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**ABSTRACT**

This article presents a reflection on the uses of the heritage of Portuguese dictatorship, especially by tourism. It makes use of the theory of dissonant heritage and questions the contribution of dark tourism’s theoretical framework for to the interpretation of this heritage.
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**PORTUGAL, PAÍS DE TURISMO: DISSONÂNCIAS E USOS TURÍSTICOS DO PATRIMÓNIO DO ESTADO NOVO**

**RESUMO**

Este artigo reflete sobre os usos, especialmente os turísticos, da herança patrimonial da ditadura em território português. Recorre à teoria do património dissonante e questiona o contributo que o enquadramento do turismo negro pode dar para a interpretação deste património.
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**INTRODUCTION**

The creation of Secção de Presos Políticos e Sociais [Political and Social Prisoners Section] in 1934 gave way for the Polícia de Vigilância e Defesa do Estado [State Security and Defense Police] (PVDE, later called Polícia Internacional de Defesa do Estado [International and State Defense Police] – PIDE) to directly manage the Aljube prison, in Lisbon, the Fortress of Caxias, the Fortress of Peniche, the Fortress of São João Baptista, in Angra do Heroísmo (Azores), and, after 1936, the Tarrafal concentration camp, on the island of Santiago (Cape Verde). In addition to these, Estado Novo had military political prisons, or military prisons that received military political prisoners, such as the Military Reclusion House of Trafaria, which operated in the Fort of Nossa Senhora da Saúde da Trafaria (Caldeira, Rosas, Quintanilha, Pimentel & Martins, 2011). PIDE had detention and interrogation centers throughout the country, but these facilities joined the private prisons that operated in the delegations of Coimbra and Porto (known as Aljube do...
Porto) and in the directory in Lisbon, on António Maria Cardoso Street (Caldeira et al., 2011).

These are the most emblematic sites of the repression and violence exercised by Estado Novo. However, there are many other buildings in Portugal with strong connections to the repressive and ideological apparatus of Estado Novo.

The Plenary Courts of Boa Hora, in Lisbon, and of São João Novo, in Porto were created for the purpose of judging Estado Novo’s opponents. In practice, they were nothing more than a “disguised police institution” (Pacheco, 2006) through which Estado Novo summarily sentenced its political opponents. In Lisbon, there were Salazar’s Government headquarters, in Praça do Comércio, the headquarters of União Nacional [National Union] (later Acção Nacional Popular [National Popular Action], Estado Novo’s single party), the headquarters of Mocidade Portuguesa [Portuguese Youth], the headquarters of Secretariado Nacional de Informação [National Secretariat of Information], Salazar’s residence on Bernardo Lima Street, and PIDE’s School. In Estoril, the Fort of Santo Antonio was Salazar’s holiday residence.

Heritage such as this is linked to a contested past containing dissonant elements which are potentially destabilizing for the sense of identity of communities and even nations (Logan & Reeves, 2009; Macdonald, 2009; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). Thus, its management presents a specific set of challenges for societies in general and for heritage managers in particular (Logan & Reeves, 2009). Reflecting on the heritage associated to an uncomfortable past for groups or nations contributes to destabilize cultural premises and identity and memory entanglements at different times (Macdonald, 2009). It is therefore important to reflect on it in order to highlight the difficulties of representation and public reception (Macdonald, 2009).

This article seeks to contribute to this reflection on the uses of the heritage of the dictatorship in Portugal, with a greater focus on those involving tourist activity. Although there already are studies in Portugal about these sites from a Museology perspective, there hasn’t yet been an analysis addressing their condition of intrinsically dissonant heritage and exploring their relationship with tourism related to death and suffering. To this end, we first discuss the concept and heritage condition attributed to these sites, based on Tunbridge and Ashworth’s (1996) theory of dissonant heritage. This theory transposes Psychology’s notion of cognitive dissonance into to the heritage field, arguing that heritage may also contain elements that are not coherent with each other, not at an individual level but on collective and political dimensions. Afterwards we present the concept of dark tourism, which is addressed here as a complex phenomenon encompassing varied objects and actors in places which, due to their characteristics, allow visitors to establish a relationship with death and suffering. We propose that the approach of this type of tourism can make a relevant contribution for the interpretation of the heritage of the dictatorship in Portugal, by encouraging reflection and reflexivity with regard to tourists, site managers and the community as a whole. We then present the current situation of some of the most significant heritage of the Estado Novo institutions,
mentioning the processes that led to the buildings' current use, especially by tourism, and more specifically by cultural tourism. We conclude with the analysis of these same uses and processes in light of the theories previously presented.

Dissonant heritage

The concept of heritage has several meanings. It began by designating an inheritance or family assets, until it was extended to the entire cultural and artistic production of a group or nation and became muddled with the concept of culture (Silva, 2000; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). At present, heritage can be broadly defined as a legacy of the past that we pass on to future generations (Silva, 2000).

However, the concept of heritage equals neither that of past nor that of culture: it is a selection and a product of the present. The process of formation or creation of heritage implies a selection by each generation of aspects or elements inherited from the past that it wishes to pass on to future generations (Silva, 2000; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996): “it is a symbolic process of social and cultural legitimation of certain objects that give a group a collective feeling of identity” (Silva, 2000, pp. 218-219).

Parallel to the process of selecting objects to become heritage, there is a process of exclusion. This can happen when the existing heritage no longer complies with current directives, that is, when it has contradictory messages that are dissonant in the context of prevailing norms or dominant ideology (Logan & Reeves, 2009; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) also refer to the occurrence of disinheritance. The process of heritage creation will inevitably exclude “social, ethnic or regional groups” whose experiences are “discounted, marginalized, distorted, or ignored” (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, p. 29).

This process is common to all heritage, but it can be more severe in heritage linked to a past that groups or nations recognize as meaningful but which remains “contested and awkward for public reconciliation with a positive, self-affirming contemporary identity” (Macdonald, 2009, p. 1). This is the case of heritage related to repressive and violent political and/or judicial regimes:

a range of places, sites and institutions represent the legacy of these painful periods: massacre and genocide sites, places related to prisoners of war, civil and political prisons, and places of ‘benevolent’ internment such as leper colonies and lunatic asylums. These places bring shame upon us now for the cruelty and ultimate futility of the events that occurred within them and the ideologies they represented. Increasingly, however, they are now being regarded as “heritage sites”. (Logan & Reeves, 2009, p. 1)

These sites can have political functions and be used to serve the interests of governments or other citizen groups. They are often used to strengthen or even (con)form national memories and identities. Logan and Reeves (2009) point out that this use may reach the point of revisionism or conscious distortion not only of the histories of those places and heritage, but also of collective memory:
a distortion strategically aimed at manipulating the collectivity by manipulating its history, by ‘explaining’ its history in order to win support for a particular set of policies or for the maintenance of their hegemonic power in the present social order. (Logan & Reeves, 2009, p. 2)

According to Logan and Reeves (2009), this is something that happens frequently in production contexts of nationalist representations, but it is also common in postcolonial societies, due to the need to achieve political and social cohesion.

The destruction and desecration of this kind of heritage are also very common (Forest & Johnson, 2001). Sometimes there is an effort to erase or conceal buildings’ connection to particular political regimes and social orders by destroying or defacing them (Macdonald, 2009). This effort is compounded by the demystification of sites through their conversion to places of daily use (Macdonald, 2009). The author gives as an example the case of Nuremberg, whose inhabitants believed the fact that the city was known by the Nazi Party Rally Grounds (Reichsparteitagebäude) erased all other historical aspects of the city while at the same time representing a risk of the city becoming a pilgrimage site for neo-Nazis. For these reasons, public authorities carried out a process of building defacement in the post-war period, until a shift in public opinion occurred in the 1970s that forced a new intervention to reconvert the complex. Since then the city has begun efforts to restore some of the complex’s buildings and finish building others, even creating the Documentation Center of the Nazi Party Rally Grounds. It has been installed in one of the wings of the unfinished Congress Center and, in addition to serving as a documentation center and educational forum on the Third Reich, it also houses the exhibition *Fascination and Terror*, which offers a look at “the causes, the context and the consequences of the National-Socialist regime of terror”.

Sometimes the local community struggles to accept that a certain piece of heritage or a certain aspect of their past has national or international interest (Logan & Reeves, 2009). The authors point out that interaction with the local community is fundamental, as is the “recognition that the context in which professionals work is political” (Logan & Reeves, 2009, p. 13).

Although there are authors who classify this heritage as “difficult” (Macdonald, 2009), we consider that all heritage is, by definition, full of tensions and difficulties. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) introduced the idea that all heritage has dissonant elements.

The concept of dissonant heritage was inspired by Festinger’s (1957) cognitive dissonance. This theory, born in Psychology, generally states that individuals need to attain coherence between their cognitions, and that when at least two elements (beliefs, opinions, behaviours) are not rationally hinged there is conflict or dissonance (Festinger, 1957). Similarly, heritage dissonance “involves a discordance or lack of agreement and consistency” (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, p. 20) between its elements. This dissonance can occur at various moments and dimensions: in aspects of merchandising and marketing, in the content of the messages transmitted through interpretation, and in societies’
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very own attitudes about and towards a certain heritage. Dissonance is intrinsic to heritage, that is, it is part of its nature, and cannot be removed. It is also universal in the sense that it is a condition that all assets possess, albeit with very different intensities.

For Tunbridge and Asworth (1996) there is a particular type of heritage whose characteristics enhance dissonance: the heritage of atrocity, where dissonance can provoke intense emotions and have links to memories that cause profound changes in the self-image or identity of peoples. The authors define atrocity as “especially shocking” “acts of singular cruelty” perpetrated by people against people (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, p. 95), while safeguarding that both elements may be present in varying degrees of intensity.

Tourism in places of death and suffering

The attraction for places of death and suffering has existed since people are able to travel (Sharpley, 2009). The broader reach of information about events and places of death and suffering brought about by media development gave rise to the growth of tourist interest in these places and the development of tourism activity (Logan & Reeves, 2009; Sharpley & Stone, 2009; Walter, 2009).

The concept of dark tourism designates tourist activity in places that accidentally or intentionally became tourist attractions and have concrete and identifiable links to episodes or situations of death and suffering. Dark tourism symbolically exhibits the death of the Other in its attractions. These are places where contemporary mortality is reconfigured and revitalized, thus mediating the complexity of death and fostering a reflection on the death of the Self (Stone, 2011).

Stone (2011) identified four reasons that explain dark tourism’s role of as mediator of death in contemporary society, the first of which being that dark tourism represents and communicates death. The second reason pointed out by Stone is that dark tourism gives the visitor the opportunity to accumulate “death capital”, which they can then use when necessary. The fact that dark tourism sites are places where contemporary mortality is reconfigured and revitalized, thereby mediating the complexity of death is the third reason. The last reason mentioned by Stone (2011) is that dark tourism mediates what is apparently macabre by symbolically exhibiting death.

This mediation role assumes particular relevance in this time described by Martins (2002) as the media era, wherein rituals of celebration of death no longer mediate the passage “between this life and the other” (Martins, 2013, p. 113) and the media present us with live death without any ritual that mediates the passage.

Dark tourism sites are lieux de mémoire (Nora 1993) that foster a group’s sense of attachment to its past, embracing traumatic social collective memories, relating life and death, and presenting a past time which does or should remain as a symbol (Logan & Reeves, 2009). In this sense, they form heterotopias (Foucault, 1984): physical and social spaces where normality is interrupted and where meanings related to the place, what it represents, and the individual who visits it are projected (Stone, 2013). They are places where local culture is reflected and simultaneously transcended, allowing visitors
to reflect on present and future crises with supra-national significance. Thus, these sites represent more than a single moment in the past; instead pointing to a juxtaposition of times (Stone, 2013).

Dark tourism attractions are related to death and to suffering in different degrees of intensity. Miles (2002) attributes these differences to spatial and temporal factors, which he illustrates with examples such as the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington and Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camp. According to Miles (2002), tourism in Auschwitz-Birkenau has a more intense relationship with death and suffering than tourism in the Holocaust Memorial because the former is a place of real death and suffering while in the latter there is only an association or allusion to death and suffering that have occurred elsewhere. Temporal factors, on the other hand, influence the intensity of the relation of places to death and suffering since situations of death and suffering that are part of first-generation memory or can be validated by living witnesses create greater empathy (Miles, 2002).

Stone (2006) condenses his view on the intensities of dark tourism in a spectrum of intensities of dark tourism offer (Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Dark Tourism Spectrum](source: adapted from Stone, 2006)
The extremes of this spectrum are lightest dark tourism and darkest dark tourism. Lightest dark tourism comprises places that were conceived as tourist attractions and explore an association with death and suffering for entertainment purposes. Hence, they have little political and ideological influence. Their focus on older events or situations of death and suffering will also have a lower emotional charge. These are places endowed with strong tourist infrastructure that promotes the consumption of a tourist product built around romanticized and merchandised presentations or representations of death and suffering.

Darker dark tourism takes place in real sites of death and suffering which have occurred more recently and is geared towards education. The physical presence of buildings makes it harder to forget them and represents an invite to celebration and reflection; it is therefore an integral part of their museological and interpretative identity (Macdonald, 2009). These places focus on the conservation of spaces and the preservation of memories. The only infrastructures added are those considered essential for tourist activity.

Darker dark tourism sites tend to have a greater symbolic charge and to be subject to greater political and ideological influence. The events or situations of death and suffering that took place there tend to be more recent and often have a strong relationship with political regimes and social issues (Macdonald, 2009; Stone, 2006). Duffy (2001) classifies these places into sub-typologies: memory museums, Holocaust and genocides museums, slave and slave trade museums, African American civil rights museums, prison museums, and torture museums. Williams (2007) adds more specific themes: terrorism, nuclear accidents, and other forms of irregular conflict. These classifications are very restrictive in their applicability to different cultural contexts, for example those of countries that have gone through oppressive and/or dictatorial political regimes. Thus, it is necessary for these categorizations to include museums of resistance and other museums, centers of interpretation, or memorials that materialize these traumatic pasts.

All of these places of traumatic events that became object of tourism activity have varied themes, diverse locations and specific missions, yet they have certain characteristics in common, according to Williams (2007). The first is that they are usually linked to relevant political events, such as memorial days. Museums and interpretation centers also tend to have a strong pedagogical mission that includes a psychosocial component in working with survivors, and educational work which seeks to establish connections with current problematic issues (Williams, 2007). In addition, it is common for many of these museums to be linked to truth and reconciliation commissions and human rights organizations; also, there is often a group of people with a special relationship with these museums, such as members of the resistance and family and friends of the victims or even of the perpetrators.

**Estado Novo’s heritage in current Portuguese Culture**

Currently, the uses given to the heritage of *Estado Novo* are quite diverse. There are derelict buildings, restored building, buildings in uninterrupted use and even some
cases where the places were memorialized thanks to the intervention of citizen groups. Next, we present a general view regarding the current use of some of the most emblematic buildings of Estado Novo’s ideological and repressive apparatus in Portugal.

PIDE’s headquarters, in António Maria Cardoso Street, in Lisbon, are a paradigmatic case of the management of Estado Novo’s heritage in Portugal. A rental from the House of Bragança², the property gradually degraded after 1974, managed by the Assembly of the Republic. The rental ended in 1990, and in 2005 the building was sold to a private investment group, which recovered it and transformed it into a gated community. This happened in spite of the lively protests of citizen groups, which were at the origin of the formation of Movimento Cívico Não Apaguem a Memória! [Civic Movement Do Not Erase Memory!] (NAM), which will be addressed in more detail in the following section. In 1980, by initiative of a group of citizens, a plaque commemorating the four people killed by PIDE agents was added on 25 April 1974. This has been replaced multiple times: “In the construction works for the condominium, the plaque disappeared, there were protests, the plate returned, it was stolen in 2014, complaints were made and it returned in replica” (Alves, 2017).

The Aljube jail, in Lisbon, is now Museu do Aljube: Resistência e Liberdade [Museum of Aljube: Resistance and Freedom]. After the jail was shut down due to poor conditions, in 1965, the building underwent improvements, but did not resume its operation. After the revolution of the 25th of April, 1974, Aljube remained under the Ministry of Justice, which installed several services there; this required some construction to convert the property (Martins, 2015). The first official inquiries about the possibility of establishing a museum of resistance in Aljube date from beginning of the 1990s, (Oliveira, 2012) however this museum only came to be in 2015. The Museum of Aljube is supervised by the Lisbon Municipal Council and managed by a municipal company (EGEAC – Empresa de Gestão de Equipamentos e Animação Cultural [Equipment and Cultural Animation Management Company]).

Museum of Aljube’s permanent exhibition is based on four above ground floors and a basement. It begins by telling the building’s history and goes on to present the Portuguese fascist regime and to contextualize with its counterparts. It then goes on to detail the various forms of oppression and resistance during the dictatorship in Portugal and in the countries it previously occupied, culminating in the victory of democracy and the Revolution of the 25th of April, 1974. The exhibition also contains sections devoted to reports of torture and suffering of prisoners and political detainees perpetrated by Estado Novo, with a re-creation of the isolation cells (called “curros” in Aljube) and the mapping of the regime’s various prisons and concentration camps³.

In addition to the permanent exhibition, the Museum of Aljube hosts temporary exhibitions related to anti-fascist resistance and has both an Educational Service and a Documentation Center⁴.
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2 Former Portuguese Royal House.
3 Retrieved from https://www.museudoaljube.pt/exposicao-permanente/
4 Retrieved from https://www.museudoaljube.pt/sobre-o-museu/
The building that housed PIDE’s delegation in Coimbra had several uses after the 25th of April: it was the Coimbra delegation of the Serviço de Coordenação da Extinção da PIDE/DGS [Coordination Service for the Extinction of PIDE/DGS], then the headquarters of the Direcção Regional de Educação do Centro [Regional Directorate of Education of the Center], and an extension of Celas’ Centro de Saúde [Health Center] (Alves, 2017). Owned by the same family since the end of the 1940’s, the property was put on sale in 2013, after having been vacated by the health service. This intention of sale was the target of popular indignation and that of several public figures who where once “processed there”; they defended the construction of a museum of the memory of resistance to fascism (Sede da PIDE à venda por dois milhões de euros, 2013). The sale did go through, but the conversion to a museum did not either. The building, fully restored, is now a hostel: the Luggage Hostel & Suites. Although the hostel’s website does not make any mention of its past, one of the owners mentioned, in an interview with Sábado magazine, that the cells were kept and can be visited by guests (Alves, 2017).

The building complex called Peniche Fort or Fortress has been classified as a National Monument since 1938, and it is owned by the State. It was originally intended for military functions but was used as a prison since the early 20th century. As a political prison, the Fortress of Peniche has become a symbol of oppression and resistance and was the stage of some of the most notable escapes of the Portuguese prison system (Caldeira et al., 2011). After the release of political prisoners in 1974 it even housed returnee families from the former Portuguese colonies. In 1984 the Municipal Museum of Peniche was established in a part of the complex and, later, the Municipal Dance Studio and the Local Atelier of Arts, all of which are under the Municipality of Peniche. The Municipal Museum included spaces dedicated to the history and cultural production of the municipality of Peniche and to the history of the Forte itself, as well as the nucleus of anti-fascist resistance. This nucleus occupied several sections of the Fortress and had recreations of prisoners’ daily life in high security cells, besides other tourist information on the political prison. The museum is currently closed for the construction of the National Museum of Resistance and Freedom. The creation of this museum was possible due to popular protest, since in 2016 the Fortress was added by the Government to a list of monuments that would be concessioned to private initiative – the REVIVE program.

PIDE’s delegation in Porto, also known as Porto’s Aljube, was installed in a nineteenth century family home which now hosts the Military Museum. The genesis of this museum (with a different location) dates back to the late 1950s, still during the dictatorship,
but it was only inaugurated in 1980\textsuperscript{11}. The museum is dedicated to Portuguese military history, having several “exhibition halls dedicated to miniaturism, uniforms, light weapons and heavy artillery, and spaces dedicated to political-military events that occurred in the city of Porto”\textsuperscript{12}, mentioning the role of that building during \textit{Estado Novo}.

The Fortress of São João Baptista in Angra do Heroísmo, Azores, served as a military political prison during the dictatorship and has been used uninterruptedly by the Portuguese Army since 1643\textsuperscript{13}. Garrison Regiment No. 1, a military unit created in 1993, currently occupies these facilities. The Fortress is classified as Imóvel de Interesse Público [Property of Public Interest] in conjunction with the adjacent church and inscribed in the Historic Center of Angra do Heroísmo, Unesco World Heritage Center since 1983\textsuperscript{14}. It is open to public visits. There is a plaque marking the presence of political prisoners in the Fortress of São João Baptista “on the wall of a chapel facility next to a park, on the road that gives access to the Fort”\textsuperscript{15}, whose placement resulted from URAP’s initiative (Union of Resistant Portuguese Antifascists) and the Municipality of Angra do Heroísmo.

The prison at the Fort of Caxias housed men and women accused of political crimes during \textit{Estado Novo}. After being deactivated with the Revolution of 1974, the complex remained unused until it was handed over to the former General Directorate of Prison Services in 1988, and has since functioned as a high security prison\textsuperscript{16}.

The Tribunal of São João Novo is still functioning as a court, even though it is in a state of degradation (Tribunal de São João Novo no Porto está a cair, 2018). The Plenary Court of Boa Hora, in Lisbon, worked in Convento da Boa Hora, which is included in classification of Lisboa Pombalina\textsuperscript{17}. This building remained in full ownership of the Lisbon City Hall until it was partially purchased by the Ministry of Justice in 2012\textsuperscript{18}. The Lisbon City Hall will install, in its part, an elementary school (Simões, 2016). The main building, owned by the Ministry of Justice, was supposed to receive the Center for Judicial Studies, the Judiciary Museum and services of the Institute of Registries and Notaries\textsuperscript{19}. However, the most recent news is that there will be installed the Lisbon Court of Appeals (Agência Lusa, 2018a).

The fortress of Our Lady of Good Health of Trafaria, a military prison during the dictatorship, is currently vacant; it is owned by Almada’s City Hall\textsuperscript{20}. Any plans for the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item Retrieved from https://www.explorebonfim.com/museumilitardoporto
  \item Retrieved from http://assets.exercito.pt/SiteAssets/RG1/Síntese Histórica.pdf
  \item Retrieved from http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/20
  \item Retrieved from https://justica.gov.pt/Justica-Criminal/Servicos-de-execucao-das-penas/Area-territorial-alargada-do-tribunal-de-execucao-de-penas-de-Lisboa/Estabelecimento-Prisional-de-Caxias#Caracteristicas
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
location are unknown. In 2016, three exhibitions were held there, including one entitled “The Prison and Trafaria- 450 years of History” (Belo, 2016). The Fort of Santo António da Barra, in Estoril, was the holiday home of Salazar and the place where the fall that resulted in his death occurred\(^{21}\). It is a building with historical and patrimonial value that nevertheless remained abandoned until the current year\(^{22}\). The site’s state of degradation of was denounced several times in the media. After a report by RTP (Ferreira, 2018) in early 2018, the Ministry of Defense chose to hand over the exploration of the building to the Cascais City Hall, which restored it and opened it for visits (Agência Lusa, 2018b).

The building which housed Salazar’s office when he was president of the Council of Ministers, in Terreiro do Paço, Lisbon, later served as a police station and was occupied by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (Alves, 2017). In 2015, after rehabilitation, a luxurious hotel establishment was born here: the Pousada de Lisboa (Chaves, 2015).

In an article in Sábado magazine (Alves, 2017) two more examples are mentioned. In Montalegre, the former political police detention center was used as a Health Center before being converted into a hotel and is currently occupied by Montalegre Hotel. And in Lagos, the local headquarters of the Portuguese Legion is now the Hotel Casa da Moura.

**“Portugal, land of Tourism” with little memory**

Political prisons of the Portuguese dictatorship and the political police’s headquarters and delegations, in particular, are places with a close relationship with suffering. It is undeniable that the prisons, concentration camps and interrogation sites of Estado Novo’s political police were places where suffering – and sometimes even death – occurred: “the political police used torture systematically, this being their main weapon of ‘investigation’” (Caldeira et al., 2011, p. 117). Physical violence, combined with the poor conditions and isolation lived in prisons, was the main form of torture used by the political police in Portugal during the dictatorship (Caldeira et al., 2011).

Nevertheless, this connection was in many cases ignored and/or dismissed after the dictatorship ended. In some cases, such as that of the Caxias prison, the São João Novo Plenary Tribunal in Porto, and until recently that of the Boa Hora Plenary Court in Lisbon, the buildings maintained the function they already had in the previous political regime. Several other sites, such as Aljube Jail and PIDE’s Coimbra delegation, remained under state ownership and housed successive public and administrative services, which stripped the buildings of some of the physical or architectural characteristics they had in their previous functions.

We also came to realize that there are several buildings occupied by Estado Novo’s institutions that have been transformed into hotel establishments. Although some, such as the Luggage Hostel & Suites in the former PIDE delegation in Coimbra and the Pousada de Lisboa in Salazar Council’s premises, may be able to maintain some physical aspects of their past, they were demystified through their transformation into places


of leisure, and the lack of tourist information on these aspects of the building’s history erases their past as places of violence and suffering.

There are also buildings that have remained unused or have reached a state of dereliction, which is the clearest symptom of the difficulty of successive Portuguese governments to deal with the dictatorship’s heritage. In fact, this type of heritage is a challenge for national identity. The uncomfortable past represented by these places risks crossing into the present in disruptive ways, and can lead to social divisions (Macdonald, 2009). At the same time, this shows a change in the criteria of heritage selection. Because of their links to the dictatorship’s contested past, these buildings were no longer considered worthy of preservation for future generations and were excluded from the current concept of heritage.

As in Nuremberg, there was an effort to demystify (MacDonald, 2009) the heritage of the Estado Novo in Portugal, by converting it into spaces for the daily use of citizens. Even buildings that were converted into hotel units, and therefore endowed with the extraordinary character that comes with tourist use, were deprived of the characteristics that identified their past connected to the dictatorship, either physically or by the absence of tourist information that details this connection. In the case of PIDE’s headquarters, in António Maria Cardoso Street in Lisbon, there was even an effort to erase the building’s past as a place of imprisonment, torture, and suffering that can be considered successful. However, as was the case in Nuremberg, these efforts were not a complete or permanent success.

In Portugal, the actions of pressure to create spaces of memory of the anti-fascist resistance gained traction after 2005. Several initiatives were concentrated in NAM – Civic Movement Do Not Erase Memory!. This movement was born of a spontaneous initiative of citizens in protest against the transformation of the former headquarters of PIDE into a luxury condominium23. First, they issued a petition signed by more than 50 former political prisoners and then a petition with more than 6,000 signatures, which required the approval of a framework law that ensures the creation of national museum spaces, where the memory of resistance to the dictatorship, and of the struggle for democratic freedom, is a legacy of political knowledge and civic pedagogy, in favor of future generations.24

The petition, presented to the Assembly of the Republic by Mário Soares, former President of the Republic and former political prisoner and by Marques Junior, a deputy and intervenient in the Revolution of the 25th of April 1974, was welcomed and gave rise to Assembly Resolution no. 24/2008. This Resolution recommends to the Government, in point 1, the creation of a “museum of freedom and resistance” in Aljube Jail, in Lisbon, as well as the “valorisation and support to the Museum of Resistance installed in the Fortress of Peniche” (Resolução da Assembleia da República n.º 24/2008, 2008).

23 Retrieved from http://maismemoria.org/mm/home/historia/
24 Retrieved from http://maismemoria.org/mm/home/historia/
The resolution recommends the implementation of museums and memorials in places related to the memory of the anti-fascist resistance in Portugal, in particular in Aljube Jail in Lisbon, the creation of programs to encourage the various autarchic and civic musealization projects, the construction of memorials relating to resistance to dictatorship and, in point 2, the constitution of a national route of freedom and resistance, through the places and buildings considered of national interest, within the framework of resistance and the struggle for freedom, including, of course, those which are important references in the victory of the Revolution of the 25th of April 1974, and, if possible, the adoption of preservation measures and their use, in the most appropriate cases, as spaces for preservation, investigation and dissemination of historical memory. Resolução da Assembleia da República n.o 24/2008, 2008

One of the few actual results of this resolution was the creation of the Aljube Museum in Lisbon. This is a museum that integrates as a central element to its museological identity its past as political prison and place of suffering. The Aljube Museum assumes as objectives the education of visitors and the preservation of memories and testimonies about the period of dictatorship in Portugal and the actions of resistance. The reports, testimonies, and images of death and suffering present in the museum, as well as the physical presence of the place itself, contribute to increase the intensity of relationship with death and suffering. At the same time, they foster reflection on these episodes of death and suffering and the context in which they occurred, as well as their projection onto different times. Notwithstanding this content, the exposition route of the Museum of the Aljube ends with the message of victory of democracy, reinforcing a positive national identity.

Less than a decade after the approval of Assembly Resolution no.24/2008, which specified the need for valorisation and support to the Nucleus of Resistance in the Municipal Museum of Peniche, this place was in the process of being concessioned to private initiative by the State. Once again, the determinant factor was the intervention of citizen groups, who managed to use public contestation in favor of the preservation and memorization of one of the greatest symbols of the dictatorship’s prison system and of resistance in Portugal.

Unlike the more precise identity of the Aljube Museum as a resistance museum, the museum that operated in the Peniche Fortress included aspects of the municipal history and culture beyond the nucleus of resistance, presenting a dissonant identity. This dissonance was further aggravated by the presence, in the same space, of municipal leisure equipment.

The museum that functions in Porto’s old PIDE delegation is a curious case because, although it is not oriented to its recent past as a PIDE detention and torture

---

5 Retrieved from https://www.museudoaljube.pt/sobre-o-museu/
center, it maintains a connection to death and suffering as a military museum. This connection, however, is relatively tenuous and less intense than it would have been if the museum had formed around its past as a delegation of the political police. The various functions of the building over time—family residence, PIDE delegation, military museum—have the potential to endow it with a high degree of dissonance.

The diversity of functions performed by all these buildings before, during, and after the dictatorship is a source of dissonance. However, the greatest cause of dissonance is their connection to the repressive and ideological apparatus of the dictatorial regime: “all places of pain and shame reveal dissonances, since there are always perpetrators and sufferers and their perceptions inevitably differ radically” (Logan & Reeves, 2009, p. 3).

Conclusions

Heritage is a contemporary creation, but each generation leaves heritage to the next. It is up to the following generations to deal with this heritage and to reconcile with it, to integrate it or to intervene in it. However, heritage is concept in flux and filled with tensions (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996).

The broadening of the definition of heritage allowed the inclusion of places related to unpleasant aspects of the history of peoples and places. However, it is necessary to build a new philosophical basis for this definition, since if all forms of social behaviour are part of culture, the management of their heritage requires the establishment of limits and perspectives (Logan & Reeves, 2009).

Long and Reeves (2009, p. 78) state that “the purpose of heritage preservation in the case of places of pain and shame is to commemorate the victims” and that “there is little role for preservation of perpetrator sites”. However, it is not always easy to make this distinction. Political prisons, for example, can simultaneously be seen as places of oppression and resistance. In addition, the mere memorialization of this type of heritage can encourage the glorification of perpetrators by those who identify with them or their motives (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996).

The interpretation of this type of heritage in the light of dark tourism represents an opportunity for heritage managers, policy makers, and visitors. The presence of death and suffering in the interpretative content of places gives them an extraordinary character that can destabilize constructions of memory, culture, and identity. However, for this interpretation to be possible it is necessary that the connection of Estado Novo’s buildings to death and suffering is not erased by their tourist use.

Portugal remains a “land of tourism”, as suggested by António Ferro’s slogan that inspired the title of this article. The analysis of current uses of the main heritage of Estado Novo shows that several of the regime’s most emblematic buildings currently have a predominantly tourist use. However, in most cases this use was gained by the loss or even erasure of the characteristics that connected the sites to their dark past during the dictatorship.

26 Director of the National Secretariat of Information, the organ responsible for propaganda during Estado Novo.
It can be argued that it is not possible for all places related to the memory of dictatorship and anti-fascist resistance in Portugal to be memorialized or even preserved. However, the erasure of the unpleasant aspects of the history of the sites is not the only alternative to musealization. Even in places that focus on entertainment or relaxation, such as the hotels several *Estado Novo* buildings have been turned into, it would be possible to have tourist information about their past connected with death and suffering. Information is not limited to physical panels in buildings: it can be present in tourist routes, where interpretation is made by guides, whether human or using technology – from traditional paper guides to augmented reality. This is a great interpretive opportunity when the buildings now have very different functions than those they had during the dictatorship.

The deciding factor in the creation of museums and memorials of anti-fascist resistance in Portugal seems to be the action of citizen groups such as URAP or NAM. Despite the official inquiries and resolutions of government agencies, it was popular protest, not only, but also, organized in those movements, that triggered concrete actions of preservation and musealization of various spaces linked to *Estado Novo*.

Still, there is only one museum of resistance in Portugal, in Aljube Jail. The future National Museum of Resistance and Freedom, to be installed in the Fort of Peniche, will be an important step in preserving the memory of the struggle against the Portuguese dictatorial regime, but the dreamed National Route for the Memory of Resistance and Freedom remains, to a large extent, circumscribed to the text of Assembly Resolution nº. 24/2008.

It would be interesting for future investigations to verify which other initiatives of memorialization and tourist use of material and immaterial heritage linked to *Estado Novo* and anti-fascist resistance may be under way in Portugal and in other countries it previously colonized. What narratives will be on the basis of these initiatives? This investigation has opened us up to an even broader inquiry: how is it that this and other “unpleasant” aspects of Portuguese History, such as slavery, Inquisition, colonialism, are incorporated by tourism? The doctoral thesis wherein this research is inserted will not provide unequivocal answers to these questions but will contribute to widen the range of knowledge about Tourism in places of death and suffering in Portugal, by considering the tourist activity in the Museum of Aljube from the theoretical and methodological perspective of Cultural Studies.
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