



JÖNKÖPING INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS SCHOOL
JÖNKÖPING UNIVERSITY

Democratic development in Belarus and Cuba

Is it possible?

Master Thesis in Political Science

Author: Gunilla Edwertz

Tutor: Benny Hjern

Jönköping June 2009

Master thesis in Political Science

Title	Democratic development in Belarus and Cuba - Is it possible?
Author:	Gunilla Edwertz
Tutors:	Benny Hjern
Date:	2009-06-09
Search words	Democracy, Cuba, Belarus, political science, liberal democracy, civil society, rule of law, democratic development

Abstract

This is a study of whether it is possible for the governmental form of democracy to be applicable in states that have not had democracy as their governmental form earlier in their political history. In this thesis the concept of liberal democracy is the major theory used as well as the concepts of rule of law and civil society. After giving a description of the concepts the thesis continues with two chapters that respectively describe and explain the states of Belarus and Cuba. The two states are going to be used in the analysis at the end of this thesis.

The analysis includes several conditions to assess if democracy exists. These conditions are derived from the chapters on democracy and rule of law. In the analysis the states of Belarus and Cuba are analyzed based on the conditions derived from the chapters on democracy and rule of law. The results of the concluding discussion are that the probability for democracy to survive in Cuba is higher than in Belarus because Cuba seems to be transitioning from an authoritarian form of regime to a form of democracy. In contrast to Belarus, Cuba seems to be willing to open up from seclusion and isolation, as well as listen to its people than what the state of Belarus is willing to do.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Previous research on the topic	1
1.2	The problem	2
1.3	The purpose.....	2
1.4	Delimitations	2
1.5	Methodology.....	3
1.5.1	Descriptive study	3
1.5.2	Explanatory study	3
1.5.3	Case study	3
1.5.4	Criticism of methodology	4
1.6	Sources	4
1.6.1	Criticism of sources	4
1.7	Outline	5
2	Democracy’s history	6
2.1	The historical aspect of democracy.....	6
2.1.1	The waves of democracy.....	6
2.2	The meaning and definition of democracy	10
3	Democracy and its prerequisites	11
3.1	Liberal democracy	11
3.2	Rule of Law.....	15
3.3	Civil Society.....	19
4	Belarus	21
4.1	History of Belarus	21
4.2	The political background of Belarus in the 1990s.....	23
4.3	Belarus Today	25
5	Cuba	27
5.1	History of Cuba.....	27
5.2	The political background of Cuba, the change of political system	28
5.2.1	Constitution of Cuba	30
5.3	Cuba Today.....	31
6	Analysis.....	34
6.1	Democracy in Belarus.....	35
6.2	Democracy in Cuba.....	37
6.3	Results.....	40
7	Concluding discussion.....	42
	References	47

Printed sources	47
Internet sources.....	48

1 Introduction

The idea of this thesis began in a political science class where the topic was about democracy in the European Union. The discussion had turned to the possibility of democracy in Iraq and that the United States together with other democracies wanted Iraq and its people to embrace Western democracy, also known as liberal democracy, and apply it to their governmental system. It was in my opinion already clear that it would be difficult to force democracy on a state that had not had that kind of governmental system before. Democracy has taken a long time developing and the democracy that Western states have today has taken centuries to develop. Back then I claimed that supporting a state to introduce a governmental form like Western liberal democracy that had not been that state's governmental form before would be difficult than what Western states seemed to believe. Democracy has to develop on its own in each state. At that time I wasn't even clear on what I wanted to write in my master thesis as I still had a few years before deciding on a subject. I am there now and when it was time to decide my subject I remembered this statement I had made and wanted to find out if democracy was at all applicable in states that had not had it before.

I've chosen Belarus and Cuba as my cases because both states are authoritarian as Iraq once was. Iraq had once had a dictator and that dictator had been overthrown. Belarus and Cuba both have dictators who have made life for the states' citizens hard and difficult. I find it interesting to see how alike these two states are, but yet they are different. Cuba makes no secret that it is an authoritarian regime, while Belarus portrays itself as a democratic republic while the international community, with the United States at front, has dubbed the state as being the last dictatorship in Europe. It is also interesting to look at Cuba because of the change in presidency after Fidel Castro resigned and his brother Raul took over. While it might not be a big difference in the international community, I find that that there are indications for changes when reading articles about Cuba's relations to the international community.

1.1 Previous research on the topic

There has been research on democracy since the ancient Greece, however this has helped historical political thinkers and philosophers to understand the time and government that they have been living in and also developed models that might fit better to understand the ways a government should be ruled. The vision of politics and democracy has changed. Authors of modern time has discussed democracy in similar ways analyzed to see if it is applicable or not in a different sense than I am about to do. For example we have Gordon Graham, who in his book *The case against the democratic state* deals with the question if the war of everyone against everyone, that Hobbes discussed in his work *Leviathan*, would indeed break out (Graham, 2002).

Previous research on democracy being imposed on a state that has not experienced it before is not as easy to find. There are of course some reports and studies that have been made on the topic of Iraq, as well as a look on Cuba, but that report focused mainly on how the Constitution was to be changed in order for Cuba to make a smooth transition into democracy.

Previous research on the topic of transitional states exists extensively, but while this is not part of my thesis, I would like to give example on a research made on transitional states called *After the Break-up: Institutional design in transitional states* by Pauline Jones Luong.

1.2 The problem

The problem of this thesis mainly concerns the probability of democracy to succeed in a state that has not experienced democracy before. Democracy is a form of government that takes time to develop in a state, but the problem is also whether or not it exist rule of law in that state. A second problem when democracy is introduced is that the state, that is the government and the administration, the political leaders in charge, might not be willing to embrace democracy even if the citizens of the state might be.

1.3 The purpose

My problem in this thesis has developed into a purpose where four questions are asked:

- Based on the conditions of Western liberal democracy, do Cuba and Belarus have the means to become democracies?
- Have the political histories of Belarus and Cuba affected their democratic development?
- What is the relationship between liberal democratic development and rule of law?
- What kind of role does civil society have in a democratic development?

These questions are to be answered in the analysis as well as in the concluding discussion.

1.4 Delimitations

This thesis contains several parts that take up subjects and concepts that would've been sufficient to study just that particular part. Because of my questions and purpose I have therefore seen a need to delimitate each part severely in order to still give a good overview and depth to the intended subject of each chapter. I chose to only focus on the 20th century democratization process as this shows how democracy has been struggling to survive the different stages of resistance to it. I also chose to only focus on the model of democracy that is liberal democracy because this is the form of democracy that Western modern society and states have applied to their governmental form.

In the chapter about Belarus I delimited the chapter to only have an overview of the history, because I didn't want too much focus on it. I rather wanted to give focus on the parts of Belarus today and its political background, but still keep it as understandable as possible. The chapter about Cuba is a much delimited chapter as the state has a very long history and which I have chosen to focus mainly on the 20th century and the decades of the Castro-regime. The delimitations of this thesis have been crucial in order for it to ever be possible to finish.

1.5 Methodology

I will in this section explain and describe the research methods I have used for this thesis. The research methods concerned are a case study of two states as well as a descriptive study and an explanatory study of the theoretical framework. The descriptive study of the theoretical framework is put forward as a qualitative study of democracy and while qualitative studies are the most general form of method to be used in research it is also one of the study approaches that is criticized, because the results in a thesis doesn't necessarily have to be generalized, and then used in other studies (Esaiasson, 2004).

1.5.1 Descriptive study

Descriptive study is the form of study where questions such as where, when, how, whom and who are to be examined and answered. The difference between a descriptive study and an explanatory study is that the explanatory study wants the answer to why something is, not just how it has come to be that situation. The descriptive study has more demands on itself rather than an explanatory study, because almost anyone can do a descriptive essay. A thesis of descriptive study of scientific nature therefore requires that the material for the theoretical framework presented is used in some way (Esaiasson, 2004, p.35).

In this thesis the theoretical framework of democracy is used to analyze the two cases of Belarus and Cuba. An important requirement for a scientist to use the descriptive study on a case study is that the case study then can answer the question of "a case of what?", meaning that if the scientist can't explain what the case is about, the descriptive study won't be useful (Esaiasson, 2004, p.36). Using descriptive study means that I as a researcher want to make a complicated matter more understandable (Punch, 1998, p.15). In this thesis I want to make democracy, which is a quite complicated concept, understandable and then use it as a variable for my analysis.

The thesis is not only looking at the importance of democracy, but it also brings up two other important concepts that are essential for Western democracy, or liberal democracy, to sustain. These two concepts are rule of law and civil society. I want to address the concepts because I want to explain what they are and why they are important to a liberal democracy.

1.5.2 Explanatory study

I find that the thesis is not only a descriptive study, but an explanatory study as I use the theoretical framework to prove whether or not it is possible for a democratic program to be applicable in a state that has not experienced democracy before. Using a theory and testing it is one of the classical examples of how research is done. Why I see my thesis as being an explanatory study where a theory is being tested is because the other side of the explanatory study rather puts the cases in a study in focus and wants to explain what has happened in the cases. The thesis is therefore a theory being tested as it is tested upon two cases. I chose to use the theoretical framework in this thesis because of what significance liberal democracy and rule of law have today in the modern society (Esaiasson, 2004).

1.5.3 Case study

A case study is where an object or state is studied in detail and that the methods used for the study is appropriate. When doing a case study the general objective is to develop an understanding of the case that is as full and detailed as possible for the reader to under-

stand what it is about. The purpose of a case study differs as the purpose might only be interesting for the particular case in the thesis or has a more general idea that the outcome and conclusion might be of interest for other case studies (Punch, 1998, p.150).

The results of the case studies I'm making in this thesis for Belarus and Cuba is mainly of interest for these two cases alone. This is because the results of this thesis doesn't really apply to others as I in my analysis will use conditions for a state to be democratic that I see as important and therefore they are formed from my perspective and knowledge that I will acquire during the process of this thesis.

1.5.4 Criticism of methodology

The methodology I have chosen was for me the most obvious one as I am familiar with case studies from the previous thesis I did on the bachelor level as well as qualitative research. It wouldn't have been impossible for me to use other forms of methodology for this thesis, as an example I could've made a quantitative study where I used statistics and data to compare democratic regimes and non-democratic regimes as well as looking at the different conditions that are needed in order for a state to be democratic. Though this definitely was a possibility, it didn't seem as something that would fit my purpose and my problem in this thesis. I found that doing a study of quantitative research was outside of my interests and if I would've made a statistical research I might've had to change the structure of the thesis. I believe that a case study that I decided to use combined with explanatory and descriptive study was the best way for me to go as it then would give me a range of material that would be useful and I would then be able to use the theory I had chosen. With a quantitative study with statistical data I would've had other purpose questions and the questions I know are to answer would not have fitted.

1.6 Sources

This thesis has a variety of sources that stretches from books to reports to news articles. The thesis is primarily built upon resources that are secondary because it is quite hard to get reliable information from the two states' homepages. The secondary resources are as mentioned books about democracy, about the two countries as well as news articles and reports that are found on reliable web pages on the internet. These resources found on the internet have had search words: *Cuba, democracy, liberal democracy, Belarus, Constitution of Cuba, waves of Democracy*. These search words have been used on search engines such as Google and Academic Elite Search.

1.6.1 Criticism of sources

For the sources used in the chapter titled democracy I have used sources that are mainly literature and some scientific articles. I believe that these resources have been reliable and valid as they have independently of each other provided information and facts that I now have used in my thesis. There is of course a huge amount of literature and resources on this subject that I haven't used, either because it hasn't been attainable or it hasn't been the right kind of resource for the purpose of my thesis and theoretical framework. The chapter on democracy and the sub-chapters has in my view had reliable information as it is also what I as a citizen and a member of a society experiences.

The choices of sources for chapters 3 and 4 concerning Belarus and Cuba does at some sections not seem to be sufficient, however when researching the topics there hasn't always been attainable information. Reasons for the information being unattainable are documents being unavailable through library or required the researcher to have a subscription of the journal that the document has been published in. Not all material has been unattainable, but was not used because the source has been questionable and the material has been irrelevant for the subject. Therefore there are controversial authors used, but the information and material that they have provided appears to be valid due to the contents and the reaffirmation that the authors give each other by giving the similar material in their research. The information on both Belarus and Cuba has at times been restrained, especially on information on Belarus because of limitations such as restriction of the freedom of press and freedom of speech.

The articles used in this thesis are either news articles or debates. The reliability of these articles is somewhat limited and can be argued not even truthful, however the articles used in this thesis are retrieved from sources such as the Economist, the Guardian and the BBC News, three sources of information that I have found to be honest and reliable in their source of information. It is always difficult when dealing with states that are very isolated and closed and doesn't allow free press to the extent as one might wish to find information that is truly reliable. The information that comes from inside these states is more likely less reliable and valid and somewhat tweaked to favor the state that holds the control.

Due to the difficulties with not knowing Spanish and Russian I have had to rely on English language only, giving me a tougher starting point. I can then only rely on material that is in English or Swedish. The material can then be at times skewed to one point of view and that can give the material reliability problems. However I do believe that by using the material I have found my sources are reliable as I have used articles and debating articles from The Economist, The Guardian and the BBC, all of which have different kinds of starting points in where they get their information as well.

1.7 Outline

Chapter 1, which we are in now deals with the problem of the thesis, the purpose and questions, method and sources and the criticism of the sources used. Chapter 2 will deal with what is the theoretical framework of democracy where it will be defined and also it will bring up the concepts of rule of law and civil society. Chapter 3 discusses the case of Belarus, "the last dictatorship in Europe". Chapter 4 deals with the case of Cuba. Chapter 5 will be the analysis, it is divided into two categories, one that deals with democracy in Belarus, the second will deal with democracy in Cuba, and lastly in chapter 5 there is a conclusion. The thesis ends with a reference list.

2 Democracy's history

There has to be clarity about democracy when we are to define it. Democracy is not a governmental form that is easy to define or to describe. It doesn't have a clear view of what it is and what it is suppose to do. If that was true we wouldn't need democracy to be explained. We would simply know that democracy was the best governmental form, but that has not been clear. It is why mankind has since ancient Greece debated and explored the different governmental forms of monarchy, authoritarianism, feudalism and lastly democracy. In this chapter we will explore what democracy is and concentrate on the late nineteenth-century and twentieth-century development of democracy, focusing on the three waves and what kind of impacts they had on democracy as a whole. We will also look into the concept of rule of law. Rule of law is an important concept, because without it there cannot be a democratization process that is successful and sustainable. Civil society is a concept that we will look closer into because it has not been stated what type of civil society is workable with the modern Western democracy.

2.1 The historical aspect of democracy

Theory and practice of democracy have since ancient Greece been highly criticized and it is only in recent decades that democracy has become an overall accepted form of governance that is sustainable. Fascism, Nazism and Stalinism that have colored the history of the European twentieth-century history are all evidence of this. There are political thinkers that don't see democracy as being a governmental form to be further discovered. They have therefore proclaimed the West as triumphal over all political and economic alternatives with its form of democracy (Held, 1995, p.3). If this is true, there wouldn't be a need for any further investigation to what democracy is, but the history of twentieth-century Europe and the war in Iraq, the changes on Cuba that has come forward since Fidel Castro's resignation, all of this shows that the end of history has not been reached yet. We will therefore look further at what democracy has been like in the 20th century and what significance it has had.

2.1.1 The waves of democracy

The democratization process began in the nineteenth century; however it became even more present during the first two decades of the twentieth century. The process that had taken its first steps in the nineteenth century showed that there was a will for change. The American civil war came to be the turning point for democracy in the United States when slavery was abolished and the black men became equal in the eyes of the state and received the same right as the white men, the right to vote (Hadenius, 2001, p.22).

The European wave of democratization

The first democratization process had its greatest impact in Europe. In the beginning of the 20th century the democratic countries were counted to only be a merely few, most of Asia and the states of Africa were colonies and ruled by European powers. States like Germany, Japan and the Ottoman Empire had in the early 20th century begun to experience some democratic elements such as introducing a parliament, drawing up a Constitution to define the powers that various institutional bodies would be in control of. The states in Latin America had for a long time experienced elections, though there was complexity in the pre-elections with violent intimidation and that the counts of the votes were deceitful.

Back in Europe the elected parliaments had gained power while the monarchs had weakened. Still, there was much work left to be done (Markoff, 1996, p.72).

While the increase in democratic institutions continued, the number of democratic states increased, and in the early 1920s there were approximately twenty-two democratic states. Most of the democratization process had been about changing the election process, for example in Italy where the restrictions on male voting had been eliminated, as well as introducing secret ballots in Argentina and institute direct elections of senators by voters in the United States (Markoff, 1996, p.73). During this stage of democratization the First World War broke out. It had different effects on the democratization process. On one hand the democratization process came to a stop as the First World War had democracy coming out not as victorious as the world had hoped for. This became evident when the communists in Russia took over the reign in the February Revolution in 1917; it inspired other groups in other states to take similar actions. In Italy the fascists, led by Mussolini, and the Nazis led by Hitler in Germany decided that actions similar to the one in Russia were only beneficial for the states. The fascists and the Nazis wrote themselves as being democratic institutions, adopting Constitutions that ensured them the 'right' kind of power (Hadenius, 2001, p.22-23).

On the other hand, democracy wasn't only failing after the war, but it was winning ground in some states. Finland is one good example of this. The state had, up until that point, been part of the Russian Empire. After the war it experienced a development towards autonomous democratic institutions that later became free from subordination to Russia. In terms of democracy and the revival, the First World War had had its greatest negative impact on the European states, but states outside the European borders were experiencing the positive sides of democratic elements. Constitutions with democratic tendencies were written in Mexico, Turkey and Japan (Markoff, 1996, pp.74-75).

The democracy process, as has been mentioned above, took a halt between the two world wars. The democratic advancement accelerated in Western democracies that had won the First World War, but though some of the social movements that occurred in Western world claimed to be democratic movements to change the authoritarian regimes, some were clearly not. Democratic systems began to lose, as well as gain, grounds; however, by the time that the democracy seemed to gain enough ground, it was pushed back by movements such as the Italian Fascist party coming to power and the similar movements occurring in Europe. The effect that the Italian Fascist party had was that they denounced the competitive parties and any parliamentary debates, two very important components of democracy. Patterns, symbols, and conceptions became known to the outside world. Germany and Spain took Italian movements to their hearts and by the early 1930s; the democratization process had been completely overturned (Markoff, 1996, pp.76-77).

The fall of democracy didn't only concentrate itself to Europe, but moved over the Atlantic Ocean and as far as to Latin America. As the Second World War began, democracy in states like Czechoslovakia fell as Germany by military force abolished it, as well as they did in Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg and France. Finland would also be suffering from the fall of democracy from the east and the Soviet Union. After the war broke out in 1939, the democracies had diminished to only be ten in the world and it seemed that there was no end to the decrease (Hadenius, 2001, pp.22-23). Outside of Europe, the antidemocratic forces had followed the movements that had occurred in Europe and both Brazil and Argentina were seized by anti-democratic forces in 1930, Japan had in its semi-democracy diminished and eliminated the democratic aspects, however the over-

run of the European continent by Nazi Germany would be seen as the most dramatically change and removed of democratic governments of that time (Markoff, 1996, p.77).

Post-war democratization

The Second World War became the reason for the democratic processes to come to full stop. The wave of democratization that had been going on for the first thirty years of the twentieth century appeared to have seized to exist. The victory over Germany and its allies by the combined forces of the Soviet Union and Western democracies in 1945 did, however, inaugurate a new, larger democratization wave. Europe was divided into east and west, having the Soviet Union controlling the Eastern Europe, while the United States' forces had dominant control in Western Europe. The democratic regimes that once had been turned over and overruled in the war were with the help of the US and the allies restored. In Italy, West Germany, Austria, Greece, Japan, and South Korea new democratic systems were installed (Markoff, 1996, p.77). Outside of the major participants of the Second World War the return of democracy to Latin America showed that democracy once more was winning ground in the world. A major effect after the war was that the European democracies that had been colonial powers were beginning to abandon the colonies in Asia and Africa, leaving the states to become independent and sovereign on their own (Hadenius, 2006, p.27).

It seemed to go better for the Latin American states and even more for some of the countries in the north of the South American continent. Venezuela attempted on a democratic rule as early as in 1948 when the Democratic Action Party came to power. In Costa Rica, there had already been a long tradition of peaceful transitions known and they were well associated with the Constitution they drew up in 1949 that would calm a civil war that had broken out the previous year (Markoff, 1996, p.78). The previous colonies in Africa introduced democratic forms of governing and it would seem that democracy once more would have won another victory (Hadenius, 2001, p.27). The European states that were assisting in helping the states to reintroduce democracy were in the process also democratized, as an example the French women were allowed to vote, plural voting in Great Britain was abandoned and women in Latin American states were extended the right to vote as well (Markoff, 1996, p.78).

This democratization process would not prevail; it would fall back, now it was concentrated to Latin America, Africa and in the south of Europe. At the beginning of the 1960s, the second wave of democratization had exhausted itself and it showed already during the 1950s that some of the authoritarian characteristics had been adapted by regimes (Huntington, 1991, p.19). In Africa the democracies fell, in Latin America as well in Latin America the governments had their people endure torture, murder and disappearances, the military regimes reentered the political scene and were far more brutal than before. The authoritarian rule was reintroduced, either as a military- or one party-rule. The picture of the world had once more changed, quite radically and while the military regimes took over the continents of Africa and Latin America, the eastern Europe suffered the tyranny and authoritarian rule of the Soviet Union, while Spain, Portugal and that the military abolished democracy in Greece at the end of the 1960s (Hadenius, 2001, p.27).

It is said that the fallback to authoritarianism was most dramatic in Latin America with the start of a military intervention in Peru, in 1962 that altered the results of an election. Following were military coups in Brazil, Bolivia in 1964, in Argentina 1966. Ecuador and Uruguay and Chile fell in 1972 and 1973. The difference in the Latin American states from

other states with authoritarian regimes was that the military regimes were applying a new type of political system called “bureaucratic authoritarianism” (Huntington, 1991, p.19).

Bureaucratic authoritarianism refers to the style of military dictatorship that reflects a phenomenon in Latin America where leadership of professionalized armies passed to the sons of the middle class that committed themselves to modernize the infrastructure in the societies. The believers of the bureaucratic authoritarianism are convinced that a democratically elected regime can't take hard measures in order to curb inflation, reassure foreign and domestic investors and accordingly then quicken the economic growth to a point where democracy safely can be practiced (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2009).

Democratization wave in the modern world

The thoughts of democracy only thriving in special conditions were beginning to convince the social scientists of this time and it seemed as if there was no light in the end of the tunnel, but the democratization process had not stopped. The third wave of democratization began in the latter part of the twentieth century. It has been said that the day when the third wave started was on April 25, 1974, in Lisbon, Portugal. The coup that eventually would bring down the dictator, Marcello Caetano, was successful in its plans, but the intentions for a democracy had not been thought over. It marked itself as a movement towards change because it was not common that a *coup d'état* introduced a democracy, it was more frequent that *coups d'état* overthrew them. The democracy didn't enter the scene automatically after the fall of the dictatorship, but it did help to bring back popular, social and political forces that had been suppressed during the dictatorship (Huntington, 1991, p.3-4). Though the changes for democracy have been many, they've all been in favor for democracy. As the development of democracy has progressed in the thirty countries that turned from authoritarian regime to either be reintroduced or just introduced to democracy, there has been constant positivity for the development (Hadenius, 2001, pp.29-31). The movements towards democracy gained both strength and legitimacy.

The new wave of democracy had its resistance and setbacks; it still seemed that the movement was taking on a different kind of character that eventually would be seen as a global tide moving across the world. As the democracy wave settled in Europe, it moved to Latin America in the end of the 1970s Ecuador, Bolivia and Argentina were pulled towards democratic regimes, in the end in Latin America there were only two states left that would be non-democratic, Mexico and Cuba (Hadenius, 2001, p.27-29). The wave also found itself manifest in Asia, India and Turkey were some of the countries taking in the democracy, as well as Taiwan loosening some of their restrictions on political activity, creating a democratic political system. South Korea found itself being ruled by the opposition after the military government had won a questionable election (Huntington, 1991, pp.21-23).

The communist world finally had their moment in the democratic wave as Hungary began to transit to a multiparty system in 1988, the Soviet Union produced an election for a national congress in 1989 causing several of the Communist Party leaders to see themselves defeated (Huntington, 1991, pp.21-23). The democratization wave also found itself back to the eastern European block where a significant symbol for the success of democracy, the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989, came to mark an ending and a new beginning for several of the states under the rule of the Soviet Union. These are only some examples of what the third wave of democracy did to the world, but as each wave of democracy has occurred, more countries have been involved and the geographical area that has been involved has grown bigger with each wave. It has been profitable to be a part of a wave of democracy, even if it has been short. The experience of democracy has helped to brew the democracy

when new attempts have been made (Hadenius, 2001, pp.27-31). *The April coup* in Portugal, as it would become known as, would set off a beginning of a democratic wave that for the first fifteen years would bring as many as thirty countries to shift from authoritarianism to democracy (Huntington, 1991, p.4).

2.2 The meaning and definition of democracy

Democracy literally means ‘rule by the people’ in Greek (Birch, 2001, p.73). The English word for democracy is derived from the French ‘démocratie’ (Held, 2006, p.1), but its origins from Greek derives it from ‘demokratia’ that has been composed by the two words *demos*, which means ‘people’ and *kratein* (Ball & Dagger, 2009, p.20), or *kratos* (Held, 2006, p.1), which means ‘rule’.

It is when law enforcement and rule-making appears to be justified that we see them as democratic. Whether or not this is true, the theory and practice of democracy has since ancient Greece been highly criticized. The commitment to democracy is relatively speaking a very recent phenomenon (Held, 2006, p.1). Today there are 123 of 192 countries that see themselves as democracies (Freedom House, 2009), but those 123 countries have not had an easy road to create and sustain democracy. Fascism, Nazism and Stalinism have together been close to abolish the democracy altogether as a form of government. Yet as we saw above in this chapter, democracy has survived these struggles (Held, 2006, p.1).

It is clear that for as long as there have been studies of democratic politics there have been as many theoretical definitions of democracy as it has been political theorists. The definition of democracy can be divided into a maximalist and a minimalist definition, however, one should not zero in at only one of the definitions because the minimalist definition, introduced by Joseph Schumpeter, only takes into account that democracy is when individuals are allowed to vote in free and fair elections to choose their representatives in the government (Lipset and Lakin, 2004, p.19-20). The criterion for free and fair elections is a widely accepted criterion for democracy (Huntington, 1991, p.11), but it is not sufficient to completely understand democracy as a whole in the modern world, which is why we in the chapter about the model of democracy will look at the whole liberal democracy and not just one point of view.

Democracy in the modern world has not had a definition that has seemed to be consistent, but the debate has resulted in three approaches that can define democracy and find it sufficient. That is that democracy is the will of the people, the common good and the procedures that constitutes the government that represents the citizens. The citizens should be actively involved in democracy (Huntington, 1991, p.6), but the modern definition also legitimizes the rules, laws and policies that are stipulated by the state through the state’s Constitution. The Constitution exists for the purpose of regulating how the state should be organized and who should control the official authorities (Ross, 1967, p.89). Rules and laws can only legitimize the state if they are seen as democratic (Held, 1995, p.3).

As can be seen, the defining of democracy is not as easy as one might think. It is the history and the complexity of the idea of democracy as well as the conflicting conceptions that makes up a democracy (Held, 2006, p.1).

3 Democracy and its prerequisites

In this chapter the concept of liberal democracy, also known as Western democracy, will be looked further into. For democracy to be possible in a state there are two prerequisites that need to be fulfilled. The two prerequisites are rule of law and civil society.

Democracy during the twentieth century has developed into several variants, but those who we can see as being the major models of the twentieth century can be divided into three. These are the liberal representative democracy, direct democracy, and the one-party state model of democracy. The direct democracy and the one-party state model will not be part of this thesis as it is the liberal democracy that dominates in Western society and is the one that has been derived from the above mentioned, general definition of democracy. We can say as much about direct democracy that it is considered the original democracy and it is from here that we find the political ideals of equality, liberty, laws and justice of today's Western political thinking.

The ideals of direct democracy are also found in the liberal democracy. The one-party state system of democracy is highly debated to whether or not it really is a democracy or if it should be considered as more of an authoritarian rule. It is influenced by Karl Marx and he viewed that the state is an extension of civil society and not included in the civil society. According to Marx, it is considered to be a replacement of liberal democracy because eventually the liberal democratic system will fail (Held, 1995).

Rule of law and civil society are important for democracy because they give the state limited power and forces the state to take actions that doesn't benefit the state itself, but the state and the whole society. Civil society, as will be further shown in chapter 3.3, balances out power between state and society by having leverage consisting of organizations and people who work for the benefit of the democratic state and do not hesitate to raise their voice to any

3.1 Liberal democracy

The liberal representative democracy derives itself from the liberalistic views that began to emerge in the sixteenth- and seventeenth century with the political thinkers Thomas Hobbes and John Locke as the introducers to the need of establishing liberty of the individual and the sufficient power for the state that then would guarantee social and political order (Held, 2006, p.61). The definition of liberal democracy is a complexity of theories that are for the classic notions of liberal democracy as well as theories that looks at liberal democracy as in where democracy is necessary for the realization of liberal ideas. Liberal democracy tends to be difficult to define because of the different political viewpoints that have put their mark on liberal democracy, it has also affected the definition of democracy as well (Holden, 1993, p.15).

The definition of liberal democracy can be taken even further because of its complexity and what it is built upon when it comes to the meaning of the words. The structure of liberal democracy implies that the regime it describes is not a pure or simple type of any of the different governmental forms, but a combination of two principles of government. The word 'liberal' tends to hold the idea of the protection of rights, limited government, and deliberate decision-making processes; some of these will be discussed further in this chapter. The other word, 'democracy', points toward the rule by people and that the government exists through the democratic understanding of justice, in which the government is to

promote and mirror the interests of the majority and not of the minority. These two concepts have developed independently, but are two constituent parts of liberal democracy (Ceaser, 1990, p.8).

The political theorists, that study liberal democracy, have been known to only see this governmental form as the only possible and most effective political democratic system, all others are seen as bogus (Holden, 1993, p.15). Liberal democracy has become the governmental form that is envied by those who do not possess it, and also the model that more nations are aspiring to achieve (Ceaser, 1990, p.5). While liberal democracy and democracy are to be two different kinds of governmental forms, the two have become very closely attached to each other and it has come to a point when democracy and liberal democracy are treated as being the same. However, one should be careful of doing so when democracy and liberal democracy have two different meanings. While democracy means rule by the people, liberal democracy's meaning is that the government's power and authority are somewhat limited. The limitation is shown in written Constitution or bill of rights (Holden, 1993, p.15-17).

Described above is a point of view that liberalistic thinkers describe as the classical viewpoint and there is a side of liberalists that do believe this is the best view of liberal democracy. The other side of liberal democracy consists of political scientists, who see democracy as a necessity for the realization of liberal ideas, but both the classical viewpoint and the people of the newer viewpoint agree on the fact that limit on the government's authority and power is important. Liberal democracy is therefore a political system that should give people the right to make the basic decisions that are, for good or bad, for the important matter of public policy, the system also provides a limitation on these decision makers, putting them in a restricted area because of the limitation set on the legitimacy of that area. For a liberal democracy to actually work this is not something that actually occurs, in fact in a properly working liberal democracy the people doesn't make decisions that are of important matters of public policy because they aren't entitled to make those kinds of decision (Holden, 1993, p.17-18).

Drawing knowledge from what we have learned from historical political theorists, the thought that Holden brings up is similar to the one of how the relationship between the sovereign and the society should be in the view of the liberal theorists of Hobbes, Locke and also Montesquieu and Rousseau to some extent. It is to be noted that of these liberal thinkers it is Hobbes that stands on the outskirts, his ideas of the sovereign being the head of the state and society didn't go well with most of the upcoming philosophers after him. The decisions to be made, according to Hobbes, could only be made by a legitimate sovereign, one that had been chosen by the people when they had given him their support and submission and formed a contract with him. The legitimacy of the sovereign only came from the sovereign's subjects, because if they didn't consent to the sovereign being in authority over them, he would not be legitimate and would have to step down (Held, 2006, p.61-62).

The reason to why public authority should be limited, or any governing within liberal democracy for that matter, is because liberals of the classic notion want to ensure the individual freedom or liberty. The human rights or the basic individual rights that had been seen as being the natural rights for each individual are corresponding to the classical thought of liberal democracy, because it is only possible to secure these rights and protect them if the state is limited in its power (Holden, 1993, p.17-18). The thoughts of liberty and rights are consistent with John Locke and his political thoughts that during the time of his living life were in contradiction to Hobbes. In fact John Locke was one of the many critics of

Hobbes's political thought, Locke on the other hand saw first of all that without trust in each other it wouldn't be possible for individuals to entrust their security in an authoritative figure above them, second of all Locke found it more acknowledgeable that the sovereign or the institution of government should be the instrument which provided the security needed to ensure that individuals would keep their rights, liberty, life and estate (Held, 2006, p.62-63).

Humans are to be free and equal because they will then act and think rationally. The rights that they then will be appointed will be of the rights to dispose of their own labor; the right to property, which is one of the rights that are fundamental; it will give the people the right to life, liberty and estate. The subjects' rights will not be transferred to the political realm as the government was formed, except the rights to lawmaking and enforcement (Held, 2006, p.62-63).

For liberal democracy's history there has been a large amount of famous political philosophers who modern political researchers and scientists ascribe to be contributors and fathers of liberalism and liberal democracy, but one philosopher that seems to be overlooked at many times is Alexis de Tocqueville. Tocqueville found it interesting to analyze the case of America in his book *Democracy of America* where he looked upon both sides of the constitutional-republican equation with liberal democratic eyes. Tocqueville was mostly concerned with the traditions of a society, such as the beliefs, the habits and the sum of moral and intellectual dispositions. These civilized traditions were needed by the citizens in a liberal democracy. The traditions help to distinguish and separate the public and private spheres. Liberal democracy and the traditions of liberal democracy can be viewed as both republican and constitutional. The republican side of liberal democracy requires that there is some sort of civic-mindedness. The citizens of a liberal democracy are required to have some degree of individual pride as well as possessing some common sense and a jealous spirit of independence. A quality that also is important for liberal democracy is the active engagement in society, this quality is not as noted or counted for as others, but it does hold an important position. It involves that the citizen are active and have some political knowledge (Ceaser, 1990, pp.15, 17-18).

Liberal democracy in a state has to be maintained, but how should it be maintained, and how much active maintenance is required? The answer isn't one that can be told without some knowledge of what political knowledge does for the liberal democracy in a regime. In fact the answer holds two different views. One view claims that a liberal democracy is easily maintained. It means that the state that upholds a liberal democratic view can at most times be self-regulated. The other view is the opposite; it holds that a liberal democracy must be superintendent. This can't be written into a constitution or a set of laws, instead it has to come from being readapted and adjusted by secondary institutions and of intellectual strategies (Ceaser, 1990, pp.19-20).

Western liberal democracy is supposed to be a modern regime that can encompass a nation state on the principle of individual rights and being governed by the majority of the population. While the liberal democracy requires maintenance it is the most difficult one to maintain. However, liberal democracy allows the citizens of a regime to form themselves and define their ideal life for their own individuality in society. The citizens are allowed to develop on their own within a liberal democracy (Ceaser, 1990, pp.26, 30).

A true liberal form of government has separated the realm of politics from the realms of society. This is because politics is not supposed to control the realms of society, political authority should only have control within its own sphere otherwise it will overstep its

boundaries. The rights of society to control itself privately come from the principle of letting the modern society safeguard liberty. Tocqueville described that in order for a liberal democracy to maintain the aim of protecting the freedom of civil society there has to be some sort of power in society that can resist the state, as well as a will among the citizen to limit government power and protect their rights. There has to be an opposition to promote the power and will among the society (Ceaser, 1990, pp.33, 35).

The political culture that upholds liberal democracy tends to be described as a product of not only law, but of philosophic and religious views as well. Within liberal democracy it has become evident that political science has found its place in society and constitutes an important function for a liberal regime. What political science do for a liberal regime is that political legislators, elected officials, religious leaders, poets, scientists and so on are all influenced by political science as they help to direct society. Political science does this because of the dispersed authority in a liberal democracy. What a liberal democracy also does for a state is that it depoliticizes direct political control and regulation (Ceaser, 1990, pp.37-38).

We've seen from above that liberal democracy is not an easy form of government, it is quite the opposite. Liberal democracy does have its critics and while the criticism of liberal democracy is not included this time, it is not forgotten. There are those who believe that liberal democracy might be on its last round and will be replaced by a much more moralistic and religious growth in the civil society. However, it is now possible to set up a list of important attributes that are required for there to be a democratic regime of liberalistic view in a state. From the chapter about liberal democracy, I have derived several conditions that I find to be the most important conditions for a liberal democracy in the sense of how Western democracy looks today. The conditions that will be used for the analysis of the states of Cuba and Belarus are:

- Free and fair elections.
- A written constitution or bill of rights that regulates and limits the government's power and authority for the benefit of the state and society.
- The sovereign in a liberal democracy should have institutions of government that ensures the security of individuals' rights, liberty, life and estate.
- Citizens in a state are to be free and equal within the society and before the laws and regulations the state has provided.
- The representatives of the state, the sovereign and the government are to mirror the majority of the people.
- Politics within a liberal democracy should not control the realms of society that are separated from the realm of politics. Modern society safeguards liberty of the citizens and will keep the political authority focused on how to govern the state.
- A power in society should be allowed within a liberal democracy that can function as a resistance to the state and make sure the government in control doesn't overstep its boundaries.

3.2 Rule of Law

Dealing with liberal democracy and seeing where it is headed, it is apparent that it includes not only liberalistic views but also constitutional conditions where the government is constitutional, which goes hand in hand with what the liberal democracy believes the government should be, limited. Authority in a constitutional government should be divided among different political institutions, giving each of the institution sufficient power to stand on their own and hold against their own against other institutions (Ceaser, 1990, p.9). The constitutional government and the liberal democracy are connected and with something that needs to be a part of any state in order for a state to uphold democracy, rule of law.

The states of Western politics have for decades and centuries developed and established one of the essential pillars for democracy to rely upon, rule of law. It has in the last two decades or so become a respected part of Western political philosophy and where democracy can be found, rule of law can be found. For states that still are in the midst of transition themselves from one governmental form to another, the rule of law is key, developing it and then establish it is the cure. What the rule of law is suppose to do is that it is there to help states find a good base to stand on in their reform towards political and economic liberalization, however it is not so easy to do. The way for rule of law to help with the reforms is that it implies several initiatives that have to be made by those countries who want to reform themselves. The initiatives are among others rewriting constitutions, laws, and regulations. The thing with rule of law and its reform is that it will only succeed if the obstacles can be dealt with and the result of the dealing is a success, the major obstacle is of political and human nature, meaning that rule of law can only work if the leaders doesn't refuse to be ruled by the law (Carothers, 1998, p.95-96).

How do one define rule of law? There are several ways that the principle can be defined, one is that it is a system with laws that are of public knowledge, clear in what they mean and everyone abides bid them, therefore are equal in front of the law. The laws within rule of law exist to protect the political and civil liberties that have the status of universal human rights, even though this has only been true for the past fifty years (Carothers, 1998, p.96-97). In order to get a clear picture of what rule of law is and do, it is important to look back on its beginning to find the components that started the development into the rule of law that is seen today, one can definitely say that it is in some ways correct to say that the origins of rule of law began in ancient Greece, but because of it losing ground during the Dark Ages, it is also incorrect. The rule of law has found its footing in the ancient Greece and Roman Empire, as well as the medieval ages and centuries much closer to our modern times.

As has been said, rule of law is often traced back to the classical origins of the Greeks, however this might not be the exact truth, the Greek ideas of rule of law can be used as exemplary models as the thoughts of rule of law, the traditions of it were not established in the world until a thousand years after the superiority of the Greeks. If the Greek thought hadn't been lost during the Dark Ages, this might have been different. One of the main ideas that the Greek political thinkers have left for the modern time and the modern way of looking at rule of law is that all are equal in front of the law. When there is equality in the law, it means that everyone from low class to upper class is all bound to follow the law (Tamanaha, 2004, p.7).

The principle of rule of law is built upon several conceptions. These conceptions have helped the principle to be looked upon as the very foundation of life in the modern world

today. Without rule of law it wouldn't be as easily, or even legitimate, to call our Western world democratic. The concepts that build up this principle are formal justice, the regular and impartial administration of public rules, or "justice as regularity". What happens with these two different concepts is that they become rule of law when they are applied to the legal system. The rules that are to be within a legal system have to be just and fair and if so they can be accepted by men and pay out the benefits that result, as well as showing that there are obligations that needs to be attended as there are legitimate expectations that arise (Rawls, 1972, pp.235-236).

The idea of a legal system as the rule of law implies that a state should have the demand on laws that they should be known to everyone, that they have a clearly defined meaning, and that the statutes aren't used to harm particular individuals and only used generally in statement and intent. Because a state should have a legal system, in order for them to also be seen as democratic it is important that the rules in a legal system are there to serve to organize social behavior and not be changed because the sovereign thinks they need to be changed (Rawls, 1972, pp.237-238).

Nobody stands above the law, everyone is equal, including political leaders that have been picked to sovereign and lead the society. These men and women have to accept the rule of law as the natural law and one that stands above them (O'Donnell, 2004). This characteristic of rule of law can be traced as far back as to the ancient Greeks, and it is found that the classical notion of rule of law also holds the condition that while new laws could pass they are not to disregard the preexisting laws and therefore the new laws are subject to them. It was a way and still is today, to protect the democratic system and by doing that obligating the principle of popular sovereignty to be subordinate to the principle of sovereignty of laws (Tamanaha, 2004, p.8).

The formulation of rule of law has not only taken its construction from the Greek thoughts, but as well, for good and for bad, from the Romans. However, there are those who believe that what mostly came from the Romans to form and construct the rule of law is negative, and only one Roman stood for the positive, Cicero. Cicero's notion of what should come highest, the individual or the law, is that it is the law that should be magistrate and that when living under a king it would be the same as living under "a body of law for a free community." Translating this into modern times, it does serve an important part in the modern world of democracy. It could easily have been said that living under the government's rule is the same as "living under a body of law for a free community" and still see that the government, the representatives of the public, are abiding by the same rules as the public. The rule of reason that Cicero saw as a natural law specifically stated that the law that everyone were to abide had to be for the good of the community and that it should be just, and with it the community would preserve the safety and happiness for its citizens (Tamanaha, 2004, p.11).

Furthermore there is another era that has given the modern notion of rule of law a substantial mark. The Medieval age might've put a lid on the classical thoughts of the Greeks and Romans, but at the same time the Middle age developed three key contributions for the modern rule of law. These three sources of contribution to the construction of the rule of law as it looks today are the contest between kings and popes for supremacy, the Germanic customary law, and the Magna Carta. These three have contributed separately to the concept of rule of law. The contest between kings and popes have contributed by establishing the justice of the law, where it also is to be an external regulator of society and that there is to be justice for all people under the Christian faith. At this point in time, Christianity and

the Church was a big part of the political world and had in some parts taken over it completely (Tamanaha, 2004, p.15, 23).

Already in the medieval times there was a possibility to spot the liberal ideas that wouldn't come about until centuries later. It was the Germanic customary law that had notions of something that could resemble to the liberalistic view of rule of law in the sense that the customary law, the law itself was recognized by the people and complied. The legislation, then, was generally understood as a declaration and clarification of existing unwritten customary law, furthermore, during this time of political history were notions of property rights in motion, as it was stated that the king did not have the right to lightly seize the property of others (Tamanaha, 2004, p.23-24).

To uphold rule of law the institution that is central for this is the legal system, that is the courts, the prosecutors, and the police. There can be no influence or manipulation of the political sense because the state is to be under the law as well (Carothers, 1998, p.96-97). Findings in historical contexts have shown that the last of the greater impacts on the development and construction of the rule of law that can be derived from the medieval times were the Magna Carta. The Magna Carta set a concrete institutionalized component to the law system, the court and jury of peers, as well as emphasizing once more that all are equal under the law (Tamanaha, 2004, p.25).

The Magna Carta was a charter drawn up in England and signed in the 13th century. It has its own pillar to stand on in the history of events, because of its significant impact on the rule of law tradition. It became a symbol to struggle against arbitrary power, by mistake, and settled the knowledge that for a sovereignty to be able to actually sovereign he would need acceptance and support from the public and his subordinates, as well as hold he couldn't rule them without taking into consideration the interests of all free men. Furthermore the Magna Carta also helped to establish the right to be judged by court and not by the sovereign directly. It is not for the sovereign to judge upon a citizen, and no free man is to be taken or imprisoned against his or her will, or outlawed without a legal judging. It was to be fit for a sovereign to live by the laws and not above them, though the sovereign is sovereign through the law, he still will have to yield to it and govern accordingly (Tamanaha, 2004, p.25-27).

The legal system is supposed to be an aspect of social order, which would then bring definition, specificity, clarity and predictability into human interactions. There are some general characteristics that says that the laws that are established have to be possible to follow, meaning that they have to be reasonable and not place any unreasonable or behavioral demands on those that the laws are addressed to (O'Donnell, 2004). One important precept or condition that rule of law advocates is that similar cases are to be treated similarly. It means that without the precept actions of men can't be regulated, and it also means that actions committed aren't regulated in an equal and justified way. This is a criterion that forces the authority that has been assigned to regulate men's action, which is the courts and judges, to justify the distinctions made between one person and the other based on the legal rules and principles relevant to the case. It gives a required consistency in the judging and interpretation of all rules and justifications (Rawls, 1972, pp.237-238).

One important concept in rule of law is liberty. Liberty is a complex conception, built up by rights and duties defined by institutions, but it gives mankind freedom to do as they please within the limits of the legal system set up by the state. There are different kinds of liberties all specify different things that men are free to choose to do, and once we have chosen what we want to do, no one else is allowed to interfere with the action taken. This

is to be within reason of what the legal system's rules and principles say and not as free as going outside of those boundaries (Rawls, 1972, p.239).

One can distinguish four kinds of liberties that helps set up the rule of law and its structure. First of all it is important that one realizes that liberty doesn't mean freedom without consequences, some liberty must be sacrificed for the sake of the interest of personal security and social order. The four different kinds of liberties that regulate the freedom are; political liberty means that the individual is free to a certain extent, as long as the law allows it. The individual both rules and is ruled, an example of this self-rule is representative democracy. Legal liberty means that the individual is free to a certain extent as long as the government acts in accordance with preexisting law, the citizens of a country is therefore only subjects to law and is not to be succumbed by arbitrary power (Tamanaha, 2004, p.34).

The third kind of liberty is the one called personal liberty. Personal liberty deals with the degree of autonomy that individuals retain from after consenting to live under law. Personal liberty is constructed by the protections that are necessary to achieve that all individuals receive the right to pursue their own good in their own way. The fourth and final liberty that together with the other three, becomes a part of rule of law, and is important for the continuation and function of the rule of law, is the institutionalized preservation of liberty. This liberty is in effect when separate departments of the government have different kinds of power (Tamanaha, 2004, p.35).

There is a relationship between democracy and rule of law. It is shown because rule of law handles the individual rights that are core for democracy; they both stress the fact of institutions and processes that are rooted in democracy, as well as in rule of law. Based on the law there are basic elements of the modern market economy made, those of property rights and contracts made between citizens and the sovereign. It wouldn't be possible for any major economic institution to function properly if rule of law was nonexistent. One should, however, remember that rule of law is not a new idea; lately it has become the major talk and receiving more attention than usual because it's become such a central part to both democracy and the market economy (Carothers, 1998, p.97). Rule of law works with several dimensions that more or less explains the different qualities of democracy as well as the desirability of the rule of law (O'Donnell, 2004).

Rule of law's conditions for a state to prevail with liberal democracy can be found in the three following conditions:

- For democracy to exist there has to be rule of law present.
- Rule of law sets the prerequisite that all citizens are equal before the law. This includes the political leaders and legislators.
- The legal system should mirror the social order among the citizens.

In addition to the conditions for a liberal democracy on page 14, these conditions will also be used in the analysis on Cuba and Belarus.

3.3 Civil Society

It is a term that is well used in today's society, but the term civil society is not something that appeared recently. It stems from Eastern Europe and the Polish opposition during the 1970s. The civil society was said to be the solution to the Marxist crisis that started in 1968 with neo-Marxism turning into post-Marxism during the 1980s. The purpose was to reform ideologically, but they still wanted to keep the basic Leninist standpoint. This was that the state was an instrument in the bourgeois class society (Dahlkvist, 1995, p.153). The term civil society appears often when there is talk and discussion about democratization, democracy and more specifically liberal democracy. Alongside with market and democracy, the term civil society is part of the developmental panaceas that emerged in the 1980s. What civil society contributes to this panacea is a sociological counterpart to the market's economic sphere and the democracy's political sphere (White, 2004, p.6). However, in this thesis and this chapter we will not look upon what these three terms can do together, but only what civil society is about and what it does for democratization and liberal democracy.

State and civil society are not the same. The terms mean different things and it is important that the distinction between these two is made. In a Marxist view civil society means in a simple way "the people", while the state is looked upon as "the sovereignty" (Dahlkvist, 1995, p.164). The term civil society is however an elusive term, and while "the people" is one meaning, it is not the only meaning or definition because the term's elusiveness has given it a tendency to mean differently depending on how you use the term in a discussion (White, 2004, p.6). The liberal traditional usage of the term civil society doesn't just concern the society as a whole, but it means the whole society including the political government. This is where the elusiveness of the term also appears, as it obviously has a completely different meaning depending on whether or not the view is Marxist-Leninist or liberalistic (Dahlkvist, 1995, p.190).

Civil society has two sides; one is that civil society is an ideal type of concept that includes not only qualities of separation, but also autonomy, and voluntary association. The other side sets civil society takes these principles and embodies them to various degrees in an empirical world. This side gives no clear view of the boundaries and often shows that states and civil societies can play important roles for each other in establishing and improving themselves in various overlapping degrees. It is important as well to remember that while many might refer civil society as being political society in liberal democracy, this is not entirely true. A political society includes political parties and political leaders who can either strengthen or weaken the democratic system. The political parties and political leaders are crucial for discussions about the relationship between civil society and democratization efforts (White, 2004, p.12-13).

Civil society's has a role that is to undermine authoritarian governments is based on a set containing four requirements that will help contribute to an establishment in the state. The four requirements concerned are as follows (White, 2004, p.13-15):

- The balance of power between state and society. Here the favor lies with the society who can give a balanced opposition against the state which is one of the crucial characteristics of democratic regimes.
- Disciplinary role in relation to the state, which means that standards of public morality and performance are enforced as well as the improvement of accountability of politicians and administrators.

- There is a crucial role for organizations to play as an intermediary or transmission-belt between state and society.
- Lastly civil society has the opportunity to play a constitutive role. The role is played out by redefining the rules of the political game to be democratic.

In the concluding discussion of this thesis the requirements will be reflected and discussed in relation to Belarus and Cuba.

4 Belarus

This chapter is as you might have noticed from the title about Belarus, a state in Europe. It differs quite significantly from the former chapter where the theoretical framework was built up and will be used in the analysis to examine the questions asked. What chapter three will do is to present Belarus as one of the cases, one of the states that might be a possible candidate for introducing democracy. What will be looked into in this chapter is the history of Belarus, how the political background looks in Belarus during the 1990s and then how Belarus looks today. This chapter is going to be used for in order to see whether or not Belarus has any future and hope of being a democracy.

4.1 History of Belarus

Belarus is 207 600 km² and have a population that was in 2008 9,7 million people. It neighbors a total of five states; Russia in the north and east, Poland in the west, Ukraine in the south, and Lithuania and Latvia in the northwest (NE, 2009a). The country's history is filled with occupation, suppression and tyranny since the 13th and 14th centuries. The country has been occupied by Lithuania, Poland and Russia (UI, 2009a). Belarus was an agrarian country where the people were first of all farmers, the economy and politics were mostly dominated by the Polish, Russians and eventually Jews. During the 16th century, Polish culture dominated the influences of Belarus and it resulted in a persecution and repression of the Belarusian culture at the end of the 17th century. The Belarusian country was primarily agrarian with the Belarusian people first and foremost being farmers, the economy and politics were dominated by the Polish, Russians and eventually the Jews. During the 16th century the Polish culture had a big influence on Belarus (NE, 2009a).

The state was part of Lithuania and during the later part of the 16th century Poland and Lithuania went together and became a union, one state. The Belarusian people suffered in the 17th century when the Belarusian culture was persecuted and suppressed by the Polish (NE, 2009a). Several attempts of revolt against the Polish had been made by the Belarusian farmers, but they all failed, which caused them to flee their homeland. Between 1772 and 1795 Poland was divided three times, it resulted in Belarus becoming a part of the Russian Empire, the state lost its self-rule and Russia began a process where Belarus was to become more Russian. In 1840, the name Belarus was prohibited and the state was divided into Russian provinces (UI, 2009a).

The Belarusian people were not inclined to become a persecuted people and the sense of national independence grew during the 19th century. It continued with rebellion against the tsar in Russia, however, the rebellious farmers were no match for the Russian Army and the state continued to be in an occupied situation. In 1905, Russia lost a war against Japan leaving Belarus to want increased autonomy, the tsar was forced to acknowledge it and as a result the Belarusian language, literature and other Belarusian culture was once again allowed (UI, 2009a).

The first political parties in Belarus were founded in the first years of the 20th century. The political interest held a pro-Russian political view, as well as one that held ground from the 19th century of society; with slavery abolished, the rise of the agricultural class, industrialization and the expansion of the urban cities (NE, 2009a). After the February Revolution and the fall of the Russian monarchy in 1917, the Belarusian nationalists and socialists formed a council in Minsk that had a purpose to introduce self-rule in Belarus, however when the communist troops marched in to Minsk in November 1917 the council was dissolved. In

March, 1918 Minsk was once more invaded by German troops and most of Belarus became German in the peace at Brest-Litovsk. The Belarusian national republic was proclaimed the same year as a new state, but was not recognized by the occupying state, Germany. In the end, Germany retreated from Belarus, but the country didn't get a chance to become self-ruling, Belarus once again was under Russian rule and was proclaimed as a Belarusian socialist soviet republic January 1st, 1919. In addition to becoming an occupied state by Russia once more the state was merged with Lithuania to be a Lithuanian-Belarusian soviet republic (UI, 2009a).

When Lithuania and Belarus were separated in the beginning of the 1920s, Belarus continued to be a soviet republic that later became a soviet autonomous republic. It became divided between Poland and Russia in 1921 after a peace conference in Riga after the Russian-Polish war 1919-1920. The eastern part of the country became the socialistic soviet republic of Belarus, while Western part became Polish. Joseph Stalin had become the president, the leader of the Soviet Union and as eastern Belarus became a part of Soviet a hard-core pro-Russian politics was initiated. It abolished the independent agricultural class in the country; instead it introduced a devastating infrastructural change in the country (NE, 2009a). Instead the agriculture became collectivized, the Belarusian farmers tried to revolt against the regime, but the answer from Moscow was imprisonment and deportations of the people, as well as Belarusian nationalists were persecuted. Between the years of 1936 and 1938 there is estimation that about two million people became victims of the Stalinist terror (UI, 2009a).

The eastern part of Belarus that had become a part of Poland had from the beginning experienced a hard time and a tone from the Polish people that was hard and the result was, among others, an economic fall. It wasn't just Western Belarusian people that suffered from persecution. Those who lived in the eastern part were experiencing it as well from the Polish. When the communist red army marched in to the east of Poland in 1939, the people celebrated, but would soon realize that they had not been freed from peril. It was rather the opposite. Belarus experienced a severe blow to their population as the Soviet regime deported about 300 000 people from Western Belarus to soviet work camps between 1939 and 1941. The Second World War would come to be a disastrous war for Belarus. In 1941, Nazi Germany occupied Belarus and the persecutions and deportation and killing of Belarusians continued. The estimation is that about 2.2 million people died during the occupation, Jewish citizens being the ethnic group that suffered the most. Buildings were destroyed and cities like Minsk and Vitebsk were destroyed to the ground. When the red army once again marched in to the country, Belarusians fled to the west and under the Soviet regime the persecution and assault continued. On the order of Stalin those who had helped the Nazis or been in German work camps were deported (UI, 2009a).

Belarus declared itself to be a sovereign country in 1990. This proclamation had apparently been approved by Moscow. It gave Belarus the right to have its own military force, its own currency, and an independent domestic- and foreign policy. In August, 1991, Belarus was declared an independent state (UI, 2009a). It would however not be until in 1994 that the constitution that the Soviet Union had set up would be changed to a constitution that was declared to be post-Soviet. The first presidential election was held in July the same year. Alexander Lukashenka was elected president (NE, 2009a), the election was considered to be democratic and Lukashenka won because a lot of the voters were disappointed in the old politicians and his political program seemed to be working in favor for what the public believed in; fight against corruption, closer ties with Russia and a slowdown of the reformation in the country (UI, 2009a).

The parliamentary election held in 1995, resulted in the soviet conservatory politicians won. These politicians were not interested in any economical or political reformations, instead they continued on the same path as had been laid out for them during the Soviet regime. The parliamentary elections that have followed have only benefited those who are supporting Lukashenka's politics. Since the referenda in 1995, Russia and Belarus have come closer together, both economically and politically (NE, 2009a). In 1996 the constitution from 1994 was changed during a questionable and criticized national referendum. The change in the constitution granted president Lukashenka more power and authority. After this referenda Belarus was rumored to be the last dictatorship in Europe (UI, 2009a).

4.2 The political background of Belarus in the 1990s

On August 25th, 1991, Belarus declared its independence from the former Soviet system. This marked a change in the Belarusian history when it would be the second time in the state's history to become an independent sovereign state. The state had in the year before had parliamentary elections which had resulted in a short-term of success for the democrats, but it was the communist majority that prevailed (Korosteleva, Lawson & Marsh, 2003, p.3). Belarus had though been ill prepared for independence in 1991. There was no referendum on the question of independence, and the structure of leadership was not defined, at the time the authority was divided between the Speaker of the parliament and the Prime Minister (Marples, 2003, p.21).

The democratic success prevailed only until 1992 when new parliamentary elections were called for, however it was ignored by the old-fashioned parliament. The idea of having a nation has not been accepted by the majority population (Korosteleva et al, pp.3-4). Evidence of this is shown when it comes to, for example, the situation of language. In 1995, Russian became, together with Belarusian, the official state language (Marples, 2003, p.27). It was replaced in 1995 by a new multi-party legislature, having the external appearance change, but the internal appearance remained as it was. The parliament was dissolved in 1996 by Alexander Lukashenka, the first President of Belarus due to a change in the constitution that had been drafted in 1994 (Korosteleva et al, pp.3-4).

It is said that Belarus once held the structural foundation that democracy could have been built upon, but this foundation has been insufficient for the national consolidation (Korosteleva et al, 2003, 1, 4). However, it was shown already in 1991 that Belarus had no notion of democracy or alliances because there was no such form in Belarusian politics. There had never been a working alliance between the communists and former communists, as well as no alliance between the nationalists and communists on the other side (Marples, 2003, p.27). Due to structural and institutional factors, democratization in Belarus has been delayed. During the years of independence as a sovereign state that Belarus has experienced there has been no sight of any progress of democratization. Political parties have not been able to gain office or sustain the momentum for change; it was shown in the parliamentary elections of 1995 and of 2000. The different opinions and the petty disputes as well as the lack of co-operation gave no intention of a future in democracy (Korosteleva et al, 2003, p.1, 4).

The parties have not been so important among the electors because they don't win seats, the power is concentrated to President Alexander Lukashenka and while his rise to power has increased, the decrease for democracy has only become far more evident. An arbitrarily change in the constitution, not once, but twice, no free and fair elections, suppression of the media and parliament, the arresting, disappearance or the exile of uncountable opposi-

tion leaders, and the constant violation of civil and human rights, have caused Belarus to become isolated in the global society (Korosteleva et al, 2003, p.1,4).

The scaffoldings of democracy only conceal what really is going on inside the borders of Belarus, which is a dictatorial style of polity building. While Belarus on the outside might put up a face of democracy, within it is different environment. The institutional and structural environments within Belarus told outsiders that the legacies and inherited structures of the old Soviet have put democratic system consolidation in an unfavorable environment. The parties and other interest organization have very low ideological profile, and they aren't able to have full capacity for their organizations or finances. The presidential decision-making in the state dominates and the political system is fragile because of the inability for the opposition to capitulate on voters' preferences and the need for organization and finance. The state has a structural legacy that depends on Russia, a system of patronage, a weak state, and ineffective laws. These traits have been reinforced with the public's traditionalist adherence to a strong leadership which have resulted in a moderate nationalist stance and a pining for Soviet-era stability (Korotsteleva et al, 2003, p.6-7).

Why the state has been kept in such a strong hold by the president can mainly be found in the alterations of the constitution. As has been said it was changed not once, but twice. The first time in 1996 through a national referendum that got high criticism and was condemned as not legit by the observatory. One of the major changes that occurred during the referendum was that the power of the President increased. It meant that the president would hold the right to dissolve parliament if it failed to accept the choice of prime minister twice. The president's authority would also be enlarged with the decision on election dates, appoint judges, the times of parliamentary sessions, the officials of the Central Electoral Commission and half the members of the Constitutional Court (Marbles, 1999, p.89).

There seems to be three key features of post-communist Belarus; the relative absence of nationalist sentiment; the failure of the opposition; and the popularity of President Lukashenka. Furthermore the theorists and researchers of Belarus are all in agreement that without nationalist feeling the creation of a cohesive modern state is quite difficult, and without any nationalist sentiment to give the people, there wasn't much hope for active participation in democratic politics (Korotsteleva et al, 2003, p.9-10).

The popularity of President Lukashenka can be traced back to the early 1990s and the liberation of the Belarusian society (Korotsteleva et al, 2003, p.9-12). He was seen as a better alternative to the candidates of the old regime and the 'Russophobic' Popular Front. Lukashenka was during these turbulent early years of the Belarusian independence portrayed as a man of the people, who spoke the simple and non-convoluted language, and had a hostile approach to the ideals of the nationalists who had broken the country away from the Soviet (Marples, 2003, p.28). The independence of the state opened opportunities for someone unknown, as Lukashenka had been at the time, to move in and win the citizens' affections and interest and win over the existing political elite. It is said that the opposition that wants to move the state into a democratic development have only them to blame, because of fragmentation and unpopular views. His rise to power can be caused by his own persona, the charismatic approach and populist platform that he's stood on helped him to appear to be a fighter for justice and appeal to the masses of ordinary voters as that (Korotsteleva et al, 2003, p.9-12).

Since the elections in 1995 and in 1996, there have been quite the changes over the years and intrusions into the already fragile democratic structure that prevailed in the state. The control over the media, harassment, and punishment of opposition figures, as well as re-

stricting demonstrations and public activities have been some of the democratic ideas that have had intrusions by the Presidential Administration (Marples, 2003, p.28). Theorists tend to describe Belarus as an elected dictatorship due to the fact that the country has some democratic traits, such as elections and though the opposition is weak it does exist. However, it is the constant abuse of human rights and the disappearance, arresting and expulsion of oppositional leaders that contributes to the pull back of the country into being an authoritarian regime (Korotsteleva et al, 2003, p.14). The Presidency has since the first Presidential referendum in 1994 only had one person on its seat, Alexander Lukashenka. The steps taken to have his mandate retained and extended have been of those that have put the presidential authority bigger and larger than his counterparts in France and the United States (Marples, 2003, p.29).

The relations between Belarus and the states around have been, the least to say, frosty. Belarus's foreign policy has been moving towards Russia, there are close and friendly relations with the Russian federation, both economically and politically. The wish to become closer and more integrated with the Russian federation has prevented the country to form their own nation and it is shown in how the country is ruled by its authority and by the authority's power, when it doesn't take into account the identity of the state that the authority is to control (Marples, 2003, p.31). It also seems that even though Belarus started out as an independent nation questions about if the state can survive as an independent nation have arisen. It specially has shown in the constant violation of the human rights and the international concern has grown considerably of the authoritarian tendencies in the country as well of the state's foreign policy (Krivosheev, 2003, p.165).

It is understandable that the country might feel a bit disoriented because of their questionable history. While the country and its people have been on the same spot since the 9th century, there is question to how the history of Belarus really looks like and if it can give any real national tradition to the country. The state of Belarus has a history that frequently refers back to the Republic of Lithuania, as well as Poland and Russia in the later centuries. The only proof of an attempt of independence is the attempt in 1918 when the Belarusian National Republic made an effort of proclaiming the state independent, but this was only for a short while before it once again was under the rule of Russia (Korotsteleva et al, 2003, p.10; Marples, 2003, p.22).

4.3 Belarus Today

For the past three years, Belarus has been in the spotlight for several reasons. The "last dictatorship in Europe" with President Alexander Lukashenka at the top has several times been denied, slammed and put up for protests for several reasons. Most recently is the 2008 parliamentary election where the seats of the parliament all went to the politicians that back Lukashenka. That is 110 seats in the House of Representatives in Belarus. The opposition condemned the election as flaw and unfair, and not legitimate. Representatives for the oppositional parties even said that the election was only a show that was put up for the West. Of course the response from President Lukashenka was that the elections had been free and fair and that the election would bring Belarus closer to the West (BBC News, 2008a).

In March of 2006 the West, that is the EU and the US, were to impose sanctions against Belarus. The reason was the presidential election that resulted in a landslide win for President Lukashenka and his third term as president. Also the Belarusian government has no respect for the opposition which was also one of the reasons to why the sanctions were to

be imposed (BBC News, 2006a). One of the major restrictions that were placed upon the country was travel restriction. The restrictions were put on Belarusian officials and leaders, including the president. Travel restrictions mean that the persons that have a travel restriction on them are not allowed to travel in or through any European Union states. There were exceptions that could be granted, such as travel for attending international conferences at the UN and similar organizations of interests (Utrikesdepartementet, 2009). However, some of the sanctions on Belarus have been lifted; EU lifted the travel ban in late 2008 after a decision had been made by the foreign ministers in the EU. It was an attempt to help encourage the democratic processes in the country (BBC News, 2008b).

The “last dictatorship in Europe” has more than once been criticized for its authoritarian policy and the “fair and free” parliamentary election in 2008 was from the OSCE and other countries classed as unfair. The reason for the OSCE to condemn the parliamentary election was that the 110 seats in the House of Representatives all went to politicians that backs president Lukashenka. However the OSCE did admit that there had been minor improvements compared to previous polls, but if Belarus is going to ever be accepted into the community of the European states and Western world as a whole, the state is in need of becoming more open and investment-friendly. The hopes shouldn’t be too high though, according to the skeptics. The rigging of elections and arresting dissidents will still continue as the president and his government will continue to play the European neighbors and Russia against each other (Beehner, 2008).

Belarus has several demands on them from the West as well from Russia, but is Belarus willing to change in order to come closer to the West? It seems that after they denied to recognize the two states in Georgia that are backed up by Russia, the state seems to be welcome to attend the European Union’s summit in Prague in May (Economist, 2009c). The Belarusian independency has survived since the state separated from the Soviet Union, but as the election in 2008 came closer the president made an effort to try and ease things and to get in favor with the West. The decisions to allow some minor opposition campaigning, releasing political prisoners and inviting foreigners to watch the campaign, was an effort that hopefully will see as efforts in going to a democratic direction, as well as continuing to lift sanctions on the country (Economist, 2008a).

5 Cuba

Cuba is my second case that will be used in order to see where democracy is applicable. This chapter is built up the same way as the third chapter with Belarus. It starts with a history of Cuba, to move on to a political background during the latter of the 20th century. The chapter ends with how Cuba looks today. In the analysis Cuba will be analyzed based upon the theoretical framework in chapter two.

A note to why there is a special section to the Constitution of Cuba. While the Constitution of Belarus is quite important for the analysis as well, the Cuban Constitution is one that has never been fully used and is often ignored. It is noted in the chapter about democracy that a constitution is essential, but if it never has been in use, what significance does it have, and what does it say?

5.1 History of Cuba

The island of Cuba was discovered by Columbus in 1492 and was conquered from the natives in 1511 by Spain. Though the interest for the island would soon die when there were other conquests that lured the Spanish away from the small island (NE, 2009b).

There was always a wish of freedom that hung over the Cubans during the centuries and it became even more apparent during the early 19th century, especially among those in the lower classes of the economy. Any forms of understanding and reformation attempts were cast away by the Spanish authorities, and in 1868 a rebellion against Spain was set in motion. It would develop into a war that would last ten years and resulted in a compromise that included an increase in self-rule. A revolutionary party was established in 1892 by José Martí. A new war would arise, but this time the United States meddled and settled it in a few months, however, the consequences were that the Cubans would not rule the island (NE, 2009b). Instead the US put an American governor to rule Cuba until 1902 when the country formally became politically independent and the first president, Tomás Estrada, was elected (UI, 2009b).

It was after the revolution against Dictator Fulgencio Batista in 1959 that the country changed to become a one-party state with Fidel Castro in the lead. After decades of corruption, dictatorship and violence as a mean to leash the social worry, the country was in a silent uproar. In 1953 Fidel Castro and students that opposed the Batista regime would make attempts to get the regime dismissed. He began this in court where he argued that the regime should be invalid, but he didn't get any response from the court on this and instead he led an attack in July, 1953 against the Moncada-barracks in Santiago, it was a failure and Castro was arrested. He was judged to fifteen years in jail, but was released in 1955 in an amnesty and went to Mexico. There he built up the July 26-movement which organized Cubans in exile, and the purpose of the movement and organization became clear when Castro returned to Cuba in 1956 with eighty, military trained rebellions to forcibly take over the government of Cuba. The attack failed and the survivors fled, but it wasn't the end of the changing cycle that had begun (UI, 2009b).

The rebels gathered more sympathy and followers, the support to Batista was weakening and in January, 1959 Batista was thrown out of office. Cuba became under Castro's control and he began to radically change Cuba. Cuba underwent an agricultural reform, nationalizations, increase in wages, lowered rents, as well as making welfare better for the people. The changes caught attention with both Cubans in power with interest and North American in-

terests, as well as those who were on the side of the revolution. The development caused problems, the president left his position in protest, while the United States wanted to slow down the development and did so by cutting off all imports of Cuban sugar in 1960 (NE, 2009b).

Cuba and Castro were drawn to the Soviet socialism and while the United States had shunned Cuba, the Soviet Union was more approachable and influenced the regime on Cuba enough to want them to try and take after the Soviet industrialization that had occurred during the 1930s. It failed, because Cuba had no tradition of industry and the Soviet planned economy was not a good model for the Cuban situations (UI, 2009b). In 1962, the famous Cuban missile crisis occurred when the United States discovered that there were launching bases for the Soviet Union's near range nuclear missiles being built on Cuba (BBC, 2009a). The crisis lasted for thirteen days and while Cuba was in the middle of it with being sanctioned by the United States, the two superpowers were not letting the regime and Castro into the negotiations. After thirteen days Moscow agreed to take down the ramps (UI, 2009b).

Certain elements of Maoism were introduced to the regime when China found interest in the agricultural retreat that Cuba did as a result of their failed attempt on industry. The country was favored over the cities between 1966 and 1970, however in 1968 Castro's regime nationalized all of the privatized small companies, it was a hard blow on the city inhabitants and it was to calm the revolutionary spirit and create a new person that didn't put material motives before moral and ideal ones. The influence from Maoism on Cuba was replaced by the dependence on the Soviet Union in the beginning of the 1970s (UI, 2009b).

5.2 The political background of Cuba, the change of political system

Cuba's political system is quite different from Western political systems. They stem from different traditions. It was mentioned in chapter 2.3.1 that Western political systems of liberal democracy stems from authors and political thinkers such as Montesquieu and Locke, however Cuba's political system stems from an entirely different side of the political realm and authors. The Marxist-Leninist theory and praxis have been the main influences on the Cuban system (Saney, 2004, p.46). In 1959 Cuba's history and political system entered a change when the Cuban revolution was initiated by Fidel Castro and his followers. The revolution had the political system put to the test as it was set to experiment with how the state would be established in world affairs as well as what form of economical management would be the most effective for the state's economical system (Lievesley, 2004, p.129).

Why did the revolution occur? Cuba was already struggling with exercising sovereignty and attain social justice (Saney, 2004), but the inequalities of economical, political and social structure contributed to the start of the revolution. The government was, according to the rebels and the revolutionaries, corrupt and repressive by the United States. This spurred the Cuban identity and the nationalist instincts to alienate and cut the ties with the US. Fidel Castro came at the right time in the right moment to light the fuse for a radical change (Staten, 2005, p.71). The overthrow of former President Batista and the neocolonial regime was considered to be a democratizing effect in the trail of the revolution. The old system that Batista and his regime had practiced was rejected by the people and they looked forward to a new governmental form (Saney, 2004, p.48).

The effects of the revolution weren't as swift and smooth as might be considered, but the state was overwhelmed with external threats and internal rebellions that opposed the new regime governing the state (Lievesley, 2004, p.130). The necessity to keep the state together and to keep the citizens faithful to the cause became increasingly important. The thought of a single party having the control and setting the governmental form helped the Cuban Revolutionary Party (PRC) to give a sense of hope of new beginnings and thereby forging a national unity to give the citizens of Cuba something to believe in, as well as stability to the regime (Saney, 2004, p.46).

As mentioned above the Cuban revolution didn't go smoothly, there was opposition to the new regime, not only among the citizens of Cuba, most who were middle and upper class, but also within the ranks of the revolutionary leadership. The tension between the two lines of the revolutionary leadership, the non-communists and the communists, became further strained as the communist influence grew on the Cuban government. The result of the opposition was a forced resignation of President Urrutia. To keep the unity of the people in line Castro began, as a result of the opposition within the lines of the revolutionary leadership, to centralize the revolutionary power structure and to emphasize the significance of unity, loyalty and survival (Staten, 2004, p.94).

Democracy and the change that many Cubans had hoped for when the revolution was a fact was not what happened to the political system. The political forms took on a stronger feature of the corpus of Marxism as well as the Paris Commune from 1871. The result rendered in a capitalist democracy with slight changes in order for the political system to not become elitist and oligarchic (Saney, 2004, p.49-50). Though the democratic tendencies in the Cuban system seemed to prevail, Fidel Castro didn't have the attention to let go of the formal control that he and the Communist Party had seized control over. An example of this power that Castro held over the state was the revoke of elections in 1960 because he saw it as the people had already spoken and because of his popularity the election would've resulted in a favor to Castro had the election been held (Staten, 2004, p.95).

While democracy was what Castro might have had in mind when he rallied supporters for a revolution, it was as has been noted in this chapter, the communistic views that settled into being the political system. There were hopes that Castro would see himself defeated, especially from the United States where the hostility against Cuba have been evident with the trade embargo imposed after the Cuban missile crisis and the acceptance of Cuban citizens, now exiles. When the communism fell in Eastern Europe in the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s the hope for Fidel Castro to claim himself defeated and reform the state was high. Fidel Castro had on the other hand no intention of declaring himself or his regime defeated. This was because in contrast to the Eastern Europe having the communistic traditions forced upon the existing states becoming Soviet bayonets, Cuba chose to embrace the traditions. When the collapse in the Eastern Europe was a fact Cuba stood steady on the ground that the regime had built up for its people and the state they governed (Smith, 1996).

Many believed that Cuba's communistic regime would collapse due to the historical relationship the state had had with the Soviet Union and there were those who said that Cuba was not one state who could survive without the support of the Soviet. Yet, the Cuban communism survived, but not without the knowledge that communism was and is reversible. While the Cuban citizens knew of the communism's collapse in other parts of the world, they still supported their government, knowing about the difficulties, but they were able to see the success of the communistic regime. During the early 1990s the Cuban regime allowed the people to give complaints about the regime to expose corruption and

mismanagement. The Cuban regime could divert from a collapse because of the support from the people, not on the Communist Party as an institution, but because the people believed in the individuals within the party. It also learned from the mistakes made by the Eastern Europe and Castro only made a minimal of reformations in the state. Perhaps the reformation that has stuck in peoples' minds the most was the law that authorized direct elections to the National Assembly, contrary to before when the electoral system was close to non-existing. However the restriction that partisan electoral campaigning continued to be illegal and the law restricted the number of seats in the Assembly to how many candidates there were, making it tougher for opposite candidates or parties to be elected (Dominguez, 1993).

The communism in Cuba might not have been what Castro intended for the state at first, but it is what the political system is based upon even today. Cuba has a constitution, one that has not been in use for decades, the constitution is significant however for the political background and future of Cuba. The chapter of 4.2.1 does therefore take up the constitution of Cuba and what it holds.

5.2.1 Constitution of Cuba

Cuba's first Constitution was written up in 1901 when the island first had its experience in 1901, it was then later replaced by a Constitution in 1940 that after the revolution was replaced in 1976 by the Constitution that is mostly known by the people of Cuba to this day. The 1976 version of the Constitution has been revised twice in its existence, the first time in 1992 and then in 2002. However it is the extensive revision of the Constitution in 1992 that has become what the Cuban people recognize as the political system during the decades with President Fidel Castro as the sovereign. The authoritarian rule that has been mentioned in this chapter of Cuba is in effect because of the organization and the structure of the political system says and makes it so. What the 1992 revision of the Constitution did was that it reduced the property regime, decentralized the foreign trade procedures, and among other prohibited any discrimination against religious believers. The Constitution also made it possible for direct elections to the National Assembly, a small step towards a democratic regime. The National Assembly further amended the Constitution in 2002 by making sure that the Constitution would always seek to guarantee the permanent quality of the socialist system (Dominguez, 2003).

The Constitution has a principal element that has not been implemented at all; it is concerned with who has the political rights. The state institutions elected by the people are on paper very powerful, but as has been noted since Castro's take over in 1959, it has been the non-elected institutions that have been in power, such as the Communist Party and the militarization of the society, as well as the command economy structures. The revised version of the Constitution from 1992 is the version that addresses the Cuban existence of today. Both the 1940's Constitution and the Constitution as it looked originally from 1976 both have questionable legitimacy as the one from 1940 was not in affect for longer than 12 years and the 1976 version was as well at times ignored and not acknowledged (Dominguez, 2003).

In the Constitution, as has been mentioned before in this thesis, there is an article stating that the state is a single-party system and what it means is that no other parties are allowed to rule next to the party in authority, the Communist Party. However, it is only in a few articles that the legitimization is shown to be given to the Communist Party, some of the articles could in fact be cut in a way to become more democratic, furthermore the military

organization is only mentioned once or twice and the Constitution states that all are equal to join the military and can achieve the highest ranks. One thing that should be noted about the Constitution of Cuba is that it is highly influenced by Marxist-Leninist ideological formulations, which is explainable by the fact that Fidel Castro found this as being a perfect way to amend the state after the revolution and also because of the close connections Cuba had to the Soviet Union from the beginning of Castro's reign. Changes to the Constitution would be beneficial to the transition of the political regime from an authoritarian rule into a democratic system. One change would be to bind the Constitution to the declaration of Human rights in an attempt to recognize the universal human rights that every man and woman are in their right to claim (Dominguez, 2003).

While there still are flaws in the Constitution there are some positive aspects of the Constitution's amendments from 1992. Some examples of these positive aspects are that Fidel Castro is never mentioned by name, and he is not given any special rights; armed forces are subordinate to civil rights; there are no authoritarian enclaves to protect the armed forces. As of the Constitution of 1992 there are no veto points in it. That is, there is nothing in the Constitution that can give anyone the right to freeze any decision-making; however, it might be needed to introduce veto points in order for the state to be democratic (Dominguez, 2003).

5.3 Cuba Today

Cuba has for fifty years been ruled by one man, now that man has stepped down and has left a state and a civil society in the hands of his brother and a government that has yet to found its true place in politics. The government will, however, find itself at numerous crossroads where decisions are to be made which will affect the country either for the better or for worse. The people of Cuba wants a change for the better and into a more democratic era after have been living a history that has been lined with totalitarianistic rule and rule by one man. Needless to say, Fidel Castro was indeed a charismatic man who had control over the country, but what he has left behind as he has stepped down from his presidential rule is a land that falters economically, politically and socially. The economic faltering and the social restraints that Cuba have with the international community, most definitely with the European Union and the United States, has put Cuba in a position where the state stands alone with no real hope of cooperation unless their methods change. Some of the challenges that are of economic, political and social nature are an aging population, demands from Cuban consumers, problems of youth and a slow economy as a whole. These challenges may well enough be cause for the new Cuban government to alter the basic structure of Cuban polity and economy if the government is to have any prosperity in keeping the state from facing multiple and simultaneous crises (Gonzalez, 2004, p.3-4).

When Fidel Castro announced that he would be resigning as the president of Cuba, the moment it happened was something that many Cubans in exile had been waiting for. The hopes of the island finally entering the 21st century and embracing the democratic approach were high, but it seemed that the socialism that was brought to Cuba in 1959 wasn't leaving the island as easily as hoped. While the country probably will remain a communist country and a one-party state there are bound to be some reforms taken place. Some of these reforms mostly concerns trade unions and representative organizations while people are encouraged to speak of the faults in the Cuban system and at the same time suggest improvements. These suggestions and answers had been brought to the Cuban government and it seems as if the two most likely areas that will be approached for reformation are the restrictions on Cubans travelling out of the country and the food distribution and agricul-

ture. With the first one it would mean that it would make it easier for Cubans wanting to travel to come by an exit visa that is needed for leaving Cuba, and with the food distribution and the agriculture being reformed, means that the domestic agriculture would step up and increase food production causing a fall in consumer costs (Escobales, 2008).

As Cuba has moved into a new century and the leader for fifty years has stepped down it is now up to the remaining government and president to focus on aiding the people of Cuba in helping them gain control of their own destiny. The possibilities for Cuba to become a part of a Euro-Atlantic community would be far greater if it was possible for the country to move forward and away from an authoritarian rule. For this to even happen the Cuban communist party that is in control would have to let go of the control of the state bureaucracy and give up privileges and perks that has been granted them for fifty years. One step that they would have to make would be to have free and fair elections for a government that is elected and trusted by the Cuban people (CIF Author, 2008). The international community should support the efforts that are made, but at the same time it seems as if the community isn't ready to take away their restrictions on the state until the reformations made are significant enough and obvious enough to be on a democratic approach.

Cuba coming into the 21st century and how the state will prevail seem to depend greatly on how Western international community that has shunned the island, can introduce them and ease on the restrictions and sanctions that has been laid upon the country. While Cuba's government faces challenges of economical, political and social characters within the country, it also faces the fact that Western international community has not forgotten what has happened during the reign of Fidel Castro. Experts look to Europe and to the US to change their tough approach against Cuba, especially the US that has had a merchant embargo on the country since the early 1960s as a cause of the Cuban missile crisis. During the first ten initial years of the 21st century, Cuba's relationship with the US has had tension between them increased due to several decisions made by the Cuban government. The US embargo on Cuba has been fruitless and hasn't given the results that were initially hoped for at the initiation of the embargo (Moynihan, 2003).

During the Bush administration there was no real hope for the embargo to be lifted in fact the president then ordered further restrictions, among them being that Cuban-Americans were not allowed to visit or give remittances to the island. These restrictions were very recently implied to be lifted by the new president, Barack Obama. This part of the embargo is not enough for many Americans. Bills have been introduced in both houses of the United States Congress where travelling for all Americans to Cuba is suggested to be allowed, as well as ease on food sales, but to dissolve the embargo completely is something that supporters of the bills are not for, at least not as long as Cuba lacks political and economic freedoms (The economist, 2009a).

There are voices from Western international community that want an end to the American trade embargo with Cuba, but also the Latin American governments around the island, they are eager to see the end and finally have normal relations with the state. However for Cuba to be able to engage in a normal relationship with the international community it is evident that there are transitions to be made as well as reformations politically. The move towards democracy seems to have come to a stop with no liberation for political prisoners in Cuba as well as no democratic institutions being built within the state (The economist, 2009b).

It is not only the Cuban government and the Cuban people that will have to make efforts for democratic reforms, if it's even possible to introduce democracy to the state. The inter-

national community will have to act and several restrictions, sanctions and the trade embargos needs to be lifted before it is even possible for any sort of conversation about Cuba becoming a part of the international community. The US policy that was imposed on the forty years ago has failed and while the US makes some scrapping it is not enough. The European community has to embark on the same train and break free from the US policy and make their own decisions for how to address Cuba (Moynihan, 2003).

For Cuba to become a part of an international community and to even have a prospect of becoming democratic, it is important for the international community to realize that Cuba has a deep-rooted and strong desire for independency and that it is not likely that as soon as Fidel Castro dies and the post-Castro era truly takes off that Cuba will become the 51st state of the US, though this is what many in the US administration and in administrations in Europe truly believes will happen (Moynihan, 2003). On the other side of the community there is the former supporter of Cuba that is waiting. In 2008 there were news reports coming in about Russian plans on using the bases in Cuba for Russian nuclear bombers, however as the reports of this supposedly revival of the bases came to public knowledge worldwide, no one admitted to it being true. It seemed as if Cuba was put in a position between the United States and Russia, only being a pawn in their game. President Raul Castro did not respond to it, but observers did say that it was more than likely that Raul wouldn't agree on such a request from Moscow (Harding, 2008).

It is evident that changes with Raul Castro as president of Cuba will be made; however what those changes will mean is of discussion and speculation. It seems however that the changes that are to be made in Cuba will not be of changes for the better, in Western sense. Instead it is more likely that the politics and decision-making made by Raul Castro will be as centralized and tightly controlled as they were with Fidel Castro (Urbina, 2009).

6 Analysis

The analysis is divided into two parts, based on the first two questions of the purpose. The two other questions are answered within the analysis, but will be further elaborated in the concluding discussion. One part deals with democracy in Belarus and the second part deals with democracy in Cuba. These two questions are:

- *Based on the conditions of Western liberal democracy, do Cuba and Belarus have the means to become democracies?*
- *Have the political histories of Belarus and Cuba affected their democratic development?*

Neither state has ever had a full experience of a democratic regime, and as you might see from the questions, I want to see what it is that a state should already have and what has been done within the state in order for there to be any possibility of a democratic governmental system.

In order for the analysis to be possible there are a few standard issues that are covered in the theoretical framework that I find as being critical for a democracy to even be possible in a country. The conditions for a democracy can be found on page 14 and 18 in this thesis and are as follows:

- Free and fair elections.
- A written constitution or bill of rights that regulates and limits the government's power and authority for the benefit of the state and society.
- The sovereign in a liberal democracy should have institutions of government that ensures the security of individuals' rights, liberty, life and estate.
- Citizens in a state are to be free and equal within the society and before the laws and regulations the state has provided.
- A power in society should be allowed within a liberal democracy that can function as a resistance to the state and make sure the government in control doesn't overstep its boundaries.
- The representatives of the state, the sovereign and the government are to mirror the majority of the people.
- Politics within a liberal democracy should not control the realms of society that are separated from the realm of politics. Modern society safeguards liberty of the citizens and will keep the political authority focused on how to govern the state.
- For democracy to exist there has to be rule of law present.
- Rule of law sets the prerequisite that all citizens are equal before the law. This includes the political leaders and legislators.
- The legal system should mirror the social order among the citizens.

6.1 Democracy in Belarus

Belarus has been called "the last dictatorship in Europe". No matter how many times this is stated, it will not go away. The state's governmental system has had a tight grip of its people and the opposition wanting to change the form of government that is currently in use. One thing that should be clear to anyone about Belarus is that Belarus has never experienced a democratic regime that is comparable with Western liberal democracy of the modern time. Therefore it only makes it interesting to look upon the possibility of the state to apply Western liberal democracy to their governmental system.

Liberal democracy is not the easiest governmental form to maintain, but it is the governmental form that has survived in the 20th century, even if there have been doubts whether or not it is even possible for democratic states to enable and maintain the liberal democracy. There are after all only a few states in the world, that hasn't been exposed to any totalitarian rule of any kind during the 20th century. To start off this analysis will be going through each point mentioned above on what I believe is crucial for a democracy to even be possible in a state.

Free and fair elections have in Belarus been described as being present, though the international community condemns this statement. The OSCE has made observations at the official elections and while they did condemn the election, there had been minor improvements. These improvements were barely visible and the opposition doesn't come forward at all. The opposition in the state isn't as strong and convincing as it would like to be because of the limitations on free press and freedom of speech. Without these the free and fair elections fails in its attempt to let all sides in a political regime to stand up and speak for them. This Belarus does fail miserably in.

A written constitution, or bill of rights, that regulates and limits the government's power and authority for the benefit of the state and society. This crucial issue for what a state needs in order to have a possibility for a democracy is one of the main points, aside from only a few states in the modern world today, states with liberal democracy do indeed have a constitution or bill of rights written to regulate the government's power and authority. Belarus has a constitution, written up in 1994 and has been altered since to benefit the president's wishes for authority and power, and not the citizens of the state. The change to the constitution was first made in 1996 and the President's power increased. The president's increasing power has put the state on a hold and the main focus has been on what the constitution's alterations have done to hurt the people. The alterations made in the constitution in 1996 are the major alterations made and are also a cause to why Belarus is called the last dictatorship in Europe.

The sovereign in a liberal democracy should have institutions of government that ensures the security of individuals' rights, liberty, life and estate. The point of this statement as being a standard issue for a liberal democracy is because authority should be dispersed and the power of the authorities shouldn't be relied upon one institution. However, in the case of Belarus this is quite the problem. Because there is no dispersed authority and the power of the sovereign's different institutions still ends up in the highest form of institution, the President, it fails in the department of having several institutions with dispersed authority. This is because in the end the power is still appointed by the President and the president can easily take that away from the institutions beneath. Without a solid ground for the individuals' rights in the society, there can't be a democracy because of the uncertainty of having rights, liberty and estate taken away from them. Examples of this are how citizens have been treated with different opinions. It is only in the last year that prisoners that were considered political prisoners have been freed from their imprisonment on the order of the President.

Citizens in a state are to be free and equal within the society and before the laws and regulations the state has provided. It goes hand in hand with the previously mentioned topic, doesn't it? With the power and authority almost exclusively concentrated to the President's institution, the citizens of a state can be seen as equal and free in society, as long as they are on the same side as the President and his followers. However to be free and equal in a democracy there can't be any preconditions for it. A democratic regime should allow all citizens to be free and equal in all rights possible, they should be free to speak their mind and make the choices of their own free will. An important feature that isn't allowed to be put forward in Belarus is the freedom of speech and the freedom of organization and opposition resisting the power of the state. This will be further evaluated in the next point of analyzing, but what can be said is that without citizens being free and equal the state power doesn't take in consideration the will of the people at all.

A power in society should be allowed within a liberal democracy that can function as a resistance to the state and make sure the government in control doesn't overstep its boundaries. For a liberal democracy to survive in a state there has to be a power within society that can keep the government and the state in control and can resist them if their power is abusive. This does exist, somewhat, in Belarus, however the problem is that the opposition isn't allowed to make itself heard. It shows that the state of Belarus has the country in an iron tight grip and the state controls everything from the media to how citizen should think and vote in elections. The opposition in Belarus has over and over again been pushed aside and been seen defeated by President Lukashenka and his followers. This only shows that the respect for an opposition with a different opinion of how a state could be lead is non-existent in the state and therefore should make it more difficult on the state to be democratic.

The representatives of the state, the sovereign and the government are to mirror the majority of the people. A quick look on recent results of national referenda tells us that it appears that the sovereign and the government mirror the majority of the people, but there are questionable observations telling the outside world that the electoral system is corrupt and therefore might only mirror a minority of the people in Belarus. An example of how this is acted out is how the parliamentary election in 2008 resulted. The 110 seats in the House of Representatives were all seated by politicians that back President Lukashenka. Apparently the election might as well never have happened since it supposedly only was a show for the West. Whether or not the elections had been free and fair was questionable, and had they been free and fair, the result would probably have been different and even mirrored what the majority of the people would want and not the minority.

Politics within a liberal democracy should not control the realms of society that are separated from the realm of politics. Modern society safeguards liberty of the citizens and will keep the political authority focused on how to govern the state. This is a tricky one because it means that politics should only be concerned with governing the realm of how a state should act and how it should profile itself to the outside world. In one sense that is what President Lukashenka does on the outside. On the outside he profiles Belarus as a democratic state, but when one gets inside the borders of the state and actually see how the state is really being governed, one realizes that the liberty of the citizens is very limited and based on the articles about the people it is clear that they have been stripped from the liberty right and cannot be as outspoken and free as they might want. The political control goes beyond the political realm and into the modern society.

For democracy to exist there has to be rule of law present. This is critical, because without rule of law a country cannot legitimize itself or even be called democratic. The rule of law, as you might remember, is the principle of how the legal system should be built up and one im-

portant part of rule of law is that the laws are of public knowledge, clear to the citizens in their meaning and purposes and that the laws existent are there to protect the political and civil liberties. Looking at the case of Belarus the legal system that the state provides is the constitution, other than that it appears to be no other form of legal system that is significant for the state's governmental form. Rule of law is then present in the state, but how effective it is in one of its most crucial parts is rather questionable as we have seen in the former part of the analysis. The legal system seems to take more into account of the state's needs and wants rather than the citizens. It becomes a question of whether or not rule of law in fact is in effect here.

Rule of law sets the prerequisite that all citizens are equal before the law. This includes the political leaders and legislators. This point is similar to the point about citizens are free and equal, however what that didn't include was what this point does include. That being equal before the law applies to the political leaders and legislators as well. It means that no one is above the law and if there were to be an accusation made against a political leader he or she would have to bend before the law and prove that he or she is innocent while the other side would have to prove the opposite. Looking upon this requirement it might rather unclear whether or not this truly applies to the political leaders and legislators as well. It does include the political leaders of the opposition as they from time to time are being imprisoned, however, it does not seem to include the President and his followers to the extent that one would wish for it to do. An obvious example of this is the fact that the President has such strong power because of how the constitution is written and therefore it makes it hard to put the President on the stand and face the crimes he might've committed.

The legal system should mirror the social order among the citizens. This comes together with how the state and government should mirror the majority of the citizens, but what this requirement means is that the laws and legislation should mirror the fact that citizens are in a democracy free to do whatever they want as long as they abide by the law and respect each other. The same then applies to the legal system. The legal system shouldn't be of that, that it can change in one minute without regarding to what the preexisting law has stated before. If a law is made and it goes against a preexisting law, the law made should not be legitimate until it is clear in its purposes and doesn't oppose any other law in the system. In Belarus this seems to have been completely disregarded as I have mentioned many times before in this analysis that the constitution and the legal system of Belarus only mirrors the social order of those who stand behind President Lukashenka.

6.2 Democracy in Cuba

It's been fifty years since President Batista was thrown out of office by rebels lead by Fidel Castro. In 50 years the small island state has been one of the more isolated communistic states in the world. The state has only recently been opened up and even had some of the sanctions lifted. These sanctions were put on the state by the United States in 1962 as a result of the Cuban missile crisis. The embargos has been somewhat lifted after Barack Obama became the new President in the United States. The part of the embargo that was lifted concerned the Cuban-Americans in the United States, while the embargo had been in effect they hadn't been able to visit or give remittances to the island, this was now lifted after the change of Presidency in the United States.

Democracy in Cuba has been nonexistent for as long as the island state has existed. The state has been in struggle since the discovery of it in 1492. First colonized by the Spanish to later be led by the United States governor has kept the state from truly ever developing it-

self into a democratic state. During the waves of democratization the regime on Cuba had an iron tight grip of the state and has ruled it with authoritarian influences. Fidel Castro recently retired and his brother Raul Castro was named president after the dictator, but it seems that with President Raul Castro things are changing in favor of the Cuban democratic hopes from exiled Cubans and those living in the country.

Free and fair elections are one of the most essential pillars today for a democracy. With free and fair elections a state gives the society the control over the state, the government and how the government should look like. In the case of Cuba this is a bit diffuse whether or not there are any free and fair elections. The state does hold elections, especially to the National Assembly, but whether or not they are free and fair can be questioned. The knowledge of Cuba suggests that they aren't free and fair, which in the case of any possibility for a democratic transit to be made in Cuba would have to become reality.

A written Constitution, or bill of rights that, regulate and limits the government's power and authority for the benefit of the state and society. It is quite obvious that Cuba has a Constitution and that it has been through a lot of changes since the first one was introduced in 1901. The problem as has been mentioned in the thesis is that it has never been truly implemented or even been of any government's concern. The Constitution of Cuba was renewed in 1940, but it only was in process for 12 years before it was completely dismissed. It seemed that the Cubans would have to live without any sort of system that could provide them with a safety from power and authority overthrowing them. The 1940's version was replaced in 1976 which is the one in use now, however has been revised in 1992 and 2002. The revised version of the Constitution has the most potential of becoming a port into democratic ideas and a democratic system of rule. While the Constitution limits some power of the government, it doesn't do enough. There are still several flaws and articles in the Constitution that would need to be abolished or rewritten in order for the Constitution to be legitimate. One of these flaws is that the state changes its governmental form from a single-party system to a multi-party system, thereby allowing others to speak up and keep restraints on the government.

The sovereign in a liberal democracy should have institutions of government that ensures the security of individuals' rights, liberty, life and estate. Much of the Cuban institutions are centralized, there is nothing in the state that doesn't seem to be going through the very top and for a state to become part of a liberal democracy a decentralization of the institutions is needed. Not just on governmental level, but also on a regional and local level. It will help the individuals' rights to be enforced and respected within the laws and regulations that are set up. Cuba has a population where not all live within the borders of the island; many are in exile due to persecution and the sovereign's view of them being against what the state and government are trying to provide for the state. It isn't unusual that people are being imprisoned and stripped of their liberty, as in being political prisoners.

Citizens in a state are to be free and equal within the society and before the laws and regulations the state has provided. Again it is a tricky part of the democratic ideas, but when looking upon the Constitution changes for the citizens have been made. It shows that an effort appears to be made towards a democratic regime even though the path might be long still. For one thing there is the direct election of assembly members that was written into the Constitution in the revision of it in 1992, also that everyone has the right to do military service and reach the high ranks without being looked upon differently. It might not be the most essential of any free and equal rights within a society, but when military service and organization is a big part of a state's governmental system it also holds a profound weight in society. While the army is to be subordinate under the civil rights the service of military is compulsory and

all Citizens have to go through the draft for it. However, this is only a show of the fact that there are tendencies towards free and equal rights for citizens in Cuba, while other rights, such as freedom of speech and thought seems to be far more limited than in a Western democratic state, it still exist tendencies for it.

A power in society should be allowed within a liberal democracy that can function as a resistance to the state and make sure the government in control doesn't overstep its boundaries. The opposition seems to be very quiet in Cuba, however there is an opposition, perhaps not as active within the borders of Cuba, but there are the Cubans in exile that left years ago in order to escape Fidel Castro's regime that works for Cuba and the benefits of Cuba's democratic transition. The resignation of Fidel Castro was an event that many of the Cubans in exile had been waiting for and looking forward to. Analyzing why will tell us that it leans toward a change and a reform of how Cuba will be governed from then on, however it is also obvious that the voices of an opposition is not truly heard in the society, and as mentioned earlier in the analysis, without an abolishment of the article in the Constitution where it says Cuba is to be a single-party system it is hard for a resistance power in the society to speak up truly.

The representatives of the state, the sovereign and the government are to mirror the majority of the people. As being the only party in the system a first look on Cuba would say that the representatives of the state do mirror the majority of the people. However, this is questionable because of the authoritarian rule and totalitarian regime that Cuba has governed itself for decades. In fact this characteristic for a democratic state seems to have been completely overthrown by the Communist Party and has set the majority of the people aside and focused on mirroring the minority of the people. The government and the representatives seems therefore to have no intention of changing the mirroring, but under the current administration they still seem to want to make some changes to their current situation. Therefore moving towards better relationships with the foreign countries in an attempt to also welcome a democratic change for their own state and this might be a path to go if they wish to mirror the majority of the people.

Politics within a liberal democracy should not control the realms of society that are separated from the realm of politics. Modern society safeguards liberty of the citizens and will keep the political authority focused on how to govern the state. Is there even a modern society in Cuba? Perhaps that is a question that has to be examined before it is possible for an analysis of how the political authority takes its presence in society. Society should safeguard the liberty of the citizens and keep politics out of the realms of society that are not of concern for the political realm, such as the religious realm. Because of the centralized power and authority that Cuba does have, this is slightly hard to fulfill and therefore it is meddling in the modern society and the realms of its market and religious matters. As has been said before, it is needed for a decentralization of the state's power in order for Cuba to become a liberal democracy that fits its previous regime and its citizen. It must become more open and freer for people to think for themselves.

For democracy to exist there has to be rule of law present. There is rule of law present in the state. The Constitution provides a base for the legal system and it regulates the political leaders, the legislators and its citizen in order for the state to function well. Democracy should then be able to exist in the state and it should be possible for the state to make a transition over to the democratic governmental form, but one should also remember that it is a process and while rule of law is essential for democracy to even exist, the governmental form that a state with rule of law has doesn't have to be democracy. In the end the way the Constitution was revised back in 1992 it seems to have indications that the state already then was

going towards a democratic reform, but that was never any indication that came from the top administration.

Rule of law sets the prerequisite that all citizens are equal before the law. This includes the political leaders and legislators. This seems to be untrue when it comes to the Cuban people. It seems that the political leaders and the legislators stand above the law if the law doesn't suit them. An example of this is the lack of a 'veto point', whereas with a 'veto point' there might've been changes in the state that would never have been made. Without the 'veto point' it is rather impossible for everyone to be equal in front of the law as the law can change without anyone saying no and opposes the idea with putting in a veto.

The legal system should mirror the social order among the citizens. It means that the way of life that the citizens lead should be mirrored in the legal system, it means that the Cubans situation should be as free and pure as possible without any restraints being put on them that are unfair and cruel. This is not completely true that it is the case. The case of Cuba shows that the legal system doesn't mirror the social order among the citizens because of social and economical constraints, as well as the Cubans in exile who have fled the legal system and the embargo put on Cuba in an attempt to make them yield. Neither of these actions has affected the legal system and it is therefore not mirroring the social order and freedom among the citizens.

6.3 Results

Having looked separately on democracy in Belarus and Cuba I find that the two states have several things in common while they also are different. Cuba and Belarus are both, as established, authoritarian regimes, but while Cuba doesn't hide this Belarus wants to give the appearance of being a democratic state. In truth neither state is at this point a democratic state. I do find however that Cuba is leaning more towards the probability and the possibility of introducing democracy in the state. Belarus on the other hand has reached a stalemate that keeps the state and the society from moving forwards. With the current administration and the current political leadership it is hard to imagine that Belarus stands a chance of becoming democratic. The opposition is silenced as soon as it makes a noise and the power that President Lukashenka has provided himself through two changes of the Constitution has put the state in a position where routine, games and a show of democratic conditions are put up for the global community.

Cuba on the other hand, as I said above, doesn't hide that they are an authoritarian regime; this gives them an advantage that Belarus doesn't have. Since they are aware of that the regime in the state is not democratic, there is a consciousness that could be persuaded to turn the administration and political leaders to a Western liberal democratic outcome. Cuba has a lot of work to do before they can call themselves democratic. First of all they would have to open up and be willing to take help and listen to what the meaning of democracy is and rule of law. The opposition within Cuba would have to be protected under laws that are equal to all citizens, including the administration and political leaders. This also goes for Belarus. At this point neither state has laws that are equal to all people in the state. The laws are leaning only to benefit the followers of the sitting regime. Cuba will also have to allow there to be more than one Party in the government, something that Belarus will have to do as well. This is about letting the society in and not keeping them under the dark about what is happening in their own state.

For Cuba and Belarus to become a state they will have to look over what kind of rule of law they possess, as of now it is restricted and as mentioned before there needs to be a will from all parts to become a democracy and to change the legal system, the Constitution for democracy to be sustained and maintained.

7 Concluding discussion

Where is democracy applicable? That is the question that has followed me as a political scientist since a discussion a few years back and when the opportunity came it developed into two sub-questions that would work in order for a thesis to be put forward. Each of the questions can be answered with the information provided in this thesis and they might even give some light to questions made in the thesis that nobody has ever really had an answer to. In addition to answering the questions that have been my purpose throughout this thesis I will also reflect on the four criteria from chapter 2.5 on page 19 in this thesis:

- The balance of power between state and society. Here the favor lies with the society who can give a balanced opposition against the state which is one of the crucial characteristics of democratic regimes.
- Disciplinary role in relation to the state, which means that standards of public morality and performance are enforced as well as the improvement of accountability of politicians and administrators.
- There is a crucial role for organizations to play as an intermediary or transmission-belt between state and society.
- Lastly civil society has the opportunity to play a constitutive role. The role is played out by redefining the rules of the political game to be democratic.

I am going to start this concluding discussion with reflecting on the thesis's purpose and what I have learned from this experience about Cuba and Belarus.

Based on the conditions of Western liberal democracy, do Cuba and Belarus have the means to become democracies? Western liberal democracy is one of the hardest governmental forms to maintain and sustain in a state. Is it possible for a state who hasn't experienced the governmental form before to introduce it as the new governmental form? The answer could be as simple as yes, but if it was that simple it wouldn't be a problem for states that hasn't turned to embrace liberal democracy as their governmental form to do just that. Democracy is a complex concept that requires a stable state and a balance between the leaders and the citizens of the state. In my opinion democracy, or if we are to be more accurate, liberal democracy is a governmental form that holds several requirements and commitments that not always are simple to evaluate and analyze to see if the state in mind is able to apply liberal democracy to its governmental form.

A reformation either fails or succeeds. The middle ground that I'm sure many consider to exist I see as a success. A middle ground is where the state has been able to implement liberal democracy and embraced it while still keeping true to the culture and values of the pre-existing theory that a state has had tried to reform or transition from. However I do believe that it is not healthy for a state to keep any authoritarian beliefs when transitioning to democratic beliefs as it might backfire and result in a collapse and relapse to authoritarianism.

I find it difficult to see that a change to democracy will be successful for Belarus, because I don't believe that democracy is applicable in the state due to the weaknesses in the balance of power between state and society. There is very little willingness from the state to change. A question was raised in an article I read while doing research whether or not Belarus even could remain as a state. If democracy is not applicable on this authoritarian state I think that the state will not survive as being independent. Belarus has shown that several parts of their current governmental form have weaknesses that will prevent the state from becom-

ing a western liberal democracy. Since Belarus then is questioned whether or not it can survive as a state I believe that with the weaknesses expressed in the analysis it will be hard for the state to maintain and sustain such a difficult form of government that western liberal democracy is. In contrast to Belarus I find that Cuba, however, might be that kind of state that seems to have both willingness and even a few strengths that can be found in the analysis. One is a revised and rewritten Constitution from 1992. It could likely become even more revised and rewritten to fit a Western liberal democratic view.

Democracy in Cuba seems in my opinion to already be embraced, though in minimal proportions. It is also revealed that the governmental form that Cuba has today was not the initial one in consideration when Fidel Castro came to power after the revolution. That alone tells me that already then they were seeking for a change that would be better than what the old regime had already put Cuba through. In contrast to Cuba Belarus has never considered changing their governmental form. There were small attempts in the beginning, but they were all fruitless. The core of the Belarusian state's teachings and values is a pro-Russian politics where the goal in the 1990s was to bring Belarus closer to Russia again. There have been articles and opinions written that believe that Belarus is playing out Russia and the West against each other and that the state only takes the benefits from the game its playing. I tend to agree with this.

Have the political histories of Belarus and Cuba affected their democratic development? The different waves of democratization during the 20th century seem to have gone by Belarus and Cuba and not affected them at all. To me it is clear that history and the political background of a state matters when a state is to embrace a democratic program and for it to succeed. I believe that the states in the international community that does have liberal democracy today have been able to succeed in maintaining it because the states haven't been completely new to the concept. In my opinion it is that the states that have had a democracy wave hit their states and then been revoked from it by force have been able to reintroduce a liberal democratic program because of the experiences with democracy before becoming an occupied state. It is not impossible for a state that has had a different political background and history to succeed in introducing liberal democracy, but I believe it will be more difficult than if it was a reintroduction.

I feel that Belarus doesn't take its history into account when they developed the governmental system that they claim is democratic, when in truth it isn't. The long historical relationship with Russia is a disadvantage to Belarus, because the political system in Belarus has always been pro-Russian and even after Belarus became independent the government continued this path. In my opinion that is not a behavior of reformation but it is a standpoint to the international community and to Russia. The stand point says to me that while Belarus would've liked to come off as an independent and sovereign state they were still unwilling to relinquish their bond to Russia. In contrast to Belarus and other Eastern European states, Cuba's decision to be communistic and socialistic, and implement the Marxist-Leninist theory to their political system had nothing to do with the state being probed or forced to use that kind of system. The fact that it was Cuba's own decision makes me believe that they have an opportunity to succeed in introducing a program for democracy in the state, would it be a topic that came up for their political leaders.

My conclusion of these two states in this case is that the regime on Cuba made the decision to be communistic and socialistic, while Belarus never had a choice. This puts Cuba in the unique position of being able to look back at their history and political background and see that they have always had a possibility and potential to change their governmental form, because it has been their choice. For Belarus it has been different, though their political

background and history should've been a hint for them to change it when the state became an independent and sovereign state. Though I kind of understand why they moved in the same direction, it is the only way they knew about and had experience from.

What is the relationship between liberal democratic development and rule of law? Throughout the thesis I have subtly pointed out that without rule of law there cannot be a true liberal democratic development. And that is because rule of law sets up a skeleton of a legal system that will help to restrain the state from overpowering the civil society. It is obvious that rule of law exists for both liberal democracy and civil society as being a link between them as well as supporting the state to make the right decisions that benefits the state and society. While it is there to support the state, rule of law exists to protect civil society, what I mean hear is that rule of law puts up a defence for civil society so that civil society can lean on a balance of power that helps to tip the scales in favour for civil society against the state. At the same time the balance of power scale is tipped back by the state to protect them from being overpowered by the civil society.

Rule of law's function when it comes to liberal democratic development is not only about protecting civil society and the state from each other but it is about setting up a functional setting and starting point from where a state can begin its democratic development. This means that states like Sweden, the United States of America, even Germany all have a skeleton of rule of law, where legal system and boundaries are set up for the states. For any state such as Belarus and Cuba, the process of democratic development depends heavily on how the rule of law and the legal system is assembled in the state. It also depends on whether or not it exist a rule of law. If not than it is in my opinion nearly impossible to move towards a democratic state. You can see it like this way, a state can have rule of law, but no democracy and it will still function, the scales will just be tipped in favour of those in command. However, you cannot have a democratic state without rule of law.

What kind of role does civil society have in a democratic development? I will now discuss the four criteria with Belarus and Cuba as points of discussion and try and give clarity to how civil society operates within these two states and I will give my point of view on how civil society functions and whether or not this can give these two states more pressure to become democracies.

The balance of power between state and society. Here the favor lies with the society who can give a balanced opposition against the state which is one of the crucial characteristics of democratic regimes. Balance of power between state and society is essential. When balance of power exists, the civil society can put pressure on the state and they can show their appreciation or disappointment in their government and state. Balance of power wouldn't exist without rule of law and it wouldn't be a concept that we in democracies would experience if it weren't for the democratic concept and the right to express one's opinion. This is where the problem lies with both Cuba and Belarus. The right to express an opinion and the right to judge and criticize the government has been a restrictive right in Cuba, and non-existent in Belarus. The opposition in Belarus does it, but the fact is that it then ends with imprisonment and persecution.

The balance of power in Belarus doesn't exist, I believe it doesn't exist because President Lukashenka and his followers finds it necessary to put fear into the citizens of Belarus, as well as put up an illusion of them being democratic. Acting democratic and be a democratic state is two different things, which the Belarusian state doesn't understand. Cuba has a balance of power that is existent, though it may not be seen within the borders. Some may argue at this point that I am wrong that Cuba doesn't have a balance of power, but I argue

that as long as the Cubans in exile claims to be Cuban and are citizens of the state they are the balance of power that dare to speak about and criticize the Cuban regime openly. The opposition is organized outside the state, but it is within the state it needs to find a strong will to stand up against the regime and force the state to bend to the opposition's will and in that way help develop democracy.

Disciplinary role in relation to the state means that standards of public morality and performance are enforced, as well as the improvement of accountability of politicians and administrators. I believe that for this to work in reality in Belarus it means that the politicians and administrators of the state allow civil society to discipline them and to hold them responsible for their mistakes and crimes. However this might be the ideal for a civil society's role, it is not something that is enforced in Belarus. Had this been so, I am sure that President Lukashenka would not be president and that he wouldn't even be a free citizen but at least an imprisoned and judged citizen for the crimes he committed against his people during his Presidency. Belarus has need of moral, standards and that politicians and administrators can accept that what they do may not always be right in the citizens' minds.

Cuba is in this case on the same wavelength as Belarus. In my opinion there is no accountability of the politicians and administrators. The accountability, and how the standards of public morality and performance are enforced, only finds itself to be used by President Raul Castro and his closest allies as a way to cloak the truth from ever being spoken of. This is not the kind of accountability, or morality or performance that this requirement of civil society stands for, which makes it harder for Cuba to come closer to a democratic regime as liberal democracy and civil society have close bonds and one without the other can truly never become reality as they are connected.

There is a crucial role for organizations to play as an intermediary or transmission-belt between state and society. Organizations that can be the intermediate between state and society can provide the necessary tasks and the necessary means for a society to provide the citizens with knowledge of what the state does. The organizations on the other hand also provide the state with information and knowledge, and lobby against or for the state, trying to keep the state alert that it is not possible to do everything and not care about what happens to the society as a whole.

There are several organizations in Cuba and Belarus that works endlessly for this purpose and this purpose alone. There are also many more organizations that find it important and a core goal to force the state to submission and subordination of the society. I believe that these organizations are not the intermediary string between state and society that these states need. I believe rather that the intermediary string should be attended by organizations that doesn't just seek purpose that are for themselves, which organizations in the end all do. It can backfire greatly and while the organizations as a whole are not abolished, the states do make sure that the societies are completely cut off from what exactly the state is doing.

Lastly civil society has the opportunity to play a constitutive role. The role is played out by redefining the rules of the political game to be democratic. This basically means that civil society has a chance, in my opinion, to rebel and to revolte against the crimes and the abusiveness against it. Civil society is then in position of redefining the rules of the political game and make it democratic. It was what Fidel Castro once did on Cuba; however the revolution's result was not democratic, but authoritarian. Belarus on the other hand has never had a revolution that have succeeded or even one that is worth remembering. I believe that if the state is in a circle of habits and routines that hurts the civil society, civil society needs to rebel and I do

believe that it is what is needed in Belarus and Cuba for there to be a true change in the right direction. Belarusian opposition hasn't made attempts that have been severe enough for the state to worry. It hasn't even made the international, Western community to even raise a brow. If Belarus is ever to become a democratic state, the civil society needs to change the rules on the state. In Cuba the opposition comes from the outside and not from within. The opposition of Cubans in exile must do what Belarusian opposition needs to do as well. They have to redefine the rules of the political game by making a revolt, a reform that will put them on the map.

I believe that civil society in Belarus and Cuba is weak, there is no real life in it and no true will to become democratic. The opposition exists, yes, but what does it really do? It makes noise, but not noise that is loud enough for anyone to jump and try to make the changes. It is silent and it is too silent.

References

Printed sources

- Ball, T. & Dagger, R. (2009), *Political ideologies and the democratic ideals*, New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Carothers, T (1998), The rule of law revival, *Foreign Affairs*, 77(2), p.95-106
- Ceaser, J.W (1990), *Liberal democracy and political science*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press
- Dahlkvist, M (1995), "Det civila samhället" i samhällsteori och samhällsdebatt. En kritisk analys. In L. Trägårdh (Ed.), *Civilt samhälle kontra offentlig sektor* (p.153-230), Stockholm: SNS Förlag
- Dominguez, J (1993), The secrets of Castro's staying power, *Foreign Affairs*, 72(2), p.97-107
- Dominguez, J (2003), *A Constitution for Cuba's political transition: the utility of retaining (and amending) the 1992 Constitution*, Miami: University of Miami
- Esaiasson, P, Gilljam, M, Oscarsson, H, & Wängnerud, L (2004), *Metodpraktikan - konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*, Stockholm: Norstedts Juridik AB
- Hadenius, A. (2001), *Demokrati - en jämförande analys*, Malmö: Liber AB
- Held, D (1995), *Democracy and the Global Order*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Holden, B (1993), *Understanding liberal democracy*, Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Huntington, SP. (1991), *The third wave: democratization in the late twentieth century*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press
- Korotsteleva, E.A., Lawson C.W. & Marsh, R.J. (2003), Introduction: Paradoxes of democratization in post-communist Belarus. In E.A. Korosteleva, C.W. Lawson, R.J. Marsh (Eds.), *Contemporary Belarus, Between democracy and dictatorship* (p. 1-20). London: RoutledgeCurzon
- Krivosheev, D. (2003), Belarus's external relations. In E.A. Korosteleva, C.W. Lawson, R.J. Marsh (Eds.), *Contemporary Belarus, Between democracy and dictatorship* (p. 165-178). London: RoutledgeCurzon
- Lievesley, G. (2004), *The Cuban revolution: past, present and future perspectives*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan
- Markoff, J. (1996), *Waves of democracy: social movements and political change*, London: Pine Forge Press
- Marples, D.R. (1999), *Belarus: a denationalized nation*, Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers

- Marples, D.R. (2003), History and politics in post-Soviet Belarus: the foundations. In E.A. Korosteleva, C.W. Lawson, R.J. Marsh (Eds.), *Contemporary Belarus, Between democracy and dictatorship* (p. 21-35). London: RoutledgeCurzon
- O'Donnell, G. (2004), Why the rule of law matters, *Journal of Democracy*, 15(4), p.32-48
- Punch, K.F (1998), *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative approaches*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Ross, A. (1967), *Varför demokrati* (A. Degerman, Trans.), Stockholm: Santérus förlag
- Smith, W.S (1996), Cuba's long reform, *Foreign Affairs*, 75(2), p.99-112
- Tamanaha, B.Z. (2004), *On the Rule of law - history, politics, theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- White, G (2004), Civil Society, Democratization and Development: Clearing the analytical Ground. In P. Burnell & P. Calvert (Eds.), *Civil Society in Democratization* (p.6-19), London: Frank Cass and Company Limited

Internet sources

- BBC (2009a), The Cuban Missile crisis: 40 years on, *BBC*, retrieved on March 17, 2009, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/history/cuba.shtml>
- BBC News (2006a, March 24), West to put sanctions on Belarus, *BBC News*, retrieved on April 29, 2009, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/europe/4840370.stm>
- BBC News (2008a, September 29), Belarus clean sweep poll 'flawed', *BBC News*, retrieved on April 29, 2009, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/europe/7642084.stm>
- BBC News (2008b, October 13), EU to let Belarus leader travel, *BBC News*, retrieved on April 29, 2009, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/europe/7667197.stm>
- BBC News (2009), Country profile: Cuba, *BBC News*, retrieved on March 17, 2009, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/country_profiles/1203299.stm
- Beehner, L (2008, October 9), Why we need Belarus, *The Guardian*, retrieved on April 28, 2009, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2008/oct/09/usa.belarus.russia.diplomacy>
- CIF Author (2008, February 19), Getting closer to Cuba, *The Guardian*, retrieved on April 14, 2009, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/feb/19/gettingclosertocuba>
- Encyclopedia Britannica, (2009), Latin America, history of, In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved May 19, 2009, from Encyclopedia Britannica Online: <http://search.eb.com/eb/article-60824>

- Escobales, R. (2008, February 19), What next for Cuba? *The Guardian*, retrieved on April 14, 2009, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/feb/19/cuba.usa2>
- Freedom House (2009), Electoral democracies (123) 2007, *freedomhouse.org*, retrieved on March 23, 2009, <http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=368&year=2007>
- Harding, L. (2008, July 24), Russia contemplates using Cuba to refuel nuclear bombers, *The Guardian*, retrieved on April 14, 2009, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/jul/24/russia.usa>
- Moynihan, C. (2003, July 1), Cuba has been left out for too long, *The Guardian*, retrieved on April 14, 2009, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2003/jul/01/cuba.foreignpolicy>
- Nationalencyklopedin (2009a), *search word: "Vitryssland"*, retrieved on March 4, 2009, <http://www.ne.se/artikel/344813>
- Nationalencyklopedin (2009b), *search word: "Cuba"*, retrieved on March 16, 2009, <http://www.ne.se/artikel/148447>
- The Economist (2008a, October 2), Dictator at bay, *The Economist*, retrieved on April 28, 2009, http://www.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story_id=12342221
- The Economist (2009a, March 19), Courting Castro, *The Economist*, retrieved on April 14, 2009, http://www.economist.com/world/americas/displaystory.cfm?story_id=13331342
- The Economist (2009b, April 8), The ghost at the conference table, *The Economist*, retrieved on April 14, 2009, http://www.economist.com/world/americas/displaystory.cfm?story_id=13446630
- The Economist (2009c, February 26), Closer still, *The Economist*, retrieved on April 28, 2009, http://www.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story_id=13176898
- Urbina, I. (2009, April 6), In Cuba, change means more of the same, with control at the top, *The New York Times*, retrieved on April 15, 2009, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/06/world/americas/06cuba.html?_r=1
- Utrikesdepartementet (2009, January 15), Travel Restrictions, *Regeringskansliet*, retrieved on April 29, 2009, <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/11318/a/118551>
- Utrikespolitiska Institutet (2009a), *Vitryssland – äldre historia*, retrieved on March 4 2009, <http://www.landguiden.se>

Utrikespolitiska Institutet (2009b), *Kuba*, retrieved on March 16, 2009,
<http://www.landguiden.se>