

## PRESENTATION

Carlos Fico

Miliandre Garcia

End of the military dictatorship, “New Republic”. Due to Tancredo Neves’ illness and death, José Sarney – former political head of the authoritarian regime – became President of the Republic. On July 29, 1985, Fernando Lyra, the Minister of Justice (still chosen by Tancredo), held a ceremony at Teatro Casa Grande to announce the end of censorship. Among others, the event included Chico Buarque, Antonio Houaiss, Ziraldo, Dias Gomes, Chico Anísio and Darcy Ribeiro. That theater had been the stage, during the military dictatorship, of very critical political plays and, also, of heated debates with expressive names that marked democratic resistance, such as Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Lula. Behind the table, a large banner stamped the phrase: “Now, yes, the New Republic has started”. Posters showed a broken scissors with the words “Goodbye, Censorship”.

Three months earlier, Pope John Paul II had condemned Jean-Luc Godard’s new film, *Je Vous Salue, Marie* – down to earth version of Jesus’ mother. John Paul II prayed the rosary to repair what he considered an offense against the Virgin Mary promoted by Godard.

The 2nd FestRio would take place in November of that year, at the Hotel Nacional. The organizers intended to open the event exactly with the screening of Godard’s movie. But the National Confederation of Bishops of Brazil (CNBB) – which had been one of the most prominent “civil society” entities against the dictatorship, together with the Brazilian Lawyers Order (OAB), the Brazilian Press Association (ABI) and the Brazilian Society for the Progress of Science (SBPC) – asked Sarney to ban the movie. So it was done. Fernando Lyra, who had proclaimed the end of censorship in April, was put in an embarrassing situation, but followed the president’s order.

The vehement protests of Caetano Veloso and Fernanda Montenegro at the opening of the festival, on November 21, 1985, were of no use: the film was not shown. In the same month of November, the movie would end up being attended in private sessions, promoted as a way of civil disobedience to censorship. This is an episode of

ensorship in a supposedly democratic period, or rather, censorship at the time when redemocratization was sought.

It was not an isolated case. In 1955 – also in the democratic period of the Brazilian republican history, assuming that the tenure of the elected president, Juscelino Kubitschek, was threatened, the Minister of War, General Lott, deposed, in November, two presidents of the Republic, Carlos Luz and Café Filho. The vice president, Nereu Ramos, took over and ruled under State of Siege and with political censorship of newspapers until the tenure of JK.

This collection does not cover the entire period of Brazilian republican history, but we decided to call it *Censorship in Republican Brazil* because we believe that the studies gathered here are quite representative of that time. We thought about publishing it ten years ago. The initial project focused on public diversions censorship and only intended to bring together recently concluded researches, or in the process of conclusion, from the study group supervised by Carlos Fico at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ).<sup>1</sup> The project ended up being postponed due to the advisor's commitments to the History Area Coordination, at Capes, for two consecutive terms. Interested in the endeavor, Miliandre Garcia continued the collection project and invited other researchers on the topic, with whom she had contact at different times: researchers who had completed researches on censorship or who, encouraged by these and by access to sources, have been making the censorship in the republic one of the themes most worked by the historiography of the period.

The collection gained a larger volume than expected and exceeded the limits of the initial idea. Due to the quality of the chapters, as well as the issues listed by them, we decided to publish it in two volumes. This presentation, therefore, refers to the two volumes of the collection. The criteria to divide the volumes was to consider the areas under prior censorship (theater, cinema, music, television and books), but also the treatment given to them by the agencies linked to censorship, with important nuances that crossed the 20th century.

The authors' perspectives on the censorship phenomenon are multiple. Some questions, however, are common to the chapters of this collection and it is worth presenting them to the reader. For example, is censorship inherent to the State, institutionalized or not, or can it spread to other sectors of society? Is every act of

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at: <<http://www.gedm.ifcs.ufrj.br/>>. Accessed on: 9 ago. 2019.

censorship a typically political phenomenon, even if the object censored makes reference to sensitive issues of society involving race, religiosity, sex and gender? What is the relationship between moral and politic? To what extent do these instances repel and interpenetrate each other?

To be legitimate, can censorship be presented as pedagogical? What is the role of different social groups in the censorship exercise? Do these groups have a unique characterization or have nuances that should be considered? And the censor, what is his place in censorship? Does he have the autonomy to do his job or is he simply someone who executes orders and, therefore, would be exempt from any responsibility? When accepting to be part of the system, signing up, preparing and eventually being approved in a public exam, what is his degree of involvement? Is censorship all that restrains, inhibits, prohibits or can it also be considered a form of cultural policy? What is the role of censorship in authoritarian regimes? As an instrument of control, does its effectiveness depend on other mechanisms of repression? What is the relationship between them?

The historiography on censorship practices in Brazil has a considerable number of theoretical and methodological approaches and expands on multiple fronts, from memories of victims who, directly or indirectly, suffered censorship, to academic research built from journalistic sources or documents from archive.

However, two aspects remain largely unexplored when it comes to the historiography of censorship in general. One of a broader order, linked to the reflection on censorship as a historical phenomenon that crosses temporalities and geographic spaces. Another of a more specific character, related to the exercise of censorship in the *Estado Novo*, for example. Such aspects, as we shall see, were contemplated in this collection by Edélcio Mostaço and Maria Cristina Castilho Costa, respectively.

In the chapter “Censorship, the network”, which opens **volume 1 of** this collection, Edélcio Mostaço mobilizes a broad theoretical and methodological framework, moving from psychoanalysis to sociology, from the arts to history. Based on extensive bibliographic material containing recent research and others, over 50 years old but little referenced, such as the dossier *La censure et le censurable*, published in Paris in 1967. To analyze the multiple dimensions of censorship (political, psychological, social and individual), as well as contemplating more dense articulations on which it was based in Brazil during the military dictatorship and its complex architecture of power, Mostaço mobilizes the Foucaultian concept of *Dispositive*. In

general, it argues that censorship “is a macro-structural coercive dispositive regarding the maintenance of what the Doctrine, the Law and the current governments consider attacks in what is established”.

The chapter “Censorship in the Vargas government – before, during and after” is also of fundamental importance because it expands knowledge about censorship in the Vargas era, specifically during the *Estado Novo*. In order to examine it in its most structural aspects, Maria Cristina Castilho Costa analyzes the censorship process of the play *Ben-Hur*, which is available to be consulted at the Miroel Silveira Collection.<sup>2</sup> The archive received the name of this theatrologist because he was responsible for the transferring of the archive of the State Department of Press and Propaganda (Deip) of São Paulo to the School of Communication and Arts (ECA), of the University of São Paulo (USP), that nowadays is under the custody of the Public Archive of the State of São Paulo (Apesp).

The analysis of this process explicit several issues involving censorship in Vargas government and during he *Estado Novo*, but also censorship as a social phenomenon. First of them, on a more general level, “shows that censorship aims to defend the ideological interests of power, the muting of criticism and public manipulation”. In the specific case of *Ben-Hur*, “Passages that are absolutely harmless from the dramaturgical point of view” were mutilated “simply because this intervention [interested] to the policy developed and defended by the government” of Getúlio Vargas, who “did not invent censorship, but printed to it regularity, transforming it into a efficient bureaucratic apparatus of the *Estado Novo*, that survived to it, perpetuating itself, without recess, until 1988, when it was abolished by the new Constitution”.

From the early years of the military dictatorship, President Marshal Castelo Branco sought to integrate culture to his government’s development goals. As Renato Ortiz stated in his book *The Modern Brazilian Tradition: brazilian culture and cultural industry*, published by Brasiliense publishing house, in 1988, it was quickly recognized that culture involved power relations that could be “harmful” in the hands of dissidents, but “beneficial” when managed by the authoritarian power – hence the importance of acting together with the cultural spheres and promoting a culture policy (p. 115). For this reason, Castelo Branco was quick to take for himself, through the creation of the Federal Council of Culture (CFC), the responsibility of managing a National Culture

---

<sup>2</sup> Available at: <<http://www.eca.usp.br/ams>>. Accessed on: 23 out. 2017.

Plan that, slowly, was improving and unfolding on multiple fronts. “The growing importance given to culture by the State”, considered Tatyana de Amaral Maia, in her book *The Cardinals of National Culture: the Federal Council of Culture in the civil-military dictatorship (1967-1975)*, published by Itaú Cultural e Iluminuras, in 2012 , was also related to “the centralization process and the governments needs to legitimize their projects through symbolic constructions capable of aggregating citizens around the ideal of nation” (p. 158).

It should be noted that, in the post-1964, the artistic and intellectual milieu began to organize actions to resist the military dictatorship, standing out as an alternative to traditional spaces of struggle, represented by student and syndicate movements and by public and collective manifestations. It was the culmination of a cultural movement created in the 1950s, from which emerged *Teatro de Arena*, *Oficina, Tuca*, *Cinema Marginal*, in São Paulo; the Popular Culture Movement (MCP) in Pernambuco; *Bossa Nova*, *Cinema Novo*, the Popular Culture Center of the National Students Union (CPC of UNE) and, as a continuation of this, the *Opinião*, in Rio de Janeiro. The counterculture movement spread through the main centers of cultural consumption in the country. This intense movement in the field of culture, with significant implications for political life, attracted the attention of the militaries in order to promote, in the same period, the centralization of public entertainment censorship, in Brasilia, also as a strategy to control cultural activity.

They were not only concerned with political and ideological issues. Moral issues mobilized the agents of repression with the same interest. Theater and cinema were gradually transformed into threats to national stability and security. This caused theatrical and cinematographic censorship to become instruments for the authoritarian project underway in those years, also because such artistic and cultural movements were at the *front* of the so-called cultural resistance.

In the case of cinema, it is important to mention that the centralization of censorship was advantageous and was required by the own sector for a long time. It was because every producer or company that requested the censorship of movies did so with the intention of showing it on a national circuit. Unlike theater censorship, whose centralization was catastrophic because, in addition to dramatically increase costs of censorship for a very poor sector, mostly characterized by amateur production, it also prevented the the playwright or producer from going directly to the censorship headquarters to explain themselves and explain to them the objectives of their piece or

musical to them. This mediation, after centralization, was done by a lawyer who should go to Brasília, what made production much more expensive, because of the hiring fees and protocols, plus expenses with food and lodging. If it was, to a certain extent, practicable for the film industry, it was an additional obstacle for beginners, amateurs, alternative and even professional theater groups, considering that “professionals” in the theater do not have the same meaning as in other areas.

In “Censorship, resistance and theater in the military dictatorship”, Miliandre Garcia synthesizes the reflections on censorship and its relations with the theater developed in academic works in the last recent years. Assuming that the phenomenon of censorship in Brazil is inscribed in the long term, Garcia analyzes its exercise in the military dictatorship, crossed by the reaction of artists and intellectuals submitted to it, from the categories of censorship and cultural resistance, respectively. The author differentiates three dimensions of censorship (moral and morality censorship, political and ideological censorship and aesthetic and artistic censorship), without disregarding that they were articulated and even confused in the dictatorial period to attend the demands of governments. Thus, the chapter seeks to conceive censorship as a long term historical phenomenon, without underestimating the specificities of its practices in a given context.

Under the influence of the currently available bibliography, the most recent academic researches have differentiated censorship as a phenomenon and practice, simultaneously. If censorship can be analyzed as a broader phenomenon while it maintains similar characteristics that cross historical times and geographic spaces, as a specific practice, it should be noted how it was carried out from multiple demands and different exercises. It means that it is impossible to reflect on its specificities without considering what it keeps in common with other experiences in continuous and discontinuous time and spaces, in a dynamic movement of rupture and continuity. In Brazil, many researchers have already written (and have been writing) about press and public entertainment censorship, analyzing them as specific practices or even in a comparative perspective.

In this collection, another equally important aspect was analyzed by Mônica Cruz Caminha and Reinaldo Cardenuto. This is the interinstitutional dynamics between police agencies responsible for censorship, specifically between the Federal Police Department (DPF) and the Public Entertainment Censorship Division (DCDP). It is important to underline that it was not exclusively submitted to its instructions. We will

see that society and the information community also had a strong impact on censorship. Regarding the performance of DCDP and DPF, it was believed that both acted in ideological convergence, even because the first was subordinate to the second and responded hierarchically to it. However, behind the scenes of the institutions, it is clear that the relations were more strained than was already supposed and there were many “noises” between such instances. In the case studies of the play *Calabar*, by Chico Buarque and Ruy Guerra, and also of the movie *Os Homens Que Eu Tive*, by Tereza Trautman, it appears that even though it is the most politically challenging play and that the movie has prioritized the theme of moral and morality, both were banned in the same period. What exactly happened at that moment, within the institutions, that led the DPF to act more incisively on the DCDP and to ask its referrals is a question to be considered.

In the chapter “The censorship process of the play *Calabar, O Elogio Da Traição* (1973): when censorship is forbidden to prohibit”, Mônica Cruz Caminha analyzes the whole process involving the censorship of the play that had its request protocolated at DCDP and its approval revoked by the DPF. The authors contested the decision with the *Tribunal Federal de Recursos* (TFR). Caminha compares censorship to the theatrical text with that to the book published by the publisher *Civilização Brasileira*, showing how the censorship to *Calabar* became one of the most complex legal pieces of that period, because it discussed in the judicial scope the legality of censorship and under a historical perspective the sense of betrayal. It was also one of the biggest losses caused by theater censorship to a spectacle already in an advanced stage of production. Chico Buarque stated that the process was so exhausting that, after that, he decided to get away from it all, buy a farm and raise chickens. Idea that symbolically materialized in the soap opera *Fazenda Modelo*, written by him in 1974.

When analyzing the movie *Os Homens Que Eu Tive* (1973), Reinaldo Cardenuto highlights the countless achievements of Tereza Trautman’s direction when deciding to film the love life of women, represented by the character Pity, that wished, in those years of intense behavioral changes, live their emotional freedom without necessarily making it a political object. Initially, the movie was approved by the DCDP, with an age rating for over 18 years. However, even before it was shown in the movie theaters, its release was suspended by the DPF general director. These divergences between instances responsible for censorship reveal not only the internal tensions that existed between them, but also the roles reserved for each gender in the Brazilian

patriarchal system, which were reinforced by representatives of the military dictatorship, objects of Cardenuto's reflection.

William Martins, in the chapter "Dispute on the scene: the clashes between Censorship and Embrafilme", analyzes the two sides of policies aimed to the field of culture in the 1960s and 1970s. On one hand, such policies integrated a national and international demand for development of cultural goods, something that significantly and positively changed Brazilian cinematographic production. On the other hand, both national and foreign cinema were submitted to previous censorship, but, in the face of so many clashes that occurred at that time, there was a tendency of the Public Entertainment Censorship Service (SCDP) and later the DCDP to prevent, or at least mitigate any losses that cinematographic censorship could cause to national producers financed by Embrafilme.

In "Production, sex and credits: Sérgio Ricardo's *Scarecrow* in the face of censorship", Rafael Rosa Hagemeyer highlights the difficulties faced by the composer and filmmaker Sérgio Ricardo in the period of approximately a decade. In the early 1960s, he envisioned filming his first feature film called *A Noite Do Espantalho*, which was his second film production after *Menino da Calça Branca* (1961). However, due to a serie of obstacles narrated by Hagemeyer, filming it was only possible ten years later, in 1974. About Sérgio Ricardo it is intriguing to observe, and this is detailed by the author, how his artistic production, in many ways, fulfilled what was defined as the artist's social function in the troubled 1960s and 1970s, which was not simply making art to distract audiences (from theaters, cinemas, *shows* and festivals) or even as an aesthetic delight for a supposedly refined audience, but, and mainly, cause discomfort and malaise. This happened in relation to indistinct sides: the Syrian, Brazilian and public governments. From the part of the government bureaucracies, Sérgio Ricardo first had the recordings of *O Pássaro Na Aldeia* intercepted by the Syrian government, sponsor of the film; in the post-1964 Brazil, he faced problems with the censorship of his songs, films and even *shows*. From the public side, deafening boos were addressed to him at the III TV Record *MPB* Festival, in 1967, when he tried in every possible ways (and without success) to play *Beto Bom De Bola*.

The aforementioned chapter presents, therefore, an important debate for the studies of censorship, showing that it can affect in multiple ways, in different contexts, but always conditioned to the restriction through laws and impositions, in democratic and dictatorial regimes, establishing what should be prohibited, interposed, banned, cut



off, socially, politically, economically and culturally sanitized ; as well as what should be authorized and even receive production and dissemination incentives. In summary: faces of the same phenomenon that hold in common the control of works and artists, of ideas and thoughts, by governments and states, regardless of place and context.

The censorship institution, as it has already been exhaustively demonstrated, was not created in military governments. They used the expedient and a long-standing administrative structure, adapting them to the political demands of the dictatorial regime. Between 1964 and 1985 – remembering that this time frame should not be taken as a straight jacket, but just as a starting point to deal with the resignification of structures – there were, within the scope of institutionalized censorship, stiff impasses involving the censor and the censored. On the one hand, when asked to talk about their offices, the censors, often with the support of a part of the population or gradually building this support, sought to emphasize the convenience of moral and morality censorship, especially for the education of children and young people. teenagers. On the other hand, with access to the written press, artists and intellectuals, with the support of press professionals, reinforced the negative effects of censorship on the arts and thought in Brazil. For them, in general, censorship functioned as a kind of shield for military governments that defined, *a priori*, what could not be seen, heard, felt, touched and, more serious, but less researched so far, than it could be. Renato Ortiz stated, in a book already mentioned, that “censorship has two faces: one repressive, another disciplinary” (p. 114). Its repressive face has been widely analyzed by Brazilian historiography. Its disciplinary role, however, is a topic to be explored. There was no legislation instructing the censor on what he should emphasize or how he should proceed in this regard, but there are indications that he did this in the opinions.

This disproportionate clash between versions of the same phenomenon, between the censor who held the power of censorship, under the supervision of superiors, and the censor who was relatively free to criticize them, but was completely subjugated to this structure, turned the institution into a target of a process of delegitimization in which its direct agents claimed to be victims of a “smear campaign”.

To change this image that had been builded since the middle of the 20th century, the military governments initially invested in the dynamization of censorship structures and, in this process of administrative modernization, formed working groups involving artists and intellectuals, also betting on more updated laws considering the behavioral and economic changes of that time, in addition to the training of censorship

technicians who started to be part of censorship service after a public examination followed by personnel training.

It is about this formation of the censor in the cinema area that Ana Marília Carneiro deals with, in the chapter “The incredible art of creating a censor: the political formation of cinematographic censors in the military dictatorship”. Taking Waldemar de Souza as a case study, director of *Editora Ltda.* and a speaker at the National Academy of Politics (ANP), Carneiro highlights how censorship technicians were trained from their enrollment in the public examination until their participation in training courses in the field of audiovisual production. The courses functioned, more or less, as an introduction to the general principles of cinema, in which they learned the history of movements such as neorealism and *nouvelle vague* and their impact on Latin American production. They also examined the manifests of national and foreign filmmakers. Finally, they provided technical instructions on censorship legislation and on the identification of alleged juxtaposed messages with subversive content.

Realizing that all the investment did not make censorship less a target for criticism, the government representatives bet, more emphatically, on the support of society, seeking their political and social support, even if they had to drive the most backward and conservative demands of the population. Such purpose is evident in the collection of letters sent to censorship, with the respective responses of the censorship leaders. Few letters were sent in the 1960s, but the number increased considerably in the following decade, with a greater incidence in 1978 and 1985. The writers seemed more sensitive to issues related to morals and morality, showing little or no interest in political and ideological issues.

Carlos Fico focuses on these letters in the chapter “‘Dear censorship’: letters to the military regime”,<sup>3</sup> which presents **volume 2** of this collection. Originally published in the magazine called *Topoi*, in 2002, this text is fundamental for understanding censorship during the military dictatorship and it can be said that this research inaugurated and brought together a working group dedicated to such studies under new theoretical and methodological guidelines, mainly in the field of renewed political history, presenting an extensive documentary *corpus* and differentiating moral censorship from political censorship, censorship of public entertainment from

---

<sup>3</sup> The letters sent to censorship were digitized by professor Carlos Fico and are available on the website of the Study Group on Dictatorship. Available at: <[http://www.gedm.ifcs.ufrj.br/documentos\\_lista.php?ncat=24&fbclid=IwAR3ucqTXAk-4kmcycbOaao-giPvRvvu1DnYtg\\_hsCNQ2\\_VwPvQqs5IuSen0](http://www.gedm.ifcs.ufrj.br/documentos_lista.php?ncat=24&fbclid=IwAR3ucqTXAk-4kmcycbOaao-giPvRvvu1DnYtg_hsCNQ2_VwPvQqs5IuSen0)>. Accessed on: 9 ago. 2019.

ensorship to the press, ostensive laws of top secret, secret, confidential and reserved practices.

Among the more than three hundred letters previously analyzed by Carlos Fico, Adrianna Setemy selected eleven letters in order to present, in the chapter “‘Freedom and democracy cannot be confused with anarchy and licentiousness’: correspondences exchanged between civil society and censorship during the Constituent Assembly (1987-1988)”, social expectations in relation to censorship, in a context of instability in which the transfer of the DCDP to the Ministry of Education or even its extinction was publicly debated.

This selection of researches, therefore, moves from the general to the private and vice versa and contemplates the movements of continuity and rupture involving censorship as a broader phenomenon and also as a circumstantial practice. From this perspective, the movement of centralization and decentralization of censorship of public diversions should not be ignored, since it did not present the same dynamic for all artistic-cultural productions submitted to previous censorship by SCDP and DCDP.

In the 1960s, the censorship of films (decree-law n° 43, 1966, art. 26; decree n° 60.220, 1967, art. 37) and that of theater plays (ordinance n° 11, 1967) were centralized in Brasília. In the following decades, while cinematographic and theatrical censorship went through a process of decentralization, censorship of books, magazines, soap operas and musical lyrics (Ordinance No. 1, 1980) was centralized in the DCDP. The explanations for these differentiated (de) centralization movements lie in the supposed threat that the artistic sectors and the media represented for different groups in rising between the 1960s and 1980s.

In the 1960s, for example, the SCDP went through a politicization process of its bureaucratic structure acting at the rear of the repressive project, releasing what was not a threat and forbidding what represented danger, independently if whether the motivation was political, ideological, aesthetic, artistic, moral or related to the so-called “morality”. From the mid-1970s onwards, there was a reverse movement attempting to “depoliticize” the public entertainment censorship, seeking to consolidate it or reaffirm its original purposes as a public utility service, destined to the “healthy formation” of the Brazilian population. Especially children and adolescents considered more susceptible to the “perverse effects” of “mass culture”. This can be seen both in musical and cinematographic censorship, in which censor agents did not completely abandon

political censorship, something inherent to that kind of activity, but started to be guided by other demands, in a kind of “return turn” to their origins.

This particularity of musical censorship in relation to the others, as well as the internal functioning of the Federal Censorship and its auxiliary arms – and also the censorial view on musical compositions – were observed by Cecília Heredia in the chapter “Musical censorship in the Brazilian military regime”. Heredia does not see the censors in a joking way, as clumsy – as other works do – but presents a detailed study of musical censorship and points out an important aspect to be developed by researchers in the area: the multifaceted performance of censorship action, roughly summarized in two instances: one, institutional, with a significant amount of researches already done, and another, individual, more in need of studies in this field. According to Alexandre Ayub Stephanou, in his doctoral thesis entitled “The rational and technical procedure of the Brazilian Federal Censorship as a public institution”, defended at the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul (PUC-RS) in 2004 and cited by Heredia, the institutional aspect it is represented by the organizational and normative structure and the individual by the subjective action of its agents. Therefore, this combination of structural aspects (legal dispositives, administrative organization, superior determinations, institutional ties) and individual aspects (worldviews, subjectivities) deserves to be observed in future research.

Two chapters of this collection are dedicated to the analysis of the soap operas censorship: *Despedida De Casado*, by Walter George Durst, and *O Casarão*, by Lauro César Muniz. Both produced by *Rede Globo* TV and censored by DCDP in 1976. In “‘Freedom, the best thing in the world’: an analysis of the censorship process against Farewell De Casado (TV Globo, 1976)”, Guilherme Moreira Fernandes and Igor Sacramento analyze the moral aspects of the plot (marriage, adultery, family conflicts, separation, etc.) that were used by the censors as a reason to prohibit it or at least indicate its prohibition, since the DCDP director was who effectively could prohibited it. In this sense, the authors considered the links between morality in the 1970s and long-standing collective mentalities, not without relating them to the construction of anti-communist paranoia, also long-lived, which saw everything as a Machiavellian and conspiracy plan for the power-taking.

The most compelling of all the plot involving the censorship of *Despedida De Casado* is that there was nothing concrete (a scene, a character, a situation) that could justify the restrictions imposed on the soap opera, but the projection of the censors of

what could stir the spirits of the population and what could further erode the image of censorship. It was necessary, therefore, to safeguard the institution of the aforementioned “smear campaign”. In other words, the soap opera was banned for what it could hypothetically awake in Brazilian conservatism and, thereby, mobilize public opinion, not exactly because the material written and delivered to censorship was in any way against its legal dispositives.

In the chapter “*O Casarão: history, censorship and memory*”, Daniel Saraiva also chooses moral issues as the guideline for the censorship of soap operas, but does not disregard political demands as a background for censoring public entertainment. In addition, he takes up other controversial examples of censorship at that time, such as the soap opera *Roque Santeiro*, focusing, from this perspective, the hiring of communist authors by *Rede Globo*. He also considers the process of consolidating the soap opera genre in Brazil, which in a short time has become a record-breaking audience among television programs. Thus, Saraiva analyzes the DCDP censorship process, but also interviews the author Lauro César Muniz and people of the cast or connected to it. This results in a significant set of issues involving the production and the censorship of the soap opera *O Casarão*.

In this process of expansion, book censorship also had its own dynamics (although it came close to the others in relation to the criteria it used), being carried out by two different instances: the DCDP and the Office Press Sector (Sigab), both subordinated to the DPF. It was this way when it was not even more erratic, like that carried out in the early years of the military dictatorship.

About this period, Rodrigo Czajka analyzes other repression mechanisms structured by the State for the control of Brazilian publishers in the period previous to the regulation of publication censorship. In the chapter ““Whoever doesn't read, barely speaks, barely hears, barely sees”: repression and censorship to the publisher *Civilização Brasileira* (1963-1970)”, the author considers that although there was no legislation that regulated the censorship activity to the production and circulation of bibliographic works, there were, on the other hand, police practices that, through inquiries and investigations taken by the Federal Department of Public Security (DFSP), framed publications as subversive and disseminators of communist ideology. The case of the publisher *Civilização Brasileira* is interesting to be analyzed because it implies understanding the ways and mechanisms with which its editor, Ênio Silveira, had to deal with against repression even before the 1964 coup, something that would extend

until the 1970s. How did he operate in the intellectual networks established since the first moment he took over the publisher in the 1950s, but also how did he approach the more progressive military sectors as a resource for building his defense in military courts?

Czajka shows that, unlike the other fields of censorship that were already duly instituted in the 1960s, book censorship was only regulated in 1970 from Decree-Law n. 1,077. It happens that the leaders of both the SCDP and the DCDP, acting decentrally in the states, or centrally in Brasilia, were overworked at that time. Thus, adding book censorship seemed an unthinkable task in view of the volume of publications. Within the scope of the DCDP, the censorship of books was, therefore, previous like the others, but it did not have staff to analyze all books published in Brazil, including translations.

To circumvent this problem, censorship technicians began to examine only books that received some type of complaint – which could be addressed directly to the Federal Censorship and its state agencies or agencies to which it was subordinated, such as the DPF and the Ministry of Justice. But there was another censorship of books that also came from complaints, but primarily from the information community. It was not previous nor complied with the same protocol as the DCDP. Nor was it supported by the same legislation – which was basically Decree n. 20,493, of 1946, Law n. 5,536, of 1968, and Decree-Law n. 1,077, of 1970, but in the Press Law and mainly in the National Security Law (LSN). In the chapter “Academic books in the 1970s: one of the facets of censorship”, Douglas Attila Marcelino focuses on the coexistence of two book censorship during the military dictatorship, and the way they were carried out and even requested by different sectors. The author argues that, although the DCDP eventually carried out political censorship, this was not its strength with regard to printed matter (books and magazines), unlike the censorship carried out by other agencies.

In “Foreign authors, national vetoes – books and censorship in Brazil (1964-1985)”, from a thorough study of censorship processes, Sandra Reimão shows that even though the defense of moral and morality, the main justification for censorship of books carried out in the dictatorial period, the prohibitions on publications of foreign authors translated in the country were justified in this specific case considering the impact of its political and ideological aspects as a priority.

The different approaches about book censorship explicit, in general, a debate that has been mobilizing Brazilian historiography and which guiding questions were asked at the beginning of this presentation. In addition to the questions formulated

initially and which served as a guide to the organization of the collection, there is a difficulty common to all authors who have dedicated themselves to research the subject: that of understanding how the censorship agencies functioned internally, in the States or in the federal capitals, in Rio de Janeiro until the 1960s and in Brasília from the structuring of the public service in the new capital? How did they react in face of so many demands, both from government sectors and society, that crossed the 20th century?

At the end of this collection, published in two volumes, the reader engaged in reading the sixteen chapters will realize that, even though censorship is a long-term phenomenon, understood as a dispositive of a specific geopolitics or behavioral control, inscribed in the political sphere or in collective mentalities, case studies covering different sources, time frames and thematic selection are fundamental to their understanding.

Today, once again, Brazil is experiencing threats of political and moral censorship. Bolsonaro government uses economic censorship to attack traditional newspapers and tries to control government funding for artistic activities through moralistic arguments related to religiosity and sexuality. We hope that the studies gathered here contribute to the understanding of censorship in Brazil and, more than that, stimulate the combat against it.

Tradução de Adrianna Setemy