

CHANGING A NATION'S WAY OF THINKING

José Cardoso Pires

In the five centuries of its publishing history, Portugal has experienced 420 years of censorship. In statistical terms, therefore, publishing in Portugal is a cultural activity which has been carried out at a 'rate of repression' of 84 per cent. For generation after generation, while political regimes and scientific and cultural movements have succeeded one another, a slow procession of martyrs has wound its way along the thousands of miles which would be covered by the texts thrown on to bonfires and relegated to dusty archives. Resistance has become a historical reality, constantly renewed by the subterfuges devised to evade the watchful eyes of the authorities. And the tradition of repression has been increasingly refined, culminating in the clearly-defined technical unity which it achieved under the Salazar dictatorship.

Ce petit dictateur dont le nom m'échappe — the phrase with which Bernasos dismissed Premier Salazar of Portugal — was determined to transform censorship into a syntax of thought: it was to become not only a prophylactic used by the State against undesirable manifestations, but also the means of creating conformist attitudes of mind. Through censorship, Salazar sought first and foremost to isolate the citadels of Portuguese culture and ultimately even Portugal itself from the contemporary world. At the same time, protected by this isolationism, he tried to offer a more or less modern face to the inspection of the outside world in order to make himself acceptable to international opinion. To the world he was the 'little dictator'; in Portugal he could enjoy the impunity of governing in secret.

And indeed, all was quiet on the home front: a peace achieved through rigorous censorship of the press, the theatre, the arts, all public performances

and all advertising; through the insidious planting of government agents in radio and television; through the presence of emissaries of the Ministry of the Interior at every public meeting; through the revision of the school curriculum and the careful selection of teachers; through the monitoring of ham radio broadcasts; through economic conditioning of the mass media; and, finally, through the creation of an extensive network of parallel censorship imposed by enterprising private citizens. The rest could be accomplished by tightening frontier controls, withholding passports, bribing foreign journalists and news agencies or exerting pressures on them, opening private letters and tapping telephone conversations.

With the isolation barrier established, the next stop was to promote a suitable export image for Portugal: a country discreetly aloof from the major world conflicts and consequently providing a favourable climate for investment and for a political protectionism which would in other circumstances have raised an outcry in the world press. The fact that, in Portuguese law, censorship fits into a framework which includes the official propaganda and tourist information services underlines the clear link between silencing the truth and selling the facade.

The state of emergency and the 'state of falsehood'

All censorship gives rise to a state of falsehood, since all censorship operates through the elimination of truth and hence creates and puts into effect the lie by omission. Starting from a verification of the existence of a plurality of conflicting ideas, it attempts to reduce these opposites to a common denominator, namely, the ideology of power.

Since the days of Torquemada, the technocrats of obscurantism have been aware that censorship and force are aspects of the same 'raison d'état' and that the lie of power tends to create a collective psychosis in which the leader is above discussion and ultimately semi-divine. Salazar, in 1948: 'Falsehoods, fabrications and fears, however unjustified, eventually create attitudes of mind which become political realities'.

A man whose reasoning was less than brilliant but whose psychological insight was coldly accurate, Salazar deployed arguments which, although they could nearly always be easily refuted, enjoyed the inviolability of dogma, for they were unanswerable as a result of the operations of the elaborate machinery of repression. Truth was power. But the tone of his speeches had another end in view: the crude arrogance with which he expounded the most irrational of his axioms was a calculated display of his contempt for ordinary intelligence, ultimately a provocation aimed at the impotence of the ruled, who were powerless to question or to challenge his dicta.

The political lie had ceased to be a demagogic instrument or a moderator

of opinion and became instead a means of creating stress. Openly defiant and proclaiming its own impunity, it had become the extreme expression of authoritarianism, a means of exerting psychological pressure (the 'factions' and 'fears' which eventually create attitudes of mind) on citizens totally deprived of power.

The principle of non-responsibility

A military coup is inevitably followed by the imposition of censorship and Portugal followed the usual pattern: it was the *pronunciamento* of 28 May 1926 that established the modern Portuguese censorship and the military have continued to occupy the key posts in the censor's office ever since.

As a typical mechanism of the state of emergency, a summary tribunal with all the imprecision and authority of a 'temporary' repressive measure, censorship established as the cardinal point of its code the defence of the inviolability of leadership and of the sanctity of public law and order. The degree of danger of a crime depended not on the act itself, but on the emotional climate of the time; any statement was to be seen in the political context as an act of sedition; and 'abuse of freedom' was removed from the jurisdiction of common law in order to be tried by the same special tribunals that condemned armed rebellion.

The censorship sought to legitimize itself as an *exceptional measure* and only as such did it claim its special privileges. But it went on operating, became part of the establishment and has survived (for as long as forty-three years in the case of Portugal) under the protection of the 'temporary' measures which brought it into being and through which it continues to enjoy all the privileges of secrecy in drawing up its briefs and remains exempt from justifying its accusations in the presence of the accused. And there is no legal redress against its decisions (exemption from *legal responsibility*). And reversal of a decision is the prerogative of the censor himself or of the minister responsible. On the same grounds of emergency, any excess of zeal on the part of the censorship is conveniently overlooked. Its functionaries are granted the same margin of tolerance and understanding as those of repressive bodies whose activities are more openly coercive. In the words of the politicians who back its actions, the censorship is 'a necessary evil', implying its exemption from *moral responsibility*.

Finally, because of the multiplicity of themes, expressions and meanings which it has to handle, the censorship functions as an omniscient body, an omniscience exercised in the full knowledge of the impossibility of passing proper judgment in each case. Nevertheless, the censorship accepts this contradiction invoking, as always, the crisis that makes it necessary. Hence decisions can be based on suspicion rather than fact: a neat way of over-

coming the difficulties of omniscience.

The unscientific character and lack of systematization makes it possible to dispense with any specific indication of the censurable object and to use subjective judgement instead. Protected by a sufficiently vague and flexible statute, the censorship is relieved of any responsibility for a more objective definition of the dangerous. 'Contempt for law and order' . . . 'demoralization of the family' . . . 'disrespect for institutions' . . . 'pornography' . . . etc., are labels which can be conveniently produced whenever an interpretation is challenged. It follows that every word has a free translation in the censor's manual and every sentence may have a hidden meaning.

André Glucksmann (in *Communications*, Number 9) writes: '*Le censurable et le censuré ne peuvent pas être l'objet d'un jugement scientifique*'. In other words, the vagueness of the cause determines the vagueness of the effect and the randomness of the punishment. This explains why the reasons for which the notorious blue pencil of the Portuguese censor condemns texts (and their authors) should be governed by the dialectics of suspicion and why they remain so consistently impenetrable and devious.

Here are some examples of the semantic whims of the censor:

- (1) The text of a Reuter news item banned in Portugal read as follows: 'The outbreak of a plague of Colorado beetles in Portugal has led the U.K. Ministry of Agriculture to place additional restrictions on Portuguese vegetables. These supplement the measures already adopted in the case of other countries afflicted by the spread of the Colorado beetle'.
- (2) The censor prohibited horoscope columns in newspapers and magazines publishing pessimistic forecasts for the sign of Taurus (Salazar's birth sign).
- (3) A newspaper editor tells the following story: A news brief from an international news agency stating that in one of the cities of a certain country, with which Portugal has no diplomatic relations, the temperature had fallen to 45 degrees below zero, was excised by the censor. The editor wanted to know why. The censor's reply: 'We are hardly interested in the climate of that particular country'.

Self-censorship

The irresponsibility of the censor leads to the irresponsibility of the censored.

Without the Tablets of the Censor's Law to provide guidance, a journalist accepts the arbitrary as law and uses trial and error in the attempt to discover for himself the criteria applied by the tribunal to which his work must be submitted daily. He works out his own ten commandments and compiles his own manual of self-censorship.

For a start, experience has taught him a few of the rules: any article, even after the *imprimatur* has been granted, may be withdrawn at the last moment; the strictness of the censor varies from paper to paper and even from editor to editor; a quotation from an author in disgrace can mean the banning of the entire article; certain subjects will receive kindly treatment from the all-powerful blue pencil if they have inconspicuous headlines and are destined for the minor pages. And so on . . .

A journalist knows all this and hesitates. The hand which has once been slapped — a hand which has to keep the presses rolling — will anticipate the blow and avoid doubtful subjects, persons or news items, will shorten some passages and pad out others in order to make an idea more accessible or a news item less suspect.

A sociological study of the stylistics of the Portuguese language would reveal the repercussions of censorship on literary expression and in particular on the style of works subject to censorship before publication (magazine articles, literary supplements, etc.). It could be said that there is a 'clandestine' style with its own key metaphors (e.g. 'dawn' or 'day-break' for socialism; 'spring' for revolution; 'comrade' for prisoner; 'vampire' for policeman; 'poppy' for popular victory). These metaphors have been widely adopted and give a marked abstract and poetical flavour to Portuguese prose of the 1940's. Like the slang used by any persecuted community, the written language devised new forms of communication by twisting words and phrases in common use and distorting or replacing accepted (or official) images.

For journalism the consequences were much more serious. The constant constraints and the insidious irresponsibility promoted by censorship, which daily undermined the integrity of the profession and discouraged any genuine reporting, weakened its impact and made it increasingly bureaucratic. Worse still, these pressures forced it to adopt a hybrid style, tailored to official taste with clichés inspired by the speeches of government figures ('structures of the nation'; 'the Portuguese way of life'; 'historical compromise', etc.) in which the attributes of establishment personalities became vapid stereotypes (the minister of *exceptional competence*; the *dynamic* producer, the officer with a *long and distinguished* record of service; the *providential leader*; the lady whose *kind generosity* is a household word; the technocrat of *superior intelligence*, etc.).

Such pedestrianism soon brings the press into discredit. Familiarity produces its proverbial offspring and the contempt for the press openly expressed by the autocrats of the regime serves to emphasize its subservience. It need only be said that in forty years of government, Salazar never held a press conference and that some of his more notable opinions were confided to foreign journalists before they appeared in the Portuguese newspapers. Similarly, a great many news items concerning Portugal were only allowed to

appear in the Portuguese press after they had been published by the international news agencies. A Portuguese anecdote currently doing the rounds still makes this point: 'What's the latest local news?' asks an immigrant on a visit to Lisbon. 'Haven't the faintest idea,' replies his friend, 'I haven't seen today's *Le Monde*.'

Journalists are under the constant pressure of one of the most brutal forces of the dictatorship, a tribunal which, in the name of Christian values, bans the words of Pope Paul VI and which, in defence of the regime, spares no one — not even elected deputies of the only lawful political party whose pronouncements deviate from the orthodox official line. Here too, however, the classic patterns of the persecuted-persecutor relationship begin to emerge with all their contradictions. Although assured of total immunity and guaranteed all possible discriminatory powers, the bureaucrat censor is afraid of being caught out by his own cultural shortcomings and by the 'cleverness' of writers. So he creates his own self-censorship and takes exaggerated precautions. Anything he cannot understand is out. And any suspect implications are out too. The slightest reaction of officialdom or the merest possibility that something might offend influential private or public susceptibilities is enough to place the censor on his guard. After all, he cannot afford to compromise his professional integrity or his loyalty to the establishment.

In other words, censorship not only upholds the inviolability of the regime, but also endows with sanctity those private interests which it considers representative of the morals of the State.

The censor and the censored: a study of alienation

The stronghold of censorship is suitably protected against attack. Opinions are never expressed in writing; verdicts are always conveyed through the anonymous markings of the blue pencil or the impersonal bureaucracy of the rubber stamp: *Deleted, Suspended, Authorized, Authorized with cuts*. The rest is silence. Any exchange of views or any question regarding decisions is allowed only as a personal favour and then always in the form of an interview or through a telephone call. The telephone is also used to convey the most blatantly absurd decisions and any instructions beyond the descriptive powers of the blue pencil. Never anything tangible that could be placed on record or used to attribute responsibility or establish a precedent. The rules are clear: the blue line across the page, the rubber stamp.

In this way, the battalions of the censorship attempt to produce a second chronicle of the day's events. In special circumstances, however, this is not enough. Words must be found to fill the deliberate gaps which have been left in an attempt to convey a particular meaning. The censor's telephone

goes into action in the service of the really 'creative' tasks: editorials are suggested, official communiqués are dictated, wider coverage of a particular event is demanded.

In 1958, when Aneurin Bevan was refused entry into Portugal, pressure was brought to bear on Portugal's more recalcitrant daily newspapers to make 'independent editorial comments' on the abuse of national sovereignty which the visit implied.

Even more striking was the action taken in relation to the hijacking of the *Santa Maria* by Henrique Galvão. When world-wide publicity made it impossible to keep the story out of Portuguese papers, they were forced to include, with the briefest possible reference to the event itself, editorial condemnation of 'a vicious political act'.

The censor's arbitrary abuse of power and the various forms of collaborationism to which it gives rise, stem from the progressive deterioration of relations between persecuted and persecutors, a situation that inevitably arises when the tension between two diametrically opposed forces approaches breaking point. Censor and censored, engaged in the same routine performance, find themselves increasingly alienated from each other. The censor tries to break the isolation to which he is committed by the secret and segregating nature of his function. He tries to humanize it, to integrate it into current moral attitudes, to attribute to it a purely bureaucratic character and to remove from it as much political content as possible in order to place his profession on the same footing as the ordinary institutions of public life.

This accounts for the paternalistic attitude ('moderating' is the term used) of his direct relations with those he censors and for the flexibility of the condemnation or condonement. The 'necessary evil' is adjusted to accepted norms and the censor may even go as far as to accuse a journalist of disloyalty if an article manages to slip through the net.

Censorship as tax

The thousands of tons of print destroyed by the Portuguese censor represent not only a cultural holocaust, but also serious financial losses — a current account in which newspapers and publishers register a constant debit.

In fact, economic coercion must have been in the minds of the legislators when they issued a decree stipulating that adequate proof of financial backing must be established before any publication could be launched. This initial restriction was followed by other censorial controls entailing economic sanctions according to which publishers, printers and newspapers were made responsible for what they published and became liable to fines or to a complete shutdown.

Furthermore, by undermining the journalistic framework, the censorship narrows the reader market and interferes in the economics of the press. By cutting up texts, altering page sequences and banning advertising copy¹, it increases the direct financial outlay: editorial and printing staff have to work overtime to rewrite copy and reset texts, additional expenditure is involved in communications, special staff members are hired to handle contacts with the censor, advertising income is lost, editions are late in appearing involving outlay on emergency transport to prevent sales losses, etc. According to a recent estimate, these obstacles represent a surtax amounting to some 4 per cent of the sales value of the total daily edition of any newspaper not openly identified with the regime.

1. Here is an example of the whims of the censor as applied to advertising: after the press show of Jean Pierre Melville's film *Le Samurái*, the political police questioned the director of the distributing firm while the censor banned all newspaper advertising of the film and ordered the immediate removal of all advertising posters displayed in public. The posters carried the Portuguese title ('Licence to Kill') and the caption 'This man must die'. Salazar had recently been admitted to a clinic in a critical condition.

The object of the exercise is obvious. And it is here that another form of self-censorship makes its appearance: the censorship of the accounts departments. Many of the censor's apparently irrational demands are unmasked as an insidious use of economic pressure. Articles must be submitted only when they have been completely set by the printers, with headlines and sub-titles included; any news item which is suspended must be submitted daily until a final decision is made; the censor's decisions must be fully complied with at any time, even when the paper is ready for distribution. These methods are a deliberate exercise of economic pressure in the guise of bureaucratic necessity.

Parallel censorship

Self-censorship often operates as parallel censorship and the Portuguese scene is dominated by a network of such parallel voluntary controls operated by private institutions attempting to avoid official intervention and any consequent litigation with the regime. By compromising with the establishment, private institutions like the Calouste Gulbenkian and Ricardo Espírito Santo Foundations or the Automobile Club of Portugal, bring politics into their cultural activities and tacitly establish a relatively undisturbed line of action. Under close official scrutiny the cultural sections of trade unions, sports clubs and recreation centres often seek refuge in a more cautious approach which leads to a form of ultra-censorship. The programmers of the non-official broadcasting stations are governed by the same caution. Theatre producers avoid putting on plays which they consider likely to fall foul of the censor. Public relations staff of the trusts bring pressure to bear on information services. Finally, the last Grand Inquisitor of Salazarism, Mr. Paulo

Rodrigues (in office from 1962 to 1968) established a secret council operating independently of the official censor, exclusively responsible for reinforcing the censorship of literary activity.

This body, which came to be known as the 'Shadow Cabinet', derived its operational technique from the methods of the official censor, but introduced certain refinements in the way of psychological terrorism. It was not intended as a substitute for the censor, nor did it alter any of the official theories; it simply complemented official censorship, giving greater weight to the blue pencil, concentrating on details and on personal attack. All the country's literary activities, every single reference or allusion to individual authors, however indirect, passed through the Cabinet's filters, measured and decanted by the alchemists of sectarianism.

It was only to be expected that official censorship would find in the existence of the Shadow Cabinet a new excuse for its own non-responsibility. The censor-bureaucrat became the public face of censorship presenting himself as a mere subordinate, carrying out the orders of an inaccessible and mysterious power and thus unable to deal with a writer's complaints or protests. He could continue to censor while claiming that he did not know exactly what or why he was censoring. Hand on heart, he could invoke the awe-inspiring secret council: 'I have no idea . . . a decision of the Shadow Cabinet.'

The corollary is that parallel censorship attenuates the isolation of the official censor. It is simply an application of existing measures at the national and private level.

Impact of the mass media and the definition of dangerous areas

In analysing any article for publication, the censor bears in mind its potential readership. The size of the audience which the particular publication is likely to reach is highly significant and its harmfulness is diagnosed according to circulation figures, the page where the article is featured, the prominence given to the author, the number of photographs or illustrations, and even the nature of the subject itself, since certain subjects are traditionally tabooed by the blue pencil. Especially in the case of literature.

For over forty years Portuguese writers have opposed Salazar's 'politics of the mind' (the official description of his approach). This has earned them a permanent place on the black list of the unredeemed. Many have found that the price of independence is exile or imprisonment, but all, without exception, have learned that an independent line means active persecution by the censor.

Under the reign of terror of Mr. Paulo Rodrigues the isolation of the literary ghetto was undermined by an escalating series of guerilla attacks.

Extremist commandoes sprang up from nowhere to launch an anti-intellectual offensive which amounted to a crusade culminating in the complete destruction of the Society of Writers.

The preliminary skirmish was a raid on a Lisbon bookshop. This was followed a few days later by open combat. The pretext was the award of a literary prize to the novelist Luandino Vieira, who was (and still is) serving a prison sentence for 'collaborating' with Angolan freedom fighters. In the hysterical climate which followed the award, political police arrested all the members of the prize jury, the Government dissolved the Society of Writers and gave its backing to the illegal attack which had been made on the Society's premises. This was the signal for a witch-hunt against all intellectuals in which men of letters were publicly intimidated and attacked in the streets. Radio and television programmes cried treason against the intellectuals' betrayal, mothers of soldiers killed in the African conflict came out in protest, there was an outcry in the conformist press. In other words, a full-scale offensive had been launched to alienate the writer from his public.

Escalation of penalties

But there was a further end in view: the writer must be isolated not only from the public but from all those concerned in the publication and dissemination of books. Legally, books do not have to be submitted to the censor before publication. In practice, however, this does not prevent entire editions from being seized before they can find their way into the shops. Nor does it prevent the police from seizing, in their periodic raids on printers' workshops, manuscripts which have not yet been set up. In the case of the novelist Alves Redol, the censor insisted on seeing his works in manuscript and banned publication of one of his novels, *Reinegros* — a work which has remained unpublished ever since.

Such minor interventions may contradict the letter of the law. But its spirit, despite the mask of legal prose, is sufficiently obvious. The point is that by concentrating on a published work, an 'end product' whose value can be reckoned in terms of production and distribution costs, the censor involves not only the writer but the entire production network from publisher to bookseller. The law includes warnings that although the seizure of a book is not done through judicial process, the author and all those involved in its publication and distribution may find themselves in court liable to the maximum penalty of a prison sentence in the case of the author and to the permanent shutdown of their enterprises in the cases of the publisher, printer and bookseller. In short, the system is clearly designed to set in motion a chain reaction of self-censorship that covers each stage of the process.

In any case, the publisher is the central figure: it is he who is held ultimately responsible and it is he who is the real target of the censor's coercive methods, designed to enforce conformity before the law is obliged to apprehend the end consumer product. Actual seizure of a published work is simply the theoretical culmination of an escalating series of reprisals against the book.

A series of measures frequently put into effect clearly shows, by its gradation, that the final stage is prepared for by creating in the publisher a conditioned doubt and uncertainty. The first move is to alarm him by issuing an unexpected demand that certain books, selected apparently at random from his list, must be submitted to the censor for appraisal. The verdict is then delayed interminably while the book continues to circulate freely. The suspense inevitably leads the publisher to hold up any further activities in relation to the books under scrutiny. Finally, any reference to a particular book ceases to appear in the press. There is no warning and no justification. There is simply a total blank: reviews and advertisements of the doomed book are banned in all newspapers. The book may still be on sale but it is annihilated by the wave of silence imposed by the censor.

The publisher waits for the final decision, his uncertainty increases. If the book in question is a Portuguese original he is virtually certain that it will be eventually seized. He knows that the risk is greatest in the case of works by Portuguese writers, particularly if the writer is alive. He fears that reprisals will extend to other works on his list. And at that point he realises that it is extremely dangerous to publish the work of a Portuguese writer, that it is a risky business for all concerned.

In this way national writers are alienated from their publishers and it becomes difficult for them to find an outlet for their work.

Civil death

The only remaining loophole in the successive isolation of the writer is the contact between writer and reading public.

Banning a book is not enough. Sentencing a writer to prison is too risky: it might make him a martyr in the public eye and strengthen his bonds with the community rather than cut him off from his readers. A solution must be found which is less naive, not quite so obvious.

The censor therefore carries out a series of apparently unrelated 'routine' measures designed to affect the publisher, the press and the climate of cultural opinion. The ultimate aim is to tighten the net around a Portuguese writer by making him an embarrassment to public institutions, a risky undertaking for the book trade and a less representative expression of his society. They work as follows:-

(1) The lenient treatment given to foreign work, which is in marked contrast to the minute scrutiny reserved for books written originally in Portuguese, is determined not only by the greater likelihood that the original would make more impact on the public as a direct interpretation of the national social reality. It is also a means of preventing competition and is designed to affect the choices made by publishers and to condition public attitudes.

(2) The least significant and most uncommitted writers, however discredited they may be, are given preferential treatment in the official media and this unlocks the doors of all the parallel forms of censorship.

(3) Committed writers whose reputations are high enough are given official blessing once they are safely dead. As a proof of its independence, the censorship shows its willingness to overlook a lifetime's opposition to the regime in an attempt to give greater credit to the sectarianism which governs its treatment of writers who remain dangerously alive.

These three attitudes towards Portuguese writers demonstrate quite clearly the censor's intention of creating obstacles to the consolidation of national reputations. They are part of a design to promote the deliberate confusion of values and to discredit the Portuguese writer in the eyes of his public.

It is often said in Portugal that if there were no censorship there would not be so many writers. This ironic comment is directed against certain minor authors whose claim to fame is that they have had a book banned. At the same time, however, it is a direct reference to the impossibility of establishing genuine critical values in the distorted literary situation created by the censor.

This is also true of the press. As the saying goes: 'When censorship is abolished many journalists will find themselves jobless. . .' These and other commonplace assertions become part of the censorship myth, part of the justification for an alienated life style. Would-be writers or literary parasites frequently attribute their inactivity to the discouragement provided by the arbitrariness of censorship or claim that they are registering their protest against an institution which they refuse to recognise and with which they will not collaborate by allowing their works to be published by kind permission of the censor.

The general confusion of values is further intensified by the censor's elaborate treatment of purely literary articles destined for the press. An enthusiastic passage is watered down, a basic reference is eliminated, a word or sentence is omitted to produce a uniformly colourless prose which the newspaper can either resign itself to accept with all its ambiguities and inversions or, as frequently happens, decide to reject. By accentuating the negative and eliminating the positive, the censor blurs, distorts and transforms

the writer's real image and creates its own apocryphal history of Portuguese literature.

The question put by a bureaucratic censor to the editor of one of the dailies — 'Why on earth are you so concerned with living writers?' — has its point. Alive, the writer is an uncomfortable conscience, all the more so in a repressive society which neglects him and deprives him of any possibility of prestige or civil representativeness. To be a writer is bad enough; to be a living writer is to compound the original sin by adding a touch of unforgivable provocation.

The predominantly 'historicist' approach of the universities is a direct reflection of the official caution in regard to contemporary Portuguese writers. The tolerated role they play in the planning of the literature syllabus, the limited number and careful selection of contemporary authors whose works are studied are indicative of the desire to compromise with the establishment shown by Portuguese universities.

Tutors will discourage students from attempting a thesis on the work of living writers, justifying themselves on the grounds that it is necessary to maintain a certain critical distance or producing some equally flimsy argument. Even more disturbing, however, is the closed shop attitude of the universities, which defensively ignore the direct contribution of a writer to the more dynamic teaching of literature.

From all this to civil death there is a very short step. The Shadow Cabinet takes care of this side of things, obliterating any mention of a doomed writer in the press or in the supporting cultural networks. Branded with the seal of silence, he is left to run the gamut of all the parallel forms of censorship, including the involuntary censors affecting his everyday life. The total boycott comes as no surprise: it is the unwritten law of intellectual apartheid.

Postscript

In November 1969, Alves Redol, one of Portugal's most important modern novelists, wrote as he lay dying in the Santa Maria hospital: 'I am one more writer who will die in intellectual solitary confinement. They never allowed me to write down what I wanted to say.'

Salazar had already been replaced by Marcello Caetano. The new Premier, whose intellectual approach to Portugal's intelligentsia was in marked contrast to the mental colonialism of the old dictator, had long since announced his intention to introduce a new Press Law which would demolish the censorship system. But Alves Redol, António Sérgio and José Régio, three of Portugal's most representative writers, died in 'intellectual solitary confinement', because the censor had remained faithful to the Salazar tradition, as

above the law as ever and as impregnable as always in its *ultima ratio* justifications. Even the officers had remained unchanged.

Marcello Caetano's inaction was based on his discovery of the fact that after forty years of censorship, the country's intellectual standards had badly deteriorated, and on his arguable interpretation of this fact: that in such conditions public opinion would have to be educated in order to survive the abolition of censorship without falling into anarchy or the abuse of freedom. The conclusion was that the 'evil' of censorship had once more been demonstrated to be necessary as a temporary measure — this time only until (and once again the 'provisional' nature of the situation is emphasised) the Press Law is passed.

The argument was that censorship would be relaxed gradually to prepare for a stage of responsible **public awareness**. In the early days of the Caetano regime it seemed possible that this could happen. The old guard bureaucracy tried to adapt itself to the **easier atmosphere**: the blue pencil was wielded as lightly as the deep-rooted authoritarianism of the bureaucrats would allow. In comparison with the strong-arm tactics of the Salazar system, there was an obvious move towards liberalization. But it was not yet entirely clear whether this relaxation was a genuine step in the process of loosening the bonds of censorship, or whether it would prove to be simply a move towards stagnation at some vague point of relative toleration.

The answer is now clear: fluctuating capriciously between aggressive action and unconcern, the post-Salazar censorship is moving to a standstill at a point only slightly below the repressive level of the immediate past. And it will prove extremely difficult to move beyond this towards greater liberalization. Forty years of repression have left their mark. For forty years the vices of censorship — authoritarianism, incompetence, oppression — have been given full rein and it would be too much to expect an institution so perverted to facilitate the re-education of a country which it had helped to corrupt.

José Cardoso Pires is a well known Portuguese novelist and founder of the Society of Portuguese Writers. He is at present a lecturer in Portuguese literature at King's College in London.