The Parody of Politicians
Multimodal distorted imitation aimed at political discredit
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Abstract—The paper presents a model of parody, seen as distorted imitation of some object or person aimed at eliciting laughter. A qualitative analysis is presented of the parody of a politician by a comedian. The analysis is carried out through an annotation scheme that describes each sentence, gesture, gaze, facial expression of the parody, and finds out the allusion it bears and the humorous aspects it contains. Finally each point of the parody is classified as to the criteria of evaluation of politicians proposed in previous works: whether the Target is made fun of concerning his competence, benevolence, or dominance. Finally the behavior exhibited by the Parodist is compared with the corresponding real behavior of the Target, in such a way as to single out which features of the Target are imitated in a parody.
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I. INTRODUCTION

When people want to cast discredit over others, they can use various types of serious communicative acts – by insulting, accusing, criticizing, insinuating – but they can do so even simply by making fun of others. Mocking, teasing, sarcasm, ridiculization are ways to highlight another’s flaws by casting a flavor of impotence over him, and a powerful weapon in the struggle for power.

A peculiar way to make fun of others is parody: by making a parody of another person, text, or discourse, rite, I point out the aspects of it that are ridicule and not threatening, more worth to induce amusement than awe or respect: thus I can lower the pretence to power of that person or communicative act. This paper defines the notion of parody as a specific way to make fun of people, achieved through a distorted imitation of someone or something (Sect.2), and after an overview of previous work (Sect.3) focuses on the parody of politicians as a way to ridicule political opponents in order to discredit them. Through the multimodal analysis of a parody within a political satire show, it overviews the cognitive and communicative processes underlying this powerful communicative act (Sect. 4), and finally shows how the study of parody is a challenge for research on Social Signal Processing on both the Analysis and the Synthesis side.

II. WHAT IS PARODY?

According to a socio-cognitive model of mind, action, social interaction and communication [1], a parody can be defined [2] as a communicative act – a text or a verbal or multimodal communicative behaviour (discourse, song, film, fiction) – that performs a distorted imitation of another text or multimodal behavior, with the aim of amusing and eliciting laughter. Generally a person is the object of a parody – a typical case are high school students who make parodies of their teachers – but also a text, a discourse, a rite, an institution may be so. Some classic examples of parody are, in Greek Literature “Apokolokyntosis” (“Transformation into Pumpkin”), attributed to Seneca the younger, a parody of the texts glorifying emperors aimed at spoiling the memory of Emperor Claudia; in Italian literature, Tassoni’s La secchia rapita (“The kidnapped basket”), a parody of epic poems. But also a song can be parodied, a movie, a proverb.

In making a Parody, the Parodist P imitates the Target T by reproducing T’s traits and/or communicative or noncommunicative behaviors, but in a distorted – exaggerated or misleading – way that enhances the Target’s flaws; to do so s/he must single out the most characterizing features of T’s physical traits or behaviors, and imitate them while exaggerating or subtly changing them in such a way as to make them appear ridicule.

III. PREVIOUS WORK ON PARODY

According to Holman and Harmon [3], parody is an imitation, intended to ridicule or criticize, that does not need a “pretense of ignorance” like in the socratic teacher, because familiarity with the original object is necessary: to be effective it has to “sound true” to the original [4]. A parody is not a simple imitation: first it must be an “approximation” to an original source, since like in sarcasm “the subject is treated in so obvious nature from a linguistic and psychological point of view: Bachtin [6: 76] sees it as “an arena of conflict between two voices, they are detached but they are hostility counterposed” and the second voice represents a “semantic authority”. In his speculation on parody he specifies: “the audience knows for sure with whom it is expected to agree.”
The Parodist has a strong role of both communicating and informing the audience on a criticizable object or act. In fact, Rossen-Knul and Henry [7] on the production side formally mention four pragmatic aspects of parody: (1) the intentional verbal representation of the object of parody, (2) the flaunting of the verbal representation, (3) the critical act, and (4) the comic act. Finally, according to the Italian satirist Luttazzi [8], satire has two goals, informing and deforming the chosen object; it is explicit and it uses the “bodily reduction” to physical needs with the aim of destroying societal hierarchies; it represents a message in a completely free way to create a mix between sacred and secular dimension, and it is blasphemous mainly against boasting characters, to make fun of their arrogance.

On the comprehension side, the parodistic act depends on the successful interaction between parodist and audience, since not only needs the latter to recognize the “authority” and the ethical or moralistic intention of the parodist, but it also needs to know vices and virtues of the character, especially if the parody is focused also on the body and verbal features (tics, stuttering...) which are the trigger of the comic part. In sum, a verbal parody is a highly situated, intentional, and conventional speech act that re-presents some object but flaunts the re-presentation in order to convey a humorous criticism [9].

IV. IMITATION, ALLUSION, DEEP AND SURFACE PARODY

In any kind of imitation P produces some trait or behavior Y while trying to evoke an X of T, that is, soliciting A to recognize Y as similar to another trait or behavior X of T. Therefore in imitation, but even more so in parody, for the feature exhibited by P to evoke a similar (but less extreme, less exaggerated) feature of T, a key element is allusion. In Allusion, a Sender P wants an Addressee A to infer that P refers to X and through X to T, even if P does not explicitly mention X or T, but simply makes reference to them in an indirect way. P does not mention X or T for reasons of euphemism or anyway to keep indirectness, and yet wants A to understand both what P refers to (X and T) and why P does not mention them explicitly. This is why both bare imitation and allusion, to be understood as such, require a shared knowledge, a common culture between Parodist and Audience, and both cannot be entirely caught across different cultures.

But there is more to parody than bare imitation.

First, the Parodist may (re)produce not only actual visible or audible features of the Target’s traits or behaviors, but also ones that might plausibly be displayed by the Target, given his/her general attitude. To do so, P may refer to an event that saw the Target as protagonist, so that allusion makes appeal not only to similarity of perceivable features but also to aspects of that event.

Second, to select T’s physical traits or behaviors to reproduce, P must find out the core of T’s personality, and imitate those traits and behaviors that may plausibly stem out of it, even if T has never actually exhibited them. Personality is a set of internal personality traits that allow us to classify a person into an abstract category and from this to infer even some traits or behaviors that were not yet actually displayed in the real life of that person. A Parodist, as well any actor or comedian, must impersonate the Target, and behave as if s/he were him/her.

This in a sense accounts for Luttazzi’s [8] “bodily reduction”. The Parodist’s tools are perceivable displays only, be they words or body traits or behaviors, but through them he must be able to represent even immaterial things, like internal personality traits, and he does so by displaying the perceivable traits or behaviors in which they are typically expressed.

A such device is exemplified by the parody of Matteo Renzi, an emerging leader of the Italian Democratic party, by the comedian Maurizio Crozza, who impersonates him as a young boy jumping around and playing with a ball. This alludes to Renzi’s struggling against the old leaders of his party and presenting himself as a young man – even, an “enfant terrible” – carrying new ideas and a new and young atmosphere. Of course, Renzi has never shown while jumping and playing ball, but his general attitude can be well represented by that (fake but funny) image.

V. POLITICAL PARODY

In this work we focus on the parody of politicians.

In political satire, a Parodist P makes a parody of some Target T – a political subject that may belong to the same or another political party – to make fun of T, often with the goal of casting discredit over him/her, before some Audience A. Actually, sometimes the goal of the Parodist – or the non-deliberate effect of the parody – is definitely to make fun of T, to make him ridicule; but sometimes the parody may even have the goal – or the effect – of making the Target become more popular among the Audience.

Based on the above, political parody is defined by the following ingredients:

1. Similarity to the Target
2. Allusion
3. Distortion of the similarity, aimed at stressing ridicule aspects of the Target and at eliciting laughter
4. Induction of inferences implying a negative evaluation of the Target on politically relevant criteria.

According to Poggi et al. [10], in political persuasion discredit may be cast over opponents concerning three different features of their way of being or behaving: the politician’s benevolence (his caring the electors’ goals, not working on behalf of his own interest, being trustworthy, honest, ethical), competence (expertise, knowledge, planning and reasoning skills), and dominance (capacity of winning in contests, influencing others, imposing one’s will). Ingredients n.1 and 2 above are necessary for any kind of imitation, n.3, the goal of making fun, defines parody, and n.4, political criticism, is specific of parody in political satire.

If these are the ingredients of political parody, in analyzing any case of it three features can be pointed out:

a. “allusion points”: the contents in the background knowledge that the Parodist believes are shared with the audience, and to which s/he alludes in his parody;
b. “humor points”, those in which the Parodist aims at eliciting laughter

c. the inferences implying political evaluation.

An example of all three features is in the title of another parody by Crozza: “Excalidür”. This is the parody of Umberto Bossi, the leader of the right-wing party Lega Nord (North League), struggling for the secession of the North of Italy, proudly making reference to their medieval history, and the first to break the politico correctness of Italian political language by using dysphemistic expressions like “La Lega ce l’ha duro” (The league is hard – in the obscene sense). The very title of Crozza’s parody, “ExcaliDÜR”, a pun that can roughly be translated as “ExkHARDlibur” is then a case of b., since being a pun it conveys the humor point; but it also carries two allusion points (a.), alluding both to the medieval nuances of the North League, and to Bossi’s sentence “La Lega ce l’ha DURo” (ExcaliDUR instead of ExcalibUR = “ExkHARDlibur” instead of ExCALibur). Finally, by evoking the typical violent language of the North league, this title indirectly conveys a negative evaluation regarding the criterion of benevolence. In the following we illustrate a qualitative analysis of a political parody sticking to these principles.

VI. THE MULTIMODAL PARODY OF A POLITICIAN

To show how the ingredients above are conveyed by multimodal communication, we present a qualitative analysis of a real parody of an Italian politician: Paiella’s parody of Alemanno.http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=19ZACx63Vso.

Gianni Alemanno, a former member of the Italian fascist party Alleanza Nazionale (National Alliance), was the Mayor of Rome from 2008 to 2013, often criticized for his having been a fascist drubber in his youth, and, when in the role of Mayor, for his famistical management of the Roman administration, since he, among other things, hired lots of relatives and friends in the town bus company. Max Paiella is a skilled imitator and parodist working in the left-wing satire show “The show must go off”, where he ridicules tics and behaviors of various right-wing politicians.

For his parody of Gianni Alemanno, Paiella picks up an episode in which the Mayor really made himself ridicule: the snow in Rome. Below we describe the context and background of this event, with words in bold describing the “allusion points”: the objects and events, which knowledge the Parodist supposes to be shared with the Audience, to which he alludes in his parody.

On February 3rd, 2012, snow came on Rome. Not so used to see snow, Rome is generally not prepared for this challenge, but in this case the disorganized management by Alemanno and his staff turned a meteorological event into a disaster. A newsletter from the national Civil Protection warned him that 35 millimeters of water were expected to come; actually, 1 mm. water corresponds to 1 cm. snow, but Alemanno and his staff did not know this, so they expected 3.5 centimeters of snow instead of the 35 and more that came in fact. No kind of prevention was undertaken: no salt to prevent streets from freezing, no snow chains for buses; cars could not go around, buses stopped for hours with romans inside, since getting off might mean freeze to death... All that Alemanno did was to warn people to stay home, to buy a stock of shovels and distribute them to Roman citizens recommending them to clean up their doors (he also was video-recorded on TV while shoveling snow), and to say he would call the army to cope with the emergency. As the emergency was over, Alemanno was accused of disorganization and inefficiency, and to justify himself he appeared in all TV news and talk shows imputing the disaster to the Civil Protection, who had not warned how serious the situation was, and complaining that he had been left alone to confront the emergency.

Our hypothesis is that each element of a parody displays a behavior or a physical trait, either similar to one actually displayed by the Target, or such that from it a general tendency, attitude, or personality trait of the Target can be inferred. This is often done while also alluding to some relevant elements of the Target’s previous story, and picking up these “allusion points” to stigmatize his traits and behaviors and cast some flavor of ridicule on him globally. Therefore, to analyze a parody implies discovering what are the “allusion points” and the “humor points” recalled by each of the verbal and body behaviors and traits displayed by the parodist, and what information, opinion, or political evaluation these elements aim to induce in the Audience.

A. The real Alemanno

To compare the real Alemanno with Paiella’s parody, we chose a real interview to the Mayor of Rome in the days after the snow. Let us analyze Alemanno’s general attitude as far as it appears from his verbal and bodily behavior.

1) Alemanno (dressed as a snow digger) says: “Siccome i giornali scrivono si fanno le solite polemiche politiche, in cui io vengo messo sempre in mezzo, ogni cinque minuti esce qualcosa di diverso, e allora dobbiamo affrontare la situazione” (since the newspapers write they make the usual political denigration, where I always get discredited, every fifth minute something different comes out, and then we have to cope with the situation).

He makes beats and deictic gestures, and rolls both hands: a gesture to express he repeatedly has to face this situation.

By both his words telling of the attacks to himself, and by gestures implying that attacks are repeated, Alemanno is playing the victim.

2) “Attenzione io oggi ho lavorato quattordici ore, sono andato avanti e dietro per tutta la città; di queste quattordici ore un’ora l’ho dedicata ai media e non è che sto a fare sempre i realtà o cose di questo genere” (Careful, today I worked 14 hours, I went back and forth all around town, a single hour I devoted it to media and I am not always being in realities or things like that).

He gazes first downward and then toward the two interviewers (on his left and on his right) to ask for approval; then he stresses the words quattordici ore (14 hours) by slowing down and suddenly speeding up, thus displaying an abrupt emotion shift, from a calm to a nervous state. By his gestures he first indicates his work hours and then points at the table with interviewers on the other side, rotating hands several times, again to allude to the journalists repeatedly attacking him.

Again his asking for approval and complaining being repeatedly attacked result in self-victimization.
(3) “Al giorno di giovedì non abbiamo un segnale chiaro di quello che sta per accadere, allora ci sono le famose questioni di centimetri, e qualunque italiano ha scoperto questa cosa qui.”

(At the day of Thursday we do not have a clear signal of what is going to happen, then there are the famous issues of centimeters, and any Italian has discovered this).

He speaks with a slow voice, as if showing bored, he makes gestures conveying precision like thumb and index touching in a precision grip [11], he puts on his glasses, he shows a sheet of paper in his hand (the Civil Protection’s newsletter warning of the 35mm. water) while looking at both interviewers, and then starts to read it.

Here Alemanno does not simply explain the matter but speaks and moves with a didactic attitude, which, though, leaks his feeling judged, and his need to defend himself.

(4) “Io sono stato l’unico ad assumermi le sue responsabilità a sospendere le lezioni... – ed è stato criticato – e sono stato criticato, mi prendevano in giro. Ah ah... l’allarmismo di Alemanno e sono stati fì a criticare fino a mezzogiorno quando ha iniziato a nevicare e l’ho fatto su mia responsabilità senza l’avvallo del prefetto.”

(I have been the only one who took up his responsibilities, who stopped school classes – and this was criticized – and I have been blamed, and they would tease me: ah ah... Alemanno’s scaremongering, and they went on criticizing up to midday when it started snowing, and I did it on my own responsibility without the prefect’s approval).

Speech rate grows and so does the amount of gestures: precision gestures, beats, with ample gesticulation pointing at oneself and others, of medium-high speed.

Alemanno’s display of increased emotional arousal, leaking from growing speech rate and gesture frequency aims to communicate how false the accusations are, and to justify himself; to present himself as the only serious and responsible person in the whole event.

Let us now see the image that Alemanno tries to project of himself, by his multimodal behavior, in these TV talk shows, in terms of the above criteria of competence, benevolence, and dominance. To reject the charge of inefficient management of the emergency, he tries to convey a negative image of others and a positive one of himself. In case (1) and in the body behavior of case (2) he plays the victim, saying that others have criticized him in any possible way; but self-victimization turns into a demonstration of low dominance. In (2) and (4) he tries to present himself as one who has worked hard during the emergency, and one who took up his responsibilities; thus he aims to project an image of high benevolence; but since all of this was nothing but his duty as a Mayor, he does not appear so ethical or admirable in fact. In (3), while showing the Civil Protection’s newsletter he tries to give an impression of high competence. But saying “there are the famous issues of centimeters and any Italian has discovered this” in itself implies that he himself at first did not know that 35 millimeters of water corresponded to 35 centimeters (not 35 millimeters) of snow; therefore his statement finally results in admission of his low competence!

A nice thing in ridiculization is that often the Target himself makes himself ridicule; in these cases a Parodist has but to take the chance of stressing this and simply highlight the points in which the Target shot himself in his foot.

In fact, as we shall see below, Pajella points at these very aspects of Alemanno’s behavior in his parody.

B. Pajella’s parody of Alemanno

Both the real Alemanno’s and Pajella’s verbal and body behavior have been analyzed. Pajella’s video, according to the model of political parody illustrated above, was analyzed through the annotation scheme shown in Table 1. In columns 1. we write the words and in 2. the body traits or behavior displayed, in col. 3 the “allusion points”, in 4. the inference induced by the allusion, and in 5. a classification of the example in terms of the feature made fun of, whether Competence, Benevolence or Dominance. The “humor points” are simply highlighted in bold italics (Table 1).

C. Parody in stage, costume and words

Since the very first scene Pajella’s parody makes fun of Alemanno in words, visual background and body behavior, with respect to all three political evaluation criteria: low dominance, low benevolence, low competence. While acting Alemanno, Pajella shows on the screen with Coliseum in the background and flocks of snow gently falling down; he is dressed as a Roman centurion (Table 1., line 1), with his helmet on the ground, holding a big shovel in his right hand (line 2) and a sheet of paper in his left hand (line 3). While Coliseum with flocks of snow falling down simply alludes to snow in Rome but is quite a “neutral” information, only aimed to set the stage of the parody, the suit (line 1), alluding to the Roman tourist operators that welcome tourists around Coliseum dressed as centurions, conveys a somewhat negative evaluation: men playing centurions with tourists are generally connoted as underprivileged uneducated people from Roman slums, waiting for a tip after posing for a picture. This then gives Alemanno a nuance of a lout, a buffon, certainly intended by the parody, thus again casting discredit on his competence and dominance.

The shovel in his right hand (line 2) alludes to the shovels he distributed to Romans to help themselves, and to his showing himself while shoveling, to project an image of a willing boy who, though left alone by civil protection, did everything he could to help: what is made fun of, then, is Alemanno’s pretence of benevolence. But the other inference to draw from this is Alemanno’s incompetence in organizing Rome for the emergency.

The sheet of paper in his left hand (line 3) alludes to the newsletter from Civil Protection about the millimeters of water expected, and points at Alemanno’s ignorance in meteorology.

As to the verbal and multimodal behavior, Pajella-Alemanno says (line 4): “Sono stato lasciato solo... chiamo l’esercito, sono stato lasciato solo, chiamo l’esercito” (I have been left alone::: I’ll call the army, I have been left alone, I call the army). He utters this with a high voice intensity (stressing on “solo”, to mimic Alemanno’s inflection) and his
facial expression displays distress. Here Pajella ridicules Alemanno’s strategy of victimization, thus discrediting him as to dominance.

Then he says (line 5) “Dovevano direcelo che l’acqua ghiacciava a zero centigradi centimetri!” (They should have told us that water froze at zero centigrade centimeters). He says so while showing the sheet of paper with the weather forecast, stuttering and crying, displaying distress by a facial expression with tightened eyebrows. Pajella thus alludes to the newsletter of Civil Protection and to Alemanno’s low competence in meteorological issues. But this is also a “humor point” since, to make fun of the Mayor, he exaggerates his ignorance by speaking as if confusing measures of length with temperature: “water would freeze at zero centigrade centimeters!”.

Again, he adds (line 6): La Protezione civile aveva detto che sul Campidoglio sarebbero piovuti soltanto 35 millimetri di merda. (Civil Protection had said that only 35 millimeters shit would fall over Capitolium). The Italian idiom copriri di merda (to be covered with shit) is a metaphor meaning a “big loss of face”: Pajella mixes up snow with shit, meaning that snow was like shit for Alemanno: a cause for him of a big loss of face.

The last two sentences, “zero centigrade centimeters” and “35 millimeters shit” exemplify what Fo and Rame [12] point out: the Parodist informs the audience in two ways, first by being critical, second by being comic. If both the satiric and the parodistic act focus on political events to evoke the moral dimension, the parody also performs “teasing”, by reproducing a body tic, a stuttering or other exaggerated and ridicule behavior. Here, the critical and the comic act are intertwined in the Parodist’s verbal and body behavior.

D. “Deep” parody. An interpretation of the Target’s behavior

The analysis of the parody along with one of the Target’s behavior allows us to clarify the real work of a Parodist. He must not simply imitate the Target, but to pro vide an interpretation of his behavior, categorizing him within some ideal-type, to stigmatize that type of person and behavior. The bulk of this interpretation in Pajella’s parody is for instance Alemanno’s self-victimization, viewed as a way to save himself from the bad reputation of incompetence he gained in managing the snow crisis. The self-victimization of the real Alemanno pops up for example in Pajella’s facial expression of distress, in waving the newsletter as a self-justification, in repeating “I was left alone”.

VII. PARODY. A CHALLENGE FOR COGNITIVE INFOCOMMUNICATION

Studying parody is a challenge for theory and applications in CogInfoCom [13]. On the theoretical side, it puts interesting questions about Imitation. To imitate some object implies to select and reproduce its characterizing features [14], and singling out the pertinent features of a person’s traits or behaviors, and choose what to mimic strictly and what to leave out of our reproduction is somehow facilitated in parodistic imitation, where we select the funny aspects of a person. And this leads to the issue of humor and its detection and reproduction: an endeavor only at its beginning [9, 15].

On the application side, the next step might be the Artificial Parodist (AP): an automatic system able to detect – or to infer from personality – a person’s characterizing and funny features and to imitate them. An AP should choose what visual and acoustic features to imitate – the Target’s shape, posture or gestures, their velocity, fluidity, amplitude or rhythm, typical words, voice quality, speech rate or intonational contour – and imitate them while exaggerating or distorting them, while keeping into account the knowledge shared with a given Audience, to make them recognizable.

What might be the use of making an AP? The first would be a Comedians’ Trainer: a system that 1. understands others’ goofy behaviors, 2. discovers their involuntary humor, and 3. Advices/teaches how to make a parody of them. But an AP might also take up educational functions: like second language teachers or choir conductors and trainers do, a Parodist Teacher would make parodies of the pupils’ performance to explain where they are wrong. Finally, an AP, possibly in a wearable version, might become a Parodist Companion: when perceiving our own goofy behaviors, it might make a parody of us, to prevent us from being ridiculed by others, to teach us not to take ourselves too seriously, and to recommend us more adaptive behavior.

References

Table 1. An annotation scheme for the Parody of Politicians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. WORDS</th>
<th>2. BODY TRAITS AND BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>3. BELIEF ALLUDED TO</th>
<th>4. MEANING TO BE INFERRED</th>
<th>5. RIDICULED FEATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alemanno dressed as a Roman centurion</td>
<td>men playing centurions with tourists are uneducated people from Roman slums, waiting for a tip after a picture.</td>
<td>Alemanno is a lout, a buffoon.</td>
<td>COMPETENCE DOMINANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A. has a shovel in his right hand</td>
<td>he distributed shovels to Romans to help themselves, due to lack of snowplows. He showed himself shoveling, to project an image of a willing boy doing everything to help.</td>
<td>Alemanno was unable to organize Rome for the emergency.</td>
<td>COMPETENCE BENEVOLENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A. holds a sheet of paper in his left hand</td>
<td>the newsletter from the Civil Protection about the centimeters of water expected</td>
<td>A.is ignorant</td>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sono stato lasciato solo...chiamo l’esercito, sono stato lasciato solo, chiamo l’esercito. I have been left alone::: I call the army, I have been left alone, I call the army.</td>
<td>High voice intensity, Frown and oblique eyebrows A.often said he would call the army</td>
<td>He plans solemn actions. But He is impotent</td>
<td>DOMINANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dovevano dircelo che l’acqua ghiacciava a zero centigradi centimetri They should have told us that water would freeze at zero centigrade centimeters</td>
<td>shows the paper with the forecast, stutters, cries, tightened eyebrows</td>
<td>A. and his staff proved very ignorant about meteorological facts</td>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>La Protezione civile aveva detto che sul Campidoglio sarebbero piovuti soltanto 35 millimetri di merda. Civil Protection had said that only 35 millimeters shit would fall over Capitolium.</td>
<td>The snow was cause of a great loss of face for A.</td>
<td>A.was impotent</td>
<td>DOMINANCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>