

Senses of “revolução” and “revolución” in the coup written press of Brazil (1964) and Argentina (1966) / *Sentidos de “revolução” e “revolución” na imprensa escrita golpista do Brasil (1964) e da Argentina (1966) / Sentidos de “revolução” y “revolución” en la prensa escrita golpista de Brasil (1964) y de Argentina (1966)*

*María Alejandra Vitale**

ABSTRACT

In this article we cross the theoretical connections that can be established between Bakhtin Circle dialogism and some aspects of the discourse theory of Michel Pêcheux, considering the reading of both made by Jacqueline Authier-Revuz in the frame of her proposal about enunciative heterogeneities. We also try to describe the senses of the word "revolução" in *O Globo* and *Folha de S. Paulo* related to the Brazilian coup d'état of March 31st, 1964 and compare it to what happened in the Argentinean press with the word "revolución" facing the military coup of June 28th, 1966.

KEYWORDS: Dialogism; Heterogeneity; Revolution; Brazilian and Argentine coup discursivities

RESUMO

Neste artigo percorremos as conexões teóricas que podem ser estabelecidas entre o dialogismo do Círculo de Bakhtin e alguns aspectos da teoria do discurso de Michel Pêcheux, considerando a leitura que Jacqueline Authier-Revuz fez de ambos em sua proposta sobre as heterogeneidades enunciativas. Também nos propomos a descrever os sentidos adquiridos pela palavra “revolução” nos editoriais e comentários dos jornais O Globo e Folha de S. Paulo que tematizaram no Brasil o golpe de Estado de 31 de março de 1964 e compará-los com o que aconteceu na imprensa escrita argentina com a palavra “revolución” frente ao golpe militar de 28 de junho de 1966.

PALAVRAS CHAVE: Dialogismo; Heterogeneidade; Revolução; Revolución; Discursividade golpista brasileira e argentina

RESUMEN

En este artículo recorremos las conexiones teóricas que pueden ser establecidas entre el dialogismo del Círculo de Bakhtin y algunos aspectos de la teoría del discurso de Michel Pêcheux, considerando la lectura que hizo de ambos Jacqueline Authier-Revuz desde su propuesta sobre las heterogeneidades enunciativas. Nos proponemos, asimismo, describir los sentidos que adquirió la palabra “revolução” en los editoriales y comentarios de O Globo y Folha de S. Paulo que tematizaron en Brasil el golpe de Estado del 31 de marzo de 1964 y compararlos con lo que sucedió en la prensa gráfica argentina con la palabra “revolución” ante el golpe militar del 28 de junio de 1966.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Dialogismo; Heterogeneidad; Revolução; Revolución; Discursividad golpista brasileña y argentina

* Professor at Universidad de Buenos Aires – UBA, Buenos Aires, Argentina; vitaleale@fibertel.com.ar

Introduction

In this article we will begin by examining the theoretical relationship between Bakhtin Circle dialogism and some aspects of Michel Pêcheux's discourse theory, taking into consideration Jacqueline Authier-Revuz's reading of both in terms of her own theory of enunciative heterogeneities. We will then go on to describe the meanings given to the word "revolução" in editorials and commentaries¹ published in two Brazilian newspapers (*O Globo* and *Folha de S. Paulo*) which thematized the coup d'état of March 31, 1964 before comparing these meanings with those given to the word "revolución" in the Argentine press following the military coup of June 28, 1966². Specifically, we will argue that these different meanings arose from a conflict between discursive formations linked to the various socio-political sectors that made up the coup coalitions (DE RIZ, 2000; FAUSTO AND DEVOTO, 2004; O'DONNELL, 1973).

We will begin then with an overview of Pêcheux's basic theoretical approach, as interpreted by Authier-Revuz, to some of Bakhtin's ideas. Next, we will outline the methodology that guided our analysis of "revolução" and "revolution" in the discourses already mentioned. Finally, we will describe and contrast the meanings given to both terms.

1 Bakhtin / Pêcheux / Authier-Revuz

Both Mikhail Bakhtin and Michel Pêcheux criticized abstract objectivism in linguistics (DIAS, 1996). However, Pêcheux did not agree with Bakhtin's reading of Saussure even though both took a Marxist approach. Indeed, Maldidier (2003) points out that Pêcheux criticized Bakhtin's tendency to ignore the language dimension because he contrasted the abstract system of linguistic forms from the social phenomenon of interaction that takes place through enunciation, thus merging linguistics with a much vaster semiology. Indeed, Gregolin (2010) argues that the markedly Althusserian position in Bakhtin's work led Pêcheux to reject what he called

¹ See Herman and Jufer (2001) on these newspaper opinion genres.

² Only two years after the military coup in Brazil, the Argentine armed forces led by General Juan Carlos Onganía staged a coup that overthrew President Arturo Illia of the Radical Civic Union Party of the People. The coup gave rise to a dictatorship which called itself the "Argentine Revolution."

Bakhtin's "sociologism," a term inspired by the similarities between Bakhtin's views and Plekhnov's social psychology. According to Pêcheux, Bakhtin's theories were rooted in theoretical humanism, which sees discourse production as resulting from a conflict between the individual and society and places it within the context of individual relationships. In the same vein, Pêcheux held that social relations cannot be thought of in terms of interactions between human groups.

However, the theoretical differences between the two writers ran deeper. Pêcheux understood the relationship between language and ideology differently to Bakhtin / Voloshinov, for whom – as we know - the sign is the arena of class struggle and language tends to be coextensive with ideology in that "the domain of ideology coincides with the domain of signs" (VOLOŠINOV, 1973, p.10). In contrast, Pêcheux, in *Les Vérités de La Palice*, published in 1975 and translated into Portuguese as *Semântica e discurso: Uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio* [Semantics and discourse: A critique of stating the obvious] in 1988, conceived of language as a relatively autonomous material base which is common to different discursive processes. This means that language, in the Saussurean sense of a system, is "indifferent" to class struggle. On the other hand, classes are not "indifferent" to language, with the result that every discursive process is part of an ideological class relationship. In Pêcheux's view, the formal structure of language is what allows different meaning effects within different discursive processes.

For Bakhtin languages are not abstract but concrete and social ways of conceiving the world, steeped in personal perceptions and inseparable from customary practice and social class (BAKHTIN, 1984). In contrast, Pêcheux insists that historically specific discourse processes cannot be considered as coextensive to language, and therefore rejects the conception of language as a world view (PÊCHEUX, 1978, p.244).

Despite her comparison of Pêcheux's and Bakhtin's theoretical positions along these lines, Jacqueline Authier-Revuz found these two authors shared a strong common ground, especially after she revisited Bakhtin's theory of dialogism and recognized different stages in Pêcheux's thinking. It was the notion of heterogeneity that provided Authier-Revuz (1982, 1984, 1995, 1998) with a link between Bakhtin Circle dialogism

and Pêcheux's later (1990) work, suggesting that both thinkers discovered what she calls *constitutive heterogeneity* through non-linguistic approaches.

We know that for Authier-Revuz *constitutive heterogeneity* refers to the fact that there is always an 'other' in every discourse – an implicit but permanent presence that determines the discourse from outside the subject and is more speech than speaker. This “outside,” however, is still inside the subject, in the sense that it is a constitutive condition of the subject's own speech and existence. On the other hand, the heterogeneity we observe is the inscription of the other in the thread of the discourse, altering its apparent oneness. Through this heterogeneity described by linguists, speaking subjects signal that part of their discourse is not their own. Authier-Revuz hypothesizes that this heterogeneity is a form of compulsory negotiation with constitutive heterogeneity – a negotiation which must remain unrecognized if discourse is to be articulated at all. In fact, by defining and circumscribing the words of others in discourse, subjects are able to imagine that the other is not everywhere and that the rest of the discourse is their own, thus placing themselves at the centre of the enunciation.

Authier-Revuz had to distance herself from pragmatics in order to conduct a careful reading of Bakhtin. As a result, she came to see dialogism (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 1995) as the ineluctable presence of the other - an 'other' who is not the person we are speaking to and is not “different” from ourselves but is a constitutive element of our oneness. This is the constitutive heterogeneity of every discourse, the necessary relationship that every discourse engages in with an external discursive space which is a condition of its own existence (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 1995). The novel was Bakhtin's favorite genre because he considered it the most suitable means, unlike poetry, for intentionally representing the true function of language, i.e. its critical dialogism. Brait (2009) argues that the methodological care Bakhtin shows in examining the materiality and otherness of language as well as the relationships of self / other in the novel, can also be of help to those studying artistic discourse or any other type of language.

Authier-Revuz found common ground between Bakhtin and Pêcheux in her discourse theory of meaning which she presented in *Les Vérités de La Palice*. There she noted Pêcheux's affinity with Bakhtin on the pluriaccentuation of words, which makes

them living things³. Indeed, Authier-Revuz drew attention to Bakhtin Circle dialogism as reinterpreted through the constitutive polysemy of the meaning of all words in order to emphasize that Bakhtin's notion of pluriaccentuation refers to the fact that no word is neutral but is inhabited by the discourses in which it has lived its "word life" and which give it its particular meaning and value. Thus, words are loaded with other discourses that give them contradictory value accents (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 1982, 1984, 1995).

Likewise, Pêcheux has argued that:

a word, expression or proposition does not have a meaning of its own, a meaning attached to its literality. Instead, its meaning is constituted in each discursive formation, in the relationships that such words, phrases or propositions hold with other words, expressions and propositions in the same discursive formation (PÊCHEUX, 1988, p.160).

Here, Pêcheux questions the notion that words can ever have just one meaning in a language and instead argues for the polysemy of language units – an idea contained in Bakhtin's notion of pluriaccentuation (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 1995). However, Pêcheux as yet gives no real consideration to heterogeneity and his recognition of the other in discourse is limited. Indeed, he conceives of discursive formations –the material aspect of ideology that determines what can and should be said - as closed and homogeneous spaces. This suggests a single fixed meaning in the dimension of discourse for a word according to the discursive formation in which it is produced (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 1995). Moreover, Bakhtin holds that the pluriaccentuation of words involves the intention to guide, whereas the notion of intention is not relevant to Pêcheux theory of discourse. This can be seen in his perspective on the subject in language. For Pêcheux, the problem of the constitution of meaning is inseparable from the problem of the constitution of the subject, since both the meaning of words and the subject are constructed by ideology, which interpellates individuals as subjects.

The constitutive relationship with the other posed by Bakhtin's dialogism is outlined in *Les vérités de La Palice* together with the notion of interdiscourse, the

³ Early approaches to discourse analysis, specifically Pêcheux's (1969) book *Analyse automatique du discours*, had little to do with Bakhtin, and instead attempted to reduce the multiple and heterogeneous to a homogeneous sameness. Indeed, Pêcheux's method sought the propositional invariant in a paraphrastic family from corpora selected in accordance with stable and homogeneous production requirements. This made it even harder to consider heterogeneity.

'complex whole in dominance' of discursive formations linked to one another, since it prevents discourse closing upon itself, brings what is outside inside and suggests a dimension of heterogeneity in the form of something already said elsewhere. However, Pêcheux (1977) himself was to give more weight to heterogeneity by foregrounding the Marxist notion of contradiction that challenges the concept of discursive formations as closed and homogeneous spaces. He proposes then that we need to define the internal relationship that every discursive formation maintains with its specific discursive exterior, in short, to determine the constituent advances by which a contradictory, unequal and internally subordinate plurality of discursive formations is organized around class interests and class struggle, at any given stage in its development and in any given social formation. The theoretical links between the Bakhtin Circle and Pêcheux and his group are clearest in this conception of exterior, of an 'other' who constitutively determines our inner oneness.

If Pêcheux began by rejecting Bakhtin's reading of Saussure and Bakhtin's idea of the coextensivity between language and ideology, Pêcheux's later theory, as Baronas and Komesu (2008) point out, was more aligned with Bakhtin's work thanks to his intellectual encounter with Authier-Revuz⁴. This led him to highlight declarative heterogeneity and give prominence to the notion of interdiscourse. As Guilhaumou (2008) emphasizes, Pêcheux came to understand interdiscourse as the socio-historical corpus of traces that constitute a memory space. He also established that the description of an enunciation necessarily brings into play (through denials, reported speech, ellipsis, etc.) the other discourse as a "virtual" reading space (PÊCHEUX, 1990).

Nowadays, we tend to highlight the unstable, porous and diffuse borders of discursive formations and highlight the relationship that they always establishes with otherness, especially when the analyst works, as in our own case, with logically destabilized discourses (INDURSKY, 2007).

⁴ Maldidier (2003) recalls that Pêcheux met Authier-Revuz at the *Centre d'Études et de Recherches Marxistes* (CERM) in the mid-seventies and met her again at the conference *Matérialités discursives*, which took place in 1980. This marked the beginning of a collaboration that would continue until Pêcheux's death in 1983.

2 Materiality of me and the enunciative event

Authier-Revuz's reading of the ideas of the Bakhtin Circle and of Pêcheux and his group, then, leads us to assume that a word's accents are necessarily plural: words acquire different meanings and values through the social discourses in which they live and in the interplay of discursive formations from which they are produced. Guimarães's (2002, 2007, 2011) approach is consistent with Authier-Revuz's revision of Bakhtin and Pêcheux's discursive heterogeneity in emphasizing a materialist interpretation that includes the historical construction of meaning. In our view, this approach is thus suitable for analyzing the constitutive polysemy of linguistic materiality and the shifts in meaning mentioned earlier.

Indeed, Guimarães (2002) argues that we can only study the meaning acquired by words or phrases in a given discourse by analyzing their relationships with other words or phrases in the text in which they are used. Meaning is thus constructed through enunciative events, and these events always cut through a network of meanings given by the interdiscourse. Meaning is formed into a nexus where what has been said returns while the event brings forth new meanings (GUIMARÃES, 2011). From this perspective, what a given word represents is a relationship of meaning produced in the enunciative event. This is how reality is signified by language. Moreover, reference is not external to meaning: it is only possible to refer to something (i.e. to particularize it in and through enunciation) because words designate objects.

Therefore, in order to study the meanings of the word "revolução" in editorials and commentaries in *O Globo* and *Folha de S. Paulo* in relation to the military coup of 1964 and contrast them with the meanings of "revolución" in the Argentine press following the 1966 coup, we will use the rewriting procedures described by Guimarães (2007), through which the enunciation of a text repeats insistently what has already been said, and so predicates part of what is rewritten⁵. Among the rewriting procedures I will focus on definitions and expansions through descriptions. Regarding definitions, I will consider what Guimarães calls articulation – that is, relationships within the enunciation itself that concern local contiguities. We will also see how some forms affect others without rewriting them.

⁵ This method looks for links between different points in the text or between texts.

These rewriting procedures make it possible to uncover the polysemy and constitutive heterogeneity of any word. However, I will identify and discuss those cases where definitions or descriptions include traces of marked heterogeneity, especially denials and metadiscursive glosses⁶.

3 Dialogism and heterogeneity in the lexical unit “revolução”

In editorials and commentaries published in the circumstances immediately following the military coup of March 31, 1964, *O Globo* rewrote the word “revolução” through the following descriptions: “The victorious movement,” “a triumphant revolution,” “the movement demeaned by politicians concerned only with their electoral interests”;⁷ “Communist revolution”⁸; “the Brazilian revolution”⁹; “the people’s revolution”¹⁰; “today’s great revolution”¹¹; “the democratic revolution”¹²; “the democratic victory”¹³; “the restoration movement”¹⁴; “the revolution (or more technically, the counter revolution)”, “the saving revolution”, “a huge work to save the Country”, “a work of redemption”¹⁵; “victorious reaction”¹⁶; and “the day democracy was restored”¹⁷.

Thanks to the adjective “democratic” used to describe the word “revolução” and its rewriting as a “democratic victory” and “the day democracy was restored,” the term “revolução” acquired the sense of democratic “movement” (and thus João Goulart’s government was implicitly branded as undemocratic). The phrase “people’s revolution” also attributed a leading role in this revolution to the poor and the working classes.

Since the revolution was understood as a “restauração” (restoration), it acquired the sense of a “movement” back in time, a “reação” (reaction) to what *O Globo*

⁶ In metadiscursive glosses or comments, speakers comment on their own use of words in an explicitly self-reflective research process (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 1998).

⁷ Citations from “A vez do congresso” (“The turn of Congress”), 4/3/64.

⁸ “O expurgo” (“The purge”), 6/4/64.

⁹ “Schmidt: Esta foi uma revolução brasileira” (“Schmidt: This was a Brazilian revolution”), 4/6/64.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ “Castelo Branco,” 4/7/64.

¹² “Educação e finanças” (“Education and finance”), 4/7/64, and »A revolução consolidada« (“The revolution consolidated”), 4/10/64.

¹³ “A vitória do Brasil traído” (“The victory of a betrayed Brazil”), 4/8/64.

¹⁴ “Panorama econômico” (“Economic outlook”), 4/8/64.

¹⁵ Citations from “Não percamos a vitória” (“Let’s not waste this victory”), 4/9/64.

¹⁶ “A arte de vencer revoluções” (“The art of overcoming revolutions”), 4/10/64.

¹⁷ “A revolução consolidada” (“The revolution consolidated”), 4/10/64.

perceived as creeping communism in Brazil under João Goulart. This “movement” was threatened by politicians who – according to *O Globo* - were only concerned about their electoral interests (“the political movement demeaned by politicians concerned only with their electoral interests”). This favored the hegemony of the Armed Forces after the overthrow of João Goulart, while implicitly allowing the “movement” to remain linked to the common good or interest of the “people.”

The adjective “Brazilian” to describe the “revolução” appeared after *O Globo* distanced itself from various French newspapers critical of U.S. support for the overthrow of Goulart. Accordingly, *O Globo* claimed that this was a “Brazilian revolution”¹⁸. The “revolução” also was described as “saving” and salvation was rewritten as “a work of redemption” and “a gigantic work to save the country” - a mission which acquired religious overtones and implicitly cast the revolution’s leaders and activists as saviors and redeemers. In the interdiscursive network of the time, this meaning of “revolução” referred to the National Security Doctrine, according to which the defense of Christianity was a way to contain communism (DE REZENDE, 2001; GARCIA, 1991).

The “revolução” as “redenção” and “salvação” was contrasted with “the Communist revolution” so *O Globo* used a metadiscursive gloss (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 1998) “more technically” clarifying that the “revolução” was “on the contrary, a counter-revolution”. This was consistent with an orientation towards the past which linked revolution to restoration.

In short, in the dominant discursive formation in *O Globo*, the word “revolução” used with “communist” took on an implicitly undemocratic meaning: remote from ordinary people, anti-Christian, anti-Brazilian and forward-looking. It was the opposite of “democratic revolution” used to denote the overthrow of João Goulart.

A few days after the overthrow of the constitutional president, *O Globo* defined the word “revolução” as follows:

A revolution is not a parade of carnival floats. It is not to be confused with a coup, which generally only aims at the conquest of power. A revolution aims at changing a system, with the introduction of a new philosophy of Government, a different type of administration, a

¹⁸ “Schmidt: Esta foi uma revolução brasileira” (“Schmidt: This was a Brazilian revolution”), 4/6/64.

different set of leaders (“A Government that honors the revolution,” 04/04/64)¹⁹.

In the *O Globo*'s denials we find a negation marker pointing to a discourse-other which is not made explicit (*is confused with a coup, this is a coup*)²⁰. This discourse-other is governed by the principle of antithesis (FIORIN, 1988) about what can be said in the discursive formation from which *O Globo* produces the word “revolução.” The meaning of “revolução” rejected by *O Globo* would lead readers to regard this word as a synonym of “coup.” In this newspaper, however, “revolução” and “coup” establish a word-antonym relationship; the reader infers that they have opposite meanings depending on whether or not there is a change in the system of government.

An examination of the interdiscursive texture reveals that the first military president, Humberto Castelo Branco, said in his “Greeting to the Congress” on April 15, 1964: “This is not a coup; it is a revolution,” a sentence that takes up the antonymic relationship between “revolution” and “coup” and *O Globo*'s denial of an utterance from another discursive formation (*this is a coup*)²¹.

Another similar definition of “revolução” was repeated in *O Globo*:

Revolution is the substitution of one idea of law for another. A revolution is not simply a man or a minority overthrowing a government in order to take its place. That is a shallow notion (“Revolution legitimizes Power by Force and the Support of People,” 4/11/64).

Again, *O Globo* distanced itself from an “other” for whom “revolução” supposedly meant a mere change of government. Conversely, “revolução” came to mean a “new philosophy of Government” along the lines of the definition we have just quoted, a philosophy involving a transformation of the norms governing public life and institutional quality. Moreover, by rejecting the meaning-other of “revolução” as “a shallow notion” *O Globo* implicitly linked it with depth, the valued term in the philosophical “shallow-deep” pair (PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, 1971).

¹⁹ *O Globo* always begins the word «Govêrno» (Government).

²⁰ INDURSKY (1997) refers to this type of negation as an external negation of another's discourse because it impacts on an enunciation from another discursive formation.

²¹ See INDURSKY (1997, p.218).

Later, *O Globo* distanced itself again from the (alleged) meaning of “revolução” as simply a new government while at the same time associating this meaning with *civilian* governments: “For them / civilians / revolution comes down to an exchange of men”²². In this way, *O Globo* implicitly identified with the meaning of “revolução” given to it by the military.

O Globo gave two more definitions of “revolução,” again containing denials that pointed to the symbolic struggle over the meaning of the word at the crossroads of the interdiscourse:

it is a march that began badly and that will manage to stay the distance if we make up our minds that it should proceed – and anyway a change of mind, a transformation dictated by deep conviction and not just for the sake of arts, skills and conveniences (“Let us not lose victory,” 4/9/64).

there will be no revolution, but the simple act of momentary salvation, if we care only for what is accessory, if we just stay on the surface of things, if we do not address the substance of the essential (“Let us not lose the victory,” 9/4/64).

In both definitions, note how the word “revolução” is re-defined as “change” and also as “transformation”, linked to the valued terms in the philosophical pairs of “shallow-deep,” “momentary-permanent”, “form- substance” and “appearance-essence” (see PERELMAN and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, 1971). In short, *O Globo* gave “revolução” the meaning of a something profound, permanent, substantial and essential.

In contrast, *Folha de S. Paulo* used the word “revolução” within a different discursive formation which gave it meanings different to those found in *O Globo*: “a revolution to restore legality”²³; “the replacement of Mr. João Goulart, the president of the Republic”²⁴; “the civilian leader of the revolution”²⁵; “a revolution to restore legality”, “a great victory, achieved with maximum dignity”²⁶; “the fruits of the revolution,” “the movement, political explorations of the revolution, the goals of the revolution, the armed movement”²⁷; “the movement that ousted [the president]”²⁸; “the

²² “A arte de vencer revoluções” (“The art of overcoming revolutions”), 4/10/64.

²³ “En defesa da ley” (“Defending the law”), 4/2/64.

²⁴ “Nostra opinião” (“Our opinion”), 4/3/64.

²⁵ “A Lição da crise” (“The lesson of the crisis”), 4-4-64.

²⁶ “Legalidade mesmo” (“Legality itself”), 4/5/64.

²⁷ Citations from “Magalães and Krueh,” 4/5/64.

victorious movement”²⁹; “the movement, whose first phase just ended,” “the change of government in Brazil,” “the movement against the president”³⁰; “the military and civilian leaders of the victorious revolution”, “the movement”, “the goals of the movement”³¹; “the ousting of the former president”³²; “the movement that ousted the former government”, “the political and military events of the last few days”, “the political-military movement”, “the revolution”³³; “the noble ideals of the revolution”, “the goals of the revolution”³⁴; the “movement that ousted the former government”³⁵; and “the victorious Revolution”³⁶.

Like *O Globo*, where the word “revolução” was either described as “democratic” or coupled with the word “democracy,” *Folha de S. Paulo* described it as a “a revolution to restore legality”. Implicit in this formulation was the idea that João Goulart’s government had *not* respected legality.

However, “revolução” was not related to the words “redenção” or “salvação” and did not strike up an interdiscursive relationship with the National Security Doctrine. It did not acquire the meaning of structural change but simply a change of government. Indeed, *Folha de S. Paulo* differed from *O Globo*’s use the word “revolução” as “changing the system” or “change in institutional quality” and related it instead to the “substitution,” “changing” or “ousting” of “Mr. João Goulart,” the “former president,” and his “former government”, and rewrote it as “the movement against the president”, that is, a meaning of “revolução” explicitly rejected by *O Globo* which - as we have already seen –stated: “A revolution is not simply a man or a minority overthrowing a government in order to take its place”.

Moreover, the word “revolução” was rewritten through descriptions giving it a political meaning (“the political explorations of the revolution”, “the political and military events of the past two days”, “the political –military movement”). This was another thing that distanced *Folha de S. Paulo* from *O Globo*, which – as already mentioned - rejected politicians.

²⁸ “Retroceder, não” (“Never retreat”), 4/5/64.

²⁹ Citations from “O presidente definitivo” (“The definitive president”), 4/6/64.

³⁰ “Semana política” (“Week in politics”), 4/6/64.

³¹ Citations from “Comunismo e corrupção” (“Communism and corruption”), 4/8/64.

³² “Amanhã” (“Tomorrow”), 4/8/64.

³³ “Confiança” (“Trust”), 4/8/64.

³⁴ “Volta à normalidade” (“Back to normal”), 4/9/64.

³⁵ “Volta à normalidade” (“Back to normal.”), 4/9/64.

³⁶ “A Revolução vitoriosa” (“The victorious Revolution”), 4/10/64.

How are we to interpret this pluriaccentuation - this constitutive heterogeneity of the word “revolução” - within the historical context of the military coup of 1964? To answer this question, we must remember that the instigators of the coup did not form a homogeneous block but were profoundly heterogeneous. Although linked to a whole spectrum of right-wing politics with a common interest in defeating the left in general and Goulart in particular (MCGEE DEUTSCH, 1999) the discursive formations disagreed over the type of regime or government that should follow. One predominant discursive formation in *O Globo*, thus corresponded to what Fausto and Devoto (2004, p. 401) call “the hard line” within the military, which considered it essential to establish an authoritarian regime for a long period in order to end the perceived threat of communism, corruption and social disorder.

Another discursive formation, present in *Folha de S. Paulo*, belonged to the so-called “*sorbonnards*,” to whom Fausto and Devoto (2004, p.400) attribute a liberal-conservative ideology. Defenders, in principle, of constitutional order, the “*sorbonnards*” were convinced that Goulart’s brand of radical populism was leading Brazil to a “labor union republic” as a first step to communism. They believed the purpose of the revolutionary movement should be to restore social order and democracy as soon as the country had been cleansed of corrupt politicians, populists and “dangerous” labor unionists. These differences became more evident with the promulgation of Institutional Act No. 1, which subordinated the Constitution to the will of the military (ALVES MOREIRA, 1989). Indeed, such a legal instrument, among other things, established the indirect election of the president, empowering the commanders in chief to suspend voting rights for a period of ten years and terminate federal state and city legislative mandates without the courts being able to question their decisions. While *O Globo* supported this measure and criticized those who opposed it: “Let not the exaggerated purists and foolish country lawyers come now to mourn the momentary suspension of this or that constitutional provision”³⁷, *Folha de S. Paulo* distanced itself from this measure, saying: “One cannot, however, hide the fact that this measure has made everybody very apprehensive”³⁸.

³⁷ “A revolução consolidada” (“The revolution consolidated”), 4/10/64.

³⁸ “O Ato institucional” (“The Institutional Act”), 4/10/64.

4 Interdiscursivity in the Argentine media supporting the 1966 coup

Like Institutional Act No. 1, the so-called *Statute of the Argentine Revolution* sanctioned by Argentina's Armed Forces, subordinated the Constitution to the will of the military, who became the "constituent power" (QUIROGA LAVIÉ, 1987). Just as in Brazil, an interplay can be seen in the print media between two discursive formations that used the word "revolución" with different meanings. In both cases, these meanings are similar to those acquired in Brazil by the word "revolução".

The magazine *Primera Plana* defined the word "revolución" as follows:

The events of September 6, 1930 and June 4, 1943 were typical *coups d'état*, with a change of rulers and a preservation of institutional structures [...] Compared with this institutional history, the events of June 27 are, strictly speaking, a *revolution*: changing rulers and replacing the 'forward-looking' institutional structure for one which was radically new and imaginative and which did not exist until the day of the revolution ("Definitions," 07.05.66).

Using a metadiscursive gloss (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 1998), the Argentine magazine "broadly" separated the term "revolution" into two meanings, one broad and the other narrow, just as *O Globo* had done to establish two different meanings - one technical and the other non-technical - for the word "revolução". Just as *O Globo* had defined "revolução" as "changing a system, *Primera Plana* defined the word "revolución" as the replacement of the "forward-looking" institutional structure with a radically new one³⁹. Moreover, it is clear that *Primera Plana* coincided with *O Globo* that the word "revolución" should function as an antonym for "coup".

Another Argentine magazine, *Azul y Blanco (Blue and White)* rewrote the word "revolución", describing it as "the act of the revolution", "a revolutionary act" and speaking of "its constituent power"⁴⁰. Constituent power, in particular, emphasized the founding of a new order. Similarly, another magazine, *Confirmado*, rewrote "revolución" as "the mission of creating a new state where the core values in the

³⁹ A different shade of meaning is found in *O Globo* because "revolução" is a "restauração," giving a temporal orientation to the past. This recurred when *O Globo* rewrote "revolução" as "the opposite of revolução" in the sense of a counterrevolution.

⁴⁰ Citations from, "Sin una clara formulación revolucionaria desaparecería la legitimidad de la revolución" ("Without a clear revolutionary statement the legitimacy of the revolution would disappear), 7/14/66.

proclamations find their means of realization”⁴¹. This reiterated the idea of creating a new institutional order, specifically a new State.

Meanwhile, *Extra* magazine rewrote the word “revolution” as “a REVOLUTION-REVOLUTION” as opposed to “a COUP- REVOLUTION”⁴², picking up on the antonymic relationship between “revolution” and “coup,” which first appeared in *O Globo*⁴³. However, it is remarkable that *La Nación* newspaper always rewrote the word “revolution” with descriptions that gave it to mean the overthrow of a government or a change of rulers, but never, as in other media, the replacing one institutional regime by another: “the overthrow of the elected government in 1963”⁴⁴, “this transfer of authority”⁴⁵, “the overthrow of the authorities”⁴⁶ “overthrow”, “the revolutionary movement”⁴⁷; and “the collapse of the until recently governing party”⁴⁸. As we have already seen, this meaning appeared in *Folha de S. Paulo* but was explicitly rejected by *O Globo*.

Moreover, it is worth noting that, contrary what happened in *Extra* and *O Globo*, another Argentine magazine, *Análisis*, used the word “revolución” as a synonym for “coup”. Indeed, it rewrote “revolution” as “the coup”⁴⁹; “the recent military coup”⁵⁰; “the military coup”⁵¹; “the June 28 revolution”⁵²; and “the Argentine revolution”⁵³.

In Argentina, dialogism and the heterogeneous meanings of “revolución” in the press were also linked to discursive formations inherent in various sectors of the coup coalition. As Guillermo O’Donnell (1973) explains, General Juan Carlos Onganía and his followers in the military constituted a corporate - or paternalistic - sector aiming to establish a strong, hierarchical and efficient society that would integrate society

⁴¹ “Análisis de la Revolución Argentina” (“Analysis of the Argentine Revolution), 7/14/66.

⁴² “Cuidemos a Onganía” (“Let’s take care of Onganía”), August 1966.

⁴³ This use of capital letters is comparable to the use of quotes to express emphasis and points to an ‘other’ because it is as if the writer is saying, “this is the word I want to use and not another”. At the same time, this use of capital letters differs from ordinary quotes because it does not distance the writer from the words quoted (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 1981)

⁴⁴ Editorial of 6/29/66.

⁴⁵ Editorial of 6/29/66.

⁴⁶ “Entre la fe y la preocupación” (“Between faith and concern”), 7/3/66.

⁴⁷ Editorial of 7/7/66.

⁴⁸ Editorial of 7/9/66.

⁴⁹ “Las incógnitas de la hora cero” (“The zero hour unknowns”), 7/4/66.

⁵⁰ “Cinco revoluciones en 35 años” (“Five revolutions in 35 years”), 7/4/66.

⁵¹ “Cinco revoluciones en 35 años” (“Five revolutions in 35 years”), 7/4/66.

⁵² “El cambio y la libertad” (“Change and freedom”), 7/18/66..

⁵³ “Cambio de clima, de la expectativa a la incertidumbre” (“A change of climate, from expectation to uncertainty”), 7/26/66.

organically through boards and commissions and allow the various sectors to contribute harmoniously to the common good. But although upper class liberals and the more modern and dynamic sectors of Argentine society agreed with the military on the need to order society and depoliticize the more “belligerent” classes of society, they rejected the paternalistic proposal to encapsulate society within a corporative system supposedly resulting in class harmony. On the other hand, if the corporatists defended reasonable levels of wages and a policy of redistribution, the Liberals were prepared to accept a strong state apparatus -but only if it would guarantee and promote the accumulation of capital.

Liliana de Riz (2000, p.15) points out that the labor movement saw a path to power in the military coup. The labor leader, Augusto Vandor, supported the coup in order to free himself from the control of the exiled Juan Domingo Peron. Riz agrees with Catalina Smulovitz’s (1993) interpretation that, in 1966, a sector of the Argentine military perceived that a corporate system would solve the problem of Peronism - banned from participating in elections since the 1955 coup that overthrew Perón⁵⁴ - by integrating Peronism into institutional life through its labor union branch. Indeed, both Vandor’s defiance of Perón and the institutionalization of Peronism through the labor unions helped to neutralize the power that Perón still wielded in Argentina.

Thus, liberals who rejected a corporative system in 1966 and called for a limited representative democracy to exclude the Peronist movement produced a discursive formation in which the word “revolution” meant a change of rulers and was a synonym for “coup”. However, those who promoted a corporative regime created a discursive formation in which the word “revolution” signified institutional change and was an antonym of “coup.”

As mentioned earlier, the discursive formation found in *Folha de S. Paulo* distanced itself from Institutional Act No. 1, which was supported by the dominant discursive formation in *O Globo*. In Argentina, the discursive formation linked to liberals supporting the coup also distanced itself from certain actions implemented by the military government. For example, *La Nación* expressed “concern”, “anxiety”, “unease”⁵⁵ and “uncertainty”⁵⁶ about General Onganía’s corporatist project. Regarding,

⁵⁴ After the military coup of September 16, 1955 that overthrew Juan Domingo Peron, Peronist candidates could not stand for election until 1973.

⁵⁵ Citations from *La Nación*, editorial of 7/12/66.

among other measures, the “dissolution” of political parties, *La Nación* expressed the hope that this would be just a temporary “hibernation” and considered that political parties “should be the normal organs of every democratic task”⁵⁷.

In conclusion

Our analysis of the meanings acquired by the words “revolução” and “revolución” in the context of the coups d’état in Brazil and Argentina, in 1964 and 1966 respectively, shows that these meanings had a significant interdiscursive relationship. We have shown there was a semantic relationship between the sense acquired by the word “revolução” in *O Globo* and that of “revolución” in *Primera Plana*, *Azul y Blanco*, *Confirmado* and *Extra*, on the one hand, and that acquired by the word “revolução” in *Folha de S. Paulo* with that of “revolución” in *La Nación* and *Análisis*, on the other hand.

In the interdiscursive network these words were steeped in a dialogism and a constitutive heterogeneity resulting from a history of South American militarism, in which the press operated mostly as an ally. Discursive formations inherent to various sectors of coalitions involved in the two coups clashed over the meaning of “revolução” and “revolución,” establishing different meanings for those words, including semantic relations of synonymy or antonymy with “coup.” Thus, the coup was not a homogeneous block. These discursive formations, although aligned against what they perceived as creeping communism in Brazil and Argentina, were divided as to the political projects the military governments should pursue after the coups. For this reason, these discursive formations were not divided from each other by clearly delimited boundaries. On the contrary, their relationship was one of tense and volatile alliance and contradiction.

For Bakhtin (1986) every utterance is a link in an organized, highly complex chain of utterances. This can be seen in the discourses of the pro-coup sectors in Brazil and Argentina and the meaning they gave to the words “revolução” and “revolución”.

⁵⁶ “Caleidoscopio político” (“Political kaleidoscope”), 7/7/66.

⁵⁷ “Caleidoscopio político” (“Political kaleidoscope”), 7/9/66. For a more detailed analysis of the confrontation between the print media linked to a liberal and those linked to nationalist anti-liberal coup that promoted corporatism, see Vitale (2006).

We hope that the links between Bakhtin, Pêcheux and Authier-Revuz that guided this analysis of constitutive heterogeneity in Brazil and Argentina's recent past will encourage other discourse analysts to take a closer, comparative look at the question of "the same and the other" or "the other in the one" in Brazilian and Argentine discursiveness, in order to help integrate these discourses into the present moment.

REFERENCES

AUTHIER-REVUZ, J. Paroles tenues à distance. In: Conein et al. (eds). *Matérialités discursives*. Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille, 1981, p.127-142.

_____. Hétérogénéité montrée et hétérogénéité constitutive: éléments pour une approche de l'autre dans le discours, *DRAVL* n. 26, p. 91-151, 1982.

_____. Hétérogénéité(s) énonciative(s), *Langages* n. 73, mars, p.98-111, 1984.

_____. *Ces mots qui ne vont pas de soi*. Boucles réflexives et non-coïncidences du dire. Paris: Larousse, 1995, v. I.

BAKHTIN, M. M. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. H. Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

BAKHTIN, M. M. The problem of Speech Genres. In: *Speech Genres and the Late Essays*. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986, p.60-102.

BARONAS, R. L. and F. KOMESU (orgs.) Prefácio. *Homenagem a Michel Pêcheux*. 25 anos de presença na análise do discurso. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 2008, p. 7-20.

BRAIT, B. Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski e estudos da linguagem. In: BRAIT, B. (org.) *Bakhtin, dialogismo e polifonia*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2009, p.45-72.

DE REZENDE, M. J. *A ditadura militar no Brasil*. Repressão e pretensão de legitimidade 1964-1984. Londrina: UEL, 2001.

DE RIZ, L. *Historia Argentina*. La política in suspenso 1966/1976. Buenos Aires: Paídos, 2010.

DIAS, L. F. *Os sentidos do idioma nacional*. Campinas: Pontes, 1994.

FAUSTO, B. and F. DEVOTO. *Brasil e Argentina*. Um ensaio de história comparada (1950-2002). São Paulo: Editora 34, 2004.

FIORIN, J. L. *O regime de 1964: discurso e ideologia*. São Paulo: Atual, 1988.

GARCÍA, A. *La doctrina de la Seguridad Nacional/II*. Bs. As.: CEAL, 1991.

GREGOLIN, M. Bakhtin, Foucault, Pêcheux. In: BRAIT, B. (org.) *Bakhtin: outros conceitos-chave*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2010, p.33-52.

_____. Formação discursiva, mídia e identidades In INDURSKY, F. and LEANDRO FERREIRA, M. C. (orgs.). *Análise do discurso no Brasil, mapeando conceitos, confrontando limites*. São Carlos: Claraluz, p.173-186.

GUILHAUMOU, J. Considerações sobre a análise do discurso: um trajeto crítico em torno de Michel Pêcheux ao final dos anos 1970. In: BARONAS, L. R. and KOMESU, F. (orgs.). *Homenagem a Michel Pêcheux*. 25 anos de presença na análise do discurso. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 2008, p.55-78.

GUIMARÃES, E. *Análise de texto*. Procedimentos, Análises, Ensino. Campinas: Editora RG, 2011.

_____. Domínio semântico de determinação, In: GUIMARÃES, E. and MOLLICA, M. C. (Orgs.). *A palavra. Forma e sentido*. Campinas: Pontes, 2007, p.77-96.

_____. *Semântica do acontecimento*. Um estudo enunciativo da designação. Campinas: Pontes, 2002.

HERMAN, T. and N. J. JUFER. L'éditorial, 'vitrine idéologique du journal'?, *Semen*, 13, p.135-162, 2001.

INDURSKY, F. *A fala dos quartéis e as outras vozes*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, 1997.

MCGEE DEUTSCH, S. *Las derechas. The extreme right in Argentina, Brazil and Chile, 1890-1939*. Standford: Standford University Press, 1999.

MALDIDIER, D. *A inquietação do discurso*. (Re)ler Michel Pêcheux hoje. Translated by Eni P. Orlandi. Campinas: Pontes, 2003.

MOREIRA ALVEZ, M. H. *Estado e oposição no Brasil (1964-1984)*. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes/UNICAMP, 1989.

O' DONNELL, G. *Modernization and Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism: Studies in South American Politics*. Institute of International Studies. California: University of California, 1973.

PÊCHEUX, M. *Hacia el análisis automático del discurso*. Madrid: Gredos, 1978. Translated by Manuel Alvar Ezquerro. [1969]

_____. Remontemos de Foucault a Spinoza. In: MALDIDIER, D. *A inquietação do discurso*. (Re)ler Michel Pêcheux hoje. Campinas: Pontes, 2003. Translated by Eni P. Orlandi.

_____. *Semântica e discurso*. Uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio. Campinas: Pontes, 1988. Translated by Eni Pulcinelli Orlandi, Lourenço Chacon Jurado Filho, Manoel Luiz Gonçalves Corrêa and Silvana Mabel Serrani. [1975]

_____. *O discurso. Estrutura ou acontecimento*. Translated by Eni P. Orlandi. Campinas, Pontes, 1990.

PERELMAN, C. and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, L. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Translated by John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1971. [1958]

QUIROGA LAVIÉ, H. *Derecho constitucional*. Buenos Aires: Argentina. De Palma, 1987.

SMULOVITZ, C. La eficacia como crítica and utopía. Notas sobre la caída de Illia, *Desarrollo Económico*, vol.13, N°131, 1993, p.403-423.

VITALE, M. A. *Prensa escrita y autoritarismo*. Las memorias retórico-argumentales de los discursos golpistas in la Argentina (1930-1976). Unpublished doctoral thesis, Faculty of Arts, University of Buenos Aires. 2006. Ch. 5, p. 356-458.

VOLOŠINOV, V. N. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. TITUNIK. New York and London: Seminar Press, 1973.

Translated by Douglas Andrew Town – douglasandrewtown@yahoo.es

Received March 04, 2013

Accepted June 12, 2013