

António Costa Pinto. *Modern Portugal*. Palo Alto: Society for the Promotion of Science and Scholarship, SPOSS, 1998.

Michael Baum

In July 1998, the Portuguese Political Science Association (SPOSS) was founded. Besides promoting political science as a discipline in Portugal, the association also seeks to spur the exchange of research and dialogue between national and international political scientists. Thus, SPOSS's publication of a Portuguese volume in its "Modern European Nation Series" is especially propitious. In many ways it is a singular achievement in modern Portuguese scholarship in the social sciences. The editor, Costa Pinto, has invited thirteen renowned Portuguese academics (and one of the foremost American authorities on Portugal) to craft penetrating but succinct articles in English describing a wide spectrum of changes in contemporary Portugal. For those who are unable to read Portuguese, but yearn for an incisive introduction to the country's recent political history, government institutions, international relations, economic development, patterns of social change and the role of women, emigration patterns, issues of cultural and national identity, and the key movements characterizing twentieth-century Portuguese literature and art, there is no better place to begin than this volume. Of course, the book's panoramic coverage is both an advantage and a disadvantage, in the sense that scholars of Portugal may find some of the articles too brief to be of great value. Nevertheless, specialists will find up-to-date data and useful analyses describing a number of important phenomena.

Although readers of this journal clearly do not need to be convinced of the utility of such a volume, it is important to note that the editor, a professor of modern European history and politics at ISCTE in Lisbon, as well as the author of the conclusion, Nancy Bermeo, associate professor of government at Princeton University, have taken care to "sell" the relevance of the Portuguese experience to others even outside the orbit of European area studies. First, the pace and scope of change that has taken place in Portugal over the last three decades is nothing short of remarkable. As Bermeo says in her conclusion, "Portugal's ability to withstand the challenges of simultaneous decolonization and democratization is surely one of the greatest political accomplishments of any state in post-World War II Europe" (270). Second, the country's shift from a traditional, socially and economically underdevel-

oped polity to a modern nation in the first wave of countries joining the new common European currency in 1999 surely marks it as one of the more important cases for students of comparative politics and development. Bermeo's concluding chapter, though brief at only five pages, does an excellent job of summarizing the key points made by each of the book's authors and situating their lessons within a comparative perspective. The following is a more detailed critique of most of the book's chapters as well as some general comments on which audiences might find this volume especially useful.

One of the most notorious difficulties of edited volumes is their unevenness, and in some respects this book is no exception. The length of the chapters, excluding the conclusion, ranges from forty pages to a mere nine. Second, not all the authors seem to be writing for the same audience. For example, Fernando Rosas's chapter on "Salazarism and Economic Development in the 1930's and 40's: Industrialization Without Agrarian Reform" is at times unnecessarily technical and jargon-filled. On pages 94-96, the author refers repeatedly to Portugal's confirmation of the so-called "Myrdalian effects on foreign trade structures." The latter is contextually explained to be a competing model to the "so-called new economic history," but the author assumes that his readers are well-versed in these schools of economic thought. Even Costa Pinto's opening chapter, a detailed and theoretically rich comparative analysis of the Salazar regime, assumes at times the reader's familiarity with comparative studies on fascism. For example, on page eight he describes the Integralist movement in Portugal as "based on the Maurrasian ideology that had guided Action Française." Unfortunately, the reader has to wait until page eighteen for a clearer explanation of what specifically characterized the thinking of these early Portuguese fascists in this case, an elitist project aimed at recapturing a mythic and traditional "national" corporatism based on a medieval vision of Portugal. The latter was seen as an alternative to a dangerous "imported" Liberalism, which necessarily carried within it the seeds of Socialism, Communism, and of course democracy (18).

These quibbles aside, however, the first chapter, one of two written or co-written by the editor, is perhaps the most important and therefore merits twice the length of the others. In it, Costa Pinto begins with a discussion of what is unique about Portugal's political history. His thesis is that Portugal entered the "age of the masses" without passing through many of the painful nation-building processes that other interwar European countries suffered. As a substitute for the "national question" that plagued so many other

European states, the colonial empire served as the focus for all debate about the relative “progress” or “decadence” of the Portuguese nation-state. This theme is amplified and discussed in greater detail by Valentim Alexandre (ICS-Lisbon) in his chapter on the colonial empire, Nuno Severiano Teixeira (University of Évora and Director of the National Institute of Defense), who writes about the foreign policy changes that characterized the transition from dictatorship to democracy, and Nuno Monteiro and Costa Pinto’s later chapter on “Cultural Myths and National Identity.” It also finds its way into the chapter on contemporary Portuguese literature by João Camilo dos Santos, Professor of Portuguese Literature at UC-Santa Barbara.

Costa Pinto further sets the appropriate historical context for the chapters that follow by illustrating with macroeconomic and demographic indicators of how Portugal entered the twentieth century - that is, as a non-industrialized, semi-peripheral colonial power governed by a stable “oligarchic parliamentarism” not typical of other late industrializing societies. Following a section on the twentieth century’s most unstable political regime, the First Republic (1910-26), Costa Pinto provides a concise comparative examination of the rise of fascism in Portugal and the transition to Salazar’s Estado Novo. Here the author deftly presents the key points for a general audience without getting bogged down in potentially distracting historiographic and theoretical debates.¹ The same is true of his discussion of Salazarism and the emergence of the contradictions that led to the Estado Novo’s downfall in April 1974. Overall, Costa Pinto’s chapter is the best brief introduction to the Salazar regime currently available in English.

The second chapter by Valentim Alexandre discusses how the Monarchy’s loss of Brazil in 1822 led to pressures to create a “New Brazil” in Africa. The Scramble for Africa is discussed from the Portuguese vantage point, and the comparative debates about Portuguese colonialism’s relative “abnormality” are assessed critically. The author’s conclusion is that Portuguese colonialism was not, as some have suggested, simply a front serving the interests of the great hegemonic powers, particularly Britain. Nor was Portugal’s place in Africa simply a holdover from the archaic slave-trading era. Instead, Alexandre argues that forced labor and cultivation, the infamous *chibalo* system discussed in Isaacman and Isaacman’s seminal work on Mozambique, were not unique to the Portuguese colonies in Africa. They were common in French and Belgian territories as well. What was unique about Portuguese colonialism was the state’s “sacralization” of the empire, a process that

stretched from the time of the Scramble in the late nineteenth century all the way through to the Revolution of 1974. This merging of national identity, imperial destiny, and colonial “duty” effectively robbed anticolonial currents in Portugal of any political space. This explains, according to the author, not only the tenacious defense of the colonial empire right up to the end, but also Caetano’s inability to craft a neocolonial alternative.

Severiano Teixeira’s chapter investigates a century of Portuguese foreign policy. Although this is the one area of Portuguese politics that has been well-covered in English (Macdonald; Manuel; Maxwell; Maxwell; Szulec), Teixeira ably introduces the reader to the major foreign policy questions faced by Portugal’s political elites at key moments in the nation’s history. The most critical of these was undoubtedly during the Portuguese Revolution of April 1974–November 1975. The manner in which Portuguese elites changed Portugal’s “place in the world” within a decade, from something of an international pariah state to a solid member of the international community, is again instructive of why the Portuguese case has important lessons for other countries. One of the only drawbacks of Teixeira’s chapter is its relatively scanty bibliography.

Fernando Rosas’s (professor of history at the University of Lisbon) chapter on Portuguese industrialization (or better, the lack of it) in the 1930s and ’40s, focuses on the absence of a rational state-led agrarian reform and the ability of southern latifundists to resist such reforms. His argument is that ideological and sociological factors explain the Portuguese bourgeoisie’s “almost congenital fear of risk.” The foil for Rosas’s argument is the one most often associated with that of Jaime Reis. Reis has made the case that an unfavorable allocation of natural resources explains in large part Portugal’s relative backwardness. Rosas’s chapter is a useful introduction to this debate that characterizes the Portuguese literature on economic history.

José Maria Brandão de Brito, a professor of economics at the Technical University of Lisbon, picks up where Rosas finishes and continues the discussion of Portugal’s economic development from the Salazar era until the present. As in many of this book’s chapters, major developments are grouped into descriptive phases. However, Brito’s chapter is one of the weaker ones exactly because so much of it remains merely descriptive. Furthermore, some of the author’s attempts to paint a (necessarily) broad picture border on the banal. For example, the author devotes all of about two paragraphs to one of the most important and fascinating periods in the country’s political history,

namely the revolutionary period of nationalizations and agrarian reform in the Alentejo. Although “socially relevant,” Brito says the agrarian reform was “nonetheless condemned to political and economic failure after 1975” (p.109). Condemned? He also says that “the revolutionary transformations could not survive” because of the “adverse national and international conditions” which emerged thereafter. What is missing here is more evidence to buttress these assertions. Furthermore, there is no sense of what was at stake during that era and how thousands of southern agrarian laborers physically resisted the reprivatizations of the collectivized properties in 1979 and 1980. At that time there was nothing “inevitable” about the failure to defend the agrarian reform or any of the other regionally popular “gains of the social revolution.” To suggest otherwise is to denigrate the utility of studying that period in the country’s history and further does a disservice both to those who resisted and to today’s generations of young people who know little about the Portuguese revolution. Scholars who are engaged in the teaching of Modern Portugal will need to be cognizant of what is perhaps one of the book’s few glaring holes.

Fortunately, Manuel Braga de Cruz’s (ICS-Lisbon) chapter on “The Development of Portuguese Democracy,” and Maria Carrilho’s (ISCTE-Lisbon) chapter on the armed forces and democracy, help to fill in some of these holes, but Cruz focuses primarily on the constitutional and electoral/institutional issues which marked Portugal’s successful consolidation of democracy. Maria Carrilho’s chapter is especially important because it offers some public opinion data on defense and security issues and a brief examination of the understudied role of women in the armed forces.

The other high points of the book are without a doubt João Ferreira de Almeida’s (sociology - ISCTE) examination of key sociocultural changes in Portuguese value systems, Maria Ionnis B. Baganha’s (Faculty of Economy-University of Coimbra) summary of Portuguese emigration patterns, and finally, Virgínia Ferreira’s (sociology - University of Coimbra) fascinating chapter on “Engendering Portugal.” Given spatial constraints, I focus primarily on the first and the latter.

Ferreira de Almeida’s analysis of changes in Portuguese social structures and cultural values is simply one of the best short pieces of its kind this reviewer has read to date. He catalogues a number of key socioeconomic shifts in the structure of society and how these have interacted with concomitant shifts in value patterns across the various cleavages which characterize

Portuguese society. A detailed summary of these shifts is impossible here, but two of the most important changes have been the aging of the population and the continued desertion of the interior parts of the country. Furthermore, Portugal's drastic fall in birth and fertility rates are shown to be both a product of and a stimulus to other social and cultural processes of change. For example, lower birth and fertility rates are clearly linked to the remarkable rise in women's active participation in the formal economy. In 1960, women represented only thirteen percent of the labor force, but by 1994 they represented forty-one percent, well above international norms. Most of these laborers have entered the tertiary sector, which itself has grown from thirty-six percent of the economy in 1974 to fifty-six percent in 1991.

A related aspect of Portugal's jump from a traditional agrarian society to a postmodern service-based one is discussed in Virgínia Ferreira's provocative chapter on women's social mobilization. Although her article is particularly rich and full of useful data for both specialist and non-specialist audiences, this reviewer was especially intrigued by her explanation of Portugal's surprisingly low levels of sexual segregation in the structure of employment. As the author states, "Portugal is an exception to the rule that levels of sexual segregation tend to be higher in countries with higher rates of female employment" (167). This is especially true in the technical-scientific fields, where Portugal actually has a higher percentage of women employed than more advanced countries like the U.S. and Japan, and the more culturally similar Spain. A related phenomenon is the feminization of higher education in Portugal. In 1990-91 women represented fifty-six percent of matriculations and sixty-six percent of graduations (169). However, the author's explanation for these fortunate anomalies is less rosy.

Ferreira argues that the high rate of feminization of the technical and scientific professions is paradoxically a result of the still intense elitism that has traditionally characterized Portuguese society. Women from the higher social classes have entered traditionally male fields not as a result of "greater sharing of family responsibilities by men, but rather through the activation of support networks and the mobilization of unqualified female labor to undertake domestic work" (169). Simply put, middle-class women have begun to break the glass ceiling in some professions because they can still take advantage of the cheap labor of a large female subproletariat. Nineteen percent of female workers are still maids or porters. Second, according to Ferreira, "women's presence in the scientific and technical professions is a product of Portugal's

low level of economic and technological development” (170). She argues that women have an easier time entering these fields in Portugal because they are “not as competitive or as remunerative as they are in more advanced countries . . . (and thus) are more receptive to female labor” and less attractive to men (170). Clearly, Ferreira has set out a wonderfully polemical argument for those of us looking for lively debates that might engage our students with the academic literature.

In the end, this is probably one of the chief reasons why this reviewer intends to adopt this book as a primary text for an advanced undergraduate course in modern Portuguese government and politics. It covers a wide range of material in a concise and insightful way and can therefore serve as a base for further reading in the field. Other more specialized books in political science have appeared on the market recently (Bruneau; Magone; Maxwell) and these will not be replaced by Costa Pinto’s volume. But in my mind there is simply no better introduction to the history and key issues facing modern Portugal today. *Modern Portugal* could also easily serve as a required text for graduate courses in European history, political science, sociology, and anthropology.

Notas

¹ Those interested in a more detailed analysis of this period are encouraged to read Costa Pinto’s outstanding study and the two classic volumes of edited papers produced by the International Conference Group on Modern Portugal (Graham and Makler; Graham and Wheeler). Costa-Pinto wisely avoids any mention of the by now dated debates between Howard Wiarda and Phillipe Schmitter about the origins and defining characteristics of comparative corporatism.

Works Cited

- Bruneau, Thomas C., ed. *Political Parties and Democracy in Portugal: Organizations, Elections, and Public Opinion*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1997.
- Graham, Lawrence S., and Harry M. Makler, eds. *Contemporary Portugal: The Revolution and Its Antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979.
- Graham, Lawrence S., and Douglas S. Wheeler, eds. *In Search of Modern Portugal: The Revolution and its Consequences*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.
- Macdonald, Scott B. *European Destiny, Atlantic Transformations: Portuguese Foreign Policy Under the Second Republic, 1974-1992*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1993.
- Magone, José. *European Portugal*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997.
- Manuel, Paul Christopher. *Uncertain Outcome: The Politics of the Portuguese Transition to Democracy*. Lanham, NY: University Press of America, 1995.
- Maxwell, Kenneth. *The Making of Portuguese Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

- Maxwell, Kenneth, ed. *Portuguese Defense and Foreign Policy Since Democratization*. New York: Camões Center Columbia University, 1991.
- Pinto, António Costa. *Salazar's Dictatorship and European Fascism: Problems of Interpretation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- Reis, Jaime. *O Atraso Económico Português em Perspectiva Histórica (1850-1930)*. Coleção Análise Social. Lisboa: Casa da Moeda, 1993.
- Szulc, Tad. "Lisbon and Washington: Behind the Portuguese Revolution." *Foreign Policy* 21. Winter (1975/76): 3-62.