



Instituto Politécnico de Tomar

Escola Superior de Gestão de Tomar

João Paulo Mateus Pedro

**ON THE TOURISTIFICATION OF 20TH
CENTURY AUTHORITARIANISM:
MUSEOLOGICAL DISCOURSE AND THE
QUESTION OF MEMORY**

Dissertação de Mestrado

Orientado por:

Professora Doutora Hermínia Hermínia Maria Pimenta Ferreira Sol | Instituto
Politécnico de Tomar

Professor Doutor Tibor Kovács | Eszterházy Károly Egyetem

Dissertação apresentada ao Instituto Politécnico de Tomar
para cumprimento dos requisitos necessários à obtenção
do grau de Mestre em Desenvolvimento de Produtos de Turismo Cultural

Mãe, Pai, pelo vosso sacrifício



Figure 1 - Graffiti on Mikszáth Kálmán street, Szeged
March 2019

Abstract

Tourism has become one of the key mechanisms through which meanings and attitudes about the past are constructed and reproduced. Museums, in particular, have become important tools in the shaping of collective memory and historical narratives within the cultural production/consumption practices in contemporary society. On the one hand, museums can be, and often are, public education institutions that help make sense of the world. On the other hand, by necessity of their discursive practices and display choices, museum exhibitions, as well as all other tourism products, are always ideologically charged. What happens, then, when the exhibited past holds dissonant qualities or relates to traumatic events? This dissertation aims to analyse the ideological and discursive apparatuses present in two memorial museums which exhibit such past: The Aljube Museum of Resistance and Freedom in Lisbon and the House of Terror in Budapest. By applying multimodal critical discourse analysis to the permanent exhibitions and adopting a textual approach, this dissertation aims to identify specific discursive practices, such as agent roles, omissions and avoidances, among others, as well as the display strategies that create and/or reproduce them. With this analysis, the dissertation aims to contribute to the broader discussion on how tourism products engage with established social remembrance practices and memory discourses, particularly in Portuguese and Hungarian societies.

Keywords: Memorial Museum; Communism; Salazarism; Social Memory

Resumo

O Turismo tornou-se um dos mais importantes mecanismos de construção e reprodução e significados e atitudes sobre o passado. Os museus, em particular, tornaram-se ferramentas importantes na formatação da memória coletiva e de narrativas históricas dentro das práticas de produção/consumo culturais na sociedade contemporânea. Por um lado, os museus podem ser, e frequentemente são, instituições de educação pública que ajudam a fazer sentido do mundo. Por outro lado, por necessidade ligadas às suas práticas discursivas e escolhas expositivas, as exposições museológicas, bem como todos os outros produtos turísticos, têm sempre predisposições ideológicas. O que acontece, então, quando o passado em exposição carrega características dissonantes ou está relacionado com eventos traumáticos? Esta dissertação pretende analisar os aparatos ideológicos e discursivos presentes em dois museus memoriais que tratam esse tipo de passado: o Museu do Aljube – Resistência e Liberdade, em Lisboa, e a Casa do Terror em Budapeste. Aplicando a Análise Multimodal Crítica do Discurso às exposições permanentes e adotando uma abordagem textual, a dissertação pretende identificar práticas discursivas específicas, como papéis de agentes, omissões e evasões, entre outros, bem como as estratégias expositivas que os criam e/ou reproduzem. Com esta análise, a dissertação propõe-se contribuir para a discussão mais alargada sobre como os produtos turísticos se relacionam com as práticas estabelecidas de memória social, particularmente nas sociedades Portuguesa e Húngara

Palavras-chave: Museu Memorial; Comunismo; Salazarismo; Memória Social

Előszó

A turizmus napjainkra egy kulcs fontosságú elemmé vált, amelyen keresztül múlthoz való viszonyunkat formáljuk és alakítjuk. A modern fogyasztói társadalom kulturális szokásainak középpontjában különösképpen a múzeumok állnak, amelyek a kollektív emlékek és történelmi narratívák formálását segítik. Egyrészt, a múzeumok gyakran közoktatási intézményekként funkcionálnak, segítve az egységes világkép kialakításában. Másrészt, a szükségszerűen elbeszélő szokásaik és demonstráló módszereik miatt a múzeum kiállítások, mint bármely turisztikai termékek, nem ideológia mentesek. Ezeket szem előtt tartva tevődik fel a kérdés, hogy mi történik akkor, ha a múltat reprezentáló kiállítások disszonáns tulajdonságokkal rendelkeznek vagy egy traumatikus eseményhez kötődnek? Ezen disszertáció célja a fent említett kérdés elemzése két olyan emlékmúzeumban, amely ezen ideológiákkal és elbeszélő rendszerekkel rendelkezik: az Aljube Múzeum Lisszabonban és a Terror háza Budapesten. Továbbá, a disszertáció másodlagos célja specifikus nyelvi elemek azonosítása (alanyi szerepek, mulasztások és elkerülések), és ezen elemek megvalósítása a reprezentatív stratégiákban, melyet kombinált kritikus szöveg analízis használatával ér el az állandó kiállításokra fókuszálva. Ezen felül, a disszertáció harmadlagos célja, hogy hozzá járuljon azon téma szélesítéséhez, amely azzal foglalkozik, hogy a turisztikai termékek hogyan kapcsolódnak a megalapozott kollektív emlékezésekhez, főleg a magyar és portugál társadalomban.

kulcsszavak: Emlékmúzeum; Kommunizmus; Salazarizmus; Kollektív emlékezet

Acknowledgments

Those who know me know that I tend to resist the narrative of the “self-made man”. Are we not just as much, if not more, a product of our circumstances (the people we look up to or that depend on us and the opportunities we are given) as of our individual everyday strives to be better? This dissertation is an example of just that. This is a genuine thank you, to all those to whom I owe so much:

To Professor Herminia Sol, my advisor from Portugal, I owe for her belief in this research since day one, humorous encouragement and, above all, her patience as I baby-stepped through my first true academic endeavour.

To Professor Tibor Kovács, my advisor from Hungary, I equally owe for his patience, his immediate openness to this research, despite his more than busy schedule, and his vital role in my deepening enchantment with his home country.

And to both I owe for giving me the creative freedom to play around and learn. Thank you for the enriching eye-opening conversations. I hope this work makes you proud.

To Professor Luís Mota Figueira, I owe for his contagious and unyielding enthusiasm and, since early on in my academic life, his pivotal role in the path that lead to these pages.

To Rita Cruz, Encsi Kovács and Simona Petrova, I owe for the many coffees filled with debate and conversation that led to so many of the insights in this work. Above all, I owe for the encouragement and for the lasting and enriching friendship.

To my Erasmus friends I owe for the constant encouragement, for the patience to hear, time and time again, either some random idea or how much work I still had to do, and for the friendship that made Eger and Hungary an even more special place.

To Patricia Rodrigues, Manuela Silva and Gonçalo Filipe I owe for making me want to be better. Above all, I owe for their ability to turn work into fun. More research-road-trips are due.

To my many friends in JMV, particularly António Clemente, Andreia Albino and Catarina Alves, I owe for, over the years, setting the example and being role models that led me to choose a path beyond what life had chosen for me.

To my Mother and Father, I owe for their beyond-human sacrifices and for their unconditional investment in my interests since childhood. Despite the less than favourable circumstances, there was never a shortage of science books and art staples suited to my young heart's desires, even if that meant, as I now understand, giving up what was sometimes needed. To you I owe everything.

And finally, I owe it all to Him, for the blessing of being shaped by all these amazing people and the opportunity to live not just for myself.

To all of you, my deepest Thank you!

Index

Abstract	vii
Resumo.....	viii
Előszó.....	ix
Acknowledgments.....	x
Chapter I - Introduction	1
Chapter II – Literature Review	15
Temple of the Muses.....	15
Temple of the Masses.....	20
Talking the past into existence	26
A dark past	37
Chapter III – Aljube Museum of Resistance and Freedom	42
Silence and the Atmosphere of Fear	49
‘Gentle customs’ and Antifascism	56
On the Colonial War	61
The Carnation revolution and the minimal consensus	66
Chapter IV – House of Terror	69
Double Occupation.....	78
Hungary caught among superpowers	84
The Trianon Question	90
The traditional nation (Conservative Project)	96
Chapter V - Conclusion	104
Bibliography	110

Table Index

Table 1 - Sections of the permanent exhibition in the Aljube Museum, Adapted from the Aljube Museum Website (n.d.)..... 49

Table 2 - Rooms of the permanent exhibition in the House of Terror, Adapted from the Handout sheets and the House of Terror Website (n.d.)..... 77

Chapter I - Introduction

It would not be the first time that questions arose as to why some MA students prefer to opt for a more theoretical dissertation and not an actual project, especially in a master's program of Development of Cultural Tourism Products. The field certainly does not lack potential. Beyond pure academic interest, it is possible to say that the best argument in favour of this choice was laid out by John Tribe, in his 2009 book *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*. Faced with the same question, Tribe argued that "at its very simplest, philosophising is the ability to extract ourselves from the busy, engaged world of making and doing things, to disengage and to pause for reflection and thought especially about meaning and purpose" (2009, p. 5). While tourism continues to rise as one of the leading global industries and a growing body of academic work grows to match it, it is important that some of that academic work be dedicated to reflecting on what directions are being taken. As Adrien Franklin and Mike Crang noted, tourism is, indeed, one of the ways through which people understand the world (2001, p. 8). To this they added that "tourism is not just an aggregate of commercial activities, it is also an ideological framing of history, nature and tradition; a framing that has the power to reshape culture and nature to its own needs" (2001, p. 17). The same is to say that the production and consumption of tourism products is one of the influencing factors of how people perceive others, themselves and the world in contemporary society. With this in mind, it seems relevant that someone's research be dedicated to this aspect of tourism production, especially considering the need to contradict the tendency for "more practically oriented literature" to study tourism "as though it is an ideologically neutral act" (Mason, 2006, p. 20).

As such, this research aims to analyse the discursive practices of two tourism products, the Aljube Museum of Resistance and Freedom, in Lisbon, and the House of Terror, in Budapest. The focus is on the discourses adopted to invoke a version of the authoritarian past which has been created and reproduced in the permanent exhibitions in each museum. Therefore, this research is predicated on three base assumptions:

- 1) Tourism, as a social phenomenon, is, as Keith Hollingshead put it, a "worldmaking medium" (2004, p. 30). That is, tourism, as a practice of production and consumption of experiential products, is one of the tools through which identities

and overall meaning about the world are created, mediated and reshaped in contemporary capitalist societies. In other words, tourism is a “system of signification” (Jaworski & Pritchard, 2005, p. 2);

2) This system of signification is predicated on discursive practices. According to David Machin and Andrea Mayr, “discourse is language in real context of use” (2012, p. 20). In other words, discourse can be regarded as the set of socially constructed meanings, created through semiotic choices in the act of communication, which presents a “conceptually mediated” (Foucault, 2016, p. 88) version of social life. Discourse creates, reinforces and naturalizes social structures, power relations, ideologies and overall understandings about the world (Machin & Mayr, 2012, p. 21). Moreover, museums, like all tourism products, are neither created nor consumed in isolation, but are part of larger inter-subjective systems of discursive practices in their respective societies. As such, because they are necessarily referential, not only do they draw from the pool of symbols, values and ideas in their societies, but are also active agents in the (re)production of the social and ideological apparatuses (Coffee, 2006, p. 436).

3) Although social life is conceptually mediated through discourse, it still is essentially material and has material consequences. As Norman Fairclough puts it “although aspects of the social are ultimately socially constructed, once constructed they are realities” (2003, p. 8). Meaning that, although social relations and cultural practices are predicated on discourse, they have concrete material consequences, as they shape the actions of the social agents, from the political sphere to the apparently mundane interactions. An example of this can be the inclusion or exclusion of specific groups from foundational narratives in museums, as this can lead to varying levels of public perception of the issues that affect these groups, which ultimately will lead to more or less political incentives for them to be addressed (Sandell, 2003, p. 45).

Moreover, if museums are particularly influential within their societies, since their narratives are “generally viewed as definitive and authoritative” (Coffee, 2006, p. 435), then it stands to reason that they should be subjected to critique and inquiry. Two recent examples of controversies surrounding museological projects in Hungary and Portugal can illustrate

the importance of these inquiries and introduce the issue that runs through this research. First, the controversy surrounding the project for the House of Fates Museum. The project was intended to be a memorial museum to the children victims of the Holocaust in Hungary, to be set up in the abandoned facilities of the Józsefváros Railway Station in Budapest, which would be renovated for the purpose (Benárd, 2016, p. 50). The project started as a temporary exhibition in the House of Terror in 2004, which was then transferred to the southern Hungarian town of Hódmezővásárhely after the renovation of the historical synagogue (Benárd, 2016, p. 50). Controversy surrounding the project resulted from allegations that it would be a new attempt by the Hungarian government, particularly Viktor Orbán's administration, to whitewash the history of the holocaust in Hungary and shape the public perception over Hungarian responsibility. The head of the Project was the historian Mária Schmidt, the director-general of the House of Terror and responsible for other similar museological projects on the authoritarian regimes in Hungary, namely the Emlékpont Museum, also in Hódmezővásárhely. On an opinion piece for the *Mandiner Hungarian Globe* in 2014, she described a conversation about the project with another historian, in which the latter summarized the following way: "If I get it right, this is a love story. A story of love between Hungarian Jews and non-Jews. A love that has survived everything. As a result of which there is still a large Hungarian Jewish community living in this country" (2014, p. 1). The project has been continuously postponed, with the latest projections placing its opening date during the commemorations of the 75th anniversary of the Holocaust (Schmidt, 2018).

Likewise, the summer of 2019 saw the re-emergence of the debate over the controversial project for a museum in Santa Comba Dão, Portugal, the birthplace of the *Estado Novo*¹ dictator António de Oliveira Salazar. The possibility of a local museum in memory of that time period had already been projected multiple times since the 1990s by many municipal administrations, often arguing for its beneficial role as the bringer of tourism revenue to the rural municipality (Raimundo, 2018, p. 10). Several projects for a "Salazar Museum-House", a "Salazar Museum", a "Estado Novo Museum" and a "Estado Novo research centre museum and theme park" were continuously proposed and rejected (Raimundo, 2018, p. 10). Public online petitions arose against the project multiple times, the

¹ Estado Novo [New State] was the name given of the right-wing authoritarian regime that ruled Portugal from 1933 to 1974 (with precedents in the revolution of 1926)

most notorious being in 2016 and then in the summer of 2019, with the latter gathering more than 17 000 signatures and being met with a counter petition in favour of its creation, with more than 11 000 signatures (Sopage, 2019, p. 1-2). Much of the controversy stemmed from a fear of a nostalgia induced museum that would whitewash the events of the authoritarian past in Portugal. Meanwhile the arguments on the other side of the isle varied from the stoppage of the project signalling a fear of the past to it being an attempt to erase history (Saraiva, 2019, p. 10). Leonel Gouveia, the mayor of Santa Comba Dão, eventually explained the plans for a Estado Novo Interpretation Centre, which, he claimed, will be “a place for the study of the Estado Novo and never a sanctuary for nationalists” (Torgal, 2019, p. 2, own translation from Portuguese). João Paulo Nunes, one of the coordinators of the project also added that “anyone who goes to the centre with an apologetic perspective of the Estado Novo will feel, more than disappointed, disturbed, because, normally, people with this vision don’t enjoy the historiographic discourse about the Estado Novo”, concluding by saying that “it will not be a mausoleum” (Marujo, 2019, p. 2, own translation from Portuguese). He also revealed the possibility for a regional network of smaller interpretation centres connected to the figures from the region that resisted the regime, such as Aristides de Sousa Mendes (1885-1954) (Torgal, 2019, p. 2)

The reactions and controversies surrounding these projects are indicators of just how important museums are perceived to be in the act of collectively remembering the past. As Amy Sodaro remarked “around the world today, it is increasingly a political and moral expectation that societies will confront past violence as a way of moving forward, indicating a new temporal orientation toward the past in political and social life” (2018, p. 4). Memorial museums play a particularly important role in this, as they, according to the author, “seek to morally educate their visitors, using experiential, interactive, and affective strategies to give visitors an impactful encounter with the past and inspire empathy in them” (Sodaro, 2018, p. 5). However, as mentioned before, museums are not neutral institutions. They are ideologically active social participants (Coffee, 2006, p. 435) and, as the two examples illustrate, the recent authoritarian past is far from being a consensual topic. This deepens when considering that in post-authoritarian societies, the relationship to its authoritarian past is often tied with the perception of legitimacy and maturity of its democratic institutions (Teixeira, 2012, p. 24). As such, this research is based on the assumption that the narratives constructed by these museums are important as they testify to the way social agents perceive

the past and themselves. Moreover, because new projects are springing up in the dispute for memory and because this dispute is intensifying, it is relevant to inquire into the institutions that already exist.

To detail exactly how the dissertation aims to do so, it seems fitting to describe the process which led to the writing of these pages. Although the research went through major changes from its original conception, often by the need to narrow down the research topic, a few things were established from the beginning. Firstly, the dissertation would be an analysis of twentieth century authoritarian past narratives created for display in tourism attractions. As such, the study would consider attractions that either portrayed that past or were created during the authoritarian regime, which included those related to events or people connected to that time period. This soon revealed to be too broad, as it would include a pool of objects of study too wide for the limitations of a master's dissertation. As such and instead, it was established that the focus of the study would be on the discourses created in museums, because of their authoritative role in the shaping of perspectives on the past. Secondly, it was established that the research would be from the perspective of the supply. That is, the study would focus on the constructed product and the meanings created and reproduced in the exhibition content. Although other perspectives present in academic literature could be considered to inform the research — such as the museums' marketing strategies, visitor interpretations, cultural programmes of the institutions or effectiveness of information transmission — the focus would always be on the exhibited contents themselves and on what the textual, design and curatorial choices could mean. Thirdly, since the beginning, part of the research was meant to take place during an international exchange period, so that it would not just focus on the Portuguese experience and mnemonic practices, but consider it in the international context and in relation to the experiences of other societies. It is because of the adoption of this international perspective that the dissertation is written in English and not in Portuguese. The exchange took place in Eger, Hungary from January to July 2019 at the Eszterházy Károly University. One of the reasons for the choice of Hungary was because this country also spent a greater part of the twentieth century under authoritarian regimes. Furthermore, the fact that much of it was a communist dictatorship could mean an interesting case-study to compare to the legacy of the Portuguese right-wing dictatorship. Moreover, to no lesser degree were personal reasons considered, as Eger had been the place of two previous exchange periods in 2015 and 2016 and so the research revealed the opportunity to

apply previous knowledge about the country and to gain a deeper understanding and appreciation for Hungarian society.

Given these working parameters, the first phase of the research was dedicated to finding museums that could, potentially, be study subjects for the dissertation. The goal was to first comprise a list of potential museums in Portugal and proceed to visit them. This process was repeated upon arriving in Hungary. Given the criteria, a list of the following museums was compiled:

- Aljube Museum of Resistance and Freedom (Lisbon)
- Presidency Museum (Belém)
- Fado Museum (Lisbon)
- Amália House Museum (Lisbon)
- GNR Museum (Lisbon)
- National Museum of Costume (Lisbon)
- Combatant Museum (Belém)
- Exhibition hall of the Discoveries Monument (Belém)
- Exiled Memory Hall (Estoril)
- Santo António Fort (Estoril)
- MFA Command Post Museological Centre (Lisbon)
- Military Museum of Porto (Porto)
- National Press Museum (Porto)
- Neorealism Museum (Vila Franca de Xira)
- Municipal Museum of Peniche (Peniche)
- Fernando Lopes Graça Memorial House (Tomar)
- Salgueiro Maia School Museum (Coruche)
- Humberto Delgado Memorial House (Torres Novas)
- João Soares Memorial House (Leiria)
- Colonial War Museum (Vila Nova de Famalicão)
- São João Baptista Fort (Angra do Heroísmo)
- Costume Museum of Viana do Castelo (Viana do Castelo)
- Exhibition hall of the 25th of April documentation centre (Coimbra)

The visits to the museums were to be conducted in November and December 2018. The goal was to take notes and, when possible, take photographs as mnemonic aids, of the spatial arrangements of objects, the design choices and the texts in the exhibitions. To do so, the visits and, later the analysis, were to be anchored on what Rhiannon Mason described as the “textual approach” in the study of museums, that is, the “analysis of the spatial narratives set up by the relationship of one gallery or object to another ... [and] the narrative strategies and voices implicit in labelling, lighting, or sound” (2006, p. 26). In essence, the textual approach sees the museum exhibition as a “cultural text”, meaning, a piece of cultural production that, because of its contextual position within the social and ideological apparatuses of a given society, can be subjected to inquiry to provide insights on that society (Purser, 2000, p. 169). As Louis Althusser describes it, an apparatus is a “system that ensures the reproduction of the relations of production” (2014, p. 1). That is, an apparatus is the set of practices and representations that maintain the organization of the social. These are informed by a more or less cohesive set of beliefs, the ideology, which structure how individuals “behave in such-and-such a way, adopt such-and-such a practical line of conduct and, what is more, participate in certain regulated practices”(Althusser, 2014, p. 185). Moreover, ideology “always exists in an apparatus and in the practice or practices of that apparatus. Each apparatus [is] the realization of an ideology” (Althusser, 2014, p. 184). As such, to analyse the discursive and ideological practices established in tourism products, museums in this case, is to draw insights into the ideological apparatuses that they reproduce.

The first visits were conducted in early November 2018 to the Amália Museum, the Aljube Museum, the Combatants Museum, the Exhibition hall of the Discoveries Monument and the GNR Museum. The Fado Museum and the Presidency Museum, together with the Aljube Museum, had been previously visited in the context of another research project for the Curricular Unit of Tourism, Multiculturalism and Lusophony. These first visits revealed the need to further narrow down the pool of study subjects because to include all would mean an analysis either too large for a master’s dissertation or too shallow to reveal any meaningful insights. As such, the visit to the Exhibition hall of the Discoveries Monument revealed the need to exclude temporary exhibitions, as they would increase the myriad of analysis not only for this exhibit, but for many other museums on this list, such as the Aljube Museum which regularly hosts new temporary exhibitions. As such, both the Exhibition hall of the Discoveries Monument and the Exhibition hall of the 25th of April documentation centre

were excluded, together with all temporary exhibitions from other museums. Likewise, after visiting the Amália Museum it became evident that bibliographical museums should not be included, since the analysis would yield very small amounts of information to work with when compared to other museums whose focus is the time period in question. The visit to the GNR Museum yielded the same conclusion. Although the museum does have a substantial part of the exhibition dedicated to the collaboration between the police force and the regime, it is placed in the context of the broader history of the institution in Portugal. As such, it became evident that museums which do not dedicate most of their exhibition to the time period would not be relevant. As a result, a large portion of the museums on the list were excluded: the Amália Museum, the GNR Museum, the Fernando Lopes Graça and the Humberto Delgado Memorial Houses, the Presidency Museum, the Fado Museum, the National Museum of Costume, the National Press Museum, the Neorealism Museum and the Costume Museum of Viana do Castelo. The Salgueiro Maia School Museum and the João Soares Memorial House remained in the list because, although they do have parts of the exhibition dedicated to their name-sake historical figures, their focus is on portraying the time period.

Following these exclusions, the Colonial War Museum and the Military Museum of Porto were visited in late November 2018. Each of these visits included a conversation with some members of the staff which changed the perspective from which the research was being conducted. The Colonial War museum was created by the Association of the Injured Armed Forces Veterans and this was already known before the visit. However, it was only during the actual visit that it became clear just how important this aspect is to the museum. This realization came about not because of the exhibition itself, but because of the content of the conversation had with the officer that accompanied the visit. More than any other museum previously visited, the Colonial War revealed the true importance that these museums have for specific groups as experience-sharing sites. Likewise, the visit to Porto's Military Museum was an exercise in humility. When inquired if any of the exhibits were dedicated to the building's usage as the Porto headquarters of the political police, the member of staff paused and said that they did not think that enough time had passed, adding that "a lot of people died here". These are examples of some first-hand encounters with the difficulty in dealing with this past and they were key in informing the rest of the research.

Following these, the Salgueiro Maia School Museum and the João Soares Memorial House were visited in early December 2018. Other museums, however, were not visited due to logistical difficulties. The Municipal Museum of Peniche had gone under renovations for the creation of the new Museum of Freedom and Resistance and, as such, was closed during the research period. Moreover, upon calling the facilities of the MFA Command Post Museological Centre it was revealed that it would only be available for group visits, which were conditions that could not be met during the period of the visits. The São João Baptista Fort could not be visited because of its location in Terceira Island in the Azores and the travel distance that it would entail. Personal constraints meant an impossibility to visit the Exiled Memory Hall and the Santo António Fort. These were then planned to be visited after returning from Hungary.

After the arrival in Hungary, the same process of researching potentially relevant museums, with the new criteria in place, and visiting was repeated. The following museums were considered:

- House of Terror (Budapest)
- Statue Park (Budapest)
- Hospital on the Rock Museum (Budapest)
- Holocaust Memorial Centre (Budapest)
- Hungarian Jewish Museum and Archives (Budapest)
- Imre Nagy Memorial House (Budapest)
- 1956 Memorial Hall (Nagykovácsi)
- 1956 Memorial and Museum (RákócziFalva)
- Recsk National Memorial Park (Recsk)
- 1956 Museum (Kiskunmajsa)
- Emlékpont Museum (Hódmezővásárhely)
- Hungarian tragedy of 1944 Holocaust Museum (Hódmezővásárhely)

The House of Terror, the Statue Park and the Holocaust Memorial Centre were visited in early March 2019, together with other museums, such as the National Gallery, the Hungarian National Museum and the Parliament exhibitions. These last ones would not be considered for the dissertation but could give directional insights into the Hungarian museological portrayals of the period. In mid-March 2019 the Emlékpont Museum was

visited. The Hungarian tragedy of 1944 Holocaust Museum was scheduled to be visited on the same day, but it was closed. Following these, it became clear that, even with the limitations imposed after the visits in Portugal, the load of analysis would still be too large for a master's dissertation. To include all the museums considered, it would make it impossible to build a constructive discussion around the topics that these museums portray within the limitations of this dissertation. Moreover, both the Emlékpont Museum and the almost all the exhibitions in the others yet to be visited were solely in Hungarian, which would greatly complicate the analysis. As such, it was decided that the dissertation would only consider one museum in each country: the Aljube Museum in Lisbon and the House of Terror in Budapest. Although they are not the first museological instances in their countries to portray the authoritarian past, they are widely seen as the flag bearers. They set the example for later museums in their respective countries, with the House of Terror being the catalyst for the opening of other major institutions such as the Emlékpont Museum in 2006 in Hódmezővásárhely, and the Aljube Museum setting the precedent for the opening of museums such as the new Resistance and Freedom Museum in Peniche in 2019 and soon in Porto.

Given these new restrictions, multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis was applied in the analysis of the exhibitions. This methodology is built on the work of Norman Fairclough and has been used by several authors in critical sociology. According to David Machin and Andrea Mayr, critical discourse analysis is the study of “linguistic elements in order to reveal connections between language, power and ideology” (2012, p. 5). Furthermore, it is about inquiring into the “strategies that appear normal or neutral on the surface, but which may, in fact, be ideological and seek to shape the representation of events and persons for particular ends” (2012, p. 5). They went even further in adding that “the term ‘critical’ therefore means ‘denaturalizing’ the language to reveal the kinds of ideas, absences and taken-for-granted assumptions in texts” (2012, p. 5). Moreover, as Fairclough described it, critical discourse analysis is an “explanatory critique in that it does not simply describe existing realities but seeks to explain them, for instance by showing them to be effects of structures or mechanisms or forces that the analyst postulates and whose reality [s/he seeks] to test out” (2012, p. 9). The term “multimodal” refers to the introduction of “visual, sound and material design” in critical discourse analysis (Ledin & Machin, 2018, p. 60). That is, the application of the same methodology to the study of the meaning created by semiotic choices in texts

beyond the written word, be they visual, audio, spatial or a combination of several. This is particularly useful for the analysis of exhibitions, since, as Sophia Psarra puts it “museum narratives are organized in space depending on the ways in which the artefacts are positioned in a layout” (2009, p. 4).

The analysis of the discourses present in the exhibitions that will be analysed in the pages to come considered the choices of displayed elements, their relation to the space and the visitor, the aesthetic and design choices and the audio-visual elements, such as lighting, sound and video. The textual elements considered for the House of Terror were the handout paper sheets available to the visitors in each room of the exhibition. The texts on the walls were considered design elements, since they serve more for setting rather than textual purposes. For the Aljube museum, the textual elements considered were the texts inscribed on the walls, since not only are they the focal point of much of the exhibition, but they are also the main source of descriptive information to the visitors. The textual elements of the museum are written in Portuguese and are always accompanied by an English version, smaller in font size. The analysis will only consider the texts in English. The unreferenced quotations on the analysis correspond to quotes from the texts in the House of Terror and in the Aljube Museum. The remainder of quotations follows the American Psychological Association referencing style. Initially it was projected that the dissertation would include an attachment section with the scanned texts and with photos of the exhibitions. The website of the House of Terror, however, states this would require an official authorization. During a phone call, the staff stated that the time it would take to get such authorization would likely be longer than the exchange period. As such, during the analysis and discussion the dissertation opts for describing how the exhibitions are organized in both museums from the perspective of the visitor and referencing the textual elements through quotation.

The analysis was also informed by existing academic literature regarding either the museums themselves or the discourses present in them. The latter was especially vital in the analysis of the Aljube museum, since, although the study of memory of the Estado Novo is not a recent topic in Portuguese academic circles, nor is the study of social memory in general lacking in sources, the Aljube Museum itself has yet to be subjected to a large body of inquiry. The only work that was found during the duration of the research exclusively regarding its function as a memorial museum was the 2015 master’s dissertation by Ana Rita Martins, titled *A musealização de heranças difíceis: o caso do Museu do Aljube - Resistência*

e Liberdade [Musealization of difficult heritage – the case of the Aljube Museum of Resistance and Freedom]. There has also been mentions of it in articles such as the 2018 article by Belmira Coutinho, Maria Manuel Baptista, Moisés de Lemos Martins and José Rebelo titled *Portugal, land of tourism: dissonances and touristic [sic] uses of the Estado Novo's heritage* and in other publications such as the 2018 essay *Dictatorship and Memory* by Filipa Raimundo. As such, the literature that informed the analysis of the Aljube Museum was mostly about the questions of memory and of the regime's legacy in Portugal. The House of Terror, on the contrary, has an abundance of literature regarding its curating and design choices, as well as its usage as a political tool. In addition, the literature for the analysis of the House of Terror also drew a lot more from international politics of post-communist memory, since the Hungarian case is much more tied with its central European neighbours than Portugal. The sources used were mostly confined to English and Portuguese languages, with sparse use of Hungarian and Spanish when there were no alternative sources.

Regarding the structure of the dissertation itself, it is divided into five chapters. Firstly, the introduction, which gives an overview of the choices made and of the research process. The second chapter lays out the theoretical foundations of the dissertation and is divided into four sub-chapters. The first, titled "Temple of the Muses", aims to answer the question of what a museum is. It provides an overview of the field of museum studies, giving a foundational understanding of their defining characteristics, their history and how they fit into the larger system of cultural consumption in contemporary society. The second sub-chapter, titled "Temple of the Masses", aims to clarify the role of the tourism industry in contemporary cultural consumption practices, with a greater focus on its role as a medium for the creation of meaning. The subchapter gives an overview of the varying definitions of tourism according to their intended research purpose and the theoretical foundations for the understanding of tourism products. The third subchapter "Talking the past into existence" aims to discuss the ties between collective/social memory, heritage and the discursive/ideological apparatuses that surround the practices of remembering the past, especially in museums. The fourth subchapter, titled "A dark past", gives an overview of the problems surrounding dissonant heritage. To do so, the subchapter discusses the role of memorial museums as tools of remembrance, followed by the debate over the limitations of language in transmitting the experience of trauma and terror and the means through which museum practices overcome these limitations. The subchapter finishes by discussing how

the discursive and ideological apparatuses created or reproduced when attempting to overcome these limitations can be problematic. This sets the stage for the analysis of the exhibitions in the Aljube Museum and the House of Terror.

The Third chapter offers an analysis and discussion on the discursive practices in the permanent exhibition in the Aljube Museum. It starts with a very brief overview of the history of the Estado Novo period, followed by a brief exposition of the museological practices in Portugal regarding the memory of that period and an explanation about the composition of the museum itself. In this chapter as well as in the following the discourses present in the museum are discussed in separate subchapters. In reality, the discourses in question are woven into each other and appear in the same sections or rooms, especially in the House of Terror, since they often arise from the same phenomena. The dissertation is structured this way, however, in order to better clarify the arguments and to make for a more coherent read. In the Aljube Museum, the subchapter “Silence and the Atmosphere of Fear” discusses how the museum portrays the silence induced by the oppressive apparatus of the Estado Novo. Moreover, it discusses how the collective silencing that followed the end of the regime may be present in the curating and design choices of the exhibition. The subchapter “ ‘Gentle customs’ and Antifascism” debates how the museum aims to delegitimize the rhetoric of the regime and how it draws from the discursive practices of a post-Salazarian society. “On the Colonial Wars” inspects how the museum portrays the colonial conflict in the last 13 years of the regime and how its portrayals are inserted within the wider discourses on the topic in Portugal. The last, titled “The Carnation revolution and the minimal consensus”, discusses the museum’s portrayal of the revolution contextualized within the wider discourses in Portuguese society and how it informs the museum’s views on the duty of memory.

Likewise, the fourth chapter replicates the structure of the previous to analyse and discuss how the House of Terror utilizes, reconstructs and legitimizes specific discourses in Hungarian society. It starts with an overview of the history of the period discussed in the museum, followed by the memory works in Hungarian society within the museological context and with a detailing of the structure of the House of Terror. It is, likewise, divided into four subchapters detailing discursive practices. The subchapter titled “Double Occupation” is a debate into how the museum utilizes space layout and design choices to convey the already widespread discourse on the equality of Nazism and Communism,

utilizing recognizable characterizations of Nazism to portray Communism. The following, titled “Hungary caught among superpowers” discusses how the narrative characterization portrays Hungary and other agents to convey a relationship of victim-victimizer and draws a widespread discourse on Hungarian impotence in the face of History. “The Trianon Question” discusses how the legacy and contemporary political utilization of the breaking up of the historical Hungarian Kingdom following WWI as portrayed in the museum. Finally, “The traditional nation (Conservative Project)” details how the characterization of different Hungarian agents in the museum is utilized to validate specific social and political projects in contemporary Hungary.

The Final chapter is comprised of concluding remarks, in which, in light of the topics discussed in the previous chapters, it discusses what are the possible implications to be drawn. The chapter establishes some comparative remarks between both museums, especially regarding their use of spectacle for narrative purposes and their utilization and reproduction of discourses. It also provides a small discussion on the role that both play in the memorial and museological panorama at large, with a prospect of what the future may hold considering the discursive and ideological apparatuses they reproduce.

It must be stated, however, that each of the topics discussed could have its own full-sized dissertation. Most of them do, in fact, have several publications and books solely dedicated to discussing parts of those topics. As such, an extensive detailing of each would not only be counterproductive, but impossible, given the limitations of a master’s dissertation. As such, it is only meant to give an overview of the debates within those fields to inform the analysis and the discussion. Moreover, while the dissertation draws heavily from a great plethora of fields of inquiry, such as critical sociology, post-socialist studies, post-fascist studies, social memory studies, and so many more, it is, at heart it is an analysis of two cultural tourism products and how they create and recreate meaning in their societies. The dissertation is, essentially, an analysis of the “declarative value” (Hollingshead, 2004, p. 25) of these tourism products, that is, the ideological content that they carry and what consequences they have. With this in mind, the dissertation aims at contributing to the broader discussion on the role that the production of cultural tourism products has in shaping the contemporary world. The hope is that, by carefully reflecting on the narratives that are being created and/or replicated through tourism, this dissertation may leave its contribution to the public debate regarding the multiple meanings the past can have.

Chapter II – Literature Review

What connects the British Museum to an author’s memorial house in a small town or to the collection of living specimens in a university botanical garden? And what connects these to the “made-for-instagram” pop-up museums, such as the Museum of Ice Cream in San Francisco? This is one of the questions at the heart of the ever-expanding field of Museum Studies, which has been growing with and alongside others such as Tourism and Culture Studies. Its aim is to understand and manage contemporary cultural consumption in exhibition spaces and is regarded as “one of the most genuinely multi- and increasingly interdisciplinary [sic] areas of the academy today” (Macdonald, 2006, p. 14). As José Amado Mendes remarked “today there is no town, city or small village that does not want a museum of its own” (2013, p. 58). More than a sardonic remark, this is an observation of the growing role that museums and exhibition spaces have in the shaping of contemporary cultural and socio-political landscapes. Indeed, despite the overall dwindling of public funding for culture in most European countries², visitation of museums and heritage institutions, as a leisure practice (as locals and as tourists), continues to steadily rise (Eurostat, 2018, p. 134). As such, understanding the museum, as both a product of contemporary society and a tool in the shaping of that society, is an important steppingstone to recognize the larger societal forces that bring the contemporary world into being.

Temple of the Muses

Academia has encountered difficulties in finding a universally accepted definition of the term “Museum”. In fact, much like its sister field of Tourism Studies, many authors reject the very need for a one-size-fits-all definition, calling it a “feat of theory envy” that looks for “wholesale theories” to validate its own existence as a field of inquiry (Franklin & Crang, 2001, p. 5). As Michael Hall and Stephen Page put it: “definitions will change according to their purpose and context. ... By defining terms, we give meaning to what we are doing”

² “Public spending on culture of the EU member states was reduced in the period 2007-2015 by 3%. ... It is important to note that the average reduction in public spending on culture is fundamentally due to the constant fall in the southern states in relation to the other geographic areas analysed (average 4.77%, €113.26 per inhabitant, €5.68 less than in 2007)” (European Parliament, 2017, p. 4).

(2005, p. 5). As such, it is no surprise that different authors and institutions give different definitions of “Museum” according to different purposes and contexts, be they, for example, managing publics, creating legal frameworks or using museums as objects of inquiry.

The International Council of Museums, in its 2017 statutes, defines a museum as “a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment” (ICOM, 2018, p. 3). This is the definition adopted by many international organizations -- namely UNESCO -- and it is meant more as a broad management-centred definition than one meant for academic inquiry, encompassing most working aspects of the museum as an institution with specific functions. Authors such as Kiersten Latham and John Simmons are examples within academic circles of the adoption of broad definitions based on the overall functions of the museum: “to collect, to conserve, to educate, to interpret, to exhibit, to research, to serve” (2014, p. 23). These broader definitions are more useful for management-driven studies that tend to focus more on the museum practices than on the theorizing of the museum as an object of inquiry. Management-driven research is meant the study of the concrete practices and strategies that may improve a museum’s functioning, be they more effective ways to reach wider publics, effectiveness of communication to visitors or even practices of collection curating (Caulton, 1998, p. 1). Other authors, however, tend to define their study subject through the lenses of the particular function that informs their research. In his study on the construction of local identity through museums and tourism, Xerardo Pérez described the museum as “the mirror of the communities, to help them discover who they are, where they come from and where they are going” (2009, p. 183). This definition is based on the social role of museums in their host communities. In other words, the museum is regarded as a common framework for social driven research such as community museums and socio-cultural projects (Martins J. M., 2015, p. 38). Likewise, the Network of European Museum Organizations (NEMO) considers that “museums preserve and disseminate core values on behalf of society as a whole, using their collections as a basis to achieve reflective and social outcomes” (as cited in Zbucnea, 2015, p. 483). Authors more interested in the museum as a cultural text to be analysed tend to draw from social theory, especially from post-structuralism, and define the museum as a system of knowledge (Smith, 2006, p. 64). Suzanne Keene identified the museum as “a system to build and permanently

maintain an irreplaceable and meaningful physical resource and to use it to transmit ideas and concepts to the public” (2002, p. 13). Others, such as James Clifford (1997), as cited by Rhiannon Mason, also draw from the spatiality of the museum but describe the museum as a “contact zone”. The focus is on the museum as a space of “encounters” in which the various stakeholders and the objects on display “intersect, interact, and are mutually influenced by the encounter” (Mason, 2006, p. 25). This multiplicity of definitions does not entail contradictory stances between the authors, but instead points out to the different perspectives that they operate in. As Mary Alexander and Edward Alexander pointed out, most definitions reflect the balance “between the museum as a repository for objects and the museum as a place for learning” (as cited in Latham & Simmons, 2014, p. 25).

It is to be noted, however, that the museum as an institution did not always have the functions and practices that these definitions draw their characterization from. As Laurajane Smith put it: “museums developed [in the West] as a consequence of the modern condition and narratives of progress, rationality and national identity [that] became embedded in exhibition and collection practices” (2006, p. 19), especially from the 19th and 20th century. Despite this, contemporary museums draw their collection and display practices from much earlier³. Evidence from unearthed Neolithic sites show that the act of collecting and attributing representative value to collected objects can be traced, at least, to the start of human settlements (Freitas, 2014, p. 21). However, the etymological origin of the word “museum” is placed on the ancient Greek *mouseion*⁴, meaning “Temple of the Muses”, the institution founded by the ruler of Alexandria, Ptolemy Soter in the Hellenic period (305–283 BC) (Latham & Simmons, 2014, p. 40). The word was repurposed amidst the art

³ The progression of museological practice was mapped by Adam Gopnik (as cited in Latham & Simmons, 2014, p. 24). In it he described five stages of museological development:

1. “Museum as Mausoleum—a place where you go to see old things, to find yourself as an aesthete or scholar; above all a place connected to the past; a silent experience for the individual.
2. Museum as Machine—not mechanical, but productive; where you go to be transformed, to learn (about the present); you emerge informed, educated, changed; a place of quiet, significant instruction.
3. Museum as Metaphor—extravagant, flamboyant, romantic; a museum that no longer pursues an audience but provides us with a central arena of sociability.
4. Museum as Mall—exclusively devoted to pleasure; overcrowded, overmerchandised; the collection becomes a commodity.
5. Museum as Mindful—aware of itself obviously and primarily about the objects it contains; objects are intrinsic to the experience; encourages conversation but does not force information”. (as cited in Latham & Simmons, 2014, p. 24).

⁴ “Temple of the Muses” in reference to the nine daughters of Zeus and Mnemosine – the personification of memory – which inspired arts and scientific knowledge (Freitas, 2014, p. 21).

patronage of the Italian Renaissance, at first to refer to Cosme de Medici's (1389-1464) collections. This was a new reality, equally fertile in art and scientific knowledge, even if devoid of the conception of place dedicated to the reunion of sages (Freitas, 2014, p. 22). In time, the institution came to readapt itself to serve the illuminist ideals of the scientific revolution, becoming a gathering place for the scientific inquiries of the 17th and 18th centuries. The opening of the Ashmolean Museum in 1683, with the scientific contributions of Oxford University, and the publication of the treaty *Museographia* by Casper F. Neickel in 1727, were important milestones in the creation of the modern museum (Hernandez, 2010, p. 36). The 18th and 19th centuries saw an exponential growth in the number of exhibitions and museological spaces. The modernist discourses of the Manifest Destiny and American Progress created the incentives for the opening of art and natural history museums in major US cities, meant to rival European institutions and create national pride (Patin, 1999, p. 41). The processes of unification of Italy and Germany gave rise to the *Musei Civici* and the *Heimatmuseum*, museums for the creation of a national identity, which were emulated by national ethnographical museums across the world (Freitas, 2014, p. 31). This new nationalist museography came to dominate the first half of the 20th century, with grand exhibits being the “bread and butter” of cultural politics: glorifying the past to justify their political and ideological projects (Cashin, 2016, p. 73). Having taken its recognizable shape, the museum in the second half of the 20th century, especially from the 1970s onward, saw an increasing questioning of the established museological orthodoxy. An important date in the rejection of established museological practices was the ICOM ninth General Conference in 1971, with the recognition of the “New Museology” movement (Rodney, 2015, p. 4). The “New Museology” movement emerged as new voices and narratives contested the authorized discourses and as the pressure of neoliberal economic policies created the incentives for museums to widen their publics (Mastai, 2007, p. 137). As Alexandra Zbucea pointed out in her analysis of museums through the lenses of theme parks, “the role of museums has shifted from collecting and preservation, to interpretation and education, and more recently towards engaging the public and communities in a broad social sense” (2015, p. 484).

The first publications on ‘New Museology’ came as heralding the democratization of culture to the masses. Authors such as Peter Vergo (1989) sought to incorporate recent developments in social theory, shifting perspectives on the presentation of museum artefacts

and their relation to the public from intrinsically to contextually valuable (Macdonald, 2006, p. 114). But more than contributing to new perspectives, the wave of ‘New Museology’ integrated elements that “earlier [might] have been seen as outside the remit of museology proper, such as commercialism and entertainment” (Macdonald, 2006, p. 2). This was also a response to the major funding cuts that most public cultural institutions suffered in the 1970s, creating the incentive to adapt a more visitor-centred approach (Romero, 2018, p. 20). In practice, this meant an opening for the incorporation of market-oriented areas of inquiry into the body of knowledge that informed museological practice, such as Marketing, Business and Tourism studies (Zbucnea, 2015). In his account of the contemporary museum, Kenneth Hudson jokingly remarked how “as good shopkeepers, museum directors are slowly coming to think of the customers first and the goods on sale second” (as cited in Romero, 2018, p. 20). But more than that, it meant that the museum, as an institution more in line with contemporary modes of cultural consumption, would also become an incorporated part of the cultural and economic logic of the emerging neoliberal order. ‘New Museology’ is, indeed, as much a product of the commodification of culture in contemporary capitalist societies as of the genuine efforts by researchers and curators to bring the museum to larger sections of the public (Rodney, 2015, p. 21). It is because of this that theorists such as Claudia Sandoval Romero (2018) remarked how museums have been fully incorporated into what Theodor Adorno and others of the Frankfurt School called the “Culture industry”. According to these authors, in contemporary society, art and culture are produced, consumed and understood in accordance with the mechanisms of capital (Adorno, 2001, p. 9). This is closely related to the theories of Mike Featherstone regarding contemporary consumer culture. Featherstone borrows from authors such as Pierre Bourdieu and Jean Baudrillard to analyse how the process of commodification dictates the acquisition of knowledge and the creation of identity in contemporary society. According to this author, “Consumer Culture” is “premised upon the expansion of capitalist commodity production”, and, as a response to the markets, cultural production becomes institutionalized within the frameworks of the commodification process (Featherstone, 2007, p. 13). He adds: “this has resulted in a greater salience of leisure and consumption activities in contemporary western society” (Featherstone, 2007, p. 13).

Business studies have similarly observed the steady increase in the role of leisure activities in the commodified cultural and economic landscape. Louis Foglia (2019)

observed how, in this last decade, expenditures on experience related services have been growing nearly four times faster than expenditures on tangible goods. Likewise, Ryan Howell and Graham Hill have mentioned the accelerating growth in the “experience economy”, to which tourism contributes a significant share (2009, p. 513). In fact, contemporary museums cannot be understood outside the role that they play in the contemporary tourism industry. As Freitas puts it, the clear rise of cultural tourism – which will probably increase over the next decades – gave a lot of museums a greater visibility, mostly those in capitals and large cities, and is the root cause, on the other hand, of the proliferation of new spaces. Freitas goes on to describe a *museomania*, which “mirrors the postmodern anxiety of preserving everything” (2014, p. 37, own translation from Portuguese). As such, the dynamics that dictate the functioning of the tourism industry are particularly informative to a more nuanced understanding of the production of meaning and culture in museums.

Temple of the Masses

Just as in Museum Studies, Tourism, as a field of academic inquiry, has not found a unanimous definition for its study subject. Theorists such as Michael Hall and Stephen Page (2005), as well as John Tribe and Alexandre Netto (2009) reinforced the contextual nature of definitions of tourism, deeming the very conception of a universal framework an impossibility. Moreover, just like in the case of Museum Studies, authors have pointed out that “tourism studies does not need to try and find some ‘northwest passage’ or ‘big bang theory’ to legitimate itself as a school of thought” (Tribe, 2009, p. 15). According to Joey Ghanem, tourism “involves various subjects such as psychology, sociology, economy, geography and hospitality”, and, as such, “[t]ourism can be seen as an umbrella concept” (Ghanem, 2017, p. 4). Moreover, as David Bell puts it, “as bodies of knowledge, tourism studies and hospitality studies share that uneasy location between functional, vocational training for particular industries, and social science inquiry that draws on the conceptual and methodological resources of cognate disciplines” (2009, p. 19). It is, however, in this diversity within the field of tourism studies that Jafar Jafari (2005) observed the potential for interdisciplinarity and the possibility for wider-encompassing scientific inquiry.

In accordance to the recognized lack of a universalizing definition, organizations such as the United Nations World Tourism Organization have chosen to refrain from attempting to come up with one beyond statistical purposes. The UNWTO chooses, instead, to provide a measurable definition of tourism. The current working definition states that:

Tourism is defined as the activities of persons travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes not related to the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited. (UNWTO, 2010, p. 10).

This does not mean that the UNWTO does not provide greater contributions, as it opts to provide a large array of more specific working definitions, such as those of “tourism product”, “cultural tourism”, “tourism satellite account” and many more. By doing so, the organization works within the fragmentation of the field, as its more specific definitions serve different purposes for different endeavours. The adoption of a more statistics-oriented definition also means that it is up to academia to find particular definitions for their particular research.

These differing definitions within academic circles vary according to the perspective they adopt, and they can be a source of discussion for those who privilege different perspectives. To exemplify, Netto pointed out the discussion between Jafar Jafari and John Tribe (2009, p. 45). Jafari argued that “[t]ourism is the study of man away from his usual habitat, of the touristic [sic] apparatus and networks, and of the ordinary [non-tourism] and non-ordinary [tourism] worlds and their dialectic relationship” (as cited in Netto, 2009, p. 45). To this, Tribe argued that the phenomenon of tourism and the study of tourism were two different aspects and that Jafari’s definition does mix both. Tribe added his own definition: “tourism is essentially an activity engaged in by human beings and the minimum necessary features that need to exist for it to be said to have occurred include the act of travel from one place to another, a particular set of motives for engaging in that travel (excluding commuting for work), and the engagement in activity at the destination” (as cited in Netto, 2009, p. 45). The definitions provided by both theorists reflect the frameworks through which they conduct their work. Jafari’s definition is contextualized in his “analysis and discussion of education in the field” (Jafari, 2005, p. 43). As such, Jafari privileges a definition created through the lenses of tourism as a school of thought. Likewise, Tribe’s definition is

contextualized in his work in researching the processes that make up the practice of tourism as both a social and economic phenomenon (Coutinho & Seabra de Melo, 2016, p. 150).

The field's fragmentation is, however, seen by some theorists as an opportunity rather than a burden, as theorists' engagement with each other's approaches can be a source for a more well-rounded understanding of the phenomenon (Hall & Page, 2005, 38). Authors such as Jane Russell and Paul Roseby identify tourism as essentially a business, describing it as "the business of providing travel, accommodation, food, entertainment, etc., for tourists" and differentiating it from the 'tourism industry', which is "all the various businesses that provide services for tourists, considered together" (2006, p. 317). These business-oriented definitions are those that fall closest to the UNWTO framework and often serve for similar purposes of governance and localized business management. Other theorists characterize tourism as a system of interactions within a territory. These fall into what Netto promptly called "system of tourism" paradigm (2009, p. 48). That is, the framework of analysis that understands tourism not just as an isolated commercial practice, but an interconnected network of interactions between its human and institutional agents. Theorists such as Charles Goeldner and Brent Ritchie stated that "tourism is the sum of the interactions between the tourist, the businesses providing goods and services, the government of the host community and the host community" (2009, p. 5). Likewise, Licínio Cunha stated that tourism is an "agglomerate of elements that establish interdependent functional connections among themselves" (2003, p. 111, own translation from Portuguese). Cunha is also an example of a set of authors that resort to the framework of tourism as a system of interactions to analyse what he called the "creation and exchange of values", stating that "tourism itself is a social phenomenon that influences collective behaviour" (2003, p. 120, own translation from Portuguese).

This understanding of tourism as a social phenomenon is what lead authors such as Keith Hollingshead to build on the business and economic foundations of the field to analyse how "tourism is regularly used by various players/bodies/institutions to articulate preferred meanings" (2004, p. 26). These authors drew from the developments in social theory — particularly from the work of Michel Foucault on power relations reproduction through language — to analyse the institutionalization of social structures through tourism (Miller & Cheong, 2000, 332). Netto classified their work as part of the "new approaches" paradigm (2009, p. 48), even if, as Gayle Jennings (2007) pointed out, this is still a paradigm in the

making and that most authors did not forgo the economic dimension of tourism in their sociological inquiries. Adrien Franklin and Mike Crang described tourism as “a productive system that fuses discourse, materiality and practice” (2001, p. 17). Likewise, authors such as Hilary du Cross and Bob McKercher understand tourism primarily as a symbolic system, borrowing from the likes of Jonathan Culler (1981), who perceives tourism primarily as a semiotic system of signs, in which objects and interactions are understood according to sign-values (2015, p. 45). But even within the plethora of authors studying the social aspects of tourism there are differences of perspective. Dean MacCannell understood tourism and tourist experiences as a set of discursive spheres through which relations of power are established (1999, p. 20). Others such as Scott McCabe (2002), describe tourism as a set of performances in space, “creating a type of collective culture” within which tourism practices are created (Williams & Shaw, 2009, pp. 170-171). Other inquiries work within a framework that understands tourism as the “values attributed to encounters” (Figueira & Coelho, 2017, p. 38), be they between objects, tourists, locals, cultures or other elements. Tourism, as David Crouch puts it, is understood as a “practice of ontological knowledge, an encounter with space that is both social and incorporates an embodied feeling of doing” (2002, p. 211). But even these “encounters” are described differently by its proponents. For instance, John Urry (1990) describing them through the lenses of sight as the “Tourist Gaze” while Kevin Markwell, who reacted to Urry, described tourist’s encounters through a “kinesthetic sense”. That is, the meaning attributed to the movement of bodies through space (Franklin & Crang, 2001, p. 11).

The integration of social theory into tourism studies has widened the understanding of tourism as a multi-layered phenomenon, just like the introduction of market-oriented research has contributed to the enrichment of museum studies. It is important, however, to not lose sight of the profit motive behind tourism. Tourism is, after all, an economic activity and the fact that it can, nonetheless, be an effective window for sociological inquiry is, more than anything, a sign of the integration between economic production and cultural life in contemporary society (Adorno, 2001, p. 7). This also means that sociological inquiries within tourism studies are as dependant on an understanding of the market mechanisms of production and consumption as the more business-oriented tourism research.

Although, as mentioned before, working definitions vary according to the purpose and context, the bulk of tourism theory regarding the tourist experience is directly tied to the

understandings of structures of tourism products. The UNWTO defines a tourism product as “a combination of tangible and intangible elements, such as natural, cultural and man-made resources, attractions, facilities, services and activities around a specific centre of interest which represents the core of the destination marketing mix and creates an overall visitor experience including emotional aspects for the potential customers” (UNWTO, 2019, p. 8). More succinctly, at its core a product is “anything that can be offered to a market for attention, acquisition, use or consumption that might satisfy a need or want” (Cross & McKercher, 2015, p. 154). To the process through which cultural and natural resources of a given territory are transformed into a consumable tourism commodity, such as the building of infrastructure or the interpretation practices, is attributed the term “touristification” (Mínguez, Piñeira, & Fernández-Tabales, 2019, p. 5). In the case of tourism products, because they are part of the service industry, there are some differences when it comes to physical commodities. Firstly, they are essentially intangible, even if they can be predicated on the contact with the material world. What is sold and purchased is the subjective experience. This subjectivity means that, at its core, what is purchased is the access to the experience, which is mediated by the subjective understandings and meanings placed by the tourist into that experience. As such, they cannot be stored like any other product or commodity (Urry, 1990, p. 62). Secondly, unlike physical products, where the process of production is independent from the purchase and consumption, services are predicated on a momentarily performed action and encounter between the tourist and the elements in destination. As such, their immateriality necessitates simultaneous production and consumption of the purchased experience. Thirdly, this also means that they are contextually dependent, and as such need to be consumed in the destination. This, in turn, implies that “a destination that is a concentration point of amenities” (Cunha, 2003, p. 31, own translation from the Portuguese) and the visitor’s dislocation to that destination (with the intent to return). It also means that the product itself changes according to the visitors’ own perceptions, which are mediated by the sets of meaning they attribute to their encounters. This is why authors such as Nina Prebensen, Joseph Chen and Muzaffer Uysal argue that visitors are not just passive consumers, but co-producers of their commodified experiences (2014, p. 2). Authors also make a distinction between the “total tourism product”, which “comprises a combination of all the elements, which a tourist consumes during [his/her] trip”, and the “specific tourism product”, which is the “components of the total tourism

product and can be sold as individual offerings such as accommodation, transport, attractions and other facilities for tourists” (Koutoulas, 2004, p. 5). It is within this distinction that Mário Beni describes tourism products as a “composite product, conceived from other services” (Beni, 1997, p. 342, own translation from the Portuguese).

Understanding tourism as a set of meanings transmitted through the production and consumption of products in a destination has provided a helpful framework for theorists. But even within this framework, tourism presents itself as a very heterogeneous phenomenon. It was within marketing-oriented studies that a clearer delimitation was possible. A sort of theoretical taxonomy was borrowed from Business and Marketing studies as both a management practice and a set of frameworks for research (Chen, 2003). Authors and organizations divide the tourism industry into classifications, which share more-or-less similar products, tourist/consumer motivations and usage of the same types of local resources, among others. As Adrien Bull puts it, this “implies an inward attention that aligns a supplier’s competences with the needs of a known and specific market segment” (2006, p. 148). These classifications vary widely depending on the context and purpose of the inquiries. Among them, and the most relevant for the context of this dissertation, is cultural tourism.

Because cultural tourism is predicated on the convergence between two vastly complex concepts, tourism and culture (itself a very problematic concept to define), defining it is inherently as problematic as defining any of the concepts discussed above (Cross & McKercher, 2015, p. 4). At their core, most working definitions of cultural tourism tap into the two key aspects of this phenomenon: the visitor’s motivation to consume culture and the commodification of the destination’s cultural resources. The UNWTO describes cultural tourism as:

A type of tourism activity in which the visitor’s essential motivation is to learn, discover, experience and consume the tangible and intangible cultural attractions/products in a tourism destination. These attractions/products relate to a set of distinctive material, intellectual, spiritual and emotional features of a society that encompasses arts and architecture, historical and cultural heritage, culinary heritage, literature, music, creative industries and the living cultures with their lifestyles, value systems, beliefs and traditions. (UNWTO, 2019, p. 18)

According to Greg Richards and Will Munsters, “the search for cultural experiences has become one of the leading motivations for people to travel” and this “has attracted the attention of a growing number of researchers and policy makers, vastly increasing the scope of cultural tourism research” (2010, p. 2). Much of this academic interest stems from the potential that cultural tourism holds to shape identities. Hollingshead described tourism as “worldmaking” because of its ties with concepts such as Cultural Heritage (2004, p. 25). As Laurajane Smith puts it cultural and, particularly, heritage tourism “is not simply the convergence of heritage with tourism” (2006, p.123) but rather an integral part of the “wider cultural process of heritage meaning making and identity work” (2006, p.123). Because of this cultural tourism can be a tool for the preservation of cultural identities (Figueira & Coelho, 2017) and for the cultural and economic reinvigoration of communities (Butcher, 2012). It can also, however, be a tool to reinforce and maintain power structures (Miller & Cheong, 2000), which can exclude groups and create social vulnerability (Mínguez, Piñeira, & Fernández-Tabales, 2019). An example of this can be the discursive practices of “pro-poor tourism”, which are marketed with the claim that they are human development-driven commercial practices (Scheyvens, 2012, p. 124). However, these can often, at best, yield small net benefits or, at worse, perpetuate the social and economic conditions of communities, while cloaking the profit motive behind the product (Scheyvens, 2012, p. 128). It is precisely because of this dichotomy between benefit and risk that much cultural tourism research has focused on the questions of heritage and identity, which makes it one of the most heavily debated topics in the field.

Talking the past into existence

The framework of “tourism as worldmaking”, as Keith Hollingshead puts it, is premised on the “declarative value of tourism” (2004, p. 25). That is, “the synthesising view that tourism indeed serves today as [a] worldmaking medium of our time through which the poetics and aesthetics of our cultural and natural lives are politically contextualised (and de- and re-textualised) as particularly dominant visions of seeing and knowing are psychically naturalised and aspirationally [sic] commodified” (2004, p. 30). Jonathan Culler described this as an attempt by postmodern societies to “overcome fragmentation by articulating the world as a series of societies, each with its characteristic monuments, distinctive costumes

or cultural practices, and native scenery, all of which are treated as signs of themselves, non-functional displays of codes” (1981, p. 10). In short, postmodernism is the intellectual movement that emerged in the arts, human sciences and politics in the second half of the 20th century as a response to the grand narratives of the modern period that preceded it (Malpas, 2005, p. 12). Identified as “the cultural logic of late capitalism” (Featherstone, 2007, p. 51), postmodern thought is characterized by the blurring of constructed boundaries (such as human/technology and high culture/low culture), the fragmentation and plurality of meanings and identities and the hegemony of capitalist commodification practices in social life (Malpas, 2005, p. 23). Museums are, perhaps, some of the best examples of this within the tourism industry. As mentioned before, this articulation of meaning was already an important characteristic of the nineteenth century museological projects, which aimed to create a cohesive narrative of national identity (Freitas, 2014, p. 31). These museums were created in a time of equally shifting identities, as the modern nation state was coming into being and the transition from rural to industrial societies heralded the extinction of “traditional national customs” (Wimmera & Feinsteina, 2010, p. 764). Even with the rejection of the grand narratives that fuelled these nationalistic museums, the museum institution continues, perhaps more than ever, to use the vestiges of the past to create the lenses through which society evaluates itself. Afterall, an important characteristic of postmodern societies is the merging of different time periods (Malpas, 2005, p. 97). As Allan Williams and Gareth Shaw observe, “symbols of the past are reconstructed via a thriving heritage industry and represented in the present. Within the heritage industry, history becomes a commodity – a tourist spectacle” (2009, p. 121).

These reconstructions are in large informed by the research conducted since the start of the twentieth century on the means through which societies remembered the events of the past. Tadgh O’Keeffe mentioned how “the relationship of history to memory has long been a central issue in epistemological debates within the historical sciences” (2007, p. 5). However, the contributions of the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs’ in the first half of the 20th century pioneered studies on what he called “collective memory”, by building on the theoretical frameworks of societal organization of Émile Durkheim (Cordeiro, 2013, p. 106). Laurajane Smith summarized Halbwachs’ insights, pointing out how they broke away from the classical historiographical view of societal remembering. Firstly, in her description of the work of Halbwachs, Smith stated that the author perceived “shared or collective

memories [as] socially constructed in the present, and collectively legitimized in that they make meaningful common interest and perceptions of collective identity” (2006, p. 59). According to Smith, Halbwachs’ work was a break from the perspective of a clear continuity of fact between the past and the present. This is because his insights rely on the conceptualization of “collective memory” as a set of meanings attributed to past events for the uses of the present. Secondly, As Cordeiro clarified, Halbwachs drew from Durkheim’s social cohesion theories to describe collective memory as holding a social function: to create a sense of collective identity and give stability and continuity to social groups (2013, p.102). Thirdly, Halbwachs, as described by Smith, thoroughly described the processes through which collective memory is created in the present, through commemorative events and daily rituals that transmit meanings between members of the collective social or cultural group (2006, p. 59). This is highly reliant on the “language they employ to frame and define those memories” (Smith, 2006, p. 59).

Despite his influence, Halbwachs’ work has not come without criticism. Sharon MacDonald has referred how “Halbwachs has been criticised for taking for granted the existence of stable social entities as the producers of memory”, even if the author also points out how this is due to his “concern to emphasise the importance of social groups in creating frameworks for remembering” (2013, p. 14). This collective-mentality perspective is also characteristic of the historical context in which Halbwachs developed his theories. Halbwachs worked in the backdrop of the grand narratives of the early 20th century in which there was a focus on the realization of the individual within the “eschatological progress of the history of the nation” (Petri, 2018, p. 55). Moreover, although many authors continue to use the term “collective memory”, especially for more practice-oriented inquiries, some have opted for alternative terminologies. A wide pool of authors such, as Paul Connerton, apply the term “Social memory” intelligibly from “Collective memory” to refer to representations of the past which are shared by members of a group and but not necessarily held by all (1989, p. 15). Connerton also built on Halbwachs’ theoretical framework to apply the concept of “inscription”, the ritual practices of everyday life through which events enter public consciousness (1989, p. 79). Even so, this has also been the subject of some criticism, as authors such as Barbara Misztal claim that, as useful as Connerton’s insights may be, they “are tinted by a social determinism of Halbwachs’ groundwork analysis of memory” (2003, p. 5). Authors such as Jan Assmann (2011) have placed more emphasis on the culture as the

medium through which events of the past become part of the present, coining the terminology “cultural memory”. According to the author, “the collective ‘we’ identity does not exist outside of the individuals who constitute and represent it. ‘We’ is a matter of individual knowledge and awareness” (2011, p. 112). The author calls instead for the focus to be on the role of culture as the medium through which the individual perceptions of the shared past, what is called memory, are codified and communicated. According to the Assmann, “culture as a symbolic world of meaning that makes the world accessible and habitable” (2011, p. 118). This focus on the intersubjectivity of memory and on culture as the medium of transmission is common to authors such as Daniela Jara, who drew from Marianne Hirsch’s concept of “Postmemory” to study the traumatic memories in post-dictatorial societies. According to the author, the concept was used to describe the “so-called second generations [who] began making their family memories the object of aesthetic, ethical, or political reflection, impacting on the public sphere. It is also a response to questions about the transmission of traumatic memories and who is entitled to ‘inherit’ or bear them” (Jara, 2016, p. 16).

Another major contribution was the work of Pierre Nora, with his concept of *Lieux de Mémoire* (Places of Memory), focused on the effects of materiality in the construction of social memory, in which he provided a criticism of what he called the “acceleration of History” (1989, p. 7). For Nora, the “history, which is how our hopelessly forgetful modern societies, propelled by change, organize the past”, is at odds with “real memory, social and unviolated” (1989, p. 8). Tadhg O’Keeffe described Nora’s work as “fundamentally political: becoming a rallying point for a reinvigorated national cultural consciousness” (O’Keeffe, 2007, p. 7). Pierre Nora’s interest in these places of memory was meant as a criticism of the institutionalization of memory, what his proponents describe as “no longer a lived-through memory, but a consciously archived one” (Zombory, 2012, p. 59). For Nora, the practices of institutionalized memory necessarily repressed the natural plurality of voices and, as such, the study of these places of memory should be directed at uncovering the non-material layers of meaning attached to these places. As the author himself put it:

Our interest in *lieux de mémoire*, where memory crystallizes and secretes itself, has occurred at a particular historical moment, a turning point where consciousness of a break with the past is bound up with the sense that memory has been torn – but torn in such a way as to pose the problem of the embodiment of

memory in certain sites where a sense of historical continuity persists. There are *lieux de mémoire*, sites of memory, because there are no longer *milieux de mémoire*, real environments of memory (1989, p. 8).

Nora's contributions came during a time of turmoil in European Identity, seeing that the iron curtain was opening up and the shift towards greater integration of European countries was already on its way. As Amy Sodaro puts it, this signalled a "breakdown in hegemonic collective memories in the late twentieth century and a move toward inclusive, discursive, regretful memory" (2018, p. 60). This regretful aspect is particularly poignant in the study of collective memory in contemporary societies. In his book *Sins of the Fathers*, Jeffrey Olick observed that: "where earlier we celebrated our collective pasts and looked to them for models, today we appear to regret much of our remembered past, displaying an ever-growing willingness, even eagerness, to apologize and disavow" (2016, p. 19). Describing German remembrance in particular, he added that "ours is a guilty age, pervaded by a sense that we have much to atone for" (2016, p. 19).

These insights also meant a shift towards the approximation between the study of memory and the study of heritage. These last two concepts are distinguished by Sharon MacDonald the following way: "where 'memory' entices social researchers into analogies with individual memory and the language of psychology and also prompts questions about the veracity and transmission, 'heritage' directs attention to materiality, durability over time and value" (2013, p. 17). Moreover, "heritage represents some kind of security, a point of reference, a refuge perhaps, something visible and tangible which seems stable and unchanging" (Urry, 1990, p. 97). However, this distinction was blurred with the "beyond expertise" ethos of Pierre Nora and his proponents. That is, the questioning of the exclusivity of management and interpretation held by experts in the study of the past, in favor of including alternative meanings regarding memory and heritage.

The classical conception of heritage is embodied in the UNESCO classification of "cultural heritage" in the Paris convention of 1972. Cecilia Salvatore and John Lizama noted how, early on, "UNESCO [took on] a special role in protecting land, landscape, architectural sites, monuments, and geological formations" (2018, p. 5). As such, its classification mirrors this expertise-based conception of heritage:

- 1) Monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- 2) Groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- 3) Sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view. (UNESCO, 1972, p. Article 2)

The word “heritage” itself carries with it meanings of inheritance, of a kind of property that is passed down from generation to generation, and, as such, the question of ownership was just one of the many problems the classical conception ran into. Authors such as Amanda Kearney have noted that not only is it an “Eurocentric understandings of property, heritage and ownership”, but also it inevitably leads to a reduction of culture to “an inventory of objects” that “marginalizes its most important features” (2009, p. 213). Moreover, authors such as Rhiannon Mason (2006) observed that the concept itself carries different connotations within different societies. He noted that “in French, the word *patrimoine* means something more personal than the English heritage, while in German, *Erbe* connotes a meaning more patriotic than the Italian *iàscito*” (Mason, 2006, p. 202). Others such as David Lowenthal, in his critique of the “heritage industry”, equally noted how “heritage in Britain is said to reflect nostalgia for imperial self-esteem and other bygone benisons, in America to requite economic and social angst and lost community, in France to redress wartime disgrace, in Australia to replace the curse of recency to forge indigenous pride” (1998, p. 4).

However, authors such as Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett and Laurajane Smith put into question the very material foundation of heritage, which blurred the lines between the study of memory, the study of culture and the study of heritage. In Laurajane Smith’s book *Uses of Heritage*, she describes her field work with Aboriginal women from the Waanyi community in Queensland, Australia, and seizes the opportunity to characterize the insight that summarizes the non-material foundation of heritage:

Listening to the senior women telling stories to younger women about the place we were in, or events that were associated with that place, I thought of the stories that members of my own family had told me, and that I would now pass on to my own children. I realized, too, that the meanings I drew out of those stories, and the uses I had made of them, would of course be different to the meanings, and uses, the generations both before and after me had and would construct. These family stories, shared memories, could sometimes be attached to material objects or family heirlooms, and while these “things” were useful for making those stories tangible – they were not in and of themselves “heritage” (2006, p. 1).

This immateriality approach to heritage was imbued in Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s definition of heritage, as “a mode of cultural production in the present that has recourse to the past” (1998, p. 7). The materiality approach, Smith argued, “means that ‘heritage’ can be mapped, studied, managed, preserved and/or conserved, and its protection may be the subject of national legislation and international agreements, conventions and charters” (2006, p. 3) As such, the argument against this approach was founded on the insight that it was predicated not on the meanings of heritage itself, but on institutionalized practices, like “management and conservation protocols, techniques and procedures that heritage managers, archaeologists, architects, museum curators and other experts undertake” (Smith L. , 2006, p. 13). And so, Nora’s insights and call of democratization of memory found their way into the study of heritage, where the meanings and memory works attached to places began to be prioritized.

In response to a growing body of academic work on the immateriality of heritage, UNESCO held the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in Paris in 2003. The convention defined intangible cultural heritage as:

The practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with

a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. (UNESCO, 2018, p. Article 2)

One of the major shifts in this definition is the recognition of the role that communities and individuals play in the creation of heritage, as they are the ones who, according to the definition, “recognize [it] as part of their cultural heritage”. As Máté Zombory observed, this meant that “legitimate access to the ‘real past’ is less and less the exclusive realm of experts” (2012, p. 64). This does not mean, however, the complete withdrawal of the materiality component of heritage conceptions, as it is still a major part of the definitions and practices of safeguarding and consuming heritage. Even so, a large body of authors claim that all heritage is intangible since, as Dawson Munjeri observed “the tangible can only be understood and interpreted through the intangible” (Munjeri, 2004, p. 13) That is, the tangible objects of heritage are only considered as such because of the intangible meanings that are placed on them. Moreover, there is a growing understanding that “heritage is not simply an inert ‘something’ to be looked at, passively experienced or a point of entertainment; rather, it is always bringing the past into the present through historical contingency and strategic appropriations, deployments, redeployments, and creation of connections and reconnections” (Waterton, Watson, & Silverman, 2017, p. 4).

It is precisely this non-passivity side of heritage that has been the subject of a large body of academic debate. In her analysis of the displaying of Jewish cosmopolitan identity in museums, Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett observed that the production of heritage is indistinguishable from its presentation strategies:

Both heritage and tourism deal in the intangible, absent, inaccessible, fragmentary and dislocated. These are features of the life world itself, which is one reason for the appeal and impossibility of the wholeness promised by the various worlds and lands of exhibitions, whether in museums or theme parks. Museums hope that re-creations are not just clever simulations of somethings somewhere else. Not just surrogates for travel to inaccessible places. They must reveal something about the nature of what is shown that a visitor would not be able to discover at the site itself. They must show more than can otherwise be seen – the people and events and places of years ago. They animate a phantom landscape on the back of the one towards which attention is directed (1998, p. 167).

For Kirshenblatt-Gimblett “exhibitions are fundamentally theatrical, for they are how museums perform the knowledge they create” (1998, p. 3). As Steve Hoelscher put it, museums “are not passive containers, but are active vehicles in producing, sharing, and giving meaning to popular understandings of the past” (2006, p. 203). The adoption of this perspective of heritage display as theatrics is what Rhiannon Mason called “textual approach” in museum studies. Drawing from authors such as Mieke Bal, Mason states that “in museums, the textual approach can involve analysis of the spatial narratives set up by the relationship of one gallery or object to another, or it might consider the narrative strategies and voices implicit in labelling, lighting, or sound” (2006, p. 26). This perspective is informed by the premise that heritage, at its core, is discourse, that is, “language in real context of use” (Machin & Mayr, 2012, p. 20). This perspective draws heavily from authors such as Michel Foucault, who postulated that social life “conceptually mediated” (2016, p. 88), meaning that social reality is created and reproduced through language. As Smith noted, however, “the idea of discourse does not simply refer to the use of words or language, but rather the idea of discourse [as] a form of social practice. Social meanings, forms of knowledge and expertise, power relations and ideologies [that] are embedded and reproduced via language” (2006, p. 4). She added “the discourses through which we frame certain concepts, issues or debates have an effect in so far as they constitute, construct, mediate and regulate understanding and debate” (2006, p. 4). Discourses not only organize the way concepts like heritage are understood, but also serve to maintain ideologies, defining “experience and performance and, by empowering action or inaction, naturalise social relations” (Jaworski & Pritchard, 2005, p. 2).

Slavoj Žižek described ideology as a conceptual “matrix that regulates the relationship between visible and non-visible, between imaginable and non-imaginable [sic], as well as the changes in this relationship” (1994, p. 1). More than worldview or “an action-orientated set of beliefs,” ideology is an “indispensable medium in which individuals live out their relations to a social structure” (Žižek, 1994, p. 3). Furthermore, Louis Althusser claimed that ideologies have a material existence, as they are found in the actions and practices of individuals (2014, p. 271). He added that ideologies are “realized in institutions, in their rituals and their practices” (2014, p. 271). Museums serve as particularly powerful instruments of ideological apparatuses, because, as Kevin Coffee described it, “like Dorothy and friends arriving in the Palace of Oz, museum visitors are not supposed to notice what

stands behind the curtain⁵” (2006, p. 436). Their narratives are “generally viewed as definitive and authoritative, while the objects displayed are presented as emblematic of normative culture” (Coffee, 2006, p. 435). Within tourism studies, authors such as Jonathan Culler (1981), in his groundwork article *The Semiotics of Tourism*, analysed how the encounter with objects of display creates or maintains these ideological/discursive apparatuses. Culler summarized his argument in his now iconic sentence: “all over the world the unsung armies of semiotics, the tourists, are fanning out in search of signs” (1981, p. 128). The author borrowed concepts from authors such as Jean Baudrillard, particularly his “idealistic lexicon of signs” (Baudrillard, 1996, p. 203), to argue that objects of display (and the encounter with them) should be understood through “signification rather than needs or use-value” (Culler, 1981, p. 129). A sign, according to Ferdinand de Saussure, is the most fundamental building block of language, representing at the same time a concept in reality and a sound in speech (1959, p. 67). The sign “establishes the bond between the signifier and the signified” (Saussure, 1959, p. 66). Whilst Saussure’s theory of signification was a development in the field of linguistics, his insights have been applied more broadly, such as in semiotics and studies on the construction of meaning in general. As Umberto Eco remarked, “it would seem that a theory of codes merely has to consider the sign-function in itself, for its combination within a context is a matter of sign production. But sign production is permitted by rules previously established by a code, for a code is usually conceived not only as a correlational rule but also as a set of combinational ones” (1976, p. 90). It is by making use of these socially codified sets of signs that individuals and institutions create and reproduce the social world. To exemplify this socially constructed aspect of signification, Culler questioned: “Why is it almost impossible to gaze directly at the Grand Canyon and see it for what it is? It’s almost impossible because the Grand Canyon, the thing as it is, has been appropriated by a symbolic complex which has already been formed in the sightseer’s mind” (1981, p. 135). As such, in museums, as well as in all presentation and interpretation of heritage in tourism (Figueira & Coelho, 2017, p. 38), rely on this relationship of signification to create their “virtual totality”, which coalesces into a “more or less coherent discourse” (Baudrillard, 1996, p. 200). As Kirshenblatt-Gimblett puts it, “[displayed] objects are the actors and knowledge animates them” (1998, p. 3). Adding to this, Rhiannon Mason,

⁵ The author is making an analogy to the 1939 film *The Wizard of Oz* by Victor Fleming. In the Movie, the protagonist Dorothy and other characters embark on a journey to find the powerful Wizard of Oz, which is eventually revealed to be just an elaborate illusion controlled by a man controlling a machine behind a curtain.

drawing from the work of Jacques Derrida, affirmed that, in the case of discourses about the past, the fixing of meaning by the signifying relationship is “but a temporary retrospective fixing” (2006, p. 21). That is, the meanings created in the present are not necessarily the same as the meanings perceived at the time in which the remembered events occurred. Discourse and, more broadly, ideology are the medium in which this “temporary fixing of meaning” occurs in social life (Mason, 2006, p. 21).

However, Žižek also problematized that “when some procedure is denounced as 'ideological par excellence', one can be sure that its inversion is no less ideological” (1994, pp. 3-4). The author pointed out how “there is no neutral descriptive content”, every description “is already a moment of some argumentative scheme” predicated on “naturalized argumentative gestures” (Žižek, 1994, p. 11). Likewise, Culler affirmed that the study of signification cannot “rely on the naive postulate of an escape from semiosis”, as that would mean “to cut oneself off from the possibility of exploring semiotic mechanisms which [are] central to any culture or social order” (1981, p. 140). After all, language is, as Laurajane Smith described, a tool (2006, p. 15), but as Mason pointed out, a “Gramscian focus on the museum as purely an ‘instrument of ruling-class hegemony’ leads to the idealistic notion that the museum could be simply turned on its head as a counter-hegemonic tool” (2006, p. 25). In reality, the complexity of the exhibition creation process means the impossibility of an ideologically neutral and unproblematized museum (or, as a matter of fact, any tourism product). This impossibility becomes particularly evident when considering the contributions of the study of dissonance within heritage and memory literature. Dissonance can be defined as a “condition that refers to the discordance or lack of agreement and consistency as to the meaning of heritage (Ashworth, Graham, & Tunbridge, 2007, p. 37). Authors such as Gregory Ashworth and John Tunbridge (1996) argued that all heritage is, in some form, dissonant and, as such, cannot be understood outside the confines of ideology, conflict, power struggles and politics of recognition. This is especially true in heritage related to violence, such as memorial museums, where the perspective “concerned with protecting the great and beautiful creations of the past” is substituted for the “destructive and cruel side of history” (Logan & Reeves, 2009, p. 2).

A dark past

The study of dissonance in heritage and tourism is related to a key insight: the tools to analyse the phenomenon of visitation of a site such as Mount Rushmore, for example, do not fully translate to the analysis of the experience at a site such as Auschwitz concentration camp. This is because, unlike Mount Rushmore, Auschwitz is associated with what Jeffrey Alexander an “ontological evil” (2002, p. 11). That is, the set of meanings generally attached to holocaust sites cannot be understood through the same prism as other cultural heritage. Moreover, as Ashworth and Tunbridge observed, even if all heritage is prone to be contested, “atrocious heritage is particularly prone to many types of dissonance” (1996, p. 21). According to Richard Sharpley, “dissonant heritage is concerned with the way in which the past, when interpreted or represented as a tourist attraction, may, for particular groups or stakeholders, be distorted, displaced or disinherited” (2009, p. 12). The visitation phenomenon of these sites has been named as, among other possibilities, thanatourism, deriving from the Greek *thanatos*, “death” (Tanas, 2013, p. 275), or, more recently and more widely accepted, as dark tourism. The term itself comprises a wide range of phenomena, united by their representation of the “legacy of painful periods” (Stone, 2006, p. 145). These range from “massacre and genocide sites, places related to prisoners of war, civil and political prisons” to “places of ‘benevolent’ internment such as leper colonies and lunatic asylums” (Logan & Reeves, 2009, p. 1). Moreover, as Carrabine pointed out, “in the context of atrocity tourism it is ultimately place, rather than objects or images, that gives form to our memories and provides the coordinates for the imaginative reconstruction” (2017, p. 20). This is what Tony Seaton, based on the concept of *genius loci*, spirit of place, described as the “auratic qualities” of the site (2009, p. 525), that is, the association of the place itself with tragedy.

As Sharpley pointed out, “whether dark tourism is tourist-demand or attraction-supply driven” it is closely tied with “the manifestation of what has been referred to as a postmodern propensity for ‘mourning sickness’ ” (2009, p. 6). Likewise, Eamonn Carrabine noted that “the focus on extreme histories is bound up with a contemporary culture fascinated with memory and gripped by a fear of forgetting in the face of so many fleeting images encountered on screen and the very immateriality of communications” (2017, p. 14). That is why so much of this phenomenon is associated with memorial sites. The ideological

apparatus of memorial grounds is premised on the ethos of “never again” (Sodaro, 2018, p. 3), being built on the invocation of “sombre reflection, grief, sorrow, shock and horror” (Carrabine, 2017, p. 14). As Amy Sodaro puts it, memorial heritage, and memorial museums in particular, “are frequently used as central mechanisms for addressing past injustices and legitimating nations or groups in the eyes of the international community—by recognizing past victimization and demonstrating a new regime’s willingness to learn from history” (2018, p. 4). The author defines memorial museum as those institutions that focus on “past violence, atrocity, and human rights abuses, [reflecting] a demand today that those darkest days in human history [should] not only [be] preserved but musealized and interpreted in a way that is widely accessible to present and future audiences” (Sodaro, 2018, p. 3). As such, an important aspect of this heritage is to function as an invoker of social responsibility (Wight, 2009, p. 143), since it operates “as a reminder of the experience of others and the importance of ongoing vigilance” (Frew & White, 2013, p. 4).

However, as mentioned before, atrocity heritage is particularly prone to dissonance (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 1996, p. 21). As such, it tends to be contested by groups with different “ideal and material interests” (Alexander, 2012, p. 16) or that are situated in different places in the social structure. Logan and Reeves observed that contestation may arise from “what aspects of the past are being ignored or poorly represented in the interpretation of the heritage sites” (2009, p. 1) or from “the question of at what point memories can be allowed to fade and memorialisation end” (2009, p. 4). Others argue that the source of dissonance comes not from specific case-based questions, but rather from the broader forms of addressing heritage. Laurajane Smith argued that dissonance stems from what she called the “Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD)”, that is, the aforementioned institutionalized constructs that excludes alternative voices (2006, p. 6). As Višnja Kisić pointed out, “the very process of selection and interpretation envisaged through AHD” tends to create “a singular meaning of a particular heritage, while dissonance coming from diverging meanings is ignored and neutralized, leading to a single understanding of the past and identity of a particular community” (2013, p. 34). Moreover, authors such as Kelsey Wrightson tie dissonant heritage to the politics of recognition, that is, the need by groups or individuals to have their experiences acknowledged by society at large (2017, p. 37). Likewise, Jacques Rancière described the act of being recognized as the foundational political act, what he called the “distribution of the sensible” (2004, p. 13), and, as such, is

directly tied with the struggles between groups for the acquisition of symbolic capital. On the latter, Pierre Bourdieu described symbolic capital as a set of socially constructed symbols “governed by the logic of knowledge and acknowledgement” (1986, p. 257) which can be acquired by individuals or groups to signal belonging and acceptance.

Beyond inquiries on the general source of dissonance, authors such as Jeffrey Alexander (2012) focus their research on the challenges of conveying past suffering to those who have not experienced it. According to Sodaro, memorial museums “emerged in response to the violence and atrocities of the twentieth century and are intended to translate the suffering of the past into ethical commitments” (2018, p. 4). But these institutions are meant as more than a *damnatio memoriae*, more than a strategy for “attacking the memory of a dead public enemy” (Hedrick & Jr., 2000, p. 89). They are meant as instruments to “work through ... the long shadow that violence casts, the trans-generational aftermath of trauma” (Wajnryb, 2001, p. 55). As Regina Feldman observes, alongside their political and ideological functions, memorial museums “allow actors to recover their full capacities for agency” (2000, p. 559). Even so, the complexities of trauma pose complex challenges for these institutions. Jeffrey Alexander proposed the analysis of the legacy of violence through the lenses of “cultural trauma” (2002, p. 32), that is, the transposition of subjective experience of violence and its long-term effects into the set of symbols and representational strategies of society at large. According to the author, “cultural trauma occurs when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways” (2012, p. 6). He added that trauma occurs “when the environment of an individual or a collectivity suddenly shifts in an unforeseen and unwelcome manner” (2012, p. 7). Likewise, Duncan Bell described trauma as occurring when the violence of an event or period disrupts the generalized self-understanding, “when there is a break, a displacement, or disorganization in the orderly, taken-for-granted universe” (2006, p. 9). As Ruth Wajnryb (2001) observed, the source of tension in the representation of “cultural trauma” is in the impossibility for full reflexivity. That is, the impossibility of language to completely reflect subjective experiences of violence, leaving only the possibility for “fragments rather than full constructions” (Wajnryb, 2001, p. 34). To exemplify this, Jane Kilby (2007) picked up on Alice Miller’s reading of the painting *Guernica* (1937) by Pablo Picasso. As Kilby pointed out, “the

impression [of] a struggle between what Picasso must do and what he is able to do” (2007, p. 71) summarizes the gap between the experience of violence, in this case the violence of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), and the limits of language. That is, as Miller’s interpretation goes, the tools that Picasso has to attempt at expressing the brutality of war are not enough for the representation to encompass the totality of the lived experience. In that sense, the reality of trauma is met with the impossibility to be fully expressed. As Tiago Silva described, language “is a vernacular of the act of terror, a vernacular full of gaps, vacuums, paradoxes and grey areas of meaning” (2012, p. 87). According to the author, “extreme suffering, terror, hipper-individualizes the victim, throwing them to a level of experience where the role of culture is severely mitigated and where language loses transmission efficacy” (own translation from Portuguese, Silva, 2012, p. 86).

Therefore, the study of cultural trauma often leads to the study of silence, of that which cannot be said. The “blasphemous”, as Mark Bracher puts it, “derives from the recognition that the symbolic has failed to incorporate all of the real” (1994, p. 11). As Wajnryb described, to reduce the gap between experience and language, representations need to “rely on amounts of common understanding which can, and usually do, remain tacit” (Wajnryb, 2001, p. 34). Thus, memorial museums need to rely on “suggestive and symbolic” depictions, “rather than realistic” (Sodaro, 2018, p. 77). These depictions are predicated on recognizable iconography and pre-existing discourses, which serve as proxies for the subjective experience of violence. Steffen de Jong described this through the concept of *zeitzeuge*, literally “time witness”, in which the “witnesses of the past”, those with lived experience of past events, have their trauma represented not through descriptive language, but through common symbols, discursive frames and icons that can be recognized by those who are only “witnesses of history” (2018, p. 31). An example of this is the recurring use of metal shackles in American slavery exhibitions, which serve as recognizable signifiers for the oppression of African-Americans, proxies that suffice not because of their role in the events, but because of their sign-value, their place within the cultural iconography of slavery (Brooms, 2012, p. 513).

It is through these symbolic codes that, in memorial museums, “all ‘facts’ about trauma are mediated, emotionally, cognitively, and morally” (Alexander, 2002, p. 10). However, as previously mentioned, museums are not neutral repositories of “facts”, but exhibitions that are ideologically driven. As Kevin Coffee mentioned “museums do not

episodically express their ideology; they exist as collections and displays of visual ideologies” (2006, p. 436). More than being proxies that reduce the gap between trauma and language, the symbolic representations in museums are necessarily tools that shape values, ideology and discourse. Moreover, the role that memorial museums adopt as keepers of memory validates their claim as moral compasses to their host societies (Sodaro, 2018, p. 31). As Bell puts it, “forgetting is not simply [seen as] a violation of a duty to the dead, it also endangers the future” (2006, p. 25). As such, the discourses created or reproduced in memorial exhibitions weigh heavily in the shaping of the perspectives on the past. These institutions portray who society should see as victims or perpetrators, whom, if any, should be blamed for the tragedies of the past, what course of action should be taken to make amends for past atrocities and avoid repeating them in the future, and so on. Museums may portray a clear cut narrative of victimhood, which, as mentioned by Sodaro, may be “underpinned by the problematic notion that victimization equals virtue” (2018, p. 17). Contrarily, museums may entirely forego the victim portrayal and instead opt for a presentation “as historical agents who opposed [oppression] and making injustice seem like a dark past that has been entirely overcome by the democratic present” (Lehrer & Milton, 2011, p. 14). Likewise, museums may omit or put greater emphasis on certain aspects or events, as to better serve their narrative. However, as Mason noted, the curating and exhibiting choices should not be taken in absolute terms, as “clear-cut conscious manipulation by those involved in creating exhibitions” (2006, p. 28), even if they may be so. An absolutist approach, the author argues, ignores the “often competing agendas involved in exhibition-making, the ‘messiness’ of the process itself, and interpretative agency of visitors” (2006, p. 28), which are by no means passive agents. On this last point, Fairclough also pointed out the impossibility to read the integrity of ideological aspects in a text (in this case a museum exhibition). According to the author, this is because “meanings are produced through interpretations of texts and texts are open to diverse interpretations” (1995, p. 71). Even accounting for these nuances, curating and design choices in memorial museums have been the subject of much debate around memorial sites, museums and exhibitions, both for their function as moral agents and for their political uses. Besides, as Anthony Shelton noted, even the unconscious or less thought out choices in exhibitions can reveal perspectives and attitudes towards the past when read in the context of their host societies (2006, p. 78).

Chapter III – Aljube Museum of Resistance and Freedom

In his 2005 book *Portugal, Hoje: o Medo de Existir* [Portugal, today: the fear of existing], the Portuguese philosopher José Gil stated that:

The 25th of April refused to inscribe the Salazarist authoritarianism onto the real. Just like that, the colonial war, the vexations, the crimes, the culture of fear and the mediocre smallness that Salazarism engineered, it was obliterated from consciousness and life. But one cannot build a ‘blank’, one cannot eliminate the real and the forces that produce it, without reappearing here and there the same or other stigmas that testify for what one wanted to erase and insists it lingering (own translation from Portuguese, 2017, p. 16).

The question of what to do with the legacy of nearly 50 years of dictatorship and the lingering effects of its repressive forces remains a divisive topic in Portuguese society. The perception of whether or not Portugal moved on from its authoritarian past has been heavily tied with the perceived “maturity of its democratic institutions” (own translation from Portuguese, Teixeira, 2012, p. 24). At the time of the first edition of José Gil’s book, Portugal still had no memorial museum dedicated to discussing the period of the Estado Novo (New State). The right-wing, conservative and authoritarian regime, vaguely inspired by Italian fascism, ruled Portugal, first as a military dictatorship from 1926 to 1933 and then as a bureaucratic autocracy until the 25th of April, 1974 (Raimundo, 2018, p. 22). It held onto power through a one-party corporative apparatus and the systemic repression of dissidence. The Aljube Museum of Resistance and Freedom was inaugurated 10 years Gil’s book, on the 25th of April 2015 in the old facilities of the extinct Aljube prison. According to the stated mission on its website, it was created to “fill a gap in the Portuguese museological fabric, by projecting the appreciation of this memory onto the construction of a responsible citizenship, and by taking on the struggle against the exonerating and, so often, complicit amnesia of the dictatorship that we faced between 1926 and 1974” (n.d., p. 2)

The foundations for the Estado Novo regime were created following the revolution of 28th of May 1926, which put an end to the politically unstable first Portuguese republic (1910-1926) (Mattoso, 1994, p. 155). The military dictatorship that followed drew from the wave that rejected political liberalism and democratic ideals that swept through Europe in

the Interwar period. António de Oliveira Salazar (1889-1970), the Coimbra University Professor, first appeared on the political scene as the minister of Finances in 1928 and then as the President of the Council of Ministers, the *de facto* ruler of the country, from 1933 (following the approval of new constitution) until 1968 (Madureira, 2000, p. 21). Salazarism, his blend of catholic conservatism and Mussolini style nationalist corporativism, was embodied in the single-party-like political organization National Union (União Nacional), which he controlled (Léonard, 1998, pp. 76-77). As Yves Léonard described, “Salazarist thought was inscribed in the counter-revolutionary traditions and could be summarized in five values: God, homeland, authority, family and labour” (own translation from Portuguese, 1998, p. 61). According to José Rebelo, Salazar intended to create (or, in his rhetoric, recreate) “a society absent from disputes, without surprises, without startles, perfectly orderly, in perfect routine and perfectly homogenised” (own translation from Portuguese, 1998, p. 138). To achieve this, Salazar counted both in his cultural “policies of the spirit,” headed by António Ferro (1895-1956), which were meant as the “moral safeguard of the nation” (Pimentel, 2000, p. 15), and just as much in his use of authority to prevent and quell resistance.

According to Fernando Rosas and Brandão de Brito, the repressive apparatus was characterized by “state surveillance, coercion practices and torture (own translation from Portuguese, 1996, p. 748). They added “the political police functioned as the most primary instrument of repression ... discouraging deviations from ‘order,’ instigating fear and inviting resignation. In this sense, the political police acted in the perspective of prevention-dissuasion and punishment-repression, with the latter – and harshest - being the safeguard of the regime” (own translation from Portuguese, 1996, p. 749). Under the “legitimate defence of the nation” (Pimentel, 2019, p. 69), as Salazar called it, the political police was created, first as the PVDE (1933-1945), Vigilance and State Defence Police, which would later be transformed into the International State Defence Police (PIDE) in 1945 and eventually the General-Office of Security (DGS) in 1969 (Rosas & Brandão de Brito, 1996, p. 747). Their first major target was the republican opposition, which then shifted towards the Communist Party (PCP) and other left-wing movements, called by Salazar “the great heresy of our age” (Pimentel, 2007, p. 133). The height of persecutions came in 1949, within the context of the cold war and the regime’s need to legitimate itself in the post-war international order. Movements such as the MUD (democratic unity movement) and progressive sectors within

the catholic church were also targets of persecution, especially during later periods (Pimentel, 2007, p. 147). It is estimated that the regime saw over 30 000 political imprisonments (Raimundo, 2018, p. 23) but, unlike other repressive regimes, its terror effectiveness came not from massive displays of power or mass executions, but from its systemic grip on society. As Irene Pimentel pointed out, the regime relied on an extensive network of informers, very often coerced into that position, that both provided a steady source of information on civil society and kept dissidence at bay through the fear that it instilled in its citizens (2007, p. 308).

The regime's grip to power started weakening after the economic stagnation in the 1950's and the opposition that came from within the National Union, such as the election 1958 campaign of Humberto Delgado (1905-1965), which he lost due to election fraud (SOURCE). Moreover, international pressure was mounting up as Portugal became more isolated for holding on to its colonies, then called "extra-marine provinces". As Aniceto Afonso and Carlos Gomes put it "the Portuguese colonial question devolved into an open conflict with the freedom movements that formed in the main colonies", starting in Angola in 1961 (2014, p. 54). This, they add, "became an exhaustion factor for the colonial policies and transformed into the clearest factor for the overthrowing of the regime by the Portuguese military group" (own translation from Portuguese, 2014, p. 54). Despite the promises of change after Marcelo Caetano (1906-1980) came into power in 1968, the Colonial war raged on, with overall "nearly one million Portuguese conscripted servicemen" (Campos, 2017, p. 2). The "Marcelist Spring", as its proponents called it, "the program of 'opening up' and 'decompression' of the regime ... [was in fact] nothing but pure post-Salazarist continuities" (own translation from Portuguese, Rosas, 2014, p. 8). The regime came to an end with the military coup on the 25th of April 1974, with Marcelo Caetano being escorted outside the country and the political prisoners being released on the 27th of that month. The year following the coup was characterized by the political struggles between political factions with different ambitions for the transition from the dictatorship and for the new political system that was to be implemented. The field was dominated by the struggles between the Socialist Party, headed by Mário Soares (1924-2017), and the Communist Party, headed by Álvaro Cunhal (1913-2005), especially during the so called "hot summer of 1975" (Rezola, 2014, p. 14). The victory of the Socialist Party in 1975 and the passing of the new constitution in 1976 marked a transition for a system more akin to European social

democracy, even if it retained some of the socialist undertones in the new constitution (Miranda, 2014, p. 82).

The period that followed the revolution and later the approval of the new constitution of 1976 was marked by an intense renegotiation of meanings, both about the dictatorship that preceded the new democratic regime and towards the set of narratives that had been dogmatized by the Estado Novo. As Filipa Raimundo detailed, “Portuguese democracy started to rewrite its relation to the Estado Novo shortly after the 25th of April. Several symbolic and museological actions allowed democracy to legitimate itself, by opposition and by rejection of the previous regime, even if it wasn’t as profound as the revolutionary narrative supposed” (2018, p. 55). Despite the intensity of the memory negotiations that followed this period, as Raimundo added:

After the 70s, some years passed before the past would return to the [political] agenda. The decades of 80 and 90 had a relative apathy on this domain, something similar with what happened in Spain, where the period is usually described as one of silence and forgetting. Curiously, it was on the turn of the 21st century that both returned to the topics of the past, even if very distinctly: In Spain for the first time the pardon policies and the lack of criminalization of the responsible parties for the crimes committed during the Franquist period were put into question; in Portugal the weak historical memory of the Estado Novo was questioned (own translation from Portuguese, 2018, p. 68).

The Aljube museum the appeared in 2015 as a part of this resurgence of memory in recent years. But although it came as a milestone within the process of coming to terms with the authoritarian past, it was not the first museological portrayal of the period in Portuguese society. The museum itself was preceded by the temporary exhibition “Aljube: Voice of the Victims” in 2011, installed in the building itself. The exhibition was created as a partnership between the Mário Soares Foundation, the civil movement Não Apaguem a Memória [Do not Erase the Memory] and the Contemporary History Institute of the Nova University of Lisbon (FCSH) (Duarte, 2011). Before that, however, there had been some attempts to address the lack of “physical memory” (Oliveira, 2012, p. 51), even if limited, with institutions addressing particular topics within the period. The colonial war became one of the first topics to be exhibited, primarily by armed forces institutions and associations of ex-

combatants. An example of this was in 1980, in which the old Porto delegation of PIDE was converted into the Military museum of Porto, with a part of the exhibition being dedicated to the colonial war. Later, the Combatant museum was opened in 1993 in the Bom Sucesso Fort in Belém, Lisbon, with the exhibitions being curated by the League of Combatants. In the same location, the monument to the Combatant, designed by Adriano Moreira, was built in 1994, with the names of those who died during the conflict being inscribed on the marble walls. This, in itself, has led to some controversy, with debates over its interpretation, as honouring the dead or “nostalgia for the empire” (Peralta, 2014, p. 215). Likewise, in 1999, the Museum of the Colonial War was opened in Vila Nova de Famalicão, under the guidance of Association of the Crippled of the Armed Force and the support of the Municipality (Campos, 2017, p. 73). The project started as a collaborative pedagogical project between schools of Vila Nova de Famalicão, Barcelos and Braga in 1989/90, aiming to work with the war memories of ex-combatant’s families. However, as Ângela Campos pointed out, these depictions of the colonial war tend to focus “mainly on a military, factual, and pictorial perspective” (2017, p. 74). The revolution itself was also addressed in the MFA Command Post Museological Centre, inaugurated on the 25th of April 2001 in the facilities of the Engineering Regiment of the Portuguese Army in Pontinha, Lisbon. But just like the museological efforts on the Colonial War, it focused on recreating the setting of the centre of command that coordinated the revolution rather than becoming a space for discussion (Rodrigues, 2005, p. 110).

In other instances, museums recreated certain aspects of daily life in that time period, with examples such as the repurposing of out of use school buildings for museological installations. Examples of these can be the recreated school setting in the Alvaiázere Museum or the Souto Museum in Abrantes, among many others dotted throughout the interior. However, many of these are meant as invokers of memory and, possibly, nostalgia rather than spaces for revaluation. The closer that one of these institutions comes to being a space for discussion is the Salgueiro Maia School Museum in Coruche, opened in 2009. The recreated school setting was integrated with a discussion on the revolution and the bibliography of captain Salgueiro Maia, who commanded the occupation of the Commerce Square in Lisbon (CMCoruche, 2015). With the turn of the century, as Manuel Loff mentioned, there was a greater openness to discuss the legacy of the regime, which also meant a more intense “battle for memory” (2014, p. 10). With this “opening up”, museums

started to integrate the influences that the Estado Novo had on their display subjects. Examples of these can be the recognition of the use of Fado as a propaganda tool in the Fado Museum, initially inaugurated in 1998 (Parrado, 2016, p. 64) and in the Lisbon GNR Museum, inaugurated in 2014, with the open representation of the National Republican Guard's responsibility in the repressive apparatus of the regime.

Even so, the closest that Portugal ever got to having a museum dedicated to the repression apparatus before the Aljube Museum was the Peniche Municipal Museum. Initially inaugurated in 1984 in the Peniche Fort, the museum integrated an exhibition centre dedicated to the display of the imprisonment and resistance during the Estado Novo (Furtado, 2011, p. 69). Likewise, the Aljube Museum was a catalyst for the creation of new exhibition and museological projects regarding anti-fascist resistance. As an example, in Belém, Lisbon, the Discoveries Monument (Padrão dos Descobrimentos) organized exhibitions such as *Fora do Monumento - Memórias da exposição de 1940* [Outside the Monument – Memories of the 1940 exhibition] (Carvalho & Cameira, 2016), between June and October 2016, and *Contar Áfricas!* [Telling Africas!], between November 2018 and April 2019 (Carvalho & Cameira, 2018). Moreover, in the years following the inauguration of the Aljube museum, it was announced that the Peniche Fort would be transformed into the National Resistance and Freedom Museum, which opened in 2019, pulling 50 000 visitors in its first three months (Observador, 2019). This also led to the 2019 approved parliamentary proposal of a New Resistance Museum in Porto (Pimenta, 2019) and to the controversy surrounding the potential opening up of the museum in Santa Comba Dão.

The Aljube museum itself was installed in the historical Aljube prison in Lisbon. The archaeological excavations in 2004 and 2005 revealed that the building has existed in some form since the 1st century A.D. and its use as a prison complex dates back at least to the Islamic occupation of Lisbon (711-1147 A.D.) (Martins, 2015, p. 46). The name itself derives from the Arab *aljobbe*, meaning water well or cistern, which came to have a connotation closer to “dungeon” (Oliveira, 2012, p. 38). Until the second half of the 19th century, it was used as an ecclesiastical prison, being known as the “Cardinal’s Aljube”, with the name Aljube being attributed to other ecclesiastical prisons around the kingdom (Martins, 2015, p. 46). Its role as a political prison was only attributed after in the political consolidation of the regime in the 1930’s. It was in this prison that most of the political prisoners were held by the political police during the interrogation proceedings, due to its

proximity to the PIDE headquarters. It was also from these facilities that prisoners would be sent to other more long-term imprisonment facilities, such as the Peniche Fort, Caxias Prison or the Tarrafal concentration camp in the colony of Cape Verde (Pimentel, 2007, pp. 422-423). It was “shutdown in the summer of 1965, following national and international protests, including those of the International Amnesty, for the accusations of not ensuring the prisoner’s integrity, lack of heating, the horrible nourishment and the inexistent medical assistance” (Oliveira, 2012, p. 45). After its shutdown, the building was subjected to renovations from 1969 to 1970, but never recovering its central role in the repression apparatus. After the revolution of 1974, its function as a prison was ceased, being used by the Ministry of Justice for administrative purposes until It was ceded to the Municipality of Lisbon in 2009, with the purpose of converting it into a municipal museum (Oliveira, 2012, p. 47).

The building was renovated, and the interior adapted to host the exhibition. The facade kept the original exterior design of white walls surrounded by stone masonry which purposefully blends in with the other building of the historical centre of Lisbon. The permanent exhibition of the museum is divided in three floors, starting on the first floor and moving upwards. The exhibition is divided into sections, with the following order:

Sections of the Permanent exhibition in the Aljube Museum by floor		
Floor	Name of Room	Topics exhibited in the room
First Floor	Rise and Fall of Fascism	The regime of Salazar in the international and historical context
	Portugal 1890-1976	The historical context and events in Portugal which lead to the rise and fall of the regime
	"Unquestionable Certainties"	Ideological foundations of Salazarism
	Clandestine Press	The resistance movements by the opposition through the printing of press
	Clandestinity [sic]	Life as a member of the resistance
	Police and Political Courts	Political Police and the repressive apparatus
Second Floor	Resist	The several sectors of Portuguese society that were affected by the regime’s repressive policies
	Prison Circuit	The process from persecution until imprisonment
	Identification	Surveillance apparatus

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

	Interrogation and Torture	Practices of the political police to obtain information
	Prisons and Concentration Camps	The Prison complex of the regime and its organization
	Resisting in Jail	Life of the prisoners
	Isolation in the "Curros" (Bullpens)	Life of the prisoners
Third Floor	Colonialism anti-colonial struggle	Colonial war and, the independence movements and the opposition from within Portuguese society
	Those who stayed behind	Honouring the dead among the resistance
	Freedom April 25th, 1974	The day of the revolution
	Memory and Citizenship	Moral duty to remember as an act of citizenship

Table 1 - Sections of the permanent exhibition in the Aljube Museum, Adapted from the Aljube Museum Website (n.d.)

Silence and the Atmosphere of Fear

In her analysis of exhibition practices in memorial museums, Sodaro references how these institutions tend towards “suggestive and symbolic rather than realistic ... renderings of the past that rely on lighting, sound effects, and props in a way more reminiscent of stage scenery than museum displays” (2018, p. 77). This is especially true in museums that do not represent merely the events that took place in their respective spaces, but also aim at presenting the broader social reality of living under a dictatorial regime. As such, the design choices in the exhibitions of memorial museums are particularly informative for this analysis, since their elements often go beyond their architectural functionality and serve theatrical purposes (Crawley, 2012, p. 15). The use of space in the Aljube Museum is an example of this. Beyond its function as a storytelling device, the museum uses space and the visitor’s relation to it as a discursive tool. In particular, it uses space to engage with a specific discourse on the atmosphere of fear during the Estado Novo regime and the suffocating state of collective silence. “A homeland lost by silence and resignation”, as described by the Portuguese poet Sophia de Mello Breyner Andresen (1919 - 2004) in her 1962 poem *Exílio* [Exile] (as cited in Morais, 2005, p. 24). This ‘fear’ and ‘silence’ has been a staple of many descriptions of life under the Portuguese dictatorship, entering public memory discourse right after the revolution of 1974 but having been part of the resistance discourse long before that (Pimentel, 2007, p. 279). As observed by Paula Morais, “[t]he country lived dominated

by passivity and consent with the ideals of the state; it was incapacitated to act, mostly due to the fear of being against the positions predefined by politicians and incurring in some persecution” (own translation from the Portuguese, 2005, p. 22). In this discursive framework, silence is understood as a contextual absence that “relates to what it lacks” (Trigg, 2006, p. 12). Moreover, silence “becomes apparent through violently disjoining with the present context, [and by] becoming identifiable with a negation of the present, elevates itself to the absolute” (Trigg, 2006, p. 12). As such, this discourse refers to silence (and fear) as a state that dominated the very existence of those that lived under the regime, excluding the present from any possibility other than itself. The Aljube museum engages with this discourse by making it one of its central themes so that visitors may experience this type of atmosphere, even if briefly. This is achieved mostly through spatial design, namely the careful manipulation of the visitors’ movement through space and through the use of oversized replicas of objects which tall over the visitor. Moreover, the application of the darker colour palettes and dimmer lighting adds to the ambience.

The sense of space constriction is constant throughout the exhibition. The visitor engages in a physically prescribed forward motion through space in the likeness of a Dantian descent into hell. The windows on the staircase, up until the second floor, have retained their original thick iron bars. These were left unremoved by the architects that planned the intervention in the historical building and are clear signifiers of the past of the building as a prison. Moreover, the designers made use of the building’s location within the city, right next to Lisbon’s Cathedral. The visitor is clearly able to get a sense of proximity to the heart of the capital and to the Tagus river, but only through the square gaps in the iron bars. Much like the prisoners of the past, the visitor’s access to the exterior is out of reach. This was one of the aesthetic aspects highlighted by António Costa Pinto in his televised guided tour of the museum for the television show *Visita Guiada* [Guided Tour] (RTP, 2016). In it, he remarked how the visual access to the cathedral, limited by the iron bars, was meant to represent how the brutality of the repressive apparatus was hidden and yet in front of everyone. Moreover, it conveys the feeling of finding oneself arrested at the heart of the capital with freedom so close, yet so far away. This is why on the third floor the iron bars were removed, to signal the end of that which literally barred access to the outside. Furthermore, most of the first floor presents the dynamic between the resistance and the regime as a “cat-and-mouse game”. The regime’s ideology is displayed on the corridor of

“Unquestionable truths” through the representation of the iconic 1936 speech given by António de Oliveira Salazar during the commemorations of the 28th of May. Further down the narrow black corridor, hidden indentations on the wall reveal the presence of the Portuguese Resistance as an agent that functions in the shadows of this ideological order, in a section entitled “Clandestine Press”. From there, the path leads to “Clandestinity” and to the “Police and Political Courts” sections as the movement of the visitor through the exhibition circles around the perimeter of the floor as it slowly gets narrower. Other elements such as lighting and the sound of the videos that propagates through the corridors, further emphasise the feeling of being constricted. Likewise, the encounter with the oversized radio and the drawers/file cases that tower over the visitor have the same effect. These can be found closer to the end of the section “Police and Political Courts”. Lighting is also particularly potent, as its direction downward, beyond illuminating the path and the elements of display, creates the sensation of a lower ceiling and tighter space.

All these elements aim at portraying the regime as an ever-present agent of fear. The visitors’ experience of space is meant to be representative of the feeling of incarceration experienced by those who lived under the dictatorship. Other elements build on this usage of space to further frame the exhibition through this discourse. For instance, right before the beginning of the exhibition, on the stairway that leads up from the ground floor, the third inscription on the white walls by order of visit is the strophe from the 1957 poem *Queixa das almas jovens censuradas* [Complaint of the young censored souls] by the Portuguese poet, writer and journalist Natália Correia (1923-1993), which says: “They give us the cake which is the history | of our history without a plot | and no other word resounds | in our memory [other] than fear”⁶. Moreover, in the “Portugal 1890-1976” room, the text that describes the regime’s mass arrests campaign of opposition members, in 1946 and 1947, is titled “Wall of Silence” and the texts in the section “Resist” invoke Humberto Delgado’s phrase “Down with Fear”. But perhaps more than any other instance, the text on the stairways, on the way to the second floor, fully inscribes the discourse on the ever-presence of fear by quoting the Portuguese writer Mário de Carvalho (1944 - present):

Fear impregnated the whole social relationship. Fear of being arrested, fear of losing one’s job, fear of social ostracism, fear of persecution and isolation, fear of

⁶ From here onward, all quotations without a reference refer to the wall inscriptions

calumny, fear of falling into disfavour or of infringement. Fear of hierarchical superiors, fear of the police, fear of the bureaucrat, fear of one's neighbours. Fear engendered more fear. It was suffocating. For the majority. There were people who prospered and felt comfortable in the midst of other people's misfortune. There still are. And they are still the same.

Yet, although fear is portrayed as an aspect inherent to the discursive world of the museum, it is represented beyond its abstract atmosphere. Indeed, fear and violence are personified in the museum. This is not just a narrative choice to ground the visitors, rather it is also a discursive one that informs how the visitors should perceive different figures and agents of this time period. Salazar is heralded as the personification of the ideological force of the regime. In the first two rooms of the permanent exhibition, which serve as introduction to the rest, Salazar is the central figure in describing the historical period, in the "Portugal 1890-1976" room, Salazar is widely mentioned in the text sources available and appears in a large portion of the pictures and illustrations, far surpassing other politicians, including his successor Marcelo Caetano. The texts either quote from his speeches on the ideological foundations of the regime or mention his work, remarking how, for example, he "set himself up as an almost undisputed leader, at the start of 1933, after having been appointed by Óscar Carmona as head of the Government of the Dictatorship on the 5th of July 1932." However, Salazar only appears sparsely beyond the corridor of "Unquestionable Certainties". There, he is last portrayed with an action verb in one of the texts of this section, when he is mentioned as having "proclaimed" those "certainties". His appearances then on are mostly through his recontextualized words, as the museum illustrates the ideological foundations of the regime by quoting him. Salazar is still portrayed as the personification of ideological terror. The resistance is first introduced when his voice is still audible, appearing represented inside indentations on the black walls, as if hiding, on the corridor of "Unquestionable certainties" and the "Clandestine Press" section. They appear represented through video interviews of resistance members small screen hiding inside an indentation on the black wall and through the newspapers and printing devices displayed on another indentation. Moreover, the actions of PIDE/DGS are still set against the backdrop of his words. An example of this is in "Police and Political Courts", in which his speech on the "justified" beating of political prisoners frames the "necessity" for a Political Police. However, the major source of narrative tension is, from there onwards, placed on the relational dynamic

between the political police of the regime, PIDE/DGS, and the resistance. Although the actions of the police are framed by Salazar's words, the concrete acts of violence, the agency, are placed on the police whose members serve as narrative henchmen to the regime headed by Salazar. Right in the first section dedicated to the political police, PIDE/DGS is described as "tentacular", referring to its reach across the sectors of Portuguese society. By invoking the imagery of tentacles, it associates the police with a sense of sliminess and foreignness to the human body. Above all, it invokes a feeling of uneasiness and invasion. On the "Police and Political Courts" section, the references to the police's practices are presented as almost administrative-like, which reinforces how entrenched they were in society. Referring to surveillance, the text mentions how it "was a systemic practice of the political police" and how "this helped to feed the political records of those concerned and to reference other with whom they socialized, in the hope of getting information on subversive activities". This, together with the large reproductions of the aforementioned drawers and file cases that close in on the visitors, solidify the connection between the practices of PIDE/DGS and the atmosphere of fear they materialize. This cross between a Kafkaesque and an Orwellian invasion of space becomes particularly important when, in the exhibition, violence is materialized through the encounter with torture and interrogation practices on the second floor.

Still, although the museum clearly personifies violence and fear through Salazar (ideologically) and PIDE/DGE (procedurally and actionably), it is important to look at how these agents, especially the police, are characterized in the narrative beyond their antagonistic functions. A few historical figures connected to the police are mentioned or appear in photographs, particularly Captain Agostinho Lourenço, who commanded PIDE from 1933 to 1956 and was president of Interpol from 1956 to 1960. Despite this, these are just briefly mentioned, together with other references in passing to members of the political class. The police, in fact, is mostly portrayed as a highly functional machine of terror, more like an apparatus than a collection of human agents. In other words, the police force is dehumanized, as their individual motivations are not given any portrayal. This contrasts with the portrayal of the members of the resistance, of which there is an abundance of individual representations throughout the whole exhibition, be they video interviews, photos or testimonies. The sole instance in which policemen are individualized is in the 2004 short film by the Portuguese director José Barahona titled *Quem é Ricardo?* [Who is Ricardo?] on

display on the second floor. The film follows a prisoner, as he is arrested and tortured in order to retrieve information from the resistance. But even then, it is a work of fiction, even if it is meant as a realistic rendering of reality. Besides, the police agents are played by actors familiar to Portuguese audiences, such as João Didelet, Heitor Lourenço and Luís Mascarenhas (Barahona, 2004). Furthermore, in the reconstructed prison cells, at the end of the second floor, the guard's desk is empty, with only a motion activated telephone ring to receive the visitors and a few items on top of the table that would seem to belong to the absent guard, such as administrative paper (orders of internment) and an edition of the sports newspaper *A Bola*.

Another example of this omission is their portrayal of the “informers”, individuals who collaborated with the police by regularly providing information. The text on the “Police and Political Courts” section states that:

One of the pillars on which the political police based their actions was their network of informers or ‘bufos’ (squealers), as they were commonly known. This helped to foment the image of a tentacular police force, that would infiltrate all social and political circles and so obtain all kinds of information, then acting to penalise it. This was one of the main causes of the climate of fear and mistrust that reigned among the populace, and that could undermine social and even family relationships.

Just as with the police officers, the “Bufos” are mostly characterized as clogs of a very well-structured machine of fear and not human agents. The texts do not state the reasons as to why one would provide information on their peers to the police or why one would join the ranks of PIDE/DGS.

Possibly because of the recency of the museum, so far this question has not been raised by published critics or commentators. Yet, it is possible to argue that one of the reasons as to why this choice to omit characterization of the agents of repression is that the museum itself is dedicated to the prisoners and not to the perpetrators of their suffering. After all, the museum is called “Aljube Museum – Resistance and Freedom”. The initial dedication text in the stairway clearly states that “thousands of men, victims of the dictatorship’s political police, entered this prison to be taken to the isolation pens, to the collective cells or to the infirmary. ... This museum honours their memory and their sacrifice”.. This choice can stem from a perceived increasing lack of generalized knowledge, amongst the

Portuguese population, regarding the repression apparatus during the dictatorship. An often-cited example of this is the television contest “Greatest Portuguese”, promoted by the Portuguese public service broadcasting (RTP) in 2007, in which the general public was asked to vote via telephone on who they considered to be the greatest Portuguese in history. Salazar was voted the most Hence this is why this is one of the examples cited by many for the moral imperative of bringing attention to the suffering and bravery of those who resisted. Miguel Cardina presents this as a symptom of a society which sees the dictator as “above all a more or less neutral symbol of a time that is often looked at with a nostalgic look” (own translation from Portuguese, 2013, p. 33).

Nevertheless, it impossible to argue that this discursive omission can in itself be a legacy of the regime’s paralysing grip. This idea follows the argument made by the philosopher José Gil: “[w]hat was Salazarism? ... A black hole that swallowed existence in public space” (own translation from Portuguese, 2017, p. 121). The author argues that the country never overcame the regime’s political demobilization and that the lack of truly democratic public space in Portugal, which he illustrates through an ever-present “fog”, is a direct result of this trauma. He adds:

But trauma was so subtle that it wasn’t even felt as such. In an unprecedented way, the cover of silence did not collapse abruptly over social life, [instead] it insinuated and impregnated itself, in such a way that when people felt change, they did not know when and how it had started. Like so, this ill that weighed down most Portuguese was disseminated. To them [the Portuguese], it didn’t come from the political regime, it came from the «nature», from the «character», from the «essence» of Portugueseness (just as fado [fate] in a certain nationalist opinion discourse). ... To turn against that ill was equivalent to turning against ourselves. ... Salazar was able to transform existence into trauma. To exist was to participate in that ill, the metaphysical disease that had invaded Portuguese life. (own translation from Portuguese, Gil, 2017, pp. 121-122)

The closest that the museum comes to acknowledging this lingering presence of the regime’s influence is in the final part of the previously mentioned quote of Mário de Carvalho: “There were people who prospered and felt comfortable in the midst of other people’s misfortune. There still are. And they are still the same”. This ‘cover of silence’ over

the perpetrators is not understood the same way as the silence (*pacto del silencio* or *El Olvido*) of amnesty in the Spanish *transición*, which has its own consequences on contemporary Spanish society (Sobels, 2015, p. 13). Instead, it is understood as a prolongation of the regime's policies of fear, which, arguably, became ingrained even in public discourse practices. On this Antonio Barreto stated that “what all [silences] have in common is the fear to set scores” and that Portuguese political discourse “by insecurity, never converted itself to public view” (1992, pp. 10-11). Moreover, Rui Bebião pointed out three reasons for this “wall of silence”: first the “political pragmatism, associated with the stabilization of a new order”; second, a “collective response to trauma”, a “metaphysical blame, a social sharing of responsibility for the violence exerted onto others and the will to exorcise it”; the “binominal history-memory” and the inability to “resolve it properly” (2014, p. 42).

Overall, the museum engages heavily and recreates the discourse on the atmosphere of fear and paralysing silence by making it one of its central themes. This is mostly done by tying it with the figure of Salazar and the political police (even if with different narrative roles). However, its lack of characterization of the perpetrators of violence beyond their functional role may be itself a reflection of the lingering trauma, the ‘wall of silence’, that affects Portuguese society.

‘Gentle customs’ and Antifascism

Close to the end of the “Police and Political Courts” section on the first floor, the museum presents its visitors with a stark contradiction. On the top left corner, bold white letters are placed against the black background, reading “Sweet Habits” [Brandos Costumes]. Authors like Sally Faulkner and Mariana Liz (2016) have, however, translated this expression as “gentle customs” expressing a closer meaning to the Portuguese original. For that reason, this is the terminology that will be adopted in this analysis. “Gentle customs” is a reference to a specific discourse on the alleged gentler nature of the Portuguese people, a repurposed version of the *Leyenda Negra*⁷ [Black legend] (Leetoy & Vázquez, 2018). It

⁷ The 15th century anti-Spanish idea propagated by Dutch and English writers in which the brutality of the colonial practices of the Spanish crown allegedly justified the morality of the overtaking of those territories by their economic competitors (Leetoy & Vázquez, 2018)

was initially promoted to describe a “tolerant Portuguese colonialist, Lusotropicalist⁸ and less prone to racism” (Cardina, 2013, p. 34), while simultaneously being used as a “Lusotropicalist apology for colonial aggression” (Faulkner & Liz, 2016, p. 7). In other words, the rhetoric of Portuguese gentleness justified the colonial endeavors and the brutality associated with them. It was also made a frequent talking point of the regime’s propaganda in relation to the countries’ European neighbours in the wake of WWII, as Portugal was presented as the kind bringer of civilized customs. This affirmation of “gentle customs” in the exhibition contrasts with a 1950 picture of the dead body of Militão Ribeiro, a communist leader arrested by PIDE. The picture is meant to shock the visitor, which is a mission accomplished since it is the first encounter with pictorial depictions of bodily violence. The picture depicts his dead body, seen from the side, lying down on a surface from the waist up. The body is in a clearly extreme state of malnutrition, as his ribcage, his cheekbones and his pelvis are visibly protruding, with some evidence of wounds scattered throughout.

The resort to contrast is a recurring practice in the Aljube museum. Discourses associated with the regime’s rhetoric or quotes from Salazar are recontextualized, often using irony, to delegitimize them and portray them as fraudulent. The text directly correlates these ideological positions with terror, stating that “the ‘sweet habits’ propagated by the fascist regime left a trail of victims that to this day are largely unknown”. These recontextualizations are established with the premise that these discourses, ideologically instilled by the regime, are, at best, still unconsciously present in Portuguese society (Raimundo, Santana-Pereira, & Pinto, 2016) and, at worse, reinforced as the result of revisionist attempts at whitewashing the history of the regime (Soutelo, 2013). Although the “gentle customs” discourse itself is only presented and addressed directly once in the museum, the delegitimization of the regime’s discourses all refer, in one way or another, to this specific discourse. In essence, the aim of the engagement with these discourses is to contradict any perception that the regime was not as cruel as other dictatorships (Raimundo, Santana-Pereira, & Pinto, 2016, 2), by relating the regime’s ideology with the repressive forces of its policies.

⁸ According to Valentim and Heleno “Luso-tropicalist assumptions include the idea of a special skill that Portuguese people have for harmonious relations with other peoples, their adaptability to the tropics and their inherent lack of prejudice. Linked with colonial ideologies, these ideas were broadly disseminated in Portuguese society after the Second World War, and they still shape social knowledge” Valentim & Heleno, 2018, p. 34)

One of the ways in which this is achieved is by portraying the regime through the lenses of antifascism (Albanese, 2016, p. 76). Multiple times throughout the exhibition the regime is called fascist, including in the text on “gentle customs”. By establishing a clear correlation between the ideologies of Nazi-fascism and the Portuguese regime, the museum is able to strip Salazarism from any claim of ideological virtue. The video in the “Rise and Fall of Fascism” section dictates the historical events as Salazar’s Portugal appears mentioned alongside Fascist Italy, Hirohito’s Japan and Nazi Germany in the video’s narration. In the “Portugal 1890-1976” room, it is mentioned how “Portugal collaborated, in its own way, in the international coalition that was set up in the 1930s to combat democracy and socialism”. In that same room, they quote Ramada Curto, a republican opponent of the regime, stating that:

With regard to the dictatorship’s directive, it is fascism, as everyone knows. A fascism without speeches, without parades, without theatre. A fascism of the office. There are no brown shirts or black shirts. The dictator does not need shirts to support him. He just needs the rifles and machine guns of the Army. That way he avoids the duplication of expenses

But, perhaps, the more poignant example is in the corridor of “Unquestionable certainties”. As mentioned before, the section represents the iconic 1936 speech of Salazar, in the commemorations of the revolution of the 28th of May. The speech was meant as a reiteration of the regime’s ideological motto “God, Homeland, Family”, the backbone of the conservative leanings of the regime. In it, Salazar stated that:

To the souls torn apart by the doubt and negativism of the century, we sought to restore the comfort of the great certainties. We do not discuss God and virtue. We do not discuss the Fatherland and its history. We do not discuss authority and its prestige. We do not discuss family and its morals. We do not discuss the glory of labour and its duty.

This section of the speech is repeated on loop on a small screen at the entrance to the corridor. The black walls are then covered in semi-regular triangular text boxes, each representing one of the five “certainties” mentioned in his speech. All of them are headed by a large *NÃO* [No], as a visual representation of the rhythm of the speech that repeats *Não discutimos* [We do not discuss]. In the context of the speech, the act of discussing is equated

with putting into question or rejecting. Two large pictures are placed in the start and in the end of the corridor. At the start, a 1939 picture of the audience in the commemorations of the Restoration of Independence in Lisbon, with the crowd performing the Roman salute. Right after the “certainties”, staring right back at the visitor, there is a 1943 picture of a mother and child running away from the national guard (GNR) during a workers’ strike. All of these, together, form a web of meaning that engages with the regime’s ideological foundation only to dismiss any claims to “gentle customs”. The large photo of the crowd plays an important role in discrediting the regime. The large audience performing the Roman salute in Lisbon invokes the image of the crowds that saluted Mussolini and Hitler, as this is one of the cultural symbols associated with “a variety of nationalist movements such as Nazism [and] Fascism” (Winkler, 2009, p. 192). By being placed directly before the illustration of the speech, it instils the associations into the speech itself. This is especially poignant considering that while listening to the echoing sound of the speech, the visitor first sees the large picture of the crowd before seeing the texts regarding the speech itself, giving the feeling that the speech comes from within the auditorium of the picture.

Although this association with fascism is heavily present in the museum, to this day this assumption is subject to scholarly debate. Many authors still debate whether the regime falls into accepted classifications, such as Gentile’s 10 point definition of *fascismo*⁹ (Payne,

⁹ Gentile defines *fascismo* as follows:

“1) a mass movement with multiclass membership in which prevail, among the leaders and militants, the middle sectors, in large part new to political activity, organized as a party militia, that bases its identity not on social hierarchy or class origin but on the sense of comradeship, believes itself invested with a mission of national regeneration, considers itself in a state of war against political adversaries and aims at conquering a monopoly of political power by using terror, parliamentary tactics, and deals with leading groups, to create a new regime that destroys parliamentary democracy;

“2) an ‘anti-ideological’ and pragmatic ideology that proclaims itself antimaterialist [sic], antiindividualist [sic], antiliberal, antidemocratic, anti-Marxist, is populist and anticapitalist [sic] in tendency, expresses itself aesthetically more than theoretically by means of a new political style and by myths, rites, and symbols as a lay religion designed to acculturate, socialize, and integrate the faith of the masses with the goal of creating a ‘new man’;

“3) a culture founded on mystical thought and the tragic and activist sense of life conceived as the manifestation of the will to power, on the myth of youth as artificer of history, and on the exaltation of the militarization of politics as the model of life and collective activity;

“4) a totalitarian conception of the primacy of politics, conceived as an integrating experience to carry out the fusion of the individual and the masses in the organic and mystical unity of the nation as an ethnic and moral community, adopting measures of discrimination and persecution against those considered to be outside this community either as enemies of the regime or members of races considered inferior or otherwise dangerous for the integrity of the nation;

“5) a civil ethic founded on total dedication to the national community, on discipline, virility, comradeship, and the warrior spirit;

“6) a single state party that has the task of providing for the armed defense of the regime, selecting its directing cadres, and organizing the masses within the state in a process of permanent mobilization of emotion and faith;

1995, pp. 5-6), with positions raging from some using the term as practical tool of characterization to others proclaiming that there was no true fascism beyond Italy (Lopes, 2017, p. 4). Salazar too noted commonalities between the regime's ideology and the fascist movements across Europe, among them the "reinforcement of authority, war on some principles of democracy, nationalist character and its preoccupation with social order" (Sanfey, 2003, p. 405). Despite this, "Salazar marked the hedge between both regimes: more than the distinction in the use of violence [which the museum heavily refutes] [is the fact that] fascist dictatorship tends towards a pagan Caesarism" (Sanfey, 2003, p. 405). Despite this, the characterization as "fascist" is heavily present in the contemporary memory discourse and it was used even in major legal documents during and after the 25th of April 1974 revolution, including the 1976 constitution. As such, the term "fascist" serves more as a discursive tool that borrows from the "ideological hegemony of the Left [regarding memory discourse]" (Loff, 2014, p. 3) to signal the violence that is associated with the regime's ideology and, thus, discredit it through association.

To further delegitimize the regime, the exhibition uses the speech to build on the association with the violence of fascism and discredit the ideology of Salazarism through its own words. Instead of giving visual focus on the "certainties" that the regime "restored", such as "God" or the "Homeland", the exhibition places a significant focus on the word "No". The regime's ideology is depicted as having constricted the society it claimed to have liberated from the "negativism of the century". The regime is seen as a regime of negation and imposition, rather than virtue. Moreover, any claim of moral virtue is also discredited by the juxtaposition between the "certainties" and the large picture of the mother and child running from police forces at the end of the corridor. Family, one of the "certainties", is shown being desecrated by the 'not so gentle' hands of the regime.

"7) a police apparatus that prevents, controls, and represses dissidence and opposition, even by using organized terror;

"8) a political system organized by a hierarchy of functions named from the top and crowned by the figure of the 'leader,' invested with a sacred charisma, who commands, directs, and coordinates the activities of the party and the regime;

"9) a corporative organization of the economy that suppresses trade union liberty, broadens the sphere of state intervention, and seeks to achieve, by principles of technocracy and solidarity, the collaboration of the 'productive sectors' under the control of the regime, to achieve its goals of power, yet preserving private property and class divisions;

"10) a foreign policy inspired by the myth of national power and greatness, with the goal of imperialist expansion." (as cited in Payne, 1995, pp. 5-6)

On the Colonial War

Public memory of the colonial past in Portuguese society, particularly the 13 yearlong armed conflict in the African continent, is still subject to ambiguity and to the previously discussed ‘cover of silence’. Much of this ambiguity “in the social and political elaboration of memory of the Colonial War” comes from the “military origin of the democratization process [post-April 25th 1974]” (Loff, 2014, p. 3). In her work on the oral history of the conflict, Angela Campos summarized the question by saying that:

In the aftermath of 1974, the tendency in Portugal was to forget those years of armed conflict, avoiding as much as possible potential national division. ... [T]he specificity of the Portuguese case appears to lie in this political contradiction: the Portuguese Armed Forces were simultaneously the democratic liberators of 1974 and the men who were fighting for the maintenance of the Portuguese colonial empire in Africa. From 1974 onward, their image was almost exclusively associated with the revolution, and not so much with their participation in the colonial conflict. (Campos, 2017, p. 41)

Margarida Ribeiro also noted that “the concealment of the war that occurred post-25th April ... was not the result of an authoritarian artifice. It happened because people were unable to come to terms with the reality of such a painful and explosive legacy” (Ribeiro, 2002, p. 186). This post-war silence was noticed even in the years following the revolution. Eduardo Lourenço noted the tendency to “make [the war] un-happen through indifference” (as cited in de Lucena, 1977, p. 222, own translation from the Portuguese), although he also described it as the “price to pay for liberation” (as cited in Campos, 2017, p. 53). War memory would be mostly absent from official discourses and even political circles until the 1990’s, when it was stirred up by revisionist academic works from both sides of the political aisle. As noted by Manuel Loff, “articles on the massacres perpetrated against the populations of Northern Angola (1961) and Mozambique (1972) were to be published in 1992-94, making reference to the ex-combatants’ “culture of silence”, or to one of the most silenced features of Portuguese warfare, the use of napalm” (Loff, 2014, p. 3; Araújo, 2009). Loff identified this greater interest as a reaction to the political climate of the right-wing Cavaco government and adopted the expression “memory revolt” to describe this conjecture (as cited in Soutelo, 2009, p. 16).

Although the “cover of silence” was slightly lifted in the 1990s, the memory wounds did not completely heal. This “cover” hid differing attitudes towards the conflict, especially among ex-combatants. To this day, these roughly concur along political and ideological affiliations, which reflects the often-contradictory positions within wider society. This still persistent silence holds “deep-rooted feelings of guilt and shame that also reflect strong political animosities that remain unsettled” (Campos, 2017, p. 52). Many ex-combatants struggle to attach a meaning to their war experiences capable of pacifying the memories of violence witnessed or perpetrated. And to the rest of society “the moral puzzle of memory remains unresolved due to the impossibility of identifying the veterans clearly either as victims (of the dictatorial regime) or as victimizers (of the enemy in combat)” (Campos, 2017, p. 49). To the veterans, this has consequences beyond desire for the recognition of their experience (often framed through the solidarities forged during combat) or the need to pay homage to their lost comrades. An unresolved past often means the inaccessibility to material social support, such as pensions or proper health care (including mental health) (Pereira, Pedras, Lopes, Pereira, & Machado, 2010). Many steps have been taken, such as the Decree 46/99 of the 6th of June that recognized PTSD and attributed social support to war veterans who suffer from it, or the constitution of combatant associations such as the Portuguese Association of War Veterans and the Association for the Disabled of the Armed Forces. Despite this, the wider discourses on the colonial war keep it on a ‘purgatory’ of memory. On the one hand Portuguese media traditionally avoids portraying it from “angles which could morally compromise veterans”(Campos, 2017, p. 77), On the other, many attempts to set scores with this past tend to be perceived as politically motivated, even if there is a generalized awareness of the avoidance of the topic (Loff, 2014, p. 5).

The very terminology used to describe the conflict reflects these varying positions and/or animosities. This can be a useful starting point in analysing how the Aljube museum represents the conflict and its participants. Ângela Campos identified four main terminologies in the press and in the discourses of ex-combatants: “Colonial war”, “Ultramar war”, “African campaign” and “Liberation war” (2017, pp. 42-43). “Colonial war” is the most prevalent and it corresponds to the dominant discourse in the post-revolutionary period that originated on the political left, being subsequently adopted by the public and mainstream political discourse. The term ‘colonial’ refers to a rejection of the rhetoric of the regime, which referred to the territories outside the “metropolis” as “ultramarine territories”,

extensions of the European homeland, and not as colonies, subject to colonial exploration. “Ultramar war” and “African campaign” have a connotation closer to the regime’s rhetoric and both do encompass alternative voices to the viewpoints of the predominantly left-wing discourse, but they are not equivalent. “Ultramar war” is core common among the majority of war veterans, as it was the term in use during their deployment. Although it is commonly associated with right-wing leaning individuals, it stems more from holding on to a spirit-of-the-era nostalgic attitude so as to comply with the perspective in which they were raised and for which they fought, built in the now lost “backdrop of an imperial world” (Campos, 2017, pp. 50-51). “African campaign”, on the other hand, is a much more politically motivated term, often imbued with feelings of patriotic nationalism, which outright rejects the dominant memory discourse on the illegitimacy of the war and holds on to the regime’s rhetoric to deny the existence of a war, calling it a ‘campaign’ to fight “subversive forces” (Campos, 2017, pp. 42). “Liberation war” is the least predominant of the four, as it is most dominant in memory discourses in the respective African countries and not in Portuguese territory.

The Aljube museum not only uses the terminology “colonial war”, but it also portrays the rejection of the regime’s rhetoric that the terminology intends. Throughout the exhibition, the territories are referred to as “colonies”. “Proudly Alone” is the title of the first text in the section and it is a reference to the regime’s isolationist policies, which were summarized in that motto. In this context, however, it also conveys the iniquitousness of the war, as Portugal saw itself isolated from the United Nations and the target of the accusations by other member-states. The text aims to start the section by delegitimizing the very idea of colonialism or that it brought any benefit to the colonized populations, by stating that:

Colonialism, in its different periods and types, consisted in the control of the occupied territories, exercised over the respective populations, who were enslaved and severely repressed, often to the point of annihilation, with the objective of exploiting natural and mineral resources. The colonial power subjugated these peoples in the name of the alleged superiority of the white race and its ‘civilising mission’, enforcing slavery and forced labour.

By referring how the people in the colonial territories “were enslaved and severely repressed, often to the point of annihilation” and by later quoting the colonial act of 1930, the museum

discredits the very foundation of the Luso-tropicalist ideal, which still has some hold in Portuguese society (Valentim & Heleno, 2018; Newton & Sibley, 2018).

Nevertheless, the “colonial war” theme is only marginally developed in the Aljube museum., Given the fact that it still is a very sensitive topic in Portuguese society, The limited portrayal of the colonial war can itself be a reflection of the “cover of silence” that was discussed previously. The war is mentioned throughout the exhibition and portrayed not only as one of the delegitimizing factors of the regime but as the “nail in its coffin”. In the “Colonialism anti-colonial struggle” section, Salazar’s rhetoric is shown as a reflection of the “regime’s preference for the risk of war over other types of change” Likewise, in the “Portugal 1890-1976” room, it is described as an “unjust war with no way out [that] would soon topple it [the regime]”. Despite these references, only one section, the “Colonialism anti-colonial struggle” closer to the end, is solely dedicated to the war. Moreover, examples, such as the text titled “Becoming aware”, emphasise how the independence movements arose from the wider resistance movements in Portugal, by saying that: “in spite of the involvement of many political militants who opposed the Estado Novo ..., we can see that gradually their [the independence movements] autonomy from the clandestine anti-Salazarist organizations was growing” . Although this is a minor detail, as most of the section is dedicated to describing each of the independence movements in each colony, it is indicative of a wider tendency in the section. The museum focuses its attention on the independence movements and not on the conflict itself. The quote that reads “Our struggle is not against the Portuguese. Our Struggle is against Portuguese colonialism, so that we can build a country for all men”, written in large letters that frame the independence movements, is an example of this. Just like the resistance movements in Portugal, previously discussed in “Silence and atmosphere of fear”, the enemy of the independence movements is an ideological one. This can be seen in the depictions of aggression in this section. Concrete perpetrators (beyond the regime itself) are represented twice and in both cases as an illustration to the text inscribed on the walls. The first one is a picture of three men, one of them with a machine gun, on top of a jeep at night, with the description “ Portuguese settler-militias”, while the second is a picture of a crowd inside a courtyard, standing on some benches on one side and on top of black cars on another, captioned as “White settlers and their servants organized reprisals against the protests in Santana – this led to the massacre in

Batepá (1953)”. In all cases military conflict is not portrayed, beyond the statistics of the death toll of the war made available at the end of the section.

In fact, throughout the exhibition, members of the military are never portrayed in any sort of conflict. The closest that the museum comes to this is in the “Colonialism anti-colonial struggle” section, in which a large picture of a regiment of black soldiers stands in formation in Alcântara, Lisbon, as a white officer in colonial attire walks in front of them. This image is, however, itself a nod to Portuguese iconographic colonial practices, an invocation of colonial aggression by the ideological apparatus and not so much of the soldiers. Throughout the exhibition, soldiers are either portrayed neutrally or, in cases like the section “Resist” on the second floor, with a smile (due to having brought down the regime). On the one hand, this omission can be due to the intended narrative consistency of the museum, as it could be perceived as a contradiction to represent military personnel engaging in acts of aggression to then follow up with those agents portrayed as liberators in the following sections. On the other hand, this omission can be an example in the aforementioned tendency in memory representations of the war to not morally compromise the soldiers, precisely because of the “military origin of the democratization process” (Loff, 2014, p. 3). This ambiguity also means that it does not represent the soldiers as victims of the regime, as they sometimes are portrayed in Portuguese society. Its representation of victimizers is left ambiguous.

Overall, the museum does come to grips with the colonial war by making significant stands in delegitimizing the ideology of colonialism and lusotropicalism. However, much like its treatment of other victimizing agents, it engages in the same omission and ambiguity that is seen in general Portuguese society. As such, it leaves the door open for the interpretations of responsibility, ranging from denial of responsibility to the symbolic and material consequences that arise from a lack of recognition of the horrors of war.

The Carnation revolution and the minimal consensus

The museum finishes its exhibition with the representation of the 25th of April Revolution, the day of the military coup that put an end to the dictatorial regime. This is followed by a bright red wall with the sentence in white “Without memory there is no future – Preserving the memory of History is an act of Citizenship, breaking the silence in which everyone was submerged and rescuing them in order to educate the younger generations”, serving as a postlude to the previous section and to the museum as a whole. The elements in the ending sections of the museum serve as more than narrative relief from terror. They offer insights on the meanings placed on the end of the regime.

For authors like Maria Cruzeiro (2014) “freedom” and “democracy” are the minimal consensus of interpretation of the revolution. However, authors like Manuel Loff (2014) put into question the idea of freedom (for all citizens) as a consequence of the revolution being fully consensual, as it is not accepted by some conservative Portuguese (as cited in Baumgarten, 2017, p. 56). As Baumgarten (2017) notes, the meanings placed on the revolution, and especially on the revolutionary process that lasted until the 1976 constitution, are very much tied with political affiliations and are, more than any topic here discussed, used for their political poignancy. For the left, the end of the regime meant the promise of social justice and, to some, the path to a socialist society. (2017, p. 57) These are often referred to as the “Promises of April” and constitute a discourse that is very closely tied with the rhetoric of the left and, more recently, with the anti-austerity demonstrations (Costa, 2014, p. 3). These measures were instituted following the recession of 2008 and the intervention of the World Monetary Fund in Portugal (Frasquilho, de Matos, Gaspar, & Almeida, 2016, p. 220). The call for a “New April” was a particularly prevalent discourse during this period, “especially in the trade union CGTP and the communist party PCP” (Baumgarten, 2017, p. 57). This was, itself, associated with a wider disappointment over the outcome of the revolution for these factions, as the 25th of November 1975 meant a “reduction of the perspectives of the new regime to a classical parliamentary democracy through which the privileges of the eternal political class will resurrect” (Matos, 2018, p. 119). Safe from more conservative outlooks, the right does not contest democracy as an outcome of the revolution, but it does contest the revolution process (PREC) and the “excesses of April” (Louçã & Rosas, 2004, p. 17). For the right, the revolution did not

represent abolishment of a dictatorship but, instead, the process towards another totalitarian regime (the fear that Portugal would become the “European Cuba”), which was halted in time (Loff, 2014, p. 2). The political uncertainty that followed the revolution for two years, particularly the so called “hot summer” and the radical nature of the post-revolution reforms are the foundations for the criticism of the right. Putting into question whether or not Portuguese society was ready for democracy and whether the break with the regime did, in fact, bring a betterment of the conditions of life, as it was promised by the left, are common discourses in right-wing circles, especially in the years following the revolution (Marchi & Pinto, 2019, p. 340).

Because of this split perspective on the meaning of the revolution, most representations tend to focus on the mostly consensual representational points of the 25th of April, the so called “minimal consensus of interpretation” (Baumgarten, 2017, p. 56). Contemporary representations often focus on the day of the revolution itself, with its imagery of people celebrating on the streets and soldiers with red carnations on their machine guns, rather than in the controversial revolution process (Baumgarten, 2017). Despite these symbols being mostly consensual across the political spectrum, they are still particularly prevalent in left-wing activist movements, especially during the protests against the austerity measures of the Passos Coelho government (2011-2015). An example of this was the revival of Zeca Afonso’s (1929 - 1987) protest songs such as *Grandola Vila Morena* in political rallies and protests (Baumgarten, 2017, p. 58). These symbols of the day itself are the elements present in the museum. The room itself is an amalgamation of these icons. The memorial black walls of the section “Those who stayed behind” give way to a brightly lit room a mostly white and bright red colour palette. Right before the entrance to the room, large letters form the word *Democracia* [Democracy]. The room itself has three key elements: The wall in the back of the room, filled with red paper carnations, a map of the city of Lisbon spanning the floor, with the marked locations occupied by the military during the day of the revolution, and a screen displaying footage of the crowds celebrating. These expand to the walls where pictures depict the soldiers during the military coup as large crowds gather in celebration, with details of the events by time of the day. The room is filled with the sound coming from a small screen that shows a national television broadcast (RTP) about the celebrations on the streets of Lisbon. The sound is, in turn, used to signal the

euphoria, which is attributed to the room, through the voice of the reporter who describes the crowd in celebration.

As such, the museum discusses the end of the dictatorial regime and the democratic nature of the current regime by representing the revolution through symbols that reflect the “minimum consensus” approach (Baumgarten, 2017, p. 56). The radical break with the regime is depicted through the actions of the “April Captains”, the name given to the soldiers who orchestrated the revolution, with the state of euphoria experienced on the streets portrayed as the outcome. While it is true that its representation falls closer to the left’s positive perspective on the revolution, its “minimum consensus” approach means that it leaves potential interpretations open ended. On the one hand, it does not depict the process of revolution following the military coup, thus engaging neither with the left’s “Promises of April” nor with the right’s “Excesses of April”. The closest it ever comes to this is right in the beginning, in the “Portugal 1890-1976” room, in which it is mentioned the development that Portugal saw following the fall of the regime but framed through the perspective of the progression of history and as part of the wider introduction to the rest of the exhibition. On the other, it also does not make claim to any particular political project to which the revolution can give legitimacy to, beyond a call to remembering it as an act of citizenship. This non-engagement with the conflicting perspectives on the revolution leaves an ambiguity to the museum’s depiction, which can be seen as a strategy to cement the memory of the resistance outside the discursive circles of political affiliations.

Chapter IV – House of Terror

In the inauguration of the House of Terror, on February 2002, the then prime-minister Viktor Órban stated that "we locked two dictatorships together within the walls of this house. They stem from different sources, but you can see, they get on well with each other" (as cited in Zombory, 2017, p. 1037). Thirteen years had passed since the collapse of the Berlin Wall. Hungary, alongside all of post-socialist Europe, was using its cultural policies to rethink and restructure its attitude towards its past and towards its European future (Bideleux & Jeffries, 2007, p. 591). The House of Terror became one of these cultural, social and political endeavours. The new memorial museum, as Sodaro described it, was created "firmly believing that without justice in the form of holding perpetrators responsible [for the crimes committed during Communism] Hungary would not be able to move forward" (2018, p. 67). As such, "plans for a museum to expose the truth about the communist past were drawn up in the effort to come to terms with Hungary's recent history. The museum, then, was conceived in large part to be a public forum for holding the perpetrators of communist crimes accountable—if not judicially then morally" (2018, p. 67). The selected location was the old headquarters of the *ÁVH, Államvédelmi Hatóság*¹⁰ [State Protection Authority], the communist political police of the People's Republic of Hungary, a belle epoque building in the historical Andrassy Avenue. The building had previously been used by the *Nyilaskeresztes Párt* [Arrow Cross Party], the Nazi friendly political force that ruled Hungary during the final years of World War II (Apor, 2014, p. 329). As such, according to the creator and now General-Director Mária Schmidt, in a conversation with Amy Sodaro, the museum was created as a "monument to the memory of those held captive, tortured and killed in this building" (as cited in Sodaro, 2018, p. 58) by both the Arrow Cross militants and the Communists.

The period that the museum portrays covers nearly half of the twentieth century, as it spans from the invasion of Hungary by the German army in 1944 to the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. The Arrow Cross Party came to power a few months after the German intervention on the 19th of March 1944 (Romsics, 1999, p. 197). Hungary had been an ally

¹⁰ Under the name *ÁVH* since 1948 to 1956, when it was dissolved by Imre Nagy. Previously it had been called *PRO, Politikai Rendészeti Osztály* [Department of Political Law Enforcement], from 1945 to 1946 and then *ÁVO, Államvédelmi Osztály* [State Protection Department] from 1946 to 1948.

of Nazi Germany during the war effort, which contributed to the partial recovery of the lands lost in the aftermath of WWI and the Trianon Peace Treaty of 1920 (Pastor, 2019, p. 399). Despite this, German intervention came after Miklós Horthy (1868-1957), the conservative regent of the Kingdom of Hungary, tried to settle an armistice with the Soviets after seeing the advancements of the Red Army in Eastern Europe (Beevor, 2012, p. 719). Despite this, as Ignác Romsics pointed out, during the German occupation:

Hungary did not mount any resistance on the scale of the armed underground movements in western Europe or the partisan struggles in Poland and Yugoslavia. Amongst the many circumstances that might explain this, perhaps the primary factor was the gratitude that a substantial segment of Hungarians felt towards Germany, and Hitler in person, for redressing the perceived injustices of Trianon – a sentiment that obviously had no counterpart amongst the French, Poles and Serbs. A further inhibitory factor was the country's experience of its own Soviet Republic in 1919, compounded by the subsequent propaganda about Soviet Russian atrocities, which swayed many who otherwise had no particular inclination to National Socialism (1999, p. 213)

The Arrow Cross party, headed by Ferenc Szálasi (1897-1946), solidified the role of Hungary as a puppet state of Germany when it came into power in October 1944 (Beevor, 2012, p. 719). The German intervention also meant the intensification of the persecution of the Jews and other minorities. By June 1944 the Nazi genocidal plan that became known as “final solution¹¹” was already on its way. According to Arieh Ben-Tov, almost the entirety of the Hungarian Jews from the countryside, around 400 000, had been “rounded up into train carriages and sent to Auschwitz” (1988, p. 176). In early July 1944, Horthy, taking advantage of recent German losses, “ordered the deportations to be stopped ... [sparing] around 200 000 Jews still left in the capital” (Romsics, 1999, p. 213), which shortly after led to his deposition by the German occupation force and the instalment of the Arrow Cross regime. Not long after, the Soviet advancements over Eastern Europe reached the southern plains of Hungary and, in December 1944, reached the outskirts of Budapest (Ungváry, 2003, p. 102). The Battle of Budapest lasted until the 13th of February of 1945, ending with a Soviet victory and a crucial advancement in the direction of Berlin. The battle was regarded

¹¹ “Final Solution” refers to the policies of mass extermination of Jews and other groups deemed undesirable for the purity policies conducted in Nazi Germany and in its friendly or occupied states.

by many as a “second Stalingrad”, with close to 160 000 dead on both sides from either starvation or direct military engagement (Ungváry, 2003, p. xi).

In the years following the war, Hungary saw itself increasingly under Soviet influence. As early as 1945 people’s courts were installed and the transition from the national socialist style regime was managed by the Soviets on behalf of the Allies (Bottoni, 2009, p. 791). The Független Kisgazdapárt [Small Holders Party] rose in post-war Hungary as the most prominent political force, especially in the elections of 1945. However, in the following elections of 1947, rigged by fraud and the passing of laws which forced the Small Holders Party to break up into smaller fractions, the Soviet backed Hungarian Magyar Kommunista Párt [Communist Party] rose to power (Romsics, 1999, p. 236). The acceleration of the sovietisation process, ordered by Stalin, meant the complete restructuring of social organization during the government of Mátyás Rákosi (1892-1971) (Brown, 2010, p. 253). The late 1940s and early 1950s saw policies of collectivization, often accompanied by the persecution and forced resettlement of farmers, so called Kulaks, who did not abide by the nationalization effort (Békés, 2012, p. 210). Likewise, the persecution and mass incarceration of political opponents of the communist party were constant, including internal purges starting in 1948 and persecution of clergy such as Cardinal József Mindszenty (1892-1975) (Békés, 2012, p. 210). This was only possible because of the brutal and oppressive apparatus created by the ÁVH, the political police and enforcing arm of the regime, led by Gabor Péter (1906-1993). According to Romsics, “by 1953, there can hardly have been a family in which one or more members had not found itself in trouble with the police or the state security organs” (1999, p. 272). The more than 44 000 imprisoned “class enemies” were sent to more than 100 labour camps set up in the countryside, be they the copper mines in the Mátra mountains or the agricultural fields in the southern Hortobágy (Romsics, 1999, p. 272).

The death of Stalin in 1953 sent ripples across the Soviet sphere of influence (Brown, 2010, p. 265). The changes of leadership in the Kremlin and the wave of “national communists” which followed meant systemic reforms across the republics of the Warsaw pact (Brown, 2010, p. 323). In June 1953, Rákosi was removed from the leadership of the Communist Party and replaced with Imre Nagy (1896-1958). Until 1955, Nagy headed the reforms, such as “general amnesty for political prisoners . . ., closing down of the internment camps and allowing those who had been subjected to involuntary resettlement to return to

their old places of residence” (Romsics, 1999, p. 296). Later changes in Soviet leadership meant the destitution of Nagy in 1955, being replaced by Ernő Gerő (1898-1980). According to László Borhi, on the 22nd October 1956 “students of the Technical University requested permission to organize a demonstration for the following day” (2004, p. 243). Amongst their demands was the restitution of the Nagy administration. Demonstrations started in Budapest on the 23rd of that month and soon evolved into confrontations with Soviet controlled military forces (Borhi, 2004, p. 244). After prolonged demonstrations, Nagy became the prime-minister again and on the 28th of October announced that Soviet troops would leave Hungary and that the place of Hungary in the Warsaw pact would be negotiated (Romsics, 1999, p. 308). However, realizing that the revolution “posed a genuine threat to the integrity of the Soviet bloc” (Békés, 2003, p. 69), on the 4th of November, once again, Soviet troops crossed the Hungarian border. Fighting resumed until the last pockets of revolutionaries around the hills of Buda were apprehended or killed on the 10th and 11th of November (Granville, 2001, p. 1056). Nagy, after asking the UN for aid and announcing Hungarian withdrawal from the Warsaw pact, was arrested by Soviet officials and his place was occupied by János Kádár (1912-1989) (Romsics, 1999, p. 311). In the end, about 2500 were killed, 44% of which under 25 years old, and about 20 000 were wounded (Romsics, 1999, p. 311). According to Katalin Bogyay, “[t]he UN was aware” when [the Hungarian] demands were written down on October 23rd. After the first Soviet invasion, the Security Council put the Hungarian situation on its agenda” (2017, p. 30). However, the call for international intervention was in vain, as the Western powers were simultaneously dealing with the Suez crisis (29 October 1956 to 7 November 1956) (Borhi, 2004, p. 247).

The Kádár administration immediately set in motion measures to crack down on dissidence and to appease the Soviets. Persecutions to those who participated in the events of 1956 were installed and mock trials were held to condemn the leaders, with Imre Nagy being sentenced to death and executed in June 1958 (Békés, 2013, pp. 229-230). Despite the brutality of the early persecutions, the so called “Kádár Era” did not signal a return to hard-line communism. Kádár, unlike Rákosi, “did not call on society to make sacrifices but instead ... promised wealth and a better life” (Romsics, 1999, p. 337). Kádár’s pragmatics were also more in line with Pope Paul VI’s *mundus vivendi* attitude towards communism, which meant a relative loosening of religious prohibitions. It also led to the eventual permission in 1971 for Cardinal Mindszenty to leave the US embassy, where he had been

since his release in 1956, and head to his exile in Vienna (Von Klimó, 2015, p. 345). Overall, as Romsics described:

By following a moderate policy of “live and let live”, which allowed his regime to jettison its more totalitarian feature by granting relative legal security and minor freedoms within the formal framework of a communist one-party state, Kádár gained acceptance for his authoritarian system from a broad mass of the Hungarian population (1999, p. 336).

As to what exactly caused the fall of the communist regime, is still heavily debated. Several factors can be identified : increased pressures from the West in the 1980s, especially with the elections of Ronald Reagan (Brown, 2010, p. 542) and Pope John Paul II (Brown, 2010, p. 484).; the rising of movements such as Solidarity in Poland and the fallout of the Prague Spring of 1968 (Seelinger, 2018, p. 13).; Or the “decline of ideological legitimacy” (Saxonberg, 2001, p. 363) and the “cadaverous stiffness of the succession of Soviet leaders, which led to the slowing down and even stagnation of economic growth” (Brown, 2010, p. 550). Regardless, following the reforms by Gorbachev in the USSR, the symbolic gesture of the breaking of the Berlin Wall on November 1989 signalled an accelerated rate of change. Poland and Hungary “saw an institutional compromise, because the impetus for change came from the elite, which undertook negotiations with the opposition over the shape of the new institutions” (Saxonberg, 2001, p. 4). The new administration of Miklós Németh (1948 - present) in 1988 and the death of János Kádár in July of 1989 served as the catalysts for change in Hungary (Romsics, 1999, p. 438). Early in 1988 parties and political movements such as the Hungarian Democratic Forum (MDF - Magyar Demokrata Fórum), the Young Democrats Alliance (Fidesz - Fiatal Demokraták Szövetsége), the Alliance of Free Democrats (SZDSZ - Szabad Demokraták Szövetsége) or the revived Independent Smallholders' Party (FKGP - Független Kisgazdapárt) started to engage in open debate (Saxonberg, 2001, p. 292). Following the approval of the new constitution on the 23rd of October 1989 and the elections in April 1990, the MDF József Antall (1932-1993) became the first democratically elected prime minister, leading a coalition between the MDF, the FKGP and the KDNP (Christian Democratic People's Party - Kereszténydemokrata Néppárt) (Romsics, 1999, p. 440). In the following decade, MDF slowly lost its foothold, giving way to the political struggles between the increasingly right-wing Fidesz and the left-wing Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP - Magyar Szocialista Párt) (Zombory, 2012, p. 96). These

culminated in the election of Fidesz in 1998 and later the elections of 2002, which were the backdrop of the inauguration of the House of Terror and which the MSZP won (Benazzo, 2017, p. 201).

The period following the transition from communism to market economy was one of renegotiation of meanings and perspectives on History (Zombory, 2012, p. 92). As Béla Bodó observed, “the new political elite wanted to settle scores with the Kádár regime by destroying its ideological foundation” (2017, p. 199). Several museological projects were underway to meet the shifts in Hungarian society. The Memento Park was opened on the outskirts of Budapest in 1993. The park, like many other similar instances throughout early post-socialist Europe, was a repurposing of the Soviet realist public art, particularly its statues, in a recontextualized display. As a form of pastiche, the park “represents an intellectualising attitude to the sculptures put into a newly created context, which deprives the statues of their threatening effects and leaves them as no more than the mementos of a former era” (Turai, 2009, p. 101). However, even though it is, to this day, a mostly commercial-driven endeavour, “it was an official [state] decision to set up the park. The statues were given [on loan] to the park by the various self-governing districts, ... while the land is the property of the district” (Turai, 2009, p. 101). Likewise, the National Memorial Park of Reck was opened in 1996. Exhibitions were also held to portray both the communist past and to refute the interpretations of other time periods created during the communist regime, namely the interwar period exhibition in the National Hungarian Museum (Braham, 2016, p. 13). It was also around this time that the first controversies regarding political uses of museological exhibitions started to arise. An example of this was the projected exhibition, held in partnership with Auschwitz, about the Holocaust in Hungary, headed by István Ihász and with the help of Mária Schmidt, Tamás Stark and József Schweitzer. The exhibition was first drafted in 1998 and inaugurated in 2000, receiving heavy criticisms for its alleged whitewashing of Hungarian actions in the Holocaust (Braham, 2016, pp. 13-14). The year of 2002 saw the inauguration of the House of Terror, the Imre Nagy Memorial House in Budapest, under the responsibility of the Imre Nagy Foundation, and the start of the construction work on the state sponsored Holocaust Museum and Documentation Centre in the old Jewish quarter of Budapest, which opened in 2004 (Turai, 2009, p. 102). Other state sponsored institutions opened doors soon after. The Emlékpont Museum in Hódmezővásárhely opened doors in 2006, together with the renovated exhibition hall in the

town's historical synagogue, under the tutelage of the same team of creators of the House of Terror (Benárd, 2016, p. 50). Likewise, the Hospital on the Rock Nuclear Bunker Museum in Budapest opened temporarily in 2007 and then permanently in 2008, with the sponsorship of the Ministry of Defence and the Military History Institute and Museum (Sziklakorház, n.d., p. 14).

During the 2010s, the appearance of commemorative projects did not slow down. The commemorations of the 50 and 60 years of the 1956 revolution, in 2004 and 2014, saw a resurgence memorial statues and parks and exhibitions commemorating the revolution, namely the 2014 exhibition in the Hungarian Parliament visitor centre (MacDonald, 2013, p. 230). Also, around that time, the new Memorial to the Victims of the German Invasion, created by Péter Párkányi Raab, was inaugurated on March 19th 2014 in Budapest's Liberty Square, placed opposite the monument of the Soviet Liberation (Erős, 2016, p. 241). The monument depicts Angel Gabriel holding the national Hungarian orb in one hand and being attacked by a metallic eagle, representing Nazi Germany. This was another instance of a government project surrounded by controversy and accusations of whitewashing of history (Erős, 2016, p. 243). Smaller museological projects, either from local town halls or private endeavours, such as the 1956 memorial rooms and museums in Nagykovácsi, Rákóczi falva and Kiskunmajsa, also appeared around this time (Stevens & Sumartojo, 2014, p. 365).

Despite the increasing amount of commemorative and museological projects, the House of Terror remains the flagbearer for the musealized memory of authoritarianism in Hungary. In the first year of its opening alone it pulled more than 1000 visitors a day (Fuller, 2002, p. 2). Much of this is due to the effectiveness in conveying its emotion-driven narrative through the display strategies employed by the team of curators. As Hedvig Turai described, "the building has a distinct aura, especially in the grim cellar" (2009, p. 102). In addition, in a conversation with Amy Sodaro, Mária Schmidt described the House of Terror as being a part of a "loose [European] network of similar institutions that collaborate with each other and look to each other for inspiration and ideas about how best to try to represent and come to terms with the past" (2018, p. 77). She added that she was "working with occupation museums in Riga, Latvia, and Tallinn, Estonia, ... was involved in the creation of the Warsaw Uprising Museum in Poland and [was consulting] on similar initiatives in Bucharest, Romania, and Kiev, Ukraine" (2018, p. 77).

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

The permanent exhibition of the museum is divided into three floors, with the visit starting on the second floor and descending into the basement. The ground floor is occupied by the entrance hall, the ticket counter, the covered courtyard, the café, the museum shop and the temporary exhibition hall. As such, the basement, where the reconstructed prison cells are, can be accessed via an elevator which is integrated into the visit itself. Alternatively, it can be accessed via the staircase on the north side of the covered courtyard. The exhibition is comprised of thematic rooms, with evocative and symbolic representations being the focus of attention and handout paper sheets being the complementary source of information about the topic discussed in each room. The exhibition is divided as follows:

Rooms of the Permanent exhibition in the House of Terror by floor		
Floor	Name of Room	Topics exhibited in the room
Second Floor	Double Occupation	Equal brutality of the Nazi and Soviet invasions of Hungary
	Passage of the Hungarian Nazis (Arrow Cross Party)	Ideology of the Arrow Cross Party
	Hungarian Nazis (Arrow Cross Party)	Brutality of the Arrow Cross Party policies
	Gulag	Deportation of Hungarians to the labour camps in the USSR
	Changing Clothes	The forced switching of alliances in Hungarian society and in the political institutions from National Socialism to Communism
	Room divided into two sections: 1. The Fifties 2. Life under Communism	1. The prosperity and optimism professed by communist propaganda in the 1950s 2. Rigged elections, persecution and state surveillance in the 1950s
	Resistance	Suppression of resistance against the communist state
First Floor	Resettlement and Deportation	Population exchanges between Hungary and its neighbours, expulsion of Swabs, forced resettlements, persecution of dissidence
	Torture	Persecution and generalized fear
	Peasants	Persecution of <i>Kulaks</i> (independent farmers)
	Anteroom of the Hungarian Political Police	Political police apparatus

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
 Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

	Room of the Head of the Political Police Gábor Péter	Brutality of police methods and personal responsibility of Gábor Péter
	Justice	Sham trials conducted to condemn political opponents, particularly Imre Nagy
	Propaganda	Political Propaganda of the regime
	Everyday	Presence of the communist apparatus in the consumption of everyday products
	Treasury (???)	The importance of the mining of bauxite to the Hungarian communist economy and to everyday items
	Churches	Persecution of religious practices, particularly Christianity
	Cardinal Mindszenty	The importance of Cardinal Mindszenty for the resistance efforts within the catholic church
Transition between the First floor and the Basement	Elevator	Detailed brutality of the interrogation and torture practices by the ÁVH
Basement	Reconstructed Prison cells	Brutality of the imprisonment conditions
	Internment	Labour camps
	Hall of the 1956 revolution	Failed Revolution of 1956
	Retaliation	Those who were killed at the hands of both regimes
	Emigration	Hungarians who fled or emigrated to the west to escape the regime
	Hall of Tears	Honouring the victims of the regime
	Staircase of Victimizers	The Hungarians who collaborated to the oppressive apparatus

Table 2 - Rooms of the permanent exhibition in the House of Terror, Adapted from the Handout sheets and the House of Terror Website (n.d.)

Double Occupation

In his analysis of the ideological geography of Eastern Europe after the collapse of the Berlin wall, Máté Zombory stated that the end of communism left a vacuum, in post-communist societies, of belonging in post-communist societies. “The collapse of the bipolar world order, the spatial dynamic that had such a far-reaching influence, provoked a major shift in cultural belonging” (2012, p. 92). Jelena Subotic (2018) characterized this vacuum as a state of “ontological insecurity”, in which the ideological and political space for new national narratives was highly contested. The social and political agents in those societies immediately sought to create a “new political language that would substitute the grammar of the socialist state” (Franzon & Hórvath, 2002, p. 304). As the universalist ideology of communism collapsed, it opened the way for particularizing national narratives, based on individual national histories which had “gone awry, been falsified, and lied about because of communism. As part of this process, up to the ... 1990s the commemorations were characterized by a vigorous and mythologizing turning to the past, by the detailed expounding of the ‘real’ national past,” (Zombory, 2012, p. 94). In her analysis of the discursive practices in Hungarian society, Amy Sodaro (2018) attributed this to Pierre Nora’s “recovery of memory”:

Pierre Nora has written about the “recovery of memory” that occurred with the fall of communism in 1989; this recovery released a flood of memories not only from the communist period but from the preceding fascist period as well, complicating memory in the post-communist world and presenting challenges to the representation of the past in public memorial initiatives, especially memorial museums. Nora’s “recovery of memory” also echoes the theories of Olick and others that see a breakdown in hegemonic collective memories in the late twentieth century [“ideological decolonization”] and a move toward inclusive, discursive, regretful memory (Sodaro, 2018, p. 60).

As these societies found themselves without their half a century eastern-ward centre, their political search for belonging meant that the construction of new national narratives gravitated toward the European centre and toward their perceived sequestered European identity (Nancheva, 2015, p. 56). This was especially propelled by the promises of cohabitation with core European states, through the integration into the European Union which would come to fruition in 2004 (Hill, 2009, p. 588). In his 20th of August 2000 speech,

during the millennium celebrations of the coronation of Saint Stephen, the then Hungarian prime-minister Viktor Orbán stated that “we Hungarians have always been European, but the dismembered parts of the organism of Europe clearly do not represent the ideal wholeness of Europeanness” (as cited in Zombory, 2012, p. 97). This discursive figure of the ‘return to Europe’, however, brought with it some challenges. Cultivating Holocaust memory became an unofficial soft membership criterion to join the EU. The need to accumulate symbolic capital clashed with the need to deal with its recent past:

Being fully European [meant] sharing in the cosmopolitan European narratives of the twentieth century, perhaps the strongest being the narrative of the Holocaust. They [were] also anxious about their unsettled mnemonical map of their own role in the Holocaust, which includes both the extensive local complicity in the genocide but also its major demographic consequences, which have turned once multicultural societies into overwhelmingly ethnically homogeneous ones. ...Post-communist states have attempted to resolve these insecurities by undergoing a radical revision of their respective Holocaust remembrance where the memory, symbols, and imagery of the Holocaust become appropriated to represent crimes of communism. (Subotic, 2018, p. 296)

Moreover, as post-communist societies sought to come to terms with their communist past, a new discourse of “double occupation” emerged. In 1997 Alain Besançon delivered a lecture on the Memory and Oblivion of Bolshevism, arguing for the recognition of the victims of Communism to the same degree as those of the Holocaust (Zombory, 2017, p. 1033). In that same year, the Black book of Communism was published denouncing the death toll and terror practices in the communist regimes and serving as, more than an academic endeavour, a “missing Nuremberg” for Communism (Courtois, et al., 1999, p. 31). As observed by Zombory, “[t]he memory of Communism was born as the ‘twin brother’ of Holocaust memory, ... as a reaction to the uniqueness claim of the Holocaust in the power field structured by the European enlargement process” (2017, p. 1028). In Hungary, this discourse found its way even in the József Antall’s administration (1990-1993), the first democratically elected government, but found its major ground in the first Viktor Orbán administration. Orbán found help in the revisionist efforts of historians such as Mária Schmidt, who helped conceive and would later be head of the Budapest House of Terror. Schmidt argued that the history of communism should be studied with the same “yardsticks”

as the history of Nazism and, as such, the memorial efforts should regard the nation's victims (including the nation itself) equally (Terror Háza Múzeum, 2013). Moreover, this discourse was officially recognized by the European Parliament on the 19th of September 2019 (European Parliament, 2019).

Because of the importance of this “double occupation” discourse in the construction of the memory of communism, its representation is heavily present in the House of Terror:

Like other memorial museums, the House of Terror has an ambitious and complicated mission. It seeks not only to remember the victims of the two totalitarian regimes—the fascist Nazis and Arrow Cross and the Soviet and Hungarian communists—but also to serve as a space of history and learning, with its central task being to morally educate its visitors to reject totalitarian and dictatorial ideologies in the future.”(Sodaro, 2018, p. 59)

In the inauguration speech, Viktor Orbán stated that "we locked two dictatorships together within the walls of this house. They stem from different sources, but you can see, they get on well with each other" (as cited in Zombory, 2017, p. 1037). Elements representing the discourse on “double occupation” can be found throughout the museum. Even before the start of the exhibition, a large black metal frame that encompasses the top and lateral sides of the building itself has, on its corner, the carving out of the two symbols of the regimes -- the Arrow Cross icon and the Communist star. This representation is repeated in the very logo of the Museum and on the top of the entrance staircase, in which two symmetrical trapezoid shaped marble memorial stones with these symbols carved out of each, accompanied by a candle lantern and a Hungarian *emlékkoszorú* [memorial wreath], can be seen . In fact, the museum outright tells this to the visitor in the pamphlet handed upon purchasing the entrance ticket: “the House of Terror is a museum now, but it was witness to two shameful and tragic periods in Hungary’s 20th century history”. To further emphasise this discourse, the first room of the exhibition is called “Double occupation”. In it visitors find a wall that almost reaches the ceiling dividing the room horizontally, red on one side, with small screens displaying communist parades and the incursions of the Red army, and black on the other, equally with screens that present videos of military and celebratory events in the Third Reich. This room is meant to set up the conflict between agents in the narrative of the museum and their dynamics, with the Nazis and Communists

as equivalent opponents of Hungary, whose defeat is depicted in the end of the room with a large picture of the iconic Széchenyi Lánchíd bridge destroyed in the wake of the battle of Budapest. The “Changing Clothes” room is another example of the museum designers’ usage of this discourse. In the middle of a small room, a rotating pedestal places back to back two uniforms of the Arrow Cross party and the Communist Party of Hungary. The text in the handout of the room reads “the uniforms in the middle of the room symbolize the continuity of the dictatorships”. The room is a summary of the overarching message of the museum, as “this small minority of ‘bad’ Hungarians shifted sides to remain in their role as tormentor of innocent Hungary. The implication—in light of the full museum experience—is that these former fascists-turned-communists learned from the Nazis how to be especially evil, which was a skill that they would develop to its greatest potential under the Soviet occupation” (Sodaro, 2018, p. 73).

This is not to say, however, that both regimes are represented equally. This is, in fact, one of the main criticisms towards the House of Terror (Apor, 2014). Although the museum presents itself as the representation of two terror regimes, the Nazi/Arrow Cross regime is only given exclusive attention in two rooms, the “Passage of Hungarian Nazis” and the room “Hungarian Nazis”. It is discussed side by side with the communist regime in the “Double occupation” and “Changing clothes” rooms and mentioned in passing in occasion throughout the rest of the exhibition. Out of “more than a dozen rooms, only two are devoted [exclusively] to fascism, the Holocaust, and the Arrow Cross” (Sodaro, 2018, p. 59). Mária Schmidt has responded to these criticisms by pointing out that the Arrow Cross regime was violent but short lived. As such, the intended design represents the progression of Hungary’s “imprisonment”, starting with the German occupation in 1944 and ending, just like in the museum, with the farewell to the Soviet tanks in 1991 (Apor, 2014, p. 330). The relevance of this narrative order relies on the fact that it was done so, despite the museum not relying on a strict chronologically linear. Mária Schmidt has also pointed out to the fact that there already is a museum dedicated to the Holocaust in Budapest, even if the sister museum had been opened in Hódmezővásárhely and the new Holocaust museum, called “House of Fates”, is projected to be opened soon under her guidance (Schmidt, 2018).

It can be more informative, however, to analyse this imbalance of representation through the lenses of the theatrics that the museum relies on. It is not a coincidence that Attila Ferenczffy-Kovács, a “stage designer-turned-historian” (Apor, 2014, p. 331) was part

of the team that created the House of Terror. “The transformation of space and the communication of information” on these exhibitions was very carefully thought out, prioritizing “the emotional response of [the] spectators-occupants” (Crawley, 2012, p. 12). As such, the theatrical use of space for agent representation can be particularly informative of the discourses that the museum engages with. In the exhibition, the representations of Nazi-fascism serve more to characterize their communist counterparts than to inform the visitor of any new perspective on the German occupation. The “Hungarian Nazis” room is set up around a large table, with plates and cutlery set up and a mannequin figure dressed in Arrow cross officer attire, standing on its end as if welcoming the guests. Sodaro described it as a “kind of last supper of hatred” (2018, p. 72) and all its elements are placed precisely to invoke this. The dim lighting, the pictures of Arrow Cross leaders and their victims (including dead disfigured bodies), together with their hanged officer coats, and the face of Ferenc Szálasi projected in the head of the manikin, whose voice echoes through the room as he gives a roused speech. These are all elements that invoke political violence and correspond with the imagery associated with Nazism. The room is purposefully followed by the “Gulag” room, but not before presenting the visitor with two elements that invoke the holocaust before they leave the “Hungarian Nazis” room. On the wall opposite to the back of the Szálasi manikin, the large projection of a video of cobblestones at night, with the camera angle filming down and moving forward to capture the texture of the pavement, is combined with the sound of a large mass falling into water, breaking through the sound of Szálasi’s speech. Although subtle, this is a reference to the execution of Jews in the banks of the Danube in Budapest, where today stands the “Shoes on the Danube” memorial (Gelencsér, 2018, p. 14). This, audio-visual elements, together with the large picture of a disfigured body just next to the door to the “Gulag” room are strategically invoked to transfer to the next room the same set of attitudes induced in the room of “Hungarian Nazis”. Like the previous, the “Gulag” room displays the dichotomy between a victimizer and a defeated victim. The long room is meant to represent the interior of a train cargo carriage, with lateral wooden walls dotted by screens, a black ceiling and a carpet with a map of the Soviet Union covering the entire floor of the room. The screens display interviews of old Hungarian men who were prisoners in Soviet gulags and women who describe how they saw their relatives being taken away. Their voices fill up the room but ever so often the screens synchronize to

display a video of a black and white snowy and desolate winter landscape as seen from a moving train, with the sound filling up the room.

The visitor is given the feeling of being inside one of the prisoner trains. Display cases, in the shape of inverted cones, pop out of the ground in the locations of the Gulags on the carpet map. The cases contain personal belongings of the prisoners, from boots and cutlery to small prayer books and rosaries. By placing this imagery of “being taken away” right after the invocation of violence associated with Nazi-fascism, the museum can instil in the representations of Communism this same imagery of dread towards Fascist terror. It is no coincidence that this is the first depiction of exclusive communist terror in the museum. Moreover, in the handout texts it reads “[t]hose who were allowed to proceed home were bound to secrecy and intimidated to remain silent until the regime change.” By setting these rooms back to back, just like in the “Double occupation” and “Changing clothes” rooms, the museum aims to break this silence and showcase the communist terror through the same “yardsticks” as fascism is understood, the framework of European holocaust memory.

As such, in the context of the whole exhibition, the portrayals of the Nazi-fascism serve more as narrative tools, backdrops, that frame the intended portrayal of communism and inform the attitudes through which the period should be understood. This strategy can run into some problems, as Máté Zombory (2017) and Péter Apor (2014) pointed out. There is the risk of downplaying how these were opposing ideological forces, even if many of the means were common. They can also run the risk of downplaying the differences between the time periods in which they operated and even the differences of circumstances throughout the decades that communism ruled Hungary. The political circumstances must also be considered as “the main campaign slogan of Fidesz [at the time of the inauguration of the museum] ‘The future has begun’ contrasted sharply with ‘forces of the past’, which was an allusion to the Socialist Party (MSzP)” (Horváth, 2008, p. 266). Even so, this is a common framing strategy, not just in Hungary, but in most post-communist states. It was the Riga Museum of Occupations, opened in 1993, that created the “museographic concept that deals with both the Nazi and the Soviet occupations” (Zombory, 2017, p. 1032). Just like the House of Terror, others followed the example, such as the 1993 Sighet Memorial for the Victims of Communism and the Resistance in Transylvania and the 2003 Estonian Museum of Occupations. This has become a common frame of understanding of their recent past, both for the process of morally accountability (Sodaro, 2018, p. 67) but also for (at the time)

European integration. As observed by Zombory, “[m]emorial museums of Communism can be considered as laboratories where the main elements of the discursive repertoire applied in post-accession political debates about Europe were elaborated in a pan-European way. Most importantly, they create, visualize, and materialize a political space which is organized according to the equality of victimhood” (2017, p. 1052).

Hungary caught among superpowers

In his 1992 speech, József Antall, nodded to a widespread discourse in Hungarian society: that of the Hungarian nation being the battlefield of other nations’ wars, the ‘punching bag’ of history and geography:

We lie along major historical and strategic lines of force. This country was never peripheral; it was never easy for us to pull through. It was not given to us to experience anything in one of Europe’s more wind-protected places, because it was never sheltered from the wind! This truly was the highway of peoples: every war passed through here, trampling on us time and time again (as cited in Zombory, 2012, p. 98).

This discourse became especially prevalent following 1920 and the aftermath of the Trianon treaty, even if its roots can be traced to the double monarchy period (Romsics, 1999, p. 116). It became a frequent talking point for the political leaders of the interwar Horthy period and had a major resurface in contemporary Hungary, following Nora’s post-1989 “recovery of memory”, when it became closely tied with the “Double occupation” discourse (Sodaro, 2018, p. 60). Its political use, however, does not only describe the tragic fate of the nation, but it is used as both a call to historical justice and to describe a specific “national character”. As Viktor Orbán put it “the ‘little Hungarian nation’, squeezed between the great powers, ... has been dismembered into so many countries and nevertheless lives with one heart” (as cited in Zombory, 2012, p. 100).

The presence of this discourse in the House of Terror can be particularly informative in analysing how the museum characterizes the Hungarian nation. Much like Nazi-fascism is used to characterize the communist regime, so are the agents of oppression used as narrative foils to Hungary. Their evil qualities not only characterize the oppressors but,

through contrast, can characterize their victims. And so, “by injecting its exhibitions and portrayal of the past with a powerful moral message about the evils of totalitarianism, the House of Terror positions itself as something of a ‘moral compass’, ... against which contemporary Hungarian society can measure itself (Sodaro, 2018, p. 59). Right from the beginning of the exhibition, in the handout text from the “Double occupation” room, Hungary is described in the interwar period as “[finding] herself in a hopeless economic situation. Isolated politically, disarmed, encircled by hostile countries, she became one of Central Europe’s weakest, most vulnerable states”. In addition, referring specifically to the 1930s, “found herself in the crossfire of the increasingly more aggressive Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union”, both of which “had no place for an independent Hungary”. Although this perspective on historical events is based on the actual geopolitical circumstances of interwar Hungary, in certain contexts its usage can lead to certain interpretations of diminished agency. Namely the downplaying of Hungary’s role in historical events, dismissing political choices as inevitable necessities to “maintain her albeit limited elbow room and avert the worst scenario”, as stated in the “Double occupation” room. As a result, the nation’s past political choices, that could otherwise be interpreted through other moral lenses (like the antagonistic agents in the Museum), are framed as actions of *modus vivendi* (Von Klimó, 2015, p. 345). This is their more prevalent interpretation in the House of Terror.

To achieve this, the House of Terror needed to portray the Hungarian nation and people as diametrically opposed in nature and character to the evils of totalitarianism. The museum rejects Vaclav Havel’s perspective “according to which to some extent everyone had been guilty in maintaining the regime”, which at the time was still a strong opponent to the perspective that “communism [and in this case also Nazism] was imposed on the country and the people by a foreign power with the assistance of a few collaborators, therefore responsibility can be assigned and individualized, thereby acquitting society of any wrongdoing” (Kiss, 2014, p. 79). This means that, from a narrative standpoint, Hungarians who collaborated with the regimes are identified with the external antagonistic forces and not with the homogenous agent that is Hungary. Spatially, the regimes are portrayed right next to their external “puppet masters”, with the room dedicated to the Arrow Cross regime being placed right after the portrayal of the German invasion and the “Room of Soviet Advisors” being placed literally behind the “Fifties” room, which portrays the establishment of the Communist/Stalinist regime in Hungary. The texts in the latter describe how “the aim

of the Soviet experts visiting Hungary was not only to convey the experiences of ‘advanced soviet industry and agriculture’ to their Hungarian colleagues, but to try to make them accept a lifestyle and a mentality totally alien to the Hungarian people”. Complying with this alien ideology means, in the overarching context of the exhibition, an identification with the external powers and not with the national character.

The museum makes a point to show how this alien ideology of terror distorted Hungarian life. The “Fifties” room is designed on a visual contradiction. Upon entering the room, the visitor is greeted with a brightly lit red coloured room, occupied by six voting booths and a table with a box to cast a ballot vote. The room is meant to represent the cheerful atmosphere that permeated the 1950’s in Hungary, according to state propaganda. These propaganda videos that the visitors can see inside the voting booths show a bright future for a nation heading in towards a socialist utopia, through the votes that the proletariat casts in that room. Around the walls, paintings in the style of soviet social neorealism show hopeful farmers and factory workers and, on the wall just behind the ballot box, three paintings of Stalin, Lenin and Rákosi welcome the voter. This cheerful atmosphere is broken when the visitor moves behind the wall, where one is confronted with a wiretapping setting. The wall that seems so cheerful is revealed to be made of uncouth plywood, supported by equally rough wood beams. The very grey and rugged setting is made up of a crowded table with worn down wiretapping devices, old looking papers and a coat hanger with very worn-down heavy winter coats and a Russian style ushanka hat. If the first half of the room is unnaturally positive and a clearly constructed reality that suits the party’s ideology, the grim reality of the other half is no better consolation. The true spirit of the nation is found in neither. “Life under communism”, as this latter half of the room is titled, is characterized by a total oppression and perversion of Hungary, its people and its national character. Communism, being an external ideology, cannot be understood as anything more than a force that repressed Hungary. As Péter Apor put it:

Representing the communist regime exclusively as a terrorist rule generated by such external forces and maintained solely by violence is a crucial means of implementing this concept rooted in a historicist understanding of nationalism. If the communist dictatorships ... can be successfully isolated as events of non-national history, it becomes possible to claim that a range of resilient qualities and features

characterize the nation and that these remained unchanged during and in spite of communism. (Apor, 2011, p. 580)

The museum creates a clear separation between these communists, Meaning, the non-Hungarian that used Russian hats and the true Hungarians who suffered at their hands. In “Life under communism” it is mentioned how these ‘functionaries’ were not affected by the “centralized, planned economy, which soon bankrupted the country”, nor by the “empty shelves” and “queues for hours”, since they “received special treatment”. Because of the external nature of this ideology, as mentioned in the “Resistance” room, these changes were “unacceptable to the majority of Hungarians”. Again, in the “Room of Gabor Péter”, it is mentioned how “Hungarian society vegetated in the era of the ÁVH”, and how they “wanted to change the people into subjects in this regime of systematic terror”. As such, if the antagonistic regime is identified as an external force of terror, with the aim of transforming the nation’s character, the Hungarian nation is, on the contrary, identified with a patriotic and traditionalist character, ‘kidnapped by the East’.

It is important, however, to point out a consequence of this simplistic dichotomy between the good patriotic Hungary and the evil external totalitarianism: the inability for nuance of characterization. Although the idea of Hungarian subjugation is predicated on a historical state of affairs, this narrative choice has more to do with the storytelling devices of the museum than with a fully accurate representation of History. The House of Terror is very impression based, and so its strategy relies more on utilizing references and sensory queues to inform the visitor, rather than on a rigorous academic endeavour. Spectacle is used as evidence, since what matters for the curators is, as Mária Schmidt put it, to display the “artificial and anti-human teachings [that sought to] erase our collective national memory, to discontinue and eliminate our patriotism and our commitment to our homeland” (2018, p. 12). Even so, it is because of this lack of nuance that the museum employs the same lack of characterization of the victimizing agent as many other memorial museums, including to a lesser degree, the Aljube Museum, as previously discussed. There is little mention of the reasons behind why one would choose to join the ranks of the Communist party or take place in the atrocities committed by the Arrow Cross, other than a treacherous desire to attain or maintain political privileges. As such, because these treacherous Hungarians are discursively identified with the enemy, Hungary, as a narrative agent, retains its homogenous characterization as the innocent victim. This also means that any responsibility for actions

other than opposing the regimes are automatically transferred to the antagonizing party. This is, in fact, one of the criticisms that the House of Terror has received, especially when it comes to its portrayal of agency and responsibility in the Holocaust.

Holocaust memory is far from being a settled topic in Hungary and, in fact, in most central European nations. In Hungary, the Holocaust “has emerged as an ‘embarrassing’ topic for the various governments that succeeded the Communist regime” (Braham, 2016, p. 270). It was during the administrations of Péter Boross and then Viktor Orbán, that the “denationalization” of the history of the Holocaust became more accepted, along with more “defensive representations” (Hirschberger, Kende, & Weinstein, 2016, p. 33). This has, in recent years, become one of the main talking points in radical political forces such as *Jobbik* and the *Betyársereg*¹² (Skarlatos, 2018; Kim, 2016, p. 345). The defenders of this perspective point out to a need to “clear the name and honour of the nation”, seeing themselves as “patriots that seek to enable ... Hungarians to become once again proud of their history” (Braham, 2016, p. 281). Authors such as Rudolph Braham (2016) have pointed out the ways in which the House of Terror, by function of a simplistic dichotomous characterization, transfers or avoids Hungarian responsibility for the Holocaust. Among them, by deflecting attention “away from the Hungarians’ involvement in the Holocaust [and] focusing attention on the rescue activities of the relatively few Christians who had been identified by Yad Vashem as Righteous among the Nations”. In the “Churches” room, the handout text states that “Although in 1938-39 the leaders of the Christian Churches in Hungary did not gainsay the shameful Jewish Laws, following the Nazi occupation when their Jewish compatriots were in peril, a number of them hastened to their aid. Many priests, nuns and ordinary believers saved lives”, also mentioning their “heroic courage” before listing names of “but a few shining examples”. This is a common representation of national involvement in the Holocaust among post-communist societies, but it is not universal. One example of the rejection of this denationalized holocaust history is seven metro stops away from the House of Terror, in the Budapest Holocaust Museum. The exhibition not only represents how the leaders of the Christian churches “did not gainsay” the persecution of Jews and other minorities, but also, beyond showing “shining examples”, displays the picture of members

¹² Far-right political movements, with *Jobbik* being the second strongest political force in parliament in 2019 and the *Betyársereg* being a paramilitary group (Kim, 2016, 345)

of the clergy such as Calvinist Bishop László Ravasz, who openly stated the “harmfulness of mixing Hungarian blood” and supported the castration policies (Manchin, 2015, p. 247).

Moreover, the Museum barely mentions the persecution of Jews and other minorities before the takeover of the Arrow Cross party, with the only instance being the date propping of the 1938, 1939 and 1941 restrictive laws in “Double Occupation”. Because of this, the agency over the persecution of the Jewish population is transferred to the Arrow Cross party, with mentions of how “Hungary now faced a tragic situation” as “the new government handed over the countryside’s Jewish Population to the Nazi’s murderous army” dominating the discourse. Despite this, the actual historical circumstances were a lot more nuanced. In fact, anti-Semitism had been a part of Hungarian political life for a long time, with anti-Semitic parties appearing in the political arena well before the 20th century (Romsics, 1999, p. 117) and, in many ways, still is (Skarlatos, 2018). On this matter, historians such as Istvan Deák, Jan Gross and Tony Judt have also pointed out that it was with only “a minimum of German assistance, that the Hungarian authorities collected nearly half a million Jews from the countryside and sent them to Auschwitz” (Deák, 2000, p. 53).

Even so, as stated by Tony Judt , it is “necessary to place the case of these individuals [perpetrators of violence] in the larger, and more terrible, context of wartime and ... racial and ethnic purification” (Judt, 2000, p. ix) and take into consideration the moral legacy of the “righteous among the nations” (Gensburger, 2011, p. 135). This is because characterization “[should] neither [only encompass] the anti-Nazi fighters of World War II, nor the anti-Bolshevik crusade” (Deák, 2000, p. 41). By characterizing the agents in its narrative through the lenses of a simplistic dichotomy of a Hungary against the wishes of dominating superpowers, the House of Terror is able to convey a more impactful message, that is better suited for its spectacle-based approach, based primarily on “public memory” (Apor , 2014, p. 328). This, however, comes at the cost of the loss of nuance and grey areas, which may be problematic, especially in a “society as history-conscious as the Hungarian”, where these topics are “no minor issue” (Judt, 2000, p. xii).

The Trianon Question

Just as mentioned before, the House of Terror's political project aims not only at characterizing the previous regime, but also at contributing to the public negotiation of a new identity for the nation after communism. The museum's exhibition looks to the past to inform what are the pressing issues that the nation faces, according to the perspectives of its founders and architects. Because of this, the museum has often been criticized for its heavily political depictions. Péter Apor started his article on the epistemology of spectacle in the House of Terror by stating that it "is one of the most notorious examples of abusing spectacular new media audio-visual technology to exhibit a politically and ideologically biased historical narrative" (2014, p. 328). In his critique, the author adds that the museum "denies the possibility of obtaining knowledge of the past via investigation and evidence in order to persuade its audience about the credibility of its historical fiction. The House of Terror offers nothing to remember. Instead it articulates and visualizes a political message" (Apor, 2014, p. 338). Like Apor, a significantly broad scope of the Hungarian academia agrees that the political and ideological program of Viktor Orbán's FIDESZ are woven onto the museum's depictions and omissions about the past (Kiss, 2015, p. 248). Michael Toomey identified the two main points of historical politicization in Hungary, between 2010 and 2015, as: 1) the place of the conservative regent of the kingdom of Hungary Miklós Horthy in the historical narrative of the nation; and 2) the Treaty of Trianon, the peace settlement with the Allies after World War I that broke the historical Kingdom of Hungary into multiple nation states (Toomey, 2018, p. 87). Because these are key topics on the memory politics in Hungary, analysing how these integrate the exhibition can be particularly informative on the discursive practices of the museum. This section will analyse the question of Trianon, while the next will discuss the place of Miklós Horthy and his legacy.

The question of the fallout of Trianon has been an important part of Hungarian politics ever since the signing of the treaty itself in 1920. A series of governments under the Horthy regency ran political platforms on restoring, fully or partially, the two thirds of land lost after World War I (Romsics, 1999). This has become, once more, a prevailing issue in Hungarian politics and international relations, after the "recovery of memory" and the fall of the universalist ideology of communism (Zombory, 2012, p. 94). This is closely linked

with the “Hungarian victimhood” discourse, of “Hungary caught between superpowers” notion, following the “assumption that the entire Hungarian nation suffered (and continues to suffer) a collective cultural trauma as a result of the Trianon settlement” (Toomey, 2018, p. 88). “Continues to suffer” is the key idea in this discourse, as the Trianon is seen not as an unfortunate past event, but a reality lived today by all Hungarians that needs to be politically acted upon. Hungary still often runs into diplomatic problems with its neighbours, namely Slovakia and Romania, due to its policies of “reunification of the nation through the institutionalization of the relations between Hungary and the Hungarians beyond the border” (Zombory, 2012, p. 10). More recent political actions such as the changes in the Citizenship law in 2010, facilitating the access to Hungarian citizenship to ethnic Hungarians in the pre-Trianon territories, have sparked further controversy with its neighbours and with the opposition (Pytlas, 2013, p. 164). Zombory asserts that “[t]he ‘beyond the border’ discourse operates as extremely effective capital in Hungarian politics, because it implicitly uses and prescribes the definition of Hungarianness, and in this sense it is not interested in the ‘working through’ of the trauma” (2012, p. 227). This does not mean that the experience of ethnic Hungarians living outside the contemporary borders of Hungary is not a relevant issue, nor that it does not merit academic inquiry or political attention. Much of their cultural identity and sometimes material conditions are still, indeed, tied to the outcome of Trianon and the “nationality limbo” they still find themselves in (Erzsébet, 2016, p. 12). However, more important for this discussion is how this national phenomenon finds itself represented in politically motivated projects such as the House of Terror. As Michael Toomey stated:

The ingenuity of Orbán’s approaches lies precisely in the fact that ‘Trianon’ cannot ever be resolved; his intended audience is not external, but internal. As such, by engaging in a perpetual battle to restore the country’s lost honour, he continues to reconstruct the Trianon trauma, while also consolidating his image as the tragic national saviour. (2018, p. 15)

In the House of Terror, there is only one instance in which the name of the Treaty of Trianon is mentioned, which is in the first line of the handout texts in the “Double Occupation” room. This does not mean, however, that it is not present, as it is implied as an ever-present issue throughout the exhibition. The text of the “Double occupation” room starts precisely with a paragraph detailing the consequences of the treaty on Hungary: “the victorious powers deprived the country – whose area had once been larger than that of Italy and England – of two thirds of its territory. The provisions of the treaty resulted in more than

three million Hungarians being placed under the jurisdiction of neighbouring countries.” The museum firmly established Trianon as the event that brought Hungary to its knees. “Isolated politically, disarmed encircled by hostile countries, she became one of Central Europe’s weakest, most venerable states”. It is from this weakness that the larger powers are able to take over Hungary. The reason for this to be the opening paragraph of the start of the exhibition is to portray a clear picture: Hungary was the victim of larger powers who unrightfully deprived it of its territory as spoils of war, leaving it ripe for conquest by other more powerful nations. It is because of this that many aspects of the historical context are omitted, since the paragraph serves more as a narrative framing device than anything else: to create a setting in which the invasions of a weakened and venerable Hungary unfold. These omitted aspects, however, would show that the discourse of an unfortunate Hungary victimized by its greedy neighbours is not as simple as it is portrayed. The text does not refer that these territorial losses were brought in the context of the rise of nationalist movements, among ethnic minorities, that lead to the breaking up of the Austro-Hungarian empire. The various ethnic groups, such as the Slovaks, which were under Hungarian rule until Trianon, are not mentioned, nor are their strives for independence. The treaty is not portrayed as a complicated and admittedly flawed solution to the breaking up of a multi-ethnic empire. The treaty left ethnic Hungarians out of the new nation’s borders not just because of the excesses of the Versailles treaty (of which Trianon was a part of) but also because of the lack of a clear geographical boundary between Hungarian and minority populated lands.

Other aspects of the persistence of Trianon are evident throughout the House of Terror, such as the insistence in calling previously Hungarian cities in their Hungarian names in the English version of the texts. Examples of this are Kassa (Kosice, Slovakia) and Koloszvár (Cluj-Napoca, Romania). Another related omission in the “Double occupation” text are the bombardments of Kassa, Munkács and Rahó, that are mentioned as part of the aggression of the Soviet Union against the territory of Hungary. What the text fails to mention is how these cities were gained back to the kingdom of Hungary, as they correspond today to Kosice in Slovakia and Mukachevo and Rakhiv in Carpathian Ruthenia, Ukraine (Pastor, 2019). These were cities gained back through the alliance between Hungary and Germany in the beginning of World War II, being restored after the successful joint operations against Slovakia (at the time having had declared independence from the German controlled Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia) and against Carpatho-Ukraine. In the

context of the texts, these cities serve as examples of Soviet aggression and as characterizing elements to the narrative's agents, rather than complex battlefields of history, with the absence of a clear morally righteous agent.

But the main example of integrating the question of Trianon into the narrative of Hungarian victimhood is in "Resettlement and Deportation" room. The room aims at portraying many aspects of demographic changes and political persecution in Hungary through the depiction of a colder and more calculating form of violence by the Communist state. The centrepiece of the room is a black car, a "Black Maria", covered by a semi-transparent black veil hanging from the ceiling and down to the floor. It is "recognizable to even those with no direct experience of communism—evoking the heart-pounding knock on the door in the middle of the night that came with the car" (Sodaro, 2018, p. 74). Its ominousness is reinforced by the synchronization between lighting and sound in the room. The walls of the room are completely covered by arrest documents and newspapers, Hungarian and by Hungarian publishers abroad, with very dim lighting. The instrumental chords create an unsettling feeling, akin to a suspenseful scene in a spy movie. The major sources of lighting, which for the most part point from the ceiling down to the exterior of the veil, shift to the interior when the music reaches high notes, revealing the details of the car from behind the black veil. To further reinforce the central feature of this car, a small screen shows the interior of the car, with its red velvet seats and the iconic symbol of the communist party. Some small details are scattered throughout the room, including the small doorbell on the handout text dispenser that the visitor can ring, with its loud echoing high pitched sound. Despite this imagery of the communist police taking the unsuspecting citizen away in the cover of the night being so heavily featured in the room, this state persecution is not the intended focus. However, nearly half of the text is dedicated to the deportations and population exchanges that followed World War II. The first paragraph is dedicated to show how "[t]he second world war did not end collective persecution". The paragraph details the deportations of the Schwab population to Germany: "during the almost two-year-long campaign, the humiliated, ostracized Hungarian citizens of German origin completely deprived of all their belongings, were deported under inhumane conditions". The Schwab are the only minority which is given the title of "Hungarian citizens of [X] origin" throughout the exhibition and this is indicative of the narrative function that this paragraph has on the rest of the text and on the room. The deportation and humiliation of the Schwab at the hands

of the Communist apparatus is given as a proxy to the suffering that Hungarians and the Hungarian nation suffered at the hands of the same perpetrators. “Linking the tragedy [suffered by minorities] and the trauma endured by Hungary at Trianon” has become a common discursive practice to illustrate the victim role of the nation in the tides of History (Braham, 2016, p. 278). As such, the suffering of the Schwab opens a narrative framework to portray the suffering of deported Hungarians which is detailed in the following paragraph:

Czechoslovakia, one of the victors, also endeavoured to get rid of its German and Hungarian minorities. The aim was to expel unilaterally 200 000 ethnic Hungarians. Eventually under the Hungarian-Czechoslovak Population Exchange Agreement of 1946, more than 100 000 Hungarians were forced to leave their homeland where their roots had been since time immemorial, while close to 60 000 Slovaks were resettled from Hungary (“Deportation” room handout).

Some oversimplifications are used to frame the suffering of the Hungarian nation. Firstly, the context of the population exchanges, which is framed as solely the result of the victorious Czechoslovakia wishing to “get rid” and “expel unilaterally” its German and Hungarian population. Secondly, the contrast between the portrayal of the Hungarian experience of the population exchange is very different than the Slovak experience. There is an emphasis on how Hungarians were “forced to leave their homeland” while the Slovaks were merely “resettled from Hungary”. Moreover, the Hungarians’ deportation meant leaving the land “where their roots had been since time immemorial” while no mention of ties to the land is given to the Slovaks, since they are narratively associated with the enemy. These oversimplifications portray a victimized Hungary while omitting the context in which these population exchanges occurred, not just between Hungary and Czechoslovakia, but across central Europe and even the world. These population exchanges are part of an international context which saw the attempts to create ethnically homogenous nation-states from the multi-ethnic makeup of places such as Central Europe. By referring solely to the Hungarian ties to the land, the museum engages in the discourse on the retroactive perpetuity of the homogenous Hungarian nation, ignoring how central European states “historically had been multi-ethnic, culturally diverse, and religiously heterodox” (Johnson, 1996, p. 234) and how this was not just a Hungarian phenomenon:

For the first time in its history, Poland was almost exclusively ethnic Polish and Roman Catholic. The population of Bohemia and Moravia became almost exclusively Czech. In comparison, Hungary still had a considerable number of Jews and Germans, but it became much more homogeneous than it had been in the past. (Johnson, 1996, p. 235).

In the context of the room and of the exhibition, this “national tragedy” of partition and deportation is not, as mentioned before, just an unfortunate event of the past. The fact that it is represented alongside other sources of suffering is particularly informative. Moreover, A large portion of the text is dedicated to invoking images of the inhumane conditions on these prison-labour camps and to detail the dominion that the communist state had on large scale persecution:

Enclosed agricultural forced-labour camps, surrounded by barbed wire, guarded by ÁVO soldiers and police dogs. They were housed in sheep pens or barracks and were put to work under terrible conditions. Working days lasted 12 hours. The distance to the workplaces was usually 8-10 kilometres from their base, which forced labourers to make to and from on foot each day. Many died or suffered lasting health problems through insufficient nourishment, harsh conditions, strenuous labour and lack of medical facilities.

The text mentions the persecutions of more than 10 000 people, flagged as “Kulaks” (farmers unwilling to let go of their land), the mass resettlement of populations from the borders with Yugoslavia and the “mass evacuations” from Budapest, Győr, Szombathely and Székesfehérvár during the process of nationalization of private property. The text also references the horrors of Jewish persecution, by stating that “[s]ome of the forced evacuees had lived through the horrors of Nazi concentration camps. The prospect of another deportation caused a number of them to commit suicide, yet other dug up their yellow stars and pinned them on once again”. All of these invoked images are references to different events in the early history of communist Hungary, from ethnically motivated population exchanges, to ideologically motivated resettlements for nationalization by force of private property. What ties them together in the narrative, however, is the imagery of the black car in the centre of the room, since the texts are supplementary to the spectacle created in the exhibition. Historically, the black car was used in very few of the events depicted in the texts. The black car is a stylistic choice, just like the Russian Ushanka in the “Fifties” room,

meant to invoke folk wisdom rather than an actual historical context (Apor , 2014, p. 328). Despite this, it is used as a poignant referencing tool to immediately invoke the image of state sponsored persecution, narratively implying the dichotomy between persecuted Hungary and victimizer Communist state. As such, because the events detailed are portrayed under the same umbrella of terror, the museum presents them as being part of the same acts of a terrorist state against the nation.

This universalizing discourse of terror and persecution is, itself, part of the political project of the exhibition. The portrayal of the events of the Hungarian-Slovak population exchange alongside other events such as the expulsion of the Schwab and the communist state persecution plays into the popular perceptions regarding question of Trianon. The effectiveness of representation through an all-encompassing persecution (the image of the black car) is “emotionally fuelled by the difficulties of late modernity including increased uncertainty and ontological insecurity” (Sik, 2015, p. 53). Because of this, the question of Trianon is inscribed in the need for historical justice and recognition, together with the exposing of the atrocities committed by the communist state. In his commemorative speech in Budaörs to the members of the Ethnic Germans in Hungary, on the 19th of January 2016, Viktor Órban has stated that “[s]eventy years ago a process of deportation was carried out in Hungary and in other countries of Europe under the guise of relocation, and there was not a single wise and responsible person – including the representatives of the victorious powers – who resisted it” (2016). The strategy for the memory politics has been, since before the opening of the museum, to portray the current administration as the “wise and responsible” people who were missing then and are now resisting and restoring justice (Benazzo, 2017, 199). With Trianon being portrayed alongside persecution and deportation, it becomes not an unfortunate turn in History, but one of the issues that needs justice restored.

The traditional nation (Conservative Project)

One of the key aspects of FIDESZ’s politics of memory ever since the elections of 1994 is the drive to “recreate the political and moral atmosphere of the interwar Horthy regime” (Deák, 2000, p. 40). Since then, the legacy of Horthy has become an even more polarizing issue in Hungarian society, alongside the political polarization of the question of

Trianon, as previously discussed (Toomey, 2018). These issues have, indeed, been tied together in FIDESZ's political project of a conservative and traditionalist Hungary. The rehabilitation of Horthy's memory has not come without its criticisms, as the period of his regency is still associated with the political atmosphere of anti-Semitism and with the Alliance with the Axis, resulting in the defeat of Hungary and the Holocaust. Nevertheless, the reconstruction of the memory of the period serves as a "point of continuity somewhere in the past before the end of the Second World War, [that could serve as] a point of connection for the present regime in Hungary" (Benazzo, 2017, p. 206). This memory strategy, to find a point of continuity before the Second World War, is very common among post-communist states, as they tend to "represent the nation as an eternal entity, a set of virtues and values, whose history is described as a success story of the realization of these qualities" (Apor, 2011, p. 580). As discussed before, in these representations the totalitarian period is not portrayed as being part of the nation's history, but an externally imposed pause, implying the need for a point in time before this pause from which the nation must start over.

This rehabilitation of the Horthy legacy is not, however, solely the responsibility of the Orbán administration, nor is it the only memory strategy that Hungarian society and political agents have found to pinpoint the legitimacy of the current regime. Braham states that "[i]t was during [József] Antall's administration (1990-1993) that the drive to bring about the rehabilitation of Miklós Horthy gained momentum" (2000, p. 371) He also added that "a major step in this direction [the political resurrection of the former Regent] was the returning of his and his family's remains from Portugal and reburying them [in 1993] with the pomp and circumstance befitting a former head of state" (2000, p. 371). At the time, a reporter from the New York Times interviewed attendees to the funeral, whose visions were more or less aligned with those that are still present in many circles of Hungarian society today: "The Jews were taken away ... but only after the Germans came in 1944, not before" and "in the 45 years of the Communists after Horthy there wasn't any justice" (Perlez, 1993, p. 6). Portrayals of Horthy, such as the ones in the House of Terror, are built upon these conceptions and discourses that "downsize his role ... in maintaining anti-Jewish policies", while highlighting his patriotism and attempts at safeguarding national sovereignty (Benazzo, 2017). The revival of his memory goes hand in hand with the conception of a national identity predicated on patriotic conservatism and Christian traditions. It is also often portrayed as a preoccupation with reinstalling a vanishing national sovereignty. When asked

about the appropriateness of drawing legitimacy from the model of governance of Horthy, Mária Schmidt responded that “Hungary is a sovereign state. And we are sovereign so that outsiders do not tell us how we can think about our history. We couldn’t deal with Horthy for 45 years because of Soviets didn’t allow us, and now we shouldn’t deal with him because the Americans won’t let us? This is our decision, this is our history” (2017, p. 20).

It is within these perspectives that the memory of Horthy is portrayed in the House of Terror. In the “Double occupation” room, the text states that “up to the time of the Nazi occupation of 1944, Hungary’s affairs were conducted by an elected, legitimate parliamentary government, with representatives from active opposition parties sitting in the legislative chamber.” It also states that “Hungarian citizens lived a better and freer life than citizens in neighbouring countries.” By reinforcing the legitimacy of the government prior to the occupation by Nazi Germany, the museum is able to establish the Hungarian regime as diametrically opposed to the “Alien Ideology” of Nazism, being allied to Germany only to “maintain her albeit limited elbow room and avert the worse scenario”. Furthermore, in the “Fifties” room, it is mentioned how the smallholders party fought for a “civil democracy based on democratic traditions”. By referring to “democratic traditions”, the museum implies a point in the past in which the government “sought to protect the nation’s independence” and from which the current regime must derive its legitimacy from. Democracy, more concretely the type of democracy that opposes the “Left bloc”, is portrayed as the one most corresponding with Hungary’s true traditional identity. This portrayal of Hungary as conservative and traditional in nature is, in fact, present across the exhibition, corresponding with the political perspectives of “court historian of Viktor Orbán” (Benazzo, 2017, p. 203). Two instances in particular are important to understand how the FIDESZ’s conservatism perspires through the portrayals of Hungary in the exhibition: the “Peasants” and the “Churches” rooms.

The Historian Ignác Romsics stated that, within Hungarian society, the biggest enemies of the Communist state were the intelligentsia, the peasantry (farmers) and the churches (1999, p. 296). Only the last two are portrayed in the exhibition, although radically differently. The “Peasants” room is comprised of a maze-like path, with walls made of silicone recreations of one kilo blocks of lard and bright artificial lighting. The lard blocs are an ironic reference to the 1969 Hungarian movie *The witness* [A Tanú], directed by Péter Bacsó, which satirically depicts the rationing and “redistributing” policies under

Rákosi/Stalinist period. The blocs are a folk wisdom reference recognizable to Hungarian visitors, as “one kilogram of lard was precious under communist rationing” (Sodaro, 2018, p. 74). This dominance of the lard blocs over the visitor’s movement in space are representative of the condition of independent farmers as seen by the House of Terror. In the texts they are associated with the “countryside’s traditional lifestyle” and with “conservative values, customs and traditions”, whilst “they [the communists] tried to break the people’s spirit”. The farmers are shown as being defeated by the ideological machinery. This “traditional lifestyle”, which is often depicted through the idyllic open horizon of the Hungarian plains, is completely removed from the artificial and constricting space of the lard maze. On the maze walls, there are propaganda pamphlets and screens with testimonies of farmers from the plains regions of around Szeged and Szolnok, negatively called “Kulaks” by the communists, detailing their treatment on the hands of the communist police, with theirs sometimes crying voices filling up the space. The text ends with “eventually, the resistance of the peasantry was broken”. The peasants serve as an incorporation of the conservative idyllic of Hungary, crushed by the “experiences of the ‘vanguard’” and the “forced production of cotton and rice, originally not indigenous to Hungary”.

If, however, the “Peasants” room is a display of the crushing defeat of the traditions of Hungary, the “Churches” room, in the end of the exhibition before the descent into the reconstructed prison cells, is a hopeful response to this defeat. The room itself is a dark long room with a horizontal domed ceiling, similar to an underground cellar. The room stands behind a large, thick bunker-like door, with several screens on its surface playing the same video of priests detailing persecution by the communist state. The centrepiece is a large white-glowing Cross that occupies most of the floor space in the room. The floor around it is broken and the concrete underneath is revealed, giving it the sensation of being an object made of light bursting out of the ground. On the sides of the room, several objects of believers such as rosaries and prayer books are placed in display cases, with the chasuble of Cardinal Mindszenty on a display case at the end of the room, turned to the head of the cross. The room is filled with Gregorian chant, which feeds into the atmosphere of solemnness. It is the only major depiction of an agent associated with Hungary which has not been defeated by the ideological machine, but instead lies, literally, underground, resisting the efforts to crush it. The texts state that “both Nazism and Communism regarded religion as their enemy ... because ethic-religious teaching was diametrically opposed to [their] ideology”. On the

text on Cardinal Mindszenty, it is referred how the Catholic Church had a “network or educational, social, cultural and devotional institutions [that] covered the entire country and played a major role in nurturing and maintaining national culture and its traditions”. Religion is portrayed as the moral heart of the Nation, which remained resilient until the end of the occupation. It was the religious institutions who were responsible for the survival of “national culture and its traditions”. “Piece Priests”, those who abided by the orders of the communist regime, are portrayed as the ones who “tarnished the moral authority of the churches” and, as such, are not representative of the moral goodness of the true religious Hungarians. This association between the nation’s identity after communism and religion has become commonplace in many post-communist societies, especially considering the religious persecutions during the period and the role of Church leaders such as Pope John Paul II in the opposition to communism (Zielińska, 2015). This “moral authority” of the church is typified by Cardinal Mindszenty, who opposed even Pope Paul VI’s *mundus vivendi* tolerance of communism, even if he was allowed to exit the US embassy because of them. (Von Klimó, 2015, p. 345). Hence, “[t]he millennium provided an opportunity for the [FIDESZ] government to perform the historical continuity of the Hungarian state grounded in a Christian-clerical historicization and national particularism” (Apor, 2011, p. 580). By building on discourses of the recovery of religious freedom in post-communist Europe, Orbán’s conservative project displays a nation whose very past and present identity is tied with its Christianity. By extrapolation, an opposition to this conservative patriotic project is an opposition to the nation’s very identity.

This conception of national identity through the lenses of a conservative political project can also be seen in the House of Terror’s portrayal of Hungarian Communist leaders. As discussed before, they are narratively associated not with Hungary, but with the antagonistic force of Communism, with very little distinction between their policies and the historical context in which they operated. Ranging “[f]rom the Stalinist Mátyás Rákosi, to the national Communist Imre Nagy and the opportunistic János Kádár” (Deák, 2000, p. 37), each of these represents an entirely different type of communism. Even so, the communist regime is portrayed indistinguishably throughout the museum as the same foreign terror. The one exception is the figure of Imre Nagy, whose portrayal is a reflection of the complicated relation of FIDESZ’s conservative memory politics with the alternative historical sources of democracy legitimization, namely the 1956 revolution. Nagy appears mentioned several

times in the texts, such as in “Resettlement and Deportation” and “Justice”, always as putting a stop to some policy of terror. His major portrayals, however, are in the “Justice” room and in “Hall of the 56’ revolution”. The text in the latter mentions how, amidst the 1956 revolt, he “declared a general and immediate ceasefire”, after which the Soviet tanks withdrew from Hungary before returning days later to crush the revolution. He is mentioned again later in the text as being sentenced to death and executed after a “show trial held behind closed doors”. This show trial is the focus of the “Justice” room, which appears in the previous floor on the visit’s itinerary. The room itself is meant to portray a courtroom, with tables covered in courtroom files and benches in which the visitor can sit in. The left wall is covered by shelves of document folders, with a small discrete opening revealing a very small compartment room, with listening devices atop of a small table and a picture of Rákosi on the wall, meant to symbolise the rigged nature of the trials. In the place of the judge there is a screen that plays a propaganda movie depicting the crimes of Imre Nagy against the socialist state. Nagy himself is given no agency in these portrayals. He is not associated with the communist apparatus, but he is not represented alongside the active Hungarian resistance either. Despite his involvement in the 1956 revolution, he is presented as just another of the victims of its failure.

The “Hall of the 1956 revolution”, in fact, leans heavily on the portrayal of the failure of the uprising. It is a domed, brick walled, underground room on the basement, just after the Reconstructed prison cells and the “Internment” room. Its centrepiece are objects hanging from the ceiling above videos of the Soviet tanks rolling in on Budapest. Two jackets, a bicycle and an iconic Hungarian flag with a hole cut out from where the communist coat of arms would have been. On the brick wall, a white graffiti reads “Ruszkik haza!”, meaning “Russians go home”, a play on the Hungarianized Russian language word for “Russian”, referencing the graffiti that were painted across Budapest. The room itself plays into a widespread discourse on the heroism in defeat of the Hungarians, which has been present in Hungarian society since the Revolution of 1848 (Arató, 2012, p. 36). The last paragraph in the text states that:

In October 1956 the people of Hungary proved to themselves and to the world that among the peoples none are small, but some are powerless. No people can be subjugated forever, and if oppression and terror are so intolerable that they threaten the identity and existence of a nation, then the fight can and must be taken up – even

against a power which is believed to be the strongest. The Hungarian freedom fighters, with their self-sacrificing courage, inflicted a deadly wound on the vast Soviet Empire.

This “inflicted deadly wound” is a reference to the shifts towards softer impositions in the policies of the USSR towards the member nations of the Warsaw pact, following the Hungarian uprising. However, the text, and the exhibition itself, does not draw a continuity between the current regime and the political aims of the 1956 revolution, nor from Imre Nagy, instead relegating them to the role of a heroic but failed act of the nation. Mária Schmidt has described the revolution as a “communal heartbeat of the nation ... so strong that it was sensed even by those who did not want to sense it” (Schmidt, 2018, p. 4), a patriotic desire for independence and not an actual political project. This has been a feature of conservative circles in Hungarian politics of memory, in which the rehabilitation of conservative figures of the Horthy period, including Horthy himself, are accompanied by a diminishing of the memory of figures such as Imre Nagy. According to authors such as Máté Zombory (2017), this is due to the rejection that any sort of legitimacy or democratic reform could come from within the communist establishment. The presentation of the 1956 revolution exclusively through its nationalistic features also “rules out its leftist dimension”, leaving “the contemporary left [with] obstacles in claiming any linkage to it” (Benazzo, 2017, p. 207). Other political actions appear as subtle nudges for the replacement of Imre Nagy as the leading post-communist national hero, such as the lack of mention of Nagy by Viktor Orbán in his inauguration of the House of Terror speech and more recently the removal of the statue of Imre Nagy from Kossuth Square, in front of the Hungarian parliament. (Toomey, 2018, p. 100).

These are just some of the portrayal strategies employed by the House of Terror to characterize the essence of the Hungarian ethos, in line with FIDESZ’s political strategy. The museum draws on discourses already present in post-communist Hungarian society to reinforce its message as a conservative political project. By drawing from the cultural trauma of Trianon, the conflicting sources of legitimacy for the current regime or the memory of persecution and resistance, its exhibitions present a version of history that suits the political vision of its founders. It is because of this that Amy Sodaro described it as a divisive museum (2018, p. 82). Sodaro claims that its “abuses of the memory of the past” might end up “undermining the important moral role in Hungarian society that has been set for it” and that

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

“a better moral lesson might be derived from an examination of the politics that divide Hungarian society today [present in the museum]” (2018, pp. 82-83). Péter Apor stated that, ironically, the House of Terror approaches its portrayal of the agents of History in the same fashion as the Marxist philosopher György Lukács, whose Hegelian philosophy of History “expected [the historian] to demonstrate how society came to its contemporary form and which historical processes determined its contemporary state” (Apor, 2014, p. 335). “History is adopted as [FIDESZ’s] instrumentum regni” (Benazzo, 2017, p. 199), and so, the House of Terror is an example among many in post-communist Europe of how “[h]istory is [p]olitics projected into the [p]ast” (Amacher, 2018, p. 132).

Chapter V - Conclusion

This dissertation aimed at analysing the discursive practices present in the permanent exhibitions of the Aljube Museum and of the House of Terror. Adopting a perspective of tourism as “worldmaking” (Hollingshead, 2004, p. 30), the purpose was to identify specific discourses and ideological contents that these two cultural tourism products reproduce, while at the same time studying them in the context of their societies. It seems fit that the concluding remarks not only summarize the discussed topics, but also provide some comparative insights that can be drawn from the proposed debates.

Both the Aljube Museum and the House of Terror exhibitions draw from discourses already present in their societies. These discourses are recreated and represented through specific object display strategies, audio-visual elements, texts and purposeful aesthetic and spatial design. The analysis on the Aljube Museum discussed how the museum utilizes tightening space, colour, light and evocative visual elements to reproduce the discourse on the “cover of silence” (Gil, 2017, p. 121) that was imposed by the regime. It was also discussed how the museum intends to counteract the lingering legacy of this silencing, despite some of its omissions possibly reflect this very same legacy. Furthermore, it discussed the museum’s use of language, particularly how the museum utilizes the vocabulary of antifascism and how, through the recontextualization of the regime’s rhetoric, it seeks to delegitimize some of the discourses created by the regime. Moreover, it was debated how the museum portrays the colonial war. It was argued that, although the museum does replicate the hegemonic view on the illegitimacy of the war, it does fall into the silence and avoidance surrounding the topic in Portuguese society. The analysis concluded with how the revolution of 1974 is portrayed not as a process, but as an event, represented by the iconography of the day itself. This is likely due to what Baumgarten called the “minimal consensus” (2017, p. 56), that is, the portrayal of democracy and freedom as the legacy of the revolution, since possible additional meanings may be contested by differing political leanings.

Likewise, the analysis of the House of Terror proposed a debate on specific discursive practices. Firstly, it debated how the museum’s use of space and iconography is used to reproduce the discourse on the “double occupation”. This discourse, which arose in

central Europe after the fall of the Berlin Wall, equates Nazism with Communism, thus inscribing the experience of post-communist societies with the same recognition of suffering as the victims of Nazism. Secondly, it was discussed how the discourse on Hungarian impotence in the face of History is replicated in the exhibition through word choices and agent characterization. It is also discussed how this discourse is used to characterize the Hungarian nation as a homogenous entity, identified with the victim role. This form of a “no true Scotsman” argument means that the Hungarians who collaborated are identified with the perpetrator and not with Hungary. As discussed, some authors fear this may lead to an avoidance of the discussion on Hungarian responsibility in the sustenance of the regime and in events such as the Holocaust. Furthermore, the analysis details how the use of language, recognizable iconography and “folk wisdom” (Apor, 2014, p. 328) are used to portray historical events and agents for the creation of a politically motivated narrative. Namely, the insertion of wider discourses on the fallout of the Trianon Treaty into other examples of state persecution, such as the deportations of the Swab and the persecution of independent farmers by the communist state. This, as argued, is used to legitimate the conservative narrative on the topic. Moreover, it was discussed how the differences in characterization between different sectors of Hungarian society in the museum can reveal the underlying conservative perspective on Hungarian identity. This helps understand how this conservative project derives the historical legitimacy of democratic Hungary from the Horthy period, with consequences both for the presentation of History and political direction in Hungary.

Given the discussions on the practices in each museum, it is interesting to point out some comparative remarks between both museums. Despite the different contexts in which they were created, both socially and politically, they do apply many of the same design and curating choices. Moreover, because they both serve as flag bearers for their societies’ memorial and museological practices, it is relevant to comparatively discuss their exhibition practices. As such, the following paragraphs will use the insights and descriptions drawn from the analysis to briefly make some concluding remarks on their use of spectacle, their actual and potential points of criticism and their role in their respective societies.

As discussed before, both museum resort to symbolic and suggestive display strategies rather than utilizing the object-centred display strategy of more classical museums. Neither of the exhibitions aims at portraying realistic renderings of the past, but choose, instead, to use recognizable iconographic elements to weave a cohesive spatial narrative. In

this sense, both museums are heavily influenced by New Museology and, as such, draw from theatrics and other storytelling strategies to instil in the visitor the message they intend to pass on. In the case of the House of Terror, in fact, as mentioned before, the person in charge of the design aesthetics of the exhibition was Attila Ferenczffy-Kovács, a “stage designer-turned-historian” (Apor, 2014, p. 328). This application of design and audio-visual elements to create a narrative is what authors such as Péter Apor called “spectacle” (2014, p. 328). This concept was discussed by authors such as Guy Debord and Jean Baudrillard to describe the overstating of images, representations of reality, over the actual reality. As Debord argued “the spectacle is not a collection of images; rather, it is a social relationship between people that is mediated by images” (2002, p. 12). Moreover, “spectacle cannot be understood as a mere visual deception produced by mass-media technologies. It is a worldview that has actually been materialized” (Debord, 2002, p. 8). Some of the examples given in the analysis are reflections of this use of spectacle in both museums. In the House of Terror, a possible example is the choice to use a combination of changing light, screeching music and the out-of-placeness of the black car in the room “Resettlement and Deportation” to create an evocative ambience, rather than a realistic object-evidence-based depiction of reality. In the Aljube Museum, an example can be the use of overhead lighting, constricting tightening space and the evocative iconography of file cases and drawers in the end of the “Police and Political Courts” section.

However, even though both use spectacle as a display strategy, their approach to it is rather different. The use of spectacle in the Aljube Museum seems to be complementary and illustrative, since it always draws back to the texts. In the House of Terror, however, it seems to be foundational. That is, the House of Terror used spectacle as its medium to provide information. The text in the handout sheets serves more as a form of label, an explanation of what the evocative rooms are meant to portray. Contrarily, the Aljube Museum uses spectacle as a framing for the texts. An example of this is in the corridor of “Unquestionable Certainties”, in which the evocative use of space design, sound and lighting is used to draw attention to the texts and instil in their content a greater impact. One example where the museum slightly departs from this strategy is the reconstructed prison cells, in which the focus becomes the relation of the visitor to the space and the emotional impact that it causes. However, even in this circumstance, the spectacle-centred section is in the end of the second floor, after the path leads the visitor through the explanation of imprisonment in the Estado

Novo. On the use of spectacle, Sodaro detailed the reason for this choice in the House of Terror, stating that the museum “is intended to provoke an emotional reaction first and foremost, with an intellectual response following” (2018, p. 68). Adding that, “for Schmidt, [it] had to be a museum in which her daughter would not be bored” (2018, p. 68). This is the most common argument in favour of this spectacle first driven approach, the need to captivate publics, especially younger audiences. On the one hand, it can be extrapolated that the House of Terror is far more effective at conveying its core message than the Aljube Museum, especially to younger audiences. This seems especially relevant when considering the mission of educators that these museums acquire. On the other hand, the heavy reliance on spectacle can lead to oversimplification of perspectives or to the overtaking of the representations over reality. On the latter, Baudrillard pointed out that “it is no longer a question of false representation of reality, ... the imaginary is no longer true or false, it is a deterrent machine” (1995, p. 21). As such, the reliance on the evocative and symbolic, although it can be the most effective tool, as discussed before, to bridge the limitations of language, can, nonetheless, cripple debate over historical accuracy, since it does not lay claim to objective representation.

Another aspect that should be remarked is the criticism that these museums can and are subjected to inside their own societies. While the House of Terror, with the extensive literature covering aspects of it, has been subjected to several different criticisms, the Aljube Museum, in part due to its recency, has yet to be subjected to this kind of academic scrutiny. The major point that the House of Terror is criticized for is its use as a political and ideological tool for the Orbán administration. Its absences and omissions, as well as its points of deeper detailing are heavily influenced by the vision for a conservative Hungary held by its creators. As Žižek pointed out “nothing is lacking in the real: every perception of a lack or a surplus ('not enough of this', 'too much of that') always involves a symbolic universe” (1994, p. 11). Likewise, in the Aljube Museum the absences and omissions discussed in the analysis can reveal a lot about its creators. Things such as the depersonalization of perpetrators or the avoidance of certain topics such as the complex question of responsibility regarding the colonial wars can be potential points of criticism in the exhibition. Unlike the House of Terror, in which a significant body of literature points to an overwhelmingly political motive behind the museum, the origin of this absences in the Aljube Museum is not so clear-cut. A possible interpretation can be seen in its choice to focus on the resistance

rather than in the perpetrators. Its main goal is to inscribe the memory of the resistance fighters and, as such, reaffirm the moral standing of those associated with them in the collective memory of that period. Perhaps it is precisely because of this that it does not engage in potentially more controversial topics, since they could undermine the goal to reach the broadest public possible. An example could be the reactions to potential alternative representations of perpetrators. A more humanizing representation could mean accusations of exoneration, while a harsher representation could lead to accusations of demonization. Likewise, the engaging in a more complex debate over the events of the colonial wars could mean an accusation of both undervaluing the lingering suffering and trauma of the veterans and, on the contrary, exonerating Portuguese responsibility. As such, the minimal consensus approach is not just applicable to the memory of the revolution, but, to a certain extent, to the exhibition as a whole. In order to inscribe the fleeting memory of the resistance, the museum opts to remain out of these more controversial debates.

This difference between the museums can also be seen through the prism of the political and social contexts in which they were created. The House of Terror was created 13 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, while the Aljube museum has a gap of 41 years between its inauguration and the revolution. In her interview with Amy Sodaro, Schmidt pointed out that “the primary impetus behind the creation of the House of Terror was the question of what to do with the many perpetrators of crimes committed under the communist regime” (2018, p. 66). The short period of time meant that symbolic actions against the communist past were still an important part of the memory work in Hungary (Zombory, 2012, p. 9). Moreover, the early 2000s were a very politically active time in Hungary and the political fight between the forces of MSZP (Hungarian Socialist Party) and FIDESZ meant a greater incentive to create politically motivated narratives about History (Benazzo, 2017, p. 201). As for the Ajube museum, the 41 years of distance meant that the political incentive was not as present in Portugal as it was in Hungary. It is possible to point out that the resurgence of some of the symbols and rhetoric of the revolution in left-wing political movements that followed the 2008 recession did have some influence in the exhibition and, especially, in the opening of the museum (Baumgarten, 2017, p. 55). However, it is nowhere near the political influence that motivated the creation of the House of Terror.

Some final remarks can be directed at their role as flag-bearers in their societies. As mentioned before, although none of them is the first museological instance regarding the

authoritarian period, they are the major instances and they set the precedent for later museums. Sodaro observed that, at the time of its creation, the House of Terror was meant to be the model for other memorial museums, not just in Hungary, but in all Central Europe (2018, p. 77). This project came into fruition with the creation of the Emlékpont Museum in Hódmezővásárhely, following the same evocative and spectacular strategies in its exhibition, a number of temporary exhibitions across Hungary and the projected House of Fates will come into being (Schmidt, 2018). Likewise, as mentioned before, the Aljube Museum paved the way for new museums in Peniche, in Porto and, in part, instigated a greater interest in the new museological project in Santa Comba Dão. Their differing approaches to the portrayal of the past also means that the precedent that they set is radically different. Although the Aljube Museum does refrain from discussing more controversial topics, it opened the way for future museological instances to more openly debate these topics. If this does not occur, however, it can lead to a perpetuation of avoidance and, in turn, an intensification of selective forgetfulness which cannot fight the whitewashing of history. The House of Terror, on the other hand, set the precedent for a more politically oriented museum. As such, later museological endeavours can only respond with either a replication of the naturalized narrative or, on the contrary, with a rejection of it which will be more heavily perceived as ideologically/politically motivated than the former.

This dissertation is by no means meant to be an extensive analysis and many questions remain open for future inquiry. As mentioned in the introduction, this was a situated research, done with hopes to inquiry into the directions that are being taken and one day, hopefully, contribute to shape them. Opportunities abound for new research. With the opening of new museums on the topics, it becomes relevant to inquire into how these new exhibitions relate to or differ from those already established. Moreover, although the impact of the exhibition on the visitors was already studied in the case of the House of Terror (Christensen, 2011), this is still lacking in the Aljube Museum. Other aspects could also be studied further, such as the role of guided tours or audio guides (the latter just in the case of the House of Terror) in the discursive construction of the exhibition. Furthermore, other more theoretical aspects deserve deeper inquiry, such as the role of ideology in the shaping of exhibitions or even in other tourism products. The field is open for play and even though it is a crowded and acceleration field, there is still plenty of room for inquiry.

Bibliography

- Adorno, T. (2001). *The Culture Industry: Selected essays on mass culture*. London: Routledge.
- Afonso, A., & Gomes, C. d. (2014). Guerra Colonial - Dos Antecedentes ao 25 de Abril [Colonial War - From the Precedents to the 25th of April]. *Os anos de Abril Vol. 1 O fim do Marcelismo*, 54-84.
- Albanese, G. (2016). Searching for Antifascism: Historiography, the Crisis of the Liberal State and the Birth of Fascism and Antifascism in Italy, Spain and Portugal. In H. García, M. Yusta, X. Tabet, & C. Clímaco, *Rethinking Antifascism: History, Memory and Politics, 1922 to the Present* (pp. 76-91). Oxford: Berghahn.
- Alexander, J. C. (2002). On the Social Construction of Moral Universals: The 'Holocaust' from War Crime to Trauma Drama. *European Journal of Social Theory Vol.5 Issue 1*, 5-81.
- Alexander, J. C. (2012). *Trauma: A Social Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Althusser, L. (2014). *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Third edition)*. London: Verso.
- Amacher, K. (2018). Mikhail N. Pokrovsky and Ukraine: A Normative Marxist between History and Politics. *Ab Imperio 1*, 101-132.
- Apor, P. (2011). Master Narratives of Contemporary History in Eastern European National Museums. *European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen* (pp. 569-585). Paris: Linköping University Electronic Press.
- Apor, P. (2014). An epistemology of the spectacle? Arcane knowledge, memory and evidence in the Budapest House of Terror. *Rethinking History 18*, 328-344.
- Arató, A. (2012). Regime Change, Revolution and Legitimacy in Hungary. In G. A. Toth, *Constitution for a Disunited Nation: On Hungary's 2011 Fundamental Law* (pp. 35-57). Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Araújo, A., & Silva, A. D. (2009). O uso de Napalm na Guerra Colonial [The use of Napalm in the Colonial War]. *Relações Internacionais (R:I) Vol.22*, 121-139.
- Ashworth, G. J., Graham, B., & Tunbridge, J. E. (2007). *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*. London: Pluto Press.
- Ashworth, G., & Tunbridge, J. E. (1996). *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester: Wiley.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Assmann, J. (2011). *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barahona, J. (Director). (2004). *Quem é Ricardo? [Who is Ricardo?]* [Motion Picture].
- Barreto, A. (1992). *Os silêncios do regime - ensaios [Silences of the regime - essays]*. Lisbon: Editorial Estampa.
- Baudrillard, J. (1995). *Simulacra and Simulation*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1996). *The System of Objects*. London: Verso.
- Baumgarten, B. (2017). The children of the Carnation Revolution? Connections between Portugal's anti-austerity movement and the revolutionary period 1974/1975. *Social Movement Studies Vol. 16 Issue 1*, 51-63.
- Bebiano, R. (2014). Memória da Resistência ao Estado Novo num tempo sem tempo para a memória [Memory of the resistance to the Estado Novo in a time with no time for memory]. In P. Godinho, I. Fonseca, & J. Baía, *Resistência e/y Memória - Perspectivas Ibero-americanas* (pp. 41-47). Lisbon: IHC-FCSH/UNL.
- Beevor, A. (2012). *A Segunda Guerra Mundial [Second World War]*. Lisboa: Bertrand Editora.
- Békés, C. (2003). The 1956 Hungarian Revolution and the Super Powers. *Hungarian Studies 17:1*, 65-77.
- Békés, C. (2012). *The History of the Soviet Bloc 1945-1991: A Chronology Part I 1945-1952*. Budapest: Cold War History Research Center.
- Békés, C. (2013). *The History of the Soviet Bloc 1945-1991 A Chronology: Part II 1953-1968*. Budapest: Cold War History Research Center.
- Bell, D. (2006). Introduction: Memory, Trauma and World Politics. In D. Bell, *Memory, Trauma and World Politics Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present* (pp. 1-32). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bell, D. (2009). Tourism and Hospitality. In T. Jamal, & M. Robinson, *The SAGE Handbook of Toyurism Studies* (pp. 19-34). London: SAGE Publications.
- Benárd, A. (2016). Remembrance and Architecture The House of Fates project. *YBL Journal of Built Environment Volume 4: Issue 1*, 49-59.
- Benazzo, S. (2017). Not All the Past Needs To Be Used: Features of Fidesz's Politics of Memory. *Journal of Nationalism, Memory & Language Politics Volume 11 Issue 2*, 198-221.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Beni, M. C. (1997). *Análise Estrutural do Turismo [Structural Analysis of Tourism]*. São Paulo: SENAC Serviço Nacional de Aprendizagem Comercial.
- Ben-Tov, A. (1988). *Facing the Holocaust in Budapest: The International Committee of the Red Cross and the Jews in Hungary, 1943-1945*. Brussels : Springler.
- Bideleux, R., & Jeffries, I. (2007). *A History of Eastern Europe: Crisis and Change*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Bodó, B. (2017). Memory Practices: The Red and White Terrors in Hungary as Remembered after 1990. *East Central Europe* 44, 186-215.
- Bogyay, K. (2017). *A Cry of Freedom: Reflections on the 1956 Hungarian Revolution at the UN and Beyond*. New York: Permanent Mission of Hungary to the United Nations.
- Borhi, L. (2004). *Hungary in the Cold War 1945–1956: Between the United States and the Soviet Union*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Bottoni, S. (2009). Sovietization and nationalism in Hungary. *The Historical Journal*, 52, 3, 789–797.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson, *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). Westport: Greenwood Publications.
- Bracher, M. (1994). Introduction. In M. Bracher, M. W. Alcorn, R. J. Corthell, Massardier-Kenney, & Françoise, *Lacanian Theory of Discourse: Subject, Structure and Society* (pp. 1-17). New York: New York University Press.
- Braham, R. L. (2000). *The Politics of Genocide: Holocaust in Hungary*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press,.
- Braham, R. L. (2016). The Assault on Historical Memory: Hungarian Nationalists and the Holocaust. In A. Kovács, & R. L. Braham, *The Holocaust in Hungary: Seventy Years Later* (pp. 261-310). Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Brooms, D. R. (2012). Lest We Forget: Exhibiting (and Remembering) Slavery in African-American Museums. *Journal of African American Studies* Vol. 15, No. 4, 508-523.
- Brown, A. (2010). *Ascensão e Queda do Comunismo [Rise and Fall of Communism]*. Alfragide: Publicações Dom Quixote.
- Bull, A. (2006). Industrial economics and pricing issues within tourism enterprises and markets. In L. Dwyer, & P. Forsyth, *International Handbook on the Economics of Tourism* (pp. 138-154). Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Butcher, J. (2012). The Mantra of Community Participation in Context. In T. V. Singh, *Critical Debates in Tourism* (pp. 102-108). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Campos, Â. (2017). *An oral History of the Portuguese Colonial War*. Fullerton: California State University Press.
- Cardina, M. (2013). Violência, Testemunho e Sociedade: Incómodos e silêncios em torno da memória da ditadura [Violence, Testimony and Society: Discomforts and silences around the memory of the dictatorship]. In M. P. Meneses, & B. S. Martins, *As Guerras de Libertação e os Sonhos Coloniais* (pp. 29-40). Coimbra: Edições Almedina.
- Carrabine, E. (2017). Iconic Power, Dark Tourism, and the Spectacle of Suffering. In J. Z. Wilson, S. Hodgkinson, J. Piché, & K. Walby, *The Palgrave Handbook of Prison Tourism* (pp. 13-36). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carrier, P. (2005). *Holocaust Monuments and National Memory Cultures in France and Germany Since 1989*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Carvalho, J. (2017). Rising Symbol of a falling Empire: the African Footballer Eusébio. In J. Garcia, C. Kaul, F. Subtil, & A. Santos, *Media and the Portuguese Empire* (pp. 275-290). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carvalho, M. K., & Cameira, M. C. (2016, June 25). *Fora do Padrão – Lembranças da Exposição de 1940 [Outside the Monument - Memories of the 1940 Exhibition]*. Retrieved from Padrão dos Descobrimentos: https://padraodosdescobrimentos.pt/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/AF_FS_ForaDoPadrao_750x420_PT_FINAL_V2_bx.pdf
- Carvalho, M. K., & Cameira, M. C. (2018, November 25). *Exposição: Contar Áfricas! [Exhibition: Tell Africas!]*. Retrieved from Padrão dos Descobrimentos: <https://padraodosdescobrimentos.pt/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/SINTESE-Contar-%C3%81fricas-web-PT.pdf>
- Cashin, J. (2016). *Museum and Exhibition Curation Techniques in Nazi Germany: An Analysis of Curation and Its Effects on Art, Artists, and the Public (Master's Dissertation)*. Orono, Maine: Anthropology Department, University of Maine.
- Caulton, T. (1998). *Hands-on Exhibitions: Managing interactive museums and science centres*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Chaney, D., Pulh, M., & Mencarelli, R. (2018). When art inspired business: Museums as heritage redefinition as tools of brands. *Journal of Business Research* Vol.85, 452-458.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Chen, J. (2003). Market segmentation by Tourists' sentiments. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 178–193.
- Christensen, C. (2011). *Performance and Experience at the House of Terror (Master's Thesis)*. Budapest: Central European University, Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology.
- CMCoruche. (2015, March 31). *Escola-Museu Salgueiro Maia*. Retrieved from Coruche Museu Municipal : http://www.museu-coruche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=105&Itemid=144
- Coffee, K. (2006). Museums and the Agency of Ideology: Three Recent Examples. *Curator - The Museum Journal* Vol.49 Issue 4, 435-448.
- Connerton, P. (1989). *How societies remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cordeiro, V. D. (2013). Influências de Émile Durkheim e Henri Bergson nas tensões teóricas da teoria da memória e coletividade Maurice Halbwachs [Influences of Émile Durkheim and Henri Bergson in the theoretical tensions of the theory of memory and collectivity in Maurice Halbwach]. *Primeiros Estudos n°4*, 101-111.
- Costa, H. A. (2014). As greves e a austeridade: ilações sobre o caso português [Strikes and Austerity: illations on the Portuguese case]. *VII Congresso Português de Sociologia - 40 anos: democracias, progressos, prospetivas*. Porto: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto.
- Courtois, S., Werth, N., Panné, J.-L., Paczkowski, A., Bartosek, K., & Margolin, J.-L. (1999). *O Livro Negro do Comunismo (4th edition)*. Lisbon: Quetzal Editores.
- Coutinho, A., & Seabra de Melo, M. (2016). Analysis of John Tribe influences and contributions to the theory of tourism. *Revista de Turismo Contemporâneo-RTC Vol.4 Special Edition*, 135-156.
- Crawley, G. (2012). Staging Exhibitions - Atmospheres of imagination. In S. MacLeod, L. H. Hanks, & J. Hale, *Museum Making - Narratives, architectures, exhibitions* (pp. 12-20). Oxford: Routledge.
- Cross, H., & McKercher, B. (2015). *Cultural Tourism*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Crouch, D. (2002). *Critical Sociologies of Tourism*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Culler, J. (1981). The Semiotics of Tourism. *American Journal of Semiotics* 1(1), 127-140.
- Cunha, L. (2003). *Introdução ao Turismo [Introduction to Tourism]*. Lisboa: Verbo.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- de Lucena, M. (1977). Fascismo, Colonialismo e Revolução: Uma leitura de Eduardo Lourenço [Fascism, Colonialism and Revolution: a Reading of Eduardo Lourenço]. *Análise Social* Vol. 49, 211-237.
- Deák, I. (2000). A Fatal Compromise? The Debate over Collaboration and Resistance in Hungary. In I. Deák, T. Judt, & J. Gross, *The politics of Retribution in Europe - WWII and its aftermath* (pp. 39-73). Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Debord, G. (2002). *The Society of the Spectacle*. Camberra: Hobgoblin Press.
- du Cross, H., & McKercher, B. (2015). *Cultural Tourism*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Duarte, A. R. (2011, April 17). *Prisão do Aljube reproduz a voz das vítimas da ditadura [Aljube prison reproduces the voice of the victims of the dictatorship]*. Retrieved from Público: <https://www.publico.pt/2011/04/17/jornal/prisao-do-aljube-reproduz-a-voz-das-vitimas-da-ditadura-21860235>
- Eco, U. (1976). *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Erős, Á. (2016). “In memory of victims”: Monument and counter-monument in Liberty Square, Budapest. *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin* 65 (3), 237–254.
- Erzsébet, D. (2016). Székelymagyar nemzeti és kulturálisidentitás stratégiák a trianoni határokon túl [Székely Hungarian National and Cultural Identity Strategies beyond the Trianon Borders]. *Hungarian Cultural Studies - Journal of the American Hungarian Educators Association, Volume 9*, 11-27.
- European Parliament. (2017, February 21). *Public Spending on Culture in Europe 2007-2015*. Retrieved from Europarl: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/139228/ALMEDA_Public%20spending%20on%20culture%202007-2015%20-%2021F%20-%20EP%20-Cuture%20Commission%2021%20FEB.pdf
- European Parliament. (2019, September 19). *Importance of European remembrance for the future of Europe*. Retrieved from European Parliament: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2019-0021_EN.pdf
- Eurostat. (2018, November). *Guide to Eurostat Culture Statistics 2018 edition*. Retrieved from ec.europa: <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3859598/9433072/KS-GQ-18-011-EN-N.pdf/72981708-edb7-4007-a298-8b5d9d5a61b5>
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. New York: Longman Publishing.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2012). Critical Discourse Analysis. In J. P. Gee, & M. Handford, *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 9-20). Oxon: Routledge.
- Faulkner, S., & Liz, M. (2016). Portuguese film - Colony, postcolony, memory. *Journal of Romance Studies Volume 16, Number 2*, 1–11.
- Featherstone, M. (2007). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Feldman, R. M. (2000). Encountering the Trauma of the Holocaust: Dialogue and Its Discontents in the Broszat-Friedlander Exchanges of Letters. *Ethos Vol. 28, No. 4, History and Subjectivity*, 551-574.
- Figueira, L. M., & Coelho, J. P. (2017). *Apresentação e Interpretação do Património em Turismo [Presentation and Interpretation of Heritage]*. Tomar: CESPOGA.
- Foglia, L. (Director). (2019). *The experience economy is coming* [Motion Picture].
- Foucault, M. (2016). *A Arqueologia do Saber [Archeology of knowledge]*. Lisbon: Edições 70.
- Franklin, A., & Crang, M. (2001). The Trouble with Tourism and Travel Theory? *Tourism Studies 1(1)*, 5-22.
- Franzon, Z., & Hórvath, Z. (2002). A megsértett Magyarország: A Terror Háza mint tárgybemutató, emlékmű és politikai rítus [Hungary the Victim: House of Terror as an Object, Memorial and Political Ritual]. *Regio 4*, 303-347.
- Frasquilho, D., de Matos, M. G., Gaspar, T., & Almeida, C. d. (2016). Young people's well-being and the economic crisis: How does parental unemployment and family wealth affect the downturn experience? *Children and Youth Services Review 69*, 219-222.
- Freitas, D. M. (2014). *Memorial de um complexo arquitectónico enquanto espaço museológico: Museu Machado de Castro (1911-1965) Vol. I [Memorial of an architectural complex as a museological space: Machado de Castro Museum]*. Coimbra: Coimbra University, Faculty of Letters.
- Frew, E., & White, L. (2013). Exploring dark tourism and place identity. In E. Frew, & L. White, *Dark Tourism and Place Identity Managing and interpreting dark places* (pp. 1-10). Oxon: Routledge.
- Fuller, T. (2002, August 02). *Stark history / Some see a stunt : Memory becomes battleground in Budapest's House of Terror*. Retrieved from The New York Times:

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

<https://www.nytimes.com/2002/08/02/news/stark-history-some-see-a-stunt-memory-becomes-battleground-in-budapests.html>

- Furtado, A. V. (2011). *Turismo militar no Concelho de Peniche [Military tourism in the Peniche Municipality] (Master's Dissertation)*. Estoril: Escola Superior de Hotelaria e Turismo do Estoril.
- Gelencsér, G. (2018). The Zones of Twilight - Son of Saul and the Tradition of Holocaust Representation in Hungarian Full-Length Feature Films. *Journal of Film, Media and Digital Cultures in Central and Eastern Europe* n.7, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17892/app.2018.0007.26>.
- Gensburger, S. (2011). The Righteous among the Nations as elements of collective memory. *International Social Science Journal* Vol.62, 135-146.
- Ghanem, J. (2017). *Conceptualizing "the Tourist": A critical Review of UNWTO definition (Masters Dissertation)*. Ginora: Universitat de Girona, Faculty of Tourism.
- Gil, J. (2017). *Portugal Hoje, o Medo de Existir [Portugal, Today: the Fear of Existence] (14th edition)*. Lisbon: Relógio d'Água.
- Goeldner, C., & Ritchie, B. J. (2009). *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Granville, J. (2001). Hungarian and Polish Reactions to the Events of 1956: New Archival Evidence. *Europe-Asia Studies*, Vol. 53, No. 7, 1051-1076.
- Hall, C. M., & Page, S. J. (2005). *The Geography of Tourism and Recreation (third edition)*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Hedrick, & Jr., C. W. (2000). *History And Silence: Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hernandez, F. (2010). *Los Museos Arqueologicos y su Museografia [The archeological museums and their museography]*. Gijón, Asturias: Ediciones Trea.
- Hill, R. (2009). Creating New Identities, New Nations, New States. *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 25:4, 585-601.
- Hirschberger, G., Kende, A., & Weinstein, S. (2016). Defensive representations of an uncomfortable history: The case of Hungary and the Holocaust. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 55, 32-43.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Hoelscher, S. (2006). Heritage. In S. Macdonald, *A Companion to Museum Studies* (pp. 198-218). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hollingshead, K. (2004). Tourism and new sense: Worldmaking and the enunciative value of tourism. In M. Hall, & H. Tucker, *Tourism and Postcolonialism: contested discourses, identities and representations* (pp. 25-42). London: Routledge.
- Horváth, Z. (2008). The Redistribution of the Memory of Socialism. Identity Formations of the “Survivors” in Hungary after 1989. In P. Apor, & O. Sarkisova, *Past for the Eyes - East European Representations of Communism in Cinema and Museums after 1989* (pp. 247-275). Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Howell, R., & Hill, G. (2009). The mediators of experiential purchases: Determining the impact of psychological needs satisfaction and social comparison. *The Journal of Positive Psychology Vol. 4 Issue 6*, 511-522.
- ICOM. (2018, July). *International Council of Museums (ICOM) Statutes*. Retrieved from icom.museum: https://icom.museum/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/2017_ICOM_Statutes_EN.pdf
- Jafari, J. (2005). El turismo como disciplina científica [Tourism as a scientific discipline]. *Política y Sociedad* 42(1), 39-56.
- Jara, D. (2016). *Children and the Aftermath of State Violence: Memory Politics and Transitional Justice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jaworski, A., & Pritchard, A. (2005). Introduction: Discourse, Communication and Tourism Dialogues. In A. Jaworski, & A. Pritchard, *Discourse, Communication and Tourism* (pp. 1-18). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Jennings, G. R. (2007). Advances in Tourism Research: Theoretical Paradigms and Accountability. In Á. Matias, P. Nijkamp, & N. Paulo, *Advances in Modern Tourism Research: Economic perspectives* (pp. 9-35). Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
- Johnson, L. (1996). *Central Europe: Enemies, Neighbours, Friends*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jong, S. d. (2018). *The Witness as Object: Video Testimony in Memorial Museums*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Judt, T. (2000). Preface. In I. Deák, T. Judt, & J. Gross, *The politics of Retribution in Europe - WWII and its aftermath* (pp. vii-xii). Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Kearney, A. (2009). Intangible cultural heritage: Global awareness and local interest. In N. Akagawa, & L. Smith, *Intangible Heritage* (pp. 209-226). London: Routledge.
- Keene, S. (2002). *Managing Conservation in Museums*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Kilby, J. (2007). *Violence and the Cultural Politics of Trauma*. Edinburg: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kim, D. S. (2016). The rise of European far right radicalism: the case of Jobbik. *The transformations of Far Right and Far Left in Europe, Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 49 , 345-357.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998). *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums and Heritage*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Kisić, V. (2013). *Governing Heritage Dissonance: Promises and Realities of Selected Cultural Policies*. Belgrade: European Cultural Foundation.
- Kiss, C. (2014). We Must Remember Thus: Transitional Justice in Service of Memory in Hungary . *Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis Series Historica Vol. IX Transitional Justice and Politics of Memory in Europe*, 71-87.
- Kiss, C. (2015). Divided Memory in Hungary: The House of Terror and the Lack of a Left-wing Narrative . In S. Mitroiu, *Life Writing and Politics of Memory in Eastern Europe* (pp. 242-259). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Koutoulas, D. (2004). Understanding the Tourism Product. *Understanding Tourism – Theoretical Advances* (pp. 1-22). Lesbos Island: University of the Aegean & International Sociological Society.
- Latham, K. F., & Simmons, J. E. (2014). *Foundations of Museum Studies: Evolving System of Knowledge*. Santa Barbara, California: Libraries Unlimited.
- Ledin, P., & Machin, D. (2018). Multi-Modal Critical Discourse Analysis. In J. Flowerdew, & J. Richardson, *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies* (pp. 60-76). Oxon: Routledge.
- Leetoy, S., & Vázquez, M. L. (2018). Barbarossa – Bar(bar)ossa – Barbossa: La permanencia de la Leyenda Negra como discurso de otredad [Barbarossa: the lingering of the black legend as a discourse of otherness]. *Chasqui. Revista Latinoamericana de Comunicación* n.137, 227-243.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Lehrer, E., & Milton, C. E. (2011). Introduction: Witnesses to Witnessing. In M. E. Patterson, E. Lehrer, & C. E. Milton, *Curating Difficult Knowledge Violent Pasts in Public Places* (pp. 1-22). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lemos Martins, M., Coutinho, B., Baptista, M. M., & Rebelo, J. (2018). Portugal, país de turismo: dissonâncias e usos turísticos do património do Estado Novo [Portugal, land of tourism: dissonances and touristic uses of the Estado Novo's heritage]. *Revista Lusófona de Estudos Culturais / Lusophone Journal of Cultural Studies*, vol. 5 n.2, 213-231.
- Léonard, Y. (1998). *Salazar e Salazarismo [Salazar and Salazarism]*. Mem-Martins: Editorial Inquérito.
- Loff, M. (2014). Dictatorship and revolution: Socio-political reconstructions of collective memory in post-authoritarian Portugal. *Culture & History Digital Journal* 3(2), <http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/chdj.2014.017>.
- Logan, W., & Reeves, K. (2009). Introduction: Remembering places of pain and shame. In W. Logan, & K. Reeves, *Remembering places of pain and shame: Dealing with 'difficult heritage'* (pp. 1-14). Routledge: Oxon.
- Lopes, H. F. (2017). Salazarismo: Autoritarismo ou Fascismo? A União Nacional em perspectiva organizacional comparativa [Salazarism: Authoritarianism or Fascism? the National Union in an comparative organizational perspective]. *Observatório Político Working Paper* 76, DOI:10.13140/RG.2.2.32382.69445.
- Louçã, F., & Rosas, F. (2004). *Ensaio Geral Passado e Futuro do 25 de Abril [Essay on the General Past and Future of the 25th of April]*. Lisbon: Dom Quixote.
- Lowenthal, D. (1998). *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Combridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacCannell, D. (1999). *The Tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. Berkley, California: University of California Press.
- Macdonald, S. (2006). Expanding Museum Studies: An Introduction. In S. Macdonald, *A companion to Museum Studies* (pp. 14-17). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
- MacDonald, S. (2013). *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How To Do Critical Discourse Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Madureira, A. (2000). *A Formação Histórica do Salazarismo [Historical Formation of Salazarism]*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.
- Malpas, S. (2005). *The Postmodern*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Manchin, A. (2015). Staging Traumatic Memory: Competing Narratives of State Violence in Post-Communist Hungarian Museums. *East European Jewish Affairs* 45(2-3), 236-251.
- Marchi, R., & Pinto, T. (2019). A mobilização social das direitas em Portugal entre autoritarismo e democratização: o caso do Movimento Nacionalista (1972-1980) [Social mobilization of the right in Portugal between authoritarianism and democratization: the case of the Nationalism Movement]. *Análise Social* n.231, 338-362.
- Martins, A. R. (2015). *A musealização de heranças difíceis: o caso do Museu do Aljube- Resistência e Liberdade [Musealization of difficult heritages: the case of the Aljube Museum of Resistance and Freedom] (Master's Thesis)*. Lisbon: Nova University of Lisbon, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities.
- Martins, J. M. (2015). *O Museu Agrícola de Riachos: Agente de Educação para Adultos e motor de Desenvolvimento Local [The Agricultural Museum of Riachos: Agent for Education and driver of Local Development]*. Riachos: Associação para a Defesa do Património Histórico e Natural da Região de Riachos.
- Marujo, M. (2019, September 04). *Esqueçam o museu Salazar. O que vai nascer vai "incomodar" os salazaristas [Forget the Salazar museum. What will be born "will bother" Salazarists]*. Retrieved from Diário de Notícias: <https://www.dn.pt/pais/esquecam-o-museu-salazar-o-que-vai-nascer-vai-incomodar-os-salazaristas-11268565.html>
- Mason, R. (2006). Cultural Theory and Museum Studies. In S. Macdonald, *A companion to Museum Studies* (pp. 17-32). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mastai, J. (2007). "There Is No Such Thing as a Visitor". In G. Pollock, & J. Zemans, *Museums after Modernism: Strategies of Engagement* (pp. 173-177). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Matos, L. (2018). Vinte e Cinco de Abril e a memória da revolução em ruínas [Twenty Fifth of April and the memory of the revolution in ruins]. *Convergência Lusíada* n. 40, 115-124.
- Mattoso, J. (1994). *História de Portugal VII - O Estado Novo (1926-1974) [History of Portugal VII - The Estado Novo]*. Lisboa: Editorial Estampa.
- McCabe, S. (2002). The Tourist Experience and Everyday Life. In G. Dann, *The tourist as a metaphore for the social world* (pp. 61-76). Oxon: CABI Publishing.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Mendes, J. A. (2013). *Museus e Educação [Museums and Education]*. Coimbra: University of Coimbra Press.
- Miller, M. L., & Cheong, S. M. (2000). Power and Tourism: A Foucauldian Observation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 371-390.
- Mínguez, C., Piñeira, M. J., & Fernández-Tabales, A. (2019). Social Vulnerability and Touristification of Historic Centers. *Sustainability* 11, 44-78.
- Miranda, J. (2014). A Assembleia Constituinte e a Constituição de 1976 [the Constitutional assembly and the constitution of 1976]. *Os anos de Abril Vo.7 O verão Quente de 1975*, 82-109.
- Misztal, B. (2003). *Theories of Social Remembering*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Morais, P. (2005). *Portugal sob a Égide da Ditadura: O Rosto Metamoforseado das Palavras [Portugal under the aegis of dictatorship: the Methamphorsed Face of Words] (Master's dissertation)*. Braga: Minho University, Institute of Letters and Human Sciences.
- Munjeri, D. (2004). Tangible and Intangible Heritage: from difference to convergence. *Museum International* 56 (1-2), 12-20.
- Museu do Aljube - Residência e Liberdade. (n.d.). *About the Museum*. Retrieved from Museu do Aljube - Residência e Liberdade: <https://www.museudoaljube.pt/en/about-the-museum/>
- Nancheva, N. (2015). *Between Nationalism and Europeanisation: Narratives of National Identity in Bulgaria and Macedonia*. European Consortium for Political Research: Colchester.
- Netto, A. P. (2009). What is Tourism? Definitions, Theoretical Phases and Principles. In J. Tribe, *Philosophical Issues in Tourism* (pp. 43-61). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Newton, H. J., & Sibley, C. G. (2018). The pejorative power of post-colonial ideologies: Historical negation and symbolic exclusion. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations Vol.62 Special Issue: Colonial Past and Intercultural Relations*, 34-42.
- Nora, P. (1989). Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire. *Representations No. 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory*, 7-24.
- O'Keeffe, T. (2007). Landscape and Memory: Historiography, Theory, Methodology. In N. Moore, & Y. Whelan, *Heritage, Memory and the Politics of Identity* (pp. 3-18). Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Observador. (2019, August 01). *Futuro Museu da Resistência em Peniche atinge 50 mil visitantes em três meses*. Retrieved from Observador: <https://observador.pt/2019/08/01/futuro-museu-da-resistencia-em-peniche-atinge-50-mil-visitantes-em-tres-meses/>
- Olick, J. (2016). *Sins of the Fathers: Germany, Memory, Method*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Oliveira, E. C. (2012). *Aljube, uma cadeia política [Aljube, a political prison] (Master's Dissertation)*. Lisbon: Nova University of Lisbon, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences.
- Orbán, V. (2016, January 19). *Day of Remembrance for Ethnic Germans Forcibly Deported From Hungary*. Retrieved from All About Hungary: http://abouthungary.hu/prime-minister/Day_of_Remembrance_for_Ethnic_Germans_Forcibly_Deported_From_Hungary
- Parrado, P. S. (2016). *A educação patrimonial no Museu do Fado (Master's Dissertation)*. Lisbon: ISCTE-IUL.
- Pastor, P. (2019). Hungarian and Soviet Efforts to Possess Rhuthenia. *Historian Vol.81*, 398-425.
- Patin, T. (1999). Exhibitions and Empire: National Parks and the Performance of Manifest Destiny. *Journal of American Culture Volume 22, Issue1*, 41-60.
- Payne, S. (1995). *A History of Fascism 1914–1945*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Peralta, E. (2014). O monumento aos combatentes: a performance do fim do império no espaço sagrado da nação. In P. Godinho, *Antropologia e performance: agir, atuar, exhibir* (pp. 213-236). Castro Verde: 100Luz.
- Pereira, M. G., Pedras, S., Lopes, C., Pereira, M., & Machado, J. (2010). PTSD, Psicopatologia e tipo de família em veteranos da Guerra Colonial Portuguesa. *Revista de psicologia militar Vol.19*, 211-232.
- Pérez, X. P. (2009). *Turismo Cultural: uma Visão Antropológica*. Tenerife: Asociación Canaria de Antropología.
- Perlez, J. (1993, 09 05). *Reburial Is Both a Ceremony and a Test for Today's Hungary*. Retrieved from The New York Times: www.nytimes.com/1993/09/05/world/reburial-is-both-a-ceremony-and-a-test-for-today-s-hungary.html
- Petri, R. (2018). *Breve História da Ideologia Ocidental: um relato crítico [A brief History of western ideologu: a critical account]*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores.
- Pimenta, P. (2019, July 19). *Porto também terá um Museu da Resistência e Liberdade [Porto will also have a Museum of Resistance and Freedom]*. Retrieved from Público:

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

<https://www.publico.pt/2019/07/19/sociedade/noticia/porto-tambem-tera-museu-resistencia-liberdade-1880529>

- Pimentel, I. F. (2000). *História das Organizações Feministas no Estado Novo [History of the Feminist Organizations in Estado Novo]*. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores.
- Pimentel, I. F. (2007). *A História da PIDE [History of PIDE]*. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores.
- Pimentel, I. F. (2019). *Os cinco Pilares da PIDE [The five pillars of PIDE]*. Lisbon: Esfera dos Livros.
- Prebensen, N., Chen, J., & Uysal, M. (2014). Co-creation of Tourist Experience: Scope, Definition and Structure. In N. Prebensen, J. Chen, & M. Uysal, *Creating experience value in Tourism* (pp. 1-10). Wallingford: CABI Publishing.
- Psarra, S. (2009). *Architecture and Narrative The formation of space and cultural meaning*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Purser, E. (2000). Telling Stories: Text analysis in a museum. In E. Ventola, *Discourse and Community: Doing Functional Linguistics* (pp. 169-198). Tübingen: gunter narr verlag .
- Pytlas, B. (2013). Radical-right narratives in Slovakia and Hungary: Historical legacies, mythic overlaying and contemporary politics. *Patterns of Prejudice* 47(2), 162-183.
- Raimundo, F. (2018). *Ditadura e Democracia - legados da memória [Dictatorship and Democracy - legacies of memory]*. Lisbon: Fundação Francisco Manuel dos Santos.
- Raimundo, F., Santana-Pereira, J., & Pinto, A. C. (2016). An Ever-Shadowed Past? Citizens' Attitudes towards the Dictatorship in Twenty-First Century Portugal. *South European Society and Politics Vol. 21 Issue 2: The Presence of the Past: Perceptions of Authoritarianism and Democratic Transition in Contemporary Portugal*, 197-210.
- Rancière, J. (2004). *The Politics of Aesthetics*. London: Continuum .
- Rebelo, J. (1998). *Formas de Legitimização do Poder no Salazarismo [Means of power legitimization in Salazarism]*. Lisbon: Livros e Leituras.
- Rezola, M. (2014). Quem Manda? [Who Comands?]. *Os anos de Abril Vol.6 O Primeiro Ano em Liberdade*, 6-15.
- Ribeiro, M. (2002). Empire, Colonial Wars and Postcolonialism in contemporary portuguese imagination. *Portuguese Studies Vol.18* , 132-214.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Richards, G., & Munsters, W. (2010). Developments and Perspectives in Cultural Tourism Research. In G. Richards, & W. Munsters, *Cultural Tourism research methods* (pp. 1-12). Wallingford : CABI Publishing.
- Robinson, J. (2018). *Transnational Justice and the Politics of Inscription: Memory, Space and Narrative in Northern Ireland*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Rodney, S. (2015, August 28). *How Museum Visitors Became Consumers*. Retrieved from CultureCom: <https://culture-communication.fr/en/how-museum-visitors-became-consumers>
- Rodrigues, F. A. (2005). *Uma nova rede de museus para o exército português [A new network of museums for the portuguese army]*. Lisbon: University of Lisbon, Faculty of Fine Arts.
- Romero, C. S. (2018). Culture Industry: A Contemporary Revision of the Term of Theodor Adorno. In M. Khosrow-Pour, *Enhancing Art, Culture and Design with Thecnological integration* (pp. 1-24). Hershey, Pennsylvania: Information Resources Management Association.
- Romsics, I. (1999). *Hungary in the twentieth century*. Budapest: Osiris.
- Rosas, F. (2014). A Transição Falhada [The failed Transition]. *Os Anos de Abril Vol.1 O Fim do Marcelismo*, 6-21.
- Rosas, F., & Brandão de Brito, J. M. (1996). *O Dicionário da História do Estado Novo Vol.1 [Dictionary of the History of Estado Novo Vol.1]*. Lisbon: Circulo de Leitores.
- RTP. (2016, 04 25). *Visita Guiada - Museu do Aljube Resistência e Liberdade ep.8*. Retrieved from RTP Play: <https://www.rtp.pt/play/p2366/e233119/visita-guiada>
- Russell, J., & Roseby, P. (2006). *Dictionary of Leisure, Travel and Tourism 3rd edition*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Salvatore, C. L., & Lizama, J. T. (2018). Cultural Heritage Components. In C. L. Salvatore, *Cultural Heritage Care and Management: Theory and Practice* (pp. 3-16). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing.
- Sandell, R. (2003). Social Inclusion, the Museum and the Dynamics of Sectoral Change. *museum and society 1(1)*, 45-62.
- Sanfey, M. (2003). On Salazar and Salazarism. *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review Vol. 92, No. 368*, 405-411.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Saraiva, J. (2019, August 31). *Quem tem medo da História? [Who is afraid of History?]*. Retrieved from Sapo Notícias: <https://sol.sapo.pt/artigo/669666/quem-tem-medo-da-historia>
- Saussure, F. (1959). *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: The Philosophical Library.
- Saxonberg, S. (2001). *The Fall: A comparative study of the end of Communism in Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary and Poland*. London: Routledge.
- Scheyvens, R. (2012). Pro-Poor Tourism: Is There Value Beyond the Rhetoric? In T. V. Singh, *Critical Debates in Tourism* (pp. 124-131). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Schmidt, M. (2014, October 3). *A Love Story*. Retrieved from Mandiner Hungarian Globe: https://hungarianglobe.mandiner.hu/cikk/20141003_schmidt_maria_a_love_story
- Schmidt, M. (2017, December 08). “*Even as a joke, it’s a bit too much...*”: *A conversation between Anne Applebaum and Dr. Mária Schmidt*. Retrieved from About Hungary: <http://abouthungary.hu/blog/even-as-a-joke-its-a-bit-too-much>
- Schmidt, M. (2018, 10 23). *Director-General Mária Schmidt’s speech on the 62nd anniversary of the 1956 Revolution and Freedom Fight*. Retrieved from About Hungary: <http://abouthungary.hu/speeches-and-remarks/director-general-maria-schmidts-speech-on-the-62nd-anniversary-of-the-1956-revolution-and-freedom-fight/>
- Schmidt, M. (2018, September 10). *House of Fates coming to Hungary next year to mark the 75th anniversary of the Holocaust*. Retrieved from About Hungary: <http://abouthungary.hu/news-in-brief/house-of-fates-coming-to-hungary-next-year-to-mark-the-75th-anniversary-of-the-holocaust/>
- Seaton, T. (2009). Thanatourism and Its Discontents: An Appraisal of a Decade’s Work with Some Future Issues and Directions. In T. Jamal, & M. Robinson, *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies* (pp. 525-542). London: SAGE.
- Seelinger, I. (2018). Why the Prague Spring was Doomed to Failure: Fifty years ago, 'socialism with a human face' came head to head with the realities of Soviet communism. *History Today Vol. 68 Issue 4*, 12-14.
- Sharpley, R. (2009). Shedding Light on Dark Tourism: An Introduction. In R. Sharpley, & P. R. Stone, *The Darker Side of Travel The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism* (pp. 3-24). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Shelton, A. A. (2006). Museums and Anthropologies: Practices and Narratives. In S. Macdonald, *A Companion to Museum Studies* (pp. 64-80). Bristol: Blackwell Publishing.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Sik, D. (2015). Memory transmission and political socialisation in post-socialist Hungary. *Sociological Review Monograph Series: Radical Futures? Youth, Politics and Activism in Contemporary Europe Vol.63 Issue Supplement S2*, 53–71.
- Silva, T. M. (2012). Os Textos do Silêncio - Para um Tratamento Qualitativo do não-Dito [Texts of Silence - for the qualitative treatment of the non-sayed]. In P. Godinho, *Usos da Memória e Práticas do Património* (pp. 83-87). Lisbon: Edições Colibri.
- Skarlatos, T. (Director). (2018). *Prejudice and Pride in Hungary: Inside the Far Right / Radicalised Youth* [Motion Picture].
- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of Heritage*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Smith, M. (2003). *Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Sobels, K. (2015). Her Past: forgetting and remembering in post-Franco Spain. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of European Studies Vol. 6-7 Issue 2-1*, 13-19.
- Sodaro, A. (2018). *Exhibiting Atrocity - Memorial Museums and the Politics of Past Violence*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Sopage, S. (2019, August 23). *Museu Salazar provoca “guerra” de petições [Salazar Museum causes "War" of petitions]*. Retrieved from Público:
<https://www.publico.pt/2019/08/23/politica/noticia/museu-salazar-provoca-guerra-peticoes-1883988>
- Soutelo, L. (2009). *A memória do 25 de Abril nos anos do cavaquismo: o desenvolvimento do revisionismo histórico através da imprensa (1985-1995) [Memory of the 25th of April in the Cavaquist years: Development of historical revisionism through the press]* (Master Thesis). Porto: Universidade do Porto, Faculdade de Letras.
- Soutelo, L. (2013). Revisionismo histórico em Portugal: Origens e efeitos na memória da revolução e do Estado Novo [Historical revisionism in Portugal: Origins and effects in the memory of the revolution and the Estado Novo]. In P. Godinho, I. Fonseca, & J. Baía, *Resistência e/y Memória: Perspectivas Ibero-americanas* (pp. 48-57). Lisbon: IHC-FCSH/UNL.
- Stevens, Q., & Sumartojo, S. (2014). '56 after '89: Re-commemorating Hungarian History after the Fall of Communism. *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand: 31*, 355–371.
- Stone, P. R. (2006). A dark tourism spectrum: Towards a typology of death and macabre related tourist sites, attractions and exhibitions. *Tourism 54 (2)*, 145-160.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- Subotic, J. (2018). Political memory, ontological security, and Holocaust remembrance in post-communist Europe. *European Security Vol.27 n.3*, 296–313.
- Sziklakorház. (n.d.). *History*. Retrieved from Hospital in the Rock Nuclear Bunker Museum: <https://www.sziklakorhaz.eu/en/tortenetunk/>
- Tanas, S. (2013). Tourism 'Death Space' and Thanatourism in Poland. *Tourism Management Vol.61*, 275-301.
- Teixeira, N. S. (2012). Introduction: Portugal and European Integration 1974-2010. In N. S. Teixeira, & A. C. Pinto, *The Europeanization of Portuguese Democracy* (pp. 7-26). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Terror Háza Múzeum (Director). (2013). *Schmidt Mária történész, a Terror Háza Múzeum főigazgatója a bipoláris világról [Historian Mária Schmidt, director of the House of Terror Museum on the bipolar world]* [Motion Picture].
- Toomey, M. (2018). History, Nationalism and Democracy: Myth and Narrative in Viktor Orbán's 'Illiberal Hungary'. *New Perspectives: Interdisciplinary Journal of Central & East European Politics and International Relations Vol 25, no.1*, 87-108.
- Torgal, L. R. (2019, September 11). *A propósito do alegado "Museu de Salazar": a História e os seus documentos [on the alleged "Salazar Museum": History and Documentation]*. Retrieved from Público: <https://www.publico.pt/2019/09/11/politica/opiniao/proposito-alegado-museu-salazar-historia-documentos-1885839>
- Tribe, J. (2009). Introduction: Philosophical Issues in Tourism. In J. Tribe, *Philosophical Issues in Tourism* (pp. 3-24). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Trigg, D. (2006). *The Aesthetics of Decay: Nothingness, Nostalgia, and the Absence of Reason*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Turai, H. (2009). Past Unmastered: Hot and Cold Memory in Hungary. *Third Text 23:1*, 97-106.
- UNESCO. (1972). *Conventions Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. Paris: United Nations Publications.
- UNESCO. (2018). *Basic Texts of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage 2018 Edition*. Paris: United Nations Publication.
- UNESCO. (2019). *Museums*. Retrieved from UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization: <https://en.unesco.org/themes/museums>
- Ungváry, K. (2003). *Battle for Budapest: One Hundred Days in World War II*. London: I.B. Tauris.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

- UNWTO. (2010). *Tourism Satellite Account: Recommended Methodological Framework*. Paris: United Nations Publication.
- UNWTO. (2012). *Communicating Heritage: A Handbook for the Tourism Sector*. Madrid: United Nations Publication.
- UNWTO. (2019). *Definitions: Committee on Tourism and Competitiveness (CTC)*. Chengdu: United Nations Publication.
- Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Valentim, J. P., & Heleno, A. M. (2018). Luso-tropicalism as a social representation in Portuguese society: Variations and anchoring. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations Vol.62 Special issue: Colonial past and International Relations*, 34-42.
- Von Klimó, Á. (2015). The Cardinal Mindszenty Files from American Archives. *The Catholic Historical Review* 101:2, 342-347.
- Wajnryb, R. (2001). *The Silence: How tragedy shapes talk*. Crow's Nest, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.
- Waterton, E., Watson, S., & Silverman, H. (2017). An Introduction to Heritage in Action. In E. Waterton, S. Watson, & H. Silverman, *Heritage in Action: Making the Past in the Present* (pp. 3-18). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Wight, C. (2009). Contested National Tragedies: An Ethical Dimension. In R. Sharpley, & P. R. Stone, *The Darker Side of Travel The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism* (pp. 129-144). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Williams, A. M., & Shaw, G. (2009). *Tourism and Tourism Spaces*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Wimmera, A., & Feinsteina, Y. (2010). The Rise of the Nation-State across the world, 1816 to 2001. *American Sociological Review* 75(5), 764–790.
- Winkler, M. M. (2009). *The Roman salute: cinema, history, ideology*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Wrightson, K. R. (2017). The Limits of Recognition: The Spirit Sings, Canadian Museums and the Colonial Politics of Recognition. *Museum Anthropology Vol. 40 Issue 1*, 36-51.
- Zbucea, A. (2015). Museums as Theme Parks - A Possible Marketing Approach? *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy Vol.3*, 483-507.
- Zielińska, K. (2015). Lost between Caesar and God? Religion and politics in post-socialist Europe. *East European Politics* 31:3, 361-363.

On the Touristification of 20th Century Authoritarianism:
Museological Discourse and the Question of Memory

Žižek, S. (1994). The Spectre of Ideology. In S. Žižek, *Mapping Ideology* (pp. 1-33). London:
Verbo.

Zombory, M. (2012). *Maps of Rememberance: Space, belonging and politics of memory in eastern
Europe*. Budapest: L'Harmattan.

Zombory, M. (2017). The birth of the memory of Communism: memorial museums in Europe.
Nationalities Papers Vol. 45 Issue 6, 1028-1046.