

PRESS FREEDOM ON THE MEDIA AGENDA

Copyright © 2007
Associação Brasileira
de Pesquisadores em
Jornalismo / **SBPJor**

TEREZINHA MARIA DE CARVALHO CRUZ PIRES
Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais, Brazil

ABSTRACT This article proposes to present a reflection on the meanings constructed by the Brazilian written press regarding media and democracy. For this, it was necessary to recompose a specific journalistic event: the submission to the Brazilian Congress of a bill to create the Federal Journalism Council by the Brazilian President, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, at the request of the National Journalists Federation in August, 2004. This procedure gave rise to something rarely seen: the media were in the spotlight and thus it caused a controversial debate to emerge on the public scene regarding the journalist profession, journalism and press freedom, involving a diversity of political subjects.

KEY-WORDS Deliberative democracy, media, politics, press freedom, Federal Journalism Council

Introduction

The purpose here is to reconstruct – based on various sources of information – a specific journalistic event with great repercussion in the media: the submission to the Congress of a bill for the creation of the Federal Journalism Council by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, at the request of the National Journalists Federation in August 2004¹. This procedure is necessary for apprehending the meanings constructed regarding media and democracy and particularly regarding press freedom, or in the words of Motta (2005:4), for developing an analysis of journalistic narrative². According to the author, the daily news “are dispersed and discontinuous fragments of partial meanings (...) it is necessary, then, to connect the parts, to identify the thematic serial nature and the chronological narrative connection in order to understand the theme as synthesis”.

For this purpose, an analysis was carried out of the daily coverage of the newspapers with national circulation *Folha de S. Paulo* and *O Globo* in the period August 5-19, 2004, which includes the time of the presentation of the bill up to the signs of retreat by the Executive Branch. Accordingly, informative, opinionative and editorial items were taken into consideration in the examination. In a supplementary way, the repercussion of the event was followed until the month of October in local and national circulation newspapers and in monthly and weekly magazines with national circulation.

The fact and its versions

On April 7, 2004, Journalists Day, the directors of the National Journalists Federation (FENAJ) and the directors of 17 journalists unions, in a public hearing with the President of the Republic, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, requested the speeding up of the submission to the Congress of the bill for creation of the Federal Journalism Council (CFJ) which at the time was in the final phase of analysis by the Labor Ministry.

On August 4, at the opening of the 31st National Journalism Congress in João Pessoa (State of Paraíba), the Press and Publicity Secretary in the Office of the President of the Republic, Ricardo Kotscho, announced the decision by the Executive Branch to present and support the bill³. In the Federal Government Official Gazette of the following day, in section 1, page 3 the following text was published under the heading, "Measures of the President of the Republic": "Message nº 465, of **August 4, 2004**, forwarding to the National Congress the text of the bill which creates the Federal Journalism Council and the Regional Journalism Councils and other measures". (our boldface).

Thus, on August 5, according to Torves (2004:1):

At 8:30 p.m. the *Jornal Nacional* newscast of the Globo Television Network, through its anchorman and editor-in-chief William Bonner, condemned the bill, classifying it as retrogression and a threat to freedom of the press and freedom of expression. Following this a report was presented with four opinions contrary and one favorable to the bill [...].The contrary opinions occupied one minute and thirty seconds while the opinion favorable to the FENAJ president lasted fifteen seconds [...]. On the same day, in the *Jornal da Noite* newscast at 11:30 p.m., announcer Ana Paula Padão again ratified the television station's position against the bill, reinforced by commentator Arnaldo Jabor, who warned society of the return to censorship of the country's communication media, such as that

which occurred during the twenty years of dictatorship. [...] On the same day, the Bandeirantes Television Network expressed in an Editorial an opinion contrary to the bill created by the Administration, describing it as censorship and an attack on freedom of the press and freedom of expression.

On August 6, only a small note appeared in the column “Panorama Político” of the newspaper *O Globo*:

CONTROVERSY foretold: Lula sent to the Congress the day before yesterday a bill creating the National Journalism Council. For the president of the National Journalists Federation, Beth Costa, the profession needed this regulatory body, such as those that existed for other activities; it will discipline the practice of the profession, taking into account ethics and the citizens’ right to good quality information. There will certainly be reactions. Some will point to an attempt at restriction; others will say that journalists must also be supervised.

Nevertheless, this note, apparently without importance, constituted an important counterpoint for analysis when compared with this newspaper’s coverage on the following days and also that of *Folha de S. Paulo*. To begin with, it presented an inaccuracy, at the time the FENAJ was presided over by Sérgio Murilo de Andrade, who had taken office in July of that year and not by Beth Costa. Besides the inaccuracy, as will be seen below, the treatment given the matter was completely out of line with that which was later observed in the press: not just by favoring the presentation of the FENAJ’s opinion, but also by attempting to describe the Council as a body regulating the practice of the profession.

On August 7, Labor Minister Ricardo Berzoini granted an interview to the newspaper *Folha de S. Paulo* regarding the bill for creation of the CFJ. The reporter’s questions were based on the presupposition that the government had taken the initiative to create the Council as a way to put a stop to “irresponsible” denunciations made by the media. This interview can be seen as instituting the conflict between the media and the government and as a determining factor in the direction which the debate followed, or, as Motta (2005) suggests, a structuring element of journalistic narrative.

Folha - Whose was the **idea in the government** to create the council?

Ricardo Berzoini – This bill has been paralyzed in the Labor Ministry for some ten years. Recently [around three months ago], on Journalists Day, the FENAJ asked us to give an objective reply [regarding the

creation or not of the council]. We concluded that there were reasons for creating it, due to the nature of the journalist's function, due to the social importance [...] **of being the mediator, in a certain way, of the information of the State for public opinion⁴ and at the same time, because it is an activity which, if practiced in an irresponsible way, can cause extremely serious damage to companies, to people, to the country. Our concern is to have the category itself establishing ethical control mechanisms** and debates on the nature of the profession.

Folha – The decision to create this council comes after the case involving Larry Rohter (American journalist who had his visa revoked by the government) and now after the **declaration by Minister Dirceu that the accusations against Casseb and Meirelles come close to a denunciation complex.**

Berzoini – One thing has no relation to the other. We only satisfied the request by the national federation of a professional category.

Folha – Would the council be able to discipline, restrain stories characterized as simple denunciation complex?

Berzoini – Who will decide how the council will operate, what will be its ethical criteria for taking any type of measure is the professional category itself. Therefore the government will not interfere. **Obviously, when we talk about a denunciation complex, we are not talking only about the press; we are talking about the game of politics. We understand that it is necessary to guarantee all freedom of expression, of opinion and of communication. Now, we are also calling attention so that, if there is irresponsibility in denunciations, obviously this could negatively affect the country, the economy, the country's social climate, because this creates instability.**

Yesterday (the day before yesterday), for example, due to a news item [against Meirelles] which apparently was precipitated, because it did not provide the opportunity for contradiction before being disseminated, we had a variation in the Stock Market which reached almost 5%. A news item in which, in my opinion, there were no elements sufficient to characterize irregularity of a person who was living overseas [...] Our government has nothing against the free practice of denunciations. On the contrary, we believe it is a way of exercising democracy. But it is necessary, at the same time, to have responsibility.⁵ (our boldface).

Along the same lines, another story entitled "Gushiken wants to 'protect society'" was published on the same page. In it the minister heading the Government Communication and Strategic Management Secretariat, Luiz Gushiken, referring to the Council declared that **"the idea is to protect journalists and society, guaranteeing conditions so that journalism continues to be indispensable for everyone"**.⁶ (our boldface). It is also worth mentioning the phrase which closes this story:

“Gushiken **admits, however**, that the bill sent this week to the Congress is still subject to modifications”. (our boldface). This information, which is also highlighted in other stories, suggests to us that the intention at that time was to emphasize the possibility of alteration in the contents of the document and therefore mobilize public opinion.

These declarations by the ministers, always taken up in the media, together with other initiatives attributed to the Executive Branch, caused the CFJ to be identified as part of an “authoritarian escalation” by the government, as a form of retaliation for denunciations made during the previous week by the press against the presidents of the Central Bank and of the Banco do Brasil⁷, a posture similar to that adopted with relation to the New York Times correspondent, Larry Rohter⁸ - as seen in the above story - and also a proposal with similar content for the creation of the National Movie and Audio-Visual Agency (ANCINAV)⁹.

Also on August 7, our attention was called to the story entitled “FENAJ supports journalism council; ABI vetoes it”¹⁰, published by *Folha de S. Paulo*. In it the verb “support”, in the story’s title and passages indicated again that the FENAJ was probably not the author of the bill creating the Council, even though the story presented the following declaration of the former president of the FENAJ, Elisabeth Vilella da Costa: “This bill is not the federal government’s, it is from the journalists movement. We have been constructing this bill for seven years. The first proposal for creation of a federal council of journalists was in 1997, during a congress in Vila Velha, State of Espírito Santo”¹¹. In this same story, the president of the Brazilian Press Association (ABI), Maurício Azêdo, declared: “[...] The text is very far-reaching and therefore dangerous for press freedom. This bill was stillborn by the FENAJ. We are going to ask for the total rejection of the proposal by the Congress”.

The coverage on August 8 by *Folha de S. Paulo* illustrated well the strategy triggered by the media to support its position contrary to the creation of the Council: publication of editorials, letters to the editor and columns, declarations by politicians and specialists, above all from the areas of journalism, law and political sciences, in order to confer legitimacy to the argument advanced.

In this connection, the editorial published by *Folha de S. Paulo* entitled “The sinister hand” illustrated well its line of argument:

In a classic movie, directed by the American moviemaker Stanley Kubrick, actor Peter Sellers interprets the memorable Doctor Strangelove, in a corrosive satire of American anticommunist

militarism at the time of the Cold War. He lives occupied with his mechanical arm, which insists on rising up inadvertently in a fascist salute, accenting the character's ideological tendencies. Also **leftwing parties, even when converted to the rules of democratic conviviality, at times seem to be victims of Strangelove's revealing tick**: when least expected, they raise their arm and let a glimpse escape of the traces of their outworn **authoritarian centralizing concepts**.

This week, **two facts reestablished the links between the Workers' Party government and some well-known Stalinist twitches: the text of a law to create a National Movie and Audiovisual Agency (ANCINAV) and the proposal forwarded by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva to the Congress with a view towards instituting the Federal Journalism Council (CFJ). In the two bills we have the sinister hand of State control and direction trying to regulate, control and domesticate free expression of thought**. In the case of the CFJ, the justification presented by Labor Minister Ricardo Berzoini speaks for itself. "There is no institution with legal authority to standardize, supervise and punish inappropriate conduct by journalists". The minister, perhaps inspired by the example of Cuban leader Fidel Castro, who occupies a prominent place in the heroes gallery of the Workers' Party, leaves no doubt regarding what is intended: regardless of the already existing specific legislation, a "supervision" level is created, linked to the federal government, which will have an enormous potential for being used as an instrument for coercing press professionals.

The idea, which was unfortunately suggested by the National Journalists Federation itself, takes on even more alarming outlines when it is recalled that the government recently intended to expel from Brazil a correspondent of the newspaper "The New York Times", in addition to requesting, through Minister Luiz Gushiken of the Communication Secretariat, the press to be less "negativist". Not satisfied, the same Gushiken declared the day before yesterday that the CFJ would "protect society".

[...]

Fortunately, society's vehement reactions seem to have, in this case, produced some effect. The Ministry of Culture was compelled to broaden the debate and revise the text. As to the infamous Federal Journalism Council, hopefully it will be rejected by the Legislature. (our boldface)

It is interesting to emphasize that this association between the Council proposal and Stalinism has also been made by various opposition politicians, throughout the debate; for political scientist Luiz Werneck Vianna, "The opposition forces a point, talks about Stalinism to frighten the proponent, not to discuss the proposal".¹²

In this same edition, there is a story published entitled "USA entities condemn journalism council in the country"¹³ which begins in the

following way: “This is frightening’, declared Bill Kovach, one of the main theoreticians of journalism in the USA, regarding the idea of the creation of the Federal Journalism Council in Brazil [...]”. It is interesting to highlight a comment made by a reader of the newspaper with respect to this story: “What is frightening is to observe the reaction of the press with relation to this matter, placing itself above any suspicion. The intention to maintain this ‘caste’ of untouchable journalists is strange and incomprehensible. [...]”¹⁴.

Right below this story, another story was published entitled “Profession cannot have any form of pressure, says prosecuting attorney”. In it prosecuting attorney and professor of constitutional law Vidal Serrano Nunes Júnior presented his opinion contrary to the Council:

The journalist profession is differentiated and cannot be compared to other professions with specific councils. **Freedom of information is a guarantee of democracy and of individual freedoms** and against this no form of pressure against the journalist or regarding his work can be created. [...] According to article 220 of the Constitution, which deals with social communication, no law shall contain a provision which could constitute an obstacle to full freedom of journalistic information in any social communication media. Press freedom needs to be perfected, but along other paths. (our boldface)

On August 10, *O Globo* published an editorial entitled “The sole judge” which besides containing a criticism of the handling of the bill: “the draft bill was handled by the Presidential Staff with enviable speed. Entities such as the ABI were not heard – at the least, lack of respect for the entity’s history – nor were representatives of the journalistic companies. The self-sufficiency could be corrected in the Congress”, also expressed its opinion of press freedom:

[...] Somebody should have explained to the Planalto [Presidential] Palace that the press is only really free when its ethical behavior is subjected to only two tribunals – the levels of the Judiciary System, when suits are brought, and the permanent and always severe judgment of public opinion.

[...]The ethical parameters of journalism are highly subjective. The same event can have different approaches, both ethical – and society has the right to know both. Any code imposed by law on all the newsrooms will produce a homogenized journalism, standardized by timidity, and incapable of offering to public opinion that which perhaps is **its greatest contribution to the preservation of democracy: the right to choose between different views of**

reality, between different criteria for evaluation of the facts, between different ways to serve the public interest.

The only legitimate judge of the press is public opinion. No autonomous entity can take its place. (our boldface)

On the following day, the newspaper O Globo presented an interview granted in the Federal Chamber of Deputies by the vice president of the FENAJ, Fred Ghedini, and by the secretary-general, Aloísio Lopes. In the interview the vice president explained that they were there to “**denounce the massacre of the media**, in full daylight, which in the last analysis is the massacre of the very ethics of the profession. We demand that the communication media comply with the Code of Ethics, hear contrary opinions. Of the 61 news reports published, only one is favorable”¹⁵. (our boldface). The vice president also reported that there was much disinformation regarding the bill and that he supported debate on the topic in the Congress, rejecting any vote on it based on urgency.

In this story two aspects deserve to be highlighted. The first was the observation that at that time debate on the matter was lacking. The same day on which the FENAJ directors supported the need for debate, the *Folha de S. Paulo* published an article entitled “Ao debate, caros colegas” (To the debate, dear colleagues), signed by journalist and Secretary for Press and Publicity in the Office of the President of the Republic, Ricardo Kntscho, in which he invited his fellow journalists to participate in the debate which at that time was being initiated in the Congress, not only to support the profession but also society’s right to information: “If we always encourage debates on all matters, why should we not take advantage now of this opportunity to discuss the press itself and, who knows, arrive at a consensus regarding the rules of the game which should exist and be respected in any field of human activity?”¹⁶

The second aspect refers to the “massacre of the media” or the way they behaved in the discussion. On attempting to influence especially the Congress, they presented an impressive number of arguments against the bill and thus tried to transmit the idea of a majority position, inhibiting the emergence of favorable positions.¹⁷ In this connection, a story published by the magazine *Imprensa* entitled “Que imbróglio!” (What an imbroglío!) was illustrative:

[...] Among all the items [group of bills and intentions of the Executive Branch], it was the council that aroused the most irate reactions of rejection. The Globo, Abril, Folha de S. Paulo, Jornal do Brasil and Record publishing groups formed an informal front against the

proposal. The group was joined by jurists, celebrities, opposition politicians, sectors supporting the government, in addition to a good part of the newsroom base.

The Congress, **sensitive as it is to the great “unanimities” of public opinion**, reacted badly to the proposal. “The government erred on not dialoguing with the Congress. This council will not advance if there is a minimal risk of censorship or restriction of press freedom”, declared categorically João Paulo Cunha, President of the Chamber of Deputies. “This council is an aberration”, proclaimed Senator Pedro Simon from the rostrum, receiving applause from his colleagues. “It is an authoritarian escalation of the government”, completed Arthur Virgílio from the PSDB opposition party. **No exponent of the Workers Party (PT), starting with Party President José Genoino, dared to openly support creation of the council.**

[...] In the torrent of information about the creation of the council disseminated in the media, much was ignored, distorted or editorialized.¹⁸ (our boldface)

It is important to emphasize that besides the arguments against the Council explicit in the stories presented previously – authoritarian and punitive (suspension and revocation of journalists’ professional registration) nature, differentiation of the journalist profession with relation to the others, its unconstitutionality and threat to the plurality of opinions – others were activated by the media: the lack of FENAJ’s representative nature on presenting the bill on behalf of the professional category, the bill’s subjectivity¹⁹ and the risk of the Council becoming an instrument of the Workers Party since most of its directors “were linked to the government arm of the party, the Articulation faction”²⁰. However, the main point indicated as being the trigger for the media’s reaction was the content of the first paragraph of article 1 of bill 3,985/04:

The Federal Journalism Council and the Regional Journalism Councils have as their attributes to guide, discipline and supervise the practice of the journalist profession and **of journalism activity**, to look after the faithful observance of the principles of ethics and discipline of the professional class in the entire Brazilian territory, as well as to fight for the right to free plural information **and for the perfection of journalism.** (our boldface)

In this respect, it is pertinent to highlight a passage of the text “Bode nas redações” (Trouble in the newsrooms), written by the editor of the *Imprensa* magazine, Sinval de Itacarambi Leão, in the section “Letter from the editor”:

The contribution that IMPRENSA can make to the debate regarding creation of the CFJ is to endeavor to have eliminated from the text of the bill, in article 1, paragraph 1, the verb to guide which specifies the expression “the practice of the journalist profession and of journalism activity. Never has a verb embodied so much trouble. With its removal, everything can be discussed. Even another autonomous entity with its 250 councilors, coming from the newspaper association/trade union bureaucracy or not, paid by the National Treasury or not, or by the monthly dues of the members.”²¹

It is interesting to emphasize that a story published by the newspaper *O Globo* on August 12 reported and highlighted that the Presidential Staff had made modifications in the bill mentioned “in order to give the journalism council more power to punish”:

The Presidential Staff made alterations [...] modifying the original proposal sent to the government by the FENAJ. The government’s final text also altered the Labor Ministry’s draft bill, giving the council new attributions. According to the new text, the CFJ would begin to discipline and supervise not only the practice of the journalist profession, but also the activities of the communication media. [...] with this the government expanded the original intention to regulate the profession. [...] there are 2 more alterations in article 2 which deals with the authority of the CFJ, the government added the expression “journalism activity” in paragraph XIII (...resolve cases not covered by this law and by the other norms pertinent to the CFJ, as well as those relating to the practice of the journalist profession and of journalism activity”).

In article 3, which deals with the authority of the regional councils, in section IV, this same addition is made (to exercise supervision of the practice of the journalist profession and of journalism activity”) ²²

Nevertheless, the *Imprensa* magazine later published a chart entitled “Nem tudo é o que parece” (Not everything is what it seems to be), in which it sought to present “the truths and lies relating to the creation of the CFJ”, clarifying that “the article which most annoyed the owners of the communication media **was included in the final text of the bill at the request of the FENAJ**”²³ (our boldface)

On August 11, the press reported an alteration in the handling of the bill: The Chair of the Chamber of Deputies had decided to send the Council bill, in addition to the Labor and the Constitution and Justice Committees, also to the Science and Technology, Communication and Computer Science Committee, in the first place. The President of the Chamber, João Paulo Cunha (from the PT Party/São Paulo) alleged that this

expedient was necessary since the proposal dealt with matters related to communication companies²⁴.

It should be noted that starting on August 12, what was perceived in the newspapers' coverage was that it was no longer desirable to discuss the bill but rather to pressure the Executive Branch for it to be withdrawn from the Congress²⁵. In this connection, the press reported that both the National Association of Labor Court Magistrates (ANAMATRA)²⁶ as well as the Inter-American Press Society (SIP)²⁷, disseminated a communiqué asking President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva to withdraw the bill from the Congress because it was a question of "a serious attack against freedom of expression and freedom of the press in Brazil". Along the same line, it was reported that on the previous day the opposition in the Congress had started a movement for the shelving of the bill. "The leader of the PFL Party in the Chamber, José Carlos Aleluia (from the State of Bahia) asked for the bill to be returned to the Executive Branch"²⁸, "the PFL Party threatens to obstruct voting if the Chamber does not return the bill which creates the council"²⁹ and also reproduced excerpts from the proposal presented by the party:

The motion of the bench of PFL federal deputies was signed by congressmen from several parties. "The bill completes a cycle of blunders by the present government, making us go back to the shameless situation of almost 65 years ago, when the authoritarianism of the Estado Novo [dictatorship of President Getúlio Vargas] conceived the notorious Press and Propaganda Department (DIP), of sad recollection, to control public opinion through monitoring of the communication media" says the text.³⁰

And, as an aggravating factor, on the same August 12, the newspapers reported the proposal for a presidential decree which would prevent government employees, except for ministers and their press advisers, from transmitting information to the communication media³¹. Immediately, an association was made in the media between this proposal and that of the Federal Journalism Council. In a highlighted story entitled "PT Party preaches 'due disobedience' for civil servants", published by the newspaper *O Globo* on August 13, sharp criticism of the proposals was presented by the president of the PT Party, José Genoíno, and the President of the Chamber, Deputy João Paulo Cunha (from the PT/São Paulo):

[...] Genoíno said that it was necessary to discuss the matter more and preached "due disobedience" – a reference to the so-called

Law of Due Obedience signed in Argentina by former President Raúl Alfonsín, first civilian to govern the country after the military dictatorship. It was a kind of amnesty for subordinate officers who could allege in the courts that they had committed crimes due to superior orders.

[...] “when it is a question of matters which violate the Constitution, which violate the standard of transparency and ethics, any civil servant can speak out. [...] Genoino disagreed with the way the government has been handling the bill which creates the CFJ...

The President of the Chamber, Deputy João Paulo Cunha (from the PT/São Paulo) also reacted in an ironic way³² to the proposal by the Federal Government Controller General’s Office [...] Laughing loudly, he said... - what he has to do is to check with Tigre [manufacturer of plumbing connections] for a part to prevent leaks [of information].

[...] The government’s mistake [in the case of the CFJ] was not to have dialogued with the Congress. If it had done this, we would say the following: you don’t have to send it, there is a bill here already, ask the FENAJ to come here and discuss it. The bill presented by Deputy Celso Russomano deals precisely with the same matter. According to him [President of the Chamber], no bill which had as its purpose the violation of press freedom or restriction of the work of journalists will find shelter in the Chamber.³³

On August 13, the newspaper *O Globo* published a communiqué by the National Association of Magazine Publishers (ANER) signed by its president, Carlos Domingo Alzugaray, expressing its concern with relation to the CFJ bill: “The ANER and its members have no restrictions regarding the creation of an entity to regulate the practice of journalism, such as occurs in other professions, but is vehemently opposed to the delegation to this Council authoritarian powers for control of the press”³⁴.

On that same day, the newspaper *O Globo* published a note sent by the Journalists’ Union of Rio de Janeiro entitled “Crossing the t’s and dotting the i’s” emphasizing the partiality of most of the large newspapers and magazines in their journalistic coverage of the CFJ bill:

Texts which should be in the editorials and not in the news had recourse paradoxically to the sacred principle of plurality and of press freedom to disdain the contradictory opinion and the rich debate which the bill is opening in Brazilian journalism [...] in its desire to combat the CFJ, the press exercised its ability to get things mixed up and charged to the account of a supposed bill of PT authoritarianism a proposal which the 31 journalists’ unions affiliated to the FENAJ began to formulate even before the Constituent Assembly of 1988. [...] **In any debate of this kind in the world some level of tension between public freedoms and the protection of individual rights is natural.** [...] The justified concern regarding possible restrictions

was also raised by the unions [...] But the labor movement did not let itself be intimidated by taboos. [...] It cannot be forgotten that the council represents a clear risk of weakening of the unions and of FENAJ itself. [...] Much debate was necessary in all the unions [...] until the professional category reached the conclusion that the creation of the council presented more advantages for increasing the importance of the profession than risks to press freedom [...].³⁵

Also on August 13, *Folha de S. Paulo* reported that according to the President of the Chamber of Deputies, João Paulo Cunha, the bill that would have priority for evaluation would be the bill of Deputy Celso Russomano which in the former's opinion dealt with the same subject.³⁶

On the following day, *Folha de S. Paulo* published and highlighted the story entitled "Lula is articulating retreat in Journalism Council". However, it should be emphasized that the story did not present reliable information on this attitude of the president:

The negative repercussion regarding the proposal for the creation of the CFJ led the Presidential Palace to articulate yesterday a retreat, which would be to withdraw the bill from the Congress. The evaluation is that the government is suffering wear and tear in fighting for a flag which is not its own.

The President of the Chamber of Deputies, João Paulo Cunha, (PT Party/São Paulo) and the national president of the PT Party, José Genoïno, **had probably** advised the President of the Republic, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, to withdraw the bill.

Genoïno denied having given this advice, but declared that he supported the withdrawal of the proposal. "The Executive Branch cannot support this initiative and be criticized by journalists. I advise the government to withdraw the bill. It is absurd to be accused because of an initiative that is not its own", he stated.

João Paulo said the day before yesterday that the government had erred on entering the discussion which for him would have to be carried on between congressmen and entities representing the class of journalists.

He was analyzing the request of the PFL Party for the return of the bill based on the argument that it is unconstitutional and yesterday **he declined to talk about the matter, declaring only that if the "FENAJ requests it, the president withdraws it."**

[...] ***Folha* discovered that the government's idea was to pressure for the FENAJ itself to make the request for withdrawal of the bill**, which would return to the Presidential Staff and to the Labor Ministry for a new analysis and adaptation of the articles considered controversial.

DENIAL

The entity denied yesterday that it was negotiating the withdrawal of the bill. "The president of the FENAJ met yesterday with Ricardo

Kotscho, Secretary for Press and Publicity in the Office of the President of the Republic, and he **[Kotscho]** denied that the government was studying the withdrawal of the bill”, declared the First Secretary of the FENAJ, Aloísio Lopes.

“For us, it is normal and democratic that there is a perfecting of the bill, I myself already have two amendments, what is not possible is for the government to withdraw the bill”, Aloísio Lopes added (our boldface)³⁷

The same line is followed by the column entitled “Backward steps” signed by journalist Tereza Cruvinel published on August 14 by the newspaper *O Globo*:

With relation to the Federal Journalism Council [...] it seems that nobody in the government evaluated the delicate nature of the matter or the reactions that would occur. Faced with the bombardment, the government is willing to retreat; perhaps officially, by means of the request for withdrawal of the bill by the FENAJ itself, in order to be discussed more by the professional category; perhaps informally, with the President of the Chamber trying to append the bill to that of Deputy Russomano.³⁸

However, on August 14, a story published by *Folha de S. Paulo* reported that the president of the PT Party, José Genoino, asked the government to withdraw political support for creation of the CFJ and let the FENAJ negotiate directly with the Congress.

Nevertheless, in this story, the following vignette calls our attention: “President Lula is joking, saying that journalists were cowards for not defending the bill that creates the CFJ”. The story describes an episode which occurred in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic:

After participating in a dinner celebrating the taking of office of the new president of the Dominican Republic, Leonel Fernandez, President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva resorted to irony to say that journalists did not have the courage to defend the national council of the professional category.

“You ´re a bunch of cowards really. You didn´t have the courage to defend the national journalists´ council”, Lula said.

A journalist asked if he believed it was to defend the council. Lula retorted:

“Of course, where is your class position? Isn´t it a good thing for you?”

A journalist argued that there had not been any consultation with the professional category regarding the matter. But the president disagreed.

“But isn’t it a historical demand of yours? You weren’t even born yet and they were already demanding this. For me, for the government, what’s important is doing the things that the category interprets as good for it.”

The conversation was terminated when a microphone was placed in front of the president, who changed the subject: “I’m not talking”.³⁹

In this episode, it should be emphasized that even though Lula did not intend to make a public pronouncement, his remarks were publicized and later criticized on several occasions, such as in the editorial published by *Folha de S. Paulo* entitled “Lula relaxed”, an allusion to the explanation given by his press adviser. “[...] As to the phrase spoken to the journalists, it was absolutely untimely. It only served to accentuate the old habit of the provocative trade union leader, completely inappropriate for a president of the Republic. Even supporters of the bill repudiated the declaration”.⁴⁰

Finally, the outcome of the event can be presented based on a story published by the magazine *Imprensa* which reported the presence of President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva at the inauguration of the board of directors of the National Newspaper Association (ANJ) for the two-year period 2004-2006, in September 2004:

The main ceremony involving the transmission of the position of president [...] had the illustrious presence of the President of the Republic, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, a surprise for a good part of the guests. Contradicting the criticism received recently, involving the bill creating the Federal Journalism Council, Lula declared in his speech at the close of the ceremony his regard for press freedom and for newspapers’ independence, avoiding mention of the controversial initiative which has aroused so much heated debate.

[...] In his personal tone, the new ANJ president spoke in a balanced way. Recognizing the president’s tone of conciliation and diplomacy, Sirotsky considered the pronouncement appropriate, a clear sign of the superseding of the proposal for subjecting the exercising of the right to information to the scrutiny of any governmental or corporative entity. **“Lula put things in the right place”**.⁴¹ (our boldface)

Final comments

On taking up again the journalistic narrative, the dispute over meaning emerges as a first point and, at the same time, the political battle fought

around the words “denunciation” and “denunciation complex”. According to Miguel (2000:66):

Some words are highly valued assets. [...] and each one who is disposed to associate with them distorts their meaning [...] Thus the dispute regarding words and a reasonable degree of vagueness in their use are inevitable: this dispute constitutes political discourse itself.

Based on the foregoing, it is clear that for the government the media, at that time, had taken on a posture of “denunciation complex”, this being understood as presenting denunciations in an irresponsible way, generating political instability. From this resulted the need to create control mechanisms. The media, for its part, advocated that its duty was to denounce, and that the government, with the Federal Journalism Council, would probably be seeking a way to regulate journalistic activities, to “jam the system of checks and balances which is the essence of democracy”⁴², thereby constituting a threat to press freedom.

This understanding caused the media to be converted into an interested party in the debate and to fail to express the different points of view present in society with relation to the bill for creation of the Federal Journalism Council, thus revealing their new form in the public sphere as a level of mediatization and not just of mediation.

NOTES

- 1 This study, with financing from the Research Incentive Fund (FIP) of the Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais (PUC Minas) and with a valuable contribution by research trainee Carolina Nunes de Faria, presents the first results of the research.
- 2 In the article entitled “Pragmatic analysis of journalistic narrative”, Luis Gonzaga Motta develops, with all propriety, a methodology for “analysis of the construction of meanings by means of the reshaping of the journalistic event, its conflicts, functional episodes, characters, objectification (real effects) and subjectification (poetic effects and effects of the ‘cognitive contract’ between journalists and audience) strategies” (MOTTA, 2005:1). It is interesting to emphasize that this proposal theorizes and systematizes the type of analysis which I have been trying to develop in studies already prepared. An example, in this connection,

- is presented in the doctorate thesis entitled *Figurações do real: mídia e política na cena mineira* (Representations of reality: media and politics on the Minas Gerais scene), presented at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) in 2002, which refers to the research performed on the moratorium decreed in 1999 by the then Governor of the State of Minas Gerais, Itamar Franco. See also the chapter entitled *A visão do campo da comunicação nos estudos de mídia e democracia deliberativa* (The view of the communication field in media and deliberative democracy studies), published in the book *Interações mediáticas* (Media interactions) organized by PINTO, Júlio and SERELLE, Márcio, Editora Autêntica, 2006.
- 3 An interesting comment was made by Ricardo Kotscho on the absence of coverage of this Congress: "...no large Brazilian newspaper reported the fact on the following day, **since the press is not accustomed to covering the press**, even more so when the event occurred in João Pessoa, far from the Brasília-Rio de Janeiro-São Paulo axis. Only two days later some newspapers mentioned the matter..." (our boldface) Kotscho, Ricardo. Ao debate, caros colegas (To the debate, dear colleagues). *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 10, 2004, "Tendências/Debate" (Trends/Debate), p. A-3.
 - 4 Emphasis should be given, in this reply by the Labor Minister, to his view of the media as **mediators** of the relation between State and society. In reality, this constitutes the essence of the discussion regarding press freedom: based on their new form, the media abandon their role of mediating, of expressing the different viewpoints present in society and begin to also constitute political subjects, mediating the public sphere.
 - 5 Souza, Leonardo. Council will restrain excesses, says Berzoini. *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 7, 2004, p. A-16.
 - 6 Gushiken wants to 'protect society'. *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 7, 2004, p. A-10.
 - 7 Journalist Carlos Lindenberg in his column describes and analyzes well this fact. "[...] **As the denunciations have been circulated first in the press, to be sustained later by the opposition benches in Congress, the impression is that the Government is engaging in retaliation, in the attempt to intimidate the press.** This could have been the Government's intention. At least in these last few days the complaints against the action of the press have been growing in high governmental circles. Not even the President of the Republic has refrained from this, and more than once has been harping on the subject that there was a "denunciation campaign" by the press against authorities

who were serving the country. [...] in the case of the information which placed the president of the Central Bank in a difficult situation, the problem is less in the publication of the news than in the responsibility for its leaking to the press. As far as is known, the news which afflicted Henrique Meirelles and the Government a week ago was not found by some snooping journalist in a corner of the table or in a garbage can. The Government itself knows that the news came from a more precious place: the Congressional Inquiry (CPI) into the Banestado Bank. And that is where the hornets' nest is. The Government suspects that the information must have been leaked by the PSDB party, responsible for chairing the CPI. But they are just suspicions. A committee was created yesterday to ascertain the responsibility for this leak. [...]” Lindenber, Carlos. *Mais uma polêmica no ar (Another controversy in the air)*. *Hoje em Dia*. August 11, 2004, p. 4. Later the journalist gave more details in another column: “The reporting committee member, Deputy José Mentor (PT Party, São Paulo) even in the face of warnings from the Congressional Legal Adviser’s Office, preferred to request wholesale confidential fiscal, banking and telephone data of 1,200 individuals and companies.” Lindenber, Carlos. *Sombra autoritária (Authoritarian shadow)*. *Hoje em Dia*. August 16, 2004, p. 4. Also in this respect, curiously, a story disseminated by the newspaper *O Globo* added an important detail: “The leader of the PSDB Party, Arthur Virgílio (PSDB – Amazonas) declared that he was concerned regarding the creation of the CFJ. **In his opinion, this initiative of the Executive Branch, together** with the criticisms by ministers of what they classify as ‘denunciation complex of the press’ and **also the indiscriminate request for confidential fiscal, banking and telephone data of communication companies [...]**.” (our boldface). *Oposição se mobilize por arquivamento (Opposition mobilizes for shelving)*. *O Globo*. August 12, 2004, p. 11.

- 8 In May 2004, the New York Times correspondent in Brazil, Larry Rohter, wrote a report on the supposed alcoholic abuse of President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva. “The Brazilian Government even canceled the journalist’s visa, preventing him from remaining in the country. The journalist was not expelled because he was outside the country and only returned after the government retreated from its decision on receiving a letter from Rohter. In the letter the journalist requested reconsideration of the visa cancellation, arguing that he had no intention of offending the Brazilian president. But the journalist did not explicitly apologize to the Brazilian Government”. *Governo compra nova briga com Larry Rohter (Government looks for more trouble with Larry Rohter)*. *O Globo*, September 7, 2004.
- 9 “The initial text of the Ministry of Culture proposal, which was made available on the Internet [site ‘Pay TV’], in early August, contained a

controversial provision (art. 43) which gave powers to the Agency to regulate and supervise the editorial line and the programming of radio and television stations.” Holanda, Tarcísio. Agência ameaça controlar emissoras (Agency threatens to control stations). *Jornal ANJ*, August 2004, n. 189, p. 14.

- 10 Christofoletti, Lílian. FENAJ apóia conselho de jornalismo; ABI veta (FENAJ supports journalism council; ABI vetoes it). *Folha de S. Paulo*. August 7, 2004, p.A-11.
- 11 It is interesting to emphasize that the interpretation given by the media during the coverage of the event was in the sense of declaring that the bill was an initiative of the Executive Branch. On August 18 the president of the FENAJ, Sérgio Murillo and the first secretary of the entity and president of the Professional Journalists Union of the State of Minas Gerais, Aloísio Lopes, signed an article entitled “Journalistic ethics needs a Council” published by *Folha de S. Paulo* in which they seek to clarify the readers regarding the bill’s authorship: “the massacre to which the bill creating the Federal Journalism Council was subjected is one more demonstration that the practice of the journalist profession should be guided by ethics and social responsibility. Our Code of Ethics provides that journalists should always hear contrary opinions. And furthermore, professional experience says that when the matter is controversial, care should be taken to give the same space to the divergent opinions. And this did not occur in most of the stories published in the first week of debates. **The first clarification for the reader** was that the bill presented by the government was FENAJ’s proposal, approved in two national congresses of the professional category (years 2000 and 2002). The fact that the Executive Branch had presented it, and not a member of Congress, was due to the fact that the creation of autonomous entities (as is the case of the professional councils) is the exclusive responsibility of the Executive Branch This interpretation was given by the Superior Court of Justice (STJ) in the judgment of article 58 of Law 9,649. As a matter of fact it was for this reason that bill 058/98 of Deputy Celso Russomano which created the CFJ was vetoed by the Labor Committee.” Also illustrative in this connection was the content of the letter sent by the Press and Publicity Secretary in the Office of the President of the Republic, Ricardo Kotscho, asking the newspaper *The New York Times* to publish some clarifications regarding the story entitled “Plan to Tame Journalists Just Stirs Them Up in Brazil” published by that newspaper on September 6, 2004, and signed by correspondent Larry Rohter. “[...] 1. Right in the first paragraph, Mr. Rohter wrote: ‘A plan by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva to create a national journalists’ council (...)’. This is not true. The plan was not President Lula’s. [...] 2. Mr. Rohter omitted the fact that the formal request for creation of the Federal Journalists

Council was made to the President in a public hearing last April, as was published by the Brazilian press at the time. 3. The story not only failed to inform the reader of the NYT regarding who were the true proponents of the bill, but it did not even mention the existence of the National Journalists Federation, in addition to not hearing any of the entity's directors. [...]” In his letter to the NYT, Kotscho said Larry Rohter was negligent and requested clarifications. Agência Brasil, August 6, 2004.

- 12 Declaration made to *Folha de S. Paulo* in reply to a survey made by the newspaper of the existence or not of an authoritarian bias in Lula's administration. *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 15, 2004, p. A-14.
- 13 Cariello, Rafael. Entidades dos EUA condenam conselho de jornalismo no país. (USA entities condemn journalism council in the country). *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 8, 2004, p. A-8.
- 14 Villela, Antônio Carlos Mattar. Reader's Panel. *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 10, 2004, p. A-3. An interesting aspect is noted in this letter, in which the reader criticizes the newspaper. Braga (2006: 133), in his study of readers' letters as a social device for media criticism, emphasizes that the letters to the editor space “is in effect the space in which the reader and the journalist can compare views regarding social events, in which the readers talk with the newspaper, **in the newspaper** and possibly about the newspaper. However, those expectations of a relevant, significant debate do not seem to have been confirmed. [...] Letters to the editor seem to be the element with greatest interactivity in the newspapers. Perhaps for this reason, great expectations were traditionally attributed to them, since they would represent public debate itself, an element for society's verification and reaction regarding the newspapers' action, a true ‘public sphere’ actor”. (author's italics).
- 15 Braga, Isabel. FENAJ defende Conselho e acusa “massacre da mídia” (FENAJ supports Council and accuses “massacre of the media”). *O Globo*, August 11, 2004, p. 9.
- 16 Kotscho, Ricardo. Ao debate, caros colegas (To the debate, dear colleagues). *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 10, 2004. Trends and Debates, p. A-3. It is timely to emphasize that an interesting mechanism for arousing debate is observed here, coming from society itself. Kotscho justified that his participation in the debate was in reality due to a convocation by a reader: “The disinformation on the council's real objectives led reader Keko Ribeiro (‘Guided Journalism’, ‘Reader's Panel’, p. A-2, August 7) to ask my opinion on the matter and to write: ‘Kotscho, who always was guided by ethics and by the worthy posture of defending press freedom in Brazil, should, unless I am mistaken, be very uncomfortable with this

- issue'. That's right, Keko, I decided to write this article precisely for this reason..."
- 17 Also in this connection, it is also timely to mention the stories published on the repercussion the matter was having on foreign newspapers such as the *British Financial Times* and the American *Los Angeles Times*. Jornais estrangeiros noticiam polêmica (Foreign newspapers report controversy). *O Globo*, August 11, 2004, p. 8.
- 18 Venceslau, Pedro. Que imbróglío! (What an imbróglío!). Revista *Imprensa*, September 2004, p. 16.
- 19 With respect to this point, a story published by the magazine *Imprensa* presented its point of view: "[...] Yes, there are worrisome details and particulars. For example, the bill's subjectivity catches the eye. What is understood by guiding, supervising and disciplining the practice of the profession and journalist activity? What criteria will be adopted to define what is abuse, who should have his diploma canceled or simply, what goes against ethics? Or better still, who will define what is journalistic ethics?" Venceslau, Pedro. Que imbroglío! Revista *Imprensa*, September 2004, p. 17.
- 20 FENAJ versus ABI – opiniões divergentes em quase tudo (FENAJ versus ABI – diverging opinions on almost everything). Revista *Imprensa*, September 2004, p. 18. In this story a passage from the interview with the president of the FENAJ, Sérgio Murillo de Andrade, clarifies this: "Imprensa – [...] This fact has been pointed to by sectors of the media as an aggravating factor due to the proposal having been sent by the President of the Republic. Murillo – I don't see any problem in this. I'm a member of the Workers Party (PT) and I'm proud of it. They're making an enormous racket about this, as if it were a sin to be a PT militant." Also in this connection, it is interesting to highlight a passage of the story published by *Folha de S. Paulo* on August 15, 2004 entitled "Cúpula da FENAJ é formada por petistas" (FENAJ leadership is formed by PT members). p. A-15. "[...] The affiliated directors heard by the reporters expressed annoyance at being questioned regarding party affiliations. 'It's a perversion of the discussion' said Pereira Filho [...]"
- 21 Leão, Sinval de Itacarambi. Bode nas redações (Trouble in the newsrooms). Revista *Imprensa*, September 2004, p. 4. Along the same line, the magazine transcribed a passage from the column of Jânio de Freitas, published in *Folha de S. Paulo*: "One word in the CFJ bill is sufficient for it to denounce itself [...] To guide can only have one meaning: to indicate a direction to be followed, a line of action to be practiced, a course which is placed above the individual's preference. **One of the basic**

presuppositions of journalism, however, is the development of its own guidance – varied, conflicting between the media “institutions” and between journalists. This, precisely this, is press freedom.” (our boldface)

- 22 Camarotti, Gerson. Casa Civil tornou mais duro projeto da FENAJ (Presidential Staff made FENAJ bill harsher). *O Globo*, August 12, 2004, p. 10. The story clarifies that “the press adviser’s office of the Presidential Staff reported that the Governmental Action subchief’s office, when receiving bills, makes an analysis to adjust the text’s wording and correction. With relation to this case, the analysis by the Presidential Staff and the Labor Ministry concluded that the text needed to be clearer. **For this reason, the alteration was made to improve the text technically and editorially**”. (our boldface)
- 23 Nem tudo é o que parece (Not everything is what it seems to be). *Imprensa* magazine, September 2004, p. 22.
- 24 Oposição se mobiliza por arquivamento (Opposition is mobilizing to shelve the bill). *O Globo*, August 12, 2004, p. 11.
- 25 In this connection, attention is called to the fact that the newspaper *O Globo* of August 12, p. 6, in its section “Letters to the Editor” published seven letters under the title “Supervised Press” presenting opinions contrary to the creation of the CFJ.
- 26 The note signed by the president of ANAMATRA, Grijalbo Fernandes Coutinho, declared: “instead of keeping watch over the respect for press freedom, a valued aspect of Brazilian citizenship, the government intends to establish norms and rules of a behavioral nature, with a clearly authoritarian bias, for professions and activities not involving the government”. Bragon, Ranier. Juizes condenam conselho de jornalismo (Judges condemn journalism council). *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 12, 2004, p. A-7.
- 27 In the communiqué the director of the Committee on Freedom of the Press and Information of the SIP, Rafael Molina, mentioned “the Declaration of Principles on Freedom of Expression of the Inter-American Committee for Human Rights, ‘whose first clause declares that freedom of expression, in all its forms and manifestations, is a fundamental unalienable right, inherent in all people. It is also an indispensable requisite for the existence of a democratic society’ ”. Marques, Toni. Conselho seria censura, diz associação (Council would be censorship, says association). *O Globo*, August 12, 2004, p. 10.

- 28 Oposição se mobiliza por arquivamento (Opposition is mobilizing to shelve the bill). *O Globo*. August 12, 2004, p.11.
- 29 Vasconcelos, Federico. Agência Brasil “esquece” outro lado (Agência Brasil “forgets” other side). *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 13, 2004, p. A-9.
- 30 Bragon, Ranier. Juizes condenam conselho de jornalismo (Judges condemn journalism council). *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 12, 2004, p. A-7.
- 31 “The Federal Government Controller General’s Office presented yesterday [August 11] to the Office for Integrated Management of the Combat against Money-Laundering a proposal for a presidential decree. [...]. The decree consists of a single article which, according to the Controller General’s Office, should be included in the Code of Ethics of civil servants in effect since 1994. With the title ‘Relationship with the Press’, the text established that ‘the furnishing of information relating to investigatory activities to the communication media will be the responsibility of the ministers occupying positions of a special nature and of the highest directors of indirect administration entities or equivalent authorities’. The rule is valid for interview or for the passing on of information by means of press advisers. The text also provides [...] **‘Public servants, in their relationship with communication media should observe the equilibrium between press freedom and the need for secrecy for the success of investigations of criminal or administrative illegal activities’**, says the document. The proposal should be analyzed by the members of the Office for Integrated Management, sent to President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva after October. [...] The Federal Government Sub-Controller General, Jorge Hage, author of the proposal, denies that it is an attempt to restrict the press. According to Hage, the idea was suggested by the General Prosecutor of the Republic, Cláudio Fonteles, in December of last year [2003], a little while before the creation of the Office of Integrated Management. The proposal probably arose as an alternative to the Gag Law bill before the National Congress. The bill, which prohibits representatives of the Public Prosecutor’s Office from talking about investigations in progress, was one of the main topics on the country’s political agenda at that time.” (our boldface). Carvalho, Jaílton de. Governo discute criar “mordaça” para servidores (Government is discussing creation of “gag” for civil servants). *O Globo*, August 12, 2004, p. 11.
- 32 It should be noted that both the President of the Chamber made use of irony, as well as the newspaper which resorted to this linguistic recourse, on placing in the vignette the phrase: “João Paulo reacts with irony to the ‘gag’ proposal: ‘what he has to do is to check with Tigre

- [a leading plumbing connection manufacturer] for a part to prevent leaks”. According to Motta (2005), this recourse, utilized in journalistic language, leads the reader to subjective interpretations. In this case, to mockery, and thus it can be viewed as a way to disqualify the proposal and its proponent.
- 33 Medeiros, Lydia; Braga, Isabel. PT prega ‘desobediência devida’ for civil servants (PT preaches ‘due disobedience’ for civil servants). *O Globo*, August 13, 2004, p. 8.
 - 34 Editores repudiam CFJ (Publishers repudiate CFJ). *O Globo*, August 13, 2004, p. 8.
 - 35 Sindicato de jornalistas apóia conselho (Journalists’ union supports council). *O Globo*, August 13, 2004, p. 8.
 - 36 Bragon, Ranier. Petista quer projeto que fixa traje de jornalista (PT Party member wants bill that establishes journalists’ attire). *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 13, 2004, p. A-9. From the title of the story, the resort to mockery can again be perceived. Only one specific point of bill 6,817 presented by Deputy Celso Russomano (PP Party/São Paulo) in May 2002 was emphasized. In the lead it was reported: “The President of the Chamber of Deputies, João Paulo Cunha (PT Party/São Paulo), said yesterday that [...] the bill that will have priority for evaluation will be one that, among other things, defines the ‘attire of journalists in professional practice’ and ‘grants’ the professional category the right to ‘remain seated, standing or withdraw without asking permission’ from government offices”.
 - 37 Krakovics, Fernanda; Duailibi, Julia; Bragon, Ranier. Lula articula recuo em Conselho de Jornalismo (Lula is articulating retreat in Journalism Council), *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 14, 2004, p. A-7.
 - 38 Cruvinel, Tereza. Passos atrás (Backward steps). *O Globo*, August 14, 2004, Column Panorama Político (Political Panorama), p. 2.
 - 39 Jungblut, Cristiane; Galhardo, Ricardo. PT pede que governo retire apoio a conselho (PT Party asks the government to withdraw support for the council). *O Globo*, August 17, 2004, p. 10.
 - 40 Lula descontraído (Lula relaxed). *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 19, 2004, p. A-2.

- 41 Grossi, Regina; Tarapanoff, Fabiola. O brado retumbante dos empresários de jornais (The newspaper owners' resounding protest). *Revista Imprensa, Jornalismo e Comunicação*, v. 18, n. 195, Oct. 2004.
- 42 Frias Filho, Otávio, Imprensa livre (Free press). Folha de S. Paulo, August 12, 2004, p. A-2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BRAGA, José Luiz. *A sociedade enfrenta sua mídia: dispositivos sociais de crítica midiática*. São Paulo: Paulus, 2006.
- MIGUEL, Luís Felipe. *Mito e discurso político: uma análise a partir da campanha eleitoral de 1994*. Campinas: Editora Unicamp, Imprensa Oficial, 2000.
- MOTTA, Luiz Gonzaga. "A análise pragmática da narrativa jornalística". In: **CONGRESSO BRASILEIRO DE CIÊNCIAS DA COMUNICAÇÃO**, 28, 2005, Rio de Janeiro. *Annals. of Sociedade Brasileira de Estudos Interdisciplinares da Comunicação*, 2005.
- TORVES, José Carlos Oliveira. *O Conselho Federal de Jornalismo na perspectiva da agenda-setting e da espiral do silêncio*. 2004. Article (course conclusion) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Faculdade dos Meios de Comunicação Social, Porto Alegre.

Terezinha Maria de Carvalho Cruz Pires is Journalist, Master of Sociology from the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Doctor of Communication and Culture from the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Professor of the Social Communication Postgraduate Program at the Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais (PUC-Minas) and member of the "Communication and its interfaces" research group of the National Research Council (CNPq), in which she is developing research in the area of media and politics and epistemology.

E-mail: pires@pucminas.br and lodi.cruz@uol.com.br

