

Na superfície lisa da história: a imprensa e as formas clandestinas de informação

On the smooth surface of history: the press and clandestine forms of information

Ramsés Albertoni Barbosa¹

Christina Ferraz Musse²

Resumo: O artigo investiga as estratégias utilizadas pelos presos políticos ligados ao Grupo Colina, detidos na Penitenciária de Linhares, em Juiz de Fora, para denunciarem os crimes cometidos pelos militares e resistirem ao regime ditatorial, no Brasil, durante as décadas de 1960 e 1970. A reconstrução histórica foi possível por meio do arquivo de documentos oficiais que comprovam o que se tentou silenciar. Dessa forma, a análise procurou compreender as contradições desses documentos que refletem as atividades que lhes deram origem, pois foram produzidos na vigência de regimes de exceção. A pesquisa se articula em duas frentes complementares, História e Comunicação, cujas “afinidades eletivas” concernem à reflexão acerca das instâncias de interlocução, aos limites e às possibilidades do diálogo entre duas epistemologias.

Palavras-chave: arquivos; ditadura; presos políticos; história; comunicação.

Abstract: This paper investigates the strategies used by political prisoners linked to the Colina Group, detained in Linhares Penitentiary in Juiz de Fora, to denounce crimes committed by the military and resist the dictatorial regime in Brazil during the 1960s and 1970s. The historical reconstruction was possible through the archive of official documents that prove what was tried to silence. Thus, the analysis sought to understand the contradictions of these documents

- 1 Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora (UFJF). Juiz de Fora, MG, Brasil.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5852-9105> E-mail: ramses.albertoni@ich.ufjf.br
- 2 Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora (UFJF). Juiz de Fora, MG, Brasil.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3107-3734> E-mail: cferrazmusse@gmail.com

that reflect the activities that gave rise to them, since they were produced under exceptional regimes. The research is articulated in two complementary fronts, History and Communication, whose “elective affinities” concern the reflection about the instances of interlocution, the limits and possibilities of the dialogue between two epistemologies.

Keywords: *archives; dictatorship; political prisoners; history; communication.*

Discursive Traces

During the 1960's and 1970's, in Juiz de Fora, during the civil-military dictatorship of 1964, some political prisoners, linked to the Grupo Colina and arrested in the Prison of Linhares, exposed the crimes committed by military men and resisted to the dictatorial regime, however, their actions rarely appear in the town press. Therefore, we can think, according to Barbosa (2013), that the 1960's were characterized by processes where power relationships crossed media outlets. To analyze discursive traces of what was said and what wasn't said is an important aspect in the formulation of meaning in a report, because it refers to the time of the event; however, in order for us to understand the social battle created in the field of memory, it is fundamental to avoid generalizations, stigmatizing interpretations, since the past is always conflicted and fragmented. Therefore, through the reconstruction of a few overlooked narratives, the research found registers of documents that prove the resistance to the civil-military dictatorship in 1964 and the silence of the media there, since some of these narratives were ingrained through the cracks of hegemonical discourses and almost escaped their control.

The access to the events in question happened through files of the repression itself; nonetheless, if the files are institutions of cultural memory, the same happens with places of memory invested in a symbolic aura that surpasses the mere material appearance and its functionality, whose documents reflect the activities that gave them origin; therefore, it is necessary to understand and analyze its contradictions, its veiling and unveiling, because it was produced in the moment of dictatorship, whose documental hypertrophy constitute one of their characteristics, making fraud out of operational practices inside the government, since its practices of surveillance and control agency a particular work of documentation.

When we analyze discursive powers, we ponder that we cannot speak of everything in any situation, because we don't have the right of saying everything, because the "will to truth" is, according to Foucault (2007), conducted by the way knowledge is applied on our society, how it is

valued and attributed, exerting power of coercion over other discourses, since discourse and power are intimately linked. According to the author, the production of discourses, in any society, is controlled with the designation of conjuring power and danger, weakening the efficacy of uncontrollable events, with the purpose of hiding the forces that materialize social constitution. Therefore,

The moment had arrived to consider these facts of discourse, not only simply under their linguistic aspect, but, in a certain way and here I am inspired by the research performed by Americans as games, strategic games, of action and reaction, question and answer, domination and defense, as well as fight. The discourse is this regular set of linguistic facts in a certain level, and controversies and strategies on another. (FOUCAULT, 2003, p. 9)

That way. I order to the will to truth can be successfully performed, we use procedures that are external and internal to the discourse. While the procedures external to discourse limit the production of discourses, banning the word, and defining what can be said/unsaid in each circumstance, through the “object taboo” and the privileged or exclusive right of those who are speaking; internal procedures to the discourse have the role of classifying, ordering and dictating its distribution.

Therefore, discourse does not only reflect the power control, but is equally, power itself that demands individuals a questioning about the pursuit for truth, owing an attribution to discourse the character of the event, always effective in the field of materiality, because it has the space and time very well set. When we enterprise the inquiry of the meanings of silence as something that means and is distinguished from the implicit, that needs what’s “said” to put themselves under meaning, it would be possible to think of silence as an agent of censorship that refers to what cannot be mentioned on certain circumstances.

The Military Police Inquiries (IPMs) analyzed by us, are built as intertextual narratives, because what constitutes intertextuality is the relationship of co-presence among two or more texts. The origin of these forms, in the end of the 19th century, happened in parallel with

the formation of a certain number of political and social controls. Consequently, IPM, according to Fronza (2017). Enables the Military Public Ministry to appreciate the practice of the criminal fact with all its circumstances, and refers to the cursory verification of the fact and its authorship which, in legal terms, would configure military crime, having a character of provisional instruction, whose goal is to supply elements for the proposition of the penal action; however, the inspections, exams and evaluations are instructional of this action and must observe the legal formalities as to its performance, whose responsible for the inquiry must restrict oneself to the complete verification of the facts defined in their designation.

Inquiry, according to Foucault (2003), is a form of truth defined through the judiciary and penal practices and the study demonstrates how social practices engender dominions of knowledge beyond building new objects, concepts and techniques, engender new forms of subjects and subjects of knowledge that have a history in their relationship with the object, since truth itself has a history. The author points out that there are two stories of truth, the internal story of truth, which is corrected through self-regulation, the external story of truth, formed in other places of knowledge through a certain number of rules defined, as the judiciary and penal practices, therefore

Judiciary practices – the form through which, amongst men, were arbitrated damages and responsibilities, the form which, in Western History, is conceived and defined the form men could be judged according to the errors they had committed, the form imposed to certain individuals the reparation of some of their actions and punishment of others, all these rules or, if you will, all these regular practices, of course, but also modified without fail throughout history – seem to me one of the forms in which our society defined types of subjectivity, forms of knowledge and, consequently, relationships between men and the truth that need to be studied. (FOUCAULT, 2003, p. 11)

Inquiry, thus, is the most characteristic form of truth in our society, whose creation happened in the Middle Ages as a form of investigation of truth in the core of judicial order.

Therefore, when entering the archives of “institutional memory”, we perceive that in its configuration evidences a plurality of memories that transform and happen as new information come to public, subsidizing changes in the knowledge existing so far about the dictatorial regime, because knowing about knowledge is having the awareness that its origin is found in power relationships and in the way men want to exercises, one over the other, power relations (FOUCAULT, 2003). Therefore, the investigation and analysis of every material taken during the research wants to identify, consequently, discursive strategies used equally by the press and by clandestine productions to narrate events that pertain to the city of Juiz de Fora, interpreting what was the criterion used to narrate or hide facts, because analyzing the role of censorship during the period of dictatorship is to look for establishing a dialogue with the memory built around the interference over the press and the criminalization of those who were opposed to the power of State. Consequently, it will be necessary to map social relations, its reconfigurations and different forms of production, evaluating their impacts on production, circulation and consumption of news, establishing the facts and agencing the construction of a sense of past in the present, guaranteeing the problematization and intelligibility of representations of the past that remain in the collective memory and that helped consolidate certain narratives instead of others.

The handling of documents of these institutional archives require methodological care that would consider the nature of functioning of the dictatorial regime, processes of mediation used and, most importantly, their conditions of production in these regimens the documental production reproducing criminal practices, whose scope is to create evidences against their enemies, and, concomitantly, self-defending from accusations that are being inflicted. This way, all this information must

be read with suspicion, since it was produced in situations marked by the violence of extreme situations.

It is necessary to highlight that the article is articulated in two complementary fronts, History and Communication, whose “elective affinities” refer to the reflection around the instances of interlocution, the limits and possibilities of dialogue among two epistemologies, being taken, in strict sense, as an expression of cultural configurations. Consequently, the elective affinities between History and Communication are the result of a unique arrangement and an inter-relation of parties, which constitutes a new entity that reveals the (de)continuities between these two forms of operationalization and understanding of the social society. Therefore, this concept opens possibilities for the understanding of complex realities and relations, expanding the field for the surpassing of an strict reductionism that erases the nuances of meanings attributed to established social relations.

Therefore, as we build the theoretical path through files of institutional memory of 1964’s dictatorship in Brazil, the concepts of Communication, History, Truth and Power will be conjugated with the notion that an archive is not only a register of utterances, but equally its hierarchical order in many discursive series. Consequently, it is essential to have a critical reading of these archives, discovering gaps, erasures and neglects, proposing, even, a deconstruction of this concept that is hosted as something static and fixed in its ontology, in a way that is transformed, in its materiality, in a set of documents established as the positivity of truth in the historical experience (DERRIDA, 2001). While rescuing some Foucauldian concepts, Derrida (2001) make up a re-interpretation of a classic version of the archive present in the discourse of History, uttering an original conception, considering the archive as something incomplete, symptomatic and discontinuous, per passed by oblivion.

The archive, through the space in coins or medals destined to engrave a date or an inscription, commits an “archival violence”, a violence of power that puts and conserves the right,

[...] Because all the archive [...] Is at the same time a settlor and a conservative. Revolutionary and traditional. Economical archive in this double meaning: keeps, put away, conserves, but in an unnatural way, in other words, making the law (nomos) or obeying the law. As we used to say, nomological. It has a strength of law, of a law that is homely (*oîkos*), house as a place, domicile, family or institution. (DERRIDA, 2001, p. 17-18).

Enterprising the critical literature of the archive and proposing its deconstruction implies, therefore, not only articulating a new interpretation of the past and the tradition, but mainly, a different reading of the conception of history. The archive will be interpreted as something incomplete and symptomatic, a de-continuity per passed by oblivion and erasure, since the discourse and power are linked in the concept of archive, since the truth is not dissociated from the singularity of an event, because it is built in a specific time and space.

Therefore, it is up to the researcher to rebuild the dispersed parts, creating histories for their *herkunft* (origin) and *Entsenhung* (emergency), because nothing exists beyond the historic dissemination of the event that is constantly deviated, because the conflicting historical forces are fighting in the chance of the fight, being necessary to interpret the sediments hidden under the veil of visibility. The researcher submits, thus, historical truths to an exegesis, seeking to unveil the “power strategies” with the pretention of truth, since the truth itself is an event. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify which are the connections that can be observed between the mechanisms of coercion and the elements of knowledge (FOUCAULT, 2018).

Consequently, we consider that every form of knowledge has a positivity that is not conditioned to the scientific nature and it cannot be judged by a reference other than knowledge itself. It is necessary to specify, thus, a method of investigation that aims at understanding an internal order that constitutes a certain knowledge, because of that, the archeological analysis needs to transit through different conceptual formulations, belonging to different knowledges, because History had the disposition to “memorize” the past, transforming it into documents

[...] And making these traces speak, which, by themselves, they are rarely verbal, or say in silence a different thing of what they say: in our days, history is what transforms documents into monuments and unfolds, where traces were deciphered by men, where they tried to recognize the depth of what they were, a mass of elements that should be isolated, grouped, turned into pertinent, inter-related, organized into sets. There was a time in which archeology, as a discipline of mute monuments, of motionless traces, of objects without context and things left in the past, turned to history and only had meaning through the reestablishment of a historical discourse; which we could say, playing a little with words, that history, in our days, works towards archeology - to the intrinsic description of monument. (FOUCAULT, 2008, p. 8)

Foucauldian archeology is a way of making history that considers all discursive practices through the statute of happening, because what was said creates a discursive reality that allows to unravel as a man builds his own existence, since the subjects and objects do not exist a priori, but they are discursively built over what is said about them. While archeology is a method of analysis of “local discursivities”, genealogy is the tactic that makes intervene the “de-subjectified knowledges”, that become separated from the analysis because they were qualified as non-conceptual knowledges insufficiently elaborated by an hierarchy of knowledge (FOUCAULT, 1999). Therefore, in the moment you rescue these fragments of genealogy, they suffer the risk of being re-codified and re-colonized by the knowledge of power. Because of that, the researcher needs to be aware of the “battle of knowledge” versus the implications of power in the scientific discourse. Through the analysis of a set of documents, it is consented to the researcher to establish a certain number of relations and interpret every material available

[...] To apprehend behind it a type of social or spiritual reality hidden in it; their work consist in manipulating and treating a series of homogenous documents concerning to a particular object and a particular time, and the internal and external relationships of this corpus of documents constitute the result of the historian’s work. (FOUCAULT, 2008, p. 291)

The documental archeology would be gear towards, then, to the study of interpretations, appropriations, creations and regulations of knowledge on the behalf of societies in certain historic moments, enabling the formation of utterances that would be contained within the discursive formations oriented by a regimen of truth.

Therefore, our proposition is to analyze the judicial-military processes in the civilian-military dictatorship not only in its patent and ostensive traces, but also in the multiple readings authorized by the condition of posteriority of the interpreter. When we analyze the archeology and genealogy of the judicial-military processes perpetrated in the Auditory of 4^a CJM, we can ponder that they configure a penal practice that builds a form of truth in our societies, whose origin can be found in a political and administrative practices, even in the judiciary practice.

The apprehended manuscript

Due to the process 73/69, there was a collective interrogation of 12 political prisoners linked to Grupo Colina detained at Penitenciária de Linhares, between March 19th and 20th 1970, in the 4^a CJM headquarters in Juiz de Fora, and it took 27 hours. The session was presided by the judge Mauro Seixas Telles with the presence of military judges from the Permanent Council of Justice, whose object of accusation of this military process investigating 20 people in total, refers to the provocation of a subversive war, sabotage and terrorism, paramilitary groups, subversive propaganda, illicit possession of weaponry, apology to crime against national security, mutiny, attempted aggravated murder and real favoritism.

The political prisoners that were interrogated were Ageu Heringer Lisboa, José Raimundo Jardim Alves Pinto, Marco Antônio de Azevedo Meyer, Marcos Antônio Rocha, Pedro Paulo Bretas, Nilo Sérgio Menezes de Macedo, Afonso Celso Lana Leite, Ângelo Pezzuti, Júlio Antônio Bittencourt de Almeida, Maurício Vieira de Paiva, Murilo Pinto da Silva and Irany Campos. However, these political prisoners used the

interrogation to report the tortures committed by the dictatorial system, in addition to question the military court that were interrogating them.

Despite the grave accusations pronounced by the military court, the newspaper *Diário Mercantil*, two days later, in March 21st 1970, published the fact briefly and hid the severity of the report, made by the prisoners, of abuse, torture and murder committed by the dictatorial regime, according to the following quotation:

In an environment of great tension, allied with the visible fatigue of the judges, the prosecutor Simeão de Faria Filho and the other servants of justice, the 14 accused were heard, and some of their depositions lasted over 3 hours each. According to information of the auditor, there are 28 people accused, but not everyone was present, and others were accused as criminals in other processes. (Permanent Council heard members of the Grupo Colina. *Diário Mercantil*, Juiz de Fora, p. 8, March 21st 1970)

On April 2nd, 1970, the 2nd tenant of PM Mariano was on duty at Penitenciária de Linhares, on the day of visits to political prisoners. The brothers Ângelo e Murilo received a visit of their father, Theofredo Pinto da Silva, and some relatives. During the visit, the Sargent Edmundo noticed that Ângelo was carrying a piece of paper that he gave to his father when he hugged him goodbye. The Sargent waited until all the visitors were out of the room and instructed the substitute military Iguatemir to intercept the paper. Therefore, the military sent Theofredo to the Reserva do Contingente, a room next to the interview room, and handed the paper to Sargent Gomes. This paper was the clandestine newspaper Farewell 3.

The manuscript of Farewell 3 consisted on 11 sheets of white paper, without lines, numbered from 12 to 24, stapled, with a cover in a yellow paper, handwritten with a blue pen, imitating typography presenting as title the following words: “Farewell 3 – Special Edition – Biweekly Magazine: Debates – February – March/1970 – The dictatorship in the defendant’s seat – H. Expect” (PROCESSO 32/70, p. 381). The first page of this manuscript had a foreword in which the author H. Expect accuses the dictatorship of imperialism, saying that during the

interrogation that happened in march, there was a tense mood in which all those responsible for the judgement were submissive to the “pigs” and the defendants had their defenses obstructed since the Penitenciária de Linhares, place where their written reports were confiscated. In this foreword, he affirms an attempt of reconstitution of the most important aspects of the collective interrogation and concludes calling the court a sham.

After analyzing the manuscript Farewell 3, it was possible to verify that the interrogated built a discourse of conformity in their evaluations and judgements, since they denied the content of their previous interrogations, formulated under torture and duress, in addition to reporting those responsible for the abuse in several institutions and mistreatment received on the penitentiary. Through the registration of the Processo 73/69, where the depositions referred on the manuscript of Farewell 3 are located, it was also possible to make a cross referencing between two discourses, the official and the clandestine, and noticing the similarities with slight changes in tone.

Captain Walter, director of the Penitenciária de Linhares, was only informed of the apprehension of the manuscript of Farewell 3 at 7 o'clock of that same day, by the public servant of the state Afonso José, and on April 3rd 1970 communicated, in a reserved manner, to the general Itiberê, commander of the 4th Military Region, that on the previous day, April 2nd, a document was apprehended by the security at the penitentiary with “subversive information” (PROCESSO 32/70, p. 10).

After receiving this information, the general emitted the Decree 06/J, on April 7th, determining the instauration with possible urgency of the IPM and designated the captain Verlangieri as the responsible for the investigation. The first action of the captain was to send, on April 15th, 1970, a warrant for the arrest of Theofredo and on April 25th, due to the suspicion of other forbidden objects owned by political and regular prisoners, to perform a scanning process at Penitenciária de Linhares in which was possible to characterize the continuity of criminal activity on the behalf of the prisoners. However, with the goal of not to disturb

the investigation of the Process 32/70, the captain decided not to indiscriminately retain the documents and objects apprehended, leaving the interpretation and analysis for another, more specific, IPM (PROCESSO 32/70, p. 221).

On May 7th, 1970, the Report of Captain Verlangieri was published, indicting all the people involved in the process and sending to the general commander. On May 15th 1970, the general Itiberê sent the Solution of the IPM to the judge-auditor Mauro Seixas Telles who, within the following month, clarified that Ângelo and Murilo had their penal action cancelled due to being banished from the national territory, according to AI-13, on September 05th, 1969. Ângelo and Murilo were among the 40 political prisoners exchanged by the German ambassador Ehrenfried Anton Theodor Ludwig von Holleben, kidnapped by the urban guerrilla, on June 11th, 1970 and were sent to Algeria.

After several diligences and apprehension of documents, the substitute military prosecutor of the Auditory of 4^a CJM, Joaquim Simeão de Faria Filho, on July 23rd 1970, offered a report against Theofredo, Ângelo, Murilo and, later, Ângela Maria Pezzuti, accused of bringing intel to her nephews and Erwin Rezende Duarte, accused of subversive propaganda and incitement of crime against national security (PROCESSO 32/70, p. 232).

On that same day, the military prosecutor requested to the auditor judge a handwriting comparison of the manuscript *Até Sempre 3* with the handwriting of the political prisoners Nilo Sérgio Menezes, Délio Fantini, Erwin Rezende, Jorge Batista Filho, Pedro Paulo Bretas and Júlio Antônio Bittencourt to reveal the author of the manuscript, whose fault would fall over Erwin, who denies the authorship of the apprehended manuscript, requesting a new handwriting comparison, even more strict than the last. However, the experts determined “perfect convergence of morpho-kinetic-structural graphic characteristics between the handwriting that was confronted, affirming, categorically, the graphic precedence in common between these two pieces” (PROCESSO

32/70, p. 382). However, by the end of the Processo 32/70, the author of the manuscript *Até Sempre 3* will continue to be unknown.

The final judgement of those accused, with the absolution of everyone involved in the process, happened between August 10th and 23rd 1971 on the headquarters of Auditory of 4^a CJM, in the Session Room. Theofredo, Ângela, and Erwin's trial took place on August 10th, 1971 in an open court. The members of the Military Council argued that the Processo 32/70 versed about a few political prisoners accused of terrorism and leaded by Ângelo. According to the Council, these political prisoners kept having "communist/subversive" activities within the Penitenciária de Linhares through "an aversive psychologic war, a common practice" aiming to take to common knowledge, in a distorted way, "a truncated idea of what was a processual act" (PROCESSO 32/70, p. 501). Finally, the Military Council concluded that as the manuscript of *Até Sempre 3* couldn't achieve the desired publicity, which would consummate the crime, they decided to understand that the fact didn't get to go against the law and, by an unanimous vote, judged unfounded the report, recognizing that the narrated facts did not typify a crime. Later, the punishability of Ângelo was extinct on the other military processes he was responding to, due to his death, in France, on 1975. In September 3rd, 1979, eight years after the closure of Process 32/70, the Military Council decreed the extinction of punishability of Murilo, due to the Law n° 6.683/79, the Law of Amnesty.

What is left is silence

When we analyzed the vast documentation available, it was possible to determine that the press in Juiz de Fora explored the fact that the civil-military coup began in Juiz de Fora, and notwithstanding all their commitment in defending the civil-military coup became silent facing the atrocities committed by the dictatorial regime. Therefore, according to Barbosa,

Despite having to consider that the political censorship in moments of authoritarianism acts in an intermittent form, not constant and in a different manner in relation to media outlets, since the 1964 coup there were different mechanisms installed to control the information that is published. The argument frequently presented to the institution of censorship in all dimensions of cultural life of the country puts in evidence the role attributed to the media: besides informing, they should orient the population, guided by the state. The content that could serve as a stimulus to the opposition of militaries should be kept out of these publications. (BARBOSA, 2013, p. 296-297)

The standard argument used by certain press to justify the actions of dictatorship, is that they are living in a time of “war” promoted by the communist “terrorists”.

With regards to the military justice, the admiral Júlio de Sá Bierrenbach, former minister of STM during the dictatorship, comments that the most complicated case he faced was referring to the political prisoner Paulo José de Oliveira Moraes, member of a group of bank robbers and a defendant in several processes. According to the military,

Generally, I believe this was the best service I've made for the Military Justice. [...] It had a wide repercussion, and, I don't have any doubt, reduced a lot the torture and abuse in police stations of several states in the country. [...] I heard different lawyers say that in Court the judges must be restricted to what is on the document. Even after filling this position, I heard: “What isn't in the documents, is not in the world”. This case was a good service because the police saw we've checked everything. (BIERRENBACH, 2010, p. 4-6)

The minister Bierrenbach became famous for being respectful of the political prisoners and for acting in an ethical manner.

According to Antônio Modesto Silveira, lawyer of several political prisoners that were judged in Juiz de Fora, there were two types of judges in town, one, frequently seen drunk and frequenting the zone of prostitution in the city, and

[...] A judge called Antônio Arruda Marques, he was an auditor judge, very correct and dignified. [...] [...] This dignified judge [...] Simply sent a letter to [...] High Military Court, informing what had happened and more, while they did not sent a legal judge he doesn't have any ethical or legal condition to raise a court hearing and said "I am with a closed audit until the law is obeyed". [...] What happens next, the dictatorship decides to take away the rights and the position of the judge. (DEPOSITIONS, 2017, p. 7-9).

Consequently, when we retrieve the content of judicial-military processes, in which judgements are narrated of different political prisoners and cross-referencing it with the news published by the press in Juiz de Fora, we see the lack of capability of the press in telling the abuse of the repressive forces, and, in some cases, even the explicit support.

In a deposition to CMV-JF, the photographer of the newspaper *Diário Mercantil*, Antônio Geraldo Carvalho, also known as Toninho Carvalho, comments on his work routine at the time of dictatorship:

[...] Because we, as photographers, we are more... almost a machine, see. [...] So, different interviews were made with me there, I was with the reporter at the Penitenciária de Linhares, I was in different judgements there at Praça Antônio Carlos to photograph the judgement of some political prisoner, right. And at the Penitenciária de Linhares, practically half of the people there were political prisoners. So, there are different moments where I was in the Audit of War of the Military Justice and I was forbidden of taking pictures. (DEPOSITIONS, 2017, p. 2-3).

The journalist Wilson Cid, a correspondent at the time in Juiz de Fora for the newspaper *O Globo*, in a deposition to the CMV-JF, mentions that he also watched some judgements in the Audit of 4^a CJM and he saw some interesting things, however, to our surprise, he affirms he didn't have any access to information about mistreatment to political prisoners. According to him,

We knew that there were arrests, especially when the trials of Audit began, because the prosecutor used to enter complaining and the lawyer would make the defense, and we used to see that. [...] However, to know directly

from the prisoner, someone is getting hit, someone was indicted, at the time was complicated. We didn't have access to this type of information. [...] But to deal with censorship, that was awful, it leaves a mark that you don't even want to know. The most serious mark in all of that is that we created a generation of journalists concerned... in the writing "according to what was said, someone declared", the journalist sometimes is afraid to commit to an information. He attributes to others. (DEPOSITIONS, 2017, p. 4-5)

We get the impression that the journalist was strongly marked by censorship.

However, the lawyer Antônio Modesto reinforces the version of the political prisoners when he says he heard, from his clients, several stories about torture in Juiz de Fora.

I sought to hear through (stories) my clients, they weren't as serious as I've seen on other places as, for example, the Casa da Morte de Petrópolis, the DOI-CODI at Rio, the DOI-CODI at São Paulo and many other places in Brazil. In any way, I've seen something and until today I'm curious to know. I used to hear references of a house where people were tortured and people even suggested that there were people disappearing after being seen there, a house by the river [Rio Paraibuna], something like that. It may be that there were a house by the river, I don't know where, but a house where serious things used to happen and even today I haven't heard what was the address of this house, as it happened in other states too. (DEPOSITIONS, 2017, p. 9)

Another lawyer for political prisoners had confirmed the cases of torture in Juiz de Fora was Winston Jones Paiva, in a deposition to CMV-JF. According to the lawyer:

I've seen cases of torture, often it wasn't physical torture, but psychological, which can be even worse than physical torture, as the case of Avelino Coque Torres who was hooded, put naked in a refrigerated place and threatened to take his family to Ilha Grande. So, these threats happened frequently, and I can give these two examples so you can understand that, in fact, torture did happen. No one can deny that there was torture. [...] It seems, I'm not sure, but it seems to me that Avelino was to QG, the

General Headquarters. Here, there were three places, QG, 10° BI, 10ª Brigada de Infantaria and the Penitenciária Edson Cavalieri. (DEPOSITIONS, 2017, p. 3)

The professor and playwright José Luiz Ribeiro, in the 1960's, worked as a journalist at the newspaper *Diário Mercantil* and said, in his deposition to the CMV-JF, that:

We knew what was happening, cursed and all, but when we write, there was an editor. [...] This process, then, could be modified because things happened because Juiz de Fora received political prisoners; they were judged here, so, a lot of things happened, many people were arrested. (DEPOSITIONS, 2017, p. 3)

Therefore, it still wasn't possible to confirm successfully the truth of the information about cases of torture happening in Juiz de Fora, because, for now, we only have stories of people involved directly with the repressive process.

Another professional of the press to talk about the period was the journalist Paulo César Magella who clears up, in his deposition to CMV-JF, some questions about censorship and self-censorship, because there were the job of repression and fear, but there were also the financial interest of communication companies.

It is nice to understand that we were in a context of fear at the time. Was it self-censorship? Yes, it was, but people used to live in fear. But with the Geisel government, with this decompression, people began to be a little bit bolder. There was a lot of fear of losing the concession, too. But the newspaper began to advance. [...] And then you had to cover, the radio stations were almost obliged to do it. September 7th they had to transmit. And before that, you had to go to the military headquarters to get the order of the parade, you had to stay on the stage "now this is the troop x". It was a lot of pressure. [...] Fear and even interest, at that time, of being... advertisement mass... Pressure. I can't say we weren't... Newspapers weren't as resistant. Many weren't. Many were in it too, knew what was happening and covered it. [...] Newspapers, especially in country regions, where were a huge economic pressure. If you didn't do an appropriate coverage, you would get retaliation. (DEPOSITIONS, 2017, p. 6)

Therefore, when we analyze the discursive powers (FOUCAULT, 2007) of press, of official documents and clandestine newspapers, it was possible to perceive how you lead the will of truth in our society, because the form how the legal and legitimate knowledge is produced, applied, valued and attributed, allows that a power of coercion is exerted upon other discourses, considered illegal and illegitimate, interdicting the word and conjuring them the efficacy and threat, whose goal was to hide forces that materialize the social constitution, since the discourse does not only reflect the control of power, but is, equally, power itself.

Therefore, it is necessary to clarify that it is not like the professionals of the press didn't know or were censored by the repressive system instituted on 1964, but that many professionals were silent, due to fear or for supporting the dictatorship, facing incisive revelations, while others were complicit with the crimes committed. It is clear to us, consequently, that the silence, even after decades of what happened, and, in some cases, the adhesion was the characteristic brand of the press during the 1964 civil-military dictatorship in Brazil.

References

- BARBOSA, M. *História da comunicação no Brasil*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2013.
- BIERRENBACH, J. S. *Depoimento*. 07/06/2006. Rio de Janeiro, CPDOC/SUPERIOR TRIBUNAL MILITAR, 2010. 14p. Disponível em: <http://www.fgv.br/cpdoc/historal/arq/Entrevista1522.pdf>. Acesso em: 8 maio 2018.
- CMV-JF. *Comissão Municipal da Verdade*. Disponível em: www.ufjf.br/comissaoda-verdade/2016/09/21/livro-da-comissao-municipal-da-verdade-ganha-segunda-edicao. Acesso em: 30 nov. 2017.
- DEPOIMENTOS. *Depoimentos à Comissão Municipal da Verdade de Juiz de Fora*. Disponível em: www.ufjf.br/comissaodaverdade/depoimentos. Acesso em: 30 maio 2017.
- DERRIDA, J. *Mal de arquivo – uma impressão freudiana*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará, 2001.
- DIÁRIO MERCANTIL. Setor de Memória da Biblioteca Municipal Murilo Mendes. Juiz de Fora, Minas Gerais.

- FOUCAULT, M. *A arqueologia do saber*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2008.
- FOUCAULT, M. *A ordem do discurso*. São Paulo: Loyola, 2007.
- FOUCAULT, M. *A verdade e as formas jurídicas*. Rio de Janeiro: NAU, 2003.
- FOUCAULT, M. *Em defesa da sociedade*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1999.
- FOUCAULT, M. Qu'est-ce que la critique? Critique et Aufklärung. *Bulletin de la Société Française de Philosophie*, v. 82, n. 2, p. 35-63, avr/juin, 1990. Disponível em: <http://portalgens.com.br/portal/images/stories/pdf/critica.pdf>. Acesso em: 3 abr. 2018.
- FRONZA, D. *Inquérito Policial Militar*. Disponível em: <http://www.direitonet.com.br/artigos/x/30/99/3099/>. Acesso em: 8 jun. 2017.
- PROCESSO 73/69. Auditoria da 4ª CJM – STM.
- PROCESSO 32/70. Auditoria da 4ª CJM – STM.

About the authors

Ramsés Albertoni Barbosa – Literature professor. Master in Poetics at UFRJ. Master student in Communication at PPGCOM-UFJF. In this article, the author worked on the research of the files, on the interpretation of the data collected, on the library review and writing the text.

Christina Ferraz Musse – Master's in communication and Culture at Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (2001) and PhD in Communication and Culture at Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (2006). Professor/Coordinator of the PPGCOM-UFJF and leader of the Research Group COMCIME. In this article, the author worked in the conception of the research outline and the development of the theoretical discussion.

Data de submissão: 24/04/2019

Data de aceite: 22/09/2019