

The Politics and Rhetoric of Celebration:
How the Portuguese Parliament Celebrates the 1974 Revolution

Michael Billig and Cristina Marinho

Bloomsbury Press

London

Publication date: July 2017

Chapter One

Introduction

It is 25 April 2015 in the Portuguese parliamentary assembly. The president of the assembly has called upon a woman deputy, representing the Greens, to deliver a speech. The rostrum is bedecked with carnations, as is the box behind the rostrum where important members of the state are sitting. The new speaker wears a red carnation on the left side of her jacket.

Obviously, this is no routine session of the assembly. When the parliament had met the previous day, there had been no carnations; by the time that the assembly next meets, the carnations will be gone. But today it seems that there are red carnations everywhere. But that would be an exaggeration. Look closely and you will see that some of the deputies have not attached a carnation to their clothing.

The woman deputy speaks for almost twelve minutes. When she finishes, the deputies from the far-left parties applaud but those from the right and the centre left do not. Deputies from other parties are then called in turn to the rostrum to give speeches. Before all the speech-making, there had been music. The audience had stood when a military band played the national anthem. They then sat down to listen to a folk group, dressed in old-fashioned agricultural costumes, singing a song that, in contrast to their vintage style of dress, had been written in the 1970s. The whole audience, including deputies and honoured guests, applauded the folk musicians. None of the deputies, who gave speeches, would receive such widespread applause for their efforts.

‘What is going on?’ one might ask. ‘Why all the carnations?’ There is a perfectly simple answer: the Portuguese parliamentary assembly was commemorating the revolution of 25 April 1974 when the old dictatorial rule, established by António Salazar in 1932, was

finally overthrown. Since 1977 the assembly has annually marked the anniversary with a special ceremony – apart from exceptional occasions such as when the anniversary falls within the course of a general election. At all the ceremonies red carnations have been prominent. As the speaker from the Greens made clear, she was celebrating the historic event which has become popularly known as the revolution of the carnations (*a Revolução dos Cravos*). But at each ceremony the apparel of some deputies has been notably carnation-free.

The ceremony is the topic of the present book. We are asking ‘What are the deputies doing when they celebrate the revolution in the assembly?’ It is not enough just to say that they are coming together in a formal way, putting aside differences of party and ideology, to celebrate the day which transformed modern Portuguese history. As we will see, there is a lot more going on and we will be suggesting that politics and ideology are most certainly not put to one side. As such, this book is about more than this particular ceremony. It represents a case-study for the conduct of contemporary democratic politics, as well as a case-study for the political celebration of the recent past.

To explore this, we need to look closely at what the politicians in the assembly are doing as well as what they are saying. As a number of analysts have stressed, to understand what happens in a parliament it is not enough just to analyse the language of the speakers; we must also remember that the listening members of a parliamentary assembly have their parts to perform (Carbó 2004; Ilie 2010c and 2012; van Dijk 2004). Members of parliaments across the world have conventional ways for displaying approval and disapproval, support and criticism, pleasure and displeasure, etc. When the woman speaker at the 2015 ceremony got up to speak, all eyes were on her, but analysts, who seek to understand what is going on, cannot let their eyes follow the customary gaze. They must also look at the parliamentary audience to see how the other members were reacting publicly to the words that they were hearing. As we have mentioned, this speaker was received with applause at the conclusion of

her speech. However, unlike the applause that followed the folk group's performance, this was very partial and politically partisan applause. The majority of deputies did not applaud her.

This partisan applause illustrates a particular feature of the present analysis. We assume that to understand what is being done and what is being said, we must at the same time understand what is not being done and what is not being said. We must ask whether it is significant that the majority of the audience did not applaud the speaker from the Greens. Was this an exceptional withholding of applause? Or an instance of something more general? We have mentioned the highly visible red carnations at the annual celebration. But also some of the deputies, including some of those speaking at the ceremony, were not wearing carnations. Absences can be as significant as presences. In consequence, an analyst must try to follow the example of Sherlock Holmes in Arthur Conan Doyle's tale 'Silver Blaze'. At one point in the story, Holmes draws attention to 'the curious incident of the dog in the night-time'. The police inspector protests 'But the dog did nothing in the night-time' to which the famous fictional detective replies: 'That was the curious incident' (Conan Doyle [1892]1989: 672). Accordingly, we must draw attention to the curious incidents of hands not clapping and the strange button-holes with their customary absence of flowers. These absences can tell us as much as the presences do.

In particular, we will be paying attention to some curious absences in the speeches themselves. Of all the oratorical absences, none is more curious than the absence of detail about the day that the politicians of the assembly are commemorating. One might expect that speaker after speaker, in ceremony after ceremony, would recount the historic details of the great day. There have been a number of studies investigating national commemorations, including studies drawing attention to the political debates that can surround commemorative occasions (e.g. Biskupski 2012; Connerton 1989; Ensinnck and Sauer 2003; Gillis 1994;

McCrone and MacPherson 2009b; Šarić et al. 2010; Scully 2012; Spillman 1997; Tileagă 2008 and 2013; Wodak and de Cillia 2007). The previous studies did not prepare us for the perplexing absence at the heart of the speeches from Portuguese politicians. Nevertheless, one should not imagine that such an unforeseen absence is peculiar to the Portuguese ceremony or to the character of Portuguese politicians. We are seeing something – or more accurately not seeing something - with wider resonance.

In recent years, there has been a great deal of empirical research and theoretical reflection about the nature of collective memory. Some have called this trend ‘the mnemonic turn’ (Kõresaar 2014). In a broad sense, this book fits in with this turn towards looking at popular memories of the past, for we are examining how the Portuguese parliament collectively remembers the revolution of 1974. But in other respects this book fits awkwardly into the so-called ‘mnemonic turn’. Works about collective memory often examine texts and speeches in order to extract and then re-construct a group’s shared, or contested, collective representations of its past. We could have done this. It would have been possible to pore over the ceremonial speeches, extracting hints about the memory of 25 April and then collecting these hints together to form a pattern that we then claim to be ‘the Portuguese collective memory or memories’ of the revolution. If we did this, we would be acting like the police inspector who overlooks the obvious absence. In our desire to find the shared memory, we would run the risk of failing to notice how little direct remembering is going on in these ceremonial speeches.

If we searched for ‘the collective memory’ and succeeded in finding it, then our way of proceeding would parallel what the bacteriologist Ludwik Fleck ([1935] 1986) called ‘directed perception’: we would be noticing what we have directed ourselves to see. Fleck observed that biological scientists could be enormously skilled at looking for tiny microscopic signs in their own area of expertise, but these skills could hamper them from

noticing more obvious signs in other areas. Fleck mentioned a surgeon, who with a few touches could diagnose appendix problems that most doctors could not spot, but who, try as he might, could not tell the difference between a male and a female rat. Fleck's idea of 'directed perception' resembles what Thorsten Veblen (1914) with his customary lack of tact called 'trained incompetence'. The poet and self-taught scholar Kenneth Burke, whose ideas on rhetoric we will use and criticize later, was drawn to Veblen's notion of 'trained incompetence', not least because of its ironic quality (Wais 2005). Burke, always an original and quirky voice, took up the idea of 'trained incompetence' in his book *Permanence and Change*, viewing it as a hazard for any thinker or professional who had been trained in a particular method (see Burke 1984: 7ff). The problem of 'directed perception', or 'trained incompetence', is even greater for social scientists than it is for biological scientists. Human reality is so messily complex that it is not difficult to find traces of whatever we are looking for. If we search for traces of collective memory, we are bound to find them. It is as if we have been so rigorously trained that we can hear a dog barking faintly in the distance; but our acquired skill would prevent us from noticing the significance of the canine silence close at hand.

The sort of ceremony that we are investigating is one that ancient theorists of rhetoric called 'epideictic'. Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* claimed that there were three types of public oratory. There was 'forensic' oratory for the law-court and 'deliberative' oratory for public assemblies that debated political matters. Then there was 'epideictic' oratory for ceremonial occasions to praise (or criticize) a particular person, event or place. Twentieth century rhetorical theorists, such as Burke, drew attention to the importance of epideictic oratory, even in the law-court or public assembly. In his classic work *Rhetoric of Motives* Burke (1969) wrote about orators needing to identify with their audience and using the rhetoric of common values to create a sense of shared community. Burke's ideas on the importance of

epideictic oratory have been adopted and adapted by many of today's theorists of rhetoric (e.g. Condit 1985; Dow 1989; Hauser 1999; Lawrence 2008; Lindsay 2015; Nicolas 2011 and 2015; Sheard 1995; Sullivan 1993 and 1994).

A commemorative ceremony like the one that we are studying would, according to ancient and modern theorists of rhetoric, certainly be classed as an epideictic occasion. Everyone seems to have gathered to praise an event. And we would expect to hear the language of common values and shared identity being used. Examples would not be difficult to find if we wanted to confirm current theories of epideictic oratory. We could, for instance, cite those political speakers who conclude their speeches with a cry of '*Viva Portugal*'. But again we should pay attention to what does not happen. However stirring the cry and however much it appeals to a common Portuguese identity, the speakers who make such hurrahs are, as we shall see, unlikely to be met with common applause. One side or another will have hands that do not clap.

Aristotle believed that each type of rhetoric belonged to its own forum. In the modern world of mass media, we cannot expect that the language of law should be confined to law-courts or that the language of politics will only be heard in parliamentary assemblies. When a parliamentary occasion commemorates a past event, then we have a mixture of place and rhetoric which might have surprised Aristotle but which seems entirely natural for us. We should expect a mixture of epideictic and deliberative oratory on such occasions of parliamentary of remembrance. But, as we shall see, the mixture is even more complex. Existing theories of rhetoric need to be expanded, or at least adapted, to deal with the modern oratory of partisan politics, where the rhetoric of a common community ('*Viva Portugal*') can be used to stir supporters and to upstage rivals.

To see how the politicians do their political business on an occasion of national commemoration, we cannot simply take the politicians' words at face value. We have to

examine what they say closely and critically. We need to pay attention, above all, to their use of little words and easily overlooked grammatical formations. Here the methods of discursive and linguistic analysis can be helpful. A micro-analysis is required when politicians use the first person plural, citing a common 'we' while at the same time excluding or scoring a point over rivals. Even the most humdrum of politicians can be skilled at manoeuvring the little words and, of course, at omitting to say what they might have been expected to mention.

At all times we shall be trying to see what the politicians are doing with their words of celebration, for generally speakers use words to perform actions. This is certainly true of politicians. They perform the act of celebrating by giving speeches and by applauding some speeches but not others. We will find that right-wing politicians have to adapt to celebrating in a ceremony with which they are not entirely comfortable. Some pick their words carefully so that they can appear to join with the common rejection of the old right-wing dictatorship while at the same time equivocating and softening that rejection. Not all is straightforward for the parties of the left. In their celebration of 25 April, they too can have matters to avoid, as they transform the messiness of history into the simplicity of myth. We can even find elements of magical thinking in their myths. Left and right will be using their evocations of the past to further the politics of the present and we will see hard-headed speakers from the right openly justifying this pragmatic treatment of the past.

Moreover, as we shall stress, there is a somewhat shocking element. We might presume that we would encounter some partisan point-scoring on this solemn occasion and we should not be surprised by the non-clapping hands. The standard theories of epideictic rhetoric prepare us to expect the language of high politics – the sententious phrases, the clichés of national identity, the claims of lofty moralism, etc. There is that aplenty. What the standard theories do not equip us to expect is the language of low politics – the language of manipulation, of threat, of deal-making and so on. We will be examining examples of all

these. Again, if we want to understand what is going on – how speakers might be manipulating or threatening - it will be important to pay close attention to the little words. A guiding principle is that in politics things are not always as they seem.

In order not to be overwhelmed by theory and to avoid the dangers of trained incapacity, we will try to use technical terms as sparingly as possible. We will, of course, make an exception for the term ‘epideictic’ – a word that has proved its worth for more than two thousand years. We will also on occasion have recourse to some linguistic terms. We have previously expressed scepticism about the way that social scientists tend to use big words of theory, especially big nouns; often impressive technical terminology can be less precise than ordinary, non-technical terms (Billig 2013; Billig and Marinho 2015). We will try to stick with describing what speakers are doing rather than convert their actions into grand ‘theoretical things’. Some of the leading figures in ‘memory studies’ tend theoretically to elevate theoretical things over people. They can be inclined to write about what ‘collective memories’ do, rather than what people do (see Confino, 1997, for an excellent critique of this tendency). For example, one illustrious scholar writes that ‘every individual memory constitutes itself in communication with others’ (Assman, J. 1995: 127); and that ‘cultural memory works by reconstructing, that is, it always relates its knowledge to an actual and contemporary situation’ (130). Cultural and individual memory do not do such things: people do.

We hope to emphasize this point by our own choice of language. We aim to follow the great psychologist Frederic Bartlett (1932) who preferred to write about ‘remembering’ as an act performed by people, rather than ‘memory’ as if it were a thing. There can be no ‘memory’, whether collective or individual, unless people remember (Mace 2010). And we hope, in the main, to be analysing what the politicians are doing in the ceremony, when they are remembering or not remembering 25 April. Some recent researchers, including those

who, like us, advocate micro-analysing the ways that people use language, have emphasized that memory is a ‘process’ rather than a ‘thing’. Unfortunately, they sometimes then show a tendency to use ‘process-words’ to describe what is going on. Instead of describing plainly what people are saying when they are remembering, they turn such talk into evidence for things such as ‘recontextualization’ or ‘resemiotization’. It is as if these theoretical constructs are the reality and the words of actual people are but imperfect reflections of this deeper reality. A word of advice to readers: those who have approached this book in the hope of discovering more about things like ‘resemiotization’ and ‘recontextualization’ would be best advised not to continue much further. They are likely to be disappointed by the banal words in this work.

There is a further point to stress. In one sense, this is a case-study of a particular commemoration and, as such, it might be thought to be of limited interest. It would be easy to suppose that only those who are concerned with Portuguese politics would be interested. However, a case-study should always be more than just a study of a particular example, at least so long as one does not approach the particular phenomenon with the fixed purpose of finding evidence for a fixed theory by using a fixed methodology. A more open-ended approach is required, in order to examine the details of the case-study without being overly directed, or incapacitated, by the wish to champion a particular theory. If we are prepared to be flexible, then the particular can reveal new aspects of the general. As David Zarefsky (2014) has argued, the development of rhetorical theory has always depended upon the use of case-studies, in which one can examine how speakers use general features of rhetoric in particular situations. Without detailed case-studies, theories can remain, as it were, a bit too theoretical. With case-studies, theories can be tested and the world re-examined. Even Kurt Lewin ([1931] 1999), the so-called founder of experimental social psychology, recommended that concrete cases were vital for testing and developing theory (see Billig 2015a,b).

We hope that our case-study will do more than illuminate politics in the Portuguese ceremony but it will highlight more general features of today's political culture. Wider aspects of history and politics flow through the particular Portuguese ceremony, as they would with any parliamentary ceremony. As a modern nation-state Portugal resembles other nation-states and its parliamentary procedures, including its ceremonies, will resemble those found elsewhere. The idea that particular examples will contain general features is also emphasised by Ruth Wodak and her colleagues – especially in their work on the language of nationalism. They have produced important case-studies of nationalist discourse in Austria and they have used these specific studies to demonstrate wider processes involved in what they call 'the discursive construction of national identity' (e.g. De Cillia, Reisigl and Wodak 1999; Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl and Liebhart 2009).

Austrian national identity, of course, presents its own unique features but then so does that of every nation. Across the globe each nation proclaims its own uniqueness - its own unique space in the world, its own unique history, its own unique culture etc. Speakers in the Portuguese ceremony will use overtly nationalist language to extol their nation - *Viva Portugal*, they will declare. This openly expressed nationalism is not the 'banal nationalism' of unnoticed symbols (Billig 1995); nor can this once-a-year ceremony be considered as an instance of what researchers are now calling 'everyday nationalism' (Antonisch and Skey in press; Edensor 2002; Skey 2011). An annual ceremony, celebrating the nation's past in the present, contributes to the reproduction of the nation as a nation and to the continuing national identity of its citizenry. The mere existence of such a ceremony demonstrates how nationhood persists as a major political feature of today's world. Some social theorists, most notably Ulrich Beck, claim that nation-states are inexorably disappearing, giving way to cosmopolitan, global identities in a post-nationalist world (e.g. Beck and Willms 2003: 37f). The implausibility of the claim can be illustrated by an absence. The annual ceremony of

celebration – with its cries of *Viva Portugal* – is not counter-balanced by an equally solemn annual ceremony celebrating the European Community and the wider global world, with parliamentary deputies dreaming of the day when no-one will think of themselves as Portuguese.

This celebratory display of Portuguese nationalism will have points of resemblance with the ceremonies of other nations, including those of the Austrians. The claims of national uniqueness are similar for a simple reason: they express the ideology of nationalism and that ideology is itself an international ideology. The very idea of the unique nation-state is the ideological foundation of all modern nationalism. Because today's world is a world of nation-states, nationalism and its ideological assumptions about the naturalness of nations are to be found internationally. Therefore, internationalism rather than being the antithesis of nationalism, as is so often assumed especially by the champions of global cosmopolitanism, is, and historically has been, very much part of nationalism (Billig 1995; Calhoun in press).

Accordingly, the ceremony in the Portuguese parliament, celebrating Portugal's historic liberation from dictatorship, is not isolated from the rest of the contemporary world. Wodak and her colleagues have examined Austria's special celebrations, including the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the second republic and the 1996 millennial celebration of the first historical mention of 'Austria'. Such national ceremonies may recall historically unique events but they will also reflect more general features of the contemporary world. Precisely which general features are reflected within particular ceremonies of national celebration can differ from specific celebration to specific celebration.

Ruth Wodak and her colleagues take somewhat different generalities from their case-studies than we do here. This is not necessarily because they have different theoretical perspectives than us or because we have directed our perceptions differently than they have. Of course, there are inevitable differences between the ways that we and her team deal with

the details that require analysis. Here we put a bit more emphasis on examining what the speakers are doing with their words, how particular episodes unfold and what the listening parliamentarians are doing; and we place less emphasis on compiling matrices of strategies and themes. However, these are not overwhelming differences. The big contrasts between the ways that we have examined our respective case-histories reflect differences within the examples that we have chosen to study.

Case-studies can be compared metaphorically with depth drilling. The drills go down in a specific place, rather than researchers skimming the surfaces of many locations. Having drilled downwards, the drillers bring to the surface samples of buried soil and crushed rocks that need to be analysed. These samples may contain a mixture of soils and rocks that are unique to the specific place that is being drilled, as well as soils and rocks that can be commonly found elsewhere. Even if the various samples extracted from different locations contain some commonly found elements, this does not mean that they always possess the same commonly found elements. When Wodak and her colleagues drilled down into the Austrian ceremonies they found different sets of features than when we drilled into the Portuguese parliamentary ceremony. They excavated political arguments about how to recount Austria's past – arguments about which narratives to include, which to exclude and which to change. Such arguments are by no means unique to the Austrian commemorations (Wodak and Richardson 2009). We found analogous debates in our Portuguese samples, but they were not the most common of our commonly found materials.

Time after time we extracted large lumps of non-commemorative politics. In consequence, as we looked at the 25 April commemorations, we were able to observe the conduct of partisan politics. We have been granted good views of politicians using language to engage in the lower political arts. Politicians can imply one thing while literally saying another; sometimes this happens when speakers from the most right-wing party in the

assembly talk about the past, for there is much that they cannot say too directly. This tendency, however, is by no means confined to the right. And certainly Portuguese politicians are not the only politicians, who subtly and not so subtly use language for low ends (Wodak 2009). As Zarefsky noted, rhetorical case studies can contribute to the development of theory. By examining closely how speakers engage in different types of manipulating, we have been able to draw attention to various aspects of manipulation that current theories have tended to overlook. When particular cases are analyzed in sufficient detail and especially when they are placed within their historical context, they can offer the analyst much more than mere parades of particularities.

In our case-study of the Portuguese ceremony, we will be able to see how politicians can recruit the past to further the contentious politics of the present. Because we are drilling down in one spot, we can watch them doing this over time within the same ceremonial context. Familiarity should not breed contempt but familiarity should allow us to notice some less than apparent meanings in the murkier messages of political speakers. Therefore, as we observe politicians talking about the past and the present, we hope to understand not just what they are doing with their words on a specific occasion, but to appreciate how politicians in general can deploy the rhetorical arts and dubious crafts of their trade.

Structure of the book

The chapter that follows this introduction will present a short account of the history leading up to the 25 April revolution of 1974, as well as a brief description of what happened on that day. It is hoped that this will benefit readers, who do not claim to have great knowledge of recent Portuguese politics. Nevertheless, the chapter is intended to be much more than a tutorial for the less well informed. The need for discourse analysts to have historical understanding is a principle that has been enunciated and followed by Ruth Wodak when

investigating how Austrians and others remember, and fail to remember, the Holocaust (e.g., Engel and Wodak, 2013; Wodak 2011 and 2015; Wodak and de Cillia 2007; Wodak and Meyer 2010). Unless analysts have a sense of history, they cannot begin to appreciate what is being omitted from the accounts of the past that they are studying. Nor can they appreciate how such accounts might change over time. In the present case, we will point to two absences. The politicians in their speeches rarely allude to what happened in the afternoon of the great day. Similarly, one individual, whom the historians depict as central to the events of 25 April 1974, is all but absent from the speeches. The history chapter also contains short accounts of the post-revolutionary political parties, whose speakers we will be analysing in the subsequent chapters.

The analyses of the speeches start in chapter three. There we discuss the format of the ceremony and how little it has changed since the first ceremony of 1977. The structure of the occasion reflects the way that Portuguese democracy is built around political parties. In this chapter, we look at the most formal parts of the speeches – namely their beginnings and endings. Even when being formal, the speakers can be political, particularly in their choice of who to include in their formal list of addressees. The partiality of the applause at the end of speeches is also examined. The deputies typically applaud according to the speaker's party affiliation rather than according to whether they agree with the speaker's closing remarks.

The political theme is continued in chapter four. We argue that speakers promote the interests of their parties as they commemorate the national event. The use of the first person plural is a give-away, as speakers ambiguously slide back and forth from 'we, the party', to 'we, the Portuguese' and to 'we, everyone'. It is as if they are making claims that their party represents everyone. In contrast to the normal conduct of the assembly, deputies often take care not to mention rival parties too directly, but nonetheless they are able to cast implicit aspersions. We also examine in some detail episodes of low politics. There is an incident

when the speaker from the centre right threatened to withdraw the party's support from the president of the republic who was seeking re-election. We also look at the way the right-wing deputies reacted strongly against the first woman speaker at the ceremony. The analyses of these episodes constitute case-studies within the overall case-study. In this chapter we also discuss how the rhetoric of party politics differs from the rhetoric envisaged by most classical and modern theories of rhetoric. Most theorists have seen persuasion as the purpose of rhetoric. In party politics, speakers are not directly attempting to persuade their opponents in the audience: they may be trying to manoeuvre advantages over them. Even on such a national occasion, the politicians cannot resist exercising the skills of their trade.

The next two chapters consider respectively the speeches from left-wing and right-wing parties. In chapter five we look at both the centre and the far-left. By and large, left-wing speakers connect their present politics with 25 April, thereby justifying their own stances. We can see continuing political differences between the far-left and the centre left in the way that they understand the lessons of 25 April. The centre left justifies its pragmatic politics of economic compromise, while the far-left dreams of overthrowing the present financial system. Both centre and far-left speakers tend to offer brief narrative fragments about the events of 25 April, especially when they salute those members of the armed forces who took part in the insurrection of the day. These fragments omit more than they contain and they can reflect a mythic, even a magical, understanding of the day.

Right-wing speakers also make omissions, some of which are similar to those of the left and some of which are very different. These omissions, together with the politics of the right-wing speeches, are discussed in chapter six. The most right-wing party in the assembly was founded by ex-Salazarists. Its speakers tend to subtly soften their criticism of the previous regime. They can also equivocate about the celebration itself, sometimes boosting an alternative as the day to celebrate - namely the day when the far-left suffered a reverse

after the revolution. In these matters, the party's speakers have ideas that cannot be voiced too directly. The centre right also has equivocations about the ceremony. Their speakers sometimes express a pragmatic philosophy about the ceremony, celebrating while conveying reservations about history. We discuss how the centre right aligns its views of the past with an increasingly neoliberal politics of the present. It mixes hard-headed pragmatism with the appropriation of radical rhetoric. There are also case-studies of the first two centre-right speakers to wear a red carnation and how they use this symbol to reinforce their neoliberal message.

The second case-study of the carnation-wearer illustrate some of the low arts of political rhetoric. The speaker conveys messages which seem to conflict with the record but which are not literally untruths. This theme is continued in chapter seven, as we examine the low arts of manipulation. In keeping with our general approach, we do not approach 'manipulation' as if it were a clearly defined thing (or process), but we examine how speakers engage in the act of manipulating. We examine two episodes, treating them as examples of very different ways of manipulating. The first episode concerns a communist speaker manipulating information. The example shows forcefully how speakers can avoid giving an account of what happened on 25 April. The second example involves a right-wing speaker manipulating left-wing deputies to applaud during his speech. The examples are not merely intended to demonstrate how politicians can indulge in low arts in this particular ceremony; we also aim to illustrate points of general theory by arguing that manipulating information can be very different from manipulating people directly. As such, the case-studies carry wider implications.

This theme underlies the concluding chapter. As we draw together the points from the previous chapters, we emphasize that our overall case-study – the examination of the Portuguese parliamentary celebration – is more than just a case-study. It is an examination of

wider phenomena, especially political phenomena, which can be observed within the particular instance. As such, a case-study can contribute to the general development of understanding. We hope that our case-study will succeed in this aim.

