KELLOGG INSTITUTE
THE HELEN KELLOGG INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

CIVIL SOCIETY AFTER DICTATORSHIP: A COMPARISON OF PORTUGAL AND SPAIN, 1970S–1990S*

Tiago Fernandes

Working Paper #384 – March 2012

Tiago Fernandes is assistant professor of political science at Universidade Nova de Lisboa (Portugal). In addition to codirecting the project "Civil Society and the Quality of Democracy: Portugal, 1974–2010," funded by the Portuguese National Science Foundation, he is working on a book project: "Religious Origins of Civil Society: Western Europe, 1870s–1930s." His publications include articles and a book on the Portuguese authoritarian regime, *Neither Dictatorship nor Revolution: The Liberal Wing and the End of the Portuguese Dictatorship, 1968–1974* (Lisbon, 2006). Between 2009 and 2011 he was a visiting fellow at the Kellogg Institute for International Studies, University of Notre Dame. He holds a PhD from the European University Institute, Florence (2009).

*I thank Robert Fishman for many critical comments and immense support. Thanks go also to Philippe Schmitter, Donatella della Porta, Pedro Tavares de Almeida, and Víctor Pérez-Díaz. A fellowship from the Kellogg Institute for International Studies, University of Notre Dame, and debates with Andy Gould, Michael Coppedge, Scott Mainwaring, John D. Stephens, Evelyne Huber, Julia López, Manuel Alcántara, René Mayorga, Michael Bernhard, and Grzegorz Ekiert were crucial for the writing of this paper
.

ABSTRACT

This paper explains variations in patterns of civil society among third-wave democracies by comparing the cases of Portugal and Spain. In the former a civil society developed that had a tendency to be more oriented toward national issues and politics, whereas in the latter civil society tended to be more local, social, and disconnected from politics. Portugal, although having both a less developed economy and historically a weaker democratic tradition than Spain's, was a democracy that between the early 1970s and the mid-1990s offered more opportunities for the organized civic expression of popular interests.

I argue that these different patterns of civil society were the consequence of the mode of transition from authoritarian rule. In Portugal the rupture with the nondemocratic regime took a revolutionary form. During the transition the pressures of this popular mobilization acted vigorously upon the newly created political, state, and party institutions. This opened up a path of civil society consolidation in which associations representing popular groups were more recognized and able to draw support and resources from the regime. In Spain, by contrast, the continuity with the previous authoritarian regime was stronger, and consequently the pattern of civil society that had been formed during the last years of the dictatorship tended to persist during the transition to democracy. Although Spanish civil society had become richer and denser since the late 1960s, it was still very much local and largely disconnected from politics.

Finally, I also aim to contribute to theorizing about the relationship between modes of transition from authoritarianism and the quality of subsequent democratic regimes. Much research has been done about the relationship between modes of transition and democratic consolidation, but less attention has been paid to the effects of different modes of transition on democratic quality. I argue that a revolutionary path to democracy has a positive impact on the capacity for self-organization of popular groups, thus augmenting the quality of democracy.

RESUMEN

Este artículo explica la variación en los patrones de organización de la sociedad civil entre las democracias de la Tercera Ola, a través de una comparación de los casos de Portugal y España. En el primero de ellos, una sociedad civil desarrollada tenía una tendencia a estar más orientada hacia la política y los asuntos nacionales, mientras que en el segundo caso la sociedad civil tendía a ser más local, más social y desconectada de la política. Portugal, aunque teniendo tanto una economía menos desarrollada como una más débil tradición histórica democrática que España, fue una democracia que entre comienzos de los 70s y mediados de los 90s ofreció más oportunidades para la expresión cívica organizada de los intereses populares.

Sostengo que estos diferentes patrones de la sociedad civil fueron la consecuencia del modo de transición desde los regímenes autoritarios. En Portugal la ruptura con el régimen no democrático tomó una forma revolucionaria. Durante la transición, las

presiones de esta movilización popular actuaron vigorosamente sobre las recientemente creadas instituciones políticas, estatales y partidarias. Esto abrió un sendero de consolidación de la sociedad civil en el que las asociaciones representantes de los grupos populares eran más reconocidas y estaban en mejores condiciones de obtener apoyo y recursos de parte del régimen. En España, en cambio, la continuidad con el régimen autoritario previo fue más fuerte y consecuentemente el patrón de sociedad civil que se había formado durante los últimos años de la dictadura tendió a perdurar durante la transición a la democracia. Si bien la sociedad civil española había devenido más rica y más densa desde fines de la década de los 60s, todavía era fundamentalmente local y estaba, en su mayor parte, desconectada de la política.

Finalmente, también apunto a contribuir a teorizar acerca de la relación entre los modos de transición desde el autoritarismo y la calidad de los regímenes democráticos subsecuentes. Se ha investigado mucho acerca de la relación entre los modos de transición y la consolidación democrática, pero se ha prestado menos atención a los efectos de los diferentes modos de transición sobre la calidad de la democracia. Sostengo que un camino revolucionario hacia la democracia tiene un impacto positivo sobre la capacidad de auto-organización de los grupos populares, aumentando así la calidad de la democracia.

In this paper I study the development of civil society organizations in the Iberian democracies from the early and mid-1970s, the transition to democracy, to the mid-1990s, when democracy was already well established and consolidated. Because of the legacies of prolonged authoritarian rule during most of the twentieth century, both Portugal and Spain show the weakest civil societies and organizations of representation of lower and middle groups in all the Western European democracies. I argue, however, that there are important variations in patterns of civil society between the two countries. Specifically, the civil society that developed in Portugal had a tendency to be more oriented toward national issues and politics, whereas in Spain civil society tended to be more local, apolitical (or social), and disconnected from politics. Although Portugal had a less developed economy than Spain's and historically a weaker democratic tradition, Portuguese democracy between the early 1970s and the mid-1990s offered more opportunities for the organized civic expression of popular interests.

Recent scholarship has made the point that a civil society structured in organizations that are of national scope and politicized (Huber, Rueschemeyer, and Stephens 1997, 324, 328; Skocpol, 2003), as well as framing issues and interests with a global scope, are better able to express the interests of popular groups and common people in the political system, thus contributing to the depth of a democratic regime (Fishman 2004). This is an important variable that calls for historical explanation and theoretical exploration.

I argue that the different patterns of civil society in Portugal and Spain were the consequence of the mode of transition from authoritarian rule. In Portugal the rupture with the nondemocratic regime was the result of a massive popular mobilization. During the transition the pressures of this popular mobilization acted vigorously upon the newly created political, state, and party institutions. This opened up a path of civil society consolidation in which popular groups were more recognized, more firmly established, and able to draw support and resources from the regime. In Spain, by contrast, the continuity with the previous authoritarian regime was stronger, and consequently the pattern of civil society that had been formed during the last years of the dictatorship tended to persist during the transition to democracy. Although Spanish civil society had become richer and denser since the late 1960s, it was still very much local and largely

disconnected from politics. The transition from authoritarianism in Spain also saw huge waves of protest and popular mobilization, but common people and civil society organizations were never central actors in the transition process, which was mainly directed by elites. This set a pattern of separation of elites and institutions from civil society, which still shapes Spanish democracy today.

I also aim to contribute to recent theorizing about the relationship between modes of transition from authoritarianism and the quality of subsequent democratic regimes (Fishman 2010 and 2011). Much research has been done about the relationship between modes of transition and democratic consolidation, but less attention has been paid to the effects of different modes of transition on democratic quality. It is well known that many paths can lead to democracy, that democracies emerge in contexts of both low and high civil society mobilization in the transition (O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986; Linz and Stepan 1996; Collier 1999; Tarrow 1995). But less is known about "what type of democracy would eventually be consolidated" (Schmitter 1995, 290) after different transition processes. I argue that a more mobilizational and revolutionary path to democracy has a positive impact on the capacity for self-organization of popular groups. But I also show that the effects of the different transition paths that shaped variations in civil society do not last forever. The differences in civil society between Portugal and Spain since the mid-1990s are less pronounced than in the initial phases of the transition and the consolidation period, and overall levels of associational development have been declining since the mid-1990s in both countries. Thus, the impact of the transition only lasts until the late 1990s. At the end of the paper I speculate about the possible causes of these changes.

MODES OF TRANSITION AND CIVIL SOCIETY

A factor stressed in the literature on voluntary associations in the third wave of democratization is the nature of the antecedent regime (Linz and Stepan 1996). As Marc Howard has shown, the levels of associational membership for a series of countries in Western and Southern Europe, Latin America, and Eastern Europe are well explained by the nature of the antecedent political regime. In the 1990s the highest average of associational membership, an average of 2.39 per adult, was in established Western

European democracies with a strong democratic tradition. They were followed by democracies whose previous regime was authoritarian (e.g., Brazil, Spain, Portugal, and Argentina) with a mean of of 1.82. In the last place came the post-totalitarian Eastern European democracies with a mean of 0.91 (Howard 2002, 158).

As Table 1 shows, civil society is weaker in the new democracies of southern Europe, which emerged after long periods of authoritarianism, in contrast to the rest of established western European democracies, where authoritarianism never existed (e.g., the United Kingdom and Norway) or lasted only a few years (e.g., Germany and Italy). It is in Spain and Portugal that we find the lowest levels of membership in voluntary associations among the adult population.

TABLE 1

MEMBERSHIP IN VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS (PERCENTAGE OF THE ADULT POPULATION AFFILIATED)

	1977	1983	1990	1998	1999	2002	Mean	Mean (68–83)	Mean (90–02)
Austria	-	60	52	53	67	75	59.6	55.5	61.7
Belgium	71	45	58	48	68	71	55.7	48.3	61.2
Denmark	75	65	86	84	84	92	79.5	70.3	86.5
Finland	-	-	86	72	80	76	75.2	62	78.5
France	56	44	42	40	38	-	41.5	43	40
Germany	56	61	57	56	51	70	56.4	53.6	58.5
Ireland	54	55	57	51	57	68	53	46	58.2
Italy	47	36	39	34	42	35	37.4	37.3	40
Netherlands	80	77	75	79	92	84	76.8	69.3	82.5
Norway	-	61	77	75	-	84	73.4	65.5	78.6
Portugal	-	-	24	26	24	29	25.7	-	25.7
Spain	36	31	27	28	31	36	31.5	33.5	30.5
Sweden	-	67	85	85	96	90	83	75.6	89
Switzerland	-	-	43	49	-	-	40.3	29	46
U. Kingdom	54	58	62	53	34	70	54.1	53.3	54.7

Sources: For 1968 (based on cross-sectional national samples, 1959–1972, the median year being 1968), Wilensky (2002, 142); for 1977–1998, Eurobarometer; for 1999 and 2002, Ulzurrum (2001, 425).

How and through which mechanisms did the legacies of authoritarianism have an impact on civil society during the democratic consolidation period in the Iberian democracies? Which characteristics of authoritarianism are significant?

First, authoritarianism left a legacy of disconnection between organizations and politics that kept the former weak by affecting their capacity for resource extraction, mobilization, and recognition by authorities. Most associational ventures, in particular those of the lower class/popular sector, were prohibited from forming confederations and were coerced into state-sponsored vertical corporatism, which prevented horizontal communication among these groups and left them with a low capacity for self-organization at the moment of democratic consolidation. As Fishman has argued for the Spanish working class during Francoism, there was a disconnection between "oppositional activity and organization," meaning that opposition to the dictatorship could not take the form of organization building (Fishman 1990, 101). State-sponsored corporatist institutions were not built for mobilization and consciousness raising of the population but rather for control and the promotion of apathy (Schmitter 1999a; Linz 1975, 306–31; for Latin American authoritarian regimes see O'Donnell 1973, 49; Oxhorn 1995a, 257–58; Stepan 1978, 112). A survey taken in Portugal in 1973 showed that only 1 percent of the population thought that organizing a formal group was a worthwhile way in which to influence the government (IPOPE 1973, 94).

Second, the working classes had no alternative but to affiliate with the official unions (*sindicatos*), and in many cases even this was not possible, since the formation of corporatist organizations was a slow process. For instance, in Portugal many districts (*freguesias*) lacked the corporatist institutions for the inclusion of rural workers, the *Casas do Povo* (people's houses). In 1967, 34 years after the foundation of the authoritarian regime, 70 percent of the nation's parishes did not have *Casas do Povo* (Bermeo 1986, 18–20). In 1969 a government report declared that the primary sector (i.e., agriculture) was "almost untouched by collective bargaining" and that 90 percent of the *Casas do Povo* functioned only as charitable institutions (Bermeo 1986, 45). A 1969 survey of Portuguese industrial workers of Oporto and Lisbon found that only 39 percent were members of the official unions and, of those who were members, only 50 percent knew the name of the union they belonged to. Even more union members, 76 percent, had

the opinion that the union "nunca serviu para nada" ("it never had any use"). Finally, only 6 percent of those unionized had grasped the idea that unions could determine the level of their salaries (Martins 1969, 385).

In practice, this meant that popular-sector opposition to the Spanish and Portuguese regimes had to take place through informal networks. For instance, when the regimes implemented a policy of labor cooptation and liberalization of workplace relationships in the 1950s and 1960s, this provided an opportunity not for association building but for the spread of informal networks of resistance and protest. In Spain in 1958 collective bargaining was introduced between the formal representatives of capital and labor within the vertical system in order to overcome the rigid centralized process of wage formation. The Ley de Convenios Colectivos (Law of Colective Negotiation) of April 24, 1958, gave more power to the *jurados de empresa* (factory committees) and the *enlaces sindicales* (shop stewards)[1] and determined that salaries and work conditions would be regulated by direct negotiation between representatives of workers and employers. In Portugal Salazar's successor, Marcelo Caetano, also introduced changes in the corporatist system to make it more representative and to achieve real negotiation and bargaining between workers and employers. On June 14, 1969, the government published decree-law 49058, which ended the need for government permission to become a union leader, and on August 28, 1969, decree-law 49212 instituted mandatory negotiation and mechanisms of conflict resolution called *conciliação arbitral* (refereed negotiation) in companies, namely in industry and services, as well as obligatory representation of workers and free union elections (Ferreira 1994, 160).

Although these reforms led to the infiltration of official unions by opposition forces that could consequently reach workers, the workers' movement never became very strong (Fishman 1990a, 90; Pérez-Díaz 2000, 12; Royo 2002, 141). In Spain official unions were penetrated by communists, left-Catholics, and (although to a much lesser extent) socialists and anarchists. From the mid-1950s onward clandestine trade unions,

---

[1] Elections were allowed for the sections of the different syndicates at plant level for the post of *enlace sindical*, which would represent 25 workers, and the *jurados de empresa*, which were intended to represent workers and management on an equal basis to the state and the syndicate.

[2] In a rally in Lisbon it brought together 10,000 people and gathered 100,000 signatures all over country asking for an end to the law that forbade people to divorce (Sousa 1994, 504–5).

[3] Consciousness of ecological problems among Spanish citizens is high, much higher than the actual

such as the communist-led Workers' Committees (Comisiones Obreras, CC.OO, which in 1964 created a national coordinating structure) and the progressive Catholic Workers' Union (Unión Sindical Obrera, USO) began to take part in the official syndical organizations. The USO was created by members of the apostolic youth workers' organization Juventud Obrero Cristiana (JOC) in Guizpuzcoa in 1959. The Comisiones Obreras emerged more spontaneously as an ad hoc organization of an unofficial strike movement in Asturias (1958), with the CC.OO insisting that negotiations should focus on employment conditions (Meer 1997, 6). The labor movement gained some capacity for collective action after the mid-1950s. Strikes started to be organized by informal coordination committees of workers rather than through the creation of legal, formal, and public voluntary associations (Collier 1999, 127).

Government-led reforms allowed the opposition to penetrate the unions more easily in Portugal as well, especially in the insurance, banking, metal industry, electricity, chemical industry, and commerce sectors. In early September 1970, after a national assembly of union leaders, a national informal coordinating confederation, the Intersindical Nacional, emerged from the liberalization of the corporatist system. The Intersindical Nacional's aim was to develop a common union strategy toward the regime (Oliveira 2000, 434). It grew from the *reuniões intersindicais* (inter-union meetings) among representatives of several unions (banking and commerce employees and metalworkers). It was institutionalized later in September 1970 and spread quickly to 41 unions in the next two months. Most of its founders were linked to the Portuguese Communist Party (Partido Comunista Português, PCP), but it also included many Catholics from the JOC, the Catholic Workers' Junta (Junta Operária Católica, JOCF), the Catholic Workers' League (Liga Operária Católica, LOC), and the Catholic Women Workers' League (Liga Operária Católica Feminina, LOCF) (Bermeo 1986, 57). By 1971 it had a membership of about 190,000 workers (Lucena and Gaspar 1991, 865, n. 30), and by 1973 there were 105 different labor unions with over 350,000 members and an additional 350,000 associates in greater Lisbon and Setúbal. The Intersindical Nacional gave the unions the ability to organize strikes more effectively—they were able to mobilize more than 100,000 workers in 1973 alone (Bermeo 1986, 32)—but opposition-controlled unions were still only one-tenth of the total.

Although they had shared similar forms of state corporatism, demobilized and apathetic publics, and weak oppositional civil society organizations during the previous nondemocratic regimes, Portugal and Spain came to develop different civil societies during the democratic periods. Some European surveys show slightly higher levels of membership in associations in Spain, but others put Portugal ahead of Spain. In 2000 Manuel Villaverde Cabral found in a national survey that 32.1 percent of the adult Portuguese population was affiliated in voluntary associations (Cabral 2000, 135). Morales and Mota found that Portugal had higher levels than Spain in 1999–2002: 43 percent and 42 percent respectively (Morales and Mota 2006, 80).

The quantitative and individual-level data on membership of the adult population by type of association (Tables 2 and 3) also suggest that up to the mid-1990s Portugal and Spain had different associational landscapes. In the 1980s Portugal showed higher levels of membership in unions and professional associations. It also showed higher levels of membership in sports and religious associations (8 percent in Portugal during the period 1984–1999 vs. 5.6 percent in Spain during the period 1989–2002), although the differences were much smaller. On the other hand, Spain seems to have had higher levels than Portugal in New Social Movements–type associations and neighbourhood and local cultural organizations.

Union density has been consistently higher in Portugal. In 1989 Portugal had a union density of 28.6 percent of the workforce and Spain 9.3 percent (Schmitter 1999b, 418). Between 1988 and 1990 about one million people were union affiliates in Portugal, and in 2000 union density was 25.6 percent (Royo 2002, 152–53). In Spain, according to Pérez-Díaz, union density declined sharply from 27.4 percent in 1977 (Pérez-Díaz 2000, 15) to 12 percent in 1990 and 17 percent in 1997. Most accounts refer to a sharp decline in union membership in Spain after the extreme mobilization of the transition years, putting it around 13 percent or lower (Fishman 1990b, 187–88). There was also a scarcity of union plant–level leaders, and surveys of the attitudes of the mass membership reveal apathy after the early 1980s (Fishman 1990b, 201).

What could explain these varying patterns of civil society, the stronger density of traditional socioeconomic, political (unions, professional associations), and religious associations in Portugal and the more localized, apolitical, and new social movement–

type of civil society in Spain? I argue that they are explained by the different modes of transformation of the authoritarian regimes into democracies, in particular how the degree of popular mobilization during the period of the transition affected the institutional and state configurations that ultimately would shape different patterns of civil society (for a similar approach see Ekiert and Kubik 1998, 571). In the next section I analyse this historical phase and its impact on civil society during the subsequent democratic period in both countries.

TABLE 2

TYPES OF ASSOCIATIONAL MEMBERSHIP IN SPAIN (PERCENTAGES), 1980–2002

	1980	1985	1989	1994	1995	1996	1997	2000	2002
Sports	14	10	11						
Neighborhood	10.5	11	11.5						
Cultural	5	9	7	7	7				
Unions	9	6.5	7.5	5	7	6	6	7	5
Religious	3	7		5.5	4.5				
Professional	3.8	5	4		3.8	3.5			
Human rights	1	1.8	5	4					
Youth		2.5	3.8	3					
Environmental	1	1.8	1	1					
Women's	1.8		2						
Consumers	1		1	0.8					
Parties	7	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	

Sources: Morales and Mota (2006, 85); for parties Ulzurrum, (2003, 11).

TABLE 3

TYPES OF ASSOCIATIONAL MEMBERSHIP IN PORTUGAL (PERCENTAGES), 1978–1999

	1978	1984	1990	1993	1999	2000
Sports/recreational	39.7	50.4	12.2	14	8.6	
Worker's commissions	6.5	0.5				
Union	31.0	12.9	4.2	5	1.7	11
Professional	10.2	6.2	3.7	4	1.1	7
Religious	4.4	5.7	9.8	11	5.6	
Cultural	14.5	22.1	6.7	8	3.1	
Student	2.1	5.3				
Workers	3.6					
Humanitarian		7.9				
Parents		1.9				
Social welfare			4.4	5	2.0	
Political groups				5		
Work with youth			2.4	3	1.2	
Health support			2.8	3	2.2	
Third world/human rights			0.6	2	0.8	
Poverty/unemployment reduction				2		
Ecology/environmental			0.9	1	0.5	
Animal rights				1		
Peace			0.5	1	0.6	
Feminist/women's			0.2	0	0	
Local/Communitarian			1.6		1.0	
Parties and political associations				4.1	0.9	4
Other	6.2	5.9	2.1	3	3.2	
N/A	0.9	1.8				

Sources: For 1978, Bacalhau and Bruneau (1978) (questions for 1978 and 1984: with which of the following associations are you affiliated or frequently active in its activities?); for 1984, Bruneau, McLeod, and Bacalhau (1984); for 1993, Santos and Dias (1993, 59) (membership in types of associations by the Portuguese adult population, percentages); for 1990 and 1999, Delicado (2003, 235) (membership and volunteering by type of associations, social services: for elderly and disabled; local communitarian: combat poverty, employment, race equality and housing);, for 2000, Cabral (2000, 136).

PATTERNS OF CIVIL SOCIETY: A COMPARISON OF PORTUGAL AND SPAIN

The period of transition from authoritarianism refers to the phase in which there is no return to the previous authoritarian order but it is not yet clear which type of regime will replace it. Accordingly, this is a phase of extreme institutional innovation and political uncertainty. Moreover, different forms of transition have different effects on the quality and type of possible subsequent democratic regimes. Specifically, democracies will vary in their different associational landscapes according to the types of transition from which they emerged.

Terry Karl and Philippe Schmitter have defined four types of transition from authoritarian rule. They look at transitions according to two dimensions of variation. One dimension refers to the main actors that push for change of the authoritarian regime. These can be the elites or the popular sectors, the masses. The other dimension is the strategies of the main actors of the transition. These range from the use of force to a willingness to compromise and negotiate. Cross-tabulating these dimensions, Karl and Schmitter define four modes of transition: imposition, when elites are predominant and use force to bring about regime change (e.g., the foreign-led transition to democracy of Germany in 1945–47 or the military coup in Portugal in 1974 which gave birth to the democracy); revolution, when the masses are the main actor and rise up in arms to defeat the authoritarian elites (e.g., Romania); pact, when elites are still the main actors behind the transition but negotiate the terms and rules of the new regime (e.g., Spain in 1977 and Venezuela in 1958); and reform, when the popular sectors or masses mobilize from below and impose a regime transformation but without resorting to widespread violence (e.g., Poland in 1989) (Karl and Schmitter 1991).

According to Karl and Schmitter, revolution is the path of regime transformation least conducive to democracy, since revolutions usually result in the widespread use of violence that only end by state centralizations fostered by single-party hegemony. The other paths can lead to democracy, although to different types of democracy. Transitions via pacts and impositions tend to lead to more limited types of democracy. In the former the outcome is usually an institutional design in which competitiveness and accountability are restricted, and as a consequence the popular classes are demobilized

and even excluded, as was the case in Spain. In the latter a large part of the previous regime's elite will not accept the new regime (Karl and Schmitter 1991; see also O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986, 37–39). Schmitter and Karl seem to imply that reform is the best option for the development of a wider and denser associational landscape, since from the beginning popular-sector voluntary associations have a major role in bringing about regime transformation and as a consequence, all other things being equal, the new regime's institutional design will be more open to the demands of the popular sectors (see also Oxhorn 1995b, 24–26).

Still, Schmitter and Karl fail to consider that revolutions may not imply the widespread use of violence and that they can also be paths of regime transition that imply deep socioeconomic changes and radical transformations of social structures and hierarchies. This was the case in the Portuguese transition. Moreover, the path by reform (Poland), although leading to the end of the non-democratic order, did not imply deep societal changes. (On the Polish transition see Ekiert and Kubik 1998; on the Eastern European transitions see also Goodwin 2001, 217–88.) The former is a case of social revolution in which highly hierarchic social structures, especially in the countryside, were changed by popular mobilization. (On the notion of social revolution see Skocpol 1979; on the deep changes in the Portuguese rural social structure see Bermeo 1986 and Barreto 1987.) Not all revolutionary paths out of authoritarianism involve violence.

Robert Fishman's interpretation of the Portuguese revolution (1974–75) has shown that this particular path from authoritarianism to democracy made Portugal a country where political equality is taken more seriously and where elites are more open to excluded and popular interests. Fishman has focused on issues like media coverage, the reaction of authorities to poor people's demands (e.g., squatters), employment, housing and labour market policies, and cultural consumption (Fishman 2010; Fishman 2011, 1–2, 7–12). Also Goodwin and Foran have suggested that democracies born out of revolution, for example, in the case of Nicaragua, could have more progressive welfare states, land distribution, and educational policies (Foran and Goodwin 1993).

This type of argument could be extended to the study of the civil society landscapes of Portugal and Spain. I argue that revolutionary paths from dictatorship produce in its aftermath more mobilizing regimes, the creation of institutions with tighter

links between elites and masses, and stronger mass popular organizations (Skocpol 1979). As Skocpol argues, after a revolution an "enhancement of popular involvement in national political life" always occurs (Skocpol 1997, 280).

Portugal's transition, between April 1974 and the end of 1975, was an extreme case of high participation and popular mobilization through a variety of forms. It was started by the termination of the regime by a coup of left-wing, dissatisfied military officers, the Armed Forces Movement (Movimento das Forças Armadas MFA). The coup unleashed a wave of popular mobilization and associational building unprecedented in Portuguese history. The "revolutionary" period, between April 1974 and April 1976 when the new democratic constitution was approved, saw an explosion of associative movements concerned with every aspect of social life, such as the improvement of housing conditions through resident associations *(associações de moradores),* the preservation of employment, improvement of working conditions, parents' associations, and services to help children (Graham and Wheeler, 1983; Franco 2005, 13). The women's movement, Movimento Pró-Divórcio, was created in 1974.[2] And in May 1974 the Portuguese environmental organization, the Movimento Ecológico Português, was created (Eloy 1994, 334, 343–44).

Spain's transition from authoritarianism was very different. It was mainly a negotiation between the moderates within the Francoist elite (represented by Adolfo Suárez) and the elites of the opposition, the socialists, the communists and the nationalists. With the support of the new head of state, King Juan Carlos who had replaced Franco, a series of negotiations in 1977 terminated the dictatorship. But this highly secretive and elitist mode of transition left the elites of the new Spanish democracy with much weaker links to the masses.

After the coup in Portugal, by contrast, there was an institutional opening whereby popular associations were created and many of them also developed strong links with elites, institutions and the state apparatus. Both the MFA and the civilian elites of new political parties tried to sponsor and mobilize much of this popular sector (O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986, 54). The Portuguese transition involved high competition among and

[2] In a rally in Lisbon it brought together 10,000 people and gathered 100,000 signatures all over country asking for an end to the law that forbade people to divorce (Sousa 1994, 504–5).

mobilization by political parties. Unions established close links to parties, much more than in Spain. The General Confederation of Portuguese Workers (Confederação Geral de Trabalhadores Portugueses, CGTP) allied with the Communist Party (Partido Comunista Português, PCP), and the Socialist Party (Partido Socialista, PS) and the Social Democratic Party (Partido Social Democrata, PSD) counter-reacted by mobilizing other sectors of the union movement that were later used to build a rival confederation, the General Union of Workers (União Geral de Trabalhadores, UGT), in 1978 (Morlino 1995, 357–58).

During the transition stronger links between parties and civil society were established in Portugal than in Spain. Mobilizing parties have an interest in reaching out to voluntary associations. Portugal shows higher levels of party membership and identification (Gunther and Montero 2001, 92; Morlino 1995, 337), and the links between interest groups and parties have been higher in Portugal than in Spain. In Portugal party leaderships usually negotiate with interest groups about laws and legislative measures and proposals (Cruz 1988, 109–19). Data on the political elite in Portugal show that in the overall democratic period 3.7 percent of government ministers were union leaders and 7.4 percent were leaders of professional associations (Almeida and Pinto 2003, 32). Although we do not have similar data for Spain, this country shows a stronger elite continuation from the previous authoritarian regime. About eight Spanish ministers during democracy had been ministers during Francoism, whereas in Portugal all the ministerial elite were completely new (Linz, Jerez, and Corso 2003, 57; Almeida and Pinto 2003).

TABLE 4

PARTY MEMBERSHIP RATES, 1970–1993 (PERCENTAGE OF ADULT POPULATION)

	1975	1983	1990	1993
Portugal	3.5	6.0	4.5	
Spain	1.7	1.9	2.0	1.7

Source: Gunther and Montero (2001, 94).

The PCP just after the transition had a strategy of wait-and-see; between April and the summer of 1974 it even condemned some wildcat strikes not organized by the CGTP. But as the national state decomposed and the military radicals and the extreme left mobilized, the PCP radicalized in preparation for a revolutionary takeover of power. The main controversy in this period was over the control of the labor movement and union federations in Portugal. The *Intersindical* had an unofficial link with the PCP, which proposed a unitary labor movement, and the center-left (PS) and center-right (PSD) wanted instead multiple union federations as a way of fighting the PCP's monopoly over the labor movement. The provisional government ruled in favor of a single union federation on January 22, 1975, which was seen as proof of the ascendancy of the Communist Party (Bermeo 1986, 60). The labor movement (the CGTP mainly) reached its highest membership in 1975, about one and a half million unionized workers (two million, according to the CGTP), out of an economically active population of three million. The CGTP had been successful after 1974 in penetrating the corporatist unions, and the fact that it was the single confederation and organized by a party with a mobilization strategy made it grow.

Rural civil society also became linked to the elites and the new political parties in the course of the cycle of mobilization during the transition. In the north the farmers' organizations formed the Farmer's Movement (Movimento de Lavradores, MOLA). It was composed mainly of small farmers and was more heterogeneous ideologically than the CGTP, having in its first commission socialists, Catholics, liberals, and conservatives. The MOLA wanted to mobilize small tenant farmers, a group that did not exist in the more socially polarized south where the opposition was mainly between big landowners

and landless laborers (Lucena and Gaspar 1992, 139–41). In the summer of 1974 agricultural workers' unions were founded. Their potential constituency was the 510,000 individuals who classified themselves as wage- and salary-earning agricultural workers, comprising one-sixth of the active population of the whole country, but these associations became strong mainly in some parts of the southern latifundia region. Union penetration was strongest in the districts of Beja and Évora. In 1975, 62 percent of Beja's workforce was unionized and 53 percent of Évora's. In Portalegre it was less than 20 percent of all workers, in Santarém and Setúbal only 15 percent, in Faro and Lisboa even less, and in Castelo Branco the union came into existence only in 1976 (Bermeo 1986, 44–46).

In the first months of 1975 a group of workers in the south started to occupy lands and establish collective farms. A year later 23 percent of Portuguese farmland had changed hands and was now managed collectively, mainly in the south (Bermeo 1986, 6). These new cooperatives were called Collective Production Units (Unidades Colectivas de Produção, UCPs). They paid fixed salaries and they were run on an egalitarian and democratic basis by elected boards of directors and a fiscal council, with a general assembly of all workers as the supreme decision-making body (Bermeo 1986, 111). When the revolutionary process came to a halt in the summer of 1975, with the defeat of the coalition of PCP and left revolutionaries by the coalition of the moderate parties and the less ideological military, the occupation of land ended also. But the process had sparked a transformation in the farmer's organizations in the south. Landowners created a confederation called the Confederation of the Portuguese Agriculture (Confederação da Agricultura Portuguesa, CAP). It had a major mass organization, it was capable of public disruption, and it opposed any attempts at agrarian reform, declaring a war "against the Marxists" and against the "Lisbon commune" (Bermeo 1986, 186–88; Lucena and Gaspar 1992, 140). It became strongly linked with right-wing groups and supported on occasions the center-right of the PSD and Democratic and Social Center party (Centro Democrático e Social, CDS), asking for the restitution of the lost, expropriated land. Reacting against this, some farmers in connection with the PCP and the PS formed the National Confederation of Agriculture (Confederação Nacional da Agricultura, CAN) in 1978. It was an umbrella organization for 253 associations and cooperatives of small- and middle-property farmers who supported the revolution (Morlino 1998, 228). It claimed to

represent small and medium farmers from the regions outside the agrarian reform area of the south in rivalry with CAP. Existing accounts credit it with no more than weak support: in the late 1980s it had only 6,000 members (Lucena and Coelho 1989, 529–30). In the north the Farmers' and Tenants' Movement (Movimento de Agricultures e Rendeiros, MARN) was encouraged by the PCP and took the place of the MOLA. In the south, there were the Ligas (leagues), which came under PCP control in 1975 although they shared some socialist influence, and the creation of Sindicatos de Trabalhadores Agrícolas (agricultural workers' unions) (Barreto 1987, 304–5).

In Spain, after the euphoria of the transition, older patterns of civil society were reestablished. As Gunther argues, "the weakness of contemporary Spanish parties as interest representation organizations would appear to parallel the irrelevance of the *Movimiento Nacional* in the former regime's policy processes" (Gunther 1996, 54–56; see also Gunther, Montero, and Botella 2004, 14). Spanish political parties were formed without strong links to associations of popular sectors, and thus tensions and different aims easily arose between the party and union leaderships (Valenzuela 1988, 24). Elites did not present citizens with clear ideological choices and refrained from a full mobilization strategy. Many sectors of the new elite, both on the right and the left, were state technocrats (Gunther 1996, 15), and elites and political parties on the right and the left formed weak links with voluntary associations (Fishman, 1989 and 1990b).

After a brief rule by Franco's last prime minister, Carlos Arías Navarro, Juan Carlos nominated Adolfo Suárez as head of the government in July 1976. Together with Suárez, the king dismantled Franco's single party, issued amnesties to political prisoners, and presided over the first free elections. Juan Carlos's greater control over the assembly enabled him to persuade them to approve the law for political reform in October 1976, in which the assembly dissolved itself, thus clearing the way for democracy. (This paragraph draws from Fernandes 2007, 698–99.)

The party behind this transition was the Union of the Democratic Center (Unión del Centro Democrático, UCD), created in 1977 under the leadership of Suárez, which included the reformist wings within Francoism and was adept at the transition to democracy, as well as other groups such as the *Tácito* group (advocates of a regime change since the early 1970s), liberals, Christian democrats, and social democrats

(Pappas 2001, 249–50). The UCD won the general elections in 1977 and 1979, but it was unable to develop a modern party with a unitary organization throughout the territory, and it disintegrated after factional struggles. The UCD was just a collection of personalities, and it was unable to develop links to societal organizations and interests, such as the church, Catholic peasants, and business interests. In 1982 the party split, with many joining the socialists and the more conservative going to Alianza Popular and the CDS (Pappas 2001, 250–51). In sum, in the Spanish transition it was not even possible to craft the classical mass mobilization strategy of Western European right-wing Christian democracy. During the authoritarian regime and the transition the links between the elites and the Catholic masses were weak, which is an interesting outcome, since organized Catholicism was permitted and even promoted during the dictatorship. The Catholic Church was part of the social pluralism that Linz argued was a main trait of authoritarian regimes (Linz 1975, 266).

The Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (Partido Socialista Obrero Español, PSOE) was not able to create links with the workers' movement either. This is even more paradoxical, because historically the Spanish socialists had closer links to the workers' movement, in the General Union of Workers (Unión General de Trabajadores, UGT), than the Portuguese socialists ever had. Even in the first years of the transition, the party statutes required that PSOE members join the UGT. Still the party as an organization became weak. It had no more than 200,000 members, and party functionaries and elected officials predominated over union leaders in the party's internal power struggles. Members of the UGT's national executive attended party congresses as guests and had no voting rights. Likewise, the communists had weaker links to unions than their Portuguese counterparts, and the CC.OO maintained its autonomy from the Communist Party of Spain (Partido Comunista de España, PCE) (Fishman 1989, 19).

Similarly weak linkages are evident in agricultural organizations. After 1982, with the transition to democracy, the agrarian sector stabilized around four national agricultural associations: the National Confederation of Farmers and Breeders (Confederación de Agricultores y Ganaderos, CNAG), the Coordination of Farmers and Breeders Organizations (Coordinadora de Organizaciones de Agricultores y Ganaderos del Estado Español, COAG), the National Central of Young Farmers (Confederación

Nacional de Jovenes Agricultores, CNJA), and the Union of Agrarian Federations of Spain (Unión de Federaciones Agrárias de España, UFADE). They had almost no connection to parties or other organizations, and their relations with the government were mainly consultative and through occasional informative meetings (Morlino 1998, 221). During the transition the COAG was mainly established in Catalonia, País Valenciano, Navarra, Rioja, Alava, Cuenca del Duero, and Valle del Ebro, although in Catalonia, Rioja, Navarra, and León it had many conflicts with regional organizations. In the south it was weak and dispersed. The COAG originated from the peasant protest movements of the 1970s, the Unions of Farmers and Breeders (Uniones de Agricultores y Ganaderos, UAGAs). After 1977 it achieved some institutionalization as a valid interlocutor with the Ministry of Agriculture. Still, it tended to have internal divisions, and it depended heavily on its members for funding (Estrada 1984, 208). The Federation of Rural Workers (Federación de Trabajadores de la Tierra, FTT-UGT) and the Unions of Rural Workers (Sindicatos de Obreros Agrícolas, SOAs), the rural workers' federations of the 1930s, were revitalized by the PSOE in 1977. This led to some competition with the UAGAs, and the FTT had some success in the elections of 1978 for the *camaras agrarias* (agrarian chambers), especially in the regions of Andalusia, Extremadura, País Valenciano, and Castilla la Mancha, where there was a strong UGT tradition. But in spite of continuous support from the PSOE's organizational network and the obligatory membership for all socialist militant workers in the FTT (which itself is part UGT), the FTT did not consolidate and expand as an organization. After 1982 the PSOE allowed its militants to affiliate with the UAGAs (Estrada 1984, 216).

In Portugal, although the technocrats became ascendant in the Socialist Party in the mid-1980s and designed liberal economic development plans that clashed with many unions' claims for more state intervention in sponsoring welfare, they never became dominant (Bermeo 1990, 153–55). In Spain it was the contrary. As Linz has argued, a legacy of the dictatorship was the consolidation of a technocratic mode of thinking in the opposition too (Linz 1975, 269–73). This has led Spanish socialists to pursue aggressive economic liberalization policies, which antagonized labor and failed to create a more comprehensive welfare state (Bermeo and García-Duran 1994, 121–23). This distanced socialists from the workers' movement. In Portugal, by contrast, although many unions

were connected to the communists and this produced extreme conflicts with the socialist party, there was also substantial union support for the socialists (Schmitter 1999b, 436).

In the democratic period the differences between Spain and Portugal were sustained by different patterns of state–civil society relationships. (For the importance of the distinction between state and regime in the Iberian transitions see Fishman 1990, 433.) In Portugal state transformations during the transition allowed for a higher control of the state apparatus by unions, especially the CGTP. CGTP unions had a strong presence among state employees and in banking, the sectors that were nationalized during the transition. There was also very high union density in the primary sector, agriculture, and in the public services (although in private industries and services, such as construction, commerce, textiles, food industries, and ceramics, it was below average). Union membership levels were very high in vital sectors such as railways, banking, insurance, transport, and public-sector companies (Morlino 1995, 357–58). In these sectors, where unions had a monopoly of health care provision, union membership was close to 100 percent. For instance, around 90 percent of the labor force in banking had been unionized since the revolution (Royo 2002, 152–53). Finally, union density was about 47.7 percent in companies with more than 160 workers, with lower union density in smaller companies, about 27.4 percent (Cruz 1995, 303–5).

In Spain membership in unions was comparatively low, although it rose in the period from the mid-1980s until 1992, when major conflicts with the socialist governments led to cooperation between the two major unions for protest and membership mobilization. But most unions were unable to give their members such services as housing, pension, and strike funds (Hamann 1998, 430–35). Also labor laws in Spain made it easier to dismiss workers, whereas in Portugal employment could only be terminated by mutual consent, when a contract ended, or when there was a just reason (an existing legal precedent). Moreover, in Portugal collective dismissals required the approval of the Ministry of Labor and consultations with the workers' union (Garcia and Karakatsanis 2006, 93–94). Finally, in Spain there was a much wider variety of welfare funds (private, public, agricultural, self-employed), whereas Portugal was less fragmented with some sectors, such as public employees, white-collar workers, and

private wage earners in public and private companies, receiving generous protection packages (Garcia and Karakatsanis 2006, 97–98).

In Spain in the democratic period there was also a consolidation of the powerful executive and closed-state administration of the dictatorship. There was a tendency toward weak parliamentary bodies and institutions of societal corporatist policy-making. Direct imposition from above (statism) was the preferred form of policy-making, only tempered by occasional and arbitrary partnerships with carefully chosen associations (Bermeo 2000, 249–52). In sum, there was a continuation of the technocratic policy-making and decision-making style of the dictatorship (Ferreira 1994, 164; Linz 1975, 266–68; O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986, 46–47; Tarrow 1995, 219–21). This was common both to the UCD and PSOE governments. As Richard Gunther has observed, the Council of Ministers did not establish policy priorities to be resolved by consensus among the ministers as a collegial body; rather, it was the prime minister's intervention that resolved issues and made the decisions (Gunther 1996, 68–69).

Corporatist institutions also played a minor role in economic and welfare policies, and the institutional integration of unions in corporatist structures was very low. Unions were usually not consulted and had no impact on policy decisions (Gunther 1996, 68–69; Pérez-Díaz 1999, 35). The main body for corporatist negotiation, the Economic and Social Council (Consejo Económico y Social, CES), was created in 1992 to promote cooperation among unions, business, and the government. But as scholars have observed, the CES cannot "take binding decisions and its discussions are fundamentally different from the negotiation of the global pacts up to 1986" (Wozniak 1991, 9). Moreover, although Spain has become known for its *transición pactada* (pacted transition) on account of the series of agreements between October 1977 (the Pactos de la Moncloa) and the spring of 1981 (the National Employment Agreement, Acuerdo Nacional de Empleo, ANE) (Fishman 1990b, 215–17), these pacts were mainly the work of political parties and the UCD governments and were not institutionalized. For the most part, they were pacts between the UCD and the opposition parties to achieve democratic stabilization, not designed for deliberation and decision on economic policy issues. Although an incomes policy agreement was achieved, unions and employers' organizations did not participate directly in the negotiations. The national leaders of the

unions voted on these policies in the parliament as deputies and not directly with the government (Nicolás Redondo, head of the UGT, and Marcelino Camacho, head of CC.OO) (Hamann and Lucio 2003, 63).

This affected civil society. For instance, in Spain agrarian interest organizations depended heavily on personal relationships with members of parliament and individual politicians (Estrada 1984, 286 ff. and 322, 324). Agricultural policy-making was also characterized by a high degree of direct state intervention (Estrada 1984, 124). The Francoist Institute of Agro-Social Studies (Instituto de Estudios Agrosociales) became the Institute of Agrarian Relations (Instituto de Relaciones Agrarias, IRA), which continued to have powerful functions and financial control over the formation of agrarian associations and to use its power for political purposes (Estrada 1984, 142). Employers too acted less through business associations and more "by maintaining a 'family relationship' with the public sector" or by direct links with ministers (Gunther 1996, 68–69; Pérez-Díaz 1999, 35). Although 85 percent of third-sector associations (social welfare, religious, NGOs) reported having public funding, only 1 percent received it through partnership contracts and most received it by direct funding or by subventions. Moreover, only 31 percent of these associations reported a constant collaboration with the state, and two-thirds thought that the state and public authorities provided very weak support (Pérez-Díaz and Novo 2003, 179).

In Portugal during the authoritarian *Estado Novo*, as in Spain, every economic sector was under the tutelage of an institution of sectorial economic coordination, nominated by the government, which had almost absolute powers over the sector, from fixing prices and the quality of products to imports of raw materials, work contracts, and the supervision of exports (Rosas 1994, 249–58). But this changed with the revolution, much more than in Spain. Although the main union confederation, the communist-dominated CGTP, opposed integration in the corporatist tripartite body, the Conselho Permanente da Concertação Social (Permanent Council of Social Concertation), in 1984, agreements were possible with the unions affiliated with the socialist-dominated UGT. The CGTP joined the council in 1987, and though it never signed any agreement with the employers and the state, it did not always oppose them (Lucena and Gaspar 1991, 876–

78). Finally, collective bargaining coverage in Portugal up to the mid-1990s was wider than in Spain (79 percent vs. 68 percent) (Schmitter 1995, 303).

In Spain legislation inherited from Francoism reinforced the tendency toward a weak civil society. In fact, the 1964 Law of Associations was terminated only in 2002! (Pérez-Díaz and Novo 2003, 109). It is true that the 1964 law had been more tolerant of new social associations than previous legislation and had broken the monopoly enjoyed by the single party and the Church. It stimulated, for instance, the growth of some third-sector associations (Pérez-Díaz and Novo 2003, 96), and the decree of May 20, 1965, declared that associations could apply for public status. If an association was considered to be dedicated to "welfare, educational, sportive or any other ends that tend to promote the common good," it could be exempted from the general legislation on associations, receive public subventions and technical help from the state, and be consulted in affairs related with their activity (Radcliff 2005b, 8). At the same time the National Movement (Movimiento), the ruling party, was pushing its own internal project for the Associations of Heads of Families (Associaciones de Cabezas de Familias, ACF), the first of which appeared in late 1963. In fact, any new association could register either through the Ley de Asociaciones of 1964 or through the Movimiento (Radcliff 2005, 6, and 11, n. 35; Tusell 1996, 193).

Thus the regime was enabled to channel the development of voluntary associations, albeit of a social, not political, nature. In 1968 only 5,650 associations were listed, and the number of organizations per 100,000 inhabitants was 18.4. The evolution of the number of associations between 1968 and 1975 was slow and stable, although many may not have been registered because they operated at the neighborhood level (Prieto-Lacaci 1994, 200–10). In the late 1960s a new Delegación Nacional de Asociaciones (National Delegation of Associations) was formed within the orbit of the Movimiento to mobilize wider sectors of the Spanish population, and for this a specific type of association was created: local associations of *cabezas de familia* (family heads) and *amas de casa* (housewives). In 1976 there were more than 4,000 of these local family associations sponsored by the Movimiento (Radcliff 2005b, 11–12, 14–15). In the early 1970s, although repression in fact grew, associational ventures started to spread. Between 1973 and 1976 there were debates about legalizing some forms of "political

associations," but these were very ill defined as a legal category, something between an interest group and a party. For political associability the legalization was very restrictive and the approval of the Movimiento was required (Gunther 1980, 309, n. 105).

Associations could not question the public order; they were to keep the regime informed of their activities and budget and ask permission for their meetings. The 1978 constitution eliminated the clauses prohibiting freedom of association and the requisite of administrative permission in the 1964 law, but it maintained the requirement of a *declaración de utilidade pública* (declaration of public utility), which was granted through very discretionary mechanisms. Its attribution depended on the council of ministers, and it was reserved only for associations intended to promote welfare, education, culture, and sports. As a consequence, very few associations have achieved this status in democratic Spain (Pérez-Díaz and Novo 2003, 110–12). In 1987 there were 20 such associations; in 1988, 23; and between 1993 and 1997, 157 (Mota 1999, 58). This exemplifies the more local and apolitical civil society in the later years Francoism, which continued into democracy. As Schmitter has noted, after the transition in 1977 the associations that existed in the last years of Francoism were immediately legalized, but these were mostly of a local character. Moreover, authoritarian corporatist organizations, which were mainly local (in 1972 only 30 out of 14,424 corporatist associations were national), were transformed into local voluntary associations and unions during democracy. In Portugal the reverse happened. State corporatist unions during the transition evolved from 36 local- and provincial-level organizations to 109 at the national level (Schmitter 1995, 291–92).

Regime institutions emerging from the transitions were also different, being more open and supportive of civil society in Portugal, where there was a higher degree of parliamentarism. In Spain the stability of governments was somewhat illusory, because it rested on the existence of a constitutional provision that required a constructive vote of no-confidence in the parliament, a censure act that could replace the prime minister with a new one, to dismiss a government. This necessitated a large majority of the votes in the chamber, usually involving more than one party, which was not always possible. Governments were usually single party and needed only a few additional votes to pass legislation (Pasquino 1995, 268–69). In Portugal many reforms have reinforced

parliament's role since 1985 (Leston-Bandeira 2002). As Robert Fishman has documented, Portuguese parliamentary elites in Portugal were more open to listening to and negotiating with popular-sector civil society organizations (e.g., housing movements), whereas similar movements in Spain were more likely to be dealt as police and public order matters (Fishman 2011, 10).

Finally, because parties and unions were less important, socioeconomic cleavages were also less relevant for determining the type of Spanish civil society, which made room for an easier formation of New Social Movement organizations. In Portugal, on the other hand, stronger organizations and competition between traditional socialist and communist parties occupied the political space, and the socialists and communists were more successful in mobilizing possible constituencies and groups that would support New Social Movement NSM organizations; for instance, party youth movements were very important in Portugal, and there was a tendency for this type of organization to spread to other youth political movements. The existing organizations were Portuguese Communist Youth (Juventude Comunista Portuguesa, JCP); Socialist Youth (Juventude Socialista, JS,); Social-Democratic Youth (Juventude Social-Democrata, JSD,), related to the PSD and a center-right party; and Centrist Youth/Popular Youth (Juventude Centrista/Juventudes Populares), related to the CDS, a right-wing party of Christian-democratic inspiration that in 1992 changed its name to the Popular Party (Partido Popular, PP).

All these organizations, with the exception of the JCP, were created after 1974 by the leaderships of the respective political parties and closely depended on them in terms of financing, organization, and ideology. Their organizational structure tended to reproduce the party structure. The youth organizations had representatives in the leadership organs of the party, and their function was mainly to supply workpeople for electoral campaigns, propaganda, militancy substitution for regions where the party was weakly implanted, and so on. At the same time each operated as one of the many pressure groups or factions within the party (Cruz 1995, 370–73). In the early 1990s the JS and JSD each had 30,000 members between 16 and 30 years of age. The JSD existed in the majority of Portuguese districts with the exception of some areas of the south. The JCP was active mainly in Lisbon, Porto, and Setúbal, and 50 percent of its members were in

secondary school. The JC had 6,000 members in 1980 and in 1990 15,000, 70 percent of them students. The JS had 8,000 members in February 1975, 15,000 in 1976, and 16,600 in 1978, but in 1981 it had declined to 2,000, rising again to 5,000 in 1984; 40 percent of its youth was in secondary school (Cruz, 378–84). After the mid-1980s, with the exception of the JC, the membership of these organizations declined. The leaders of these organizations had themselves a high level of membership in voluntary associations (85 percent), especially in the left-wing youth organizations' elites (JCP, 93.5 percent, JS 86.5 percent, JC 84.8 percent, and JSD 81 percent). The types of associations preferred by these elites were sports associations (22 percent), students' associations (13 percent), cultural (10 percent) groups, and political nonparty organizations (8 percent) (Cruz 1995, 394).

In Spain the nonsocialist left and the communists and ex-communists were less powerful and more inclined to post-materialist values (participation, leisure, the environment), whereas in Portugal materialist values (employment, wages, welfare) are more widespread in the population than post-materialist values (Cruz 1995, 303–5). The PCE was more fragmented than the PCP, which was still organized around the principles of democratic centralism and extreme loyalty to leaders and did not permit organized factions. Since the transition the PCE had been supportive of the milder version of Marxism and Eurocommunism, whereas the PCP had maintained its Stalinist ideology and practices. After some years the PCE gave way to an electoral coalition called Izquierda Unida (United Left), forging new links with social movements such as feminists, pacifists, and ecologists, under the so-called policy of social and political convergence (Bosco 2001, 346–49).

As a consequence, NSM organizations grew more in Spain. The feminist movement had been growing strongly, and in fact it was even able to achieve sufficient national status with the Coordinadora de Organizaciones Feministas del Estado Español (Coordination of Feminist Organizations of the Spanish State) to intervene in reproductive rights by presenting project-laws to the government. (Divorce and abortion projects were presented in 1980 in order to change the penal code on the issue of abortion.) (See Prata 1997, 431–37.) By the end of the twentieth century environmental groups had also grown, having about 170,000 members in Spanish chapters, including

Greenpeace, the Environmental Association for the Defense of Nature (Asociación Ecologista de Defensa de la Naturaleza, AEDENAT), and the Federation of Friends of the Earth (Federación de Amigos de la Tierra).[3] About 348,000 people were affiliated in associations for peace, international solidarity, human rights (Movimiento por la Paz, Desarmer y la Libertad, Paz Ahora, and Coordenadora Gesto por la Paz de Euskal Herria—or Movement for Peace, Disarm and Freedom, Peace Now, and Coordinator Gestures for Peace) and in nongovernmental organizations (Architects without Borders, Doctors without Borders, etc.) (Mota 1999, 53). Some researchers claim that, although the number of these associations has been growing, many of them have low citizen participation. In fact, the surveys that have been analyzed do not seem to confirm this interpretation; the membership in voluntary associations has in fact grown.

CONCLUSIONS

The modes of transition from authoritarianism seem to predict the development of a more popular-oriented and egalitarian civil society during democracy in Portugal than in Spain. It can be argued that civil societies in democracies that are born out of a path of mobilization and revolution will empower popular sectors. Arguments like Jack Goldstone's that women and minority religious and ethnic groups will fare worse and that political equality itself will never be achieved in democracies resulting from revolution (Goldstone 2001, 169), are not corroborated by my research. There is now a number of new democracies born out of revolution or strong popular mobilization: the Philippines, South Africa, Portugal, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Nicaragua, to mention only a few (Foran and Goodwin 1993). A whole new line of research thus awaits systematic comparison and theorizing.

But a question remains: how long does the impact of a transition mode last? This is not a rhetorical question; since the mid-1990s there have been significant changes in

[3] Consciousness of ecological problems among Spanish citizens is high, much higher than the actual participation in ecological associations and ecological activities. The Catalan environmental associations, however, are able to mobilize the citizenry to a large extent. These include associations for fire protection; the interesting Foundation of Territory and Landscape (Fundacio Territori I Paisatje), which buys land in order to protect it; and groups that specialize in recycling toxic and industrial waste (Casademunt 1999, 265).

the associational landscapes of Portugal and Spain. Levels of affiliation of the adult population in voluntary associations have stabilized at around the 25–30 percent, and surveys of affiliation in particular types of associations show declines in all types, with the differences between Portugal and Spain previously noted in this paper being now much less pronounced. This is a puzzling phenomenon, because in most western European democracies between the 1940s and the 1970s, their first decades of consolidation of democracy, the level of membership in associations rose consistently (Table 1).

Looking at the data on union density (Table 5), one notices varying evolutionary patterns in Western Europe, with a decline both in Portugal and Spain. Between 1970 and 1997 there was a decline of union density in countries such as Austria (from 57 percent to 39 percent), France (20 percent to 10 percent), Germany (32 percent to 27 percent), the Netherlands (37 percent to 23 percent), the United Kingdom (50 percent to 43 percent), Spain (26 percent to 17 percent), and Portugal (from 52 percent to 26 percent). Moreover, this decline has been quite steep in some countries: Austria, France, the Netherlands, and Portugal have all had more than a 10 point fall. In other countries the decline has been less dramatic (the United Kingdom and Germany). At the same time, there has been a rise in union density in other countries, including Belgium (42 percent to 50 percent), Denmark (62 percent to 76 percent), Norway (50 percent to 55 percent), and Sweden (67 percent to 86 percent). Italy has maintained an average of 41 percent during this period

In sum, in both Portugal and Spain since the 1990s there seem to be a withering away of civil society. What accounts for this? One possible suspect is changes in the state and in the political system that have produced a downsizing of institutional involvement with civil society. European union directives and policy recommendations that reduce the size of the welfare state and empower state technocrats and a bureaucratic mode of thinking in political elites, as well as favoring business and capitalist organizations over popular groups, could be a driving force of this trend. For instance, Schmitter has argued that the common agricultural policy of the European Union had the impact in southern Europe of empowering only a few selected organizations for policy negotiation purposes. (For each issue to be negotiated only one association is selected.) (See Schmitter 1995, 308).

TABLE 5

NET UNION DENSITY
(PERCENTAGE OF THE ACTIVE LABOR FORCE)

	1970	1975	1980	1990	1997
Austria	57	-	52	47	39
Belgium	42	-	53	50	-
Denmark	62	-	79	75	76
Finland	-	-	-	72	78
France	20	-	22	14	10
Germany	32	-	35	32	27
Netherlands	37	-	35	24	23
Norway	50	-	55	56	55
Ireland	60	-	64	59	-
Italy	37	-	50	39	37
Spain	-	-	26	15	17
Portugal	-	52	-	32	26
Sweden	67	-	78	82	86
Switzerland	30	-	31	27	23
United Kingdom	50	-	56	43	-

Sources: Ebbinghaus and Visser (1999, 147); Ebbinghaus and Visser (2000, 63); for Spain and Portugal up to 1997, Gunther and Montero (2001, 109). Note: In Spain the data refer to the years 1978 and 1994; in Portugal to 1995.

Still, the impact of European-level policies must interact with national-level variables. As we saw for the case of union density, only in some European countries did it decline. I would venture the hypothesis that where the center and the left are historically more united, the negative effects of the process of Europeanization can be overcome. Where elites agree on the desirability of the welfare state and the role of civil society organizations and unions in policy-making, civil society will remain empowered. Curiously, this could also be the legacy of particular paths out of authoritarianism. In the places where the left is still divided organizationally, both at the union and party levels, it is more difficult for left-wingers to agree on policies. The cases of both Spain and Portugal are in this respect similar.

In these countries the experience of authoritarianism created deep divisions in the workers' movement that led, in particular, to communist empowerment. The communists had been a weak and insignificant political organization in Iberia in the interwar years,

where the left was much more represented by mass movements of socialists and, especially, of anarchists. The extreme harsh conditions that the dictatorships imposed on the popular sectors led to the disintegration of the anarchist and socialist movements and provided a more fertile ground for the survival of sect-like radical organizations, thus favoring the communist parties. Communists, Catholics, and, to much less extent, socialists competed for the allegiance of the workers within the corporatist unions during the dictatorships, but these divisions became clearer in the last years of the dictatorships, when they were especially promoted by government action. In Portugal the PCP was cautious and pursued a strategy of gaining recognition from the authorities (Lucena and Gaspar 1991, 865). In Spain after Franco's death in November 1975 there was a debate whether there should exist a single labor organization or a variety of unions. The policies of the authoritarian governments towards the unions made a single movement less possible. The UGT had been permitted to have a public meeting in April 1976 (when Arias Navarro was the prime minister), while the CC.OO, which was the strongest movement in Spain from the late 1960s onward, had to remain clandestine. As a result, an extreme competition between the two confederations emerged, especially in the first years of the transition, when the CC.OO was hegemonic and the UGT was fighting for its place (Martínez-Alier and Roca Jusmet 1988, 15–16, 40). This inhibited the creation of confederative structures during democracy. And in both countries the fact that this fragmentation of the left was never overcome could have made both countries less able to resist external pressures that ultimately are contributing to reduce the voice of popular sectors in democracy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agüero, Felipe. 1995. *Soldiers, Civilians, and Democracy: Post-Franco Spain in Comparative Perspective*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Almeida, Pedro Tavares de, and António Costa Pinto. 2003. "Portuguese Ministers, 1851–1999: Social Background and Paths to Power." In Pedro Tavares de Almeida and António Costa Pinto, eds., *Who Governs Southern Europe? Regime Change and Ministerial Recruitment, 1850–2000*, 4–37. London: Frank Cass.

Bacalhau, Mário, and Thomas Bruneau. 1978. *Evolução das Atitudes, Opiniões e Comportamentos Políticos dos Portugueses, quatro anos depois do 25 de Abril*. Lisboa: NORMA.

Barreto, António. 1987. *Anatomia de uma Revolução. A Reforma Agrária em Portugal, 1974–1976*. Mem Martins: Publicações Europa-América.

Bermeo, Nancy. 1986. *The Revolution Within the Revolution: Worker's Control in Rural Portugal*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

_____. 1990. "The Politics of Public Enterprise in Portugal, Spain, and Greece." In Ezra N. Suleiman and John Waterbury, eds., *The Political Economy of Public Sector Reform and Privatization*. Boulder: Westview Press.

_____. 2000. "Civil Society after Democracy: Some Conclusions." In Nancy Bermeo and Philip Nord, eds., *Civil Society before Democracy: Lessons from Nineteenth-Century Europe*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Bermeo, Nancy, and José García-Duran. 1994. "Spain: Dual Transition Implemented by Two Parties." In Stephen Haggard and Steven B. Webb, eds., *Voting for Reform: Democracy, Political Liberalization, and Economic Adjustment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bernhard, Michael. 1996. "Civil Society after the First Transition: Dilemmas of Post-Communist Democratization in Poland and Beyond." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 29 (3): 341–61.

Bosco, Anna. 2001. "Adapting to Democracy: Political Parties between Transition and Consolidation in Southern Europe." *South European Society and Politics* 6 (2): 129–36.

Bruneau, T., A. McLeod, and M. Bacalhau. 1984. *Opinião Política dos Portugueses 10 anos depois do 25 de Abril*. Lisboa: Norma.

Cabral, Manuel Villaverde. 2000. "Autoritarismo de Estado, Distância ao poder e Familismo Amoral – uma pesquisa em progresso." Paper presented to the Conference Brasil-Portugal, Recife.

Cardoso, Gustavo, Susana Nascimento, Ângela Morgado, and Rita Espanha. 2005. *Democracia Digital. Eleitos e Eleitores na Era da Informação*. Oeiras: Celta.

Casademunt, Alexandre. 1999. "Modernización Ecológica y pautas de comportaminento público y privado." In Joan Subirats, ed., *Existe Sociedad Civil en España?* 265. Madrid: Fundación Encuentro.

Collier, Ruth Berins. 1999. *Paths toward Democracy: The Working Class and Elites in Western Europe and South America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruz, Manuel Braga da. 1988. "Sobre o parlamento português: Partidarização parlamentar e parlamentarização partidária." *Análise Social* XXIV (100): 97–125.

_____. 1995. *Instituições Políticas e Processos Sociais*. Venda Nova: Bertrand.

Delicado, Ana. 2003. "A solidariedade como valor social no Portugal contemporâneo." In Jorge Vala, Manuel Villaverde Cabral, and Alice Ramos, eds., *Valores Sociais: Mudanças e contrastes em Portugal e na Europa*. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.

Ebbinghaus, Bernhard, and Jelle Visser. 1999. "When Institutions Matter: Union Growth and Decline in Western Europe, 1950–1995." *European Sociological Review* 15 (2): 135–58.

_____. 2000. *Trade Unions in Western Europe since 1945*. New York and London: Grove/MacMillan.

Ekiert, Grzegorz, and Jan Kubik. 1998. "Contentious Politics in New Democracies: East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia, 1989–93." *World Politics* 50 (4): 547–81.

Eloy, António. 1994. "O ambiente e o ordenamento do território." In António Reis, ed., *Portugal. 20 Anos de Democracia*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores.

Estrada, Eduardo Moyano. 1984. *Corporatismo y Agricultura. Asociaciones profesionales y articulación de interés en la agricultura española*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Agrarios, Pesqueros y Alimentarios.

Eurobarometer. 1977–1998. Surveys. European Commission.

Fernandes, Tiago. 2007. "Authoritarian Regimes and Pro-Democracy Semi-Oppositions: The End of the Portuguese Dictatorship (1968–1974) in Comparative Perspective." *Democratization* 14 (4): 686–705.

Ferreira, José Medeiros. 1994. *Portugal em Transe (1974–1985)*. Vol. VIII of José Mattoso, dir., *História de Portugal*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores.

Fishman, Robert M. 1989. "Labor and the Return to Democracy in Spain." Working Paper 118, Kellogg Institute for International Studies, University of Notre Dame, March.

_____. 1990a. "Rethinking State and Regime: Southern Europe's Transition to Democracy." *World Politics* 42 (3, April): 422–40.

_____. 1990b. *Working-Class Organization and the Return to Democracy in Spain*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

_____. 2004. *Democracy's Voices: Social Ties and the Quality of Public Life in Spain*. Ithaca and London; Cornell University Press.

_____ 2010. "Rethinking the Iberian Transformations: How Democratization Scenarios Shaped Labor Market Outcomes." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 45 (3): 281–310.

_____. 2011. "Democratic Practice after the Revolution: The Case of Portugal and Beyond." *Politics and Society* XX (X): 233–67.

Foran, John, and Jeff Goodwin. 1993. "Revolutionary Outcomes in Iran and Nicaragua: Coalition Fragmentation, War, and the Limits of Social Transformation." *Theory and Society* 22 (2): 209–47.

Franco, António de Sousa. 1994. "A economia." In António Reis, ed., *Portugal. 20 Anos de Democracia*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores.

Franco, Raquel Campos. 2005. "Defining the Nonprofit Sector: Portugal." Working Paper 43, The Johns Hopkins University Nonprofit Sector Project, September.

Garcia, Marisol, and Neovi Karakatsanis. 2006. "Social Policy, Democracy, and Citizenship in Southern Europe." In Richard Gunther, P. Nikiforos Diamandouros, and Dimitri A. Sotiropoulos, eds., *Democracy and the State in the New Southern Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goldstone, Jack A. 2001. "Toward a Fourth Generation of Revolutionary Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 139–87.

Goodwin, Jeff. 2001. *No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945–1991*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, Lawrence S., and Douglas L. Wheeler, ed. 1983. *In Search of Modern Portugal: The Revolution and Its Consequences*. Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press.

Gunther, Richard. 1980. *Public Policy in a No-Party State: Spanish Planning and Budgeting in the Twilight of the Franquist Era.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 1996. "Spanish Public Policy: From Dictatorship to Democracy." Estudio/Working Paper 1996/84, Fundación Juan March, Madrid.

Gunther, Richard, and José R. Montero. 2001. "The Anchors of Partisanship: A Comparative Analysis of Voting Behavior in Four Southern European Democracies." In P. Nikiforos Diamandouros and Richard Gunther, eds., *Parties, Politics, and Democracy in the New Southern Europe*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gunther, Richard, José Ramón Montero, and Joan Botella. 2004. *Democracy in Modern Spain*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Hamann, Kerstin. 1998. "Spanish Unions: Institutional Legacy and Responsiveness to Economic and Industrial Change." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 51 (3): 424–44.

Hamann, Kerstin, and Miguel Marínez Lucio. 2003. "Strategies of Union Revitalization in Spain: Negotiating Change and Fragmentation." *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 9 (1): 61–78.

Hipsher, Patricia L. 1996. "Democratization and the Decline of Urban Social Movements in Chile and Spain." *Comparative Politics* 28 (3): 273–97.

Howard, Marc Morjé. 2002. "The Weakness of Post-Communist Civil Society." *Journal of Democracy* 13 (1, January): 157–69.

Huber, Evelyne, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and John D. Stephens. 1997. "The Paradoxes of Contemporary Democracy: Formal, Participatory, and Social Dimensions." *Comparative Politics* 29 (3): 323–42.

IPOPE (Instituto Português de Opinião Pública e Estudos de Mercado). 1973. *Os Portugueses e a Política*. Lisboa: Moraes Editores.

Karl, Terry Lynn, and Philippe C. Schmitter. 1991. "Modes of Transition in Latin America, Southern and Eastern Europe." *International Social Science Journal* 128: 269–84.

Leston-Bandeira, Cristina. 2002. *Da Legislação à Legitimação. O papel do Parlamento Português*. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.

Linz, Juan. 1975. "Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes." In Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson Polsby, eds., *Handbook of Political Science*, Vol. III. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

_____. 1981. "A Century of Politics and Interests in Spain (1880–1980)." In Suzanne Berger, ed., *Organizing Interests in Western Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Linz, Juan, and Miguel Jerez with Susana Corso. 2003. "Ministers and Regimes in Spain: From the First to the Second Restoration, 1874–2002." In Pedro Tavares de Almeida and António Costa Pinto, eds., *Who Governs Southern Europe? Regime Change and Ministerial Recruitment, 1850–2000*. London: Frank Cass.

Linz, Juan, and Alfred Stepan. 1996. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lucena, Manuel de, and Mário Baptista Coelho, orgs. 1989. *Portugal. O Sistema Político e Constitucional, 1974–1987*. Lisboa: Instituto de Ciências Sociais.

Lucena, Manuel de, and Carlos Gaspar. 1991. "Metamorfoses corporativas?—Associações de interesses económicos e institucionalização da democracia em Portugal (I)." *Análise Social* 114.

_____. 1992. "Metamorfoses corporativas?—Associações de interesses económicos e institucionalização da democracia em Portugal (II)." *Análise Social* 115 (27) 135–87.

Martínez-Alier, Joan, and Jordi Roca Jusmet. 1988. "Economía Política del Corporativismo en el Estado Español: Del Franquismo al posfranquismo." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 41 (Enero–Marzo).

Martins, Isabel de Faria. 1969. "Os trabalhadores portugueses ante a sociedade e o progresso." *Análise Social* VII (27–28): 382–90.

Matos, Luís Salgado de. 1979. *Le Président de la République Portugaise dans le cadre du Régime Politique*. Volume I, *Mémoire d'Études Approfondies en Analyse Comparative des Systèmes Politiques*. University of Paris.

Meer, Marc van der. 1997. "Trade Union Development in Spain: Past Legacies and Current Trends." Working Paper I, 18, Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung (MZES), Mannheim.

Menezes Ferreira, João de. 1994. "Os sindicatos. As associações patronais." In António Reis, ed., *Portugal. 20 Anos de Democracia*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores.

Morales, Laura, and Fabiola Mota. 2006. "El asociacionismo en España." In José Ramon Montero, Joan Font, and Mariano Torcal, eds., *Ciudadanos, asociaciones y participación en España*. Madrid: CIS.

Morlino, Leonardo. 1995. "Political Parties and Democratic Consolidation in Southern Europe." In Richard Gunther, P. Nikiforos Diamandouros, and H. J. Puhle, eds., *The Politics of Democratic Consolidation: Southern Europe in Comparative Perspective*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

_____. 1998. *Democracy between Consolidation and Crisis: Parties, Groups, and Citizens in Southern Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mota, Fabiola. 1999. "La Realidad Asociativa en España." In Joan Subirats, ed., *Existe Sociedad Civil en España? Responsabilidades Colectivas y Valores Públicos*. Madrid: Fundación Caja.

O'Donnell, Guillermo. 1973. *Modernization and Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism: Studies in South American Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

O'Donnell, Guillermo, and Philippe C. Schmitter. 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Oliveira, César. 2000. "Sindicalismo." In António Barreto and Maria Filomena Mónica, coords., *Dicionário de História de Portugal*, Vol. IX. Lisboa: Figueirinhas.

Oxhorn, Philip. 1995a. "From Controlled Inclusion to Coerced Marginalization: The Struggle for Civil Society in Latin America." In John A. Hall, ed., *Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

_____. 1995b. *Organizing Civil Society: The Popular Sectors and the Struggle for Democracy in Chile*. University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Pappas, Takkis S. 2001. "In Search of the Center: Conservative Parties, Electoral Competition, and Political Legitimacy in Southern Europe's New Democracies." In P. Nikiforos Diamandouros and Richard Gunther, eds., *Parties, Politics, and Democracy in the New Southern Europe*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Pasquino, Gianfranco. 1995. "Executive-Legislative Relations in Southern Europe." In Richard Gunther, P. Nikiforos Diamandouros, and H. J. Puhle, eds., *The Politics of Democratic Consolidation: Southern Europe in Comparative Perspective*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Pérez-Díaz, Víctor. 1998. “State and Public Sphere in Spain during the Ancient Regime.” ASP Research Paper 19(b)/1998, Madrid.

_____. 1999. *Spain at the Crossroads*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

_____. 2000. “From Civil War to Civil Society: Social Capital in Spain from the 1930s to the 1990s.” ASP Research Paper 36(b)/2000.

Pérez-Díaz, Víctor, and Joaquín P. López Novo. 2003. *El Tercer Sector Social en España*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales.

Prata, Ana. 1997. “Women’s Movements, the State, and the Struggle for Abortion Rights: Comparing Spain and Portugal in Times of Democratic Expansion.” PhD Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota.

Prieto-Lacaci, Rafael. 1994. “Asociaciones Voluntarias.” In Salustiano del Campo, ed., *Tendencias Sociales en España, 1960–1990*, Vol. I. Bilbao: Fundación BBV.

Radcliff, Pamela. 2005a. “Catolicismo y asociaciones en la transición a la democracia.” Manuscript, University of California, San Diego.

_____. 2005b. “Ciudadanía y la transición.” Manuscript, University of California, San Diego.

Robinson, Richard. 2000. “Igreja Católica.” In António Barreto and Maria Filomena Mónica, coords., *Dicionário de História de Portugal*, Vol. VIII. Lisboa: Figueirinhas.

Rosas, Fernando. 1994. “O *Estado Novo* (1926–1974).” In José Mattoso, dir., *História de Portugal*, Vol. VII. Lisboa: Círculo dos Leitores.

Royo, Sebastian. 2000. “‘Still the Century of Corporatism?’ Corporatism in Southern Europe: Spain and Portugal in Comparative Perspective.” Manuscript, Government Department, Suffolk University.

_____. 2002. *A New Century of Corporatism? Corporatism in Southern Europe: Spain and Portugal in Comparative Perspective*. Santa Barbara, Ca.: Praeger.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. 1998. “The Self-Organization of Society and Democratic Rule: Specifying the Relationship.” In Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Marylin Rueschemeyer, and B. Wittrock, eds., *Participation and Democracy: East and West. Comparisons and Interpretations*. New York and London: M. E. Sharpe.

_____. 2005. “Addressing Inequality.” In Larry Diamond and Leonardo Morlino, eds., *Assessing the Quality of Democracy*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Santos, M. Emília Brederode, and Mariana Dias. 1993. "Bem Estar Individual, Relações Interpessoais e participação Social." In Luís de França, coord., *Portugal, Valores Europeus, Identidade Cultural*. Lisboa: Instituto de Estudos para o Desenvolvimento.

Santos, Paula Borges. 2005. *Igreja Católica, Estado e Sociedade, 1968–1975. O caso Rádio Renascença*. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.

Schmitter, Philippe C. 1995. "Organized Interests and Democratic Consolidation in Southern Europe." In Richard Gunther, P. Nikiforos Diamandouros, and H. J. Puhle, eds., *The Politics of Democratic Consolidation: Southern Europe in Comparative Perspective*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

_____. 1997. "Civil Society East and West." In Larry Diamond, Marc F. Plattner,Yun-han Chu, and Hung-mao Tien, eds., *Consolidating the Third Wave Democracies: Themes and Perspectives*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

_____. 1999a. "O corporativismo e a política pública em Portugal durante o regime autoritário." In Philippe C. Schmitter, *Portugal: Do Autoritarismo à Democracia*. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.

_____ 1999b. "Os Interesses Organizados e a Consolidação Democrática no Sul da Europa." In Philippe C. Schmitter, *Portugal: Do Autoritarismo à Democracia*. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. "Social Revolutions and Mass Military Mobilization." In Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 1997. *Social Revolutions in the Modern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 2003. *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Sousa, António de. 1994. "A família e a condição feminina." In António Reis, ed., *Portugal. 20 Anos de Democracia*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores.

Stepan, Alfred. 1978. *The State and Society: Peru in Comparative Perspective*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

_____. 2001. "Military Politics in Three Polity Arenas: Civil Society, Political Society, and the State." In Stepan, *Arguing Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1995. “Mass Mobilization and Regime Change: Pacts, Reform, and Popular Power in Italy (1918–1922) and Spain (1975–1978).” In Richard Gunther, P. Nikiforos Diamandouros, and H. J. Puhle, eds., *The Politics of Democratic Consolidation: Southern Europe in Comparative Perspective*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tusell, Javier. 1996. *La Dictadura de Franco*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

Ulzurrum, Laura Morales Diez de. 2001. “Citizens in Polities: The Individual and Contextual Determinants of Political Membership in Western Countries.” Estudio/Working Paper 2001/164, Fundación Juan March, Madrid, February.

_____. 2003. “Ever Less Engaged Citizens? Political Participation and Associational Membership in Spain.” WP 220, Institut de Ciències Polítiques i Socials, Barcelona, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

Valenzuela, J. Samuel. 1988. “Labor Movements in Transitions to Democracy: A Framework for Analysis.” Working Paper 104, Kellogg Institute for International Studies, University of Notre Dame, June.

_____. 1991. “Labor Movements and Political Systems: A Conceptual and Typological Analysis.” Working Paper 167, Kellogg Institute for International Studies, University of Notre Dame, December.

Wilensky, Harold. 2002. *Rich Democracies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wozniak, Lynne. 1991. “Industrial Modernization and Working-Class Protest in Socialist Spain.” Working Paper 165, Kellogg Institute for International Studies, University of Notre Dame, October.