

Lúis Reis Torgal

UDK 321.64:929 Салазар А.
321.64(469)“1932/1974”

Salazar and the Portuguese “New State” – Images and Interpretations

Анстракт: Аутор настоји да на теоријски начин дефинише режим који је владао Португалијом од 1932. до 1974. године. Закључује да је такозвани Салазаризам био једна локална варијација генеричког појма „фашизам“, који се, осим на део интелектуалних кругова, ослањао, пре свега, на цркву и официрски кор.

Кључне речи: салазаризам, фашизам, Нова држава, модерне идеологије

“New State” is the name adopted by António de Oliveira Salazar (1889–1970) to describe his political system (1932–1968 and continued on by Marcello Caetano until 1974). The “New State” was undoubtedly influenced by the *Stato nuovo*, an Italian expression whose ideals precede it and which comes to its fruition in Fascism.

Nevertheless, the “New State” conveyed a relative pleasant impression in the foreign political milieu. For instance, it was common, during its long period of existence, to recognise its “original” character and not confuse it with the generic classification of “fascism”. The Portuguese political system itself made an effort, through Salazar and salazarist supporters, to affirm this “original” character, as a means of propaganda, in official statements collected about the regime, and by Salazar and the political ideals he followed. Within these official statements, many were politicians of regimes, militants within an authoritarian or totalitarian current of thought, intellectuals right-wing Catholics, or writers that wrote by commission to Portugal or to the Portuguese “ruler”. Among these, we find names such as Keyserling, Goebbels, Eugénio D’Ors, Gil Robles, Oswaldo Aranha, Lourival Fontes, Jacques Bainville, Charles Maurras, Pétain, Léon de Poncins, Henri Massis, Alessandro Pavolini, Mircea Eliade, Gonzague de Reynold, Michael Derrick, and the Colonel F. C. C. Egerton. However, we also see mentionings to these effect of passing political figures, of newspapers and

other authors who, independent of their own intimate ideals, were widely respected. These were figures such as Pious XII, Churchill, Truman, Cardinal Spellman, Jules Romains, the London *Times*, American catholic journals, etc...

Among the latter statements, let us visit the one taken from *The Times* of the 29 of April 1939:

“All over Portugal there is the notion of freedom and one has the feeling that there is a great ruler that steers the Nation with love and trust so that the spiritual and material goals he has proposed are achieved. [...] The country progresses in all its manifestations of life under Salazar’s government.”

R. Lewinsohn, in an article for the American publication *world affairs, Current History*, published on January 1935, wrote:

“Salazar is a Professor. It is as a Professor that he bases his moral authority and his political stance.”

And Michael Kenny, in *The Catholic World*, affirmed:

“Entirely different from Socialism and Fascism, some of the best European thinkers see Salazar’s system as the most perfect and true embodiment of representative democracy.”

In fact, with the exception of the Communists, who generally termed the right-wing authoritarian and totalitarian regimes as “fascist” – see, for instance, the testimony about Salazarism by Ralph Fox in the book *Portugal Now* –, the truth is that authors of articles and works rarely accepted the “fascist” label for the New State. I want to highlight now the famous and precocious 1935 article written by the Spanish philosopher Miguel de Unamuno for the *Ahora* newspaper, which was published in Madrid. After a visit to Portugal, Unamuno, then the Dean of Salamanca University commented:

“And nothing better that to call academic fascism – both in a pedagogical and indoctrinational sense – than that which informs the current Portuguese regime. The nucleic dictatorship which Oliveira Salazar represents is an academic and military dictatorship or, if you like, a war-like scholastic one. It is a dictatorship run by generals – or colonels – and academics, with an occasional contribution from the clergy. The latter’s contribution does not amount to much, even though Cardinal Cerejeira, the head of the Portuguese Catholic Church, was a fellow student with Salazar in Coimbra and, like him, is also an academic. He is an academic clergyman, just as the other military members [of this regime] are academics.”

One can see that Unamuno's pronouncement of the "New State" is exceptional and objectively critical. One must also add, to Unamuno's reading, the critical and methodological thoughts of Sir Austen Chamberlain. These were made in a preface to an English edition of Salazar's famous interview made by António Ferro, a right-wing journalist who would later become the director of the Secretariat for National Propaganda of the New State body. Contrary to other prefaces in edited foreign language editions of this interview, such as the preface for the Spanish edition (written by Eugénio D'Ors), or for the Italian edition (written by Corrado Zoli), the English language edition does not present us with a commendatory preface to Salazar, nor does it give us a sympathetic image of "dictatorships", in which the Portuguese regime was included, as was the case, to a point, in the preface to the French edition (written by Paul Valéry). The preface written by Chamberlain first described the English parliamentary system as a model system that could only exist in countries after having emerged through its own historical and natural process. The preface concludes saying that the truth was that in most of Europe there had emerged dictatorships, of which the Portuguese one was an example, although he could not account as to the reasons why this might have happened. The statements that follow are along the lines of a comparative process between dictatorships and the English system, in which we also see a very quick comparison of Salazarism with Mussolini's Fascism and Hitler's Nazism. The preface closes with some doubts regarding the true nature of the regime run by an "Economics and Financial Science professor from Coimbra" and by the portrait presented to us by the author of the book, namely António Ferro, which, in response to Chamberlain's criticism, purposefully wrote a lengthy introduction for this English language edition. This lengthy introduction by Ferro delayed the publication considerably, as it would only appear in 1939. This is what Austen Chamberlain wrote:

"[...] Signor Mussolini, Herr Hitler, and Dr. Salazar have each set out to remake the soul of a people. An Englishman may feel that the price paid is too high. He may thank heaven that he is still free citizen of a free country, and resolve that he will guard that freedom the more jealously because of its destruction elsewhere. But no candid reader of this book will deny the nobility of the purpose which Dr. Salazar has set before himself, and no one acquainted with the progress which Portugal has made under his rule will doubt that, if much has been lost, much also has been gained by the new spirit which he has introduced into the public life of this country. In any case we have in this book a vivid portrait of a most interesting man. Is it a true portrait? Is it the whole man, and nothing but the man? Dr. Salazar himself seems to doubt it, and I confess that at moments the painter seems to me to dramatize a man who, if I judge him rightly, abhors the dramatic, and to heighten colours which the sitter would have presented in quieter tones. But these blemishes, if blemishes they

be, are far from destroying the value of the picture. It is a most interesting study of a man and a political system, little known, I think to English readers.”

Who was Salazar exactly? What exactly was the New State? *Fascism never existed* – this was the ironic and paradoxical title of a book written by one of our best essayist, Eduardo Lourenço, in which he brought together his articles from 1976. In this book, he considered that the Salazarist system had been presented in such a particular and efficient way that even the newspaper *Le Monde*, during the last years of the regime, talked about a “wise” or “paternal” dictatorship, thus moving it away from the “fascist” seal which was normally given to other dictatorships. Lourenço thought, contrary to what the words of the title might infer, that the New State was, effectively, a form of “fascism”.

The question or questions posed become even more pertinent if one sees that the majority of the Portuguese and foreign historians, sociologists, and political scientists either ignore the question of characterising the New State or recognise its own “originality” or “singularity” which should not be equated or confused with the system that is called, generically speaking, “fascism”. As an example, we can see the words of a then young French historian, Yves Léonard, who attempted to write a book which synthesised the character of the New State and its links with “fascism”. It is worth pointing out that, in this book, the preface was written by Mário Soares who, throughout his political career of opposition to the regime, never hesitated in calling the Salazar regime “fascist”. This book by Léonard was called *Salazarisme et Fascisme*, and in it we can find the following assertion:

“Singular as all regimes are regarding their historical background, Salazarism escapes a sympathetic classification which does not unjustly bring it within the fascist categories.”

*

Let us now move on to responding, however tentatively, the questions we posed earlier.

We will begin with Salazar, and specifically with an attempt to synthesise the bibliography written about him.

The historiography about the New State receives a lot of attention after 1974, and its importance is in terms of both quantity and quality. Works, that publicised or offered *fait divers* about Salazar, especially those that dealt with the emotional aspects of his life, enjoyed success as editions, and quickly becoming best-sellers. This was a repetition of what had already happened with Christine Garnier’s work, which fuelled the romantic imagination of her readers. The fact is, however, that one cannot find a work carried out by a historian that is not ideologically biased towards

the regime, which was overthrown in 1974, and towards the politician that governed Portugal for the longest time (it was 40 years in total, from 1928 to 1968).

In effect, the only major work published about the New State was the 6 volume publication by Franco Nogueira, a former Foreign Minister under Salazar. This book is a unique, referential and unavoidable work of its kind. In other words, there is no major study carried out by a historian about Salazar. This is contrary to what we find with Mussolini, Hitler, and even Franco. Moreover, in Salazar’s time we find many works published about him and about his time in various countries and languages. Furthermore, we can still see nowadays the effect of these ideological works, of the propaganda, or of a memory constructed about Salazar through *clichés*. These, in part, might account as to why Salazar was elected to be among the top ten “Great Portuguese Figures” organised by the BBC. When looking at these “top ten”, one must also take into account the current disillusionment felt in our country as regards the political situation in Portugal, within Europe and in world terms, and the power that the media have in creating and re-creating “realities”.

However, one should not deduce that Salazar’s biography is not well known among the academia, in terms of both breath and depth, so that confident interpretations about his political character can be formulated. What can be said, perhaps, is that, in Portugal, where one cannot find a well-established neo-Salazarism, we also have not created a memory that can be characterised as “scientific” about Salazar and Salazarism, nor about the New State. This is contrary to what we can find, to a certain extent, with neo-fascism and neo-nazism. In other words, the “Carnation Revolution” on the 25th of April 1974 was not able to completely kill off the representation of Salazar and Salazarism presented by the well-oiled propaganda machine in both Portugal and abroad.

*

We will now move to formulating an interpretative biography of António de Oliveira Salazar.

Salazar was born on the 28th of April 1889, six years after Mussolini, who he admired very much, and eight days after Hitler, of whom he never actually pronounced himself as particularly favourable to. All three historical figures highlighted their humble origins. Salazar described himself as a ‘poor person, the son of poor parents’ or as “a peasant, the son of land workers”. In truth, he was born in a little village called Vimieiro, in the municipal district of Santa Comba Dão, which was part of the administrative district of Viseu. To put it in other words, he was from one of the most rural areas of Portugal, from a small rural house in the countryside. He was the son of a land worker who would later become an agricultural foreman for the Perestrelo family, and who also managed to save enough money to open a small shop and inn later on in his life.

Salazar was the youngest son of António de Oliveira e Maria do Resgate Salazar, and he was also the only male offspring. When he was born, his mother was 43 years old and she had already had four daughters. The relationship Salazar had with his mother until her death in 1926 was very strong. It can be described as being almost oedipal. His father died a few years after his mother, in 1932. We are closely examining Salazar's family, which was mainly constituted by females, as it is highlighted for its importance in Salazar's image and profile later on. In other words, he will always be presented as a statesman that was intrinsically tied to the idea of the family, intimately associated with the land that saw his birth and where he would build a modest house himself so that he spend his holidays there. His relationships with women could be described as going from unsuccessful relationships on his youth to an always incomplete romantic liaison with women during his lifetime. It is as if the shadow of his mother, who gave him her surname (Salazar), hovered over any relationship and prevented it from ever developing. However, throughout his life as a university professor and statesman, he was aided by a housekeeper, D. Maria, and he also sponsored some girls as a godfather.

His academic career can be told in few words, concentrating only on the essential aspects; he entered the Viseu seminary in 1900, where he studied Theology and was pre-ordained in 1908. It should be highlighted that the seminary was, for many in Portugal, a way of obtaining an education, a stepping stone towards getting a post in the civil service, or a way in which to carry on studying. Salazar's self-doubt with regards his following of a religious career lead him to complete his secondary education and to fulfil, in the meantime, the post of prefect in the Colégio da Via Sacra of Viseu. The Colégio da Via Sacra of Viseu followed the principles of English "active pedagogy", proposed by Edmond Demolins and carried out in the *École des Roches*. In this way, Demolins was one of Salazar's main mentors. Salazar would place him before Charles Maurras, who he also admired, but whose importance attached to the "political", which involved a "grass roots" militancy, was slightly removed from Salazar's cautious temperament. Very early on in his high school career as student, and also during his teaching career, we see conferences and essays written by him.

In 1910, the year when the Portuguese First Republic was set up, he entered the Law Faculty at the University of Coimbra. The First Portuguese Republic was secular in character and had, as one of its principles, the "law of separation of Church and State." The University of Coimbra was the only university in Portugal until 1911, and, for Salazar, would always constitute an intellectual reference. It would be in Coimbra where he would join Catholic movements, in particular the Centro Académico de Democracia Cristã (CADC) [Christian Democracy Academic Centre], which was informed by the social doctrines of Leon XIII's Church. These movements lead him towards corporatism and towards leaning for conservative Christian philosophers and sociologists, such as Le Play. Salazar also writes for a Catholic student's

journal linked with CADC, called *O Imparcial* [The impartial], but he never shows himself as a “grass roots” militant. The same could not be said about Father Manuel Gonçalves Cerejeira, his friend and future housemate who would later become the head of the Catholic Church in Lisbon.

He graduated in Law in 1914 and began his university career, continuing his studies and also teaching Political Economics and Finance, in which he would later hold a chair. In this way, we can see his development as a practical financier, in which he wrote articles for newspapers about Portugal’s economic and political problems. This would lead him to be Economics minister for the first time, and in an ephemeral capacity, in 1926 after the 28th of May revolution that same year. His post would be later developed on a firmer footing in 1928, during a period where the military dictatorship became more established. He would also develop further, as was asserted earlier, in the ideals of a Christian sociology, influenced by João Serras e Silva, a Professor in the Medicine Faculty, and by the “academic socialism” that he would gain from his readings of his professor

It is during his stay in Coimbra that a pró-monarchy movement forms, between 1913–1914. This movement was clearly influenced by the *Action Française*, which defended an integrational nationalism with corporativist and organic characteristics. Salazar would never adhere to this pro-monarchy movement, but it is undoubtable that he was influenced by its theses and by the Portuguese writers that were linked to this movement’s origins, also known as the “legitimists” of the XIX century. These “legitimists” defended a Traditional Monarchy over a Liberal Monarchy. It is here, therefore, that we see his antiparliamentary and anti-liberal stance taking shape.

Even though Salazar was linked to a *sindicância* [sindicacy] in 1919, at the point where Portugal saw a monarchical revolution (known as “Monarquia do Norte” [North’s monarchy]). His link was due to alleged “realist” militancy on his part. He would never, however, pronounce himself as being pro-monarchy. He would define himself along the lines of a dogmatic political theory which would lead him to a conception of Political Power whose origins were divine and which would be carried out respecting the rights and ethics of the “people” (and the Church), putting to one side the question of the regime. This is his thesis, which he presents in a Lisbon conference for the Centro Católico Português [Portuguese Catholic Centre] in April 1922. The Centro Católico Português was the Catholic party. At this point in time, he had become a member of parliament representing Guimarães for this party. This parliament would later be dissolved due to a bloody revolt which resulted in the assassination of António Granjo, the ministerial president. This event would consolidate further his anti-liberal and anti-parliamentary stance.

If Salazar had any political action during the First Republic, it was that of a Catholic militant. It is because of this that his statesman position is often confused. He participated in a secular state that was, however, supported by the Church and in

which one of its ideals was “God, Fatherland, and Family”. However, he was seen as the defender of a Catholic State, which he never was, nor did he wish to be. He stated this very clearly in an interview with António Ferro. In this interview, after commenting that he was one of the founder members of the Centro Católico Português [Portuguese Catholic Centre], he says:

“The Catholics were completely oblivious to my entering in the Government. They were also oblivious to all of my political actions. This confusion arises, possibly, from my affinities and my friendships with some prestigious Catholic figures...”

Salazar insinuated that there was a wrongful tendency to associate him with the “Catholics”. The affirmation of this association can be seen, in fact, from both the Left and the Right. For instance, we can see how Rolão Preto, nearer to Fascism and an emerging Nazism, compares him to chancellor Seipel, from Austria. This comparison is made not only because of his “religious” educational background, but also because of his political stance as a politician of the “centre” and not as a politician of the “Revolution”.

His ideas as a statesman, as he does not identify himself as a “grass roots” politician, should not really be confused with that of a Catholic militant. In effect, the formation of his State, which only in 1932 would this state be termed as “New State”, will appear slowly but surely. Although he begins his governmental career in the area of finances – and it will be in this area that he will be mythically considered its “saviour” – he will affirm his own political ideals little by little, at a time when the politicians of the First Republic would fall due to the Military Dictatorship that they helped to bring about. These political ideals he formulated form the basis of the creation of “New States”, originating from sectors such as; Catholic, pro-monarchical integralists, socialists that turned to the Right wing, Filofascists, modernists artists that looked to create a “new aesthetics”, a “new man” and a “new world”, nationalist republicans, and presidentialists that had carved a role for themselves in the Dictatorship and in the “New Republic” that was created by Sidónio Pais, who was murdered at the end of 1918. We also see military men and officials (lieutenants in particular) that participated in the First World War and that also felt, as was the case in Italy, the nationalist drama of a “mutilated victory”. They all wanted a “Chief” and the Chief, against the wishes of some that carried on with their search for “someone else”, finally emerged through the figure of a man who seemed conservative, namely Salazar.

*

Even if Salazar was intrinsically conservative, or a traditional Catholic, the truth is that he knew how to lead a movement that fitted within the Military, or “Nationa-

list”, Dictatorship. This will always be considered a frame *a quo* within the timeline of what is now termed as the “Revolução Nacional” [“National Revolution”] of the New State. This National Revolution overcame obstacles and created a structuralisation of a “new” political system, unlike what happened in Spain with Primo de Rivera’s dictatorship. Salazar is the leader of a political movement from 1928, and especially in 1929. He gave carefully worded speeches in a learned style, in open and closed doors, to the Military and Army, to the Administrative Councils and other autarquies, to the more influential politicians, and to the “people”. In these speeches he constructed his idea of what a State is, and he would throw forth *slogans* that will be seen as setting his position from then on: such as “Tudo pela Nação, nada contra a Nação” [“Everything for the Nation, nothing against the Nation”], “Política Nacional” [“National Politics”], “Revolução Nacional” [“National Revolution”], “batalha da Ordem” [“fight for Order”].

In this way, backed by elite, he shaped his “party”, the “União Nacional” [“National Union”] (which appeared on the 30th of July 1930). He created his para-constitutional documents (Manifesto da União Nacional [Manifest for the National Union]) and his pre-constitutional documents (Acto Colonial [Acto Colonial]), and, finally, a Constitution (in 1933). This constitution was corporatist in character, and he submitted it to a plebiscite. He gave his State a legal shape, where there is even an inclusion of the affirmation of all the fundamental civic rights, which is done in a very masterful way. These civil rights were withdrawn in its own laws. This negation took the shape of various decrees, some of which that would see the light on the very day in which the Constitutional text was ratified (on the 11th of April). Before all of this happens, he asserts in a famous speech, made on the 23rd of November of 1932, that all the political parties, were they “pro-monarchy”, “Catholic”, “former republican parties”, or worker and socialist organisations, should cease to exist and, instead, group within a sole civic association constituted by the União Nacional [National Union]. In the Constitution the separation of Church and State (article 46) is maintained, but the wording is done in a very conciliatory way. This led to the 1940 Concordat. In fact, despite Catholic protests, the mentioning of God will only appear in the New State’s constitution in the revision carried out in 1971, when Marcello Caetano was already president.

Salazar created his propaganda machine along these lines. He began by the *best-seller*, a kind of interview where the portrait of Salazar – as Austen Chamberlain sagely noted – is painted and retouched by him and António Ferro. António Ferro, as well as a journalist that interviewed dictators, was a modernist writer, an editor for the literary journal *Orpheu* – where Fernando Pessoa wrote –, a traveller, playwright and a cinema lover who visited Hollywood, the land of dreams and “make-believe”. Ferro would become, as we already commented, the director of the National Propaganda Secretariat.

Consequently, the New State will place itself in a “third way”, among and against democratic liberalism and communism, within the corporatist ideology. Marcello Caetano, a supporter of Salazar from the beginning and, later, his successor, commented that this ideology was rooted in a Portuguese corporatist tradition, a socio-Catholic theory framework that appeared at the end of the XIX century, and also as emerging from the experiences of Italian fascism and the teachings of Ma-noiesco. Although we define the New State as an authoritarian “third way”, it can also be considered as “totalitarian”. The theoretical differences between Salazar and Mussolini were not that substantial as, whereas Mussolini stated “Tutto nello Stato, niente contro lo Stato, nulla al di fuori dello Stato” [“Everything in the State, nothing against the State, everything negated to those outside the State”] Salazar stated “Tudo pela Nação, nada contra a Nação” [“Everything for the Nation, nothing against the Nation”] Within this authoritarian “third way” there was an inscription of all the characteristics found in a “fascist” type State. This is despite Salazar having always pronounced himself as being the maker of an “original” and “singular” State that was different to that of Italian fascism and other states of this kind. It is because of this that Salazar presented an idea in 1933 that would be repeated and accepted internationally, as we have seen earlier. In 1933 he comments:

“Undoubtedly we can find, in this world, political systems in which Portuguese nationalism has similarities and points of contact – however, these are restricted almost always to the corporatist idea. The differences are very marked in the process of making the State, and especially in its conception, and its organisation of the government’s political and civil support. One day, Portugal will be acknowledged for having been steered by a unique system, as unique as its history and geography, which differ from all others...”

*

In truth, however, we can find every type of fascist institution in the New State. Institutions such as the political and social organisation which Salazar crowns as “Chief”, and the one-party State. Even though Salazar (and not some salazarists like Marcello Caetano) did not consider the União Nacional [National Union], as a fascist institution, it can be seen as such. We also find military-type organisations, such as the Mocidade Portuguesa [Portuguese Youth] and the Legião Portuguesa [Portuguese Legion]; ideological and propagandist organisations of culture and pleasure such as the National Propaganda Secretariat and the Fundação Nacional para a Alegria no Trabalho [National Foundation for Happiness at Work] (equivalent to Italy’s *Dopo Lavoro*). Upon his closing of these institutions, which had an “organising” and reproductive character to them (in an organicist logic), one can also see the emergence of repressive institutions, such as the Censorship and the Polícia de Vigilância e de Defesa do Estado [Police force for the Safeguarding and Defence of the State], which

was created in 1933, and was upheld by a repressive ideology which was justified to the “people” through the 10th commandment of the *Decalogue for the New State* (1934), which read as follows:

“The enemies of the New State are enemies of the Nation – that is of everyone’s order, common interest and justice – should the case arise, we can, and will, use force towards enforcing the legitimate defence of the Fatherland.”

If one cannot talk about an expansionist Imperialism, one can definitely talk about an “Empire” discourse, which was not only located overseas and historically rooted, but which was also formulated along the lines of preserving and defending it. Because of this, and due to the traditional perpetual alliance with England, which was established around 1372 or 1373, Portugal was able to retain a “neutrality”. However, this was more of a “geometrical neutrality” in that it was equidistant in relation to the forces present, and which would transform itself into a “cooperative neutrality” in the 1940s, when it cooperated with the Allies, something that succeeded in deceiving a lot of people.

It is because of this that the New State was not considered a form of Fascism during and after its existence. Apart from philosophers such as Unamuno, who upon examining the New State, noticed straight away that there was no “grass roots” political parties, such as the Partido Nacional Fascista [Fascist National Party], which would constitute the first step in the combat towards a “new order”. Unamuno did not question that Salazar’s regime could be defined as “fascist” – “Academically Fascist”, in that he saw it as a regime in which incredible measures were taken from above, in an identical logic to that of “regime fascism” in Italy and to “academic socialism”, the latter different to “grass roots socialism”, which had more Marxist overtones. As we have seen, through this strategy, Unamuno foresaw a relationship of power of the new Portuguese State with the Military and the Church. Curiously, in 1976, Eduardo Lourenço also noted something similar in Salazar’s New State; our “fascism”, as Lourenço saw did, in fact, *exist*, although it was along different and more general lines, and more perfectly “organic” than Italian fascism, due to its link with the Church.

This fascism – “fascism without a fascist movement” as Manuel de Lucena also lucidly called it – can only be presented practically as “non-fascism”. This is due to Salazar, his “erudite” ideology, the representation that he and his supporters made of him and of his regime, and to its “rhetoric of invisibility”, an expression which the philosopher José Gil categorically used to describe his power discourse.

Резиме

Луис Реис Торгал

Салазар и португалска „Нова држава“ – представе и тумачења

Аутор настоји да на теоријски начин дефинише режим који је владао Поругалијом од 1932. до 1974. године. Да би то постигао, он се, с једне стране служи изворним текстовима и дефиницијама вође тог режима, самог Антонија Салазара, а с друге настоји да га уклопи у тумачења која о тој теми нуди теоријска литература. Посебну пажњу аутор чланка посвећује лидеру португалског режима, Антонију Салазару, као интелектуалцу сеоског порекла, настојећи да карактер режима повеже и са карактером особе кључне за његово формирање. Закључује да је такозвани Салазаризам био једна локална варијација генеричког појма „фашизам“, који се, осим на један део интелектуалних кругова, ослањао и на друге конзервативне слојеве друштва и државе, а пре свега на католичку цркву и официрски кор.