Portuguese Prime Minister resigns amid rising social protests

By Paul Mitchell and Alex Lanier

Prime Minister José Sócrates resigned yesterday, after all five opposition parties rejected the budget presented by his minority Socialist Party (PS) government. The budget included huge spending cuts, tax increases and a freeze on pensions intended to prevent Portugal from seeking a bailout like those granted to Ireland and Greece last year.

Sócrates said he would remain in office in a caretaker capacity: “The country will not be without a government. The government will continue to fulfill all its duties as a caretaker government.” President Aníbal Cavaco Silva could now call a snap election within two months. However, the Portuguese constitution mandates a waiting period of at least 55 days between the calling of snap polls and when the elections are in fact held. Silva issued a statement declaring that he would not call for polls at all until tomorrow.

Until now, the minority PS government functioned with the tacit support of “opposition” parties like the PSD, which refrained from exercising their option of blocking the PS’s policies in the legislature. The right-wing Social Democratic Party (PSD) had abstained in previous votes on the austerity measures, allowing the minority PS government to pass them.

This time the PSD decided to vote against, declaring that “a broad government coalition” is needed to force the necessary austerity measures through.

“I hold the president of the PSD’s firm and irreversible position on this matter,” PSD leader Pedro Passos Coelho declared. “We expect the government knows how to and because the Western countries started bombing Libya a day before the mission arrived. I would feel embarrassed to have to be backed by Western warplanes because gasfields of foreign interests have never helped Africa,” Museveni said in the statement. “We have had a copious supply of them in the last 50 years – Mobutu, Kabwea, Banda and so on. ‘The West made a lot of misstakes in Africa and in the Middle East in the past. Apart from the slave trade and colonialism, they participated in the killings of Patrice Lumumba of Congo, Felix Moumoune of Cameroon, Bartholomew Boganda of Central African Republic and the support for UNITA in Angola.

Now the West is taking advantage of the fact that it has been given that support to let itself in a position in which tomorrow it would be masters of resources of Libya, especially the oil. And it is this oil, oil which is the undoing of the Libyans.”

Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni said in a statement this week that what was happening in Libya necessitated an urgent AU meeting to discuss the crisis. He said that the AU had a plan for Libya but its mission could not get there.

Peasants and farmers threatened with bankruptcy when banks and investors on the financial markets refuse to lend them money, which would make it even more difficult for the country to repay its debts. The Bank of Portugal had revised its forecast of zero growth next year, made at the end of last year, to a 1.3 percent drop. The bank said pay cuts, tax increases and increasing unemployment could cause domestic demand to slump by 3.6 percent this year and investment by 6.8 percent.

The interest rate on Portuguese sovereign debt has almost doubled over the last year, making it even harder for Portugal to repay its debts. Yesterday the rate on 10-year bonds rose to 7.8 percent, while 5-year bonds fell to a record of 8.2 percent. Germany pays just 3 percent in contrast.

The PS government claimed it has already cut 13.5 billion euros and we have helped cut the budget deficit to 4.6 percent of gross domestic product this year, from last year’s estimated 7.3 percent and to 3 percent in 2012. However, the country still has to borrow about 20 billion this year to finance its deficit. It has only 6 billion in cash reserves to pay back 13 billion in 5-year bonds due in April and June.

An indirect bailout is already taking place, as the European Central Bank will stop buying bonds of governments in the eurozone, while the ECB is printing money to lend to the Portuguese government under conditions where other banks are refusing to lend money to Lisbon.

Finance Minister Fernando Teixeira dos Santos said that the rejection of the PS’s austerity budget would cut off access to such loans, and increase pressure on Portugal to accept an IMF plan.

“There are no reasons for this plan to worsen the country’s financing conditions and create added difficulties which I doubt we could overcome on our own,” Teixeira dos Santos said as he opened the debate in parliament. “In such moments, a measure measures to save the eurozone, which is a huge project, would be felt immediately.”

Financial analysts agreed. “The fear is that if Portugal failed to agree on austerity measures, we can potentially see the country forced into the IMF [the European Financial Stability Facility],” said Mary Nicola, an economist at BNP Paribas.

The IMF is a 750 billion bailout fund set up by the European Union, the IMF and various European governments in May 2010, amid the Greek debt crisis. It is designed to lend money to Eurozone countries threatened with bankruptcy when banks and investors on the financial markets refuse to lend them money. Here are the terms of the loan, the country must then participate in a “country programme,” imposing drastic social cuts negotiated with the IMF and the so-called “EFSF” (the European finance ministers.

Sócrates’ resignation sets the stage for the election of a right-wing government, prepared to impose even more drastic social cuts on workers in alliance with international banks. By voting against the PS’s austerity measures, the PSD has virtually excluded any chance that financial authorities will force Portugal to accept a European bailout, while precipitating an election when Sócrates and the PSD both come in on opinion polls due to their anti-worker policies. Currently, the PSD’s Coelho leads in the polls and is expected to be elected as prime minister.

A bailout will mean international financial institutions effectively taking direct control over the Portuguese economy and imposing even more severe than those being carried out by the PS government. Portugal has had the experience of IMF influence in 1977 and in 1983, which led to huge spending cuts on the living standards of workers and deep recessions.

Portugal already has one of the largest, greatest and greatest economies in the EU, and a fifth of the population survives on less than 360 per month. Employment is a record 11.2 percent. One in three full time workers is paid less than one million—less than the minimum wage of 475 per month. Nearly 40 percent of workers work in “precarious” part-time or temporary employment.

Some bourgeois commentators have expressed concern that, should a financial crisis hit before the next elections, it might create an atmosphere in which a caretaker government—that is, one without a formal mandate—attempted to impose unpopular social cuts on the 10 million.

The EU Observer wrote: “And any austerity programme contained in such an [EFSF] agreement would undoubtedly be even more wide-ranging. A political commentator reported last week that a caretaker government—would be, one without a formal mandate—attempted to impose unpopular social cuts on the 10 million.”
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