Introduction

The Student Effervescence

As other European countries, Portugal lived for a long time under right-wing authoritarianism. The military dictatorship established in 1926 was replaced, in 1933, with a regime called the New State (*Estado Novo*) – institutionalized by António de Oliveira Salazar and in force until 1974. During this period, the Portuguese authoritarian institutions faced strong waves of contention on various occasions and carried on by different opponents. Among these opponents, students had gained increasing importance since the mid-1950s and, as of the second half of the 1960s, started to represent one of the strongest threats to the regime. In fact, during the last years of the New State, education establishments were disturbed by growing agitation, and students were involved in different forms of conflictual activities: from those more connected to academic life – such as the occupation of university spaces – to more politicized and radical actions – such as support to deserters[1] and participation in actual terrorist activities. In other words, the future Portuguese political elites showed, during the last years of the New State, deep disaffection with respect to the regime in force.

Significantly, in defining this increasing unrest, the political police of the New State – the International and State Defence Police (Polícia Internacional de Defesa do Estado, PIDE), the future Directorate-General for Security (Direcção Geral de Segurança, DGS)[2] – began to use the emblematic expression of 'student effervescence'. To a certain extent, this institution, directed towards the control of social and political conflict in Portugal under the regime, suitably applied the concept of collective effervescence, penned by Durkheim almost a century previously. With this concept, the French sociologist indicated particular times during which new ideals and fresh visions of the world emerged from the collective which contributed to social change – 'magic' moments when individuals transcend themselves and prefigure a new collective order: 'In certain historical periods, social interactions become much more frequent and active. Individuals seek out one another and come together more. The result is the general effervescence

that is characteristic of revolutionary or creative epochs … People live differently and more intensely than in normal times' (Durkheim 1995: 212–13).

It is important to emphasize that these moments, in the majority of cases, infringe the rules in force and act in the domain of illegality and, very often, that of criminality. However, Durkheim himself stresses that crime can contribute to social development, delineating the social values of the future. Normally, the acquisition of new rights or the process of abolition of discriminatory rules follows this path of illegality to legality. This appears to be even truer if, as in the Portuguese case, crimes have been committed, especially political crimes, under authoritarian regimes. Hence, the social movements that emerge in moments of collective effervescence contribute not only to social change, but also to political and institutional change: social behaviour or political actions that are illegal thus impose their legitimacy and contribute to create new balances. From this perspective, it is interesting to note that PIDE/DGS identified the student effervescence as a particularly relevant risk to the fate of the New State. Indeed, Salazar's policy correctly recognized in this uprising the formation of new visions of the world and the potential to open new spaces of legitimacy, impose new behaviour, new forms of aggregation, which would have compromised the stability of the regime.

This awareness underpinned, especially as of the second half of the 1960s, the enormous effort of surveillance, constant and omnipresent, towering over all activities at education establishments or linked to students. Detailed reports drawn up by informers or agents (of the PIDE/DGS or other police units) arrived at the Lisbon PIDE/DGS on a daily basis in the case of Lisbon, or weekly in the case of Porto and Coimbra. By the 1970s, student activism had become one of the most menacing threats to the regime, as demonstrated by the fact that in 1973 students numbered over half of all political prisoners.[3] This means that, by the end of the regime, students represented the social category most affected by the repression, which is even more significant considering that in Portuguese society this involved a fairly small group of people.

On the other hand, from the perspective of agents used to dealing with much more structured forms of opposition, the student effervescence, as its actual definition underlines, appeared from the onset to evade overly rigid categories and interpretations. The PIDE/DGS reflected on these difficulties right to the end, attempting to lead back the different student uprisings to defined ideologies, training or organizations. In reality, as will be shown, ideologies, training and organizations were changing from one day to another, above all as of the late 1960s. It was not only the regime that

was inveighed with this wave of effervescence as the highest incarnation of authoritarianism, but also the historic organizations of the left.

In view of these considerations, the following pages seek to analyse the emergence, development and path of the Portuguese student contestation during the last two decades of the regime. Particular attention will be given to provide an in-depth examination of the role of student movements in the opening of democratic spaces under the New State, which presented a fundamental experience for the subsequent process of democratization. In this sense, the Portuguese student movement contributed to create an arena of participation and experimentation of social connections which, even more than the actual contents of the demands, were placed, in their horizontality, in clear contrast with the vertical dimension that the New State intended to imprint on civil society. At the same time, these forms of engagement and aggregation contributed to create some of the forms of participation that distinguished the revolutionary period that immediately followed the fall of the regime after the coup of 25 April 1974 – the so-called Processo Revolucionário em Curso (PREC, Revolutionary Process Underway).

The main part of this study covers the period between 1956 and 1974. The date of 1956 was chosen for two reasons. Firstly, this was the year that the Portuguese students' movement started to represent a specific and autonomous actor in the field of Portuguese contention against the New State. Moreover, 1956 was also an extremely important year at an international level, and especially in terms of social movements and conflictual politics. This will be explained in greater detail later, but for the moment I shall merely highlight two examples illustrative of the relevance of that year. On the one hand, 1956 was the year of the XX Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), with Khrushchev's so-called 'Secret Speech', which had profound and broad-reaching consequences not only in the Eastern Bloc, but also in the ideologies, actions and agenda of Marxists all over the world, including Portugal. On the other hand, the two-year period of 1955–1956 was seminal in the development of the civil rights movement – mainly due to the famous 'Montgomery bus boycott' – and, consequently, for the subsequent movements that emerged around it, such as the American students' movement. As far as the date of 1974 is concerned, this was the year that the Portuguese dictatorship came to an end, followed by the Greek one a few months later, and then the Spanish regime in 1975. Moreover, at an international level, the mid-1970s can be situated as the end of the period that Arthur Marwick defined as the 'Long Sixties' (Marwick 1998), characterized by a transnational cycle of protest and radical change in the field of politics, culture and ways of life.

Politics in Movement: Students against Authority

As underlined by Kostis Kornetis for the Greek case (Kornetis 2013: 4), even if Marwick referred to democratic countries, and mainly Italy, France, Britain and the United States, this periodization can also be applied in the case of authoritarian states. The expression 'Long Sixties' refers, above all, to the cultural dynamics of the major changes that occurred during this period. However, the boundary lines between the social, cultural and political are always very blurred, as is demonstrated by the fact that the political authorities, in particular in authoritarian contexts, were always concerned in regulating the social and cultural behaviour of citizens, for example through censorship.

Undoubtedly, students were among the main actors of the Long Sixties all over the world: in Western liberal democracies, in the left-wing regimes of the Eastern Bloc, under the right-wing dictatorships of Southern Europe and Latin America, as well as in Maoist China. The common element of these large-scale and transnational student uprisings is in all certainty their anti-authoritarian tendency, whether against social and cultural behavioural models or against political institutions generally considered authoritative and conservative, albeit to different extents in different countries.

However, in the context of this work, I shall take into account, above all, the specifically political elements of the large-scale student mobilizations that spread all over Europe and many other parts of the world during the Long Sixties. On the one hand, while it is true that the movements that developed in authoritarian contexts – Eastern Europe, dictatorships of Southern Europe – were essentially directed at political change, it is also the case that in the movements that emerged in democratic regimes, in Europe and in the United States, the specifically political demands played a very important role. The actual democratic regimes were, in many cases, perceived by the student movements as having authoritarian characteristics, a perception that could be enhanced considerably by the effectively rather undemocratic response to the conflicts and social protests. On the other hand, various Western democracies showed, albeit to different degrees, effectively authoritarian aspects not only in the management of public order but also in the concession of fundamental rights, in terms of equal opportunities and in the steadfast existence of discrimination, endorsed or not by law, in relation to certain groups of citizens, such as for example, women, or, in the United States, the Afro-American community.

In this perspective, there is a line of continuity between the movements of the Long Sixties – the civil rights movement, colonial independence movements, student movements, feminist movements, to name but a few –

which is similar to the fight against the authoritarian aspects of the most diverse regimes and, in the case of Western democracies, to the stimulus towards compliance with promises made at the time of the democratization processes. In some cases, this democratization process was very recent. The example of Italy is significant in this case: the democratic transition, at the time of the first student movements in 1960, was only fifteen years old and the memories of fascism were still very alive. The great expectations of the democratization appeared to have been betrayed by the permanence of authoritarian elements, not only in political attitudes, but even in the actual legislation, whether civil or criminal. In this regard, as sensed, as Sidney Tarrow (1989) and della Porta and Reiter (2003) emphasize, from different points of view, the large-scale movements, in particular coming from students and workers of the Italian Long Sixties, played the role of providing new impetus to boost a democratization process that appeared to have become dormant, in particular in the areas of family law, education, labour legislation and in the management of public order.

The 'Long Sixties' under Authoritarian Rules

The recent literature dealing with aspects of transnational youth and student movements rightly stresses the need to look at this as a phenomenon that crosses national boundaries, although the nature of the movements varies according to local conditions (Klimke and Scharloth 2008; Klimke, Pekelder and Scharloth 2011; Kouki and Romanos 2011). As highlighted by Klimke, Pekelder and Scharloth, 'viewing the respective protests not only as parallel but interconnected phenomena on the global playing field of the Cold War' (2011: 20) is indeed important. However, while recent publications on the transnational wave of protest in Europe have addressed the cases of Spain and Greece, they lack any reference to the Portuguese movements, before or after the fall of the New State. Actually, the analysis of the Portuguese case might contribute to improving our knowledge of the contentious politics under the dictatorships of Southern Europe and their role in the subsequent democratization processes.

In the context of the Long Sixties, the case of the Portuguese student movement is thus particularly relevant for several reasons. First of all, as for other countries in Southern Europe, Portugal lived under an authoritarian right-wing regime during this entire period. As stressed before, this did not impede the development of social movements or the process of strong politicization and even radicalization among students and youth in general, which was in part similar to that occurring during these years in other

countries living under different regimes. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the regime, besides limiting, to a great extent, the social and cultural changes that were taking place at an international level, in several ways conditioned the development of social protests, and, most importantly for this study, of student movements. On the other hand, with the fall of authoritarianism, the Portuguese – and likewise the Greek and Spanish – student movements and militants experienced a radical political, social and cultural opening. This opening had different and sometimes unpredictable consequences on student activism, the analysis of which – besides being important in itself – can also enlighten us on the processes of mobilization in authoritarian contexts.

The case of the student movement at the twilight of the Portuguese New State might thus allow us to better understand the possibilities of development, the perception of opportunities, and the claims and agenda of a social movement in the context of a right-wing dictatorship. The study might be also more fruitful if situated in the context of other analyses of student movements and the Long Sixties in authoritarian contexts, and mainly under the right-wing regimes of Southern Europe. Similar studies have started to see the light over recent years, such as the pioneering analysis by Kostis Kornetis (2013) on the Long Sixties in Greece, and the studies by Miguel Cardina and Giulia Strippoli on student contestation in Portugal, France and Italy (Cardina, 2008; Strippoli 2013). José Maria Maravall's monograph on student and worker opponents against Franco's regime, published back in 1978, while it did not situate the Spanish case in the larger context of the transnational mobilizations of the Long Sixties, also offers important reflections on this issue.

A common element that emerges in these studies is the predominance, in the student and youth movements of these countries, of political claims with respect to cultural and social demands. However, at least in Portugal, political claims only started to be at the centre of the student contestation as of the second half of the 1960s. Until then, even if political demands were certainly implied, the declared claims of the student activism were related to the students' condition and rights, and mainly to the defence of freedom of academic associations.

A further consideration must be made with regard to the repertoire of contention under an authoritarian regime (Davenport, Mueller and Johnston 2005; Tilly 2006). It is quite obvious that such a context radically moves the axis distinguishing legitimate and illegitimate actions. Most of the actions considered 'conventional' in a democratic context, being part of the normal process of political competition and participation, are usually considered illegal under authoritarian rules. All political activities developed

beyond the regime's structures (such as the single party, or youth or women's organizations) are thus considered illegitimate. Creating or being a member of a political group or party – other than the regime's party – writing or disseminating a political flyer or journal, attending a political meeting or assembly, and many other activities considered normal and legitimate in a democracy, are illegal and, therefore, transgressive actions in most autocracies. Such actions, as occurred several times in the case of Portugal, could ultimately lead to imprisonment for political crime.

This pressure caused by illegality pushes political action and militants towards a clandestine dimension, which has strong effects on the form of political engagement and on the militants' biographies and trajectories in authoritarian contexts. In this sense, contentious political activism under dictatorships has a radically different significance than it does in democratic settings. As underlined by José Maria Maravall, with respect to student and worker activism against the late Franco's dictatorship:

> Three conditions in the process of becoming a dissenter have to be considered: the availability of radical ideologies, the commitment to such ideologies, and the conversion of this ideological commitment into political action. These three sequential steps in the process of political radicalization are determined by the existing political conditions, which act as restrictions on radicalism. These restrictions may be normative and non-normative, preventive and repressive. From this perspective, becoming a political dissident within a non-democratic context can be interpreted as a process similar to that of becoming deviant. (Maravall 1978: 118–19)

This also means that the costs of becoming a militant in an authoritarian context are far higher than in a democratic context. Among these costs, repression is a particular high one. The most evident form of repression is the 'direct' one, which is expressed in the control of public order, in violence against demonstrators, in the imprisonment of dissenters, in the absence of guaranties for the arrested, in the use of torture, and in the various kinds of security measures and forms of punishment for political crime. But there are also more 'indirect' forms of repression, such as making life difficult by impeding militants finding a job, carrying on their studies, developing social relations – and thus, because of their clandestinity, even starting a family. In any case, these high costs associated with becoming a dissenter also make it more difficult to step away from this condition and tend to increase the intensity of relations among militants. In this context, frequently the only possible exit – if one excludes the rare cases of dissenters who, more or less

voluntarily, become collaborators of the regime, or exile – is their transfer from one group to another. In this sense, an authoritarian regime, such as the Portuguese one, might provoke a paradoxical 'absolutization' of political militancy. Thus, while the political demobilization of opponents is the main objective of such regimes, frequently they actually create a set of conditions that make the disengagement of the militants particularly difficult.

This mechanism can be observed from different points of view. Firstly, with respect to psychological costs, the high psychic costs borne for taking the identity of a dissenter in turn cause high costs to quit this same identity. From a material point of view, as seen above, the regime blocked almost all possible exits from political militancy – jobs, studies, relationships – which made their disengagement very complicated due to the difficulty for the militant to 'find a place' in society after leaving political activism.[4]

Returning to the case of the New State, it appears clear that, because political persecution meant imprisonment, exile, expulsion from university, a life in hiding and professional obstacles, for many anti-regime students – and militants in general – political engagement had entailed a radical discontinuity in life trajectories and, on the other hand, an intensification of the militancy's network (Accornero 2013a, 2013b and 2013c). When we look at these dynamics, we understand why, after the fall of the regime on 25 April 1974, most militants left political activity, or they decreased their engagement. The end of the dictatorship, besides introducing political freedoms, social and civil rights and a cultural renovation, also allowed political militants the possibility to restart the activities that they had been forced to abandon: the regime change opened up new educational, relational and professional avenues. This fact stresses, in contrast, the weight that the regime had on the opponents' trajectories of life.

Having said this, it is nevertheless necessary to consider that students represent a special category of militants, and this is especially true under an elitist and corporative regime such as the New State and in a hierarchical and vertical society such as Portugal's during the Long Sixties. In fact, the Portuguese academic milieu was, at least until the late 1960s, very restricted, and university students came from the most privileged sectors of society. Both due to their social origins and the special role that university played in the framework of the New State, students benefited from a series of advantageous conditions. Some of their rights, mainly in terms of freedom of association and participation, were unknown to most other citizens, and especially the other main actors of social conflict: the workers. As these rights had corporative legitimation, it allowed students to experience a space of participation unique in the context of the New State, as will be described in the following chapter.

Finally, another element that distinguishes and makes the case of authoritarian Portugal particularly significant for the analysis of student movements during the Long Sixties is the weight that the Colonial War had on the lives of people, especially youths and students. The Colonial War only entered the students' agenda as of the late 1960s, and mainly after a watershed demonstration in Lisbon in February 1968 against the Vietnam War, symbolically associated with the Portuguese war in Africa. Thereafter, the opposition to the war, combined with the claims against the dictatorship and the increasing demands for socialist solutions, strongly characterised the agenda, repertoire and aims of the Portuguese student movement under the late New State.

Indeed, in the final years of the regime, the more radical groups – mainly influenced by Maoism – were strongly critical not only of the dictatorship, but also, like their counterparts in other European countries, of the Western democratic model, which was criticized for being capitalist as well as authoritarian. The two processes of politicization before (started in the mid-1960s) and radicalization after (mainly as of the early 1970s) made the Portuguese student movement increasingly more similar, in terms of repertoire, agenda and claims, to the student movements in course throughout democratic Europe.

Portugal in Transitology

As is known, the Portuguese dictatorship ended with the famous Carnation Revolution. Not only was this a local event, but its resonance greatly transcended national boundaries. On the one hand, at a European level, the revolution was immediately regarded with enormous interest and hope by various Marxist groups, old and new, that had multiplied during the so-called Long Sixties. On the other hand, this event also represented a turning point in the field of political analysis on processes of change of regime.

Indeed, the coup d'état of 25 April 1974, put in motion by the Movimento das Forças Armadas (Armed Forces Movement, MFA) and through which Portugal was liberated in less than twenty hours from an authoritarian regime that had been in place for over forty years, inaugurated at an international level what would be defined as the 'third wave' of the democratization process (Huntington 1991). And it was precisely from this third wave – which apart from Portugal included Spain and Greece – that this area of political science, later to be called 'transitology', was conceived. In the words of one of its founders, Philippe Schimtter, 'The pretence of this neo- and, perhaps, pseudo-science is that it can explain and, hopefully, guide the way from one

regime to another or, more specifically in the present context, from some form of autocracy to some form of democracy' (Schmitter 2014: 2).

Philippe Schmitter threw himself into studying the Portuguese case exclusively, based on which a large part of his theory of democratization would be developed. The monograph that he published, *Portugal do Autoritarismo à Democracia* (1999), was probably the first case study in the area of transitology entirely dedicated to Portugal, and represented a milestone not only for future studies on 25 April 1974, but also, at an international level, for the analysis of other cases.

The paradigm of 'transitology' was enormously successful during the 1990s, especially through the work published by Huntington and the famous work by Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan (1996). In their book, the authors produce a comparison of fifteen cases of democratic transitions in Europe and South America. The Portuguese case continues to be considered as 'unusual' with respect to all the other cases analysed, above all because of the cause of the 'crisis of the State' that followed the coup.[5]

Therefore, the first analyses of the Portuguese transition came to light in international studies of a comparative nature. These studies highlighted the unique aspects of the Portuguese transition when compared both to the Spanish and Greek transitions, and to the cases of Eastern Europe and South America. In fact, in the first place, the Portuguese process of democratization appeared to be characterized by elements of rupture that were much more profound than those that followed a few months later in Greece and Spain. This rupture was characterized by the actual way that the regime fell, through a peaceful military coup, and was extended by the major social mobilization that was triggered right after the coup, during the two years of the PREC (1974–1975). According to Thomas Bruneau, this Portuguese phenomenon was an 'unexpected transition' (Bruneau 1989). The developments of the military coup were considered unpredictable, above all because the embryonic beginning of a revolutionary transition process appeared to contradict the canons considered habitual in the case of military intervention in political life (Rezola 2010).

On the other hand, PREC was considered by various social scientists as a moment of exceptional social mobilization at a European level. Indeed, both the contemporary reports and the subsequent academic analyses, in most cases, also considered these mobilizations as rather unexpected. According to Manuel Braga da Cruz, this was an unprecedented mobilization with neither a past nor future in the history of the political attitudes of the Portuguese. In his opinion, the high levels of political participation by the Portuguese population during the revolution were a consequence of political and social decompression, the effect of which was a release of the

accumulated tensions in society. However, he states that the subsequent demobilization showed that the deep-seated political culture of the Portuguese had remained unchanged (Braga da Cruz 1995). Likewise, Philippe Schmitter suggests that this phenomenon should be viewed as an 'awakening' of civil society, due to the institutional void produced by the coup d'état. This vision is shared by Howard Wiarda, who considers the political culture of the Portuguese as traditionally non-participative, with the exception of the transition period, when 'the "other Portugal" exploded in revolution' (Wiarda 2006: 123).

Thus, some of the most important studies on the Portuguese democratization process have portrayed elements of discontinuity among political participation and social mobilization during the transition, and among the levels of activism of the Portuguese before and after this moment. The social scientists who had addressed this issue were forced to face the challenge of explaining why there was this explosion of political and social participation, in its most diverse forms, during the PREC. In turn, my study seeks to demonstrate that the intense wave of mobilizations which characterized the Carnation Revolution did in fact have a past, and attempts to reconstruct, through particular focus on the student contestation, the processes that led to the 'unexpected' radicalization of the PREC. The analysis of social movements, more than a focus on institutional politics and processes led by political elites, can help, in my opinion, to throw light on this continuity. In this sense, I think that it is important to continue to look at the Portuguese case by analysing the long-term processes that led up to the great mobilization of the PREC, following the path opened by works such as *The Revolution within the Revolution* (Bermeo 1986) and *Building Popular Power* (Hammond 1988). Even if studies like these do not fit within that great area defined as 'sociology of social movements' – which is the main inspiration for my analysis approach, as I will explain below – they have been fundamental for understanding the bottom-up processes characterizing the Portuguese regime change, allowing an examination beyond the dominant elite-oriented approach.

Conducting Politics by Other Means

The historical reconstruction of the dynamics briefly described above will mainly be based on research developed in various Portuguese archives, especially the archives of the PIDE/DGS and of the Ministério do Interior (Home Office, MI), and on press sources, primarily the newspaper *Diário de Notícias* and student press and propaganda.[6] This empirical material has

been analysed not only for the purpose of recreating the course of events, but also in order to understand the specificities of the profound dynamics that characterized the Portuguese student movement as a case of social movement developed under particular conditions – a right-wing regime and in a context of war – and during a special period – the Long Sixties. For such, the study has been developed with the support of different theoretical, methodological and analytical instruments.

While studies developed in the context of the so-called 'transitology' referred to above have been central in various analyses of the Portuguese change of regime, my main theoretical references come from the sociology of social movements. In fact, as stressed by Donatella della Porta, social movements 'during the different steps of the democratization process have rarely been addressed in a systematic and comparative way', and they 'have been far from prominent in the literature on democratization, which has mainly focused on either socioeconomic pre-conditions or elite behaviour'. Della Porta also stresses that, 'on the other hand, social movement scholars, until recently, have paid little attention to democratization processes, mostly concentrating their interest on democratic countries' (della Porta 2016: 53).

Following the implicit recommendation in these critiques, I thus attempted to apply the instruments developed by social movements studies in the analysis of the student mobilizations during the late Portuguese authoritarianism and the way in which they contributed to the transformation of a coup d'état into a revolution. As is well known, social movements studies address the forms of mobilization and militancy that are developed outside the official channels, and take on the characteristics of more or less open contestation to the institutional politics; the studies are on the borderline of different social sciences, such as political sociology, historical sociology and history. These less-conventional forms of conducting politics have been summarized under the name of 'contentious politics', which will frequently recur in this study.[7]

One of the key concepts that has been created in this context is that of Political Opportunity Structure (POS).[8] According to Sidney Tarrow's definition, political opportunities are 'consistent – but not necessarily formal, permanent or national – dimensions of the political environment which either encourage or discourage people from using collective action' (Tarrow 1998: 32). Some authors have also stressed the relevance of individual perception and networks' mediation in the interpretation of POS 'signals', while others have underlined the reciprocal interrelation between social movements and institutions, more than the unilateral influence of institutions on social movements.[9] These reinterpretations were strongly influential in the development of my study.

The first author to use the theoretical tools surrounding the concept of Political Opportunity to study the processes and possibilities of mobilization in Portugal was Rafael Duran Muñoz in his research on collective actions during the Spanish and Portuguese democratic transitions (Duran Muñoz 1997a, 1997b and 2000). Under these terms, Diego Palacios Cerezales (2003) conducted his study on the PREC which characterized the period after the fall of the New State. This author considers the great mobilizations characterizing this time to be a consequence of the opening of the POS following the coup d'état, which led to an actual crisis of the State.

Sidney Tarrow (1989) integrated the POS approach in a broader theoretical framework on the occasion of his study on the mobilizations in Italy between 1965 and 1975.[10] There he introduced also the concept of 'protest cycle', defined as 'a phase of heightened conflict and contention across the social system' involving, among others features, 'a rapid diffusion of collective action from more mobilized to less mobilized sector' (Tarrow 1998: 42). This last analytical instrument has been extremely helpful for interpreting the different phases of the Portuguese student movements and its progressive politicization and radicalization, two processes closely tied to two successive protest cycles that shook the country between 1956 and 1965, and between 1968 and 1975.

This study is thus structured to follow the evolution of these two protest cycles, and their relations with the changes that occurred in the New State itself. The first chapter highlights the relevance of the international events of 1956, with the Khrushchev report and Civil Rights Movements, in the scale of the contentious politics of the following years. Particular attention is also paid to the Sino-Soviet conflict, the China of Mao and the Cultural Revolution, which most catalysed the interest of the youngest militants – and also those living under right-wing regimes, such as the Portuguese – searching for new interpretations of Marxism and new forms to accomplish it. The field will be then restricted to focus on Portugal, to portray the existing student resources of mobilization in the context of the New State.

The second chapter focuses on the intense conflict that perturbed Portugal between 1958 and 1962, which had all the aspects of a cycle of protest. It would only draw to an end with the great wave of repression of 1964–1965, followed by a process of demobilization, pluralization of political forces, and radicalization. During this time, and until the end of the regime, students emerged as one of the main actors of the contentious politics in Portugal.

The third chapter starts with a description of the students' involvement in the relief provided to the population affected by the floods of 1967. This is a fine example of the fine tuning of mobilization resources and networks, and is considered as the starting point of a new protest cycle, whose path,

however, would not be as linear as the first one, and in which the agitation at the University of Coimbra was to be particularly important. The fourth chapter deals with Marcelism, the last period of the New State characterized by the adoption of some measures of liberalization by the new Prime Minister, Marcelo Caetano, who replaced Salazar in 1968. It analyses the situation of the Portuguese academic milieu and especially that of Lisbon in the final years of the regime as one of permanent conflict, characterized by radical political atomization and polarization, the use of more transgressive and in some cases violent repertoires since 1968, and increasing distancing between the new and the old left wing. During this phase, the student movement increasingly resembles – in its ideologies, claims, repertoire and culture – the student and youth movements that were contemporaneously exploding in Europe.

The fifth and final chapter describes, on the one hand, the pluralization of the political forces on the eve of the revolution, and the increasing importance of the resistance to the Colonial War as a factor of mobilization and also as the main common denominator among the different opposition groups. The radicalization of the student movement and its shift to the new left, especially Marxist–Leninist, is thus followed until it merges in the protest cycle up to 1975.

Finally, one of the main aims of this volume is to stress the existing continuities among the mobilizations in course under the regime and against it, and in particular those led by students, and the social movements that characterized the PREC. As stressed above, a variety of social scientists such as Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Fernando Rosas and Pedro Ramos Pinto agree that the PREC was one of the periods of most intense mobilization in post-war Europe.[11] Various authors have analysed it in depth (Duran Muñoz 1997a, 1997b and 2000; Palacios Cerezales 2003; Ramos Pinto 2013), making a fundamental contribution to the study of the transitional period and mainly the PREC, from the point of view of social movements and contentious politics. On the other hand, except in the case of Ramos Pinto's work, also in these studies, contingent elements – such as the opening of the POS following the coup d'état – have generally been considered the key factors provoking this great wave of protest and participation.

The following pages will try to demonstrate that the explosion of social mobilizations characterizing the PREC had a recent past in the social movements – and in this case, mainly the student movement – developed in the fight against the New State. These mobilizations were themselves a strong factor contributing to the political opening. The 'revolution', before becoming a reality in Portugal during the two years of 1974–1975, had been a clear project strongly diffused among students and youth in general, and a

powerful factor of mobilization against the dictatorship. With its innumerable undertones, from the more moderate to the more radical, this book would like to be the history of this project and of the fight carried on by Portuguese students to accomplish it.

Notes

1. As explained in the following chapters, Portugal was involved, from 1961 until the fall of the dictatorship in 1974, in a long and costly Colonial War against the independence movements in Angola, Guinea and Cape Verde. Opposition against the Colonial War was one of the main issues of student protests from the late 1960s until 1974.
2. Although the PIDE would only be transformed into the DGS at the end of 1968 (see Chapter 3 in this regard), the term PIDE/DGS will be used throughout herein, in order to standardize the text and facilitate its reading.
3. There were 187 student prisons recorded in 1973, with various students having been arrested more than once. In the same year, there were 289 prisons for other actors (source: Instituto dos Arquivos Nacionais Torre do Tombo – IAN/TT, Political Prisoners File of the PIDE/DGS).
4. These dynamics are well described by Olivier Fillieule, who stresses that 'the psychic or material cost of defection, and therefore its probability, is due to a number of factors amongst which we will mention the extent of the sacrifices accepted to enter the group (initiation rites, trials, hierarchization and isolation of collectives); weaker or stronger group socialization … and finally the rules in place at the time of the defection, sometimes rendered impossible by material dependence or the threat of being pursued as a traitor' (Fillieule 2010: 2).
5. However, according to Philippe Schmitter, the thirteen pages of Linz and Stepan's book dedicated to the Portuguese case 'ignore almost completely the issue of the dissolution of Portugal's overseas empire … What was more significant in the long run – and absolutely crucial for the eventual consolidation of democracy – was a dramatic and long overdue change in national identity, from an Atlanticist conception based on empire to one rooted in membership in the European Community' (Schmitter 1997: 168–74).
6. For a more exhaustive account of the sources used for this work, see the section 'Sources'.
7. One of the main authors to consider that contentious politics was not abnormal, but a source of social and political action of the same stature as other forms, was Charles Tilly, in particular in his pioneer essay *From Mobilization to Revolution* (1978), then subsequently in works that became classics such as *The Contentious French* (1986) and *European Revolutions, 1492–1992* (1993), and up to the most recent essay, co-authored with Sidney Tarrow, actually entitled *Contentious Politics* (2006). It is clear that in an authoritarian context, where the prospects of conducting politics through formal channels are very limited, any kind of opposition, whether partisan or not, finds its only possibility of expression in contentious politics.

8. Eisinger was the first author to use this expression in 1973 in order to explain the differences in the success of protests in different American cities, concluding that it depended, above all, on the degree of openness or rigidity of the local political systems (Eisinger 1973).
9. Doug McAdam, for instance, considers the emergence of social movements as 'a combination of expanding political opportunities and indigenous organization, as mediated through a crucial process of collective attribution' (McAdam 1999: 2). In turn, in his critique to the concept of political opportunities, Olivier Fillieule has shown that they are 'not structurally insensitive stocks that exist prior to action; rather, they are continuously updated through the relationship with the movements' (Fillieule 1997: 97).
10. It was in this study that the author delineated the concept of protest cycle, specifically identifying four relevant characteristics for the emergence of movements: (1) the level of openness/rigidity of formal channels of access to political power, (2) the stability/instability of political alignments, (3) the presence and strategic guidance of potential allies, and (4) the degree of division of the political elites (cf. Tarrow 1998: 42).
11. Boaventura de Sousa Santos defines it as 'the broadest, deepest people's social movement in post-war European history' (de Sousa Santos 1990: 27); Fernando Rosas as the 'last left-wing revolution in twentieth-century Europe' (Rosas 2004: 15); and Pedro Ramos Pinto as 'some of the widest popular mobilizations of post-war Europe' (Ramos Pinto 2007: iii).