

The evolution of facts - Introduction



The evolution of democracy in any country at the end of the XX. century has to be dealt with simultaneously at the political, social, economic and cultural level. ~~Freedom is not a simplistic formula.~~

The interdependence between these \neq levels is far from being understood. We wonder if today it is possible to speak of democracy without spelling out what it entails as:

- capacity of being aware of one's own destiny + means + instruments to become more + more the subject of one's own history
- aptitude to enter into meaningful + useful relationships in society, on the basis of the mutual accountability that social life demands;

- aptitude to handle the material ² resources for the betterment of human lives and capacity to control their processes ~~without~~ ^{and not} being controlled by them;

- capacity to enter into participatory decision-making with autonomy, assertiveness and independence.

Of course, there are many other ways of speaking of democracy in inter-related terms. What, indeed, did ~~we~~ we mean by endogenous or self-centered development? When in the 60's development was defined as the capacity for a society to face its own historical evolution, we were not far from what I am pointing out to.

(But this is another story... In the West and in int'l bodies we seem to have put a lot of weight on our hopes for develop/ as if somewhere out there in new forms democracy could be fully achieved.)



When I analyse the evolution of democracy in P. I could as well use the term "develop/" and see ~~around it~~ ^{the} shortcomings and possibilities of develop/ in my country.

By stating this I am affirming the mutual interdependence and interrelatedness of the two instruments of international law which give the basic guide-lines in this regard, namely the international "Fact on civic + political rights" and the international Fact on social, economic + cultural rights.

(Ideological battle on that as irrelevant, though it goes on even now.)

But the evolution of democracy in P. does show that the two sets of rights cannot be dealt with in isolation.

Event
~~First period~~ after 25th April 74 A

It is my conviction now as it was my perception then that the 25th April 74 aimed at two things:

— the establishment of the basic mechanisms of democracy on political level

— the chaping of a new social + economic policy ~~with~~ outlined in the measures drawn up in the program of the Armed Forces.

Already at that time, this second aspect was overlooked by political leaders. As many of them came from the opposition during the previous regime the social + econ. dem. meant very little. Rather, the political democracy ^{was} of paramount importance.



I Period

Two years during which there were the steady steps towards ~~for~~ the ~~an~~ comprehensive mechanisms of the formal representative democracy.

The 1st free elections took place as scheduled one year after the 24th.

They elected a parliament with the task of drafting a Constitution.

Climate in which this draft took place.

But ... is a Constitution to be drawn outside the forces at work?

One year of ^{social} pressure on the parliament.

It ended with second elections for a normal period of legislative activity.



At the same time, many forms of direct participation (examples)

(seen by many just as "agitation"
or "gauchisme")

Inability of political leaders to theorise, articulate + institutionalise such forms of community action.

Objective alliance of parties from left + right to deny the democratic value of such endeavours.

Period of many steps in social + economic democracy:

— come as the attempt to satisfy the basic rights of individuals, on the fundamental assumption that such rights spring forth from the right to live + not as rewards because of one's participation in the labour force (minimum salary, social welfare for the unemployed, maternity leave of 90 days, etc.)



Other steps, however, came directly
the "hand books":

- nationalisations were done on a *sil-julistie*
basis without ~~the~~ ^{necessary} study + reflection upon
its conditions: state as entrepreneur

- Agrarian reform was conducted more
as a struggle against the latifundia in
the south than as an overall policy for
helping agriculture to weigh positively
in our exchanges with exterior markets;

Fundação Cuidar o Futuro



II period:

Two years of ^{so-called} socialist governm.

Some attempts were made at stabilization of the agrarian reform and at establishing health national service.

With the socialist governm. several factors arose:

- party + governm. were intermingled in such a way that party "clientele" started invading the public sector

- econom. dem. became remote:

loan from IMF

Fundação Cuidar o Futuro

- cult. dem. was suffocated because of total separation between culture + econ. life (no way of understanding cultural fundamentals of developm.) and because "kindergarten" priority approach to education (loss of interest of adult people for education)



III period

F

Interim period of 1 year of
a full technocratic policy
"right-oriented"
aimed at securing managers +
capitalists

IV period

6 months of attempt to ~~set~~
formulate satisfaction of basic needs

Fundação Cuidar o Futuro

V period

restoration of privileges
subordinate to E.U.M.B.



Period in which we are NOW:

• Political democracy cannot be built on the concept of left + right. They have lost their meaning. They are drifting along, losing any connection with the reality they would be supposed to ~~change~~ portray and to serve.

Left + right are strongly based on their programs on ideological contents. They have ~~Instead of~~ giving flesh and bones to their ideology they rather used it as a banner.

Because of the failure, rather, the fallacy of their contents, ideologies cannot lead the country to any new impetus in creating the forms of democracy at all levels.

It is a blatant case in which the classical division of left + right ~~is~~ doesn't ~~mean~~ carry with it the capacity to polarize or ^{to} mobilize people.

• Democracy cannot be built with the use of inappropriate ^{tools in the} ~~science of~~ economic field. ~~economics.~~ The econ. science is a language to interpret reality and to help to solve problems.

How can ~~the~~ economic theories ~~that~~ which were developed ^{at} the very beginning of industrialisation ~~or~~ ^{and the other} at the dawn of the massive post-economic changes brought about by the heavy industries, how can such theories interpret and give answers to today's world?

I will take two examples: the fundamental functions of economy performed by the human beings and the ~~evolution of the very concepts~~ ^{practice of planning.} of work + labour force + employment.



It is understandable that in the ⁽³⁾ beginning of industrialization the production of new goods appears as the main economic activity which is going to determine the capacity to buy, ^{It is also} ~~as~~ well as to divide society in social classes in reference to the process of production. Hence, the concept of the "workers" as the forefront... Where did it lead in P.? ~~It~~ ~~led~~ to the marginalization of the old people, of all those whose work was not translatable into monetary value.

At the same time, consumption as the other side of production has been seen in ^{convergent} two ways. At the level of society, with moral overtones as if consumption will be opposed to frugality, simple living, frugal life-styles. At the level of the state, consumption is used as means to use production, stimulated or refrained in order to save the so-called economy.



Isn't there another way of looking at the economic functions? Isn't consumption a regulatory function of the market ~~of~~ which all citizens are actors + agents?

If so, cannot we ask ourselves what are the basic needs of a population, what goods + services they want to consume and to adapt production accordingly?

~~It is~~ The formulation of the basic needs ~~that~~ leads to the adequate allocation of resources.



Like wise, planning ~~is~~ will stop ⁽³⁾
being the imaginary function it is.
Theoretically, planning is putting
together needs + resources for the
accomplishment of well defined
goals.

But the use of obsolete economic
science has made of planning a
mere fiction! Often, it is ^{maybe always} the model
of macro-economics ~~it~~ which
guides the planning. The real
needs of people are far away
All the attempts to incorporate
people in the planning have
failed. Which leads us to think
that maybe planning has to be
an ~~democr~~ expression of participa-
tory democracy more than any
thing else.



• Social democracy cannot be built
as a supplement to economic forms
or functions.

(work & employment vs. activity
socially useful)

(productive activities with redistributive
elements)

(appropriate technologies)

Fundação Cuidar o Futuro



• Cultural democracy asking for: 7
man's control of technology
+ not control of the masses by technology
(fare de Lyon!)

A new mode of knowing reality is at stake. People cannot almost choose the means to reach their goals. They are guided by the means, the instrument, the operations.

It is not true that men master nature, that they can act upon technology. It ~~is~~ is technology which acts upon men.

Technology is not only conquest, mastering, product, machinery. It is a way of knowledge, ways that become operations interiorised.

As it is a phenomenon touching ~~over~~ all individuals, technology becomes a form of social structuration.

There wouldn't be any possibility
for a democratic future as long as
culture + technology follow separate
~~to~~ paths. Because the popular will
has ~~or~~ only 'traditional modes ~~of~~
~~to~~ to express itself
while all its life is mediated through
the technological language.

Fundação Cuidar o Futuro



To deal adequately with cult. dem.⁹
we have to cope in an imaginative
way with the informatique society.

As the m-m create events, condi-
tion our behaviours, they ~~are~~ are
an autonomous power.

Parallel with econ. power and
political power at the end of XIX
century, ^{relation of} m-m power + political
power ^{has} have to be expressed.

~~From one side,~~ ^{ndação Cuidar o Futuro}
✓ they constitute an occupation
force;

from another, they can become
the instruments of ~~de~~ direct
-contact between the citizens.

