
Housing and Citizenship:

Building Social Rights in

Twentieth-Century Portugal

PEDRO RAMOS PINTO

Abstract

This article investigates the origins of modern citizenship in Portugal through the example of the historical construction of housing as a social right. It argues this process owes much to the centralisation and strengthening of the state undertaken by Salazar's 'New State' (1933–74), whose transformative project changed the nature of the relationship between the governing and the governed, making political claims based on social rights plausible. The ensuing political dynamic changed the nature of the social contract in Portugal, tying the legitimacy of the state to the provision of social rights, a factor which eventually contributed to the dictatorship's demise.

I

In recent years there has been a renewal of interest in the history of the Portuguese transition to democracy by scholars calling for a broader perspective of the process, taking more seriously the role played by collective actors, such as the labour, agricultural workers' and urban movements which led to factory, farm and housing occupations throughout the country.¹ While this interest is to be welcomed, the nature

School of Arts, Histories and Cultures, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL; pedro.ramospinto@manchester.ac.uk. In writing this article I benefited immensely from my time as Visiting Scholar at the History Department of Harvard University at the kind invitation of the Center for History and Economics and Professor Emma Rothschild, as well as of the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies and Professor Kenneth Maxwell. Professor Amartya Sen's support and encouragement was equally valuable, as were comments from Rosie Vaughan and this journal's anonymous referees. All translations of quotations from untranslated sources are by the author.

¹ Nancy G. Bermeo, *The Revolution within the Revolution: Workers' Control in Rural Portugal* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986); Nancy G. Bermeo, 'Myths of Moderation: Confrontation and Conflict during Democratic Transitions', *Comparative Politics*, 29 (1997), 305–22; Diego Palacios Cereales, *O Poder Caiu na Rua – Crise de Estado e Ações Colectivas na Revolução Portuguesa 1974–1975* (Lisbon: Imprensa das Ciências Sociais, 2003); Rafael Durán Muñoz, *Contención y Transgresión – Las movilizaciones sociales y el Estado en las transiciones española y portuguesa* (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales, 2000).

of its focus on a time-limited process, bookended by the military coup of April 1974 and the confrontation between radicals and moderates in November 1975, has tended to remove these events from their historical context. This is apparent in the way in which most of these studies fail to problematise the historical emergence of the issues that motivated these movements and the way in which they relate to political traditions in Portugal. To do so may help to explain not just the trajectories and strategies of such movements and their role in the transition, but also to put forward more general questions regarding contemporary Portuguese history.

The urban social movement active during the transition is a case in point. Across the city, starting out in its poorest areas, residents created neighbourhood committees to pressure the transitional authorities into providing social housing and other urban services, including public transport, nurseries and healthcare. These committees organised self-build schemes for playgrounds, nurseries or sports centres; decided on the allocation of social housing to local families; and, in some cases, led to the occupation of vacant housing and its distribution to the poor. This rapid and intense mobilisation took the transition government by surprise and forced a number of concessions that confirmed a commitment to housing provision by public authorities and forceful intervention in the housing market. Due to its popular appeal, this urban movement became a coveted ally for the political factions of the revolution, and I have argued elsewhere that it played an important role in the transition to democracy in Portugal.²

Previous studies of the movement have tended to assume a more or less mechanical connection between urban conditions (or class positions) and the mobilisation of affected populations. As such, they fail to address a crucial question that becomes apparent if the movement is regarded in the context of the history of popular political mobilisation in Portugal. What is striking about the urban movement is that it was essentially concerned with social rights, understood as entitlements of citizenship.³ The idea that housing conditions and shortages were problems to be addressed by state provision, which previous research has taken as read, was in fact new to the political vocabulary of Portuguese popular politics. For much of the previous two centuries, governing elites and the general population shared an understanding of citizenship that entailed very limited expectations regarding social welfare. Both the

² Pedro Ramos Pinto, 'Urban Social Movements and the Transition to Democracy in Portugal, 1974–1976', *Historical Journal*, 52, 4 (2008), 1025–46. Older, but important, works include Charles Downs, *Revolution at the Grassroots: Community Organizations in the Portuguese Revolution* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1989); Luís Leitão, António Dias, Jorge Manuel and Laurent Dianoux, 'Mouvements urbains et comissões de Moradores au Portugal (1974–1976)', *Les Temps Modernes*, 34 (1978), 652–84; Vitor Matias Ferreira, 'A Cidade e o Campo. Uma leitura comparada do movimento social, 1974–1975', *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais* (1987), 549–78.

³ This article treats citizenship not as a category, but rather in Charles Tilly's sense of a set of relations between a state and a population composed of 'enforceable rights and obligations', which, following T. H. Marshall, can be categorised as political, civic and social rights. Modern forms of citizenship have come to be defined by a fairly expansive combination of all three kinds. Charles Tilly, 'Citizenship, Identity and Social History', *International Review of Social History*, 40 (1995), 1–17; T. H. Marshall, *Class, Citizenship and Social Development* (Garden City, NJ: Doubleday & Co., 1964).

liberal monarchy and the republican state limited the very notion of the right-holding citizen to a minority of the population.⁴

Furthermore, in the absence of a large urban population and with the escape valve provided by emigration, few broad-based popular movements appeared throughout the modern period, allowing state power to be exercised without resorting to the kinds of cross-class alliances that were crucial in the process of bartering the terms of citizenship elsewhere.⁵ For large sectors of the population a distant and limited state was more often seen as an enemy or a hindrance than as a potential deliverer of social improvements.⁶ Even when working-class organisations developed in major urban centres towards the end of the nineteenth-century, reformist, state-oriented political strategies soon lost ground to anti-state ‘excluded’ ideologies such as anarcho-syndicalism, in the face a political system consistently impervious to popular demands.⁷ The interplay between state structures, ruling ideologies and popular strategies combined to produce a form of citizenship in which social rights did not go beyond scattered programmes (in comparison with other European countries) in the spheres of education, working conditions and social insurance.⁸

The same applies to the history of urban and housing conditions as a social problem. Hygienist concerns regarding urban squalor dated back at least to the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Yet well into the First Republic (1910–26) housing was rarely envisaged as field of direct public intervention, and the problem was most often put in terms of the relation between wages and living costs, with solutions sought in labour legislation or private philanthropy.⁹ Between 1910 and 1918, parliament

⁴ Rui Ramos, ‘Portuguese, but not Citizens: Restricted Citizenship in Contemporary Portugal’, in Richard Bellamy, Dario Castiglione and Emilio Santoro, eds., *Lineages of European Citizenship: Rights, Belonging and Participation in Eleven Nation States* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 92–112; Rui Ramos, ‘Sobre o Carácter Revolucionário da Primeira República Portuguesa (1910–1926): uma primeira abordagem’, *Polis: Revista de Estudos Jurídico-Políticos*, (2003), 5–60.

⁵ Marshall, *Class*; Bryan S. Turner, *Citizenship and Capitalism* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986); Charles Tilly, *Contention and Democracy in Europe, 1650–2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

⁶ Rui Ramos, ‘A Segunda Fundação (1890–1926)’, in José Mattoso, ed., *História de Portugal*, (Lisbon: Estampa, 1993), VI, 83–91.

⁷ Maria Filomena Mónica, *Artãos e Operários: Indústria, Capitalismo e Classe Operária em Portugal (1870–1934)* (Lisbon: Instituto das Ciências Sociais, 1986), 148–53; Manuel Villaverde Cabral, *Portugal na Alvorada do Século XX: Forças Sociais, Poder Político e Crescimento Económico de 1890 a 1914* (Lisbon: A Regra do Jogo, 1979), 317, 319; Michael Mann, ‘Ruling Class Strategies and Citizenship’, *Sociology*, 21 (1987), 339–54, 344.

⁸ On the difficult birth of the beginnings of a ‘welfare state’ in Portugal – including the opposition of voluntary credit unions whose membership included a large proportion of the urban working class – to social insurance legislation, see Miriam Halpern Pereira, ‘As origens do Estado-Providência em Portugal: as Novas Fronteiras entre Público e Privado’, in Nuno Severiano Teixeira and António Costa Pinto, eds., *A Primeira República Portuguesa – entre o Liberalismo e o Autoritarismo* (Lisbon: Edições Colibri, 1999), 47–76.

⁹ Much of the political rhetoric on housing problems of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century – often promoted by the Republican Party itself – placed blame with landlords. In 1912, concurrent demonstrations by landlords and tenants had to be prevented from coming to blows by the Republican Guard. David Ferreira, ‘Inquilinato’, in Joel Serrão, ed., *Dicionário da História de Portugal, Vol. II* (Lisbon: Iniciativas Editoriais, 1971), 551–2. For overviews of the history of working-class housing in Portugal in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries see Marielle Christine Gros, “Pequena” história

failed to approve several legislative projects inspired by state-driven housing policies elsewhere in Europe.¹⁰ It was not until the short-lived dictatorship of Sidónio Pais in 1918 that legislation on state-supported social housing along such lines was published. However, it is telling that the motivation for the breaking of the traditional boundaries of liberalism was inspired not by popular pressure but rather by an ideology that would find its fullest expression under Salazar's regime. Samara has suggested that Sidónio Pais's reforms were driven by the desire to 'hygienise and moralise' the labouring classes, creating the conditions for the 'good worker' to resist sedition. These welfare programmes were aimed at undercutting the independent mobilisation of 'citizen Lenin', and hence it is unsurprising that such gifts were regarded with suspicion by most workers' organisations.¹¹ While it was as a result of this new legislation that work started on the first state-sponsored workers' neighbourhood in Lisbon, Arco do Cego, it is a measure of the government's commitment that building work was halted in 1922 and that the project would not be completed until 1935, when a much more comprehensive housing programme was undertaken by Salazar's *Estado Novo* (new state) between 1933 and 1974.¹²

This article argues that the transformation of housing from a private concern to a social right in the eyes of the majority of the population was a by-product of the *Estado Novo's* policies. Through them, certain categories of goods (housing in this case, but it is possible to make similar claims regarding health provision and social insurance) became politicised; that is, they were first instituted as an object of direct intervention by the state.¹³ From these beginnings, two developments followed. First, the regime's centralisation and strengthening of state power created the conditions for the development of a logic of technocratic intervention that generated internal pressures for a rolling-out of the state's responsibilities. Second, although initial programmes were highly segmented – with different categories of recipients and entitlements – they set the precedent for the principle of provision of social rights, making the case for their universalisation plausible.¹⁴

do alojamento social em Portugal', *Sociedade e Território* (1994), 80–90; Carlos Nunes Silva, 'Mercado e Políticas de Habitação em Portugal: a questão da habitação na primeira metade do século XX', *Análise Social*, 29 (1994), 665–76; Manuel C. Teixeira, 'As estratégias de habitação em Portugal, 1880–1940', *Análise Social*, 27 (1992), 65–89; Nuno Teotónio Pereira, 'Pátios e Vilas de Lisboa, 1870–1930: a promoção privada do alojamento', *Análise Social*, 29 (1994), 509–24.

¹⁰ See, for instance, 'Projecto Lei no. 42-E', *Diário da Câmara dos Deputados*, 1, 1, no. 137, 29 July 1914, 8–18.

¹¹ Maria Alice Samara, *Verdes e Vermelhos: Portugal e a Guerra no Ano de Sidónio* (Lisbon: Editorial Notícias, 2002), 179–93.

¹² Carlos Nunes Silva, *Política Urbana em Lisboa: 1926–1974* (Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 1994), 90–91.

¹³ Charles S. Maier, 'Introduction', in Charles S. Maier, ed., *Changing Boundaries of the Political: Essays on the Evolving Balance between State and Society, Public and Private in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 4.

¹⁴ Bellamy categorised such demands for rights as 'continuous' claims, as opposed to those that seek to institute rights *tout-court*. Richard Bellamy, 'Introduction: Modern Citizenship', in Richard Bellamy, Dario Castiglione and Emilio Santoro, eds., *Lineages of European Citizenship: Rights, Belonging and Participation in Eleven Nation States* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 11.

II

Although draped in conservative rhetoric, the *Estado Novo* had a utopian goal at heart: the creation of a corporatist society based on Catholic values. For all its glorification (and reinvention) of a mythicised past, it was an essentially modern project which sought to transform society.¹⁵ Its ideas drew on the Catholic movements in which Salazar had been active before his ascent to power, combining contemporary conservative nationalism, fascism and Catholic social thinking.¹⁶ Inspired by these traditions, Salazar regarded the art of government as guided by a moral goal and the exercise of political power not as an end in itself or as a tool of economic progress, but rather as an instrument for moral discipline, for the creation of a new man, released from the ‘acquired vices . . . of education, of mentalities’ and guided by Christian morals.¹⁷ Only in ‘spiritual life’ would the country find ‘progress worthy of that name’.¹⁸ In Salazar’s view, the pursuit of this moral goal and the proper rule of the nation were not possible in a parliamentary pluralist system that constrained the actions of the executive. The moral state had to be strong, ‘so strong that it does not need to be violent’.¹⁹ If the guiding principle of society was spiritual, the family was its vessel: ‘civil society will . . . see how its morality, consistency and cohesion depend directly on the morality, consistency and cohesion’ of the family, the ‘purest source of the moral values of production’.²⁰ Moral regeneration would only be possible if the institution of the family was protected from disaggregating trends such as women’s work outside the home, materialism and collectivist ideologies. This ideology also regarded private property as the basis of moral independence, making housing a key instrument with which to create and sustain the ideal family, a theme already explored in the historiography by Baptista and Medina.²¹ The 1933 Constitution stated that ‘in order to defend the family, it falls to the State and the municipalities to encourage the constitution of independent and salubrious family homes . . . [and] take measures that seek to avoid the corruptions of mores [*costumes*]’.²² The design both of houses and of housing programmes was conditioned by this preoccupation with the welfare

¹⁵ Fernando Rosas, ‘O Salazarismo e o Homem Novo: ensaio sobre o Estado Novo e a questão do totalitarismo’, *Análise Social*, 35 (2001), 1031–54.

¹⁶ During the Republican period Salazar was elected to parliament for the Portuguese Catholic Centre in 1919, and the Catholic movement later provided many of his most trusted lieutenants. Manuel Braga da Cruz, *As Origens da Democracia Cristã e o Salazarismo* (Lisbon: Presença, 1980), 377.

¹⁷ António Ferro, *Salazar: O Homem e a Sua Obra* (Lisbon: Empresa Nacional de Publicidade, 1935), 151.

¹⁸ ‘O Estado Novo Português na Evolução Política Europeia’, speech given on 26 May 1934, in António de Oliveira Salazar, *Discursos, Vol. I: 1928–1934* (Coimbra: Coimbra Editora, 1935), 340.

¹⁹ ‘Princípios Fundamentais da Revolução Política’, speech given on 30 July 1930, *ibid.*, 81.

²⁰ Speech of 26 May 1934, *ibid.*, 341. ‘As Grandes Certezas da Revolução Nacional’, speech of 26 May 1936, in António de Oliveira Salazar, *Discursos e Notas Políticas, Vol. II – 1935–1937* (Coimbra: Coimbra Editora, 1937).

²¹ ‘Conceitos Económicos da Nova Constituição’, speech of 16 March 1933, in Salazar, *Discursos, Vol. I*, 200–3. Luís Vicente Baptista, ‘Casa, Família, Ideologia: a emergência da política de “moradias unifamiliares” em Portugal nos anos 30’, *Ler História*, 34 (1998), 137–64; João Medina, *Salazar, Hitler e Franco – Estudos Sobre a Ditadura* (Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 2000), 67–74.

²² *Constituição da República Portuguesa e Acto Colonial* (Lisbon: Livraria Moraes, 1935).

of the family as the perpetuator of Christian moral values. Collective housing blocks, which Salazar, along with much of contemporary opinion, considered ‘repellent to the reserve and modesty inseparable from family life’, were rejected in favour of single-family dwellings with gardens – ‘proper homes, around whose hearth familial love is warmed and the bonds of moral life strengthened’, as Pedro Teotónio Pereira, then secretary of state for corporations and welfare, put it.²³

These ideas also shaped the terms of access to housing. Not only did programmes discriminate in favour of families (only married couples could hope to access state housing), they also used property as a means of reinforcing family ties through a complex system of ownership and inheritance. In the flagship ‘Economic Houses’ scheme, tenants would earn ownership of the house after twenty-five years, but, on death, heirs were liable for outstanding rents until the end of that period. Selling the house was also subject to official consent, even after ownership had passed to the tenant. In cases of divorce (rarely legal in any case), ownership could not be allocated to one or the other of the parties. These stringent regulations sought to bind home and family together, looking to create in the city the strong attachment to place that Salazar so admired in his vision of rural society.²⁴

The regime devoted substantial energy to its housing programmes, and their importance is attested by the fact that one of its rising stars, Duarte Pacheco, was chosen to spearhead them in his dual role as minister for public works and president of the Lisbon municipality. Pacheco was also given specific responsibility to prepare the capital for the 1940 ‘Double Centenary’, a monumental propaganda exercise meant to be a demonstration of the regime’s authority and a reassertion of Portugal’s imperial destiny.²⁵ In preparation for the celebrations, whole areas of Lisbon were to be redeveloped, large shanty neighbourhoods cleared and re-housing hundred of families rehoused, creating space for new monumental squares, parks and boulevards. This great transformation was to include the construction of several new state-built neighbourhoods, mostly through the Economic Houses programme (1933) and, later, through the ‘Housing for Poor Families’ scheme (1945). With these initiatives, the *Estado Novo* went beyond anything previously attempted, placing the state at the centre of efforts to resolve the housing question. According to Gros, the regime passed about sixty pieces of housing legislation between 1928 and 1963, in comparison with the handful of decrees, most often directed at regulating private developers, passed between 1910 and 1928.²⁶

²³ Salazar and Pedro Teotónio Pereira, cited in Gros, “‘Pequena” história do alojamento social em Portugal’, 87.

²⁴ Rosas, ‘O Salazarismo e o Homem Novo’, 1035, Medina, *Salazar, Hitler e Franco – Estudos Sobre a Ditadura*.

²⁵ The Double Centenary celebrated both the Portugal’s foundation as a country (set at around 1140) and the restoration of independence following a period of Spanish rule in 1640.

²⁶ Marielle Christine Gros, *O Alojamento Social sob of Fascismo* (Porto: Afrontamento, 1982), 139. Although the *Estado Novo* dates from 1933, Salazar was effectively in power from 1928, at the invitation of the military dictatorship.

Despite this, the *Estado Novo*'s housing programmes of the 1930s and 1940s were limited in output, partly because of the economic constraints imposed by the war, and made little difference to the overall housing conditions of an urban population that continued to expand on the back of a steady rural exodus. Nevertheless, these programmes did have important political repercussions, creating a space where the use of public resources in the solution of urban problems could be freely discussed, and contributing to the creation of a class of technocrats invested in state-driven forms of development. These in turn generated a momentum for the expansion of state welfare that would be a dominant theme from the 1950s onwards and a defining characteristic of Marcello Caetano's attempts to save the dictatorship in its final years. Furthermore, by coming into contact with these programmes and the agencies that delivered them, by being exposed to a growing rhetoric of housing as a right, the urban poor developed strong feelings of entitlement and expectations that would ultimately be frustrated, serving to delegitimise the regime, and that would be the basis of the widespread urban mobilisations of 1974–6.

III

The first two of these effects, the politicisation of housing and the development of a 'technocratic' class, are related. Until the 1960s the debate on housing and urban welfare was driven by experts, often under the auspices of the regime. Starting in technical domains such as meetings of urban experts or in fringe intellectual publications, these debates gradually moved to more openly political fora, accompanying, and no doubt often stimulating, new policy interventions. From the 1940s calls for an extension of housing programmes could be heard from a number of different quarters. Under the cover afforded by the government's admission of urban housing as a problem, someone like Manuel Vicente Moreira, a physician, philanthropist and social reformer, could write a series of pamphlets exposing the poor housing conditions of the population of Lisbon and call for further state provision in such a way that, although interspersed with praise for the regime's achievements, it was a call to action framed in moral terms.²⁷ Political insiders such as Júlio Martins, a Lisbon municipal councillor, publicly argued that the state needed to do more to solve the housing problem, 'which today is common to the poor and middle classes, raising moral, social and sanitary issues so alarming that neither the State nor the Municipality can ignore'.²⁸ Throughout the 1940s there was strong debate and no little criticism of the regime's housing policies in technical circles. Architects and urban planners, influenced by Le Corbusier's Athens Charter, called for a shift towards high-rise building as a means of solving the housing problem. At the First National Congress of Architects in 1948, 'promoted . . . with the government's sponsorship', participants openly criticised the existing model of single-family dwellings as 'not viable for the mass of the population' for economic reasons or because it fostered an 'egoistic spirit'

²⁷ Manuel Vicente Moreira, *Problemas da Habitação (Ensaios Sociais)* (Lisbon, 1950).

²⁸ Júlio Martins, 'O problema da habitação de rendas acessíveis às classes média e pobre', *A Arquitectura Portuguesa e Cerâmica e Edificação (reunidas)* (1944).

divorced from 'human fraternity'.²⁹ The shared assumption was increasingly that it was the duty of the state to provide housing. Crucially, this idea could be framed within the regime's ideology, as one contributor to the 1948 Architectural Congress argued:

The State must take advantage of modern techniques, building a new type of home, something that is entirely compatible with Corporative Organisation. [Their basic principle] will not be profit, but rather competition to profit. Private initiative should be encouraged to build, but within boundaries previously established by the Government, in order to prevent speculation.³⁰

If the corporative system could subsume the contradictions between capital and labour to the advantage of the nation, it was conceivable that it could do the same to the contradictions between capital and land. The regime's intervention had set on course a process whose logic could be (and was) used to demand the expansion of social provision.³¹

Throughout the 1950s and until its demise in 1974, the dictatorship continued to expand the remit of its welfare provision. In the field of housing, having experimented with large-scale urban planning by directing the urbanisation in the 1940s and 1950s of what is today the neighbourhood of Alvalade, the regime moved towards massification of construction, the greater centralisation and professionalisation of urban planning, and housing, and the setting of increasingly ambitious targets for public provision.³² In 1959, under government auspices, the Lisbon city council created a Technical Office for Housing, with special powers to lead the process of urbanisation of two large areas in the east of Lisbon, Chelas and Olivais. The aim was to build three thousand new dwellings a year, in apartment blocks set in park-like surroundings.³³

This impetus was confirmed and reinforced by Salazar's successor from 1968, Marcello Caetano. The 1968 five-year plan, setting out how the 'social state' would be built, was candid in regard to the country's needs and the limitations of previous achievements. It was the first of the dictatorship's plans to include a section devoted exclusively to housing, where it was recognised that earlier schemes had failed to meet targets.³⁴ A new state agency with responsibility for social housing was created, new powers of land expropriation for city council authorities were announced, the construction, by public and semi-public entities, of around 50,000 new houses by 1973

²⁹ Miguel Jacobety, 'A Racionalização na Habitação e na Urbanização', *1º Congresso Nacional de Arquitectura* (Lisbon: Sindicato Nacional dos Arquitectos, 1948), 223–8, 225, Viana de Lima, 'O Problema Português da Habitação', *1º Congresso Nacional de Arquitectura* (Lisbon: Sindicato Nacional dos Arquitectos, 1948), 215–22, 217. Debates among experts regarding the expansion and reform of social provision along similar lines were happening concurrently in other areas, such as social insurance and social service; cf. José Luís Cardoso and Maria Manuela Rocha, 'Corporativismo e Previdência Social (1933–1962)', *Ler História* (2003), 111–34.

³⁰ Lima, 'O Problema Português da Habitação', 218.

³¹ This was also true among detractors of the regime whose criticism took the form of detailed analysis of the regime's policies: cf. Anteu de Carvalho, 'O Problema Social da Habitação', *Seara Nova*, 24 (1945), 251–2, 272–4.

³² Pedro Janarra, 'A Política Urbanística e de Habitação Social do Estado Novo; o caso do Bairro de Alvalade de Lisboa: entre o projecto e o concretizado', *Ler História*, 34 (1998), 105–34.

³³ Silva, *Política Urbana*, 160–3.

³⁴ Presidência do Conselho da República Portuguesa, *III Plano de Fomento Para 1968–1973* (Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional de Lisboa, 1968), 537–8.

was promised, and, in Lisbon, the housing agency's remit was extended to include the elimination of all shanty neighbourhoods in that city.³⁵ These commitments differed greatly from the beginnings of social housing provision essayed in the first decades of the dictatorship. Across the country, the state's contribution to overall numbers of new building had risen from 1.9 per cent in 1971 to 5.7 per cent in 1973.³⁶ By 1970, state-built housing in its various forms accounted for 18.1 per cent of Lisbon's housing stock, up from 11.2 per cent in 1960, and the rate of new builds doubled.³⁷

These commitments regarding housing were part of the wider policy shift that saw Caetano attempt to rebrand the regime as an '*Estado Social*' (social state), giving public welfare provision a central role in the legitimating discourse of the dictatorship.³⁸ Caetano's reforms must be understood in the context of the need to find new sources of legitimacy in the face of the social transformations of the post-war period and, from 1961, the looming issue of the colonial war. The regime found itself confronted by a number of challenges for which the old rhetoric, developed in reaction to the political conditions of the First Republic, was increasingly ill-matched. These included a growing pressure for liberalisation from diverse sectors across society, from business leaders to students, and the ever greater sacrifices being asked by the regime from its subjects as the war against African independence movements grew in intensity.³⁹ In response, Caetano set out his vision for the development of Portuguese society. He rejected the idea of a small, regulatory state, arguing that war and economic crisis had forced states to intervene 'boldly' in order to address the needs of growing populations that could no longer be met by unplanned private charity. At the same time, Caetano warned of a 'great crisis' in the Western world, undermining the fabric of society through the weakening of the authority of the family, education and moral values. The state, Caetano argued, could not witness this 'quietly and passively', rather it must act to shore up the collective good threatened by excessive individualism.⁴⁰ This was to be done through a programme of welfare expansion that would also serve to legitimise the regime itself, as Caetano himself admitted. Stating that calls for democratisation were misguided, he argued that

what is asked of leaders is not more freedom – rather prices that match salaries, decent houses, accessible education, efficient social insurance, good medical assistance and guaranteed pensions in old age and incapacity. What good is it to ensure in the Constitution civic rights if citizens do not have the economic and moral conditions of exercising them? . . . The State can no longer distance itself from the function of ensuring the services that allow all citizens access to the fundamental commodities and guarantees of civilization.⁴¹

³⁵ Ibid., 544–6. 'Lei de Solos', *Decree-Law 576/70*, 24 Nov. 1970.

³⁶ Teresa Barata Salgueiro, 'A Promoção Habitacional e o 25 de Abril', *Revista Crítica das Ciências Sociais* (1986), 673–91, 675.

³⁷ Cited in Gros, "'Pequena" história do alojamento social em Portugal', 85; Silva, *Política Urbana*, 171–6.

³⁸ Pierre Guibentif, 'The Transformation of the Portuguese Social Security System', in Martin Rhodes, ed., *Southern European Welfare States: Between Crisis and Reform* (London: Frank Cass, 1997), 228.

³⁹ Fernando Rosas, 'Prefácio', in Fernando Rosas and Pedro Aires Oliveira, eds., *A Transição Falhada: O Marcelismo e o Fim do Estado Novo (1968–1974)* (Lisbon: Notícias, 2004).

⁴⁰ Marcello Caetano, *Renovação na Continuidade* (Lisbon: Verbo, 1971), xvii–xxiii.

⁴¹ Ibid., xxiii.

That Caetano turned to the state to save Salazar's project suggests the importance of the country's developing bureaucracy: such welfarist solutions were only possible because of the machinery created by the *Estado Novo*. A rigid, authoritarian and oppressive administrative system, designed to control as much as to deliver, it was nonetheless a much more efficient state than the historical norm in the country. In contrast to the other fascist dictatorships in Europe, power was exercised through the administrative system, rather than through a party or movement.⁴² The *Estado Social* was to be created by a new technocratic bureaucracy endowed with a degree of autonomy and capacity and even a public service ethos rarely seen before in Portugal. In the field of housing, it is clear that there was a new generation of architects, urban planners and sociologists who looked to promote the expansion of the regime's commitments in terms of welfare delivery, developed experimental (and in some cases radical) methodologies and, perhaps most importantly, linked the question of housing to a language of rights that would soon become dominant. The 1969 Housing Congress, held under the sponsorship of the ministry for public works, shows how policymakers and government staff were experimenting with both discourse and forms of public intervention. The congress was held in the relative openness that preceded the 1969 elections. The discussion paper produced for the conference, taking its cue from the admissions of the 1968 five-year plan, noted the failures of housing policy in previous decades, and asserted that only the state could deliver affordable housing. This was not posed simply as a matter of expediency in the face of temporary shortcomings of private developers. Instead, the team who prepared the paper saw the role of the state in this field as an obligation:

The responsibility of the State in the satisfaction of fundamental rights . . . covers equally health, education, the supply of jobs, and finally the creation of the living environment, of which housing is a key component.⁴³

Dozens of participants and speakers reiterated the right to housing, and the primary role of government in addressing it. This understanding was enshrined in the first conclusion of the conference's final report, which read, 'each family unit needs a home. From this comes the concept of the right to housing which, being a right, has to be assured to all by the collectivity, under the responsibility of the State.'⁴⁴

Another of the conference's papers proposed experimenting with housing co-operatives bankrolled by public funds, involving residents' committees in the building

⁴² Lawrence S. Graham, *Portugal: The Decline and Collapse of an Authoritarian Order* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1975), 13–14; Dimitri A. Sotiropolous, 'Old Problems and New Challenges: The Enduring and Changing Functions of Southern European State Bureaucracies', in Richard Gunther, P. Nikiiforos Diamandouros and Dimitri A. Sotiropolous, eds., *Democracy and the State in the New Southern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 210–11; António Costa Pinto, 'O Império do Professor: Salazar e a Elite Ministerial do Estado Novo (1933–1945)', *Análise Social*, 35 (2001), 1055–76, 1059.

⁴³ Ministério das Obras Públicas, *Colóquio Sobre Política de Habitação: Texto de Base* (Lisbon: Ministério das Obras Públicas, 1969), Section II, 4.

⁴⁴ Ignácio Peres Fernandes, A. Celestino Costa, J. M. Ferreira da Cunha, José Ruy Gomes, Nuno Portas and J. M. Alves de Sousa, *Colóquio Sobre Política de Habitação: Relatório Final* (Lisbon: Ministério das Obras Públicas, 1969), 2.

process – a radical ‘participatory’ scheme in the context of a country under an authoritarian regime.⁴⁵ According to one of the conference’s organisers, Nuno Portas, this idea drew on Latin American experiences in slum rehabilitation with which he had become acquainted during the course of a fact-finding trip in the 1960s.⁴⁶ In fact, this scheme would be rolled out after 1974 as the provisional government’s flagship housing scheme, when Portas was appointed secretary of state for housing, and relied on the enthusiasm and ideas of a younger generation that had cut its teeth in the dictatorship’s bureaucracy. There has been little research on this generation of technocrats, trained as a result of the regime’s investment in technical education and who staffed important front-line sectors of the public bureaucracy. Many had come to hold liberalising, if not outright leftist, sympathies and regarded public service as a form of political action.⁴⁷ It is no coincidence that in the later years of the regime, emerging oppositionist movements recruited extensively in these sectors, and that many of the men and women responsible for urban policy after the revolution started their professional careers in public service under the dictatorship.

The 1969 congress shows how Caetano’s strategy was seized upon by the state bureaucracy, who explicitly linked the language of rights to housing. Once such commitments were made in public, it was possible for oppositionists to use them as a political weapon, particularly by pointing to the gap between the regime’s promises and its achievements. Articles in the magazine *A Habitação*, published by the Lisbon Tenants’ Association – an organisation staffed by critics of the regime and operating at the limits of its tolerance – used quotes from the 1969 congress to highlight the limitations of the regime’s interventions:

The right to housing . . . was recognised by the Congress on Housing Policy promoted by the Ministry for Public Works. But were these just empty words, carelessly spoken, a kind of literary poetry? It is clear the housing has not ceased to be regarded as a commodity, without any social considerations . . .⁴⁸

Other, more mainstream, publications also felt sufficiently emboldened to draw attention to urban squalor. In January 1971 the weekly magazine *Vida Mundial* published a thirteen-page report on the problem of shanty neighbourhoods in the Lisbon area. Only a few years earlier, when the daily *Diário Popular* had tried to run a series of articles on urban poverty and housing, censors had halted publication.⁴⁹ Avoiding direct criticism of the authorities, items such as these nevertheless used extensive citations from the 1969 congress or other such official statements to call attention to the problem and frame it in the language of rights and to argue that the

⁴⁵ J. Reis Álvaro, ‘Auto-Construção’, in Ministério das Obras Públicas, ed., *Colóquio Sobre Política de Habitação* (Lisbon: Ministério das Obras Públicas, 1969), 57–68.

⁴⁶ Interview with Portas reproduced in Jaime Pinho, ‘O Caso de Castelo Velho – Lutas Urbanas em Setúbal (1974/76)’, master’s thesis, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1999, 247.

⁴⁷ For a similar argument in the field of social work, see Alcina M. C. Martins, ‘Serviço Social Crítico em Tempos de Ditadura em Portugal – Mulheres Rebeldes em Serviço Social’, Centro Português de Investigação em História e Trabalho Social (Coimbra: 2002).

⁴⁸ ‘O Direito a Habitar’, *A Habitação*, December 1972, 6.

⁴⁹ Nuno Teotónio Pereira, *Tempos, Lugares, Pessoas* (Matosinhos: Público, 1996), 29.

regime was still as far from solving these issues: ‘the “scandal” [of shanty towns] is today identical to the situation that called for emergency measures by the Government in 1938 ... In any case, the problem exists and ignoring it will not contribute to its solution.’⁵⁰ Going a step further, opposition groups explicitly linked the regime’s record on housing to the need for democratisation. At the 3rd Congress of the Democratic Opposition, during the 1973 election campaign (elections were still held under the dictatorship, but with franchise and freedom of speech that were highly restricted, as well as widespread ballot rigging) the right to housing was used to leverage demands for civic and political freedoms. The rhetoric of rights employed by the dictatorship was called ‘a mystification, since the right to housing cannot be acknowledged in isolation from all rights that guarantee the full development of each person within the collectivity’.⁵¹ Architect and oppositionist Keil do Amaral set out his assessment of the reasons for the regime’s failure:

I believe that our rulers for the past 50 years would have liked to have gone beyond what they managed in terms of social housing ... But a thorough analysis of the situation ... has convinced me they were not impeded by technical, economic or administrative shortcomings ... but by conditions inherent to the very political system; its dictatorial and centralising tendencies; [and] the habit of overvaluing its achievements through propaganda.⁵²

IV

The criticism of oppositionists was aided by the regime’s failure to deliver, as it consistently fell short of its publicly stated goals. Caetano’s reforms, despite all the publicity, failed to address Lisbon’s urban problems. Space to build on was crucial and public land was scarce, not least because in many parts of it migrants had built shanty towns and illegally established neighbourhoods whose residents needed to be rehoused before any new building could start.⁵³ New powers to expropriate private land for public use required long and complex processes, as well as expensive compensation. Officials in the new state agency for housing complained that a lack of organisation and communication with other government departments seriously hampered their work.⁵⁴ Rising construction costs caused by growing inflation also meant that increasing proportions of houses built for low-income families were sold or let privately to make developments viable.⁵⁵ At the same time, the private sector was unaffordable to those who most needed housing: in 1970, the average rent for

⁵⁰ Viriato Dias, ‘Barracas: Ignorar a Sua Existência Não Solucionará o Problema’, *Vida Mundial*, 29 Jan. 1971, 27–39.

⁵¹ Grupo de Trabalho de Estudantes de Arquitectura do Porto, ‘O Direito à Habitação’, 3^o Congresso da Oposição Democrática: Teses, 3^a Secção – 4^a Secção (Lisbon: Seara Nova, 1974), 224.

⁵² Francisco Keil do Amaral, ‘O Problema da Habitação em Portugal – Generalidades’, *ibid.*, 140.

⁵³ Silva, *Política Urbana*, 164.

⁵⁴ Margarida Coelho, ‘Uma Experiência de Transformação no Sector Habitacional do Estado – SAAL 1974–76’, *Revista Crítica das Ciências Sociais* (1986), 619.

⁵⁵ Silva, *Política Urbana*, 163.

newly built apartments in Lisbon represented from 73 to 116 per cent of an average industrial worker's wage.⁵⁶

Perhaps even more importantly, existing social housing schemes came to be perceived by many as unfair. The regime's rhetoric had instituted a right to housing that was increasingly discussed in universal terms, while in reality access was both segmented and fragmented.⁵⁷ This contrast contributed to an increasingly negative assessment of the performance of the dictatorship in delivering these rights.

The segmentation of the dictatorship's welfare system worked not only by privileging the family, but also by establishing different categories of recipients with access to differentiated benefits and making progress through them extremely difficult. The urban poor in the real sense – dependent on menial forms of casual employment, working in construction or even in the in-between world of agricultural labour in the small plots and market gardens that were dotted across the city – very seldom had access to the 'ideal home' of the *Estado Novo's* propaganda. Instead, their needs would be covered by schemes such as Homes for Poor Families, in most cases neighbourhoods of temporary prefabricated housing. Unlike in the grander neighbourhoods of 'economic houses', tenancy would not evolve into ownership and was always precarious. Tenants could only aspire to be upgraded to 'economic houses' if they were deemed to meet the right 'social conditions', which gave the local agents of state and church agencies that ran these neighbourhoods considerable of power over residents' lives. Very few ever made the transition and temporary neighbourhoods, designed to last only five to ten years, were still in use four decades later, in very poor repair. Even in those lower-quality neighbourhoods, access was strictly controlled and the urban poor whose conduct fell short of the standards set by the regime were shut out of the system. Single people or unmarried mothers, for instance, were not considered to be worthy recipients of housing.⁵⁸ Access was conditional on 'good moral conduct', attested by a hierarchical superior and enforced by the municipal police and housing authorities. Getting on the wrong side of either could mean forfeiture of tenure and all moneys paid towards the acquisition of the house; tenants could be evicted if deemed to be 'unworthy of the right of occupation' or to have caused a 'public scandal'.⁵⁹

This segmentation of benefits was intentionally designed into housing schemes from the outset and persisted in many ways until the end of the dictatorship. Speaking in 1930 Salazar asserted that the republican exaltation of democracy and equality had

⁵⁶ Christian Topalov, 'La Politique du Logement dans le Processus Révolutionnaire Portugais (25 Avril 1974–11 Mars 1975)', *Espaces et Société* (1976), 109–36, 115.

⁵⁷ Segmented since they were aimed at certain categories of the population and excluded others, and fragmented because even within those covered there were differences in types of benefits accessible. See Marisol García and Neovi Karakatsanis, 'Social Policy, Democracy, and Citizenship in Southern Europe', in Richard Gunther, P. N. Diamandouros and D. A. Sotiropoulos, eds., *Democracy and the State in the New Southern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 93–103.

⁵⁸ Gros, *O Alojamento Social sob of Fascismo*, 119–20, 24.

⁵⁹ Manuel Cachulo da Trindade, *Casas Económicas: Casas de Renda Económica, Casas de Renda Limitada, Casas para Famílias Pobres – Legislação Anotada* (Coimbra: Coimbra Editora, 1951), 41. See also appendix: Decree-Law 35:106 of 6 Nov. 1945.

created a ‘downward levelling’, against ‘natural inequalities’ and ‘the legitimate and necessary hierarchy of values in a well-ordered society’.⁶⁰ The regime’s policies would see that this well-ordered society was rebuilt and preserved. Salazar explicitly laid out his Faustian bargain whereby access to welfare was conditional on ‘moral conduct’:

As we wish no one to be privileged [over another], we cannot allow the working class to be a privileged class . . . In a regime of strong authority we require only that its work is orderly, virtuous and conscious of the common good . . . With the same concern with which we have addressed other needs . . . we will look after its employment, its housing, its hygiene, its health, its infirmity, its education, its organisation and defence, its social standing, its dignity . . . Our mind is open to the widest social and economic reforms; we only stop at those that ignore the hierarchical principles of values and interests, and of their best combination within the unity of the nation.⁶¹

But there was another, more practical, way in which housing was used by the regime, and which jarred with the evolving discourse on rights. It was used to reward those in the employment of the state or its dependent corporations, securing their loyalty. Those on whom the regime relied were clearly favoured, especially as it sought to establish itself in its first decades: in the 1930s almost a quarter of heads of household in the ‘Economic Housing’ neighbourhoods in Lisbon belonged to either the military or one of the police forces, mainstays of the dictatorship. In the following decades, city council and government employees became major beneficiaries.⁶² Overall, there was a marked preference in allocation for lower-middle class state employees, especially those who were members of the government-approved corporative trade unions.⁶³

These biases would eventually become a source of resentment, as later schemes and programmes continued to build on the foundations laid by the regime in the 1930s and 1940s. Urban residents were confronted by a contradiction between an evolving discourse on rights and their own experience of such entitlements. But while it is relatively straightforward to chart how discussions on housing and urban issues gradually became an issue of elite political debates, it is rather more difficult to establish what popular opinion made of them, given tight control over the press, even during the relative openness of the electoral period. The everyday experiences of the urban poor under the dictatorship deserve to be the subject of detailed research that has yet to be done. In the meantime, the political demands and actions of grass-roots organisations during the transition to democracy can suggest how popular views of citizenship had come to be articulated, if not the exact process through which they came into existence.

⁶⁰ António de Oliveira Salazar, ‘Discurso de 30 de Julho de 1930’, in Mendo Castro Henriques and Gonçalo de Sampaio e Melo, eds., *Salazar: Pensamento e Doutrina Política – Textos Antológicos* (Lisbon: Verbo, 1989).

⁶¹ António de Oliveira Salazar, ‘As Diferentes Forças Políticas em Face da Revolução Nacional – Discurso à União Nacional, em 23 de Novembro de 1932’, *Antologia: Discursos, Notas, Relatórios, Teses e Entrevistas, 1909–1953* (Lisbon: Editorial Vanguarda, 1954), 182.

⁶² Luís Vicente Baptista, *Cidade e Habitação Social: O Estado Novo e o Programa das Casas Económicas em Lisboa* (Oeiras: Celta, 1999), 165.

⁶³ Moreira, *Problemas da Habitação*, 456–66; Baptista, *Cidade e Habitação Social*, 147–66; Maria Júlia Ferreira, ‘O Bairro Social do Arco do Cego – Uma Aldeia Dentro da Cidade de Lisboa’, *Análise Social*, 29 (1994), 697–709, 705.

There are few signs that housing was a source of political mobilisation during the first four decades of the *Estado Novo*, but by the 1970s instances of confrontation and mobilisation begin to appear in the sources. In 1970, forty-eight 'ill-housed' families decided to occupy illegally an empty estate in Odivelas. The authorities responded by cutting off water and electricity to the squatters before they were eventually evicted after a few months.⁶⁴ Organisations such as the Lisbon Tenants' Union encouraged the formation of occasional residents' groups to petition the authorities, although these were short-lived and regarded with suspicion.⁶⁵ In 1972 a group of residents from the shanty town of Curraleira approached a member of the National Assembly to complain of the 'inhuman' treatment meted out to them by the municipal police and the authorities' 'lack of consideration'.⁶⁶ However, these were isolated incidents, and it was only with the removal of the dictatorship that the issue of housing could be articulated fully.

Virtually all the residents' groups formed over spring and summer 1974 defined their claims in terms of rights. A group from a 'Poor Families' prefabricated neighbourhood stated that 'the right to housing is a right of all working people', and demanded an end to the distinction between tenants who could earn the right to own their state-built home and those who could not. Committees from Lisbon's shanty towns wrote to the new authorities highlighting their 'subhuman' living conditions, 'barely fit for animals, let alone people for whom it is said the hour of freedom and fraternity has arrived'. They demanded their 'right as human beings' to homes of 'bricks and mortar'.⁶⁷ Crucially, these rights were not considered abstractly (say as human rights), but concretely, as duties of the state: all demonstrations, petitions and arguments by the emerging movement were state-oriented.

The sources also show the strength of animosity in poor neighbourhoods towards housing authorities. Shortly after the April 1974 coup, shanty town residents mistrustful of the integrity of allocation processes seized social housing under construction across Lisbon. In the Salazar Foundation estate, occupied on 2 May, a woman told a newspaper how the decision to move in had followed rumours spreading across a neighbouring shanty town: '[People said:] do you think you'll get to live [in the new estate]? That's for the secret police agents! That's for police officers!' Although the neighbourhood had been promised to the slum residents, the woman thought that was 'only to shut them up', and only those who could afford to bribe social services staff with 'kilos of ham, jugs of olive oil and thousands of escudos' were awarded houses. In the eyes of the occupiers, it was the undeserving who

⁶⁴ A. Barbosa, F. S. Alves, J. Azevedo, M. Sousa Lobo and P. Villas-Boas, *Ocupação do Bairro do Bom Sucesso em Odivelas, por 48 famílias de barracas* (Porto: Afrontamento, 1972).

⁶⁵ *A Habitação*, November 1971, 7.

⁶⁶ Assembleia Nacional, *Diário das Sessões*, 160, 8 March 1972, 3306.

⁶⁷ Arquivo Histórico Municipal de Lisboa/Arquivo do Arco do Cego (AHM/AAC) *Correspondência Eleitoral 1976*: Comissão de Moradores (CM) da Quinta da Calçada to Secretário de Estado da Habitação e Urbanismo, 9 May 1974; CM do Bairro de Pedralvas to Câmara Municipal de Lisboa (CML), 4 July 1974; CM da Zona de Barracas de Campolide to CML, 15 July 1974.

got the houses; Américo Tomás' driver,⁶⁸ an 'engineer' or a city council employee. Similar accusations were made by the occupiers of hundreds of apartments in Chelas, which they claimed were being allocated to police and army veterans ahead of the poor.⁶⁹ In Musgueira, where the Lisbon municipality was building a housing estate and clearing local slums, residents organised to ask for the sacking of head of local social services, whom they accused of accepting bribes of 'ham and olive oil' in return for preference in housing allocation.⁷⁰ In one of the city's largest and oldest shanty towns, Casal Ventoso, the residents' commission organised a protest outside the local social services centre, accusing the priest who ran them of 'never having done anything' for them, and demanding to be given control over the community centre.⁷¹ Elsewhere, social services were accused of 'bad faith' in assessing the incomes (and therefore priority rankings) of families on housing waiting lists.⁷² Another common target was the municipal police who patrolled poor neighbourhoods, and whose references for 'good conduct' could guarantee a house, or whose disapproval could mean immediate eviction; the newsletter of the Relógio commission demanded the sacking of dishonest city council officials and

the corrupt and disgusting Municipal Police, responsible for so much of our exploitation. We shall never forget the humiliations that our wives and mothers went through at their hands as they begged for a house for their families.⁷³

These examples reveal not only how far state-provided housing had come to be regarded as a fundamental social right, but also how much resentment had accumulated towards the regime and its agents perceived to be denying the people their entitlement. Without a doubt, housing and urban welfare were two of the fields that contributed to the deligitimisation of the regime, but these rising expectations were largely of its own making. As de Tocqueville said of the French monarchy's empty rhetoric on the right to work, 'it was indiscreet enough to utter such words, but positively dangerous to utter them in vain'.⁷⁴

V

Most accounts of the development of citizenship in Europe tend to emphasise the importance of social conflict – most often class-derived – in driving the expansion of

⁶⁸ Américo Tomás was president of the republic between 1958 and 1974. *Luta Popular*, 25 March 1975, 10.

⁶⁹ Francisco Martins Rodrigues, ed., *O Futuro Era Agora. O Movimento Popular de 25 de Abril* (Lisbon: Ed. Dinossauro, 1994), 106.

⁷⁰ *Diário de Notícias*, 15 May 1974, 11. There were also counter-mobilisations defending the role of social services, although even supporters protested against 'a society who allows people to live in shacks'. *Diário de Notícias*, 16 May 1974, 12.

⁷¹ *A Capital*, 13 May 1974, 13; *Républica*, 24 May 1974, 21, 27.

⁷² AHM/AAC, CE 1976, J. F. do Beato to CML, 6 Nov. 1974.

⁷³ *Diário de Lisboa*, 21 June 1974, 11. See also AHM/AAC CE 1976, CM da Quinta do Narigão e Quinta do Alto letter to CML, 3 Jul. 1974.

⁷⁴ Alexis de Tocqueville, *The Old Regime and the French Revolution*, trans. Stuart Gilbert (New York: Anchor Books, 1983 [1851]), 181.

the content and coverage of rights, but the roots of citizenship in Portugal seem to lie elsewhere. It was not until a relatively late stage in the life of the dictatorship that the issue of social rights became explicitly tied to the issue of political legitimization, at the time of Caetano's attempts to build an *Estado Social*. In this case, we have to consider the autonomous influence of authoritarian ideologies and the issue of a bureaucratic momentum, factors that have been hitherto neglected and require further investigation. Both are connected through a process of state building whereby, to quote Theda Skocpol and Edwin Amenta, policies created politics, and not vice-versa.⁷⁵

In terms of the history of contemporary Portugal, this idea suggests some further considerations. First, it encourages research into the transformation of popular political beliefs and attitudes during the dictatorship as a way of understanding contemporary political culture. Having established how these were considerably different in 1974 from what they had been in 1928, it is striking how little we know about the changing opinions and life strategies of ordinary citizens under the dictatorship. Villaverde Cabral has recently linked the familistic attitudes and perceptions of distance from power prevalent in Portuguese society to a tradition of state authoritarianism.⁷⁶ To what extent were these reinforced by the dictatorship's reformulation of state–society relations, how were democratic understandings of citizenship formed at the popular level, and how have these influenced contemporary attitudes towards the state? More broadly, this leads to considerations regarding the nature of the relationship between state and society in Portugal. South European countries are often described as having 'weak' civil societies. This article suggests that changes in the nature of the relationship between state and population created the conditions for broad-based social movements that belied this image of weakness, suggesting that state structures could be important in explaining patterns of low participation. Where states are isolated from citizens, formal and informal associations are less likely to support state-oriented mobilisations that have been taken to be the indicator of strong civil societies. Seen in this light, the *Estado Novo* presents a paradox. On the one hand, it stands with the tradition of authoritarianism and insulation of politics from society that is characteristic of Portuguese history. On the other, it also contributed, however unwittingly, to the creation of new forms of citizenship, whose active expression was most visible in a short period when the Portuguese state showed an uncharacteristic openness to popular demands, between 1974 and 1975.

⁷⁵ Theda Skocpol and Edwin Amenta, 'States and Social Policies', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12 (1986), 131–57, 149. It is important to note, however, that it was the post-revolutionary governments that truly expanded welfare coverage to a majority of the population, even if Marcelo's *Estado Social* was a radical departure from the historical norm; see, for instance, Gøsta Esping-Andersen, 'Budgets and Democracy: Towards a Welfare State in Spain and Portugal, 1960–1986', in Ian Budge and David McKay, eds., *Developing Democracy: Comparative Research in Honour of J. F. P. Blondel* (London: Sage, 1994).

⁷⁶ Manuel Villaverde Cabral, 'O Exercício da Cidadania Política em Perspectiva Histórica (Portugal e Brasil)', *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 18 (2003), 31–60.