

Praxis, memory and cognition in Journalism

Contributions to the periodization of Journalistic Knowledge in Brazil

JOSÉ MARQUES DE MELO

Abstract

The aim of this article is to rescue the seminal event of the Brazilian Journalistic Research. By reviewing authorship, thesis and arguments of the study written by Fernandes Pinheiro (1859) it also explains the role played by the main research agents. Another focus is the social impact caused by the historical recognition of Dutch colonizers as early introducers of typography in Brazil.

Keywords

Communication Sciences, Media Scholarship, Journalism, Research, History, Brazil

*Sometimes a person,
simple fact, an event,
embodies a period within itself.
José Rodrigues Honório*

Related chronology

Kunczik (1997) recognizes the twentieth century as a time frame of academic autonomy in the field of Journalism media. Overcoming ideological preconceptions, resisting to geopolitical idiosyncrasies and facing epistemological hegemonies, the author uses the argument of authority to suggest Max Weber (1924) and Walter Lippmann (1922) as guarantors of this international consensus.

The watershed is its professionalization, meaning, the no longer amateur exercise of news information activity, legitimizing itself as an occupation ethically governed professional corporations and technically standardized by culture industry.

These factors foster cognitive demands that give impulse to the creation of universities, because elucidative forays that were taking place other intellectual spaces and in other scientific disciplines were proved to be insufficient in meeting their specific requirements.

Until then, the stored knowledge about journalistic phenomena was the result of episodic and patchy observation, or of immediate and often passionate reflection, as well as of and the narratives of emblematic cases or customized reports.

1 Professor at the Escola de Comunicação e Artes of Universidade de São Paulo. Director of UNESCO Chair of Communication of Universidade Metodista de São Paulo. President of Federação Brasileira de Associações Científicas e Acadêmicas de Comunicação.

This is clearly a useful "knowledge", however, not "cumulative", explaining the emergence of "new types of knowledge" (Burke, 2003: 20).

Thus, the rescue of journalistic practice ceases to belong solely to the residual space and the informal "memory", entering the territory of systematic, rigorous and controlled "cognition".

Methodological assumptions

Brazil is no exception in the global panorama in the media research (Marques de Melo, 2003c). Although catalyzing the attention of Brazilian scholars since the nineteenth century, journalism only became a field of knowledge in the twentieth century (Marques de Melo, 2006: 15-36; Pena, 2008: 226; Machado da Silva, 2008: 91).

However, it remains unclear when the interest of analysts by the phenomenon ceases to be informal, speculative or isolated, creating data, building memory or nurturing schools of thought. It also remains unclear the time when the study sets a collective and objective activity (Duverger: 1962: 36), producing knowledge from praxis.

In the process of institutionalization, journalism is at first a problem that provokes observation or controversy and becomes the object of reflection and debate, which is soon recognized as an academic discipline to form productive agents, until a scientific community dedicated to its cognition is structured. Thus, it aims to encourage ongoing criticism of existing routines in the production system, having influence upon update, activating or reinvention of praxis.

The challenge of filling this historiographic gap makes timely the rescue of an event (Burke, 1997: 328) whose 150th anniversary is celebrated in 2009, trying to understand it as a "milestone" (Duverger, 1962: 43) of theory and research of Journalism in Brazil (Marques de Melo, 2006). Naturally, a proper understanding of this event requires the review of its itinerary. But first of all, it is prudent to locate this process of knowledge in time and space (research) to better define when the field itself (journalism) takes form.

Cognitive beacons

The authors differ about the genesis of our journalism. There are those who favor the *operation of the press* as a reference landmark (Bahia, 1964; Sodré, 1966; Barbosa, 2008). There are also those who establish the *freedom of the press* as a crucial element (Viana, 1945; Rizzini, 1946 and 1957, Morel & Barros, 2003). But there are still the ones who prefer to consider the *circulation of news* as triggering fact to the social phenomenon (Beltrão, 1960; Ipanema, 1967; Hohlfeldt & Strelow, 2008).

Morel & Barros (2003), after critically reviewing the literature about the “emergence of the press in Brazil in the nineteenth century”, concluded that Brazilian society entered the age of journalism since the circulation of European newspapers, brought here in ships, with the proper authorization of authorities. For reading and reflection of our educated elite “... newspapers were produced in Europe and regularly brought to Brazil at least since the eighteenth century.”(Morel & Barros, 2003: 17)

However, the Brazilian journalistic praxis only starts to emerge when the *public opinion* introduced itself in our society, which means, when the "public space" here germinates and flowers, allowing the formation of a "public opinion" independent from the government. "... although the press disseminated information, opinions and ideas, it did not practice debate nor political divergence publicly, in the context of Portuguese Absolutism (though illustrated). "(Morel & Barros, 2003: 17)

Therefore, the above authors emphasize that the "first generation of Brazilian journalists" (p. 16) is the "image of the public man, which was until that moment inexistent in Portuguese America" (p. 15), but not yet as a "professional category"(p. 49).

This category was only structured in the turn of the century, exactly when the press acquired industrial feature (Sodré. 1966: 175). However, the journalistic praxis acquires density in the middle of the nineteenth century (Barbosa, 2000: 63), when the system of press freedom becomes effective and interferes in the formation of different tendencies of public opinion.

It is precisely in this moment when the intellectual elite starts to show interest in having further knowledge about the history of journalism in national society, enabling the beginning of research in the field. Originally done with a diachronic approach, its first representatives are historian-journalists who regularly transited between history institutes (where they are academically legitimized) and newspaper editorials (which have public recognition).

Characterized by the autonomy of the object, such context sets a sort of ad hoc research, synchronously focusing on the vehicle of diffusion, without examining the process embedded in it.

Periodization of the process

Leaving aside the comments and thoughts on journalism that were made in the heat of the moment by our paradigmatic journalists such as Hipólito da Costa, Evaristo da Veiga and Frei Caneca, the oldest incursion that we know of in this field was undertaken by Francisco Souza Martins² (1846), who published the curious article "Progress of

2 Born in Oeiras, in the state of Piauí, Souza Martins studied Law at the Faculdade do Recife, worked in the legal system and later made career in politics, as state representative and province governor. Accepted by the IHGB in 1939, he published only two works,

journalism in Brazil." Hosted by the prestigious Journal of IHGB (Vol. 8, 1846: 262-275), this is an assessment of Brazilian press, which praises the modernity of the graphic infrastructure installed in the country, besides comparing newspapers circulation across the country with data that were relevant to other countries.

The size of the magnifying glass through which the author sees the increase in the number of readers of national newspapers is amazing. Initially small during the time of our political independence, it increased in the course of time. The author says that a quarter of a century later (1822-1846), a total of "86 newspapers were published throughout the empire." By comparison, he explains that this amount "does not show the disproportion related to those published in France", a country whose total population is "eight times bigger than ours." The circulation of typography was estimated at more than "eight million sheets," which encourages the historian to ask: "if perhaps the diffusion of public education will more favored in the future (...) we might be able to expect that in twenty years from now we can stand side by side with more civilized nations of the old continent?"³

In spite of being well illustrated with quantitative data, Souza Martins' text had problems related to credibility, due to its speculative over optimistic attitude as well as its withholding of documentary sources. This may explain the silence around his thesis, as well as the gap of more than ten years between the text and the publication of the seminal study of our research in journalism. As shown below, the text written by Fernandes Pinheiro in 1859, adopts a moderate and sober style, making arguments in accordance with the peculiar standards of the academic ritual of his time. Such features, made the text to be considered a landmark of journalism research in Brazil.

At that time, the research in journalism sees the press as a puzzle to be solved in the heart of society. Considered a "problem", it strengthened the demand for convincing answers capable of eliminating perception-related doubts and overcoming cognitive impasses. For example, the controversy of its introduction in the national territory, which was an episode that polarized the hearts and minds of Brazilians, especially in Rio de Janeiro and Pernambuco (Moreira de Azevedo, 1865; Nascimento Feitosa, 1867; Duarte Pereira, 1883; Pereira da Costa, 1891; of Alfredo Carvalho, 1899). Its culmination occurred in 1922, when Max Fleuiss publishes the first inventory of accumulated knowledge about the press in the country.

Later, journalism is no longer studied from a technological support - the press - and starts to be understood as a socio-political-economical process. It is symptomatic that its architect, Barbosa Lima Sobrinho, makes the interpretation of the transformation of journalism into a market-oriented activity, but he does not refer nominally to the phenomenon and his book is entitled: *The problem of the press* (1923).

Actually, the young journalist with plenty of talent for researcher seeks to unravel the

one of them is the controversial article of 1846.

³ Unfortunately, his prophecy was not confirmed, reinforcing the non-scientific nature of the article that was based more on his will than in reality. One only has to check the index of current readings in our country to see how optimistic the author was.

nature of journalism as a good. It points out the end of a politically engaged and “homemade” journalism. It is an analysis that reveals the information process, including variables that go beyond the historiographic domain hitherto hegemonic (Marques de Melo, 2008c: 301).

This cycle ends with the publication of the collection of studies about our press in the nineteenth century, by Hélio Viana (1945), and the classic treaty on the evolution of printing books and newspapers in Europe and in Brazil, in which Rizzini (1946) catches a glimpse of embryonic manifestations of journalism in Brazilian society.

If initially journalism was the background to the scene, it dominates the focus on the narrative in this second phase, significantly leading itself to being in the spotlight. Legitimized as a cognitive process, its passage to the third phase was a natural and it became a field of university studies.

The foundation of journalism courses at the university level in São Paulo (1947) and Rio de Janeiro (1948) would be a decisive factor for the growth of national research, initially supported by universities and more recently funded by official agencies that promote scientific research (Hohlfeldt & Strelow, 2008). The new field of research reached its climax when its identity became recognized by scientific societies of the large field of Social Communication (Marques de Melo, 2008b), precisely when journalism study groups are created at Intercom (1993) and COMPÓS (2000).

We are currently experiencing the fourth phase of our historic path in which journalism is structured as national academic community. Since the foundation of SBPJor (2003), we have sought to establish ourselves with the international academic community, and stimulate the critical inventory of our history. This may contribute for a better guidance of new tendencies in the research that will be carried out by this generation that will mature in the 21st century.

Considering the data collected and observations made in the documents, we propose the following periodization to schematize the history of the knowledge of Brazilian journalism:

a) Period of Establishment

Phase 1 - Journalism as a theme of reflection - 1808-1858 (Thought)

Phase 2 - Journalism as a topic of observation - 1859-1922 (Memory)

Phase 3 – Journalism as an object of cognition - 1923-1946 (Research)

b) Period of Institutionalization

Phase 4 - Journalism as an academic field - 1947-1992 (Discipline)

Phase 5 - Journalism as an invisible college - 1993 - (Community)

This article aims to take a step forward in the process of institutionalization by examining the genesis of the research in journalism, so as to situate new researchers in the early days of our field. This is, in fact, to fill a gap that is present the origins of periodization proposed in previous studies (Marques de Melo, 1972, 1983, 2006) and to some extent recaptured in more recent studies (Pena, 2005, Machado da Silva, 2008; Hohlfeldt & Strelow, 2008).

Reference Framework

The thesis to be demonstrated says that the legal framework of the beginning of Brazilian research in Journalism was the publication of the article “*A imprensa no Brasil*” (The Press in Brazil), in November 20th, 1859, in Rio de Janeiro. It was written by the historian Fernandes Pinheiro and published in the magazine *Revista Popular*, vol. 1, n. 4, p. 217-224.

This document represents the seed for the establishment of the academic field of journalism. It is natural that the tree, irrigated and cultivated, would only bear fruits in the twentieth century.

It is an event that curiously embeds a historical contradiction, since the late birth of Brazilian press contrasts with the precociousness of reflection about the peculiar nature of journalism.

Instead of inhibiting the pioneers of our journalistic activity, the lack of typographies in the national territory for three centuries (Marques de Melo, 2003), will increase their reflective interest. The exercise of critical thinking towards the occupation, by actors of the field such as Hipólito da Costa or Evaristo da Veiga, reflected the eager search for alternatives to compensate intellectual deprivation. (Marques de Melo, 2007: 15-40). Moreover, the historical situation by itself justifies the behavior of "precursors" of Brazilian journalistic thinking. It is characterized by the consolidation of the doctrine of freedom of the press, a fact that was triggered by the bourgeois revolutions at the end of the eighteenth century.

We reiterate that, although Hipólito da Costa anticipated by diffused nation-wide the European journalistic way of thinking, one cannot consider this activity as a journalistic research. It triggers a critical reflection on the phenomenon, but does not set a process of systematic observation, nor the accumulation of knowledge about the praxis of the press.

The regular study of such processes would only a fertile environment and the appropriate condition to be successful outside the productive system.

In Europe, its preferential locus was university, as occurred in Germany with the seminal research of Tobias Peucer, in 1690, defended at the University of Leipzig. (Marques de Melo, 2008B, 9)

In Brazil, ecclesiastic seminars and history institutes provided appropriate space for such intellectual exercises, as it will take place with by Frei Caneca whose *Tratado de Eloquência* (Eloquence Treaty), including the *Tábuas sinóticas do sistema retórico de Fábio Quintiliano* (Synoptic of Fábio Quintiliano's Rhetorical system), in 1821, are pioneers in the research on communication and were presented in the Olinda Seminar. (Marques de Melo, 2007: 15-40)

Although coming from the religious environment, Fernandes Pinheiro's intellectual activity actually develops itself in a secular space, at the school Colégio Imperial Pedro II, where he continues in 1857, to study the rhetorics of Quintiliano / Caneca, publishing his *Postilas de Retórica e Poética* (1872) . Before that, he had an emblematic opportunity, in the erudite environment of the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute, to which he is admitted in 1854. (Ribeiro, 1958: 116-125).

His first contribution to the field of communication was presented there in the form of an essay entitled "Brief reflections about the religious instructions practiced by the Jesuits in Brazil" IHGB Magazine, Volume XIX, 1856, p. 379-397). In this text, he analyses the education strategies of communication used to persuade the Indians to adopt the standards of Christian civilization.

However, the important role Fernandes Pinheiro played in the field of journalism would only be confirmed three years later. Despite being an isolated intervention among his historiographic activities, it becomes important due to the controversy it ended up causing. It triggers a rich amount of document studies, responsible for the removal of communication from the list of nostalgic memoirist, speculative essay or celebration notes. By generating trustworthy reports that didn't need to be proved by third parties, it will project it with the use of systematic observation of evidences provided by primary sources.

The controversial precursor

But who is the author? What is his intellectual path? Why does he strain credibility?

Joaquim Caetano Fernandes Pinheiro⁴ was born in Rio de Janeiro in 1825. He had his religious education in St. Joseph Seminary, in Rio de Janeiro, and finished his theology studies in Rome. After passing the exam, he was granted the chair of the Department of Rhetoric of the Colégio Imperial de Petrópolis. Hired by the Brazilian Historical and

⁴ His biographic profile was published in the opening note of the dossier "Centenary of Fernandes Pinheiro", published by the Magazine of IHGB, vol. 240, 1958

Geographical Institute in 1854, he was immediately nominated director, position in which he developed a "laborious and fruitful" work until his death in 1876.

He also worked in the field of journalism and became one of the main authors of the "rhetorical essay." He published a vast number of books, being one of the pioneers in the production of school books that were the base to the intellectual preparation of several generations.

Roberto Acízelo de Souza (1973: 73) says that Fernandes Pinheiro is "a successful man of letters": he published several historical and literary studies, and several school textbooks." He benefited from the "recognition" of Emperor Pedro II, he became the "official historian" and named "the most important chronicler of the empire ..."

According to Joaquim Ribeiro (1958: 115), its main merit was to be "an anticipator on various aspects of our retrospective lives."

Since he was a man of great erudition, he only dedicated himself to the study of obscure and misunderstood aspects of our history. (...) There is no doubt that he opened ways for future historians. (...) Discussing partial themes of our past, (...) he has become, by virtue of his accomplishments, one of the fundamental sources for our specialized historiography (p. 100-101)

This argument is endorsed by Werneck Sodré (1964, p. 326-327):

And was not uninteresting literature, at the time, that it no longer deserved the exercise of criticism, of historical and biographical reconstitutions ... (...) In this sense, it is not possible to demerit the work of Fernandes Pinheiro ... (...) It is worthy of attention, however, the task of those who gathered data, organized the subject, established parallels, distinguished influences - everything within a natural deficiency that led them to partiality. (...) (...) These works (...) are clear indications of a literary development that required great effort from its rare writers.

But the real truth is that, despite this projection (or because of it), the work of Fernandes Pinheiro has been relegated to oblivion. Criticized or rejected by intellectuals such as Silvio Romero, Alfredo de Carvalho, Otto Maria Carpeaux, it is being recognized or praised by other prestigious writers such as Barbosa Lima Sobrinho, Américo Jacobina Lacombe, Wilson Martins and Nelson Werneck Sodré.

It is still lamentable the attitude of writers who have benefited from his work, but who plundered it or obscured it ruthlessly. Joaquim Ribeiro believes that it is an inevitable "misfortune". "Like any precursor, one cannot escape the fate of being forgotten exactly when one should be remembered." (p. 115).

Rhetorical arguments

Fernandes Pinheiro's thesis was presented to the national intellectual elite, by the magazine *Revista Popular* in an emblematic article. Its structure clearly reflects the author's familiarity with the classical rhetoric (Caneca, 1875: 61-161). It contains four very well defined parts: exordium, narration, confirmation, and peroration.

Exordium

By opening the text so smoothly, the author wants to win the benevolence of the reader to a controversial thesis.

It recognizes the importance of typographic art to the development of society, but warns about the difficulties brought by the agents of power. "Today, no one knows the importance of typographic art... (...) There are many studies about its origins (...) and embarrassment that it had to fight, caused by obscurantism ... (...)" (P. 217).

Then, he prepares the mind of the reader for the enunciation of the hypothesis. He focuses on the obscurantist strategy used by the Portuguese regarding the American colony, reflected on the elimination of the press and other cultural apparatuses.

It seems now common place among Brazilian writers constant complaints about the state of abandonment in which we were left by the metropolis whose ruthless policy advised that we remained covered in the darkness of ignorance, applying to us the evil system which Juliano used with the nazareans. (p. 218)

But it also highlights the contrast between this retrograde policy and progressive guidelines that previously existed in the heart of the empire. "Portugal was one of the nations of Europe that first received typographic art, starting in the years 1464 and 1465, (...) before France, England and Spain profited from this useful invention." (P. 218)

He does not forget that, after having committed the error of expulsing Jewish printers in 1497, D. Manuel redeemed himself by attracting Christian printers. He extended took the benefits of the press to the entire kingdom, including "remote regions". "The Jesuits will take typographic art to the most distant areas of the globe (...) printing their books of devotion, covered with the competent licenses of Portuguese." (p. 219).

But Brazil, which was part of the Lusitanian orbit in the beginning of the sixteenth century, no longer enjoyed such privilege. A change in policy took place in the Kingdom, after the disaster of Alcácer-Kibir, where D. Sebastião dies.

... Portugal lost its hopes of keeping its Asian empire ...(...) and (...) looked to Brazil as the last anchor of salvation that was left to it, trying to hold to it by all means, with selfishness and monopoly. (p. 219)

Narration

After reviewing the chronological time line, designed to situate less informed readers in the heart of the historical situation, Fernandes Pinheiro is ready to answer the key question: How and when the press was introduced in Brazil?

To achieve the outlined purpose, the author uses the method of "restricted narration" by listing the facts and its circumstances.

It shows initially that Brazil was formed as a caricatured appendix of the Portuguese metropolis in a repressive environment, without freedom, without prospect of development, therefore, without the press.

Despots have an admirable astuteness (...) to predict in the near future the political emancipation of this great country. (...) Knowing from experience how could the press, despite being gagged by censorship, was able to still hurt them ... (p. 219)

He then explains how this panorama changes completely when the Dutch seize a vast part of our territory in the seventeenth century, adopting a policy an encouraging and progressive policy. "But then the Dutch occupation came to frustrate the plan conceived in obscurantism and to light among us a source of light ..." (p. 219)

He praises the author of this historic breakthrough, giving Nassau credit for the introduction of the press in Brazil. "Not a single Brazilian (...) is unaware of the administrative sagacity and tact with which ruled the count (...) Maurício de Nassau. Our homeland owes this gentleman the introduction of the press." (P. 219)

This is of course a brief narration, sufficiently clear and as real as possible.

To prove his assertion and convince the reader to assimilate it, Fernandes Pinheiros uses an astute strategy.

He is fundamentally supported by the argument of authority. He quotes authors nationally and internationally renowned who defended the primacy of the methods used by the Batavia colonization under the aegis of Nassau.

The chroniclers and historians agree in admitting that major improvements throughout the government were made in Pernambuco. (...) Mr. Varnhagen, whose wide authority we like to quote (...) always praises him for his sincere love for the letters ... (...) Refere Barleus and Netscher that founded libraries and museums. (p. 220)

But the author is cautiously shrewd when tackling the introduction of the press. He recognizes that Varnhagen, the most authorized source, did not include the press

"among the benefits of Nassau's wise administration." In contrast, he endorses Carlos de Laet's assumption about its existence.

Laet makes us believe that some newspaper was published, when he talks about intrigues and calumnies that were published in press by the enemies of the Count, who was forced to repress them, imposing silence on their infamous detractors. However, Nassau could not do so if these writings were published in Holland, where there was no domain, the place that profited from the most complete freedom of press (...) it is clear that they were printed in Pernambuco (p. 220)

Aware that this argument was inevitably ambiguous, the author presents a "proof", a document which confirmed the operation of the press in Dutch Brazil. It is the booklet *Brasilsche Gelt-Sack*, which had in the masthead its printing in the city of Recife. This document was part of the collection of the Fluminense Library, where it was examined by Fernandes Pinheiros.

Supported by this historiographic trick, the author does not hesitate to conclude emphatically:

It is therefore clear that the Dutch introduced the press in our northern provinces, since we are unable to accurately know the exact time when such a great success took place: but believing it took place between the years 1637 and 1638, which means, during the first period of the government of Nassau, finishing the work of repairing the evils inherent in the conquering process ... (p. 221)

Peroration

Fernandes Pinheiro closes his article proclaiming the interruption of printing activities in Brazil, with the withdrawal of the Dutch. "When the Dutch were expelled, (...) the press disappeared among us ..." (p. 221)

In his conclusion he reiterates the thesis of obscurantism practiced by the Portuguese colonial government. "... the press (...) was not convenient to the plans (...) of the metropolis and it went back to them with remarkable ingratitude. (...) One century passed before our homeland saw a printing shop"

Concluding its contribution to the history of media in Brazil, the author evaluates the development of typography, during and after the era of D. João VI, as well as the dawn of the periodical press, in the post-independence phase.

Strength was to expected for better days to come in the Brazilian horizon, to cease at once the mistrustful fear nurtured by Portugal against the moral development of its American colony. (...) The arrival of King John VI is the landmark of the real era of our political emancipation. (...) From the lethargy in which laid the public spirit, it awakened the constitutional movement of 1820, and a large number of newspapers appeared full of enthusiasm and inexperience. (p. 222-223)

Explicitly referring to the "journalistic arena," Fernandes Pinheiro locates Rio de Janeiro's *Jornal do Commercio* at the "avant-garde of journalism", pointing out that he was then considered the *Brazilian Times*.

The attitude towards the object is symptomatic of the intellectual attitude of the author, besides being in accordance with the academic research. He avoids analyzing the phase of the Brazilian press in that context - half of the nineteenth century - by placing himself as a mere "witness" of "contemporary times".

Even so, it recognizes that the country has profited from the benefits of a "scientific, literary and even political press", which contrasts with the "over excitement that once existed". And he continues by saying that the press adopts a style of "restraint and dignity", considering the modernity with which it discusses national problems.

Organic Challenges

The publication of Fernandes Pinheiro's controversial article took place in a context that was favorable for the exacerbation of feelings in our society. In one side, the pride of the intellectual elite increases due to the restoration "as the management of certain social groups or classes", forging a Brazilian nationality. On the other side, the nostalgia of Dutch Brazil also increased, cultivated by the popular imagination that represented this period "with the wonderful, and even supernatural, colors." (Cabral de Mello, 1997: 34)

In the following year (1860) the author spiced up the controversy by publishing the study entitled *Brasil Holandês* (Dutch Brazil), in which "he does not disguise his enthusiasm for Nassau's work" (Cabral de Mello, 1997: 375).

To counterbalance this "pro-Dutch historical revisionism", the aristocracy of Pernambuco founded in 1862 the IAGP – Institute of Archeology and Geography of Pernambuco - designed to be the "guardian" of pro-Portuguese memoirs.

This did not prevent Pereira da Costa from supporting the "Batavia nostalgia" in his speech at the IAGP (1876), showing indignation towards the outcome of the restoration of Pernambuco. His argument was that it signified the return to Lusitanian obscurantism, responsible for our material delay and cultural oppression.

Such heterodoxy irritated the historian Maximiano Gomes Machado, who refuted Pereira da Costa's thesis. During this verbal wrestling, Fernandes Pinheiro's heresy concerning the Batavia press, was also denied by Alípio Augusto Ferreira who doubted that the Dutch were responsible for introducing the press in Brazil. So, these two patriots from Pernambuco carried out investigations to prove the spurious character of *Brasilsche Gelt Sach*. By questioning the only evidence presented by supporters of Batavia colonization they wanted to end the conflict.

In this context the Missão Higino José Duarte Pereira (1885-1886) was created and its

results were considered to be a landmark of the "scientific study of the Dutch period (Cabral de Mello, 1997: 396).

José Rodrigues Honório (1969a: 80) comprises a clear summary of this historiographic embassy.

José Higino went to Holland in the beginning of 1885 and remained in The Hague until 1886. His research focused on the Royal Archive of The Hague, where it is possible to examine and copy the entire archive of Zeeland, which had become part of the Royal Archive in 1856 ... (...) José Higino's research obtained a remarkable result ... (...) and it did not limited itself to a mere copy of a new source. He gathered pictures and brochures, examined various files and translated documents and books. (...) José Higino was the perfect man for such a task. He knew how to research, he had bibliographic information, knew the collections of manuscripts that were brought to Brazil and was able to read Dutch.

The "excellent report presented when he returned from its mission" was described in detail by José Antonio Gonsalves de Mello (1979: 22), who also mentions the complementary task developed by Alfredo de Carvalho, who finished the work begun by his IAGP partner. Both Carvalho and Pereira publish articles in the Journal of IAGP, describing their observations and reporting their conclusions.

When translating the document that was Fernandes Pinheiro's key-element used in his argument, Duarte Pereira (1883: 121-124) publicly warned his contemporaries, summarizing the hypothesis of the documental research project he aimed at developing in the archives of the West Indies:

1) "The Brasilsche Gelt Sach is (...) a discreditable brochure or libel against the directors of the Company of the West Indies ..."

2) "As far as we know, this is the only example of a text that is contemporary to of the Dutch dominance concerning the introduction of the press in Recife. This testimony alone, however, is in an anonymous pamphlet, probably dictated by malevolence and, therefore, does not have the authority to destroy the evidence that point to the contrary, which results from the silence of all coeval writers."

3) "If the press were introduced in the capital of Dutch Brazil during the eight years of Nassau's government, it is extraordinary that the panegyrist Barleus did not celebrate such an honorable fact in order to be noticed by this prince who is a friend of the arts and letters."

Considering Pereira Duarte's preliminary reports, Pereira da Costa is the one who draws back its opinion about the mythical Dutch typography (1991: 25), but without renouncing to his overoptimistic patriotic, not to say narrow-minded, behavior.

The hypothesis that the press in existed in Pernambuco during the Dutch Brazil was discarded in the middle of the seventeenth century, even so, it is still Pernambuco's priority the possession of typography in Brazil in 1706, or a little before, (...) typography was established in Recife ...

However, it was Alfredo de Carvalho's task (1899: 711-716) to fully unravel the controversy over the existence of typographies in Brazil, before, during and after the Dutch occupation:

Of all the American countries, Brazil was the last one to receive the establishment of typographic art. (...)

However it is necessary to confess that, despite all favorable factors that would contribute to the introduction of typography in Brazil, especially in Pernambuco, in the end of the 16th or beginning of the 17th Centuries, there is no physical evidence of its existence was yet found.

Besides the lack of existence of one single print that can be attributed to this source, the complete silence of coeval documents and of all chroniclers about a fact that could hardly be ignored, contributes to further invalidate such assumption. (...)

... however, the circumstances were so favorable that a vague tradition of the existence of typography in Pernambuco during the Dutch dominance remained among some historians.

Canon Dr. Fernandes Pinheiro widely popularized this memory and Dr. Mello Moraes claimed to have evidences that were irrefutable to confirm it. (...)

However, it was Dr. José Higino's fate to be the one to give such brilliant piece of news, followed by the translation of the famous pamphlet, the elucidation of this important bibliographic problem. (...)

With the present evidences, we believe to have put an end to the debate on such a controversial issue of the establishment of the press in Pernambuco by the Dutch, and it is proved that such an attempt existed, but did not take place.

cognitive delay

Between the publication of Fernandes Pinheiro's article (1859) and the dissemination of Alfredo de Carvalho's article (1899), there was a gap of 40 years. The controversy over the Batavia primacy regarding the introduction of the press in Brazil was solved. What, then, explains the persistence of such an inconsistent thesis?

Three factors may explain the situation: a) Strategy of Dissemination b) Argument of authority, c) Popular acceptance. Let's briefly review each one of these convergent reasons.

Strategy of Dissemination – the acceptance, the popularity and the presence of

Fernandes Pinheiro's explanation for our delay in the typographic field is partly due to the nature of the vehicle chosen for its dissemination.

Instead of using the appropriate mean to communicate with the intellectual elite - the magazine of IHGB - he preferred to use the *Revista Popular*, which had a wider scope and read by avant-garde opinion-makers.

Werneck Sodré (1966) explains that the magazine, which was "edited by Garnier," was "one of the most appraised publications of its time" (p. 221) and reinforced the recognition of the publisher. "Garnier was the great editor of the second half of the nineteenth century. The publishing house conferred recognition upon the authors it chose." To be published by him was an honor (p.238).

Wilson Martins (1977, p. 111-112) states that "*Revista Popular* was an illustrated newspaper published by Garnier, released 5 to 20 each month. 16 volumes were published until 1862, when it became the not the less famous *Jornal das Famílias*. (...) It was in the magazine *Revista Popular* that Joaquim Nabuco published in chapters his *História da Literatura Brasileira* (History of Brazilian Literature)..." In short, it emphasizes the level of importance of this publication for the Brazilian elite. "*Revista Popular* is, at this point, the dynamic center in the renewal of literary ideas ..." (Martins., 1977, p. 114)

One can noticed that the author of the thesis was right in publishing an article he knew would cause controversy among the country's intellectual elite.

Argument of authority - Although young, he was aware of his intellectual prestige and the importance of the institutions that supported him intellectually. It is, therefore, a double authorized source.

Fernandes Pinheiros outstands in the intellectual panorama of his time by passing the exam and being granted the chair of the Department of Rhetoric of the Colégio Imperial de Petrópolis. But he was truly legitimized within the national intellectual environment by the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute⁵.

Werneck Sodré (1966, p. 211) clearly summarizes the symbolic power that intellectuals who surrounded Dom Pedro II, who "... knew each other, related to each other and met in the Historical Institute, in Paula Brito's house, or at the *Patológica*, in Largo do Rocio. This did not happen only in court, but also in the provinces, since (...) the imperial laziness began to dominate."

Popular acceptance - Since he also worked as a journalist in many publications located

5 Source: Dossier "Centenary of Fernandes Pinheiro", published by the Magazine of IHGB, vol. 240, 1958

in Rio de Janeiro, Fernandes Pinheiro had the sensitivity to detect when and which topics would attract popular interest.

Accusations made by the press were very common at the time. This explains the inference made by Wilson Martins (1977, p. 315) with his journalistic practice "Accusations (...) continued to be frequent and numerous ... (...) Intentionally or not, this was the effect caused by the appearance of a study by Canon Fernandes Pinheiro about the *Padres do Patrocínio...*".

Moreover, its debut in the intellectual scene occurs with the accusation that there were problems with the Jesuits' teaching methods (1856), followed by the appearance of accusations concerning problems with the Portuguese colonization and defense of the Batavia administration, which also had space in the press (1859). Soon, the protest against the "severity" applied in Calabar's historic trial, due to its "mixed race condition" (1860). Then, finally, rough criticism regarding general-captain Rego Barros, whose he claimed ostensibly.

Fernandes Pinheiro was certainly aware of that dissonance regarding the Dutch dominance, opposing Brazilian "state memory" to "popular imagination". While the first one celebrates restoration, the second demonstrates a clear that Alfredo de Carvalho says to be tied to an "idea of an ancient race, fabulously rich, gifted with prodigious skill and able to perform colossal works." (Cabral de Mello, 1997, p. 35).

Manuel Correia de Andrade (2001: 41) didactically explains the context of this dissonance.

In Pernambuco there is an idea that the Dutch were more advanced than the Portuguese, hence the large monuments that were built here. This idea was, of course, a result of Maurício de Nassau's performance, when governor of Dutch Brazil, with his competence and tolerance, and the tendency of the people of Pernambuco to identify Nassau with the Dutch dominance. After the expulsion of the Batavians, the struggles between Pernambuco and the Lusitanian made many people idealize the Dutch dominance, imagining that if we had remained under the tutelage of the Flemish, we would have been better developed and would have a better destiny.

Reinforcing this mythic dimension, Gilberto Freyre (1979, p. 17) makes a parallel between the Brazilian and the Portuguese imaginary. "The Flemish times remain in the imagination of our people just like the Moors times remain in the imagination of the Portuguese. The Dutch legend in Brazil even has its equivalent for the enchanted Moorish: the legend of the *alamoa*."

Conclusive Síntesis

The research on the phenomena of journalism in Brazil dates back to the second half of the nineteenth century, since the natural conditions of the historical period that goes

from D. João VI to Pedro I were marked by legal restrictions and limited freedom of press. Inhibiting the development of our journalism, they acted as adverse factors for the systematic research of this phenomenon that will only find a fertile environment in the second empire.

But it is certainly during the Second Reign that the press has its best period, with the guarantee of freedom due to the wisdom of Pedro II. In the midst of this atmosphere of reconciliation of national elites, Historical Institutes began to recover the early history of our journalism, creating controversies that won the hearts and minds of our intellectuals by "praising the Dutch pioneers who introduced the press in Brazilian lands, contrasting with the delay of the Portuguese who forbid and repress." (Marques de Melo, 2003b)

Without disqualifying its historical significance, the episode whose main role was played by Fernandes Pinheiro is an advance for the Brazilian research in journalism.

The "primary concern" of this pioneer and his immediate followers is "not focused on the processes of the news, but in its means of diffusion, more precisely in the technology of printing books, newspapers and magazines". (Marques de Melo, 1999)

Fernandes Pinheiro's thesis was based on sole existing documental evidence: the *Brasilche GeltSak* leaflet dated 1645 and supposedly published in Recife.

Historians from Pernambuco left aside speculations and searched for empirical evidence to refute that were capable of refuting its authenticity, denying what they understood as a mere "hypothesis".

Their "research focused on Brazilian and Dutch archives and produced results that would deny the dominant hypothesis." The conclusion accepted in consensus by the historiographic community was: "Nassau's initiative was not consummated, for fortuitous reasons, and the leaflets, allegedly printed in Recife, were actually reproduced in European graphic companies." (Marques de Melo, 2003b)

Anyway, the controversy raised in the second half of the nineteenth century, whose spark was the controversial article of 1859, boosted historians to reconstruct the history of our press, motivated by the national celebrations 1908, "starting with the double centenary: the creation of the Royal Press and the launch of our first independent newspaper, *Correio Braziliense*, which belonged to Hipólito José da Costa."

Max Fleiuss, who was the partner of Alfredo de Carvalho in the inventory of the first century of the Brazilian press (1808-1908), produced in Rio de Janeiro, "one of the first state of art of the historical research on journalism. The text is published in 1922, during the celebrations Centennial of Independence.

However, "these studies do not focus journalism as a defined object", dealing with "the press and its products" and giving little importance to "the socio-political processes that give peculiar features to the communication of current events." (Marques de Melo, 2006)

Partner of Alfredo de Carvalho in the inventory of the first century of the Brazilian press (1808-1908), Max Fleiuss produced in Rio de Janeiro, "one of the first state of art historical research on journalism, the text of which appears in 1922, during the celebrations Centennial of Independence.

Strictly, however, "such studies have not focused on the journalism as defined object", in the "press and its products, and only narrowly focusing on" the socio-political processes that give peculiar physiognomy to the communication of updates." (Marques de Melo, 2006)

The watershed is certainly Barbosa Lima Sobrinho's paradigmatic study. This journalist will, in the future, occupy a memorable place in the avant-garde of Brazilian journalistic community during the twentieth century. He draws a profile of the development of journalism in industrial society and the dilemmas present in Brazil, using his professional experience as a journalist and the methodology of analysis learned in the context of legal science, also using historical science.

Situated on the borders of journalism and law, history and economics, this work is apparently interdisciplinary, but its careful reading will show that the author tried to understand the "problem of the press" with the "tenacity of a journalist that wants to accomplish serialized studies in the midst of a dispersive life" (Barbosa Lima Sobrinho, 1923: VII)

His example would be emulated half a century later, when Carlos Rizzini, an intellectual whose profile is similar to Barbosa Lima Sobrinho's, publishes his wonderful historic inventory about the book, the newspaper and typography in Brazil, produced with the experience of the reporter and experimenting methodological strategies "illuminated by professional practice" (Dias, 2004: 12).

Rizzini actually acts as a bridge that links the pioneer work of Fernandes Pinheiro with studies that founded the academic field of journalism whose initiative was taken by Danton Jobim (1960) and Luiz Beltrão (1960) who were part of a generation of journalists-teachers in which Rizzini was completely integrated, teaching journalism in the former University of Brazil and directing the Casper Líbero School of Journalism, located in São Paulo.

Questioning the hypothesis of "immersion in stupidity" (Dias, 2004: 15) and criticizing other assertions of Fernandes Pinheiro, Rizzini in a sense legitimized the exploratory

work of this historian, whose performance in the communication field, especially in journalism, deserved an exciting incursion by his biographer, Paulo da Rocha Dias (2004). His factual and critical insights invite other researchers to provide answers to questions that remain challenging to the interpreters of media historiography.

Thus, on the day before the bicentenary of his birth (2025), justice will be made for this prolific intellectual who dared to explore unknown paths, even at the risk denying his investigative assumptions, as it happened in the case of the press. If it weren't for his impetuous character, perhaps the mythical Dutch typography would continue to fascinate new generations, like so many other episodes that intrigue scholars in the field.

References

- Andrade, Manuel Correia (2001). *Pereira da Costa, o homem e a obra*. Recife: CEPE
- Bahia, Juarez (1964). *Jornal, História e Técnica*. Rio: MEC
- Barbosa, Marialva (2000). *Os donos do Rio: imprensa, poder e público*. Rio: Vício de Leitura
- _____ (2008). *História Cultural da Imprensa*. Rio: Mauad
- Barbosa Lima Sobrinho, Alexandre José (1923). *O problema da imprensa*. Rio: José Álvaro Editor
- Barros, José d' Assunção (2008). *O campo da História*. Petrópolis: Vozes
- Beltrão, Luiz (1960). *Iniciação à Filosofia do Jornalismo*. Rio: Agir
- Burke, Peter (2003). *Uma História Social do Conhecimento*. Rio: Jorge Zahar
- _____ (1992). *A escrita da História – novas perspectivas*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP
- Cabral de Mello, Evaldo (1997) *Rubro Veio – o imaginário da restauração pernambucana*. Rio: Topbooks, 2ª. ed.
- Caneca, Frei Joaquim do Amor Divino (1875). **Tratado de eloquência**. In: *Obras Políticas e Literárias*, tomo I. Recife: Typographia Mercantil, p. 61-161
- Carvalho, Alfredo (1899) **Da introdução da imprensa em Pernambuco pelos Holandeses**, *Revista do IHGB*. Rio (n.52: 71-716)
- Dias, Paulo da Rocha (2004). *O amigo do Rei – Carlos Rizzini, Chato e os Diários Associados*. Florianópolis: Letras Contemporâneas
- Diehl, Astor Antonio (1998). *A cultura historiográfica brasileira*. Passo Fundo: Ediupf
- Duarte Pereira, José Higino (1883). **Advertência**, *Revista do IHGB*, Rio (n.28: 121-126)
- Duverger, Maurice (1962) *Métodos de las Ciencias Sociales*. Barcelona: Ariel

Fleuiss, Max (1922). **A imprensa no Brasil**. In: *Dicionário Histórico, Geographico e Etnographico do Brasil*, Rio: Imprensa Nacional, p. 1550-1585

Fernandes Pinheiro, Joaquim Caetano (1859). **A imprensa no Brasil**, *Revista do IHGB*, v. 1, n. 4: 217-224

Freyre, Gilberto (1979). **Prefácio**. In: Gonsalves de Melo, José Antonio – *Tempo de flamengos*. Recife: BNB, 2ª. ed.

Gonsalves de Melo, José Antonio (1979) *Tempo de flamengos*. Recife: BNB, 2ª. ed.

Hohlfeldt, Antonio & Strelow (2008). **Métodos de Pesquisa em Jornalismo**. In: Sousa, Jorge Pedro (org). – *Jornalismo, História, Teoria e Metodologia*. Porto: Edições UFP, p. 378-391

Ipanema, Marcello e Cybelle de (1967). *História da Comunicação*. Brasília: UnB

Kunczik, Maichael (1997). *Conceitos de Jornalismo*, São Paulo, Edusp

Lippman, Walter (1922). *Public Opinion*, New York - Tradução brasileira de Jacques Weinberg: *Opinião Pública*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2008

Marques de Melo, José (2003 a) – *História Social da Imprensa*. Porto Alegre: Edipucrs

_____ (2003b). *História do Pensamento Comunicacional*. São Paulo: Paulus

_____ (2003c) **Midiologia Brasileira: o resgate das fontes paradigmáticas**. In: Lopes, Maria Immacolata V. – *Epistemologia da Comunicação*. São Paulo: Loyola, p. 105-120

_____ (2008 a). *História política das ciências da comunicação*. Rio: Mauad

_____ (2008b) – *O campo da comunicação no Brasil*. Petrópolis: Vozes

_____ (2008c). **A teorização do Jornalismo no Brasil: das origens à atualidade**. In: Sousa, Jorge Pedro (org). *Jornalismo, História, Teoria e Metodologia*. Porto: Edições UFP, p. 295-314

_____ (2007). **Pensamento Jornalístico, a moderna tradição brasileira**, *Revista Brasileira de Ciências da Comunicação*. São Paulo: Intercom (30-2: 15-40)

_____ (2006). *Teoria do Jornalismo: identidades brasileiras*. São Paulo: Paulus

_____ (1999). **A constituição da comunidade acadêmica brasileira no campo das ciências da comunicação**. In: Lopes, Maria Immacolata (org). *Vinte anos de Ciências da Comunicação no Brasil*. São Paulo: INTERCOM (p.49-74)

Martins, Wilson (1977). *História da Inteligência Brasileira*. São Paulo: Cultrix, (v. III, 1855-1877).

Morel, Marco & Barros, Mariana Monteiro (2003). *Palavra, Imagem e poder*. Rio: DP&A

Pena, Felipe (2008). **A teorização do jornalismo no Brasil – após 1950**. In: Sousa, Jorge Pedro (org.). *Jornalismo, História, Teoria e Metodologia*. Porto: Edições UFP p. 226-294

- _____ (2005). *Teoria do Jornalismo*. São Paulo: Contexto
- Pereira da Costa, A. F. (1891). **Estabelecimento e desenvolvimento da imprensa em Pernambuco**, *Revista do IHGB*. Recife (n. 39, 21-50)
- Ribeiro, Joaquim (1958). **As antecipações do Cônego Fernandes Pinheiro**, *Revista do IHGB* (vol. 240, p. 100-115).
- Rizzini, Carlos (1946). *O livro, o jornal e tipografia no Brasil*. Rio: Kosmos
- _____ (1957). *Hipólito da Costa e o Correio Braziliense*. São Paulo: Nacional
- Rodrigues, José Honório (1985). *História Viva*. São Paulo: Global
- _____ (1969 a). *A pesquisa histórica no Brasil*. São Paulo: Nacional
- _____ (1969b). *Teoria da História do Brasil*. São Paulo: Nacional
- _____ (1966). *Vida e História*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira
- Souza, Roberto Acízelo de (1999). *O império da eloquência*. Rio de Janeiro: Eduerj
- Souza Martins, Francisco (1846). **Progressos do Jornalismo Brasileiro**, *Revista do IHGB* (vol. 8: 262-275)
- Vianna, Helio (1945). *Contribuição à História da Imprensa Brasileira*. Rio: Imprensa Nacional
- Weber, Max (1924). *Gesammelle Aufsätze zur Sociologie und Socialpolitik*, Tubingen, Verlag com J. C. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) – obra que reproduz sua “Alocução no Primeiro Congresso Alemão de Sociologia (Frankfurt, 1910), disponível para consulta em espanhol na *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas – REIS*, n.57, 1992, p. 251-259
- Werneck Sodré, Nelson (1964). *História da Literatura*. Rio: Civilização Brasileira. 4ª. ed.,
- _____ (1966). *História da Imprensa*. Rio: Civilização Brasileira. 1ª. ed.,