

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

REPRESENTATIONS OF DICTATORSHIP IN PORTUGUESE CINEMA

ISABEL MACEDO, RITA BASTOS,
ROSA CABECINHAS

Introduction

We are experiencing a time characterized by the unprecedented presence of history and memory in the cultural sphere. In this context, visual artifacts, such as films, play a key role in transforming the way historical events can be assessed, giving them renewed visibility by raising public awareness. The presence of these visual products—their various genres, styles and interpretations of the past—can contribute to a richer understanding of history and collective memory and to the development of more reflective and self-aware historical individuals. Cultural memory comprises a body of images and texts, specific to each society and each age, that serves to stabilize and convey its self-image.¹ By means of cultural heritage, each society becomes visible to itself and others. Cultural memory is based on communication through media.² Media technologies, such as film, broaden the temporal and spatial range of remembrance. Film has its specific way of remembering, generating and molding images that have the power to shape the collective imagination of the past.

Currently, in Portugal, there is a renewed interest in telling stories about the recent past and the dictatorship in particular. This is even more noticeable among filmmakers, who often try and fill the gaps in historiography

¹ Jan Assmann and John Czaplick, “Collective Memory and Cultural Identity,” *New German Critique*, 65 (1995): 125-133.

² Astrid Erll, “Literature, Film, and the Mediality of Cultural Memory,” *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 389-398.

by focusing on history from below (using ordinary people as witnesses), and confronting official history with it.³ In fact, our understanding of the dynamics of the Portuguese recent past has been enhanced in recent years by the role of culture and aesthetics. The number of films produced in Portugal between 2004 and 2011 has noticeably increased. Moreover, the number of non-fiction films has shown a significant rise in this period.⁴ The topics covered by these documentaries mainly concern the areas of *Arts and Artists* (painting, sculpture, theatre, cinema, literature...). In spite of that, local realities, (autobiographical) memories and events from the recent past are also recurrent issues.

Our research shows that nineteen documentaries were produced between 2007 and 2013—our range of analysis – and Portuguese dictatorship and the colonial past are their major subjects. The two films analyzed in this paper – *Fantasia Lusitana (Lusitanian Illusion, 2010)*, by João Canijo, and *48 (2010)*, by Susana de Sousa Dias—are both reflections on the Portuguese dictatorship and constructions of present understandings and awareness. They refer to the values that were widespread during the period in question, as well as to the climate of violence and repression in which people lived. In short, they disclose—using testimonies and archival footage—what had tacitly been forgotten, while maintaining a critical awareness.⁵ We believe that by offering archival material and testimonies, the debate about the Portuguese dictatorial past can be revived.

The key question in this essay is: how is Portuguese dictatorship portrayed in current films? In this paper we focus on the phenomena within, between, and around films which have the power to (re)produce and (re)shape cultural memory.

³ Sonja De Leeuw, “Dutch Documentary Film as a Site of Memory: Changing Perspectives in the 1990s,” in *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 10.1 (2007): 75-87.

⁴ Since 2011 until now, due to the economic crisis the country has experienced, there was a decrease in the number of films produced.

⁵ Assmann uses the concept of “dialogical forgetting” to illustrate those societies which look for pragmatic solutions to bring a conflict to an end by “controlling and containing the explosive force of memory.” Aleida Assmann, “From Collective Violence to a Common Future: Four Models for Dealing with a Traumatic Past,” in *Conflict, Memory Transfers and the Reshaping of Europe*, ed. Helena Gonçalves da Silva, Adriana Martins [et al.], (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010), 14-22, 22. The author adds that dialogical forgetting or the pact of silence becomes a strategy of European politics.

From the Military Coup to the Consolidation of the *Estado Novo*

Before focusing on the films we chose, we will briefly describe the Portuguese dictatorship that lasted 48 years. We thus hope to clarify how the *Estado Novo* (New State) (1932-1974) was developed and consolidated, as well as discuss the role of film and propaganda in the creation and preservation of the regime's image. The First Portuguese Republic began in 1910 and ended as a result of a military coup in 1926. From this year until 1928, Sinel Cordes and General Carmona ruled the country as a typical military dictatorship. However, among the dictatorship's followers there were rebels who claimed that Sinel Cordes and Carmona had betrayed the military coup. They considered that the Republic and the democratic institutions were in danger. Indeed, the regime established press censorship from the beginning and undertook other repressive measures against individual rights. The financial deficit in the country worsened during this period (Oliveira Marques 1986). The increasingly stronger opposition was exasperated, and in 1927, both in Porto and in Lisbon, revolutionary movements supported by members of the army, navy and thousands of civilians broke out. The government had a difficult time silencing the riots and there were hundreds of dead and wounded. Further unsuccessful riots occurred in 1928 and 1931. The political police increasingly intervened in the lives of citizens, forcing many opponents of the regime into exile. In 1928, Carmona, the only presidential candidate, won the elections once more and Colonel Vicente de Freitas formed a new government, which included Oliveira Salazar as minister of Finance. Salazar, 39, Professor of Economics at the University of Coimbra,⁶ was admired for his books and articles on economic and financial issues. Salazar accepted the ministry of Finance in 1928, but conditionally on his being able to oversee the budgets of all ministries and having veto power on all expenditures, thus becoming the "country's 'financial dictator'."⁷ The success of his financial policy granted him prestige and converted him into the "saviour of the Nation". The so-called New State and the *União Nacional*⁸ (National Union) were set during 1930 and 1931. The *Acto Colonial* (Colonial Act), a kind of political code of dictatorship concerning

⁶ For a biography of Salazar see Filipe R. Meneses, *Salazar: A Political Biography* (New York: Enigma Books, 2009).

⁷ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁸ A party created by Salazar whose aims included "encouraging all that was national, and brought the Portuguese together; it existed to encourage a new, national, way of thinking." *Ibid.*, 132.

the Portuguese colonies, was also established during this period. In 1932, Salazar replaced Domingos de Oliveira and formed a government predominantly composed of people of his generation who admired him.⁹

The last steps involved in the shaping of an authoritarian and corporate State were taken between 1932 and 1933: Salazar rejected any sort of agreement with opposition groups and called for a political unity of the country around the National Union, of which he became the leader. In February 1933, the text for the new Constitution was published, followed by the *Estatuto do Trabalho Nacional* (Statute of National Labour) and a number of measures related to the organization of the corporate State. Political parties, secret societies and trade unions were banned. In the course of 1936 two typically fascist organizations were created and enthusiastically presented: the *Legião Portuguesa* (Portuguese Legion), or the body of volunteers to defend the regime, and the *Mocidade Portuguesa* (Portuguese Youth), a pre-military organization for teenagers.¹⁰ The New State was firmly established.¹¹ All along Salazar determined what this new regime—the New State—would be like. The resemblances to Italian fascism are clear in several areas, such as the strengthening of authority. In spite of that, he characterized the Portuguese regime as milder and less severe than the Italian one. However, according to Lourenço, contrary to what one might think the title of his book “Fascism never existed” hints at, the New State was, effectively, a form of “fascism.”¹² The PIDE (1945), *Polícia Internacional e de Defesa do Estado* (International and State Defense Police) was the main tool of repression used by the authoritarian regime during the New State.¹³ Created in 1926 and initially designated Information Police of Lisbon and Porto, after World War II, the political police gained new powers,¹⁴ focusing all branches on political repression

⁹ António H. Oliveira Marques, *História de Portugal, vol. III, das revoluções liberais aos nossos dias* (Lisbon: Palas Editores, 1986).

¹⁰ Luís R. Torgal, “Salazar and the Portuguese ‘New State’ - Images and Interpretations,” *Annual of Social History*, 2 (2009): 7-18.

¹¹ Oliveira Marques, *História de Portugal*.

¹² Eduardo Lourenço, *O Fascismo nunca existiu* (Alfragide: Publicações D. Quixote, 1976).

¹³ José Mattoso, *História de Portugal Vol. VII – O Estado Novo (1926-1974)* (Lisbon: Editora Estampa, 1993).

¹⁴ After the coup of May 28, 1926, which established the Military Dictatorship, the Information Police of Lisbon and Porto were created. They were unified in 1928, with the designation of Ministry of Domestic Information Police. Their main functions were the repression of “social crimes” and assisting the government in international police matters. Although they acted for nearly half a century under different names, the fact is that from 1926 to 1974, this state police never ceased to

and the prevention of crimes against the internal and external security of the State. Pimentel states that the legislation which created PIDE aimed at legalizing the illegal practice of detention for an unlimited time without charge. This condition continued permanently.¹⁵

Propaganda, Ideology and Cinema in the *Estado Novo*

Throughout the first decade, the Salazar regime placed cultural policy at the top of its political agenda. The ambitious aim was to recover “a true Portuguese culture” rooted in conservative and outdated principles. It was a strategy based on a subtle articulation of censorship/ propaganda and prevention/ repression. The SPN, *Secretariado de Propaganda Nacional* (SPN - Secretariat of National Propaganda), created in 1933, was established as the brain-centre of cultural policy and propaganda. Its director, António Ferro,¹⁶ reported directly to Salazar. He maintained that “politically there is only what the public knows that exists.”¹⁷ The SPN was expressly in charge of fostering national identity and a “spirit of unity,” and used propaganda to transmit the government’s message to a largely illiterate population through media such as the press, radio, cinema and theatre. For Ferro, the educational function was paramount. The intention was no less

be an organization of social and political terrorism, serving the interests of the military dictatorship and the regime that Salazar/Caetano represented, thus constituting the principal organization to sustain the regime for several decades. Alberto Pedroso, “A polícia política,” in *História de Portugal. Dos tempos pré-modernos aos nossos dias*, ed. João Medina (Amadora: Clube Internacional do Livro, 1998).

¹⁵ Irene F. Pimentel, *A História da PIDE* (Rio de Mouro: Círculo de Leitores, 2007).

¹⁶ António Ferro projected a “policy of spirit” which put art at the service of New State propaganda, in order to instill enthusiasm for the actions of the regime in the Portuguese people. Patrícia Vieira, *Cinema no Estado Novo: a Encenação do Regime* (Lisbon: Edições Colibri, 2011). Writing about António Ferro, Torgal adds that he was also “a journalist that interviewed dictators, a modernist writer, an editor for the literary journal *Orpheu*—where Fernando Pessoa wrote—, a traveler, a playwright and a cinema lover who visited Hollywood, the land of dreams and ‘make-believe’.” Luís R. Torgal, “Salazar and the Portuguese ‘New State’ - Images and Interpretations,” *Annual of Social History*, 2 (2009): 7-18, 15.

¹⁷ Propaganda Nacional, 26 de Outubro de 1933, in Salazar, *Discursos*, Vol.1, 159.

than the “moral regeneration” of the nation,¹⁸ using the arts as instruments of collective “seduction” that contributed to a “healthier” life.¹⁹ By establishing a relation between culture (in particular cinema and theatre) and propaganda, Ferro opposed spirit to matter, setting up a sort of binary vision (spirit *versus* matter; good *versus* evil), which guided the aesthetic direction of Salazar’s propaganda. So, the artistic forms welcomed by the New State always had to convey a harmonious and cheerful social image of the country. Films that did not follow these standards were censored and banned. The notion of harmony became omnipresent and set the emblematic image of the country, as an example of a united corporative State. The organs of censorship would spring into action, prohibiting views/representations which did not come to terms with the regime’s ideals. The SPN’s “policy of the spirit” tried to recover and promote national popular traditions, such as folklore, and to restore Portugal’s “spiritual sovereignty”, using the heroic past, connecting it to the present and to the future.²⁰ An illustrative example is the *Exposição do Mundo Português* (the Portuguese World Exhibition) of 1940, the major cultural event in Portugal.²¹ Corkill and Almeida reported that it had a triple function for the regime’s propagandists “in their quest for the regime’s legitimacy, for propagating Salazar’s nationalist version of the nation’s history, and in shaping the national consciousness of the Portuguese people in order to eliminate the ‘anti-national’” feeling.²²

Cinema was identified as an important propaganda tool. In spite of his catholic and conservative education, Salazar, under the influence of António Ferro, understood that he needed to continue imposing his

¹⁸ David Corkill and José C. P. Almeida, “Commemoration and Propaganda in Salazar’s Portugal: The Mundo Português Exposition of 1940,” *Journal of Contemporary History*, 44.3 (2009): 381-399, 384.

¹⁹ Graça dos Santos, “‘Política do espírito:’ O bom gosto obrigatório para embelezar a realidade,” *Media & Jornalismo*, 12 (2008): 59-72, 61.

²⁰ In fact, several State events organized by António Ferro made Portugal famous abroad in the 1930s and 1940s. For example, by participating in international exhibitions (Paris, 1937; New York and San Francisco, 1939). As Torgal mentions, the New State conveyed a relatively pleasant image in foreign political milieus. Torgal, “Salazar,” 7. For instance, it was common, during the long period of its existence, to recognize the New State as having an “original” character, thus avoiding the generic classification of “fascism”.

²¹ The Portuguese World Exhibition, 1940, is an example of a celebration about fundamental symbols of identity as defined by the Salazar regime: God, nation, family, work, authority, national cohesion, empire and multiracialism were some of the values conveyed.

²² Corkill and Almeida, “Commemoration and Propaganda,” 381.

doctrine by means of propaganda. The government lavished resources on film and newsreel in order to ensure that their ideas were transmitted to audiences, and major public events were recorded in documentary films. According to Paulo “subjects connected with the most diversified organisms of the New State began adopting the cinematographic documentary as their main vehicle for popularizing their message.”²³ *Jornal Português* (Portuguese Journal) and *Imagens de Portugal* (Images of Portugal) are examples of this approach. The latter was directed by António Lopes Ribeiro—known as the filmmaker of the regime and responsible for the SPN and the SNI.²⁴ Paulo stresses the strategy of releasing these documentaries among Portuguese emigrants, namely in Brazil, spreading an idealized image of the country. In 1940, with the aim of asserting the regime’s “neutrality” during World War II and thus keeping the peace in the country, the New State carried out and recorded in short films the *Comemorações do Duplo Centenário* (Commemorations of the Double Centenary). This idea of “a world apart (Portugal) in a Europe at War” reaches the interior of the country through the “Itinerant Cinema,” and foreign countries thanks to promotional events carried out by the regime.

As far as fictional cinema is concerned, we underline the importance of Leitão de Barros, one of the filmmakers who was most connected to the regime, due to his focus on historical celebration and the nationalist idea of “conversion” to the “glorious” history of Portugal, that his films show.²⁵ *As Pupilas do Senhor Reitor* (The Priest’s Pupils, 1935), and *Camões* (1946) are his most relevant films. One of the most important propaganda films of the regime is António Lopes Ribeiro’s *O Feitiço do Império* (The Spell of an Empire, 1940), a film about Portugal’s mission to bring ‘civilization’ to Africa. In this film,²⁶ the fiction meets the “real” image of the regime through the documentary. According to Torgal, this is a film that, besides trying to promote Portugal and its colonial empire, is also an example of “conversion.”²⁷ In this case, of a Luso-American character converted to the virtues of Portugal and its Empire, whose aim is to inspire

²³ Paulo Heloísa, “Documentarismo e Propaganda: as imagens e os sons do regime,” in *O cinema sob o olhar de Salazar*, ed. Luís R. Torgal (Lisbon: Círculo dos Leitores, 2011), 92-116, 103.

²⁴ SPN was replaced in 1945 by SNI – *Secretariado Nacional de Informação* (Secretariat of National Information).

²⁵ Luís R. Torgal, “Propaganda, Ideologia e Cinema no Estado Novo: a ‘conversão dos descrentes’,” in *O cinema sob o olhar de Salazar*, ed. Luís R. Torgal (Lisbon: Círculo dos Leitores, 2011), 64-91.

²⁶ Captured by the photography of Isy Goldberger and Manuel Luís Vieira.

²⁷ Torgal, “Propaganda, Ideologia,” 82.

Portuguese emigration to Africa, instead of to Europe. This “conversion” cinema was a type of propaganda, used during the years of the dictatorial regime, with the militant intention of reproducing the ideology of the New State.

In 1951, international pressure on the Salazar regime increased, due to its colonial position in Africa. The sociologist Gilberto Freyre (1933-2002) traveled throughout the country and the “overseas departments,”²⁸ producing several books that Salazar’s regime used to establish the ideology of “Portuguese exceptionalism,” thus broadening the alleged dimension of the Portuguese national character. Freyre coined the concept of “lusotropicalism” to explain the apparently successful relationships between different cultures in Brazil. This ideology is based on the alleged natural capacity and ability of the Portuguese for miscegenation and relationship with other cultures. This trait would explain the “unique character of colonial relationships, and would, nowadays, have a positive impact on the relationships between the Portuguese and immigrants.”²⁹ Freyre’s theory of “lusotropicalism” was useful in the regime’s efforts to justify the persistent possession of overseas colonies, as it sustained the existence of a racial/cultural affinity between Portugal and Africa³⁰ as well as the construction of a self-representation of the Portuguese as non-racists.³¹ According to Almeida, this perspective fitted “nicely with the regime’s growing strategy of presenting the Portuguese empire as multiracial.”³²

The year 1961 represents a turning point in the history and politics of Portugal. The beginning of that year saw the start of military operations in Angola to counteract independence movements. The Portuguese government sent armed forces that triggered the outbreak of the Colonial War, which spread to Guinea and Mozambique and lasted 13 years. About 50 percent of public expenditures and a mobilization of about two hundred

²⁸ This international pressure led the Portuguese elites to use all their persuasive power to make the world believe that the ‘overseas departments’ were part of a Portuguese ‘pluricontinental nation’”, Bernd Reiter, “Portugal: National Pride and Imperial Neurosis,” *Race Class*, 47 (2005): 79-91, 79).

²⁹ Jorge Vala, Diniz Lopes and Marcus Lima, “Black Immigrants in Portugal: Luso-Tropicalism and Prejudice,” *Journal of Social Issues*, 64.2 (2008): 287-302, 289.

³⁰ Reiter, “Portugal: national pride.”

³¹ Miguel Vale de Almeida, “‘Longing for oneself’: Hybridism and Miscegenation in Colonial and postcolonial Portugal,” *Etnográfica*, VI.1 (2002): 181-200.

³² Miguel Vale de Almeida, “Portugal’s Colonial Complex: From Colonial Lusotropicalism to Postcolonial Lusophony,” *Queen’s Postcolonial Research Forum* (Belfast: Queen’s University, April 28th 2008).

[[Top of Page](#)]

Copyright © 1994-2017. Auto-Graphics, Inc. Ontario, California. All rights reserved.

thousand soldiers annually were devoted to it. According to Barreto “over the following ten years, the colonial war became a crucial aspect of national life. It not only affected policies, but also absorbed considerable portions of both budget and resources, which caused an increasingly repressive dictatorship.”³³

Marcelo Caetano replaced Salazar in 1968, but still the Colonial War continued, and it determined political strategy. From that year onwards, there were a series of transformations in Portugal, in which the conflict between the opposition and the regime became clearer. For example, the University of Lisbon went on strike and there were constant civil commotions beginning in late 1968, influenced by the events of “May 1968” in France. The students were against the educational system, the curricula of the universities, the political regime, as well as colonialism and war. In 1969 there was a student occupation at the University of Coimbra and for a week there were “free courses” dedicated to (neo) Marxism. In April 1969, in Coimbra, violent clashes between students and police forces marked the visit of Américo Tomás³⁴ to the University. The 1969 elections were affected by several illegalities and serious restrictions on fair electoral competition, exacerbating the political and social unrest.³⁵

From 1970 onwards, the direction of governmental actions saw several changes. Bent on keeping the Colonies, and silencing subversive student movements, the government put an end to any sort of liberalization, by shutting down student associations all over the country. There was “a succession of police raids in university facilities, dozens of students were arrested or forced to incorporate into the colonial army.”³⁶ In addition, from 1970/1971 to 1972 the number of arrests increased and cultural cooperatives were placed under the supervision of the Domestic Ministry, which increased censorship, repression and violence.

Portugal’s revolutionary road to democracy began on April 25, 1974, when middle-ranking officers in the armed forces, organized in a clandestine movement of captains, launched a coup against the authoritarian New State and the Colonial War in Africa. The MFA, *Movimento de Forças Armadas* (The Armed Forces Movement) used a commercial radio station to broadcast

³³ António Barreto, *Mudança Social em Portugal, 1960/2000*. Working Papers do Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa, 2002. Available online: <http://www.ics.ul.pt/publicacoes/workingpapers/wp2002/WP6-2002.pdf>.

³⁴ Américo Tomás (1894 -1987) was a military figure and the last President of the “New State.” He was overthrown in the revolution of April 25, 1974.

³⁵ Fernando Rosas, *História de Portugal, Vol VII, O Estado Novo (1926-1974)*. (Lisbon: Editorial Estampa, 1994).

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 553.

“Grândola”—a folk song written by José Afonso that appealed to an egalitarian regime. Crowds of jubilant citizens greeted the MFA in the streets, placing red carnations in the barrels of guns and tanks.

Portuguese Cinema: An Overview

If you take film as an effective tool for political propaganda, the Salazar regime, especially during the 1930s and 1940s, found both a weapon of political propaganda and a mass entertainment medium in cinema. In this period, a unique sort of genre develops in Portuguese cinema. Films from the *comédia à portuguesa*³⁷ (Portuguese comedy) reveal a certain uniformity in the way they share the virtues of the State and a cheerful and corporatist Portugal, by making “the people” the protagonists of the narrative. They are often sentimental, have a rural nature, and a light and direct message. As we have seen, during this period, the regime also used the film as a medium to build and disseminate images of the Portuguese empire.

According to Monteiro, the arrival of the 1950s revealed an “irreversible decline, in terms of ideas, aesthetic renewal, public and even, production”, which resulted in some sort of misshapen and unattractive cinema.³⁸ However this turns into a moment of intense cinematic discussion in the country, strengthened by the film society movement, which aided the renewal of the following decade. The 1960s witnessed aesthetic rupture and formal invention, which laid the foundations for the affirmation of filmmakers’ freedom and for a reflection about national matters, common subjects of later decades. The standing of the *Novo Cinema*³⁹ (Portuguese New Cinema) established a total rupture with the cinematic past, moving

³⁷ *A Canção de Lisboa* (*A Song of Lisbon*, 1933) by Cottinelli Telmo, *O Pai Tirano* (*The Tyrannical Father*, 1941) by Lopes Ribeiro, *O Pátio das Cantigas* (*The Courtyard of Songs*, 1941) by Francisco Ribeiro, *O Costa do Castelo* (*The Costa of the Castle*, 1943), *A Menina da Rádio* (*The Girl of the Radio*, 1944), and *O Leão da Estrela* (*The Lion of the Star*, 1947) by Arthur Duarte.

³⁸ Paulo F. Monteiro, “Uma margem no centro: a arte e o poder do ‘novo cinema’,” in *O Cinema sob o Olhar de Salazar*, Luís R. Torgal (Lisbon: Círculo dos Leitores, 2001), 306-338, 307.

³⁹ One of the key aspects that assured films’ renewal was Cunha Telles Productions (featuring António da Cunha Telles), and particularly the production of the first film by Paulo Rocha – *Os Verdes Anos* (*The Green Years*, 1963) – understood as “a new way of thinking life and cinema matters, considered as inseparable parts of a single whole.” João Mário Grilo, *O Cinema da Não-Ilusão. Histórias para o cinema português* (Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 2006), 19.

closer to European vanguards. This new generation⁴⁰ is characterized by almost exclusively foreign references and the cinephile culture of its members. The direct contact with the major film texts produced throughout Europe was a determining factor, as were the training courses and traineeships abroad which were promoted by the *Fundo Nacional de Cinema* (National Film Fund), from 1959 onwards, and by the *Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian* (Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation) from 1961 onwards.⁴¹ Lemière claims that from 1970 until 1990 the Portuguese cinema took a stand, due to a group of “author-directors” that firmly defended cinema as art, thus turning their back on the industrial model and the role of the producer.⁴² Considerable political, social, economical and cultural changes set a group of filmmakers and technicians into motion, including the founding group and a second wave involved in Portuguese New Cinema. They got together in search of internal legitimacy and public recognition of film as art. This movement coincides with an unprecedented process of internationalization in the panorama of national cinema. Producers and filmmakers inevitably grew apart, whereas the CPC, *Centro Português de Cinema* (Portuguese Cinema Centre), turned into a cooperative of authors.

During the 1970s, State interference in the way films were produced in Portugal became clear. On the one hand, Law No. 7/71⁴³ was passed and the IPC created; on the other hand, there was the creation in 1973 of the School of Cinema,⁴⁴ with Alberto Seixas Santos as its first director, supported by important CPC members.⁴⁵ As Cunha puts it, it is worth

⁴⁰ Paulo Rocha, Fernando Lopes, António de Macedo, António da Cunha Telles and Fernando Matos Silva, among others.

⁴¹ Paulo Cunha, “As origens do novo cinema português: o turismo cinéfilo e o novo cinema português,” in *Atas do XI Encontro da Socine* (Brasília: Socine, 2009).

⁴² Jacques Lemière, “Um centro na margem”: o caso do cinema português,” *Análise Social*, v. XLI.180 (Lisbon: Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa, 2006): 731-765.

⁴³ On December 7, 1971 the Law No. 7/71 which created the IPC, *Instituto Português de Cinema* (Portuguese Institute of Cinema), was passed. This was a State measure which aimed to control national cinema production. After the fall of António da Cunha Telles (1967) and CPC (1976), and the impossibility of engaging in independent productions, the only way out for cinema was State funding through grants.

⁴⁴ The first public school of cinema in Portugal.

⁴⁵ Fernando Lopes, Paulo Rocha and António da Cunha Telles, the technician Costa e Silva and the critics Bénard da Costa and Eduardo Prado Coelho, are some of the top names.

noticing that “(...) the School of Cinema intended to reconcile ‘prolonged empirical practice’ and ‘a good practical-theoretical training,’ preparing their graduates for the future development of film culture and the labor market.”⁴⁶ This school proved to be crucial in the following decades, by forming successive generations of Portuguese filmmakers and film technicians. One should stress that many projects⁴⁷ submitted during this period were censored by the regime. With the revolution of April 25, 1974, censorship was abolished. As a consequence, banned films were released, diversifying the choice of films available in the country, but also the variety of proposals. In 1978 the radicalism of *Amor de Perdição* (Doomed Love, 1976-1978), by Manoel de Oliveira, launches a new breakthrough in the dominant characteristics of Portuguese production of *militant* cinema, pointing to the symbolic failure of the cooperative mode of production.

From the 1980s onwards, Portuguese cinema experienced a period of expansion and a strengthening of its internationalization, especially in large festivals, signaling a Portuguese uniqueness, with the films of Manoel de Oliveira, António Reis and Margarida Cordeiro, Paulo Rocha, João Botelho, João César Monteiro (as well as José Álvaro Morais, Alberto Seixas Santos, Fernando Lopes, Jorge Silva Melo, João Mário Grilo).⁴⁸ Apart from that, and as a result of implementing a policy for new filmmakers, and thanks to the financial contribution of Portuguese Public Television (RTP), several new directors completed their first works, such as João Canijo, Pedro Costa, Margarida Gil, Joaquim Pinto, among others. Thinking about the modes of production, Paulo Cunha considers that this was a moment of transformation:

During this period, a change became visible in the way ‘filmmaking’ was done in Portugal, turning from a model of ‘production without producers,’ in which filmmakers and technicians unions proliferated within a model centered around collective work, into a model of co-productions with

⁴⁶ Paulo Cunha, *Os filhos bastardos. Afirmção e reconhecimento do novo Cinema português 1967-1974* (Coimbra: Dissertação de Mestrado apresentada à Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, 2005), 162.

⁴⁷ Some films with deep cuts that would prevent their distribution, as is the case of the film *Quem espera por sapatos de defunto morre descalço* (*He Goes Long Barefoot that Waits for Dead Men's Shoes*, 1970), by João César Monteiro, and others hit with full prohibition, as is the case of Eduardo Gêada's *Sofia e a educação sexual* (*Sofia and Sexual Education*, 1974).

⁴⁸ Lemière, “Um centro na margem.”

international financial partners like French producers of art films, best personified by the producer Paulo Branco.⁴⁹

The 90s were a *sui generis* period in the history of Portuguese cinema. While reflecting the new political situation of the country, with its integration into the European Community, the film industry becomes submerged in policy, legislative and institutional changes, in order to attract European funding. As a consequence, the insistence on the “national” is put in question, increasing the tension between quality and great public cinema. It was because of this duality that new authors emerged and, as Ferreira explains, either engaged in a local and internationally acclaimed film such as Teresa Villaverde, or used the “universal” language of the dominant cinema that is consumed by a national audience.⁵⁰ In this latter situation, Portuguese private television channels made their stand, as was the case of Joaquim Leitão and his films *Adão e Eva* (*Adam and Eve*, 1995) and *Tentação* (*Temptation*, 1997). The increasing importance of funding through international partners also became noticeable, culminating in a panorama of co-productions, especially with Brazil and the Portuguese-speaking African countries. The need to engage in an overview of colonial history, or in contemporary relationships with the former colonies became clear. On this subject Ferreira concludes:

(...) It is a fact that the film production of the 90s seeks dialogue, seeks new forms of production, and tries to engage more with colonial history, contemporary Portugal and a redefinition of male and female roles. The fact is that these searches—sometimes shared, sometimes not—took place in an environment that enabled a great diversity in film production, which differed from the previous decade.⁵¹

Areal argues that in Portugal, after the introduction of democracy in 1974, there was a boom in documentary films, as a result of the “need to document the real in transformation.”⁵² A set of exogenous and

⁴⁹ Paulo Cunha, “A ‘diferença’ portuguesa?” in *Cinema português: um guia essencial*, ed. Paulo Cunha and Michelle Sales (São Paulo: SESI-SP, 2013), 215-237, 236.

⁵⁰ Carolin O. Ferreira, “Estabilidade, Crescimento e Diversificação,” in *Cinema português: um guia essencial*, ed. Paulo Cunha and Michelle Sales (São Paulo: SESI-SP, 2013), 238-267.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 267.

⁵² Leonor Areal, *Cinema Português. Um País imaginado. Volume I - Antes de 1974* (Lisbon: Edições 70, 2011), 19.