



9th Erasmus Week

Teaching Crossroads

Edited by

Elisabete Silva

Clarisse Pais

Luís S. Pais

Título: Teaching Crossroads: 9th IPB Erasmus Week
Editores: Elisabete Silva, Clarisse Pais, Luís S. Pais
Edição: Instituto Politécnico de Bragança · 2014
5300-253 Bragança · Portugal
Tel. (+351) 273 303 200 · Fax (+351) 273 325 405
<http://www.ipb.pt>
Execução: Serviços de Imagem do Instituto Politécnico de Bragança
Capa: Soraia Maduro
Tiragem: 50 exemplares
Depósito legal: 374254/14
ISBN: 978-972-745-166-1
Online version: <http://hdl.handle.net/10198/9447>

Index

<i>Elisabete Silva; Luís S. Pais; Clarisse Pais</i> Preface	7
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND APPLIED SCIENCES	
<i>Patrick Siegfried</i> The importance of the service sector for the industry.....	13
<i>Axel Sikora</i> The Internet of Things – State of the Art	23
NURSING AND HEALTH CARE	
<i>Pedro Gutiérrez Moraño. Belinda Basilio Fernández. José Luis Bote Mohedano</i> Ulcers and Amputations Prevention in the Diabetic Foot. Screening to determine the Risk of Suffering Foot Lesions in Primary Care	35
ECONOMICS	
<i>Alba María Priego de la Cruz</i> Economic Value Added as a source of information for stakeholders	49
LAW AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION	
<i>María Rosa Vázquez Rodríguez</i> Environmental policy: environmental education	61

EDUCATION

Elisabeth Fernbach

With an Open Mind 71

Cláudia Martins

Diatopic variation in Portugal: notes on European Portuguese dialects.... 81

LIFELONG LEARNING PROGRAMME. ERASMUS MOBILITY FOR TEACHERS

Isabel Chumbo

Translators censoring Propaganda – a case study on the translation of Salazar’s speeches into English 101

Elisabete Mendes Silva

Isaiah Berlin and the Role of Education: from Riga to Oxford..... 117

Translators censoring Propaganda – a case study on the translation of Salazar’s speeches into English

Isabel Chumbo

ischumbo@ipb.pt

*Polytechnic Institute of Bragança, School of Education
Universidad Rovira I Virgili, Intercultural Studies Group
Portugal*

Abstract

This study analyses translation as a support of propaganda during the dictatorial regime of António Oliveira Salazar (1932-68) in Portugal with particular emphasis on the 1930s and 1940s when many of the foundations of the regime were laid. The research is developed in two parts. First it investigates the relevance Salazar’s regime attributed to translation, mainly from Portuguese into English. Second it analyses a set of speeches by Salazar in order to understand how translators were influenced by the natural constraints of living and working in a dictatorship thus originating the occurrence of self-censorship.

Keywords: *Censorship, self-censorship, translation techniques, history*

Introduction

This article is the result of my Erasmus mobility visit to the University of Zagreb in Croatia, where the English department of the Faculty of Letters was so kind to receive me and to host my lectures. The very attentive audience provided me with comments and insights into my subject of study due to their recent national history.

Censorship refers globally to the suppression of information in several forms and happened in different places all over Europe (Merkle, 2002, p. 9). As it is known, censorship still exists today in many same or other forms which will be mentioned in this article, and it is known to exist for centuries in many places.

If we go back to Freud's writings in *Die Traumdeutung* we will understand that censorship mechanisms exist in order to create a censor in each individual (Freud, 1981, pp. 656-720). In the introduction to the *TTR* issue on Censorship and Translation Denise Merkle emphasizes that Freud's

rich psychoanalytic legacy has strongly marked the reflection on social organization of a number of twentieth-century thinkers, Marcuse and Bourdieu, to name only two, having explored the relationship between repression (censorship) and civilization/society from Marxist and sociological perspective, respectively (Merkle, 2002, p. 14).

Between 1926 and 1974 Portugal lived under a dictatorship, first a military one and then another one divided in two periods starting from 1932: under Oliveira Salazar (1932-1968) and Marcelo Caetano (1968-1974).

Since 1926 there was a centralized censor department, although the history of censorship in Portugal goes back to several centuries before. There was only one state press agency and newspapers had to apply to that agency for news.

Propaganda seems to be an obvious part of a dictatorship. Everywhere in Europe the twentieth century provides examples of dictatorships which found several media to pass their message efficiently to the people. From posters to radio broadcasting and itinerant cinema many were the ways found to manage collective attitudes and behaviours.

Oliver Thomson (1999) explains that there are several types of propaganda, being the political the most important one in this case. He states that the politicians' objective is to conquer or justify the political power and that the final aim is "nationalism, patriotism and respect for authority" (p. 23). The new media, like cinema were used in combination with the illusion of masses on a great scale.

As seen, the area of this study is the history of translation during the dictatorial regime of António Oliveira Salazar. More precisely, the topic of the research is the role of translations in Salazar's propaganda, with particular emphasis on the 1930s and 40s as well as on the translation of a corpus of his speeches into English by translators working for and in the SPN- *Secretariado de Propaganda Nacional*.

This study's objective is twofold. On the macro-level it aims to investigate the relevance Salazar's regime attributed to translations, mainly from Portuguese into English in the 30s and 40s. These decades were seminal for the implementation of the regime, namely through major repression guidelines which were to outlive Salazar, until 1974, year of the Carnation Revolution.

The analysis of Salazar's speeches will provide us with information relevant for the micro-level of the study, especially when referring to the set of procedures used by translators, the most important being word shifts, omissions and additions.

Translation from within the regime was very important and constituted a real industry. Although produced in a censored environment (inside SPN) translators would self-censor and use techniques such as omissions or substitution. The translations produced improved the image of Portugal in Europe and in the USA.

Bearing in mind the two-fold objective of this study the quantity of translated material will also be mentioned, so that the relevance of translation in the global propaganda policy of the regime can be clarified. Unfortunately the *Index Translationum* does not refer to technical translations (politics, economy) from Portuguese into other languages.

Literature review

During the thirty six years Portugal was under Salazar' dictatorship, every cultural intervention in whatever its form, was thoroughly controlled by the official censorship commission and reported to the SPN and from there to the top of the system. The censorship committees were mainly composed of military and men of letters, other times by people who were illiterate and there was tight legislation to enforce official censorship which was spread across the country with the help of the political police – PIDE.

Censorship occurred in a very bureaucratic manner and several ministries had censor departments, although the *Direcção-Geral da Censura* officially existed in the Ministry of War and Domestic Affairs. There were Press Offices, Reading Offices (*Gabinete de Leitura*), to which all printing presses and editors had to apply for publication licenses, Public Shows Examination and Classification Committee (for theatre and cinema) and many other departments (Azevedo, 1999, p. 55-56).

The censorship system was redesigned in 1933, including a Board (*Direcção de Censura*), committees and delegations spread throughout the country. Still according to Azevedo, censorship mechanisms contributed to create a "virtual Portugal" and were an instrument to manipulate both consciences and behaviours (Azevedo, 1999, p. 23). He also confirms that censorship and propaganda went together, a phenomenon which is common to other dictatorships (see Rundle, 2000; Sturge, 2000; Merino and Rabadán, 2000) and that the supreme commander of all this was Salazar himself (Azevedo, 1999, p. 56).

Because he was the *Presidente do Conselho* (president of the government) the propaganda was under Salazar's direct supervision through the SPN first (1933-1944), then through the SNI (1944-68). The law that created SPN states that its role was also to "coordinate all information regarding actions from the several ministries, in order to show evidence, in our country and other, that the Portuguese State lives in a spirit of unification, when referring to past and future works" (My translation of *Decreto-Lei* 23:054, 25th September 1933, artº 2).

The SPN starts its action in October 1933 and Salazar holds a speech where he argues that this new office's purpose is not to praise the government but to fight a battle against "error, lies, defamation or simply ignorance" (my translation of Salazar, 1935, p. 264).

This office comprised an internal and external section. In Portugal the office had eight main objectives to pursue: to regulate the relation between the press and the state, to promote publications on the governments activity, to organize an information service on the work done by the different ministries, to support the ministries actions, to organize public manifestations for the population with educational purposes, to prevent the dissemination of ideas which might harm the national interest, stimulate and find a solution to cooperate with Portuguese artists and writers through the creation of awards which would develop an art and literature "acentuadamente nacionais", and use resources such as radio-broadcasting, cinema and theatre in order to fulfil its tasks (*Decreto-Lei* 23:054, 25th September 1933, artº 4).

The same law establishes SPN's action abroad: cooperation with all the national departments outside Portugal, monitoring of all official press services outside the country, and a third objective which is related to the production of translations inside the propaganda machine.

All departments of the state were to cooperate with the SPN in these matters and people working for the Propaganda Office had free access to all public performances.

The action in other countries is justifiable with all the examples from other dictatorships in Europe but also by the context. Every nation was trying to adjust to a different political map after the failure of imperialism and therefore, "é de suma importância o apoio da opinião pública internacional, tanto para o regime que se afirma como para o espaço colonial" (Paulo, 1994, p. 75).

This approach to other countries and cultures is the reason why translation gained importance in the whole propaganda system:

The contact with the exterior and the necessity to amplify international support originates the approximation to several countries. Therefore, several works based on the objectives and guidelines of the regime are translated into English, French, Spanish, Italian and German (my translation of Paulo, 1994, p. 76).

Azevedo (1999) considers that the SPN was rather efficient in the pursuit of its purposes until 1940, the time of the propagandistic climax, with the Historic Exhibition of the Portuguese World, a very popular event, taking place in Lisbon in that very same year.

The director of the SPN, António Ferro, was a well-known journalist and writer and he implemented what he called the “Policy of the Spirit”, the true following of the regime’s guidelines.

In 1944 Salazar ends Ferro’s commission as leader of the SPN. The war had had its influence and Salazar decides on a new name (SNI) for the same old ways, its objectives being “to improve the image of the regime, making it more efficient regarding information and propaganda” (my translation of Azevedo, 1999, p. 170).

Writing in times of dictatorship is not an easy task. The whole censorship system is attentive and tries to delete everything which is regarded against the regime. The military dictatorship had already established a set of rules for the different media and spread them as instruction for their local leaders across the country. In those days the main target of censors already was the press although freedom of speech was consecrated in the Constitution. Many of the guidelines from the military dictatorship passed on to Salazar’s, whose regime implemented more detailed action under some general rules.

To summarize the document known as “Instruções Gerais” there were to be no disrespectful references to the state and all other people of importance, no news causing public alarm, no references to people in exile or who had been deported, no extensive details on crimes of passion, no reference to suicides unless they were of recognized criminals, no reference to child murder unless in context with the news on the assassin’s sentence, no allusions to censorship itself and no blank spaces in newspapers are just some of the many guidelines (Azevedo, 1999, pp. 387-388).

In 1936 new regulations were found for censorship compiled in a document titled as “Regulamento dos Serviços de Censura”. It established what was subject to prior and post-censorship, being the press the most important part of it. Before proceeding any further terminology regarding different types of censorship should be cleared. Regarding the Portuguese example we can say the system was divided in two types of the phenomena: prior and post-censorship. This classification is drawn on Merkle’s introduction to the *TTR* issue on Censorship and Translation (Merkle, 2002, pp. 11-12).

Prior censorship happened mostly with newspapers and magazines. Every single piece of writing should go through censorship first and censors would expect a journalist to rewrite the same piece of news two, three times a night, so that the result would be convenient to the regime.

Post-censorship resulted mainly in the banning of books. And many were banned. Studies undertaken by the *Comissão do Livro Negro do Regime Fascista* (Black Book Commission on the Fascist Regime, my translation), whose purpose

was to analyze the real action of censorship during dictatorship, came up with a surprising number. Over 75 thousand books were apprehended in publishers' storages and over 3.000 titles were banned.

A famous case is the banning of *Time* Magazine for several years, because on the 22nd July 1946 it published a cover story on Salazar calling him the dean of dictators.

The journalist César Príncipe (1994) states that all the rules created over the years of dictatorship transformed Portugal into a virtual country, because there was no prior censorship, no political prisoners, no suicides, no abortion, no war, no hippies, no strikes, no drugs, no homosexuals, no hunger, no pollution, no typhus, and the ministers were never sick, did not eat and had no car accidents. It was a fiction against reality (p. 12).

During my research in the Archives I have not found evidence of an official policy regarding translations but several authors have suggested the existence of *unwritten rules* (my emphasis) which may be classified as self-censorship. (José Saramago, cited in Azevedo 1999, p. 32)

Spain seems to have replicated this idea under Franco. Merino and Rabadán (2002) clarify that there was a “subtle form of covert self-censorship: authors were aware of unwritten rules and they knew what had to be done to comply with or subvert the values of the Establishment” (p. 127). Sturge (2002) shows a diverse viewpoint on this by saying that in Germany “direct intervention by the state was less important than the system of self-regulation by the agents of book publishing and distribution themselves” (p. 154).

Portuguese Literature, Foreign Literature and Translations: different action

All publishers had to submit the books they intended to publish to the official censorship system, where after a thorough analysis the censor would decide if the book received authorization to circulate or if it was to be banned or still, if there were any suggestions as to delete or change texts.

Before reading the book, which would take from two days to one week, the censor had to fill a form indicating who sent the book (the editor, the police, etc.), how many books were to be printed, the title, the author, editor, the translator, the printing press and the publication's final destination. Then the book was read and a report completed the form, with the indication of “Autorizado” or “Proibido” (authorized or prohibited).

The main impediments for publication were themes related to politics, sex and religion. Then there were the authors who were permanently *persona non grata* for the regime and forced to exile. Internal memos report that any reference to the following writers was to be excluded: Urbano Tavares Rodrigues, Sophia de Mello Breyner Andresen, Francisco de Sousa Tavares, Natália Correia, Augusto

Abelaira, Jacinto do Prado Coelho, because “these writers are dead!” (my translation, Azevedo, 1999, p. 512)

On the whole, the panorama regarding domestic literature was the same across European dictatorships. In Italy the censorship machine “did succeed in weeding out anything written by Italian opponents of the regime, most of whom were now living in exile” (Dunnet, 2002, p. 100). Only Germany’s fascist regime presented a different perspective. According to Sturge, the Nazi regime disliked the public taste for translations because they were “weapons to undermine the *Volk*, the racialized folk community invoked by Nazi discourse” (Sturge, 2002, p. 153).

In Portugal, the publishing industry was allowed a certain margin of liberty when it came to foreign literature. As long as the established order was not challenged with subversive references it was possible to go around censorship. Paradoxically the state preferred to allow the circulation of translations instead of national literature as a way to deviate attention. Again a phenomenon which was common to Italy where although the publication of translated novels could not be encouraged openly by a nationalist government, there was however a pragmatic acceptance that, if publishers were to survive, they needed to be able to offer readers translations (Dunnet, 2002, p. 98).

In the period called *Estado Novo* or New State, foreign literature had the opportunity to flourish in Portugal, sometimes even with the censor’s consent. Portugal liked to value its picturesque characteristics and disliked foreign influence in every field, from politics to literature. Nevertheless, throughout the years of dictatorship a large number of books was translated from English, French and German.

Translated books were a commercial success dictatorship was not able to guess or even prevent. In the form of low-cost book collections, books were sold out very easily. For publishers and translators this was good. Publishers did not want their books to be banned after publication because this represented a financial burden and to prevent this they were careful not to publish anything that would attract the censor’s eye.

On the one hand translators (many times authors to be) earned their money translating, while publishers were relieved not to have the political police apprehending books in their warehouses. On the other hand, literary establishment disliked what they called an “excess and proliferation of translations”. Critics would complain in the *Revista do Grémio Literário*, the official magazine of the publishing houses association, but to no avail (Seruya, 2004, p. 39). The 1940s saw the appearance of two very important collections: *Livros RTP* published by Verbo and *Clássicos Inquérito* published by Inquérito. They were cheap, with more or less the same number of pages, comprised about 100 books and were sold at a pace of one per month. *Livros RTP*, one of the most popular collections, even had several editions until 1974 and is currently considered a rarity.

In these collections publishers offered the public novels by Graham Greene, Oscar Wilde, Leo Tolstói, Goethe and the so-called “acceptable” Portuguese authors like Camilo Castelo Branco or Júlio Dinis, just to name a few.

Research into the censorship of books in Portugal during the dictatorship is difficult, documents are missing and although reports of the censors were recently made public, it must be said that records referring to several years are missing, others are incomplete. In other cases there are a lot of details concerning one specific work.

Unlike the censorship’s attitude of establishing rules for the press, there was no such thing for censors dealing with foreign literature or translations. The reports on books show that there was a lot of subjectivity involved, sometimes different censors would have a different way of reading one same work and most of them regarded translations as unimportant.

In 1943 *La Joie de Vivre* by Émile Zola was translated into Portuguese and the censor who read the translation reported the following on May 15th: “The French edition has been authorized, but when reading certain detailed passages in translation, I realize that publishing this book may not be convenient” and suggests the book to be forbidden (SPN/SNI File 628, Report 2241).

Another report, from July 3rd the same year argues that the translation of *The Professor* by Charlotte Brontë should not be allowed based on the fact that there are some passages on social upheaval. Although the recommendation was to ban the book, the truth is that it ended up being published (SPN/SNI File 628, Report 2312). Examples like these show us that it was very difficult for translators to guess what went through the censor’s mind.

In the *Gabinete de Leitura* (Reading Office), official readers, some of them only holding primary education, would censor books after being printed. Sometimes censors would allow a book based on the fact that it had been circulating for too many years in its source language, although the translation was not considered good or adequate for the Portuguese people. In those days all major Portuguese authors were either imprisoned or in exile, others worked as translators and later became well known writers themselves.

Technically speaking, books were supposed to be published only after being approved by the censor but this was not always the case. Sometimes translations could even circulate at the publisher’s risk.

From within the regime

The regime wanted favourable opinions from abroad reported and therefore a team of translators were employed by the SPN to scan foreign press and translate articles of interest. As previously explained, a section of this Office was dedicated to external propaganda and therefore to translation. Archaeological work in the Oliveira Salazar Archive (AOS) has proven that in those days the State was heavily

worried with its image around the world and there was a huge amount of work translated by the so-called “official translators” (AOS/CO/PC-16A).

The existence and role of the official Propaganda Office (Secretariado de Propaganda Nacional – SPN/ later Secretariado Nacional de Informação – SNI) is not ignored by the Portuguese historians, nevertheless their focus is mainly on the actions undertaken by the Office as an organ of control and repression on others and hardly ever on the Office as a center of production or industry of translation.

Helena Matos (2004) gives a different insight. She is aware that the SPN/SNI housed translators for propaganda purposes and even that it organized translation contests where T.S. Eliot was a member of the jury. The scope of her work is just to give an overview of the propaganda machine; therefore there is no follow up for this information. Nevertheless, she clearly points out an activity of attracting foreigners to write about Portugal. Promoting Portugal was serious business for the regime and this is corroborated by SPN/SNI’s budgets.

According to Matos (2004), the money spent by SPN shows

The political intention of reinforcing Portugal’s international prestige, but also the will to provide credibility to the government, based on these foreigner’s opinions, hence considered independent (p. 56).

Besides attracting intellectuals from other countries, translations of speeches, lectures or other writings by the dictator were on top of the in-house production. To promote the image of Salazar was the SPN’s main guideline. There are hardly any other written productions from other members of the government in whatever language.

Translations of Salazar’s books became a political issue in 1934. The director of the SPN, António Ferro wrote a book on Salazar which in Portuguese reads *Salazar. O Homem e a sua Obra* [Salazar. The Man and his Work] and was published in 1933. Ferro’s wife, Fernanda de Castro, worked as a translator into French and translated that book. The title in French became *Salazar, le Portugal et son Chef* (1934). The translator’s choice created a political incident between Salazar and the president of the Republic, Óscar Carmona, who supposedly was the leader.

Ferro had been touring France before this book saw the light of day, trying to convince intellectuals and journalist of the charm of Portugal. Paul Valéry, member of the French Academy wrote the preface to the translation of Ferro’s book, a fact which gave the book immediate visibility. A good promotion of the book as well as a party at the Hotel Ambassadeur helped sales a lot. SPN’s budgets show how important that preface was. As a matter of fact it was more expensive than the party itself (AOS/CO/PC-19).

Matos emphasizes the opinions expressed by foreign writers and artists. She says: “... these texts sound like rhymes”, which means that all of them ended up

writing more or less the same about the dictator, which is a well-known technique for propaganda to be effective (Matos, 2004, p. 54).

In that very same summer, writer Martin du Gard (he wrote *Lettres Portugaises* (1934) and one chapter is dedicated to Salazar - "La dictature du professor") and artist Paul Colin toured Portugal. "Expenses with foreigners" appears as an important part of SPN's budgets.

In 1935 the SPN continues the work of glorifying Salazar's image. Intellectuals are constantly invited to come to Portugal. The English edition of Ferro's book is published as *Salazar, Portugal and her Leader* (1939), containing a preface by Austen Chamberlain. In July that same year a Translation Prize is created and awarded to the best translation of one of Salazar's speeches. It was awarded to a student of Portuguese at the Hamburg University (AOS/CO/PC-19, page 166).

Salazar's speeches seem to be a particular source of interest for the SPN. António Ferro is especially dedicated to this task and spends some time in France during 1937 to promote the French translation. At the same time Ferro was representing Portugal at the International Exhibition in Paris (AOS/CP-112, file 3.3.11, pages 242 and 243).

It can be said that the SPN operated in a pioneering way for the time in Portugal. Besides inviting foreign journalists and artists to Portugal, the Propaganda Office also supported Portuguese authors financially and bought their books. Pamphlets and brochures on economic matters were particularly important because they were a way to prove Salazar's financial miracle in a country which had been bankrupt for years.

In fact a lot was translated in those days by in-house translators. Besides tourist brochures, politics and economics were the main themes. The collection *Salazar Says* comprises several booklets with speeches by the leader and all the major texts written and delivered at conferences by Salazar ended up being translated.

In a first stage SPN had people working with the category of translator, but in the early 40s there was a public service reform and translators ended up integrated with very common names for their functions and were not referred to as translators anymore. Although all the official translators worked for the SPN they were in fact commissioned by the Foreign Office Ministry, the Interior Ministry and even Salazar himself.

It is not easy to assess if these translations were effective concerning its purpose of improving the image of the country. Nevertheless there are some clues which can be taken into account. In 1949 a book of quotations in the foreign press on Portugal was compiled by *União Nacional* and although this fact may have biased the whole question, the fact is that newspapers like the *Times* could not have been manipulated to publish certain comments on Salazar and his action. The book is organized according to countries and many personalities are quoted, for instance Mircea Eliade.

In 1942 *The Times* publishes that “a obra de Salazar é tão grande que honraria qualquer país do Mundo/ Salazar’s work is so great, it would honour any country in the world” (Matta, 1949, p. 171). Bearing this inflamed version of Salazar’s work in mind, I will henceforth focus on some of Salazar’s speeches which compose the corpus of this case-study.

Data and Methodology

The corpus which is the pillar of this case-study is composed of 28 speeches compiled in *Doctrine and Action* (1939) and their original version organized in *Discursos* (1935), as well as other speeches by Salazar also published by SPN/SNI. Para-texts, such as introductions were also taken into account.

Several documentary sources (correspondence, budgets, files) from the Oliveira Salazar Archive (AOS) will be referred to and others which may be relevant.

No specific methodological model has been elaborated to investigate the proposed objectives and hypotheses, however, textual analysis was used in order to isolate micro-units of the text and the correspondent strategy.

The number of translations happening from within the regime has never been studied and this flow has not been analyzed from the statistical point of view.

In order to test the hypotheses a pilot-study was carried out on randomly chosen speeches. When analyzing Salazar’s speeches I will draw on Molina and Albir’s (2002) concepts of translation techniques. As these authors point out, translation techniques describe the translator’s options and give indication about the general methodology the translator adopted (p. 499). The several techniques used were analyzed in order to find out if translators used self-censorship procedures.

Still the definition of strategies presented by these authors cannot be forgotten, they are viewed as “an essential element in problem solving”, more precisely related to the “mechanisms used by translators throughout the whole process to find a solution” (Molina, 2002, p. 507). Strategies are part of the process while techniques affect the result. Five basic characteristics to define techniques were used in this pilot study: they affect the result of the translation, they are classified by comparison with the original, affect micro-units of the text, are discursive and contextual by nature, and are functional.

Paraphrasing Tymoczko (2000) translators must make choices, selecting aspects or parts of a text “to transpose and emphasize”. The fact that only some aspects are chosen, *partiality*, in the author’s definition, “is not merely a defect, a lack, or an absence in a translation – it is also an aspect that makes the act of translation *partisan*: engaged and committed, either implicitly or explicitly” (p. 24).

These choices or options also govern the dynamic and functionalist approach proposed by Molina and Hurtado Albir (2002) on translation techniques. They clearly differentiate techniques from strategies saying that the first affects the result and the latter are part of the process. Although they are different, when looking

at historical texts they cannot be completely separated. The authors explain that strategies “are the procedures (conscious or unconscious, verbal or non-verbal) used by the translator to solve problems that emerge when carrying out the translation process with a particular objective in mind” (p. 508). This particular objective can be closely related to censorship and propaganda, as well as the aim of giving one particular image of the country.

The perspective that technique and strategies are an essential differentiation but it is the analysis of the choices made by the translator concerning a specific micro-unit of the text which will give us ideas about the self-censorship hypotheses.

Salazar’s Speeches: how were they censored?

António Oliveira Salazar published five books of speeches in Portuguese, but only one was translated into English. As a matter of fact it is not a complete translation of the first volume of the speeches in Portuguese. It is more like a negotiated solution between the translator and the leader, compiling some of his most important speeches from the first two Portuguese books.

Doctrine and Action was published in 1939 by Faber and Faber in the United Kingdom. The book contains a preface by Salazar himself, dated 1936. This is the date the translation began and the speeches were gathered. The SPN used to receive indications by the chief of government on how to proceed with the translation and since the whole process was very bureaucratic it took several years to see the light of day.

Research in the Oliveira Salazar Archive has so far indicated that usually translations were sent out and in the office, so that several people could revise them. This is certified by filed correspondence in AOS/CO/PC-16A.

In order to test the idea that techniques such as omission and substitution were used by translators to self-censor I have randomly chosen three speeches from *Doctrine and Action*, more precisely: “The National Interest in the Policy of Dictatorship”, “National Propaganda” and “The Place of the New Portuguese State in Europe’s Political Evolution”.

The next step was to find words, expressions or other text units which might contain a political or ideological concept. To start from the target text is based on Gideon Toury’s idea (1995) that “translations are facts of target cultures” (p. 24), and later developed by José Lambert and Hendrik van Gorp in the article “On Describing Translations” (1985). Their proposal of comparison between target and source texts is indicated for literary texts, but can easily be applied in this case as well.

Doctrine and Action compiles some of Salazar’s most important speeches, almost all of them related to international policies. The chosen speeches are from the thirties, a time when many of Salazar’s pillars concerning propaganda were established.

After listing micro-units of the texts the techniques used were classified in order to understand the implication of the occurred alteration, word shifts or deletions.

It was important to understand if the final version of the text contained different ideas from the initial version and if these might have contributed to improve the image of Portugal in Europe, in this case, the United Kingdom.

The number of omissions is of extreme importance, not only because of the quantity in itself but mainly because of the quality or output of the English text. The speech “National Propaganda”/”Propaganda Nacional”, held at the opening of the SPN Office in October 1933 contains a paragraph in the Portuguese version which is completely deleted in the final text:

Vamos abstrair de serviços idênticos noutros países, dos exaltados nacionalismos que os dominam, dos teatrais efeitos a tirar no tablado internacional. Tratemos do nosso caso comezinho. / Let’s abstract ourselves from similar entities from other countries, from the exacerbated nationalism that dominates them, from all those dramatic effects on the international stage. Let’s just look at our very simple case (Salazar, 1936, pp. 258-9)

The critique is rather obvious. Salazar claims that he wants a Propaganda office which should be different and suggesting he does not approve of his fellow dictators’ ideas. This would not be a good passage to translate if the final aim was to promote the image of Portugal abroad, especially not through a publishing house which already was prestigious in those days.

In the speech “The Place of the New Portuguese State in Europe’s Political Evolution”/ “O Estado Novo Português na Evolução Política Europeia” the English version omits an adjective related to Portugal’s independence which was very dear to Salazar and his followers. On page 335 of *Discursos*, Salazar refers to the “alma da Nação”, to the “forças componentes do nosso ideal colectivo” and consequently to “nossa independência peninsular”. The English version keeps everything in the right place except for the independence, which is transformed into “traditions of independence”, an expression which takes away a lot of the patriotic value of the original expression.

In the same speech the translator chooses to omit “multidões de egoísmos” and decides to transform that in a people who “demands”.

Omissions also occur at para-text level, with deletion of the original introduction to the speeches, when Salazar addresses the audience or gives other sort of information. In the English version a brief text introduces the speech saying where and when it was held, many times the opposite of what happened in Portuguese where there are long contextualizations for most of the speeches.

These are just a few examples of what happens at a much more general level in a lot of other speeches by Salazar which were translated into English.

Conclusion

Archival work proves that translation from within the regime was an industry and that this feature of the dictatorship needs to be studied. Researchers on censorship, propaganda and translation in Portugal have not paid enough attention to what happened from the inside in order to improve the image of the country. This text provides an example and a new insight to how translation cooperated with the propaganda of the regime in a context largely under-studied in Portugal. In-house translation and the way translators perform in a dictatorship can certainly make the difference in the image of a country. This case-study seems to confirm that and allow a whole new line of research in the field of history of translation in the country.

References

- Azevedo, C. (1999). *A Censura de Salazar e Marcelo Caetano*. Lisboa: Caminho.
- Azevedo, C. (1997). *Mutiladas e Proibidas. Para a História da Censura Literária em Portugal nos Tempos do Estado Novo*. Lisboa: Caminho.
- Decreto-Lei 23:054, 25th November 1933
- Dunnet, J. (2002). *Foreign Literature in Fascist Italy: Circulation and Censorship*. *TTR, Censure et traduction dans le monde occidental*, 15(2), 97-123. Available at <http://www.erudit.org/revue/ttr/2002/v15/n2/007480ar.html>
- Freud, S. (1981). *Obras Completas*. Vol. I, Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Lambert, J. & Hendrik van Gorp (1985). On Describing Translations. In Hermans, T. (ed.), *Manipulation of Literature*. New York: St. Martin's Press. pp. 42-53.
- Matos, H. (2004). *Salazar – A Propaganda (1934-38)*. Lisboa: Temas e Debates.
- Matta, C. (1949). *Projeção de Salazar no Estrangeiro*. Porto: União Nacional.
- Merino, R.b & Rabadán, R. (2000). Censored Translations in Franco's Spain: The TRACE Project – Theatre and Fiction (English-Spanish). *TTR, Censure et traduction dans le monde occidental*, 15(2), 125-152. Available at <http://www.erudit.org/revue/ttr/2002/v15/n2/007481ar.pdf>
- Merkle, Denise, (2002). *TTR, Censure et traduction dans le monde occidental*, 15: 2
- Molina, L. & Hurtado Albir, A. (2002). Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach. *Meta*, 47(4), 498-512.
- Paulo, H. (1994). *Estado Novo e Propaganda em Portugal e no Brasil. O SPN/SNI e o DIP*. Coimbra: Minerva.
- Príncipe, C. (1994). *Os Segredos da Censura*. Lisboa: Editorial Caminho.
- Salazar, A.O. (1935). *Discursos (1928-1934)*. Coimbra: Coimbra Editora.
- Seruya, T. (2004). A Tradução como espaço de interculturalidade na vida literária do Estado Novo: o caso das coleções. In *Actas do VII Seminário de Tradução*

Científica e Técnica em Língua Portuguesa: 2004. Lisboa: Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia.

Sturge, K. (2002). Censorship of Translated Fiction in Nazi Germany. *TTR, Censure et traduction dans le monde occidental*, 15(2). Available at <http://www.erudit.org/revue/ttr/2002/v15/n2/007482ar.pdf>

Thomson, O. (1999). *Easily Led. A History of Propaganda*. Stroud: Sutton Pub.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tymoczko, M. (2000). Translation and Political Engagement. Activism, Social Change and the Role of Translation in Geopolitical Shifts. *The Translator*, 6(1), 23-47.

Archive Files

SPN-SNI/ADS/628

AOS/CO/PC-16A

AOS/CO/PC-19

AOS/CP-112