

The training of the contemporary journalist: the history of a worker without a degree

*Formação do jornalista contemporâneo:
a história de um trabalhador sem diploma*

Cristiane Hengler Corrêa Bernardo*

Inara Barbosa Leão**

RESUMO

Reconstituir e analisar o contexto em que a profissão de jornalista se desenvolveu no Brasil e as influências que sofreu é o objetivo deste artigo que, por meio do materialismo histórico dialético, pretende explicar o processo pelo qual a situação contemporânea se configura como síntese. Essa contextualização torna-se fundamental para a compreensão dos conflitos de interesses políticos e econômicos que determinaram a configuração histórica dessa profissão e do controle sobre a atuação do profissional que a exerce. Revela ainda como as mudanças técnicas alteraram a sua base material de produção e, necessariamente, geraram novos conceitos, que compuseram a sua superestrutura nos diferentes períodos sociais, econômicos e políticos, tornando possível observar os objetivos relacionados a tais mudanças.

Palavras-chave: trabalho; jornalista; história da imprensa.

ABSTRACT

Reconstructing and analyzing the context in which the journalistic profession has developed in Brazil and the influences on it are the purposes of this article, which aims through the historical and dialectical materialism, to explain the process by which the contemporary situation is configured. This context is fundamental to understanding the conflicts of political and economic interests that determined the historical setting of this profession and the control over professional practice. The results indicate how technological changes altered its material base of production and have generated new concepts, which have become parts of its superstructure in different social, economic, and political periods.

Keywords: work; journalist; history of the press.

* Universidade Estadual Paulista (Unesp). *Campus* de Tupã. Av. Domingos da Costa Lopes, 780, Jd. Itaipu. 17602-496 Tupã – SP – Brasil. cristiane@tupa.unesp.br

** Universidade Federal do Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS). Cidade Universitária, s.n., Caixa Postal 549. 79070-900 Campo Grande – MS – Brasil. inarableao@hotmail.com

It is, at the very least, somewhat against common sense to state that the press which reports on a daily basis, in chapters, the history of a society does not print in its own pages the history of the professionals who do this. While, it is correct to affirm that this history is not stamped in huge letters on the pages of newspapers and magazines, nor in the reduced texts of the television news, nor can it be heard on the radio and not even can it be read in the on-line newspapers, it is more correct to think that, even if this is not the agenda, the press portrays between the lines the history of a profession marked by censorship since the most tender age.

The findings contained in this article are the fruit of the dissertation *Educação Jornalística: entre a cruz da academia e a espada do mercado*,¹ presented in 2010 to the Post-Graduate Program in Education from Universidade Federal do Mato Grosso do Sul, in the research area of education and work.

Reconstituting and analyzing the context in which the journalist profession developed in Brazil and the influences upon it, is the aim of this article which, using the methodological approach of dialectical historical materialism, seeks to explain the process in which the contemporary situation is configured as a synthesis.

This contextualization is fundamental for understanding the conflict of political and economic interests which determine the historic configuration of this profession and which consequently introduced control over the actions of the professionals who exercise it. It also reveals how technical changes altered the material basis of production and, necessarily, created new concepts, which make up its superstructure in different social, economic, and political periods, making it possible to observe the objectives related to these changes.

A brief diversion needs to be made here to present a necessary distinction between journalism and the press, in order to clarify their relations and also their contradictions. According to Genro Filho (1987), the press is the material body of journalism, the technical process of the newspaper – which has its counterpart, for example, in the technology of the radio, the television, and the internet, resulting in a final product which can have distinct languages, in accordance with the communications vehicle for which it is intended. Journalism, in turn, is a modality of information which systemically emerges from these medias to meet certain socio-historic needs.²

The choice of the press as a space to be analyzed in this article is justified because it is configured as the space where the journalist works. It thus becomes necessary to locate this journalist as a historic subject during the different stages of the development of the press, in order not only to analyze professional practice of the journalist, but principally the socio-political and economic contexts traversed by the profession and which, consequently, reflect and suffer reflections on the training of this professional.

It needs to be understood that the meaning of press used here does not strictly refer to the printed newspaper, but to the press as a whole. This paper focuses on the printed newspaper, because this is the primary vehicle of mass communication in the press.

Previously present only in the newspapers, journalism has gained space on radio, television, magazines, in press offices, and most recently on the internet. It can be seen that the transformation of journalism occurred in the material locus through the intermediation of new means of communication, although this has not been the sole location. It is also present with an almost regular change in the superstructure in relation to the objectives of capitalist society.

To understand the contradictions responsible for these transformations, not with the intention of theoretical or methodological support, but rather to corroborate the discussion about the fact that control over the professional of journalist has always been present throughout its history, presented here is the trajectory of global journalism conceived by Neveu (2001). Which can be summarized as follows: genesis of the profession; evolution of its morphology; staff and organization constraint in which the exercise of journalism develops; written journalism as a specific form of discourse, the powers of journalism, and finally, crises and renewal of journalism.³

Neveu (cited in Serrano, 2003) also raised the point that the journalistic techniques and concepts which originated in Great Britain and, above all, in the United States of America – such as factual centrality; the predominance of objectivity; the utilitarianism; business activity, and finally a forced professionalization – intensely influenced Brazilian journalism and its professionals.⁴

The practices and the professionalization which the author refers to were born with information seen as a merchandise and its autonomy as a social

activity in the nineteenth century. It is within this order that there emerged a new type of discourse in journalism: news, which is still present. The news, 'a product for sale' as defined by Medina,⁵ is the fruit of the capitalist system, and all its transformations, therefore it accompanies the changes in this system.

It can thus be seen that along with industrialization, the growing rural exodus and urban expansion, newspaper, the initial representatives of the so-called mass communication, became highly commercial products and led to the emergence of the professional activities of the journalist.

The techniques that have occurred in journalism since then have transformed the previously opinion based text, into a neutral and impartial one, with a basis in objectivity. This US and English standard of informative journalism, with clear demarcations due to the division of news into editorials, delimiting what is opinion and what is information, came to preponderant in the twentieth century and led to the birth of... *informative journalism*, or, if we prefer, 'journalism *par excellence*.' (Genro Filho, 1987, p.167. Original emphasis)

The analysis made by Traquina (2005), who also refers to the creation of a new journalism in the nineteenth century, covers a further aspect: the public.⁶ US newspapers adhered to the concept of the *Penny Press* (low cost sales) and began to sell copies for one cent, thereby managing to increase the circulation of newspaper at whimsical prices. In this way they managed to create a large and generalized readership. This was how there emerged in the United States in 1833 what is considered the first mass newspaper: the *New York Sun*, followed in 1835 by the creation of the *New York Herald* and later in 1836 in France by *La Presse*.

All these newspapers published daily news, such as crimes, lawsuits, catastrophes and other themes from the daily lives of cities, without a single line of opinion. In this way informative journalism was consolidated as the discourse of the press of the twentieth century.

La Presse, which was known for its tradition of long political articles, came to offer the French public a newspaper with articles about fashion, scoops, and cooking, but the principal innovation of the period was the introduction of serials, which provided reading for entertainment and caused much enthusiasm at the time. In summary, *La Presse* decisively contributed

to the consolidation of this new concept of journalism, which stressed the importance of fact to the detriment of opinion. It thus collaborated with the emergence of a very specific function within journalism: the reporter, who came to be seen as having neutral and objective techniques to report the facts.

This model gained space not just in US and European journalism, but was also absorbed by journalism worldwide as the synonym for the best journalistic practice and in this way produced new journalistic formats, such as the covering of the US Civil War (1861-1865). The *New York Herald* alone sent more than sixty correspondents to cover this.

In this phase the interview also entered the pages of the newspaper and became a common practice, as well as a simple communication of the facts. This journalism, purely informative, came to be strongly defended, in news agencies, such as the Associated Press and Reuters, founded respectively in the US in 1844 and England in 1851.

In the same period the sensationalist press also gained space, and according to Traquina (2005), the model came to be used as an instrument of socialization in the task of aggregating US society. With the same objective there emerged the *Lead*⁷ and Inverted Pyramid⁸ techniques. Used for the first time in 1861 by the *New York Times*, these techniques were promptly appropriated by sensationalist newspapers and press agencies from all over the world.

The form in which capital uses its material and superstructure resources in a coordinated manner complemented with its purpose of increasing the profit margin is evident. On the one hand, there is industrialization tied to urbanization and the process of teaching literacy; on the other, a greater production of newspapers, allowed by new technologies and lower costs.

Also clear is the aim of using the press as an instrument of control. The use of the press in the US to control new situation – such as the liberated black population and the large number of Europeans emigrating to the New World in search of opportunities or fleeing wars – can be an example of this. These two parts of the population, feeling marginalized, could have rebelled against the state organization and attacked the pro-democracy discourse.

An official discourse, spread by the media, preached that the press was playing the role of mediator between government and society with the aim of social inclusion. However, the discourse of inclusion was used as a democratic argument against the possibilities of a counter-hegemony emerging.

Since the political interests of social control offered the media advantages of greater profits, the press let itself be used, without asking any questions, and at the same time made use of this to increase still further its possibilities of making money.

The mass communications market increased the publicity industry, which became the principal form of sustenance of journalistic companies. Newspapers had to sell and increasingly expand their public, for which communication strategies were used. Nevertheless, these strategies were constantly counterpoised to the educational aspect of the press and the social function of journalism to inform, educate and denounce abuses of political power, and by organizations and society in general, but in the direction of industrial model adopted by the press in the production of the newspaper. Genro Filho (1987) reinforces this idea when he states that

journalism, which is the most legitimate child of the marriage between the new universal fabric of social relations produced by the advent of capitalism and the industrial means to spread information, in other words the most typical product of this historical consortium, is not recognized for its relative autonomy and undisputable grandeur. On the one hand, it is seen only as a private instrument of bourgeois domination, as a language of enticement, manipulation and alienated consciousness. Or simply as a chain of transmission of the *ideological apparatus of the state*, with servile and anodyne mediation of the power of a class, without any authentic symbolic appropriation of reality. On the other hand, are the merely descriptive or even apologetic descriptions – typically functionalist – in general lightly tinged with the colors of liberalism: journalistic activity as a *critical responsibility* based on the simple objective dissemination of the facts, a *social function* concerned with the *improvement of democratic institutions*. In the most direct language of the master (Durkheim), “an activity concerned with the denunciation and correction of social pathologies,” for the cohesion and reproduction of the *normal* state of society, in other words, capitalism. (Genro Filho, 1987, p.37. Original emphasis)

In this model of journalism the question becomes inevitable: what journalist is created by it? For Neveu (2001) this journalist molded along American lines is not what he calls an artist or even a involved in political partisanship, but rather a professional in employment who receives a salary for their production.

The history of the press shows how the current model arrived, since the ancestor of the modern journalist emerged much before in Italy in the thirteenth century. In this period the people who lived its West coast, having become rich from the mercantilization of trade with the Arabs, created a new form of social organization based on urban agglomeration in the commerce of exchange and in class struggles, which afterwards affected the entire European continent, known as the Bourgeoisie.

Alongside mercantilism there emerged the need to publicize the products being sold and the interests of the large traders and bankers. In order to meet these objectives, the so-called *Avisis* were created, small manuscript pamphlets considered the ancestors of today's advertising. The writers of the *Avisis* made this into a profession and thus was born in continental Europe the model with preceded modern journalism with its focus on publicity and, as a result, economic interests.

It can be said that the principal contradiction in the function of journalism was born with this model. If journalistic activity emerge to meet the needs of mercantilism, what was actually created was a publicity activity in its purest form of the mercantile ideology.

Journalism developed bringing in its wake the characteristics of free trade at the same time that the ideological discourse tried to dress it in the clothing of providing a service and representing the public interest, independent of the interests of the dominant classes. With this model of social relations of the thirteenth century there not only emerged the ancestor of the modern journalist, but principally, its greatest crisis of identity – which would accompany it to the present day.

On German soil (in the old Prussia) there emerged, almost at the same time as the *Avisis*, the *Zeitungen*, small pamphlets with announcements from the dominant class. Although they were considered as intellectual works because they were produced with the written language, of which few had any dominion, it was mere reproduction, since the content came already prepared by representatives of the dominant classes.

The great innovation of the *Avisis* and *Zeitungen* in the thirteenth and fourteenth century was that they were aimed at the general public, to the contrary of the *Acta Diurna* of the first century Romans, considered to the predecessors of today's wall newspapers, which were aimed at small specific groups

of the public. The content of the *Acta Diurna* was basically governmental (matters of the Senate or of Caesar), whilst the other two were financed by private interests. It can be said that the two more recent represent the first major breaking of the monopoly of the interests of the state and the Church over the means of communication.

The historic records of journalism researched by Lage (2001)⁹ show that the oldest newspapers published in periodical manner emerged in Germany in 1609. The next records are from Belgium, where *Nieuwe Tijdingen* started in 1616, in France in 1631 with the publication of the *Gazzete*, and in England in 1665 with the publication of the *London Gazette*.

Weekly gazettes began to spread through Europe with the invention of the mobile typesetting attributed to Gutenberg. These periodicals published news from Europe, occasionally including information brought from Asia or the Americas. The recurrent questions in the French newspapers were the scandals of the English royal family, while the English newspapers reported the military defeats of France.

The contents of newspapers began to return to more daily matters in the second half of the seventeenth century, but always under the gaze of censors. Rarely were they able to deal with questions which were considered dangerous to the government or which could incite the people to take part in actions of opposition.

The bourgeoisie made use of newspapers to spread the idea of free trade and free production, and the state used them to transmit its ideology. In addition to being an instrument of bourgeois ideology and of the protection of the interests of the state, the defense of free expression gained strength in another historic period: “Two events made this liberation possible, after more than a century of restrictions and constraints: a) the Industrial Revolution; and b) the particular role which advertising gained in the life of newspapers” (Lage, 2001, p.25).

The Industrial Revolution increased the economic dependence to which the press was submitted, since it also increased print runs and its public reach. However, it has to be underlined that the Industrial Revolution only increased the proportion of this dependence, since at no time could it have been judged to be free. What occurred afterwards were emancipatory initiatives which if

they did not meet the interests of capital, had the function of established a counter-hegemonic power.

THE JOURNALIST: A HIDDEN SUBJECT

Genro Filho (1987, p.216) believes that journalism “is concerned with bourgeois ideology, sponsoring ever more intensive and sophisticated forms of control and manipulation of the information process.” This so-called bourgeois journalism involves in its discourse the hiding of the subject who produces information, as if there were no intermediation between the fact and the public.

A recurrent political critique states that the subject hidden in journalism through the objectivity of discourse has intentions closely linked to manipulation. As Genro Filho (1987) states, the proposal of this critique is the revelation of the subject. However, in modern journalism, based on collective and industrial production of information, there is no space for the individual subject. In fact, the journalist here has the voice of the social subject which can only be identified in the class contradictions and group interests.

Technologies also resulted in new communication vehicles, such as radio, photography, television, magazines and the internet. However, in the historical context of the press, it was the printed newspaper which had the most important configuration of journalism. All the later changes were of a much more technical nature and language than of content and, especially, of objectives.

In order to understand how these transformations occurred, and the contradictions in which they originated, we can start with the statement that “Brazilians have a *macunaímica* vocation, caused by our anthropofagic capacity to swallow imported models, transforming them into mixed, durable, resistance and utilitarian substitutes.”¹⁰

Drawing on the concept proposed by Marques de Melo, the discussion begins in the period which he calls autonomization, i.e., the present day, corresponds to the twenty-first century. Marques de Melo’s statement (2007, p.31) that “notwithstanding the fact that Brazilian journalistic thought has been demonstrating analytical vigor and critical vigilance at the beginning of the twenty-first century, the governing climate within academic has been

shown to be distant, out-of-date and out-of-step” in relation to what occurs within society.

According to de Melo this environment was favored by the crisis of identity experienced by the profession, trapped by the social forces against reserving the market to journalists who had a university education. Some initiatives, such as the creation of the Brazilian Society of Researchers of Journalism in 2003, and the holding of annual congresses, have tried to rescue what was called the corporatist spirit. However, despite these attempts, there is no obligation to have a university degree to work as a journalist.

This atmosphere of the professional devaluation of journalists and the so-called crisis of the press referred to by Sodré (1999)¹¹ finds in the history of the profession and the press its principal motivations. In addition, the instruments of censorship have changed in accordance with the epoch, with the political system and the mode of organization of society. However, censorship, as it is today, finds its correspondence in various other stages of the development of Brazilian society.

Taking as a starting point the arrival of the press in Brazil, two contradictions can be found: the first is the fact the its late starting date (also in comparison with the other countries in Latin America); the second, the *macunaímicas* characteristics of national culture, which permit European and US influence over the press and Brazilian journalism .

Sodré (1999) began his report with the Colonial Press, the first in the country which officially arrived in Brazil along with the court of d. João VI. Furthermore, Sodré says it was born under the rigorous gaze of Portugal and the government established in the country along with the Royal Family.

An official printing press, with equipment brought from Portugal along with the Royal Family published for the first time on 10 September 1808 the *Gazeta do Rio de Janeiro*. D. João VI read all the reports before going to press and absolutely everything that was printed in Brazil passed through this censorship which determined what could or could not be published, according to the interests of the colonizing country and, thus, the Royal Family.

Intellectuals who wanted to work in Brazil as journalists had a profound European influence, especially Portuguese. Political and economic power were in the hands of those benefiting from the Portuguese court, and they had no intention of upsetting the colonizers.

Correio Braziliense, first published on 1 June 1808 – thus before the *Gazeta do Rio de Janeiro* –, was edited in England by Hipólito José da Costa, now considered the patron of the Brazilian press. Its first issues had translations of the works of the German writer Johann Benzenberg about the need for the freedom of the press.

In fact, in Brazil the press emerged already predicting the censorship it would encounter. Even being published abroad, *Correio Braziliense* introduced in the country the discourse about the need for a free press, an ideal widely discussed at the time in Europe and North America.

On 29 December 1821 the *Gazeta* changed its name to *Gazeta do Rio*. Following the Proclamation of Independence it stopped circulating, being replaced by *Diário Fluminense*, which had the same objective and which was owned by Pedro I, and later under Pedro II by *Diário do Governo*. Both of these were organs of the official press. Also in 1821, the publication of a pamphlet with an author – although it was known that it had been written by the Commodore and French Colonel, F. Caille de Geine, with the knowledge of d. João VI – arguing that the Royal Family should remain in Brazil, caused such controversy that it was withdrawn. However, the episode served as an incentive to the publication of works with opinions about the history of Brazil and arguing for its independence from Portugal.

Folheto de Caille, as it became known, was the inspiration for many later publications of this type, all with the same argument. The fact that the text had been attributed to a common citizen stimulated new publications and was understood as the beginning of freedom of expression.

An analogy can be made between the feelings awoken in society in the 1820s in relation to freedom of expression, and what happens in the present day, especially through Citizen Journalism or Journalism of Sources. The ending of the requirement for a degree to work as a journalist has awoken in society the same type of feeling in relation to freedom of expression as marked the decade in question. In other words, any common citizen, as Lustosa (2000) pointed out,¹² can give their opinion to the public

What calls attention in this analogy between the two historic periods is that both in the 1820s and the current day anonymity is present in a large part of these publications. The aim of this anonymity in the past can be understood, as it was an instrument in search of freedom of expression, and thus, of

the press. However, its permanence, or re-emergence, in the current day does not make sense to the extent that it is configured as a contradiction to the democratic system in vigor.

This positioning of individual through anonymity prevents the establishment of “a more democratic and real dialogue, as advocated by the defenders of citizen journalism.”¹³ Present in a democratic society, this anonymity can be seen as the bad use of an open space, appropriated for the materialization of ideologies in order to organize the social representations of the group to which they belong and which, consequently, should guide their practices and social production.

This bad usage is justified because, despite the anonymity, they emit concepts. These are easily destroyed by the lack of credibility connected to public opinion given in an anonymous form in a democratic society, different from what led to the presence of anonymity in societies under the rule of political censorship. In this case the public was prepared to read between the lines of anonymity, due to the physical and psychological coercion that could be imposed on the journalist who while doing their job might harm in some manner the interests of the state.

In 1821, following the end of prior censorship of the press, the publications circulating in Brazil multiplied, as a reflection of the political conditions directing the country’s process of independence. There was an epidemic of pamphlets and small newspapers.

Despite not being well developed, the journalism produced in the Colonial Period was of extreme importance in the process of Brazilian independence. In a conflicting manner, the press moved from the Colonial Phase to Independence. The conflict reflected the differences of opinion about independence and brought this confrontation to the pages of the newspapers, often with bitter accusations and censorship.

Journalism at that time, profoundly ideological and militant, and which had become one of the principal political and revolutionary instruments, was strictly based on opinion. Sodré (1983) states that the publications were a reflection of the political debate, first of all about the question of independence, and afterwards about the structure of the national state to be constructed following the separation from Portugal.¹⁴

Republican ideas began to conquer the press. Newspapers defended the Republic and the liberation of slaves. The abolitionist movement was increasingly strong. This epoch marked a more idealist journalism, divided between republicans and abolitionists.

Despite the partial liberty at the beginning of the nineteenth century, journalists were constantly submitted to various arbitrariness. It should be noted that irregularity and ephemerality were characteristics of vehicles of communication at that time: "Since they were linked to the struggles of their time, the newspaper followed the dynamics of these fights. Periodicals appeared and disappeared as the conflicts in which they were involved were configured and reconfigured."¹⁵

The end of prior censorship offered an opportunity for the development of other publications, and thus the so-called *pasquins* emerged, which would have a profound impact on the style of the Brazilian press at the time, because they represented a newspaper written by a single person, most often anonymously. These would be kept being published from the Regency until the end of the first half of the nineteenth century. Although it was a type of political journalism, it consisted of unconnected voices, without a cause to unify their actions.

Alongside this political-pamphleteering type press, there emerged some small independent newspapers, though organized under business logic. These periodicals could be liberal or conservative, however, they aimed to show an impartiality towards events.

In 1831 the press helped to prepare a moment favorable to the removal of the emperor. At this time it exercised a function of agitating at the most tense and decisive moment. The following period, around 1840, was marked by reconciliation between conservatives and liberals, who united around the figure of d. Pedro II to support him. The impact on the press was visible: it withdrew its political discourse becoming closer to literary texts. Many of the main authors of Brazilian romanticism became known and famous as great writers due to their work in the craft workshops where the newspapers of the time were produced.

In the second half of the nineteenth century the Empire was structured, political journalism, principally represented by the *pasquins*, was weakened and began to reflect the other themes of urban organization. The press

accompanied the transformations of the time, such as the appearance of women as a reading public. As a result there emerged sections dedicated to women, with sonnets, fashion and love letters. Journalistic language became lighter, it no longer had irony and a critical tone as a mark, with the language used becoming more literary.

The 1850s witnessed a more conservative style of newspaper, and this epoch is marked in the Brazilian press by writers rather than professional journalists. Most of them had studied in the Faculty of Law in Lisbon and then begun to write in the newspapers.

In 1875 *A Província de São Paulo* newspaper was born, which would later be called *O Estado de S. Paulo*. The so-called republican press already totaled 74 newspapers in the country. According to Fonseca (2004), *A Província de São Paulo* was the first Brazilian newspaper to be organized as a company, resulting from the initiative of a group of traders, ranchers, businessmen, and journalists from São Paulo. Although its founders had strong ties with the Republican Party, the newspaper was presented to the public as independent and committed as a business organization. The same occurred with *Jornal do Brasil*, in 1891 in Rio de Janeiro, and *Correio do Povo*, in 1895 in Rio Grande do Sul.

Following the Proclamation of the Brazilian Republic (1889) the mainstream press continued with the same strength, although dividing into republican, with greater prestige, and monarchist, more combative, as asserted by Sodré (1999). During the First Republic the Brazilian Press Association (*Associação Brasileira de Imprensa* – ABI) was founded, whose objective was to assure the journalistic class welfare rights and to make it a powerful center of action. According to Gustavo Lacerda, its founder, the association aimed to be a neutral space which could house all press workers.

A year previously in 1888, following the Abolition of Slavery, labor began to be replaced in the Brazilian plantations. European immigrants arrived in the country as an alternative to slave labor, a historic fact which provided an important element for the analysis of the journalism in the period. Brazilian journalism, as had previously occurred in the United States, gained an educational function, with a didactic and doctrinaire function.

It was exactly by using the function of the political education of its members and by seeking to spread its ideal in the community that anarchists began to use newspaper and print to spread their opinions. In anarchism thought,

newspapers were essential factors for worker movements. They were instruments for expanding class consciousness and divulging debates.

Here the mission of the journalist was not limited to the diffusion of ideas, to politically educating or attracting political allies. In the conception of anarchism, the newspaper was not only a collection agent of propaganda, but also a social organizer. A striking characteristic is that in the anarchist press the figure of the reporter did not exist, since reports were collaborative, almost always by workers, associations and trade unions.

The anarchist press was an alternative to the capitalist press, and even with the difficulties of supporting it with little or no advertising, the ideology was a source of resources to keep it going. Journalists, as press professionals, did not participate in this so important moment of Brazilian journalism. Of course many journalists were sympathetic to anarchist ideas, and some also took part in these movements, more for its ideas than for the professional activity strictly speaking.

At the end of the nineteenth century, artisan type newspapers began to be definitely replaced by journalistic companies with more complex organizations, with more modern and sophisticated printing equipment. The production processes of the press were modernized and the typographies lost their artisan characteristics, with the purpose of becoming printing industries.

In 1900 the Republic and the press were consolidated and the latter acquired definite business characteristics. Individual journalism ended, being replaced by large companies, but actually the press was under the total dominance of the state and capital.

The organization of the press in a business structure, a movement which began among journalists and afterwards attracted some communication entrepreneurs, had the principal objective of freeing the press from the control exercised by political groups, and also the use of newspapers in the dispute for political power.

Technical and organizational development marked the press in the initial decades of the twentieth century, considered a representative of the beginning of the so-called cultural industry, according to Fonseca (2004). Later, during the *Estado Novo* (1937-1945) the Brazilian press totally moved away from the ideological objectives of political journalism and expanded the space for an intense corruption of newspapers and journalists. In 1939 Vargas

created the Department of Press and Propaganda (*Departamento de Imprensa e Propaganda* – DIP), which had a strong impact on all the means of communication, especially radio and newspapers. The DIP was responsible for the exclusive task of administrating all the advertising and propaganda of the organs of government and federal public administration, as well as all the other levels of government.

The *Estado Novo* controlled with an iron fist any criticism of the political system. The press was declared an instrument of public utility, which meant that newspapers had to publish government communiqués. It should be understood that journalism at this time was extremely fenced in and constructed an image of the *Estado Novo* in accordance with the government's wishes. It was a period of a great persecution of journalists who tried to publish anything against government interests, with imprisonments and the cancellation of professional registration.

The changes which journalism underwent then can be justified due to the political and economic context of the Second World War (1939-1945). This approximated Brazilian journalism to the US model, a lack of distance which has continued to the present day.

Getúlio Vargas' government remained neutral in the war until 1941, and only at the beginning of 1942, when German submarines attacked Brazilian merchant navy ships, did Getúlio declare war on the Axis countries. This opened for the country some opportunities of support from the United States, and after the end of the Second World War (1945) Brazilian journalism came under strong US influence – as well as that of foreign capital.

This influence gained strength with the political and commercial relations between Brazil and the US, and was not restricted to offering models for the production of journalism. It affected various areas and involved the mechanization of newsrooms with printing equipment and shareholding in some national vehicles, culminating in intervention in the academic education of journalists.

During the *Estado Novo* the journalist profession was not regulated, nor was there a specific university course for these professionals in Brazil. It was in this period that discussions about this education started in a strong way. However, it would only be in 1947 when this education would be concretized as profession, with the formal exercise of it coming to depend on holding an

undergraduate degree from a School of Journalism. This was what these institutions were initially called, but their name was changed to Schools of Communication, after the intervention of the United Nations Organization for Education, Science, and Culture (Unesco), though the creation of the International Center for Higher Studies of Journalism (Ciespal).

Specifically in Brazil, as mentioned by Sodré (1999), the crises of the press are found as much in the other capitalist systems, despite occurring in distinct epochs. Nevertheless, the peculiarities of the crisis in the national press in the first half of the twentieth century involved the purchase of imported paper and built into the debate was foreign trade and the exchange rate.

The difficulties faced by the press at the time resulted from the analysis of certain facts such as, by way of example, the debt of large press organizations with state banks, such as Banco do Brasil and Caixa Econômica do Estado de São Paulo during the Vargas administration. This indebtedness was due to a great extent to restructuring necessary to accompany the technological advances which allowed the expansion of the press system and a greater amplitude in the channels of communication which allowed the so-called mass communication.

The partial political freedom which the press at the time achieved thanks to the economic power associated with advertising was once again lost, since many of the vehicles had debts with the federal or state governments.

The large communication groups of the country, such as *Folha da Manhã*, *O Estado de S. Paulo* and *O Globo*, were brought together and founded with foreign capital at the end of the 1950s. The existing companies expanded and incorporated magazines, radio and television stations, a reality that still persists now.

The 1964 Coup in Brazil represented the beginning of various events which constituted the cycle of military dictatorships throughout Latin America, and its consequences are still felt at present, since they were responsible for the structuring of the Brazilian state.

In this context the press marked by the Brazilian dictatorship, especially until 1980, offers elements of analysis obfuscated by the rigorous censorship of the epoch. Despite this, generally speaking, journalists at that time were professionals with very critical views, although they were fooled by the means of political and economic control experienced during those decades.

The dictatorship period was a difficult time for journalists. However, despite these difficulties, there was a restless among those who made up the press and who did not let themselves be intimidated. Resources such as anonymity and the publication of clandestine newspapers were used, while many journalists exposed themselves, even knowing the punishments that they would suffer. Contradictorily these attitudes actually strengthened the journalism of the time, giving it credibility and legitimacy.

The history of the press has numerous reports of journalists and even the owners of the means of communication at the time who did not submit to the orders of the government. Some journalists chose to use pseudonyms, others publically declared themselves opposed to the government and criticized it in their articles. These were victims of torture and murder, not to mention the temporary closures of newsrooms and the cancellation of professional qualifications.

The attempts to achieve emancipation from this violent censorship, imposed by the military regime, proved very costly to those journalists who defended their ideological positions contrary to the government. They were separated, on the one hand, from the owners of production, which submitted to the interests and interacted with them, and on the other, from those who declared themselves in opposition to these interests. In addition to not receiving governmental incentives, they suffered constant reprisals.

The former adhered to the modernization of their printing presses and were transformed into large companies. The latter were bit by bit extinguished due to the lack of financial viability or due to the retaliation of the military government with torture, exile, and the cancellation of professional registration, amongst other instruments of control.

The emergence of new titles and printing, editorial, and administrative reforms implemented by the publications which were already consolidated, such as *Jornal do Brasil*, at the end of the 1950s, characterized a period seen as one of the modernization of the Brazilian press, as a result of entrepreneurial expansion in the country and increased professionalization, which would prepare the journalistic media to enter the period of cultural industries, which occurred at the end of the 1960s, becoming established in the following decade.

According to Fonseca (2004), the transformation of communications companies into cultural industries in Brazil is a phenomenon directly connected to

the entrance of the country into the monopolistic phase of international capitalism. In Brazil, as in the other advanced capitalist countries, this was done in distinct accumulation regimes.

In the 1970s and 1980s, under the influence of Fordism, the complete subordination of journalism to capitalist logic was observed; and from the 1990s in the post-Fordist period, “the dominant accumulation regime at the beginning of the twenty-first century has been a deepening of this subordination, of the market based nature of information, which came to be one of the most important instruments of profit and power in contemporary societies” (Fonseca, 2004, p.7).

Lage (2001) revealed that the concept of objectivity gained greater value in this period, emphasizing that the news which mattered was not the one lacking emotion, but rather that which is narrated by the journalist, without the actual involvement of opinionative journalism. Genro Filho (1987) also believes that it was in this period when informative journalism was consolidated.

This marked the end of an epoch when the news always contained comments and adjectives. The themes of the news also changed, and alongside political, economic, literary, or scientific questions emerged information about banal or even routine events, which increasingly attracted the interest of new readers and occupied growing space in newspapers.

News thus began to be depreciated, since as well as becoming an industrial product, it was aimed at mass communications. It was in this sense that the theory of the alienation of social classes gained strength.

Journalism as it is configured today has undergone radical changes during its history and has come to the constituted and, perhaps, normatized and normalized by the discourse of the ethics of liberty of post-modern capitalism. As Marshall (2003) stated, the creation of a new aesthetics which structured journalistic companies came to make the concepts of truth, reality and information more relative.¹⁶

POSSIBLE SYNTHESSES

The historic reconstruction of the press and the journalism which was configured allows the understanding that governments, from the Empire to the current day, have always used instruments of control in the name of

maintaining order in capitalist society. However, what is clear is that the forms of control used are increasingly subliminal and often unperceivable.

The clear form of control of the period of the Brazilian military dictatorship disappeared during the democratic society that was first glimpsed in 1985, with the *Diretas Já* movement, marking the end of the military dictatorship of Brazil.

The discourse of freedom of expression which justified the ending of the obligation to have a degree in journalism to work professionally as a journalist in 2009 is only rhetorical. The liberty which was guaranteed by the end of political censorship become ever more complex and most often imperceptible in the eyes of the public, at time even to journalists.

During the dictatorship, the public, aware of the prior censorship, managed to read the prohibitions between the lines of the newspapers. The temporary closures of newsrooms, the imprisonment of journalists, and even their public denunciations served as indications of the censorship making itself felt in the Brazilian press.

Brazilian democratic society, on the other hand, has some false ideologies, sold on a daily basis by journalism, which has lost any anxiety for emancipation. The discourse of equivalence, in which all are equal before the law, the right to come and go, to freedom of expression, to accessibility and to inclusion are some examples which mask social control and which do not let people become aware of the need for emancipation, since there is the feeling of a society in total liberty.

Nowadays what is found is not only a journalism victim of censorship linked to the advertising which finances its activities, but also of a censorship of the discourses of liberty and equality proposed by the state, accepted by the media and sold to public opinion. Both types of control occur in the worst of censorships which a journalist can face and which did not emerge now, but rather evolved with the movements of capitalist society – self-censorship.

NOTES

¹ Cristiane Hengler Corrêa Bernardo's dissertation was written with the support of a CNPq grant.

² GENRO FILHO, Adelmo. *O segredo da pirâmide: para uma teoria marxista do jornalismo*. Porto Alegre: Tchê, 1987.

- ³ NEVEU, Érik. *Sociologie du journalisme*. Paris: La Découverte, 2001.
- ⁴ SERRANO, Estrela. Érik Neveu (2001). *Sociologie du journalisme. Media & Jornalismo*, v.1, n.2, p.151-154, abr. 2003.
- ⁵ MEDINA, Cremilda de Araújo. *Notícia: um produto à venda*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense – Universitária, 1978.
- ⁶ TRAQUINA, N. *Teorias do Jornalismo: porque as notícias são como são*. 2.ed. Florianópolis: Insular, 2005.
- ⁷ According to the theory of journalism this corresponds to the first part of a report and should answer the questions: who, what when, how, where and why.
- ⁸ A technique in which the interesting facts are used to open the journalistic text, while the less relevant appear afterwards.
- ⁹ LAGE, Nilson. *Ideologia e técnica da notícia*. Florianópolis: Insular, 2001.
- ¹⁰ MELO, J. Pensamento jornalístico: a moderna tradição brasileira. *Intercom – Revista Brasileira de Ciências da Comunicação*, América do Norte, 30, set. 2007. p.17, original emphasis. Available at: <http://200.144.189.84/revistas/index.php/revistaintercom/article/view/97/90>; Accessed on: 17 Nov. 2008.
- ¹¹ SODRÉ, Nelson Werneck. *História da imprensa no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad, 1999.
- ¹² LUSTOSA, Isabel. *Insultos impressos: a guerra dos jornalistas na Independência (1821-1823)*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2000.
- ¹³ TARGINO, Maria das G.; CARVALHO, Cristiane P; GOMES, Alisson D. Centro de Mídia Independente Brasil: Jornalismo Cidadão e Democracia Representativa. *Comunicação & Inovação: revista científica da USCS*, São Caetano do Sul (SP), v.9, n.16, p.50-66, 2008.
- ¹⁴ SODRÉ, Muniz Cabral. *A comunicação do grotesco: introdução à cultura de massa no Brasil*. Petrópolis (RJ): Vozes, 1983.
- ¹⁵ RIBEIRO, Ana Paula G. A imprensa da independência e do primeiro reinado: engajamento e mercado. In: CONGRESSO NACIONAL DE HISTÓRIA DA MÍDIA, 5. *Intercom*. São Paulo, 31 maio – 2 jun. 2007. p.2. Available at: www.intercom.org.br/papers/outros/hmidia2007/resumos/R0199-1.pdf; Accessed on 10 May 2008.
- ¹⁶ MARSHALL, Leandro. *O jornalismo na era da publicidade*. São Paulo: Summus, 2003.