of their own ideals, and the Portuguese situation was more conducive to this sort of behaviour, resulting in a less stable democratic transition, indeed a transition which came close to not happening.

In a sense Suarez was walking a tightrope between the opposition who wanted a complete break with the past, and the regime, which wanted only limited reform. But, this balancing act actually worked in his favour, since he could play the one side off against the other. Conversely, the Portuguese leaders did not have this luxury since the old regime had completely crumbled, leaving left-wing extremists the room to manoevre without fear of a right-wing backlash. In Spain, Suarez ultimately convinced the opposition that a complete rupture was impossible because it would have prompted a military take-over. The opposition was then led to accept a negotiated pact to avoid this possibility. With the backing of Juan Carlos, Suarez had the support of the regime, and with the opposition willing to drop their demand for a democratic rupture, Suarez clearly had the initiative.

For their part, the opposition was already pre-disposed to negotiate. First of all the political moderation of the opposition reflected a similar moderation among the population.[108] The opposition leaders had been socialized under a system which constantly reminded them of the civil war. They no doubt realized that the radicalism of the Republic had led to the war and thus sought to avoid a repeat

of that period. During the Republic partisan issues had been placed above the existence of the system. The leaders of the democratic opposition now put the establishment of democracy above their own partisan concerns. Hence, their historical experience had a profound effect upon their political attitudes.

The opposition remained in a weaker position than did Suarez. Although the opposition became more unified with the combining of the Plataforma, the Catalan Assembly and a number of regional parties, into one coalition in October, the continued absence of a minority of parties undermined the opposition's credibility.[109] The party elites also remained isolated from their followers. While this meant that the opposition was in a weaker position than Suarez, and could not hope to topple the regime, it also meant that the party leaders could negotiate without reference to their more militant followers. That the parties chose to negotiate with Suarez reveals a large degree of astuteness. It was a leap of faith, since the opposition had no guarantees that he would carry out the reform, nor did they have any direct representation in the process.[110] This also reveals the opposition's desire to act in a consociational manner. The opposition realized that they did not have the resources to defeat the regime. Given an opportunity to prevent instability through negotiation, the opposition decided to compromise despite the abandonment of several of their key

demands.

Nevertheless, the opposition remained dedicated to rupture until late in 1976. On November 27th they finally became convinced that negotiation was their only option, and so in early December they formed a ten-member committee to negotiate the terms of the parliamentary election with Suarez. The major remaining obstacle was the participation of the PCE, both on the negotiating committee and the party's future in Spanish politics.

The PCE was initially included in the negotiating committee, but Suarez adamantly refused to negotiate with the communists, fearing the reaction of the army. This threatened the unity of the opposition, since the other parties would be tempted to move ahead without the PCE. In order to force events Santiago Carillo returned to Madrid on December 10th, and was promptly arrested. But, Suarez ordered the communist leader's release several days later and tacitly recognized the PCE's right to exist. With this tacit approval the PCE withdrew from the committee, sidestepping the question for the time being.

While the negotiations proceeded, resulting in the legalization of all parties, with the exception of the PCE and other far-left parties, in February, the opposition, and especially PSOE leader Gonzalez, insisted that they would not participate in the election without the legalization of the PCE. Suarez continued to fear the army's reaction, but he also realized that the continued exclusion of the PCE

threatened to scuttle his reforms. To avoid the question Suarez placed it before judicial review, but the courts tossed it back into his lap. With Juan Carlos's backing Suarez felt confident to make his move. Despite promising to the military the opposite, Suarez legalized the PCE on April 9th. Suarez had been impressed by the opposition, and specifically the PCE's moderation. A February meeting with Carillo convinced him of the communist leader's sincerity.[111] As well, Suarez now felt that the army was to some extent isolated and would only make a token protest. For these reasons he felt confident that he could make this move, which was ultimately necessary if his reforms were to be successful.

The PCE aided Suarez's decision by continuing their long-standing moderate stance. After all, they had agreed to accept the monarchy and dropped their demand that Spain revert to the use of the Republican flag. These positions made the PCE more moderate than the socialists and reflected the fact that the PCE leadership contained more individuals who had been politically active during the civil war than any other party.[112] Since they had directly experienced the civil war, these Communist leaders were more anxious to avoid its repetition than other political elites.

Despite the fact that Suarez made the concession on the PCE issue, it was the opposition which had conceded more to Suarez. The opposition renounced their position calling for the prosecution of Francoists, regional groups accepted

the postponement of autonomy, the left-wing parties had to withdraw their demands for a republic and accept certain nationalistic symbols.[113] As well, the opposition had to forgo any attempts at achieving justice concerning perceived wrongdoing by Nationalists during the civil war, while at the same time accepting the continuing presence of Francoists within the Spanish state. It was a combination of their perceived weakness, and a desire to avoid a recurrence of the civil war that convinced the Spanish opposition to acquiese in their demands. In Portugal the radical left had felt their position to be stronger, while a phobic attitude towards violence was less prevalent, and thus the Portuguese left was more willing to press for their demands.

In negotiating with the opposition, Suarez at least shared a preference for a parliamentary democracy. This was not the case with all sections of the Francoist state. Suarez achieved his conversion of regime members by maintaining an outward sense of continuity. By working through the Cortes to pass the Law of Political Reform he gave the transition process legal continuity. The monarchy also gave a symbolic continuity to the transition.[114] Also working in Suarez's favour was the fact that he protected the position of many of the regime's members within the apparatus of the state. As well, many regime members were encouraged by the results of opinion polls which suggested that a post-transition election would result in a conservative majority.[115] Many Francoists were therefore convinced that Suarez's controlled reforms

would lead basically to a conservative democracy, committed above all to continuity. As each step of reform proceeded without societal breakdown this view gained credence.

Initially Suarez's major initiative in convincing regime adherents of the necessity of democratization was to guide his Law of Political Reform through the Cortes. He already had the support of the Church and the majority in the business community. By gaining the support of the Cortes the only remaining opposition to his reforms would be within the bunker, concentrated in the armed forces. Suarez's reform was to be the eighth fundamental law, so it appeared to the Cortes members as merely a constitutional amendment. Fernandez Miranda was instrumental in guiding the law through the Cortes, using both implicit threats and suasion. Their stategy was to use the electoral law as a bargaining chip, but refuse to negotiate on all other issues. A 1982 survey revealed that the law initially did not have enough support to pass based on objections to the PCE's legality and the initial electoral law. Suarez was able to negotiate a compromise on the electoral law, which maintained proportional representation, a necessity for the opposition, while favouring conservatives with a 3% minimum, and a disproportionally greater representation in rural districts. By also promising that the PCE would never be legalized, Suarez was able to gain a victory for his law in the Cortes. This victory gave Suarez considerable momentum, and established the legality of his reforms.[116]

But Suarez's most brilliant move came with his decision to subject the Law of Political Reform to a referendum. "If Suarez's victory in the Cortes had gained him political momentum, the referendum results placed him in a virtually unassailable position".[117] The referendum of 15 December resulted in 94% approval, with a 78% turnout. The opposition had called for abstention, although only the far-left seriously campaigned for this position. With a 78% turnout the symbolic legitimacy of the democratic opposition was seriously damaged. As well, with less than 3% of the electorate rejecting reform, the bunker had only a miniscule amount of popular support. As in Portugal, where the electorate had voted overwhelmingly for moderate democratic parties, the population persuaded the extremists that they could rule only with great difficulty.

Despite the referendum victory Suarez still had to be concerned with the army, especially concerning the legalization of the communists. In contrast to Portugal where the military was heavily involved in politics, the Spanish armed forces had little desire to intervene.[118] This fact would work to his advantage. Suarez had also put some effort into persuading the army to support his reforms. He met with top officers in September 1976, guaranteeing the position of top military officials, the protection of legality, and that the PCE would not be legalized. Furthermore, one of Juan Carlos's supporters within the military, General Mellado, was appointed Vice President on September 15th. As long as the

army felt that they were not threatened as an institution they would support the reforms. The PCE was a sticking point. After all, the army had led the Nationalist crusade against communism, but Suarez continued to assure the generals of the PCE's exclusion.

But as demonstrated earlier, the reforms would have been threatened had the PCE been excluded. Caught between two impossibilities, Suarez waited for the last possible moment to legalize the PCE, and in doing so broke his promise to the military. By April 1977, given the support of the democratic opposition, most of the regime, and a large majority of the population, the bunker was isolated and could only react to the PCE's legalization with public grumbling. Nevertheless, the crisis prompted by the move was the most serious of the transition period. The minister of the navy resigned, and their were rumours of a coup. The intervention of Juan Carlos and Mellado proved instrumental in appeasing the military.[119] The army publicly expressed their dissatisfaction with the measure, but in the end they saved face by claiming that they accepted the move out of patriotism, and not out of obedience to the government. This rationale seems close to the truth, but it is more likely that the military respected this move because they were not too displeased with the institutional continuity that the monarchy would provide: a monarchy they believed would be conservative.

Crucial to the army's aquiescence was the role played by Juan Carlos. The King had been chosed by Franco, and to

oppose him would have been an admission that Franco had made a critical error.[120] "By detaching himself from the regime, while assuming his institutional role as head of the state, Juan Carlos could become both guarantee of the continuity of the state and guarantee of the break with the regime."[121] Thus, Juan Carlos could push for reform, while at the same time assuring the military that he represented the forces favouring continuity.

With the acquiescence of the military and the legalization of the PCE there were now no major obstacles to elections to the constituent assembly, scheduled for November 1977. Suarez's major concern was to prevent either a victory by the socialists or the Franquist Alianza Popular (AP), either of which would have precipitated a crisis for his reforms.[122] While the formation of the AP, led by Fraga Iribarne, signified the acceptance of the elections by much of the regime, it also posed a threat since Fraga had included many conservative Franquists in the coalition and this damaged the party's democratic credentials. A victory by the AP could conceivably alienate the left from Suarez's reforms. And while the electoral law would help to prevent a socialist victory it would also favour the AP.

Early opinion polls suggested that the AP could achieve a victory, and this prompted a scramble to put together a centre coalition, which eventually led to the Union Centro Democratico (UCD). To ensure a strong showing by the centre, Suarez himself was recruited as the coalition's

leader. Suarez's leadership gave the UCD the stature of incumbent, the benefit of his immense popularity and gave the UCD a monopoly in the centre. It also removed the previously justifiable opposition between the government, representing the authoritarian state, and the political parties embodying the democratic forces.[123] Finally, with Suarez presiding over the state apparatus, the UCD also had more information and an access to fund-raising that the other parties did not have.

For the socialists the election was not expected to be that successful. The party had been merely a shadow of the former government party of the Republic only three years earlier. It was only with the party congress of December 1976 that the leadership had agreed to participate in the elections, and they retained their Marxist language at that time. On the positive side, the party had the charismatic, young Felipe Gonzalez as leader, and they were facing an electorate which had a strong moderate left component.

In the event, the UCD won the elections with 34.3% of the vote, the PSOE came a surprisingly strong second with 28.5%, while the AP trailed even the PCE's 9.3%, with only 8.4%. The election results were important in guaranteeing that the transition process would continue. As in Portugal, the election results confirmed the moderation of the population, and as well they demonstrated a rough balance between the left and the right; the left received 45%, while the right obtained 44%. As well, the election reduced the close to 161 parties which had formed since Suarez's reforms

to a handful, with only two major parties, and as in Portugal demonstrated that a democratic consensus essentially existed among the population.[124] As compared to the Republic, the election demonstrated a considerable reduction in cleavages.[125] The ideological cleavages, Church versus anti-clericals and republicans versus monarchists, made no appearance at all, with the major national cleavages congealing around socio-economic issues. The elimination of ideological cleavages reflected the economic development of Spain which had produced a more sophisticated electorate, as well as pushing socio-economic issues to the foreground. As well, the strong showing by the PSOE guaranteed that the left would become much more unified. Thus the election results went a long way in demonstrating that the fragmentation that had been part of Spanish politics during the Republic was not to reappear. Not surprisingly the Portuguese elections displayed a similar reduction in fragmentation.

The elections also allowed the reform process to continue at the same rate. The UCD received a majority in the Cortes, but not a large enough majority for Suarez to stall the pace of reform. As well the election results were fortunate in that a socialist victory would have placed reform in jeopardy, by endangering the continuity necessary for the right's acceptance. A PSOE victory would have tempted an intervention by the military, and therefore Juan Carlos would have been reluctant to name Gonzalez prime minister. But by denying a PSOE victory, the credibility of the regime

would have been unalterably damaged.[126] Thus, the elections in Spain, as in Portugal, played a significant role in the transition to democracy.

However, in contrast to the Portuguese case, the Spanish population did not play a large role beyond participating in the elections. In Portugal, the public in the North reacted to PCP influence by destroying PCP offices, but no similar action occurred in Spain. To be sure labour strife continued, but the strikes remained economic and played little direct role in the transition. Survey data reveals that up to two thirds of the Spanish population remained apolitical.[127] In January 1977 only 20% had thought about which political party they would vote for, while only 4% claimed to be well informed about politics.[128] In neither the Spanish nor the Portuguese transition was popular mobilization important, but it was even less so in Spain, where the higher degree of socio-economic development should have made it more important. This reveals that economic development does not lead directly to higher levels of participation. The Portuguese case demonstrates that elite-led mobilization or, participation induced by intra-elite competition, is more likely to encourage mass participation.

In both countries foreign entities were involved in trying to influence events during the transition. The PSOE received the recognition of the Socialist International, and technical and financial aid from European socialist parties, which was critical in establishing the party's near monopoly

of the moderate left. As well, the economic crisis forced the Spanish government to look to foreign sources for aid. The EEC was able to provide leverage in this way. Another factor was the pervasion of the liberal democratic model in Western Europe, which greatly influenced individuals such as Juan Carlos and Suarez, who sought to make Spain a part of Europe.[129] Thus, although they were not deterministic, international factors played a key underlying role, and made the democratic alternative much more attractive in Spain.

Nor were they deterministic in Portugal. Many of the military leaders of the Portuguese revolution, based upon their experiences in Africa, looked to the Third World, not Europe, as their political influence. As in Spain, Portuguese parties received advice and finances from foreign parties. The CIA and the German SPD forwarded several million dollars to the PS, and the PCP received help from the CPSU, although this aid was balanced by Eastern bloc warnings to the PCP that their actions should not upset the process of detente. The PS also received the recognition of the Socialist International, and leading European socialists visited Lisbon, which played some role in the PS's election victory. Economic influence was important as the EEC delayed credits, making it clear that economic aid was dependent upon proper political development. After the moderates regained control in the fall of 1975 aid resumed. So, as in Spain, international factors made democracy more attractive, but as

Szulc[130] points out the influence of foreign powers was never the dominant factor in events in Portugal.

THE EARLY CONSOLIDATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC REGIMES

With the defeat of the leftist uprising in Portugal in November 1975, and the favourable outcome of the Spanish elections of April 1977, the transition to democracy was largely completed. However, democracy remained fragile in both countries, and there remained a period of time in which this outcome could have been easily reversed. The continuing tendency for political elites to compromise was the major factor which changed this period of temporaray consolidation into a more permanent process of consolidation.

In Spain, although Suarez formed a quasi-majority government, he continued to choose a consociational approach (see Chapter Two) to solving the problems of the economic crisis, the constitutional process, and the institutionalization of regional autonomy. The opposition reacted with a similar attitude. It appears that the memory of the civil war played a large part in the adoption of compromise. "The leaders of the PCE, in particular, frequently spoke and wrote about how the miscalculations of the Republican era, the horrors of the Civil War, and the repression of the Franquist era dictated prudent and pragmatic behaviour in founding a new regime."[131]

One concrete example of the ability of Spanish political actors to compromise was the Moncloa pact. Signed by the government, parliamentary parties and the trade

unions, the pact enacted an austerity program, which the left accepted in return for progressive tax reform, and social security efficiency. It signalled a willingness of all elites to compromise to deal with an economic crisis which could threaten the nascent democracy. The constitutional process was another fine example of compromise. The government with AP backing, could have pushed through its own constitution, but Suarez insisted on consultation. "The new habits of democratic compromise were signs of a new pragmatism, substituting old cultural patterns of intolerance, exclusiveness and rigidity".[132]

The spirit of compromise was less evident in Portugal, indeed it had been the absence of this spirit which almost destroyed the country's opportunity to establish democracy. But, following the defeat of the left, Portugal's elites showed a remarkable ability to compromise, considering how close they had come to civil war. Melo Antunes went on TV immediately after the leftist coup attempt, and having convinced Soares of the appropriateness of this move, insisted that the PCP continue to have a role to play in Portugal's revolution, including participation in the government. For his part, Cunhal used moderate language and agreed to accept the rules of the parliamentary elections to be held in April 1976.[133] Most Portuguese elites realized that "they possessed neither the power to overthrow each other nor the desire to face the bloody consequences of the attempt to seize supremacy".[134]

Pragmatism led to the Party Pact of February 1976, which reversed the pact of the previous year and dictated the return of the MFA to the barracks. General Eanes was instrumental in directing the process whereby the military extracted itself from politics. He was able to preserve a consultative role for the revolutionary council, while leaving the civilian politicians free to run the country. Ironically, he was rewarded by being elected president by a wide margin in April. The fact that the president was a military man was also designed to appease the armed forces. The constitution formulated by discussion within the constituent assembly elected in April 1975, was promulgated on April 2 1976, and with the parliamentary elections of April 25th showing results that differed little from those held a year earlier the transition phase could be considered completed in Portugal.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, once initiated the transition to democracy in the two Iberian countries happened relatively rapidly. The period of intense change, corresponding to Rustow's decision phase, was completed within three years. Although the transitions happened in quite different ways in the two countries, many similarities are apparent. In both cases the regimes attempted to deal with their crises by initiating limited reform, which ultimately failed due to pressure from both the left and the right. Once limited reform had failed, the only alternatives were increased repression or reform.

However, because of the colonial wars the Portuguese regime never had the opportunity to follow either alternative.

Almost every account of the transition in Iberia mentions the enormous social changes which took place in conjunction with economic development. As described in the preceding chapter, Spain had made the move from an under-developed rural country to an industrialized country under Franco's rule. Franco's finance minister, Lopez Rodo, had once stated that Spain would make the transition to democracy once its per capita income reached $2000, and that prediction appeared verified by the events of the mid-seventies.[135] His prediction reminds one of Dahl's effort to establish a economic threshold for the transition to democracy. However, Dahl did not hypothesize a deterministic relationship, and such a position would be theoretically difficult to sustain. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that socio-economic development did play a part in increasing the mass pressure felt by the regime. The labour movement developed as a result of industrialization, while rapid urbanization increased the demands made on the government. The Spanish youth became alienated from "a regime founded on the victory of 1939", and sustained by "the mystique of developmental triumphalism", while the consumer society fostered by development was "incompatable with a rigid authoritarianism",[136] since authoritarian rule limits the freedom of expression necessary for a consumer society to function effectively. As well, economic development had created an increase in information,

and at both an elite and mass level this had increased the exposure to democratic values.

While there is little doubt that socio-economic development created a context which made authoritarian rule more difficult than in the past, this in itself did not make the transition to democracy necessary.[137] A comparison with Portugal reveals that Portugal made the transition at a level of development much lower than Spain's, and at a level of development similar to Third World countries, rather than levels in Western Europe. Even in Spain economic development had not led to an inordinate amount of pressure for liberalization. The regime could have attempted to solve its crisis in other ways. Thus, socio-economic development as a primary causal factor does not seem to adequately explain Spain's transition, and appears to have even less explanatory power for Portugal. The Spanish regime did not feel inordinate pressure from the masses, nor did the leaders of the democratic opposition have strong enough links to their followers to direct effective mass demonstrations. The regime had the option of attempting to plow ahead, and perhaps a more talented leader, such as Carrero Blanco, who became Franco's head of government in 1969, but was assassinated in 1973, could have had greater success in this direction. Nevertheless economic development was a major factor in leading to regime crises in both countries.

While socio-economic development appears to have played a role in the transitions, there appears to be little

support for Poulantzas's argument that transition was the outcome of a struggle between the comprador and domestic factions of the ruling class. Poulantzas's descriptions of these factions are vague and make it difficult to establish who concretely belongs in either faction.[138] In Portugal, the end of authoritarian rule came as the result of a military coup, and not at the behest of a faction of the bourgeoisie, who at best played an aquiescent role in the ensuing revolutionary struggle. In Spain, the factions did not in any meaningful way appear to exist[139]. At any rate, Poulantzas appears to get the factions confused. It was the portion of the Spanish bourgeoisie which was most closely linked to multinational firms and able to face international competition, that was most in favour of further liberalization.[140] According to Poulantzas the faction most controlled by foreign capital, the comprador faction, should also be the faction which most supported the regime, and would thus be unfavourable to liberalization. Therefore, Poulantzas's explanation of regime changes in Iberia seems to be of little value.

Similarly, explanations which view popular pressure as the key causal variable are refuted by these cases. Some writers, Maravall being the most obvious example, contend that popular pressure was the major causal factor in the transition to democracy. Social mobilization is thought to have made a mere liberalization policy non-viable, and led to the willingness of the democratic right to negotiate the

transition.[141] However, this overlooks the fact that the opposition elite provided little direction, while mass protest primarily took the form of labour strife, with an emphasis placed upon economic demands. As well, the regime could have reacted to social mobilization as it had in the thirties and forties, with severe repression. As Share points out, "the social changes resulting from rapid economic growth, rising levels of mass opposition and the desire for Europeanization each were a double edge sword, that did not favour any one solution to the crisis.[142] Over the years the Franquist state had been able to keep the opposition in a state of isolation and fragmentation, and they could have attempted to continue along this path. As well, survey data reveal that the Spanish population remained highly ambiguous in their attitudes towards democracy.[143] While popular pressure clearly affected the ease with which the regime could continue, it is also obvious that the transition could not be led from below, nor was popular pressure the primary causal factor. This demonstrates that a political cultural explanation which depends upon changes in mass political culture, such as Almond and Verba's "civic culture" hypothesis, are inadequate in explaining the Iberian transition. Similarly, theories which posit that economic modernization leads to a popular uprising which supplants dictatorial regimes also fail to explain these two cases.

Ultimately, both transitions were led by elites. In Portugal, internal MFA manoevering led to the instability of

the revolutionary period, but ultimately it was moderate officers who led the transition to a liberal democracy. In Spain, the military remained in the background while the government conducted the transition. Indeed, the role of the military was one of the striking differences. The Portuguese armed forces embroiled in an unwinnable war overthrew a regime which would not withdraw from a conflict which threatened the prestige of the Portuguese military. By contrast, the Spanish military felt no threat to their institutional interests and remained on the sidelines.

As a result of the coup, the Portuguese right was neutralized, resulting in the belief by many on the left that social revolution was possible. In this context they prepared to take advantage of the opportunity and make an attempt to convert the coup into a legitimate revolution. As evidence grew that this attempt was doomed to failure, they nevertheless pushed ahead, unwilling to admit that the chances of a bloodless revolution were always minimal. The left therefore, almost destroyed Portugal's opportunity at establishing democracy.

By contrast, Spanish leaders, the communists especially, were far more willing to abandon their own goals in order to establish democracy. The most striking difference between the two cases is the almost complete consensus over this goal in Spain, compared to its lower priority in Portugal. Given, that the PCE, whose leaders had more Civil War experience than any other party, was most conducive to

compromise, it becomes apparent that the Spanish leaders were conditioned to compromise by the historical weight of the Spanish Civil War. The Portuguese also had a violent history, but not nearly as bloody as Spain's; thus, the Portuguese left was willing to pursue their agenda to the brink of civil war, but they ultimately were unwilling to go over the brink.

ENDNOTES

[1]Donald Share, The Making of Spanish Democracy, (New York: Praeger, 1986).

[2]Carr and Fusi, Dictatorship to Democracy, p. 156.

[3] FRAP - The Frente Revolucionario Anti-fascista y Patriotica.

[4]Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 44.

[5]Casanova, "Modernization and Democratization", p. 970.

[6]The state and regime could now be considered separated because the regime was now embodied in the monarchy while the state was represented by the government. Previously Franco had been leader of both the regime and the state. Thus, an institutional factor was important in allowing for some degree of regime continuity while at the same time allowing the transformation of the regime form. Such an institutional factor is completely lacking in previous theories of democratic transition or stability. Ibid., pp. 960-971.

[7]Paul Preston, ed., Spain in Crisis, (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1976), p. xi.

[8]Carr and Fusi, Dictatorship to Democracy, pp. 148-156.

[9]Casanova, "Modernization and Democratization", p. 966.

[10]Jose Maravall and Julian Santamaria, "Political Change in Spain and the Prospects for Democracy", in Guillermo O'Donnell, Phillippe Schmitter, and Lawrence Whitehead, eds., Transitions from Authoritarian Rule, (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1986)

[11]Coverdale, Political Transformation, p. 13, 74 % thought that the freedom to form unions was important.

[12]Alfred Bardaji, "Political Positions and Opposition in the Spanish Catholic Church", Government and Opposition, Volume 11, No. 2, (Spring 1976), p. 200.

[13]It may seem a contradiction that Falangists, who supposedly adhered to an authoritarian ideology would support projects of liberalization. But, it must by remembered that the Falange had lost most of its ideology and the predominant remaining function of the Movimiento was as an agent of recruitment into the bureaucracy and ultimately the cabinet. Casanova, "Modernization and Democratization", p. 967.

[14]M. G. Garcia, "The Armed Forces: Poor Relation of the Franco Regime", in Preston, ed., Spain in Crisis, p. 45.

[15]J. Romero Maura, "After Franco, Franquismo?, The Armed Forces, the Crown and Democracy", Government and Opposition, Volume 11, No. 1, (Winter 1976), p. 48.

[16]Jonathan Story, "Spanish Political Parties: Before and After the Election", Government and Opposition, Volume 12, No. 4, (Autumn 1977), p. 475.

[17]Carr and Fusi, Dictatorship to Democracy, p. 195.

[18]Spanish for openness - the option of liberal Franquists, who preferred a moderately liberalized regime. Perhaps a warning should be issued to Gorbachev who has opted to use the same slogan (Glasnost) in the Soviet Union.

[19]Preston, Spain in Crisis, p. xiii.

[20]Salvador Giner and Eduardo Sevilla, "From Despotism to Parliamentarism: Class Domination and Political Order in the Spanish State", in Scase, ed., State in Western Europe, p. 219.

[21]Coverdale, Transformation of Spain, p. 16.

[22]Edward Malefakis, "Spain and Its Francoist Heritage" in John Herz, ed., From Dictatorship to Democracy, (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1982), p. 225.

[23]Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 76.

[24]Arias apparently kept a rather large portrait of Franco over the desk in his office beside a comparatively tiny picture of Juan Carlos. Coverdale, Political Transformation, p. 43.

[25]Carr and Fusi, Dictatorship to Democracy, p. 42.

[26]Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 68.

[27]Coverdale, Transformation of Spain, p. 37.

[28]Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 78.

[29]This proposition is argued convincingly by Romero Maura, "After Franco", p. 47.

[30]Coverdale, Transformation of Spain, p. 12.

[31]Linkages between the opposition and labour leadership were

not directly prohibited by law. But, the prohibition of political parties kept most of the party leaders in exile. As well, the regime had slowly given a number of concessions, such as the right to collective bargaining, to the labour movement and this had defused their desire for a change in the regime. Both factors kept the labour movement separated from the democratic opposition. Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 37.

[32]The P.S.I. is the Partido Socialista del Interior.

[33]Preston, Spain in Crisis, p. 152.

[34]Howard Wiarda, Corporatism and Development: The Portuguese Experience, (Amherst Mass.: University of Massachusetts, 1977), p. 255.

[35]Ibid, p. 257.

[36]These liberal candidates were later to form the core of the Popular Democratic Party, which provided opposition during the revolution and participated in both provisional governments and later, as the Social Democratic Party, in constituent governments.

[37]Serras Gago and Nuno Portas, "Some Preliminary Notes on the State in Contemporary Portugal", in Richard Scase, ed., The State in Western Europe, (London: Croom Helm, 1980), p. 233.

[38]Wiarda, Corporatism, p. 261.

[39]INSIGHT, Insight on Portugal, (London: Andre Deutch, 1975), p. 69.

[40]John Hammond, Building Popular Power, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1988), p. 62.

[41]Thomas Bruneau, Politics and Nationhood: Post Revolutionary Portugal, (New York: Praeger, 1984), p. 22.

[42]Ibid., p. 21.

[43]INSIGHT, on Portugal, p. 45.

[44]Douglas Porch, The Portuguese Armed Forces and the Revolution, (London: Croom Helm, 1977), p. 86.

[45]Kenneth Maxwell, "Regime Overthrow and the Prospects for Democratic Transition in Portugal", in O'Donnell, Schmitter and Whitehead, eds., Transitions, p. 111.

[46]Kohler, Political Forces, p. 177.

[47]Hugo Ferreira and Michael Marshall, Portugal's Revolution: Ten Years On, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p.29.

[48]Porch, Armed Forces and Revolution, p. 56.

[49]Bruneau, Politics and Nationhood, p. 39.

[50]Kenneth Maxwell, "The Thorns of the Portuguese Revolution", Foreign Affairs, Volume 54, No. 2, (January 1976), p. 253.

[51]Robin Blackburn, "The Test in Portugal", New Left Review, Number 87-88, (Sept. - Dec. 1974), p. 14.

[52]Kohler, Political Forces, p. 169.

[53]Walter Opello, Portugal's Political Development, (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986), p. 199.

[54]Maxwell, "Regime Overthrow", p. 109.

[55]The best account of Caetano's surrender is found in INSIGHT, on Portugal, pp. 88-91.

[56]Porch, Armed Forces and Revolution, p. 97.

[57]Maxwell, "Thorns", p. 259.

[58]INSIGHT, on Portugal, p. 101.

[59]Ibid., p. 111.

[60]Ibid., p. 149.

[61]Guiseppi Di Palma, "Founding Coalitions in Southern Europe: Legitmacy and Hegemony", Government and Opposition, Volume 15, No. 2, (Spring 1980), p. 172.

[62]Bruneau, Politics and Nationhood, p. 45.

[63]The PPD is the Popular Democratic Party, later it would become the Social Democratic Party, (PSD). The CDS is the Centre Social Democrats.

[64]In contrast to Carillo, whose moderation was genuine, Cunhal's was wholly tactical. Eusebio Mujal-Leon, "The PCP and the Portuguese Revolution",Problems of Communism, Vol. 26, No. 1, (Jan.-Feb. 1977).

[65]Arnold Hottinger, "The Rise of Portugal's Communists", Problems of Communism, Vol. 24, (July-August 1975), pp. 4-9.

[66]Bruneau, Politics and Nationhood, p. 47.

[67]Robert Harvey, Portugal: Birth of a Democracy, (London: MacMillan Press, 1978), p. 22.

[68]Blackburn, "The Test", p. 30.

[69]Porch, Armed Forces and Revolution, p. 107.

[70]Mujal-Leon, "Portuguese Revolution", p.27.

[71]Hammond, Building Popular Power, p. 108.

[72]Tom Gallagher, "Portugal's bid for Democracy: The Role of the Socialist Party", West European Politics, Vol. 2, No. 2, (May 1979), p. 205.

[73]Mujal-Leon, "Portuguese Revolution", p. 28.

[74]Ibid., p. 28.

[75]Hammond, Building Popular Power, p. 142.

[76]Paul Sweezy, "Class Struggles in Portugal", Monthly Review, Volume 27, No. 4, (Sept. 1975), p. 11.

[77]Hammond, Building Popular Power, p. 154.

[78]It was claimed that the parties could confuse voters, since most left wing parties had a hammer and sickle in their emblem. Porch, Armed Forces and Revolution, p. 177.

[79]Hammond, Building Popular Power, p. 155.

[80]Harvey, Birth of a Democracy, p. 48.

[81]Porch, Armed Forces and Revolution, p. 181.

[82]Harvey, Birth of a Democracy, p. 50.

[83]Maxwell, "Regime Overthrow", p. 126.

[84]Tad Szulc, "Lisbon and Washington: Behind the Portuguese Revolution", Foreign Policy, No. 21, (Winter 1975-76), p. 49.

[85]Gallagher, "Portugal's Bid", p. 209.

[86]INSIGHT, on Portugal, p. 255.

[87]Szulc, "Lisbon and Washington", p. 49.

[88]Porch, Armed Forces and Revolution, pp. 191-195.

[89]Hammond, Building Popular Power, p. 220.

[90]Ibid., p. 228.

[91]Costa Gomes interviewed in Ferreira and Marshall, Portugal's Revolution, p. 177.

[92]Bruneau, Politics and Nationhood, p. 76.

[93]Ibid., p. 76.

[94]Hammond, Building Popular Power, p. 241.

[95]Porch, Armed Forces and Revolution, p. 229.

[96]Coverdale, Transformation of Spain, p. 60.

[97]Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 51.

[98]Manuel Medina, "Spain in Europe", Government and Opposition, Volume 11, No. 2, (Spring 1976), p. 150.

[99]Share, Spanish Democracy, pp. 50-51.

[100]Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 91.

[101]Coverdale, Transformation of Spain, p. 45.

[102]Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 92.

[103]Gunter, Sani and Shabad, Spain after Franco, p. 118.

[104]Giner and Sevilla, "From Despotism", p.220.

[105]Maravall, Transition to Democracy, p. 19.

[106]Paul Preston, "The Spanish Constitutional Referendum of 6 December 1978", West European Politics, Vol. 2, No. 2, (May 1979), p. 246.

[107]Kenneth Medhurst, "Spain's Evolutionary Pathway from Dictatorship to Democracy", West European Politics, Volume 7, No. 2, (April 1984), p. 35.

[108]Maravall, Transition to Democracy, p. 20.

[109]Carr and Fusi, Dictatorship to Democracy, p. 222.

[110]Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 203.

[111]Ibid., p. 127.

[112]Gunther, Sani and Shabad, Spain after Franco, p. 146.

[113]Maravall and Santamaria, "Political Change", p. 84.

[114]Maravall, Transition to Democracy, p.204.

[115]Kohler, Political Forces, p. 7.

[116]The legislative progress of the Law of Political Reform is covered well by Share, Spanish Democracy, pp. 105-111.

[117]Ibid., p. 114.

[118]Phillipe Schmitter, "An Introduction to Southern European Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Italy, Greece, Portugal, Spain and Turkey" in O'Donnell, Schmitter and Whitehead, eds., Transitions, p. 5.

[119]Carr and Fusi, Dictatorship to Democracy, p. 226.

[120]Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 209.

[121]Casanova, "Moderniztion", p. 962.

[122]Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 124.

[123]Kohler, Political Forces, p. 18.

[124]Carr and Fusi, Dictatorship to Democracy, p. 233.

[125]Maravall and Santamaria, "Political Change", p.85.

[126]Stanley Meisler, "Spain's New Democracy", Foreign Affairs, Volume 56, No. 1, (October 1977), p. 190.

[127]Maravall, Transition to Democracy, p. 85.

[128]Gunther, Sani and Shabad, Spain after Franco, p. 55.

[129]Geoffery Pridham, "Comparative Perspectives on the New Mediterranian Democracies: A Model of Regime Transition", West European Politics, Volume 7, No. 2, (April 1984), p. 26.

[130]Szulc, Lisbon and Washington, p. 3.

[131]Gunther, Sani and Shabad, Spain after Franco, p.118.

[132]Maravall and Santamaria, "Political Change", p. 90.

[133]Harvey, Birth of Democracy, p. 103.

[134]Maxwell, "Regime Overthrow", p. 135.

[135]John Coverdale, The Political Transformation of Spain after Franco, (New York: Praeger, 1979), p. 1.

[136]Developmental triumphalism is the "ideoloy" the Franco regime developed, which made economic development the key priority of the regime. This contrasts with the Falangist ideology which placed social cohesion and national pride above economic development. Raymond Carr and Juan Fusi, Spain: Dictatorship to Democracy, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1979), p. 96.

[137]One of the strongest arguments against socio-economic determinism is made by Jose Casanova, who argues that modernization set the stage for democratization but did not make democracy inevitable. He contends that the transition to democracy was made because of the decision of political actors, as well as institutional changes which facilitated the decision. "Modernization and Democratization: Reflections on Spain's Transition to Democracy", Social Research, Vol. 50, No. 4, (Winter 1983), p. 936.

[138]For example, in Portugal one of the largest companies was Champlimaud, whose owner Antonio Champlimaud was by inference a member of the domestic bourgeoisie, but who at any rate played no part in the downfall of the regime. He afterwards became a supporter of Spinola, an opponent of the regime, but less of an opponent than other members of the military. Thus, the connections are tenuous at best, and the bourgeoisie certainly did not initiate the downfall of the regime.

[139]Both Casanova and Maravall can find little evidence to support the existence of these factions. Casanova, "Modernization and Democratization", p. 941. Jose Maravall, The Transition to Democracy in Spain, (London: Croom Helm, 1982), p. 7.

[140]Beate Kohler, Political Forces in Spain, Greece and Portugal, (London: Butterworth, 1982), pp. 7-8.

[141]Maravall, Transition to Democracy, p. 14.

[142]Share, Spanish Democracy, p. 52.

[143]82% favoured election over appointment for selecting public officials, 74% supported freedom of the press, 71% favoured freedom of religion, and 58% supported freedom of association for unions, on the other hand, 36% thought it was "better for a distinguished man" to make decisions, 80% valued peace and order, while 52% thought discipline was important. In 1973 only 37% were in favour of freedom of association for political parties, while a 1975 survey found only 43% in favour of liberal democracy. Richard

Gunther, Giacomo Sani, and Goldie Shabad, Spain after Franco: The Making of a Competitive Party System, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), p. 31.

CONCLUSIONS

As a rule, when people attempt to explain the causation of events, they prefer an explanation which is simple and direct. If A causes B in a directly linear relationship, it is far easier to comprehend and to make predictions about future events. Both natural and social sciences have therefore sought to develop simple linear models to explain phenomena. Thus, for example, in explaining the emergence of democracy they have hypothesized that a certain level of socio-economic development is responsible for the initiation of the process, or that a democratic state serves a function in preserving the power of the ruling class.

However, as the two cases in this thesis demonstrate, social phenomena are rarely reducible to a linear relationship. In natural sciences the same problems emerge. The rate of acceleration of falling objects is a linear relationship which is easily explained. In such an example the variables are few. However, the newly emerging science of chaos reminds us that all relationships are not so simple. Scientists have been unable to explain the behaviour of a flickering flame or the turbulence which results from a quickly flowing river. To all appearances these events occur in a random fashion, but the science of chaos is beginning to

reveal that these events are not actually random but are a result of a highly complex interaction of many variables. It is within this context that social scientists must concentrate on turbulent social phenomena, such as the transition to democracy. As the Spanish and Portuguese cases demonstrate, it is the interaction of many variables which caused the transformation of their respective political systems.

Nevertheless, it is possible, in rough terms, to attribute the transition to democracy to some factors more than others. Several factors are important in explaining the crises each regime was facing near the end of the prepatory phase. The chief factor explaining the crises was the power deflation of both regimes, which resulted in a more equal balance of forces in both countries. Modernization resulted in conditions in which many of the families which formed the ruling coalition began to defect from the regimes. As well, the regimes faced a succession crisis, since they needed to find new leaders to replace Franco and Salazar, both of whom commanded a great deal of legitimacy and had had the ability to balance their ruling coalitions over the years.

Both regimes also faced additional demands due to an increase in the level of development, and since continuing economic growth seemed to indicate a need for economic integration with Western Europe, the regimes had an additional incentive to democratize. Finally, the Portuguese faced an additional crisis caused by military and popular

discontent with the progress of the colonial wars in Africa.

These crises caused many within the elite to question what regime-form would be most appropriate for their respective country. The process by which the decision was made was different in the two countries. In Spain it was clearly the consociational behaviour of that country's elites which was most responsible for the transition to democracy; especially its peaceful evolution. Leaders of the regime, such as Suarez, Juan Carlos and Miranda Fernandez, were united in their desire to implement democracy in a manner that included as wide a base as possible . They sought to negotiate with members of the Cortes, the bureaucracy, the army, as well as with the opposition, including the communists. In doing so they took the chance that they could be removed from their positions, either by the electorate or by intransigent defenders of the regime.

For its part, the opposition in Spain exhibited a similar desire for cooperation. First of all, they were able to bury their own differences in establishing a united opposition front. Even the PCE's wartime behaviour was forgiven in achieving this unity. More importantly the opposition showed a disposition towards compromising with the regime on issues which had separated the two sides during the Republic. The monarchy was accepted by the opposition, the Church's nominal constitutional status as the official Spanish Church was reluctantly agreed to, and finally the

opposition allowed the regime to evolve rather than demand its dissolution; permitting many regime officials to remain in their positions. Most striking was the attitude of the leadership of the PCE. More moderate than the socialists, due to their leader's direct civil war experience, the communists put aside all question of a socialist revolution in negotiating the establishment of a parliamentary regime. Thus, many members of the regime, except the minority in the bunker, and the vast majority of the opposition, put aside their own respective political goals in order to achieve a regime guided by democratic priniciples. Spain clearly seems to confirm Rustow's decision phase, and also suggests that Lijphart's notion of consociationalism, originally intended to explain democratic stability in societies which are deeply divided socially, also helps to explain the emergence of democracy in such societies.

Portugal, on the other hand, seems at first glance to refute the existence of a decision phase. Portugal's leaders seemed more dedicated to achieving their own aims than to realize a democratic regime. Two factions of the military were committed to differing models of social revolution, which resulted in a weaker position for the radical left. The communist party acted in a manner very different from their Spanish counterparts. Meanwhile leaders in Portugal acted to narrow, rather than attempting to expand, the base of power, as Suarez did in Spain. But, this appearance confirms rather than denies the decision phase. By rejecting compromise,

Portugal's leaders almost derailed the democracy installed following the coup. The second half of 1975 featured an increasing degree of political violence. Military discipline was beginning to disappear. The fear of civil war was demonstrated by the preparations being made by both the extremists and the moderates. Portugal's newly formed democracy could have easily fallen victim to either a coup by the radical left, or a civil war which would have allowed a resurgence of the right. In either case an authoritarian regime would have likely resulted.

Dictatorship was not the end result because enough leaders in Portugal realized that they needed to cooperate in order for democracy to be installed. Mario Soares acted with a great deal of astuteness in building a civilian coalition in opposition to the far left. At the same time, the group of Nine in the military published their document and gathered the signatures of 80% of the MFA to demonstrate the lack of support for revolution. Realizing that they had little chance of imposing a socialist Portugal upon a reluctant population, the far left acquiesced when faced with a vast opposition. Following the disarming of the left, the moderates hastily took measures to re-integrate the far left, and especially the PCP, into the rejuvenated democratic system.

Thus it is apparent the actions of elites are most responsible for the transition to democracy. There was not a great popular uprising which overthrew the dictatorial regimes. This is not to say that the masses were irrelevant

in the transition, only that they were not the decisive factor which sealed the fate of the dictatorships. Franco and Salazar had successfully demobilized the population previously, and their successors were not inevitably destined to fail if they attempted to do the same.

The most evident manifestation of mass protest was the steady growth of the labour movement in both countries. Spain witnessed an astronomical increase in the number of strikes, but these strikes were not political in nature. The labour movement did not have direct links with the democratic opposition, nor was it dedicated to changing the political system. In Portugal, the labour movement had only just begun to grow before the coup. During the years of turmoil following the coup, it became increasingly dominated by the far left, and began to sanction some sort of popular control of the workplace. Thus it encouraged the radical elements in the military, while not providing any support for democracy itself.

The population did play a large role in Portugal through their participation in mass demonstrations. Rallies organized by the PS played a role in convincing the radicals that the moderates had popular support. But the PCP could also mobilize large crowds of people, so in a sense mass demonstrations tended to be neutralized because they were balanced. The far left and the PCP could count on close to 20% of the population, and this would probably have been a large enough base had they been willing to establish their

regime by using coercion. It was not the mere lack of popular support which restrained the far left, but this lack of popular support combined with the opposition of 80% of the armed forces.

As well the democratic opposition in both countries had few links with their supporters. Political parties remained small groupings around notable personalities. In Portugal only the PCP existed for any meaningful period of time before the coup. Thus, the other parties had a small membership and underdeveloped organizations. Similarly, only the PCE in Spain had any significant organization. The PSOE was a largely divided party with little organization within the country. The other parties existed only as vehicles for their founders. In Spain, the parties played little role in mobilizing their followers, and their lack of organization meant that they played virtually no role in communicating the desires of their members to the regime. The Portuguese parties were to play a larger role. Their greater ability to mobilize the population can be explained by the larger degree of turmoil, which alerted people to the importance of the political struggle, and by heightening emotions, induced them to participate. But mobilization of the population in the summer of 1975 was not in itself sufficient to halt the leftward drift. The left was ultimately held in check by the opposition of about 80% of the armed forces. The far left acquiesced because they lacked the political resources that their adversaries controlled. By commanding the support of

the vast majority of the army, the moderates had enough control over the means of coercion that the radical faction had little chance of victory.

Nevertheless, the masses were able to have an effect through the results of elections and referenda. In both Spain and Portugal the population asserted its preference for democracy by way of the electoral process. The elections demonstrated to the leaders that they could continue authoritarian rule only with the opposition of the vast majority of the population. Had they been less averse to massive coercion, the bunker in Spain may have chosen this route, but the country had grown tired of violence. By contrast, Portuguese history had been far less violent, although it also had seen much repression and instability. As well, the armed forces were certain to feel some war weariness because of their long involvement in the African wars. But, historical experience was a minor factor in explaining the far left's reluctance to fight a civil war. More likely it was a prudential decision based on the large degree of support the moderates commanded in the armed forces. Thus, while the elections were important in both countries, they were not the determining factor in Portugal.

Thus mass mobilization played a limited role in democratic transition in these two countries. The transition to democracy occurred because of the leadership of individuals who were dedicated to its implementation. For this reason various explanations which rely upon the

participation of the masses can be rejected.

For example, Almond and Verba's political cultural explanation of democratic stability does not adequately explain the Iberian transitions. The civic culture explanation of democratic transition would posit that various factors are responsible for an increase in the number of people with a participant political culture, and these individuals would be predominantly oriented towards a democratic system. In neither Spain or Portugal was mass participation a key factor in the transition nor were the masses clearly oriented towards democracy. Much of the survey data reveals that both Spaniards and Portuguese had contradictions in their attitudes towards democracy. There was no clear cut indication that they valued democracy highly enough to struggle for its implementation. Authoritarian values such as order seemed to be considered as important for the masses as more democratic values such as political choice. This resulted in a notable lack of mass mobilization in Spain, but this was less the case in Portugal, where the threat of a left-wing military dictatorship aroused the population. Participation by the masses in the transition was largely restricted to voting; however elections had been regularly held during the dictatorships, so the continuation of this behaviour does not reveal a significant change in political culture. Finally, the masses may not have been democratic because they were constantly reminded by the authoritarian regimes that previous democratic experience had

ended in political violence and disorder. Nevertheless, mass political culture was developed sufficiently highly that at the crucial moment of the elections enough people voted for the forces favourable to democracy. A message was sent to undemocratic forces that dictatorships would be increasingly difficult to maintain.

Similarly, Marxist class explanations seem inappropriate in accounting for the Iberian transitions. Pro-democratic forces tended to have cross-cutting class membership. Nor was there an anti-monopoly capital alliance as Carillo had suggested, since many of the representatives of monopoly capital were also in favour of democratization. An explanation which focuses upon intra-class competition would seem to be much more promising. Poulantzas attempted to furnish such an explanation, but his effort failed because he confused the pro-regime and pro-democratic factions of capital, and he also failed to provide any empirical evidence of their separate existence. Furthermore, capital did not provide any significant leadership in the transition, especially in Portugal, where the authoritarian regime fell due to a military coup. Finally, Marxist analysis of state-form transition suffers because there have been few detailed studies concerning the form of the capitalist state.

Socio-economic explanations - such as those of Lipset, Dahl and Powell - propose that democratic transition occurs due to a popular uprising caused by various manifestations of economic modernization, such as

urbanization, industrialization and increased communication. They also seem to be inadequate, firstly because these two cases exhibit an absence of popular participation. However, economic development did bring some social disruption, and socio-economic variables were important in causing regime crises in both countries. Furthermore, socio-economic changes had a profound influence upon the attitudes of elites in Iberia. Nevertheless, socio-economic variables on their own do not offer an adequate explanation of democratic transition.

Both Spain and Portugal experienced a large degree of development during the sixties, a fact which appears to lend credence to the economic development explanation. In response, Share has argued that the socio-economic variable is invalid because the transitions in the seventies happened at a time of economic downturn, not during a period of growth. But the key variable is not the economic growth trend, but rather the absolute level of economic development. Economic development during the preparatory phase allows for the development of an infrastructure which increases the level of communication and knowledge. This leads to a crisis for the regime, but this does not lead inevitably to democracy. An additional intervening variable is necessary, and this variable is the elite decision making. Share also argues that the regimes received a great deal of credit for the economic growth, but this credit does not guarantee the regime's durability, since economic development led to

conditions which made an authoritarian system more difficult to sustain. Finally, the fact that Portugal remained only roughly half as developed as Spain, begs the question: why did their transitions take place at approximately the same time? But, the fact that the Portuguese transition almost led to a military dictatorship rather than a liberal democracy seems to confirm the importance of socio-economic development.

Socio-economic development was important in the two country's democratic transition in the following ways. The results of development had some influence on the attitudes of elites, especially in Spain. Industrialization resulted in the growth of the labour movement. This directly resulted in the desire of some business leaders to introduce collective bargaining, which put many of them in opposition to the regime. As well, unionization provided an element of turmoil to Iberian society which caused regime leaders to question the long-term durability of their regimes. However, labour unrest was a double-edged sword. In Portugal, the labour movement contributed to the strength and the confidence of the non-democratic left in its attempt to take power.

Also socio-economic development was aimed at achieving a society with a social pattern and standard of living equivalent to those in Western Europe. Since Western Europe also had political democracy, and because many connected the higher level of economic development with the existence of democracy, democracy's value was also increased.

This was especially true for individuals like Suarez and Juan Carlos in Spain, or Mario Soares and Melo Antunes in Portugal. Thus, economic development led to a desire to install democratic values such as civil liberties and human rights for many of the elites in Spain, and to a lesser extent in Portugal. Finally, the predominance of the desire for economic growth led to pragmatism rather than idealism, and thus an acceptance of alternative political forms.

Nonetheless, cultural and economic factors were not the primary cause of the transition. Democracy was not the inevitable outcome. The regimes could have attempted to "re-ideologize", renew the anti-communist crusade or apply an increased amount of repression. In Spain, the regime's leaders decided against any of these solutions not because they were impossible, but because a conservative democracy offered the best chance of preserving some of the regime's institutions while cautiously introducing increasingly attractive democratic values. But, most importantly democratization would prevent bloodshed. Portugal may have followed the same route, but in that country the African wars prompted a military coup derailing any possibility of the regime's own internal reform.

Clearly Portugal's regime fell because of an international factor: the pressure against a small nation's attempt to remain a colonial empire. But other international factors were also important in affecting the beliefs of each country's elites. In Spain and in Portugal to a lesser

extent, the desire to emulate European society was present among many of the regime's younger members and the business community. This was heightened by a feeling that continued economic growth depended upon membership in the EEC. As well, it was made quite clear by Western countries that future economic aid depended upon the development of democracy, and political forces that supported democracy received help from various West European and American institutions. These external factors provided further encouragement to elites who favoured parliamentary regimes.

Although Rustow's hypotheses concerning the decision phase appear to be supported by these two cases, those of the preparatory phase are less clearly established. It is difficult to see any prolonged political struggle in either country. To be sure, there had been opposition to the dictatorships from their inception, but this opposition had never been meaningful enough to threaten their existence. In any case what regime is completely free from those who work to bring about its demise? In Spain, the democratic opposition remained quite weak right up to the period of Suarez's reforms. There was clearly an alternative to the regime, but it did not ultimately lead the transition to democracy. In Portugal, there was a struggle over the continuation of the colonial wars, but it did not become particularly intense until about eight months prior to the coup. Following the coup, an intense political struggle did ensue, but it was of such intensity that democracy was almost

submerged. So, although there was clearly a struggle in both countries between pro-democratic and anti-democratic forces, this struggle was neither as prolonged nor as intense as Rustow theorized it should be.

Despite the mildness of Spain's transition and the short time period of Portugal's transition, elites in both countries made a decision that they would support an attempt at democratization. However, the decision was made much more reluctantly in Portugal, where two military factions seemed bent upon socialist revolution. What factors account for the differences in the two country's transitions, and the greater degree of consensus in Spain?

First of all, Spain and Portugal had differing historical experiences. While both had discouraging early experiences with democracy, Spain's early experiment was far more tragic. The breakdown of Spain's Republic resulted in a civil war causing the deaths of hundreds of thousands, and severe post-war repression. The Republican period had been characterized by intense class division and near social revolution, with a large degree of popular mobilization. In contrast, Portugal's Republic passed almost bloodlessly to the orderly New State, while the Republic had witnessed little class division or popular participation. Spain's experience was deeply ingrained in the minds of its leaders. Some of them had personally participated in the civil war, and others had been subjected to decades of socialization about it by the Nationalist regime. The Portuguese, while

aware of the Spanish experience, and also their own unstable Republic, were less concerned with avoiding a future civil war. Spain's leaders, eager to avoid a repetition of their bloody history, were more willing to negotiate a democratic future.

Furthermore, political forces were more equally balanced in Spain than they were in Portugal. In Spain the impulse of the left to push for social reform was contained by the knowledge that the bunker would not accept a progressive democracy. Thus the left was more willing to negotiate, and this meant that the right was also less able to adopt an intransigent position which they could have justified if the left had been more radical. In Portugal the right was eliminated by the coup, as a result there was no counterbalance to the extreme left. This group was thus able to advance its interests without the fear of a right-wing coup. The balance in Spain gave the forces of the centre a position from which to initiate negotiation, while the centre in Portugal was in a weak position, and had to struggle for their survival.

Another factor was the direct involvement of the military in Portuguese politics. Because the post-coup leaders in Portugal were officers, and officers are accustomed to a hierarchical rather than bargaining type of decision making, the Portuguese leaders were more likely to reject democracy than were Spain's civilian elites. As well, suffused by anger derived from the frustration at being

forced to fight unwinnable colonial wars, Portugal's officers were not prepared to settle for a negotiated political arrangement. Given their orientation towards the left, this anger led to an intense desire to implement social reform in Portugal. Finally, Portugal's leaders were less politically experienced than Spain's, and thus had fewer bargaining skills.

As well, the Portuguese transition occurred through a complete break with the old regime, while Spain's was led by the old regime. This lent a degree of continuity to the transition, which made it easier for the right to accept the transition. Particularly important was Franco's decision to restore the monarchy. The monarchy as an institution guaranteed the continuity of the regime, and suggested to the Bunker that the regime would continue to be conservative. Because this continuity reassured the Bunker, the regime leader's, Juan Carlos and Suarez, could proceed with the transition process. In Portugal there were no institutions which guaranteed continuity and so the various political forces were less willing to compromise due to the lower level of certainty.

A final factor was Spain's greater desire to be a "part of Europe". Spain sought to emulate democratic Western European society. A section of the Portuguese military had become radicalized, mainly through their exposure to revolutionary writings while fighting in Africa. Thus Portugal's military leaders were influenced by Communist bloc

and Third World experience. For this reason Spanish leaders were more apt to emulate Western political systems while the Portuguese leaders felt a greater attraction to alternative political models.

Therefore, it seems apparent that the most important factor in the transition to democracy is the decision made by elites that they will put aside their differences and work towards installing a democratic political system. Based on a comparison of the Iberian cases, it would seem that this decision is made because of an overarching desire to avoid violence. Historical experience would seem to be the most likely factor in initiating this belief. Another likely reason for the attitudinal shift which led to the decision on the part of elites to implement democracy was their negative experience with the dictatorships.

The conclusions of this study do not appear to be easily applied within a general theory. They suggest that each case of democratic transition may be unique, involving differing combinations of interacting variables. But, some theoretical generalizations can be made. The processes of economic development, resulting in increased education, communication and societal tension, combined with a deterioration in the strength of the ruling coalition or the necessity of finding a new leader is likely to lead to a crisis for an authoritarian regime. As well, an intervening international factor may also lead to regime crisis. With the regime facing a crisis, its leaders are confronted with the possibility

that they may have to change the nature of the regime. Democracy is likely to emerge where there is a rough balance in forces, and a strongly led, well identified democratic opposition exists. Furthermore, conditions which promote compromise are also necessary. An atmosphere of compromise is most likely to exist where historical experience has imprinted the necessity of avoiding confrontation; where international conditions encourage a transition to democracy; where there is an orientation towards the West; where democratic values have become appreciated; and where there is some degree of institutional continuity.

The key variable is the existence of a clearly-led democratic opposition. Much has been made of the supposedly mass-led "people's power" transition in the Philippines. But even there, the transition was led by Corazon Aquino, who as a widow of a martyr, provided a powerful symbol to give unity and strength to the democratic opposition.

The need for democratic leadership highlights the necessity of a transition led by elite decision-making. Only when the vast majority of the elite seems willing to avoid violence and accept democracy does the transition seem possible. The most likely factor in influencing this elite belief would seem to be a violent past. Indeed almost all democratic countries have gone through periods of violence. However, this is not to suggest that civil war is a necessary development in a nation's democratic political development. Perhaps knowledge of the violent histories of other nations

could be sufficient in achieving a consensus for democracy.

These conclusions do seem to lend themselves to more clarity in making predictions. For example, the recent events in China, where the opposition led by students was crushed, seems to confirm that mass-led opposition without strong leadership is ineffective. In contrast, the changes in the Soviet Union, which have been given the blessing of Mikhail Gorbachev, the current leader of the regime, and with reform-oriented leadership under Boris Yeltsin and the Inter-regional Deputies Group, would seem to have a much greater chance of success.

But while these conclusions do appear to have some predictive value for societies which have entered the decision phase, what about their prescriptive value? Must we sit back and wait for each nation's elites to learn that violence must be avoided? And once learned, is this lesson ever forgotten? These questions remind us that the maintenance of democracy is a never-ending task. Democracy is never completely consolidated. Democratic stability is strengthened by a continual process which reinforces the original decision that the leaders make that such a regime and its associated values are more important than their own narrow political concerns. Democracy will be built elsewhere by encouraging elites to come to this decision. This may be distressing for those looking for an instant solution, but it appears to be the only way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almond, Gabriel, Flanagan S., and Mandt R., eds., Crisis, Choice and Change, Boston: Little Brown, 1973.

Almond, Gabriel, and Verba, Sidney, The Civic Culture, Boston: Little Brown, 1963.

Amodia, Jose, Franco's Political Legacy, London: Allen Lane, 1977.

Amsden, Jon, Collective Bargaining and Class Conflict in Spain, London: L.S.E., 1972.

Arbos, Xavier, "Central Versus Peripheral Nationalism in Building Democracy: The Case of Spain", Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism, Vol. XIV, No. 1, Spring 1987.

Barnes, Samuel H., McDonough, Peter and Lopez Pina, Antonio, "The Development of Partisanship in New Democracies: The Case of Spain", American Journal of Political Science, Volume 29, No. 4, Nov. 1985.

Bardaji, Alfred Fiero, "Political Positions and Opposition in the Spanish Catholic Church", Government and Opposition, Volume 11, No. 2, Spring 1976.

Ben-Ami, Schlomo, "The Dictatorship of Primo de Rivera: A Political Reassessment", Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 12, No. 1, January 1977.

Blackburn, Robin, "The Test in Portugal", New Left Review, Number 87-88, Sept.-Dec. 1974.

Brenan, Gerald The Spanish Labrynth, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1943.

Browne, Harry, Spain's Civil War, Essex: Longman,1983.

Bruneau, Thomas C., "Church and State in Portugal: Crisis of Cross and Sword", Journal of Church and State, Vol. 18, No. 3 Autumn 1976.

----, "Continuity and Change in Portuguese Politics: Ten Years after the Revolution of 25 April 1974", West European Politics, Volume 7, No. 2, April 1984.

----, Politics and Nationhood: Post-Revolutionary Portugal, New York: Praeger, 1984.

Carr, Raymond, ed., The Republic and the Civil War in Spain, London: MacMillan and Company, 1971.

----, The Spanish Tragedy, London: Weidenfeld-Nicolson, 1977.

----, Modern Spain 1875-1980, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Carr, Raymond and Fusi, Juan, Spain: Dictatorship to Democracy, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1979.

Casanova, Jose, "Modernization and Democratization: Reflections on Spain's Transition to Democracy", Social Research, Vol. 50, No. 4, Winter 1983.

Clark, Robert P. "Language and Politics in Spain's Basque Provinces", West European Politics, Vol. 4, No. 1, January 1981.

Coverdale, John, The Political Transformation of Spain after Franco, New York: Praeger, 1979.

Dahl, Robert, Polyarchy, Participation and Opposition, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.

de Figueiredo, Antonio, Portugal: Fifty Years of Dictatorship, New York: Holmes and Meier, 1976.

Di Palma, Guiseppe, "Founding Coalitions in Southern Europe: Legitimacy and Hegemony", Government and Opposition, Volume 15, No. 2, Spring 1980.

Dodd, Lawrence, Coalitions in Parliamentary Government, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Eckstein, Harry, Division and Cohesion in a Democracy, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Ellwood, Sheelagh, Spanish Facsism in the Franco Era, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.

Gago, Serras, and Portas, Nuno, "Some Preliminary Notes on the State in Contemporary Portugal", in Richard Scase ed., The State in Western Europe, London: Croom Helm, 1980.

Gallagher, Tom, "Controlled Repression in Salazar's Portugal", Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 14, No. 3, July 1979.

---- "Portugal's Bid for Democracy: The Role of the Socialist Party", West European Politics, Vol. 2, No. 2, May 1979.

Giner, Salvador, and Sevilla, Eduardo, "From Despotism to Parliamentarianism: Class Domination and Political Order in the Spanish State", in Richard Scase ed., The State in Western Europe, London: Croom Helm, 1980.

Gunther, Richard, Sani, Giacomo and Shabad, Goldie, Spain after Franco: The Making of a Competitive Party System, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Hammond, John, Building Popular Power, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1988.

Harvey, Robert, Portugal: Birth of a Democracy, London: MacMillan Press, 1978.

Hermet, Guy, "Spain Under Franco: The Changing Character of an Authoritarian Regime", European Journal of Political Research, Volume 4, No. 3, Sept. 1976.

Hottinger, Arnold, "The Rise of Portugal's Communists", Problems of Communism, Vol. 24, July-August 1975.

Huntington, Samuel, Political Order in Changing Societies, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

Hurwitz, Leon, "Democratic Political Stability", Comparative Political Studies, Volume 4, No. 4, Jan. 1972.

INSIGHT, Insight on Portugal, London: Andre Deutsch, 1975.

International Labour Organization, "Report of the Study Group to Examine the Labour and Trade Union Situation in Spain", International Labour Organization Bulletin, Vol. LII, No. 4, 1969.

Jaurequi, Gurutz, "National Identity and Political Violence in the Basque Country", European Journal of Political Research, Vol. 14 No. 5-6 1986.

Kohler, Beate, Political Forces in Spain, Greece and Portugal, London: Butterworth, 1982.

Lancaster, Thomas, "Comparative Nationalism, the Basques in Spain and France" European Journal of Political Research, Vol. 15, No. 5, 1987.

Levine, Daniel, "Pardigm Lost: Dependence to Democracy, World Politics, Vol. XL, No. 3, April 1988.

Lewis, Paul H., "Salazar's Ministerial Elite, 1938-1969", Journal of Politics, Vol. 40, No. 3, August 1978.

---- "The Spanish Ministerial Elite, 1938-1969", Comparative Politics, Vol. 5, No. 1, October 1972.

Lijphart, Arend, The Politics of Accomodation, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

----, "Typologies of Democratic Systems", Comparative Political Studies, Vol. 1, No. 1, April 1968.

Linz, Juan, "Europe's Southern Frontier: Evolving Trend Towards What?", Daedalus, Volume 108, No. 1, Winter 1979.

----, "From Falange to Movimiento-Organacion: The Spanish Single Party and the Franco Regime", in S. Huntington and C. Moore, eds. Authoritarian Politics in Modern Society, New York: Basic Books, 1970.

---- "Opposition to and Under an Authoritarian Regime: The Case of Spain", in Robert Dahl, ed., Regimes and Opposition, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.

Linz, Juan, and De Miguel, Amando, "Within-Nation Differences and Comparisons:The Eight Spains", in Richard Merritt and Stein Rokkan, eds., Comparing Nations, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

Linz, Juan, and Stepan, Albert, The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1978.

Lipset, Seymour, Political Man, Garden City N. J.: Anchor Books, 1959.

Livermore, H. V., A New History of Portugal, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Malefakis, Edward, "Spain and Its Francoist Heritage" in John Herz, ed., From Dictatorship to Democracy, Westport: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Maravall, Jose, "Students and Politics in Contemporary Spain", Government and Opposition, Volume 11, No. 2, Spring 1976.

----, The Transition To Democracy in Spain , London: Croom Helm, 1982.

Martins, Herminio, "Opposition in Portugal", Government and Opposition, Vol. 4, No. 2 Spring 1968.

Maxwell, Kenneth, "The Emergence of Portuguese Democracy", in John Herz ed., From Dictatorship to Democracy, Westport: Greenwood Press, 1982.

----, "The Thorns of the Portuguese Revolution", Foreign Affairs, Volume 54, No. 2, January 1976.

Medhurst, Kenneth, "The Political Presence of the Spanish Bureaucracy" Government and Opposition, Vol. 4, No. 2, Spring 1968.

----, "Spain's Evolutionary Pathway from Dictatorship to Democracy", West European Politics, Volume 7, No. 2, April 1984.

Medina, Manuel, "Spain in Europe", Government and Opposition, Volume 11, No. 2, Spring 1976.

Meisler, Stanley, "Spain's New Democracy", Foreign Affairs, Volume 56, No. 1, Oct. 1977.

Moore, Barrington, Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.

Mujal-Leon, Eusebio, "The PCP and the Portuguese Revolution", Problems of Communism, Vol. 26, No. 1, Jan-Feb. 1977.

Nevins, Lawrence, "The Portuguese Revolution", Worldview, Volume 18, No. 7-8, July-August 1975.

O'Donnell, Guillermo, Schmitter, Phillipe, and Whitehead, Lawrence, eds., Transitions From Authoritarian Rule, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1986.

Opello, Walter, Portugal's Political Development, Boulder: Westview Press, 1985

Payne, Stanley, Falange: A History of Spanish Fascism, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961.

Pimlott, Ben, "Parties and Voters in the Portuguese Revolution", Parliamentary Affairs, Volume 30, No. 1, Winter 1977.

Pollack, Benny, "Spain: From Corporate State to Parliamentary Democracy", Parliamentary Affairs, Vol. XXXI, No. I, Winter 1978.

Powell, G. Bingham, Contemporary Democracies, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Porch, Douglas, The Portuguese Armed Forces and the Revolution, London: Croom Helm, 1977.

Poulantzas, Nicos, The Crisis of the Dictatorships, London: NLB, 1975.

Pridham, Geoffery, "Comparative Perspectives on the New Mediterranian Democracies: A Model of Regime Transition", West European Politics, Volume 7, No. 2, April 1984.

Preston, Paul, "The Dilemma of Credibility: The Spanish Communist Party, the Franco Regime and After", Government and Opposition, Volume 11, No. 7, Winter 1976.

----, "The Origins of the Socialist Schism in Spain 1917-31" Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 12, No. 1, January 1977.

----, ed., Spain in Crisis, Sussex: Harvester Press, 1976.

----, "The Spanish Constitutional Referendum of 6 December 1978", West European Politics, Vol. 2, No. 2, May 1979.

Ramirez, Manuel, Espana, 1939-1975, Barcelona: Guadarrama, 1978.

Riker, William, The Theory of Political Coalitions, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.

Robinson, Richard, Contemporary Portugal, London: Allen & Unwin, 1979.

----, "Political Conservatism: The Spanish Case, 1875-1977", Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 14 No. 4 October 1979.

----, "The Religious Question and the Catholic Revival in Portugal 1900-1930", Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 12, No. 2, April 1977.

Romero Maura, J., "After Franco, Franquismo?, The Armed Forces the Crown and Democracy", Government and Opposition, Volume 11, No.1, Winter 1976.

----, "The Spanish Case", Government and Opposition, Vol. 5, No. 4, Autumn 1970.

Rustow, Dankwart, "Transitions to Democracy", Comparative Politics, Volume 2, April 1970.

Share, Donald, The Making of Spanish Democracy, New York: Praeger, 1986.

Soler, Richard, "The New Spain", New Left Review, No. 58, Nov.-Dec. 1969.

Stanislawski, Dan, The Individuality of Portugal, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1959.

Story, Jonathan, "Spanish Political Parties: Before and After the Election", Government and Opposition, Volume 12, No. 4, Autumn 1977.

Sweezy, Paul, "Class Struggles in Portugal", Monthly Review, Volume 27, No. 4, Sept. 1975.

Szulc, Tad, "Lisbon and Washington: Behind the Portuguese Revolution", Foreign Policy No., 21, Winter 1975-76.

Thomas, Hugh, "The Balance of Forces in Spain", Foreign Affairs, Vol. 41, No. 1, Oct. 1962.

Tierno Galvan, Enrique, "Student´s Opposition in Spain", Government and Opposition, Vol. 1, No. 4, Autumn 1966.

Tovias, Alfred, "The International Context of Democratic Transition", West European Politics, Volume 7, No. 2, April 1984.

Vilar, Sergio, Historia del Anti-Franquismo 1939-1975, Barcelona: Plaza & Janes Editores, 1984.

Weiner, Myron, "Empirical Democratic Theory and the Transition from Authoritarianism to Democracy", P.S., Volume XX, No. 4, Fall 1987.

Wheeler, Douglas L., Republican Portugal, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.

----, "Thaw in Portugal" Foreign Affairs, Vol. 48, No. 4, July 1970.

Wiarda, Howard, Corporatism and Development: The Portuguese Experience, Amherst Mass.: University of Massachusetts, 1977.

World Bank, World Bank Atlas, Washington 1974.

World Bank, World Development Report, Washington, August 1978.