

Department of Media and Communications, Goldsmiths, University of London

IMPORTANT

1. This template must be used for the MA DISSERTATION
2. The Dissertation must be submitted by the deadline

Late submissions will not be marked unless there are acceptable mitigating circumstances according to College procedures

Insert your personal details below

Student Number	33338962
College Email	Jnoea001@gold.ac.uk
Degree Programme	MA in Political Communications
Word Count; Incl. notes, excl. reference list & appendices (NB: Appendices are <u>not</u> assessed)	
Deadline	26th of August

Dissertation Title

Type in box below

There will be no coup! Objectivity and partisanship in Brazilian political journalism: an analysis of the coverage of the impeachment of the president Dilma Rousseff through the eyes of alternative outlets.

Definition of Plagiarism

Plagiarism is an attempt (deliberate or inadvertent) to gain advantage by the representation of another person's work, without acknowledgement of the source, as the student's own for the purposes of satisfying formal assessment requirements.

Recognized forms of plagiarism include

1. the use in a student's own work of more than a single phrase from another person's work without the use of quotation marks and acknowledgement of the source;
2. the summarizing of another person's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without acknowledgement;
3. the use of ideas or intellectual data of another person without acknowledgement of the source, or the submission or presentation of work as if it were the student's own, which are substantially the ideas or intellectual data of another person;
4. copying the work of another person;
5. the submission of work, as if it were the student's own, which has been obtained from the internet or any other form of information technology;
6. the submission of coursework making significant use of unattributed digital images such as graphs, tables, photographs, etc. taken from books/articles, the internet or from the work of another person;
7. the submission of a piece of work which has previously been assessed for a different award or module or at a different institution as if it were new work;
8. a student who allows or is involved in allowing, either knowingly or unknowingly, another student to copy another's work including physical or digital images would be deemed to be guilty of plagiarism.
9. If plagiarism is suspected students will be required to supply an electronic copy of the work in question so that it may be subjected to electronic plagiarism detection testing. Therefore students are required to keep work electronically until after they receive their results as electronic detection may be part of the investigative process.

Source: Assessment Handbook 15f.

In submitting this work I

- 1) Confirm I have read and understood the regulations relating to plagiarism and academic misconduct when I confirmed my **assessment confirmation form** online.
- 2) Agree/Do not Agree (indicate your preference) to have my dissertation entered in my program's Dissertation Archive if it is selected.

SIGNATURE:

DATE:

ABSTRACT:

Taking as a starting point the impeachment of the Brazilian president Dilma Rousseff, this dissertation analyses the coverage of the process by the partisan alternative media in comparison to the so-called objective mainstream media. In order to do this, the work scrutinizes the coverage of two alternative and two mainstream outlets. Techniques of discourse analysis were used to verify how the word “coup” – reason of a controversy in the country – was used by the outlets. Subsequently, there is an evaluation on how the norms of objectivity were used or challenged by the alternative media. In the end, proposals were made with the objective to help in the development of the alternative media in Brazil.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Dedicated to my supervisor, Des Freedman, to my family, to my friends, to Hunter S. Thompson, to Raoul Duke and to Jeffrey Lebowski. All of you were sources of inspiration and help.

Sumário

INTRODUCTION.....	7
CHAPTER 1 - LITERATURE REVIEW	10
1.1 - JOURNALISM AND SCIENCE.....	10
1.2 - SCIENCE INTO PERSPECTIVE	15
1.3 - OBJECTIVITY UNDER CRITICISM.....	19
1.4 – GONZO AND LITERATURE	25
CHAPTER 2 – METHODOLOGY	33
CHAPTER 3 – FINDINGS	38
3.1 THE BATTLE OF THE COUP.....	38
3.2 – THE COVERAGE OF THE IMPEACHMENT.....	45
3.2.1 – REQUEST OF ARREST AGAINST LULA.....	46
3.2.2 - PHONE RECORDINGS	49
3.2.3 - VOTE IN THE CONGRESS	56
CHAPTER 4 - DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	66
CONCLUSION.....	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY:	74

INTRODUCTION

It was neither Berlin nor Belfast, but Brasília. In the morning of that fateful Sunday, 17th of April, a steel fence that had been installed some days before split the surroundings of the Congress, in the Brazilian capital, into two different sides. The so-called “petralhas”, who were against the impeachment of the president Dilma Rousseff, stood on the left, while the “coxinhas”, supporters of the impeachment, were on the right¹. Afraid of possible acts of violence, the authorities of a country known by its cordiality assessed to be necessary to separate the two groups on the day that the deputies would vote if the process of impeachment against Dilma would be sent to the Senate.

The scene was a perfect metaphor of what some call a divided nation. As if it was a grotesque football match, the “coxinhas” vibrated each time a parliamentarian voted in favour of the impeachment. On the other side, “petralhas” repeated the motto “Não vai ter golpe!” (There will be no coup!). The final result was 367 votes in favour of the impeachment against 137 to keep Dilma in power. Some said that the “coxinhas” won. Others said that, actually, the democracy lost.

Those with this opinion argue that Dilma did not commit any crime in order to be ousted from the post. The first woman elected president of Brazil was accused of delaying transfers of financial resources to public banks without the authorization of the Congress, which is considered a breach in budget laws. This operation had been made by other presidents before her but they were never punished.

Some people believe that the reason for such rigour with Dilma was a serious political crisis in the country. After being re-elected with a tight difference in the elections in 2014, her situation

¹ Petralhas is a pun in which supporters of the Workers Party (the Partido dos Trabalhadores, or PT) are deemed as criminals. Coxinhas is a slang used as a reference to higher classes people who support the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff.

only declined. Many of the politicians of her party, the PT, were accused of being involved in the Lava-Jato scandal, a corruption scheme in Petrobras, the most important Brazilian public company. Furthermore, an economic crisis made the popularity of Dilma plunge to the lowest level ever registered.

However, Dilma has never been accused of corruption. The same cannot be said about Eduardo Cunha, the then president of the lower house of the Congress, considered by many as the “architect” of the impeachment. Along with Michel Temer, the then vice-president, he is regarded of having planned the destitution of Dilma in order to make Temer take the power and help him not to be arrested.

Eduardo Cunha, however, might have had some contribution. The Brazilian mainstream media, for example, is accused of establishing an alliance with upper classes and acting as an opposition party to remove Dilma. Glenn Greenwald, in fact, stated that mainstream media in Brazil pretend to be impartial and objective, but acted as a tool of propaganda, stimulating protests against the government (Greenwald, 2016). On the other hand, it can be argued that some alternative media outlets acted in favour of the government, promoting a partisan account of what they classified as a coup.

This is the background that inspired this dissertation, which will analyse the coverage of the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff through the eyes of alternative outlets. The choice of this subject was the necessity of providing accounts of how media acted in this controversial moment in the History of Brazil. It is the intention of this work to offer an account of objectivity and partisanship in Brazilian political journalism. In order to do this, one of the questions that this work intends to answer is how was the approach of partisan alternative outlets compared to the so-called objective mainstream media during this coverage. It is also the intention of this dissertation to assess if it was pertinent the distinction between objective and partisan journalism in the reporting of the

impeachment. The last question to be answered is what the main strengths and flaws of the alternative media were in this episode.

CHAPTER 1 - LITERATURE REVIEW

As it was aforementioned, one of the aims of this dissertation is to analyse the coverage of the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff according to the adoption of objective and partisan approaches in the media. Therefore, it will be necessary to find definitions for these concepts. The first task of this literature review, therefore, will be an attempt to clarify what objective journalism can mean. This will lead to the necessity of discover what the criticisms against objectivity are and what are some options to it. One of them, the partisan journalism, will be analysed in its relation to alternative media. The subsequent task of this literature review will be to verify if it is possible for alternative media to be developed beyond the distinctions between objectivity and partisanship and how this could be done.

1.1 - JOURNALISM AND SCIENCE

The First World War is considered as a turning point to the adoption of objective procedures in the elaboration of reports by American newspapers. Michael Schudson observes that the combat brought to people a feeling of hopelessness. The democratic institutions, for example, did not avoid the conflict and began to be questioned. The public, who elected those who were in power during the beginning of the war, was seen as irrational. The consequence was that it became necessary to create objective ways to transmit information based on facts and not only values. However, these facts would be only interpretations if were not submitted to a filter of established rules (Schudson, 1978). In a certain way, therefore, the adoption of objectivity in the United States was considered a

reaction to the outcomes of the war as a way to shield media against the peril of being deceived by political leaders.

As a result, the appearance of professional associations and the adoption of codes of ethics contributed to the establishment of objectivity as a guideline in journalism. Another aspect observed by Schudson is that journalists sought to keep themselves away from the manipulation of public relations specialists and propagandists. By this time, objectivity as an ideal was expressed in textbooks used in schools of journalism, for example (Schudson, 2001: 162-163). It might be possible to say, hence, that transformations in the way journalists were organized helped the objectivity to be regarded not only as an optional practice, but as a norm that would give credibility to news if properly followed.

Other transformations in the American society also contributed to the adoption of objectivity as a norm in journalism. The change in the system of voting in the country was one of them. Michael Schudson explains that, before 1890, the American electors voted with ballots provided by the parties. However, the government took control of the system and started to print the ballots, which would be marked by the voter in the privacy of the booth. From this point, the act of voting became “a social practice that incorporated a new model of objectivity”. The consequence was that voting became “an activity in which voters make choice among programs and candidates, not one in which they loyally turn out in ritual solidarity to their party”. This required changes in journalism as well, since the press had to be transformed into an institution independent from political parties (Schudson, 2001: 159-161). This observation is important because it might show how the origin of objectivity is related to a certain detachment of newspapers from determined political stances, for example.

It was reasonable, therefore, that the norms of objectivity would be used by journalists to distinguish values from facts when reporting. In order to do this, it was necessary that each side of a

controversy was fairly represented in a report without comments of journalists, for example (Schudson, 2001: 150). Maybe, that is why Schudson classifies objectivity in journalism as a “moral philosophy”. The author argues that it provides a moral guidance on which groups base what is relevant for audiences. In this sense, objectivity is a way to assess what kinds of thinking people should engage in (Schudson, 1978:08). This way, journalists would use objectivity to decide the information that should be considered relevant to be printed in newspapers.

Gaye Tuchman, in an analysis of news media routine, offers a description of five “strategic procedures” that characterize the adoption of objectivity by journalists. The first one is verifying information with sources every time it is possible. The other strategies are the presentation of conflicting versions about an event, the presentation of supporting evidence, the use of quotation marks and the structuring of the information in an appropriate sequence (Tuchman, 1972: 665-671). These tools have the aim to inform the public and maintain the credibility of a publication. Adopting this strategy, news media can stand between people and governments (Tuchman, 1980:160-161). Following this reasoning, it is possible to say that news media acquired credibility to be considered an institution that would defend people from being deluded by those who were in power.

This image of news media might have been constructed based on the idea that journalism had a safe distance from power figures. Tuchman observes that the quotation marks, for example, were used by journalists to remove themselves from the story and let the “facts” speak. However, it is necessary to say, the author ponders that a reporter or an editor can use quotations of other people to express their own opinion in a piece. This way, their views would be conveyed, but not coming from the reporter himself, which would preserve his so-called “neutrality” (Tuchman, 1972:669-669). In fact, this might show that the very choice of the quotes attributed to a source can disguise a point of view under the veil of impartiality.

It can also be argued that a journalist will be closer to the objectivity if different versions of an event are presented. Tuchman observes that a statement of an opposition senator, for example, can be challenged by a government secretary. When these two versions of a story are presented to the public, the journalist can claim that followed the rules of objectivity. A story, nevertheless, can have more than two versions and opinions, which will oblige the reporter to convey all of them. In this case, the public would have to assess what version is true (Tuchman, 1972:665-667). Tuchman also argues that the Enlightenment presupposed that the truth would emerge from the conflict of divergent ideas. Following this reasoning, if the public cannot access diverse opinions, it will not be able to better assess governments actions (Tuchman, 1980: 165-166). Kathleen Hall Jamieson and Paul Waldman, on the other hand, observe that the balance of the ideas presented in a report is regarded as an important principle of objectivity. If an environmentalist is quoted, for example, it is necessary to quote someone from the industry lobby as well, for example. However, sometimes different opinions about an issue might not be equally valid (Jamieson and Waldman, 2003: 169). Tuchman notes that some authorities, such as government ministers, for example, are more likely to be trusted as a reliable source, since they have more access to “facts” (Tuchman, 1972: 672). Additionally, Daniëlle Raeijmaekers and Peter Maesele observe that the use of balance as a norm in journalism can reinforce the idea that “society – as ultimate benchmark for a mimetic media representation – is balanced as well”. In the opinion of the authors, this notion of balance can lead the audience to think that there are no major conflicts and that society is relatively consensual and harmonious (Raeijmaekers and Maesele, 2015: 07-09). At the same time, the idea of impartiality reflects a conception of detachment of journalist from a subject. Passions and emotions must be put away in the name of a rational solution of problems by experts, for example. The authors state that this idea of impartiality is highly ideological, since it excludes voices that are not considered reasonable enough to participate in the debate (Ibid). This exclusion, in fact, is debated by the

Propaganda Model of Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky. The authors argue that mainstream media is submitted to filters such as concentration of ownership, reliance on information provided by official sources and advertising as a primary source of revenue. These filters leave “only the cleansed residue fit to print” and lead to the marginalization of dissent voices. Convinced that they are interpreting news “objectively”, media professionals exclude views that are not considered legitimate to be reported (Herman and Chomsky, 2002 [1988]:02). After the observation of these ideas, it is possible to say that there is a hierarchy of sources. The problem of this hierarchy is that certain kinds of sources can be dismissed simply because they do not occupy positions of power, transforming objective journalism into a mere reproduction of elite ideas. There are also cases in which sources are in positions of power, but in positions of power that are not accepted as legitimate by a certain group.

Even with this criticism, however, it is possible to say that the adoption of objectivity norms could be considered a kind of scientific method to reach true claims in journalism. Schudson, for example, observes that journalists wanted their profession having the prestige of science, which was considered a god at that time of the rise of objectivity (Schudson, 2001: 162-163). Walter Lippmann, in the same line of thought, argues that the self-awareness of subjectivity allows us to notice our prejudice. Then, the destruction of prejudice gives an immense relief, breaking a version of the world. What follows is an appreciation of the scientific method and its virtues (Lippmann, 1998 [1922]: 409-410). The definition of objectivity by Richard Kaplan, in fact, is that it is a performance in which journalists adopt the perspective of scientists, eliminating their own beliefs and values. The aim of this stance is to abolish from the news any social commitments and organising philosophies, for example (Kaplan, 2012:26). Brian McNair, in his turn, understands objectivity as a method of processing information that “is independent of ideology in so far as it can command universal acceptance of its reliability” (McNair, 2013:84). The distance of the journalists

from the subjects presented in their reports, therefore, can be considered a basic principle of objectivity. Like scientists, objective journalists should rely on rational accounts of the world, without allowing their reports to be affected by personal issues.

1.2 - SCIENCE INTO PERSPECTIVE

The idea that journalism can function as a science, however, has to be put into perspective. Marcel Broersma argues that the main characteristic of the journalistic discourse is its claim to truth. The author observes that this assertion has been made since the advent of the press, which try to differentiate itself from gossip and pamphlet, for example. Consequently, if there is a violation of this claim, the credibility of journalism is in peril (Broersma, 2010:24-25). However, the author ponders that, in “99.9 percent of cases”, journalists are not able to be present in the events that they report, obliging them to rely on sources. The problem is that these sources have their own interests to cooperate with journalists and can manipulate or select the information leaked. So, the journalist has to gather information from different sources, which transform news into a “social construction that constitutes reality”, based on a selection criteria culturally and ideologically determined (Broersma, 2010: 25-26). It can be said, therefore, that news are a social construction of the reality. First, the sources will convey information according to their interests and also to their culture and personal ethics, for example. Afterwards, journalists can do the same.

In fact, Tuchman points out that, for some authors, knowledge is located in a place and time. This means that the knowledge acquired by anyone is inevitably linked to his or her class, culture, etc... Thinking this way, newswriters are always subject to their personal or professional bias (Tuchman, 1980: 177-179). One example given by the author might be pertinent to understand this idea. Tuchman defines supporting evidence as “additional ‘facts’, which are commonly accepted as

‘truth’”. This way, if in an obituary a musician is presented as “master” by the reporter, the editor, then, asks what makes this musician a master. The answer given by the reporter is that he played with a famous musician. This additional “fact” was accepted as evidence that the deceased was a master. However, Tuchman reminds that “assessment and acceptance of facts is highly dependent upon social processes” (Tuchman, 1972: 667-668). In this case, some supporting evidence can be only considered facts through social acceptance. The famous musician who played with the deceased, for example, could not be considered as a master by the public. At the same time, the fact that somebody played with a master does not transform this person into a master as well. If Theresa May, for example, was photographed drinking tea with Donald Trump, the British Prime Minister could be seen with distrust by some of her voters. However, on the other side, she could gain the confidence of some British National Party electors, for example.

What follows this reasoning is that truth claims made by objective journalism and even science depend upon a social acceptance. The psychologist Kenneth J. Gergen offers a good example of how objectivity and claims considered true can be challenged. Gergen cites the example of an odourless desk that is solid, weighs around 80 lb and has a mahogany colour. From the point of view of a biologist, the desk can have odour, since dogs have a superior sense of smell, for example. The same happens with an atomic physicist, who would say that the desk is not solid because it is formed by empty space. A rocket scientist, in turn, would say that the weight depends on the gravity. Finally, the psychologist would inform that the desk has no colours, because colours are only the reflection of light waves on the retina. Gergen observes that each of these professionals uses a specific vocabulary of their fields and, thus, objectivity and truth would be byproducts of “community traditions” (Gergen, 1999:14). Even what is taken as a natural scientific truth can be depicted in a way that favours a specific interpretation. One example cited by Gergen is found in biological texts that represent processes of the female body such as menstruation with a negative

connotation, as if the process was a lost opportunity for a woman to have a child. The author states that this account is not neutral because it reflects male interests (Gergen, 1999:22-23). The acceptance of this idea could create an immense problem to objectivity, since any fact could be questioned. In an example, cannibalism could be seen as a serious crime in certain communities while in others could be just a tradition. Following this reasoning up to an extreme point, there would be no facts; and if nothing is a fact, nothing could be reported objectively. Maybe, in order to avoid such nihilism, it is necessary to contextualize any statement that is taken for granted.

Raeijmaekers and Maesele, for example, argue that the ideal of objectivity in journalism is connected to conceptions about ideology in society and media. In the 1950s and 1960s, the thesis of the end-of-ideology was in vogue. This line of thinking defended that the Right and Left lost their meaning to give place to a consensus on capitalism and Welfare State. The media, in its turn, was conceived as an institution with no ideology and the focus of academia was in the analysis of the content conveyed in the news. By the 1970s and the 1980s, the rise of the New Left with movements such as feminism transformed the assumption of media as non-ideological. Media, then, was seen as a tool which reproduced hegemonic ideologies and the analyses of it were focused on how the media discourse was constructed within a dominant frame. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, however, the idea of end-of-ideology arose again, but with a neoliberal consensus. Once more, ideology has no role to play and “conflicts could be resolved in a rational way, either by the market or by experts”. This apparent new end-of-ideology, nevertheless, is contested by some authors, who defend that nowadays what happens is a conflict between right and wrong. Now, those who are against neoliberalism are deemed as fundamentalist or blind radical, for example (Raeijmaekers and Maesele, 2015: 04-06). In a similar way, those in Brazil who are against the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff can be deemed as “petralhas”, or defenders of corruption.

Taking this idea into account, it is possible to have one more argument to claim that objective journalism, in fact, can suffer from a lack of facts and an excess of bias. Raeijmaekers and Maesele, however, note that even the critique about media bias has to be put into perspective. The authors argue that the criticisms about the lack of objectivity are realized “within the box” of social consensus. Thus, the observations are restricted to mainstream political parties and politicians and do not touch on subjects that are out of the consensus between the both sides. In American politics, for example, the debate about media bias takes place only around disputes between Republican and Democrats. However, issues such as American imperialism are excluded from the debate (Raeijmaekers and Maesele, 2015: 10). In Brazil, this could also be true, since mainstream media can focus on issues concerning a battle between PT and its adversaries on the right, leaving their opponents on the left almost voiceless.

In this case, perhaps what happens is that objectivity is neglected as norm. Daniel C. Hallin, for example, proposes the division of journalism in three different standards. One of them, classified as the “Sphere of Legitimate Controversy”, is where objectivity and balance “reign”. In this sphere, there are political debates about contested issues. A second area is the “Sphere of Consensus”, where the journalists are not obliged to follow objectivity norms and even act as advocate of consensus values. The third area is the “Sphere of Deviance”, where those who violate or challenge the political consensus are exposed and condemned (Hallin, 1986: 116-117). This can be the sphere of anarchism and communism, nowadays, in countries such as Brazil and United States, for example.

This does not mean that an idea cannot move from the Sphere of Deviance to the Sphere of Controversy, for example. David Mindich gives two pertinent examples of how this can happen. The first one is the woman’s right to vote, which was in the Sphere of Deviance but nowadays resides on the Sphere of Consensus. The same might be happening with same-sex marriage, which,

in the opinion of Mindich, is in the Sphere of Controversy going towards the Sphere of Consensus (Mindich, 2016). Following this reasoning, the stances taken as serious by objective journalism can vary according to the sphere where a discourse is inserted.

One example is seen in an analysis of Wikinews, a website where the users can change the content of the news. Einar Thorsen observes that Wikinews admits that has a point of view based on the Anglo-American order of discourse. The author notes that any discourse from other spheres can be rejected on the grounds of being biased or not neutral. Thorsen concludes that neutral point of view is a constructed concept. Thus, what is considered a neutral point of view in one sphere “may differ considerably from the neutral point of view from a different discursive sphere” (Thorsen, 2008: 939-940). Objectivity, therefore, is a concept that will have different meanings depending on the time and place that it is located. It might not be even surprising, hence, to see some reactions against what is considered objectivity by mainstream media in the current days.

1.3 - OBJECTIVITY UNDER CRITICISM

The idea that what is neutral depend on time and place is reinforced, for example, by nature science. McNair writes that the theory of relativity problematized the notion that detached observation was the only way to report facts. McNair highlights that the relativity brought up to journalism the idea that the observer viewpoint is important in reporting. In this sense, there was more than one true account of events and “as science abandoned simple notions of objectivity, so over time did journalists” (McNair, 2010:120). Therefore, the idea of an absolute truth was substituted by an account in which truth could have many different aspects according to the point of view (Ibid). Some authors, in fact, defend that even the concept of objectivity can be under an unavoidable threat. Natalie Fenton and Tamara Witschge note that objectivity is seen as a factor that

characterizes journalism as truth seeking and rational. However, the abundance of voices found in the online environment “favours the acknowledgement of the impossibility of objectivity and an increased awareness of subjectivity” (Fenton and Witschge, 2011: 150). The importance of these accounts may lie in the recognition that the journalist also occupies a position when reporting. If we accept that the evolution of technology potentially gave to every person the possibility of being a journalist, thus the objectivity and neutrality lose their status of a detached observation of reality.

In the *Columbia Journalism Review*, Brent Cunningham lists some other problems that come with objectivity in journalism. One of them, the author argues, is the reliance on official sources. Another drawback is that objectivity can excuse a kind of “lazy reporting” and keep the public away from the truth, since it can make journalists satisfied with only the “both sides of the truth” when an issue is more complex. Cunningham highlights that changes in technology also contributed to make objectivity even more pervasive in journalism. In an era in which journalists are required to report 24 hours per day, it became easier to official sources pitch their point of view without being challenged (Cunningham, 2003). Nick Davies, for example, argues that journalists nowadays tend to sit in front of a computer without going to the streets after stories. The consequence is the emergence of what he calls “churnalism”, a practice in which journalists passively process information provided by PR or on-line sources without even checking its veracity (Davies, 2008). In the opinion of Fenton and Witschge, the recent economic crisis in newsroom also brought crescent threats to activities such as verification of information provided by sources. The result is that objectivity and impartiality became “the pseudo-science of the twenty-first century” (Fenton and Witschge, 2011: 160). Objectivity and reliance on facts thoroughly checked, therefore, have been transformed into something more difficult to be found. It might be reasonable to ponder that, in certain occasions, media can be biased not because of the adoption of a political stance, but only because it has no conditions to perform adequately the norms of objectivity.

The difficulties and criticisms about the objective journalism in the current days might have given more space to the rise of new possibilities of reporting. Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick, for example, argue that, during the coverage of conflicts, objectivity tends to favour the War Journalism, which is a practice of journalism that is bound to search violent responses for combats. The authors explain that in War Journalism there is a bias favourable to official sources, besides of a priority in reporting events over processes and a dualism that separates, for example, “us” from “them”. Actions of civil society in favour of peaceful solutions, for example, tend to be marginalised in the news (Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005:209). Unfortunately, it can be argued that the coverage of politics in Brazil has been showing some elements of War Journalism. This argument might be proven if we observe the separation of the country between the so-called “coxinhas” and “petralhas”.

In the coverage of conflicts, Lynch and McGoldrick propose a model of “Peace Journalism”. This kind of journalism gives prominence to the seeking of a peaceful solution to wars. Among its grounds is the attempt to expose all sides of a story, instead of prioritizing official sources, for example. The authors argue that the seeking for objectivity can forget “the edge of the news”. Lynch and McGoldrick observe that, in the coverage of Iraq War, for example, there was a tiny number of reports about the question of control of oil in the area. Relying only on official sources, journalism tends to ignore that the “actions of authorities on ‘our side’” are also part of the problem (Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005:204-205). Furthermore, the detachment of objective journalism from the facts that are being reported can lead to an idea that the work of journalists is not part of the problem.

A declaration by Bob Jobbins, a former editor of BBC World Service, published in the website *Reporting the World*, can summarize the pervasiveness of this stance. Jobbins stated that “conflict resolution is something on which I report not something in which I engage. A side effect

of my reporting may be that it makes conflict resolution harder or easier but that's a judgement that is made after our reporting" (quoted in *Reporting Before the Intifada*, 2002). In the opinion of Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick, this is a "linear way of thinking", which ignores the consequences of reporting as simple "externalities". The authors defend that journalism is part of a "feedback looping", in which audience can be transformed into sources or actors and, thus, responsibilities and outcomes of reporting must be considered (Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005:216-218). The authors use the ideas of Jacques Derrida to explain some aspects of objective journalism. Derrida states that the text is not "a finished corpus of writing, (...) but a differential network, a fabric of traces referring endlessly to something other than itself" (quoted by Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005: 219). This observation can be useful to understand that a journalistic text has causes and consequences beyond its words. Thus, if the experiences of a reporter are present in the text and this text overrides its limits, the existence of any objectivity or neutrality in journalism might be easily imploded. One way to try to overcome this limitation hence would be to assume and explicit the presence of a reporter and his experiences in the very journalistic text.

Chris Hedges, for example, classifies objectivity as "the disease of American journalism", transforming journalists into mere "voyeurs" who do not quest for justice and are disproofed of passion. The creed of objectivity, in his opinion, serves to make journalists stay away from unpleasant truths (Hedges, 2011:209). One might argue, thus, that the adoption of partisan journalism, with more proximity between journalist and source or journalist and subject being reported, can be positive to the profession.

One definition of partisan journalism is provided by Colin Seymour-Ure. The author describes three different models of partisanship. In one of them, the newspaper is directly linked to a party, for example. Another model is characterized by a correspondence between the paper and the party. What happens, in this case, is that commercial reasons lead one paper to adopt determined

political view, depending on the preference of the readers. The last definition is the case in which the newspaper is economically and organizationally independent, but it chooses to support the goals of a determined party or political actor (cited by McQuail, 1993:190). Initially, therefore, partisan journalism could be presented as a kind of counter-objective journalism.

The contrast between objective and partisan journalism is considered by Broersma as a distinction between what he calls “reflective style” and “news style”. The reflective style is related to the partisan journalism, where subjectivity is a necessity and in which “journalism derives its performative power from its ability to link up to the visions and knowledge of its own group”. On the other hand, the news style claims to have a neutral stance in order to serve the public interest. The author states that, in the reflective style, truth is “found in a vision of social reality”. In the news style, “truth can only be found in social reality itself (facts)” (Broersma, 2010: 29). This is a pertinent distinction, but it might be worth to notice that the partisan journalism can have elements of objectivity as well.

Michael Schudson observes that the adoption of a model of partisan journalism does not mean abdicating the pursuing of truth. The author states that, in this kind of journalism, outlets are explicitly declared allies of political parties, for example, using their reporting as a tool of partisan struggle. However, “partisan journalists, like objective journalists, typically reject inaccuracy, lying and misinformation, but partisan journalists do not hesitate to present information from the perspective of a particular party or faction” (Schudson, 2001: 150). In a certain way, this definition could be applied to one of the characteristics that are seen in alternative journalism.

What Chris Atton observes is that alternative outlets can overtly advocate in favour of some causes, replacing the ideology of the so-called “objectivity”. The author highlights that their practices can prioritize the use of the first person and an “eyewitness account by participants” (Atton, 2003:267). Another characteristic of alternative outlets can be the eschewing of hierarchical

organization in their structures (Ibid). Atton also states that alternative outlets profess democratic and participatory principles. These media provide readers with a chance to participate in the production of content that it is not seen in the mass media. There are also even cases in which the audience can take part in editorial decisions (2002:155). In the opinion of John T. Caldwell, alternative media work to contest hegemonies but also construct identities of marginalised groups. The author considers that alternative media give voice to oppressed people at the same time that provide them with an understanding of the power structures in which they are inserted (cited by Atkinson, 2010: 16). Jennifer Rauch, in her turn, notes that there is a strong relationship between alternative media and activism. The author observes that a salient contribution is made by alternative outlets in mobilizing activists. On the other hand, activists form a remarkable share of the audience of alternative media (Rauch, 2007:996). What is drawn from these definitions, hence, is that alternative media can be openly partisan, trying to stimulate the participation of the audience not only in the production of the news, but also in the struggles reported.

Considering this connection between media and activists, one the main challenges for alternative outlets, therefore, is being heard in the public sphere, which was initially classified by Jürgen Habermas as “a domain of our social life in which such a thing as public opinion can be formed” (Habermas, 1989 [1962]: 231). In a revision of his theory, however, Habermas ponders that, “under certain circumstances”, social movements can challenge the domination of mass media over the public sphere, which has boundaries that, “in principle”, are “permeable” (Habermas, 2009 [1996]: 373-374). The author asserts that, in periods of mobilization, it is possible to have changes in the balance of power (Habermas, 2009 [1996]: 379). This could be exemplified by the role played by *Mídia Ninja*, one of the alternative outlets that will be analysed in this dissertation, during the protests of 2013 in Brazil. In that occasion, one video published by *Mídia Ninja* was used in *Jornal Nacional*, the most watched TV news programme in the country, to clarify that one protester

was being wrongly accused of carrying explosives during a manifestation (Jornal Nacional, 2013). This case, however, seems to be an exception. It might be argued that, usually, alternative media voices are restricted to a certain ghetto or exclusion from the public sphere.

This space can be called the counter-public sphere. John Downey and Natalie Fenton observe that, in the counter-public sphere, marginalized groups have a chance to exercise solidarity in a desire to challenge the dominant capitalist communication. Political interventions, however, might need a certain interaction with mainstream media to have an impact on public opinion (Downey and Fenton, 2003:193). One problem noticed by Nick Couldry about the voices present in the counter-public sphere, for example, is a certain “cacophony”, where everyone speaks but nobody listens (Couldry, 2015:43-44). It might be reasonable to ask, therefore, is how the rejection of the objective journalism can be used to overcome an isolation of alternative media.

1.4 – GONZO AND LITERATURE

Brian McNair argues that among the recent transformations in journalism are the dissolution of lines between information and entertainment and objectivity and subjectivity, for example. The author states that it is increasingly more difficult to distinguish what is “serious” and “not serious journalism” and what is “fact” and “opinion”. With less financial resources, investigative journalism, for example, has been giving place to “the subjective journalism of the ‘I’” (McNair, 2013:79-80). Additionally, Natalie Fenton and Tamara Witschge argue that the increasingly diverse, complex and pluralist society of the current days, where the number of content providers rose sensibly, can result in a journalism that reflects these transformations. In this journalism, subjectivity and partiality are considered as a *modus operandi* to find what is taken by true (Fenton

and Witschge, 2011: 150). Perhaps, an inspiration for this new form of journalism of the future can be found in the past.

One example can be the Gonzo Journalism, a style of reporting defined by Bob Franklin et al. as "bold, exaggerated, irreverent, hyperbolic and extremely subjective, which positions the author at the centre of the narrative" (Franklin et al., 2012: 95). McNair classifies the Gonzo Journalism as a way of reporting that lies not only on the presence and participation of the journalist in the events reported, but also on "provocation by the reporter of those being observed and reported on" (McNair, 2010:129). McNair also highlights that the Gonzo never cared about distinctions between reality and fiction, literature and journalism (Ibid). In fact, the author argues that many similarities can be found between journalism and literature. The latter, the McNair writes, can be considered just as a description of reality in an original way. In his opinion, journalism and literature could be considered as "just different pathways to the same destination – that of understanding the real" (McNair, 2010:119). One could argue that the use of literature elements in journalism might undermine its credibility. However, even in academic essays, literature is present.

In *A Thousand Plateaus*, for instance, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari justify the quotations of fictional books arguing that the only question that is worth to be raised when one writes is what "machine" will be connected to the text. In the case of Kafka, for example, it was "a most extraordinary bureaucratic machine" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2011 [1980]: 05). The authors also state that literature "has nothing to do with ideology" and that it is an assemblage: "What if one became animal or plant through literature, which certainly does not mean literarily? Is it not first through the voice that one becomes animal?"(Ibid). Two aspects can be apprehended from this excerpt. The first one is the objective characteristic of fiction that can be inferred from the assertion that literature is not connected to ideology, which might be considered one component of partisanship, for example. The second one is the capacity of literature to reproduce and also produce

realities. As Kafka reproduced a bureaucratic reality, Orwell foresaw what could be interpreted as an overly guarded society with his “Big Brother”. Thus, literature can be understood as an interpretation of reality with the capacity to influence or anticipate the future. In a certain way, that might be exactly the same thing that journalism does.

That is why the inspiration of alternative media from Gonzo Journalism might be pertinent in the current days. Created by Hunter S. Thompson, this model of journalism might have had its first manifestations in the mid-60s. At that time, the motorcycle gang Hell’s Angels was considered a menace to America, with hundreds of records of felonies. The members of the group were frequently seen exhibiting swastikas on their helmets while terrorized the United States on their bikes. Hunter S. Thompson, then, accompanied the Angels for almost one year, going to their parties and seeing their fights. The proximity with the gang provided the opportunity for certain insights and also a better understating of its traits. “If they wanted to be artful about bugging the squares they would drop the swastika and decorate their bikes with the hammer and sickle. That would really raise hell on the freeways... hundreds of Communist thugs roaming the countryside on big motorcycles, looking for trouble”, observed Thompson about the Angels (Thompson, 1999 [1966]: 293). The merit of Thompson was not on depicting a fair, balanced and rational portrait of a gang of motorcyclists. Imprecisions or biased accounts might have been committed by Thompson, as he confesses that he was spending much time with the Angels: “I had become so involved (...) that I was no longer sure whether I was doing research on the Hell’s Angels or being slowly absorbed by them” (Thompson, 1999 [1966]: 55). This demonstrates that there was not a detachment between journalist and his subjects. However, he wrote a book with a close portrait of a “world most of us would never dare encounter” as the *New York Times* observed (Litwak, 1967). Thompson, then, was able to understand the world of men “who lost all options” and were excluded from the American society (Ibid). This might have been his major merit when writing about the

Angels. A merit that is impossible to be achieved if a journalist follows the norms of objectivity and neutrality.

The immersion of Hunter S. Thompson in political journalism occurred in 1972, when he covered the presidential elections in the United States. Openly anti-Nixon, the journalist wrote about the Democrat primaries for the *Rolling Stone* magazine. In one of his first articles, Thompson raised polemic when deemed as a “swine” a judge who was nominated to the Supreme Court (Thompson, 2005 [1973]: 31). Once more, neutrality was not a priority for Thompson, who wrote that “[w]ith the possible exception of things like box scores, race results and stock market tabulations, there is no such thing as Objective Journalism. The phrase itself is a pompous contradiction in terms” (Thompson, 2005 [1973]: 44). In fact, right from the beginning of the coverage, the journalist declared that the Democrat senator George McGovern was the only candidate in any party that was worth to be voted (Thompson, 2005 [1973]: 30). The engagement of Thompson could be perceived when he invented that there were “rumours” that Ed Muskie, one of the adversaries of McGovern in the primaries, was addicted to a hallucinogen called ibogaine (Thompson, 2005 [1973]: 143). The affirmation was a clear invention created by Thompson to attack Muskie, although it rendered some criticisms. One fact is that Thompson might have had more freedom to write, but he was not traditionally a political journalist and was covering the campaign for only a year.

“The most consistent and ultimately damaging failure of political journalism in America has its roots in the clubby/cocktail personal relationships that inevitably develop between politicians and journalists – in Washington or anywhere else where they meet on a day-to-day basis. When professional antagonists

become after-hours drinking buddies, they are not likely to turn each other in... especially for ‘minor infractions’ of rules that neither side takes seriously” (Thompson, 2005 [1973]: 14).

The observation might be relevant if we consider that beat reporters can be bounded to their sources in a way that impedes them to publish whatever they want, keeping information off-the-record. Thus, even when journalists claim to follow the norms of objectivity, the relation with the source can be another threat to an honesty account of events.

The Gonzo Journalism, of course, raised criticisms. Some authors, for example, point out that while Hunter S. Thompson was practicing the Gonzo, Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein were being more effective, using “un-Gonzo” techniques (Cox, 2008). In 2007, for example, BBC was accused of doctoring TV footage in the programme *Newsnight* to affect the image of the then Labour leader, Gordon Brown. The professional responsible for the programme justified the edition of the footage as an example of “Gonzo Journalism”. However, Brown’s office declared that Gonzo Journalism should not be used in a serious programme such as *Newsnight* (Walters, 2007). Certainly, this assertion is exaggerated, especially in the current days.

In a rejection of objectivity, Hunter S. Thompson declared that a journalist could not be objective about Richard Nixon or Bill Clinton, for example. In fact, he argued in 1997 that objective journalism was “one of the main reasons American politics has been allowed to be so corrupt for so long” (quoted by Hahn, 1997). If he was still alive, Thompson would certainly question how the norms of objectivity could be applied to figures such as Donald Trump.

It can be argued, in fact, that recently the Huffington Post used some Gonzo techniques in the coverage of the republican candidate campaign. The newspaper announced that “if Trump's words and actions are racist, we'll call them racist. If they're sexist, we'll call them sexist”

(Huffington, 2015). In the *Columbia Journalism Review*, for example, David Mindich notes a change of journalistic detachment in the United States in relation to Donald Trump's campaign. The author argues that "facts alone may be a poor weapon against a campaign that rarely admits errors, choosing instead to double down on dubious claims" (Mindich, 2016). Explicit disparagements of people such as Trump, however, are not the only thing that Gonzo Journalism can offer.

The ethnographer Bradley L. Garret, for example, defends that Gonzo Journalism is "crucial" to the understanding of cities. He cites Peter Høeg, to whom the best way to understand a different culture is living it. In the opinion of Garret, journalists need to have a long-term immersion in order to have more powerful accounts about urban phenomena. Garret states that the immersion of Thompson, such as that observed with the Hell's Angels, can be dangerous, but it can be transformed into valuable narratives from inside out (Garret, 2015). This immersion might be useful to be applied in politics as well. Perhaps, the best way to give a deep account of the Republican Party, for example, is joining it in order to experience its routine and better know who its members are. In Brazil, the same thing could happen either to give a deeper account of the routine in favelas or of the thoughts of those who defended the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff. So, a journalist can cross the line of objectivity not only giving an opinion about an issue, but also by immersing in a community or a group.

Walé Azeez and Sarah Marshall, in fact, note that one of the research models of Anthropology is the participant observation, in which anthropologists spend long periods of time with the subjects of a study. The aim is to distinguish the differences between what they say and what they do. The authors also point out that both Journalism and Anthropology analyse the human behaviour, but in different time spans (Azeez and Marshall, 2013). It might be reasonable for journalism to become more an anthropological work in a certain way. Perhaps, the use of distanced objectivity is not enough anymore to provide stories relevant to the audience.

Another source of inspiration for journalism can be found in the writings of George Orwell. Bernard Crick reveals that, in 1928, Orwell went to Paris to become a writer, but ended up with no money. He worked washing dishes in a hotel and experienced the routine of poor neighbourhoods in the French capital for at least ten weeks. The result was a section of the book *Down and Out and Paris and London*. Crick, however, observes that it is impossible to distinguish exactly what was real or fictional in the narrative of Orwell (Crick, 1980:111-112). Dervla Murphy, on the other hand, states the discussion if the events narrated in the book are autobiography or fiction is trivial. *Down and Out* is “the white-hot reaction of a sensitive, observant, compassionate young man to poverty, injustice and the callousness of the rich. It offers insights rather than solutions; but always insights have to precede solutions” (Murphy, 1989: xii-xiii). One aspect observed by Murphy is that the condition of Orwell in Paris was different from what the majority of writers’ experience. Instead of pretending to be poor to report a certain reality, Orwell was not “playing a game” and was living a modest life (Murphy, 1989: viii). The description of Orwell about how it is to be hungry certainly could not be provided by any kind of objective journalism:

“With bread and margarine in your belly, you go out and look into the shop windows. Everywhere there is food insulting you in huge, wasteful piles; whole dead pigs, baskets of hot loaves, great yellow blocks of butter, strings of sausages, mountains of potatoes, vast Gruyère cheeses like grindstones. A snivelling self-pity comes over you at the sight of so much food. You plan to grab a loaf and run, swallowing it before they catch you; and you refrain, from pure funk” (Orwell, 1989 [1933]: 15).

It still remains a question if these ideas provided by Orwell and Thompson, for example, are used by alternative journalism in Brazil as a form of challenging the so-called objective narratives of the mainstream media. The next task of this dissertation, therefore, will be to examine the similarities and differences between mainstream and alternative media during the coverage of the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff. Before doing this, however, it is necessary to detail some methodological aspects of this analysis.

CHAPTER 2 – METHODOLOGY

The use of the word “coup” was a motive of massive controversies during the process of impeachment of Dilma Rousseff. Those who were against the impeachment, based on the grounds that the president did not commit any crime, deemed the ousting of her as a “coup”. On the other hand, those who wanted to take the power defended that the procedures were based on democratic rules and that the impeachment was legal. It could be argued that the legitimacy of the word and its meaning have become the object of a dispute in the “Sphere of Controversy”. Each “side”, thus, relied on an army of jurists, sociologists, historians and other pundits to support their respective views.

The media can be considered the main field of this battle. However, mainstream outlets that, in theory, follow the norms of objectivity were accused of being biased during the coverage of the impeachment... or the coup (Greenwald et al., 2016). That is why the first task of this case study of this dissertation will be analysing the use of the word “coup” in the two newspapers that are considered the most influential in the country, *Folha de São Paulo* and *O Globo*, in the period of one week. Afterwards, it will be made a comparison of the use of the word in two selected alternative outlets, *Mídia Ninja* and *Jornalistas Livres*, during the same space of time.

In the second part of the case study, it will be analysed the coverage of three events that can be considered pertinent in the process of impeachment of Dilma Rousseff. To do this, the texts published on three different dates in *Folha*, *O Globo*, *Mídia Ninja* and *Jornalistas Livres* will be examined. Since it might be a difficult task to measure the impact of an event to the impeachment, the episodes chosen to be analysed in this second part of the case study can be considered relatively controversial in the point of view of those who were in favour or against the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff.

Before describing the methodology of the analyses, it is necessary to explain the reason for the choices of the outlets that will be scrutinized in this work. *O Globo* and *Folha* are, respectively, the second and the third most sold newspapers in Brazil (ANJ, 2015). The leader of the ranking, *Super Notícia*, was excluded from this research because it is a tabloid with regional circulation, while *O Globo* and *Folha* are national. Both newspapers, it is necessary to say, declare themselves “nonpartisan”, following the principles of objectivity (*O Globo*, 2016h, and *Folha de São Paulo*, 2016i). On the other hand, *Mídia Ninja* and *Jornalistas Livres*, sustain that produce information in a way that challenges the mainstream media, with alternative points of view and a non-hierarchical structure that counts on active participation of readers. Furthermore, none of them is funded by advertising, which makes them dependant on donations to survive (*Mídia Ninja*, 2016a, and *Jornalistas Livres*, 2016a). These characteristics, therefore, can fit them into the category of alternative media.

The choice of *Mídia Ninja* and *Jornalistas Livres* was not fortuitous. Despite the inexistence of a formal readership ranking of alternative media in Brazil, the pages of these two outlets have a considerable number of “likes” on *Facebook*. *Jornalistas Livres* has more 480 thousand (*Jornalistas Livres Facebook*, 2016) and *Mídia Ninja* accumulates more than 970 thousand likes (*Mídia Ninja Facebook*, 2016). These numbers put both websites among the most read on the *Map of Independent Journalism in Brazil* (Agência Pública, 2016). Additionally, *Mídia Ninja* can be considered a relevant website, for it has already had reports reproduced in the mainstream media (*Jornal Nacional*, 2013). Thus, it might be argued that both *Mídia Ninja* and *Jornalistas Livres* are important alternative outlets in the country.

In this work, the methodology used to analyse the texts will be the discourse analysis. As Deacon et al. put, this kind of analysis can expose “the assumptions and values that are wrapped up in the construction of even relatively simple grammatical forms” (Deacon et al., 2010:150). Klaus

Krippendorff, in his turn, states that the discourse analysis tends to draw its attention on how a certain phenomenon is represented. The author defines discourse as “text above the level of sentences” (Krippendorff, 2013: 22). Deacon et al. also observe that texts represent the point of view, beliefs and values of a certain social group and the analysis of discourse allows the understanding of links between discourse and sociocultural practices (Deacon et al., 2010:151). The media messages, they argue, “are not neutral” and “tend to mobilise or reinforce relations of control”. The authors defend that “understanding how communication operates is necessary, and the value of critical work in the social sciences and humanities is that it provides opportunities to stand back and investigate, from alternative perspectives, the common-sense basis of the ways (...) the media communicate to their audiences” (Deacon et al., 2010:154). Additionally, Krippendorff claims that discourse analysis can allow the researcher to perceive bias in media representations. Another aspect mentioned by the author is the chance of making readers aware of possible alternative readings of determined texts (Krippendorff, 2013: 68). Anders Hansen and David Machin state that discourse analysis can reveal how language and grammar in texts are used to persuade or even manipulate people, sometimes concealing these intentions (Hansen and Machin, 2013: 115). In this context, the discourse analysis will be relevant to this research because it will help to discover if texts classified as impartial, for example, are really impartial. Moreover, it will permit to investigate how the norms of objectivity were used or challenged by the outlets studied. One observation has to be done regarding the first part of this analysis. Deacon et al. ponder that “objectivity in any absolute form is an illusion” (Deacon et al., 2013: 138). The assertion of the authors, that could be used to talk about the characteristics of journalism, is also relevant in this discussion of methods. In the words of Deacon et al. , “when quantitative and qualitative approaches are used methodologically in combination with each other, the resulting analysis is invariably stronger” (2010:140). That is why the first part of the case study will have a quantitative

account of how the word “coup” was used by the selected outlets. In this case, there will be a quantification of who were the persons or institutions to whom the use of the word “coup” was attributed to during the selected period. This will be measured by the observation of quotation marks and sentences in the text attributing the mention of the word to a determined source. After this examination, a qualitative analysis will scrutinize the results, highlighting some cases that might need attention.

Some drawbacks concerning the use of these methods have also to be taken into consideration. One of them, observed by Hansen and Machin, is that discourse analysis tends to be critical of the way language is used. This characteristic can lead the analysis to be seen as a political project and “unscientific”, “since it lacks the necessary objective stance to what we study that is normally required by academic ideals” (Hansen and Machin, 2013: 116). The authors, however, argue that the overt acknowledgement of the agenda of a research can be an advantage because researchers usually do not state the reasons for carrying out an analysis (Ibid). Deacon et al. ponder that even the adoption of techniques to avoid bias does not mean that “prejudices, assumptions and ideas will not have any bearing on” the research (Deacon et al. 2010: 139). The authors also state that the researcher has to be aware of the dangers of generalisation as a conclusion of a text analysis. This kind of research can show intentions in texts, but it is not enough to jump to conclusions without more evidence (Deacon et al., 2010:156). However, it might be important to analyse texts because it can provide tools to show ideological discourses contained in the texts but that are seen as a natural fact (Deacon et al, 2010: 158). It is expected, therefore, that the analysis made in this work can shed a light on possible relations, interests or, at least, intentions contained in the journalistic texts that can convey certain representations to their readers, but it has to be highlighted that this analysis is not a definite analysis, but only one possible analysis.

After the discussion about the method used in this case study, it is important to describe some of the strategies that can be used in this work. One of them is called lexical analysis. Hansen and Machin describe it as an analysis that simply focuses on the words that were used in the text. In this context, it is relevant to notice, for example, what kind of words are used with more frequency and what could be the objective of the use of these words (Hansen and Machin, 2013: 122). The presence of what is defined as over-lexicalisation can also be important in this work. In this case, what is important is to notice if a word is being used in abundance or if there is an over-description. In the opinion of Hansen and Machin, this can show “some anxiety about the need to persuade” or “suggests something about the contentious nature of the claim being made” (Hansen and Machin, 2013: 123). The authors also point others forms of analysing a discourse. If a text is not nominalising a politician, for example, this can be a form of criticizing a person in an institutional or generic way, without personalising or holding this authority into account (Hansen and Machin, 2013: 127-128). These kinds of approaches used in the analysis of the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff can be important to detect possible stances adopted by outlets during the coverage.

CHAPTER 3 – FINDINGS

3.1 THE BATTLE OF THE COUP

The first part of this analysis consists of an examination of reports published on the four selected outlets between 11th and 18th of April, the day following the vote of the impeachment of Dilma in the lower house of Brazilian Congress. The aim is to check what person, institution or organization was the source of the word “coup” in articles about the impeachment and how these sources were treated on the reports. It is important to notice that editorials or opinion articles were excluded from this study. In the case of the alternative outlets, the reports studied can contain opinions (due to the partisan nature of the websites selected), but they should also convey the description of an event. The research also considered that if the word “coup” appeared twice in the same sentence, for example, this was considered only one appearance. However, if the same source used the word twice in different sentences, the word was counted twice. In the case there is not any source attributed to the word, the outlet itself was considered the source. The results of this research were grouped according to the distinction between mainstream and alternative media.

The “coup” in the mainstream media

The analysis found that the word “coup” appeared 102 times in the mainstream media. In most of the occasions - 84 times - the word was attributed to persons or institutions that were against the destitution of Dilma and considered the process as a coup. The term was also used 9 times by supporters of the impeachment, who rejected its classification as a coup. The process was not considered a coup by two neutral sources, who did not state any opinion about the permanence

of Dilma in the power. Other three sources were neutral about the use of the word coup and about the impeachment. In other four occasions, the source of the word was the newspaper itself.

These numbers might show that the coverage of the mainstream media about the issue of a possible coup was reasonably objective. Almost all the times the word “coup” was pronounced, it was attributed to a source. A close observation of the data, nevertheless, reveal that in some cases this objectivity might have been only apparent.

In a report published by *O Globo* on 18th of April, for example, there is a description of the reactions of Latin American leaders to the vote in the Congress. Without citing any source, the newspaper says that the Argentinian government “has never talked about a coup in Brazil and never will”. Shortly thereafter, *O Globo* expressed that “sources” informed that Mauricio Macri, the president of Argentina, said that the country “will not meddle in internal affairs” of Brazil (*O Globo*, 2016a). The same report says that the presidents of Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador “publicly defended the government of PT and denounced ‘a civic, media and judicial coup in Brazil’” (*Ibid*). The newspaper continued saying that the Venezuelan president, “who has the government of PT as one of his main political allies in the continent” posted on his *Twitter* a picture of “manifestations pro-PT” (*Ibid*).

Initially, this report could be considered a perfect example of objectivity. The facts were described, conflicting opinions were expressed and quotation marks were used. However, if we analyse carefully, it is possible to notice a certain attempt to undermine the credibility of some sources. Firstly, the relation between Argentina and Brazil is described as being more institutional. Macri, for example, says that will not interfere in internal affairs. There is not any citation about possible affinities between Macri and Brazilian politicians. So, Macri could be considered a neutral source according to what was published. The situation is different to describe that the presidents of Venezuela, Ecuador and Bolivia defended not the Brazilian government, but “the government of

PT”, in the words of the newspaper. The same applies when it is said that the Venezuelan president posted a picture of “manifestations pro-PT” and that he is an ally of the “government of PT”. Suddenly, the government of Brazil was transformed into the government of a party.

The classification of the president of Venezuela as a political ally of the “government of PT” in the continent can also be put into a perspective. One can argue that this is an undeniable truth and should be stated in order to preserve the impartiality of the report. This is a reasonable argument. However, at the same time, it could have been expressed that the Argentinian government had a political affinity with the adversaries of Dilma Rousseff. This assertion can be proved, for example, if we observe a recent event, occurred after Dilma was suspended from the presidency by the Brazilian Senate. Already under the government of Michel Temer, Brazil joined Paraguay and Argentina in a movement to avoid the transference of the leadership of Mercosur to Venezuela (Mello, 2016).

This is only a coincidence, one could claim. Surely, but in the same text it is possible to notice another coincidence. The report has a quote of Luis Almagro, general secretary of the OAS (Organization of American States), saying that the accusations against Dilma Rousseff do not justify a “process of destitution”. In the text, however, it is informed that Almagro “was recently in Brasília” (Ibid). Even if it is not said that Almagro is an ally of Dilma, the information that he had been in the Brazilian capital can be interpreted as an evidence of his proximity with the government of Brazil or, better, “the government of PT”. Therefore, it could be a way to undervalue sources that are against the impeachment.

In fact, it is possible to say that there are, at least, two other cases in which the objectors of the impeachment had their credibility reduced by the mainstream media. In reports about protests against the “coup” published by *O Globo* and *Folha* on 16th of April, for example, the main aspect highlighted was the problems in the traffic caused by the manifestations (Mariz, 2016, and *Folha de*

São Paulo, 2016a). Another case was found in a report of *Folha* about the differences between the impeachment of the then president Fernando Collor, in 1992, and the impeachment of Dilma. In the report, the PT senator Lindbergh Faria is described as a politician investigated in the corruption scandal of Petrobras who says that “the impeachment is a coup” (Rossi, 2016). Ironically, in the report, the senator from PSDB, Aécio Neves, who is investigated in the same case, is only described as “one of the main opponents of the government” (Ibid). While the text linked a scandal to a politician who “says that the impeachment is a coup”, another politician who defends the destitution of Dilma was not linked to the same case. Taking this into account, this report could be considered at least incoherent to not to say unbalanced or biased.

It was also possible to notice at least other two ways in which the credibility of those who classify the impeachment as a “coup” was undermined in the mainstream media. One of them can be seen in a report published by *O Globo* on 18th of April, after the loss of Dilma on the lower house of the Congress. The text states that, after the defeat, the ally of Dilma and former Brazilian president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, known as Lula, and PT would do everything to “reinforce the discourse of the coup” in order to change the game on the Senate (O Globo, 2016b). In a period of three days before this report, something similar could be read in other two articles of the same newspaper. One of them says that Lula “insists (...) on the discourse of the coup” and the other conveys that “the PT plans to insist on the discourse of the coup” (Remígio, 2016, and Krakovics, 2016). On 18th of April, *Folha* also published that, after the defeat in the Congress, the “discourse” of PT would be that the problems of Brazil would not be solved by a president who got to the power “through a ‘coup’” (Uribe et al., 2016).

Here, one aspect to be noticed is that the “coup” is classified as a “discourse”. The logic seems to be basic. If there is a “discourse of the coup” used by Lula and PT, this can mean that there is no coup, but only a simple communication strategy used by the PTists to transform the

impeachment into a coup and then keep the power. Additionally, the use of the verb “to insist” could also denote that the PTists simply do not accept that nobody believes that the impeachment was a coup. It can be said that the norms of objectivity were followed in these texts, surely. However, it can also be argued that the norms of objectivity were bent in order to undermine the credibility of those who believe that the impeachment was a coup.

The coup in the alternative media

Before discussing the results found in the alternative media, one observation is necessary. Differently from the selected mainstream media outlets, the alternative outlets will not be analysed by their compliance to the norms of objectivity. In fact, the content published by *Mídia Ninja* and *Jornalistas Livres* will be examined mainly through the optics of how they challenged the mainstream media and its objectivity norms. *Mídia Ninja*, for example, claims that gives a space to “multimedia citizens” share their “own opinions” in the virtual world through a collaborative platform (Mídia Ninja, 2016b). In its turn, *Jornalistas Livres* asserts that has side and that “individually” each one who makes the website is not “neutral”. The members of *Jornalistas Livres* say: “we have one side” because “each one of us has his own sides” (Jornalistas Livres, 2016b). Following the norms of objectivity, therefore, is not the priority of *Mídia Ninja* and *Jornalistas Livres*.

The numbers of how the word coup was presented in the alternative media, therefore, might not even be surprising. In total, there were 79 citations of the term. Most of them, 45, were made by people who were against the impeachment and considered it a coup. In other 30 times, the word was used by the outlets themselves, without any quotation marks or indication of source, in order to condemn the impeachment. In the other 4 occasions in which the word coup was used, it was to describe the name of a camp in Brasília where protesters against the impeachment spent the day of the vote of the process. There was not any case of adversaries of Dilma quoted in the outlets.

From the analysis of the discourse presented by the alternative media, it might be possible to infer that there was an attempt to shape an image of those who used the word coup to condemn the impeachment. One example is a report of *Jornalistas Livres* that had a video showing testimonies of people against the removal of Dilma Rousseff. The interviewees are mostly students and professors, but there are also representatives of social movements and artists (Jornalistas Livres Amazonas, 2016). Something similar happened in an article published by *Mídia Ninja* on 15th of April about a protest in the South of Brazil against the impeachment. In the text, the manifestation is depicted as “pacific”, with the presence of “students” and “artists”. The report also relates that the act occurred with people in a “laid back atmosphere, differently from the current moment of tension and polarization” in the country, making people pay attention to the “importance of standing against the coup” (Biondo, 2016). Another report of *Jornalistas Livres*, about the women present in the camp of protesters against the impeachment in Brasília, begins calling attention to the “high amount of young people” present in the place (Cortez, 2016). What emerges from the examination of these texts is the construction of an image in which the objectors of the impeachment have an intellectual profile and are not prone to use violence in order to have their demands met.

Some elements found in the texts of alternative media, however, might disavow this claim, showing a certain segregation discourse made by objectors of the impeachment. In the aforementioned report of *Jornalistas Livres* about the presence of women in the protests against the impeachment, for example, a young student who took part in the manifestation was scared about the “fascist climate expressed by the supporters of the coup” (Ibid). Additionally, in an article about an act of artists for democracy in Rio de Janeiro, a minister of the cabinet of Dilma said that “they try to give a character of legality to the coup (...) but openly flirt with fascism” (quoted Ninja, 2016b). It was not clear in the text who were “they”, but it seemed to be a reference to the mainstream media.

Clearly obvious was another reference to a certain division in a text about an act against the impeachment on the beach of Copacabana, considered an upper class area in Rio. The text says that “representatives of social movements”, “professors”, “artists”, “students” and “children”, for example, took the streets around the beach that, “for a long time, have been frequented by the Brazilian higher class” (Tostes, 2016). It is also reported that the owners of “luxurious penthouses made a sign” with inscriptions in favour of the impeachment (Ibid). The depiction of the elites as pivots of the coup can also be noticed in a text about a debate at a university in São Paulo, where one of the panellists compared the impeachment of Dilma with the military coup in 1964, in Brazil. He said that “who still have not understood that the coup has a class elitism, that this coup is a regression that has never been seen since 64, have not understood anything” (quoted by Bacha, 2016).

As it is possible to notice, some excerpts of these texts depict a separation between “us” and “them” that shows a “flirt” of the alternative media with objectivity principles present in the War Journalism described by Lynch and McGoldrick (needs reference). The classification of the supporters of the impeachment as “fascists” or “elitists” overlooks important particularities and can lead to a generalisation as dangerous as the stigmatization of all those who voted ‘Leave’ in the UK referendum as xenophobes.

In a certain way, this reflection is made by Lula in one the reports published by *Mídia Ninja*. First, the former president says that “the elite think that poor people have to be housekeeper, cleaner. Only they can be doctors and engineers. We changed this logic! Before, the university was only for them” (quoted by Ninja, 2016b). Lula, however, ponders, saying that he does not want “to divide the country between us and them. I governed a country for everybody. They do not like politics. Do you know who speak for them? The democrat Bolsonaro” referring to Jair Bolsonaro, a

Brazilian congressman who is famous for his declarations supporting the military coup of 1964 (Ibid).

Despite denying the intention of dividing the country, the declarations of Lula still are based on the idea of us and them. This is similar to what could be noticed in some texts referring to the coup in the alternative media. The two selected outlets claim to provide a different stance from mainstream media, but might be falling into the traps of a polarising journalism. A certain division between poor people and elite and democrats and fascists exists, it is undeniable. However, the alternative media might be failing to investigate and demonstrate in deep the characteristics of the elite and the characteristics of this fascism. Perhaps, a close look will show that classist elite and fascists are on the both sides of the dispute of the impeachment.

3.2 – THE COVERAGE OF THE IMPEACHMENT

The second part of this analysis will focus on the comparison of the coverage about three events that can be considered relevant in the process of impeachment of Dilma Rousseff. Differently from the first part, where the meaning of a word was scrutinized according to the stances adopted by mainstream and alternative media, now what will be scrutinized is the coverage itself. Once more, the adoption or challenging of the norms of objectivity will be taken into consideration. It is also important to highlight that, in order to do this, only reports will be analysed. The texts of editorials and columnists, considered more as the expression of opinions, are excluded of this dissertation. As it happened in the first part of the analysis, however, text with comments published by alternative media can be analysed, since they offer an account of the events.

3.2.1 – REQUEST OF ARREST AGAINST LULA

The first event whose coverage will be analysed is the request of arrest against Lula. The request, made by prosecutors of the State of São Paulo, was based on alleged evidence that building companies had paid for a refurbishment in an apartment that would belong to Lula, in return for advantages in public contracts. Since Lula is one of the most important allies of Dilma, this request was considered fundamental to influence the public opinion in favour of the impeachment. This request, made just three days before of protests that were scheduled to demand the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff, was criticized even by members of the opposition. The main argument is that, in Brazilian law, prisons are necessary only in extreme cases, to avoid the destruction of evidence or the escape of the accused, for example. However, in the same week, the Federal Police, in a similar investigation, had already gone to the house of Lula in order to search and seizure evidence. Additionally, the request was also questioned because of its fragility.

Mainstream Media

The action of the prosecutors was reported in the main headlines on the front page of both *O Globo* and *Folha de São Paulo* on 11th of March 2016. In *O Globo*, there was a considerable space for the criticisms against the request. The text of the headline, for example, was: “Prosecutors request the arrest of Lula; opposition suggests caution”. Still on the cover, most of the texts related to the subject were about politicians and attorneys criticizing the request (O Globo, 2016c). The front page of *Folha* also gave space to the criticisms against the request (Folha de São Paulo, 2016b) and, initially, seemed to be reasonably balanced in terms of objectivity.

One of the reports about the subject in *O Globo*, however, began the text informing that the request of arrest against a former president was “an unprecedented (*inédita*) decision in the History of the country” (Dantas et al., 2016). Here, it might be possible to say that the word “unprecedented” can have a positive connotation, as classifying the request as something that was pioneering. Another aspect to be noticed on the same report was the second sentence, which says that “in order to shield Lula against the request, the president Dilma invited him to be her minister” (Ibid). In Brazilian law, ministers can only be prosecuted in the Supreme Court and not by prosecutors of the first tier of Justice. The newspaper emphasized on the invitation made by Dilma and assumed without quoting anybody that it was made to protect Lula against arrest requests. One could also argue that citing the name of Dilma in the lead could be a way to link the president with a potential criminal.

The rest of the report enlists the arguments used by the prosecutors to request the arrest of Lula balanced with declarations of his lawyer. The newspaper chose to report soundbites of the request, such as a sentence in which it is said that Lula used “violent manoeuvres” against the Justice (Ibid). Folha also made a report based on quotations from the prosecutors and excerpts of the document (Mena et al., 2016). Both newspapers informed briefly the fact that the prosecutors cited the names of “Marx and Hegel” in the document, when they were actually referring to Marx and Engels (Dantas et al., 2016 and Mena et al., 2016). This observation can be a subtle way to question the credibility of the investigation, since it might show the lack of general knowledge or, at least, the lack of caution, by the prosecutors.

This indirect criticism of the work done by the prosecutors, however, was compensated in *O Globo* with an almost passionate profile about them. The article highlighted the humble origins of one of the prosecutors, stating, for example, that he took ten years to complete his Law studies due to lack of financial resources. Additionally, the piece informs that the prosecutor “usually says that

perseverance is the word of his life” (Carvalho, 2016a). This profile, accentuating the overcome of difficulties by one of the prosecutors, can be considered a way of building the image of a hero. Therefore, it seems that, despite all the criticisms about the request of the arrest of Lula, *O Globo* still had the perseverance to depict one of the prosecutors with a positive image.

Both newspapers, nevertheless, reserved a considerable space to the exposition of the criticism against the request. In fact - it has to be pondered - *O Globo* had a clever article to question the credibility of the petition. One of the jurists cited in the document to base the arguments of the prosecutors was interviewed criticizing the request (Carvalho and Berta, 2016). However, the criticisms reported were more about the necessity of the prison request in detriment of technical failures of the document.

Two different approaches by *O Globo* about the prison request could be perceived. On the front page, the principles of balance might have been met, since the cover dedicated a reasonable amount of space to the criticisms against the document. However, in the reports about the subject, there were more emphases on the reasons alluded by the prosecutors (one of them depicted, in a certain way, as a hero) to request the prison.

Another aspect is that the excerpts of the documents chosen to be highlighted always favoured the arguments of the prosecutors and the criticisms were always made with quotations. This can be a way to use the norms of objectivity to weaken the criticisms, since quotations are used more to convey an opinion and an official document has a more “scientific” characteristic.

In general, it is possible to claim that *Folha* made a coverage slightly more balanced than *O Globo* about the prison request. One aspect is that Dilma Rousseff was less related to Lula in the reports of *Folha*. The reports of both newspapers, however, did not mention the impact that the prison request could have in the process of impeachment of Dilma Rousseff.

Alternative Media

The only of the selected alternative media outlets that reported any information about the prison request was *Mídia Ninja*. However, the site limited its coverage of the episode to the reproduction of a report published by a magazine about a document of Latin American leaders defending Lula. In this case, *Mídia Ninja* highlighted “the attempts of the Brazilian judicial system and part of the media to destroy the image” of Lula (Ninja, 2016c). The report only mentions that the manifest of the leaders was made in the same week of the prison request against the president. Following these brief comments, the entire declaration of the leaders was published.

It is necessary to state that the coverage of the request of arrest by the selected alternative outlets was very limited. The criticisms about the document did not reverberate in the outlets, what was reinforced by the complete absence of *Jornalistas Livres*, for example. At the same time, if these outlets were engaged in a quest to defend the democracy against a coup, this engagement lacked power or, at least, some dedication. On the other hand, in the brief report published by *Mídia Ninja*, it is possible to see a different approach about the request, classifying it as a way to damage the image of Lula among citizens. The criticism of *Mídia Ninja* about the way mainstream media covered the episode deserves attention. However, in general, it is possible to say that the coverage of the event was extremely weak and even the mainstream media, in theory acting against Lula and Dilma, offered more relevant criticisms against the request.

3.2.2 - PHONE RECORDINGS

Another episode considered fundamental in the narrative of the impeachment was the disclosure of recordings of phone conversations between Lula and Dilma Rousseff by the judge Sérgio Moro. The magistrate, who works in the first tier of the Federal Justice, is responsible for the process of Lava-Jato, about the scandal of corruption in Petrobras. The press speculated that he was about to order the prison of Lula for involvement in the case. However, Dilma Rousseff appointed the ex-president for the post of minister, which would give Lula the right to be judged only by the Supreme Court. In theory, this would benefit Lula because Moro has the reputation of supposedly being a ridge judge and the processes tend to have a slower pace in the Supreme Court. One conversation between Lula and Dilma, however, showed that Dilma was sending to the former president a document officialising his appointment to be used “in the case of necessity”. The expression was interpreted as an attempt of Dilma to obstruct the actions of the Justice, since after Lula became a minister it would only be possible to judge him in the Supreme Court. The decision of Sérgio Moro of disclosing the conversation was extremely controversial. One criticism is that the case could not stay with him, since there was a conversation with Dilma Rousseff and she can only be judged by the Supreme Court. Another issue is that the conversations were disclosed less than three hours after they happened, which could show a political motivation by Moro. Finally, the conversation happened after Moro himself had ordered the end of the recordings. Illegal or not, the fact is that the disclosure of the recordings triggered a wave of protests in the country demanding the resignation of Dilma Rousseff. On the following day, the dialogue was printed on the front page of the main newspapers in the country.

Mainstream Media

The front page of *O Globo* on 17th of March, for example, stated that the appointment of Lula as a minister was a way to make him “escape from decisions of Sérgio Moro” and that the conversations revealed “indications” that Lula and Dilma tried to “obstruct the Justice and undermine the investigations, according to the police” (O Globo, 2016d). The cover also mentions another conversation, between Lula and a minister, and says that, in the dialogue, the former president “asks the minister (...) to stop one investigation of the Receita Federal (a kind of Brazilian HMRC)” about Instituto Lula, a non-profit organization created by the former president (Ibid). In this excerpt, the newspaper inferred that the ex-president tried to stop investigations, without attributing this interpretation to any person involved in the inquiry. Certainly, this kind of procedure could be considered a breach of the objectivity norms by *O Globo*. On the other hand, *Folha de São Paulo* did not make this kind of assumption on its front page, which was undoubtedly more balanced than the cover of *O Globo*. *Folha*, for example, published more assertive criticisms about the disclosure of the recordings than *O Globo* on its front page (Folha de São Paulo, 2016c). However, the objections against the recordings were based on declarations of supporters of Dilma and jurists. It was not mentioned on the cover that the recording between the president and Lula was made after Moro had determined the end of the wiretaps. The balance of *Folha*, therefore, was constructed between objective information (content of the recordings) and declarations (of supporters of president and jurists). It is possible to say, thus, that the impartiality was built on elements of different weights.

The reports about the case published by both newspapers assume that crimes have been committed by Lula and Dilma. In *O Globo*, it is said that a “plot” with an “attempt to obstruct the justice” shook the country (Menezes, 2016). Shortly afterwards, the report states that policemen and jurists saw “signs of attempted obstruction of justice in the dialogues” (Ibid). *Folha de São Paulo*, however, went further and asserted that it was “**clear** (emphasis added) the intention of Lula of

trying to influence authorities” to act in his favour in the investigations, in a reference to the conversation between Lula and a minister (Folha de São Paulo, 2016d). This conversation was also reported by *O Globo*, which stated that Lula asked the “interference in an investigation”. During the dialogue, *O Globo* described, Lula says that “it is necessary to follow what the Receita Federal is doing” and that he would ask this in a written document (Menezes, 2016). In a report about the conversation between Lula and the minister by *O Globo*, the newspaper once more suggests the Lula was trying to interfere in an investigation about his institute. The newspaper, however, highlights that there is also an investigation about the institute maintained by Fernando Henrique Cardoso, adversary and predecessor of Lula in the presidency (Carvalho, 2016b).

What has to be noticed here is the difference between what was said by Lula in the conversation and the interpretation of the newspapers. In the dialogue, Lula says that it is necessary to “follow” the investigation. The mainstream outlets, however, reported this conversation as an attempt of interfering in the investigations. *O Globo*, in fact, ensured that this attempt was “clear”. However, one thing that has to be highlighted is that the words of Lula can have many interpretations. This happens especially because, in one point of the conversation, for example, Lula tells that he would write a document to ask for clarifications about the inquiry of Receita. What was not answered or questioned in the reports is why Lula would officialise in a document an illegal action. These observations do not intend to acquit Lula. One can argue, however, that it is clear that the dialogue itself was not enough to take any conclusion about the intentions of the ex-president. In this case, therefore, it can be observed that the mainstream media mixed facts (Lula asked the minister to follow the investigation) with opinions (Lula asked the minister to interfere in the investigation). Expressing an opinion, of course, is not a problem, the problem is expressing it in a newspaper disguised as a fact, especially if this newspaper claims to convey only the facts.

Maybe that is why this conversation between Lula and the minister was the subject of another report in the same edition of *Folha de São Paulo*. In this case, however, the outlet did not interpret the recording as an attempt to interfere in the inquiry. The report simply related that Lula asked the minister to “follow” the investigation (Talento et al., 2016a). Curiously, on the same day, *Folha* had two different attitudes in relation to the dialogue. In the first time, the outlet made what can be considered a biased interpretation of the words of Lula and, in the second time, it restricted itself to report the facts.

The disclosure of the recordings had another controversial aspect. Among the dialogues that were revealed to the public, there was one in which Lula complained about the Supreme Court and the Congress, saying that they were “cowed” (Herdy, 2016). In the same dialogue, there is what was interpreted by the mainstream media as an attempt of Lula to interfere in decisions of the Supreme Court concerning investigations about him (Ibid). It could be reasonable to understand the disclosure of the excerpts in which Lula can be trying to interfere in the Justice. However, the same does not apply to the excerpts in which he expresses personal opinions about institutions that are directly involved in his future. The media, in this case, could have two attitudes in this episode. Firstly, it would be quite sensible not to publish excerpts in which the ex-president expresses that the Judiciary and the Legislative are “cowed”. Certainly, there is not any public interest in this information, which serves only to disturb the relations of Lula (and also of Dilma Rousseff as a consequence) with the Congress and the Judiciary. Secondly, the media should be assertive questioning the disclosure of this kind of information. However, the dialogue was entirely published with prominence.

There were also reports with criticisms about the recording and the disclosure of the conversations by Sérgio Moro. These questionings were restricted to the fact that some interlocutors could only be recorded with the authorization of the Supreme Court. The opinion of those who

considered that the recordings did not show a crime was reserved to a small box in *Folha de São Paulo* (Arbex et al., 2016). The legality of the recordings, on the other hand, was justified by Moro, who argued that only the phone of Lula was being tapped and the ex-president did not have the right of being judged exclusively by the Supreme Court of the country. One point, however, was clear. The conversation between Dilma and Lula happened after Moro had determined the end of the taps. This fact was treated by *O Globo* in a small report in which an association of judges defended the attitudes of Moro (Carvalho et al., 2016b). In *Folha*, there was also a discrete report about the subject. The article had an objective description of the chronology of the facts that occurred on the last day. Sérgio Moro was contacted to provide the reason to disclose recordings of conversations that were made after he himself ordered the interruption of the wiretaps. The judge however, did not make any declaration (Ammora et al., 2016). This report was an almost perfect example of objectivity, without adjectives or disguised comments. One could even infer that this was an exercise of selective objectivity.

Another report of *Folha*, in fact, could also be considered as a subtle exercise of selective objectivity. The newspaper described the manifestations that happened in favour and against the impeachment after the disclosure of the recordings. One important aspect to be noticed about it was the difference between the two texts. When talking about the protests demanding the renouncement of Dilma Rousseff, the outlet said that “sound cars joined” the group of protesters. On the other hand, it is read in the text that the protest supporting the president “was sponsored” by two different institutions (Folha de São Paulo, 2016e). What is possible to infer is that there was a personification of the sound cars in the first case, as if they “joined” spontaneously the protest, without any necessity of sponsorship. The treatment was different about the protest in favour of Dilma, which was “sponsored” and, therefore, not spontaneous.

Alternative Media

Once more, the coverage of the alternative media about the case could be considered insufficient. *Mídia Ninja* only reproduced a report published on the website *The Intercept*, in which the Sérgio Moro is criticized for leaking to the media a recording with an “extremely vague conversation between Dilma and Lula, which Globo and other anti-PT forces immediately depicted as incriminating” (Greenwald et al., 2016). *Jornalistas Livres*, however, published a short report in form of comment about the episode. In the text, it is said that there is an alliance between media and prosecutors in order to impose a “judicial terrorism” against a significant part of the public opinion. There are criticisms about the actions of Sérgio Moro, who would have the intention of “contaminate the country” with sadism supported by an espionage apparatus and with methods comparable to the ones used by the “KGB” and “Gestapo”, for example. Furthermore, the text also contains the reproduction of a video in which a couple who supports Dilma was attacked by a group of protesters in favour of the impeachment (Brito Junior, 2016). Therefore, despite offering a counter-narrative that sometimes is not exactly guided by the principles of objectivity, the selected alternative outlets had a disappointed coverage about the event. The impression is that they missed an opportunity to create engagement or, at least, challenge the mainstream media more vigorously. Apart from comments against the actions of Moro in *Jornalistas Livres*, there was not information about the possible breach of the law committed by the judge, for example. The aggressions against the supporters of Dilma and Lula were well documented, but with a video made by a radio of the same group of *O Globo*. This might mean that even the most relevant information published by *Jornalistas Livres* was, in fact, provided by mainstream media.

3.2.3 - VOTE IN THE CONGRESS

The last episode to be analysed and probably the most important is the vote of the impeachment in the lower house of the Congress, which took place on 17th of April. In total, 367 deputies – 25 more than the necessary - gave authorization to the Senate to open a process of impeachment against Dilma. Almost one month later, the senators approved the suspension of Dilma for a period up to 180 days. In order to be permanently removed from the post, the senators must confirm the vote. Until this dissertation was finished, the definite session had not happened yet.

Mainstream Media

The both selected mainstream newspapers dedicated their editions of the 18th April almost entirely to report the vote in the Congress. In the first article about what was classified as a “historic session”, *Folha* reports wrongly that Dilma Rousseff was accused of being involved in the scandal of corruption in Petrobras (Folha de São Paulo, 2016f). There is not any formal accusation of misconducts of Dilma related to the scandal. The process of the impeachment, in fact, is based only on accusations of breaking of budget laws by the president.

Ironically, *Folha* treated Michel Temer, then vice-president and adversary of Dilma, in a different way. The newspaper reported that the “party of Temer, PMDB, was cited as benefiting from the kickback scheme set up in Petrobras” (Cruz and Lima, 2016). It was not mentioned, however, that Michel Temer himself was cited as authorizing the appointment of two men later accused of corruption to posts in Petrobras. One report about this citation, in fact, had been published in the same *Folha de São Paulo*, less than one month before (Guimarães, 2016).

Both newspapers used the word “challenge” to list some of the obstacles that Michel Temer would have to overcome in case he became president. *O Globo* - it might be worth to highlight - treated naturally how Temer offered jobs in a possible government to allies in exchange for votes in favour of the impeachment of Dilma. The newspaper said that it would be a “challenge” to Temer to allocate politicians who “helped him in the impeachment”. What is worth to notice is that this “challenge” can be interpreted as a way to praise the political ability of Temer, which was deemed as a having “strength” to conduct political negotiations (O Globo, 2016e).

Another thing that can be observed in this report is the way the newspaper do not question the exchange of votes for posts in the government. The political trade is treated as something natural. In fact, the newspaper also considered unsurprising that allies of Temer “got the support of businessmen, who made their private airplanes available” to parliamentarians fly to the capital in case of necessity. The PMDB, the party of Temer, declared that the use of the airplanes was not necessary (O Globo, 2016f). There was not any ethical questioning about the relations between private businessmen and deputies by the newspaper.

The vote itself deserved a considerable space in the two newspapers. *O Globo*, for example, highlighted that members of the Congress criticized Eduardo Cunha, the then president of the lower house accused of corruption in the Petrobras scandal (O Globo, 2016g). As president of the chamber, Cunha was responsible for accepting the request of installation of the process of impeachment against Dilma Rousseff. The reasons for him to approve the request, however, can be considered questionable, as it was reported by *O Globo* itself. On 3rd of December 2015, the headline of the newspaper front page said: “Cunha retaliates PT and opens impeachment proceedings against Dilma” (O Globo, 2015). The text informed that, as a form of vengeance, Cunha decided to accept the request to open the process of impeachment only five hours after

deputies from PT having decided to vote against him in the Ethics Committee of the house (Ibid). Since those days, Cunha has been facing a long process that can make him lose his mandate.

However, the actions of Eduardo Cunha in the impeachment were so important that he deserved a profile in *O Globo* about the strategies used by him on the day of the vote. The newspaper, for example, classified him as “the captain” of the vote, in what could be considered a positive connotation about his “remarkable ability to convince parliamentarians”. Citing only briefly that Cunha is accused of corruption, the newspaper enlisted that the then president of the lower house promised important positions for those who voted in favour of the impeachment. According to the newspaper, among his promises was the inclusion of some deputies “who dream about traveling abroad” in international missions of the Congress in foreign countries (O Globo, 2016h). In another report, about the manoeuvres of Cunha to avoid the loss of his office, however, the newspaper highlighted that the process against Cunha in the Congress had been conducted at a much slower pace than the one against Dilma. Another excerpt of the report states that Cunha faces the risk of having his mandate revoked because of having “allegedly” lied about maintaining secret bank accounts in Switzerland (O Globo, 2016i). The use of the word “allegedly” in this case might be worth some attention. *O Globo* was never careful like this to describe crimes allegedly committed by Dilma and Lula, for example. Cunha, on the other hand, “allegedly” lied about bank accounts in Switzerland whose existence is extensively documented by federal prosecutors.

Another adversary of Dilma who could be considered a protagonist of the vote was Jair Bolsonaro. The politician dedicated his vote in favour of the impeachment to a military who admitted practices of torture during the dictatorship in Brazil. The declaration was a clear reference to the fact that Dilma was tortured in the days of the authoritarian regime. The episode was briefly reported by the two newspapers (O Globo, 2016g, and Valente et al., 2016). None of the outlets asked for a declaration of Bolsonaro about the discourse. They restrict themselves to inform

objectively what *The Guardian*, for example, considered “arguably the lowest point” that happened on that “dark night” (Watts, 2016). It might not even be a surprise that, when describing the reaction of the supporters of the impeachment who watched the vote near the Congress, *Folha* only mentioned that they “thrilled” after hearing the discourses of Eduardo Cunha and Jair Bolsonaro (Reverbel et al., 2016). In the name of objectivity, this researcher will have the same attitude of *Folha* and will make no comments about it.

That, in fact, was the same stance that the newspaper had about the discourses made by the parliamentarians to justify their votes. They said that they made their choices for an array of reasons, such as “for the foundations of Christianity”, “for the peace in Jerusalem” and even “for all the estate agents”. The outlet enlisted many of them in one page that usually is dedicated to an interview on Mondays. The only question of the “interview” was: “how does your Excellency vote?”. The answers, yes or no, were grouped with their justifications, but the names of the deputies were not published (Folha de São Paulo, 2016g). Objectively, *Folha* demonstrated how far the self-depreciation of the Brazilian humour can go. *O Globo*, in fact, published a report about the discourses also with a certain humour. In the headline, it was said that “the majority of the parliamentarians forgot the discussion about the impeachment” and that personal reasons prevailed among them. A discourse with grammar mistakes was classified as the “best”, with certain sarcasm (O Globo, 2016g). Unfortunately, apart from the headline, nothing in the report questioned the posture of the deputies.

Both newspapers also published profiles of Michel Temer, the man who would assume the post of Dilma Rousseff. *O Globo* depicted him as an ambitious politician that could be president “without receiving a single vote”. In fact, this observation might be surprising for those who accuse *O Globo* of acting as an opposition party, since the fact that Temer could be president without a vote was always highlighted by the supporters of Dilma. Another fact reported by the newspaper was that

Temer kept neutrality in relation to the military coup in Brazil. The proximity between him and Eduardo Cunha was also reported. In this case, it was said that Cunha used to visit the official residence of Temer with the “frequency of friends”, in the words of the newspaper itself (Gama, 2016). This relation with Cunha was also in the profile that *Folha* made about Temer, who was praised for his “ability” in politics and his “fame” of “conciliator” and “moderate” (Lima and Cruz, 2016). The newspaper quoted Cunha saying that Temer is his “friend”. On the other hand, non-identified sources linked to Temer said that they were only “occasional allies” (Ibid). There is only an apparent balance between the two versions, since Cunha was quoted, but Temer was not. In this case, however, it might not have been interesting for Temer to speak publicly about his relation with Cunha. The newspaper also cited the accusations of corruption against the then vice-president, but pondered that they have never been proved. Additionally, his fame as a politician with the ability to manage different interests was repeatedly accentuated based on declarations of allies.

The reasonably positive profile about Temer in *Folha* contrasted with a discrete and small box hidden at the bottom of a page, where the newspaper mentioned without quoting anybody that “a possible government Temer, supported by Cunha, may restrict the investigation [about the corruption in Petrobras]”. The reason for this, *Folha* argued, was that “there may be a favorable environment for proposals that make it difficult to punish the politicians involved” in the scandal (Folha de São Paulo, 2016h). Despite all the conditionals used in the sentences, the newspaper published an argument used by the objectors of the impeachment without any quotation marks. This was a rare case in which the norms of objectivity were abandoned in favor of Dilma Rousseff.

In general, however, there was a selective objectivity against Dilma. This can be seen, for example, in the way *Folha* described the reactions of the people who were watching the vote on that Sunday next to the Parliament. The last vote in favour of the impeachment, the newspaper informed, was celebrated with “party (...) and a lot of dance” by those who were supporting the

ousting of Dilma. This atmosphere was much different from that seen by *Folha* among the objectors of the impeachment, where a syndicalist was saying that it was “time of *porrada* (violence, in a loose translation)” and that they would “set the country on fire” (Reverbel et al., 2016). Here, it is possible to see a clear opposition between the peaceful climate among the supporters of the impeachment and the darkness of the violence among those who were against the destitution of Dilma.

In reports about the protests in favour of the impeachment in the rest of Brazil, for example, *Folha* enumerated cases of people who were on the streets in a “mood of World Cup” (Boldrini et al., 2016) or in an atmosphere of Réveillon, in which people “cried”, “greeted even strangers”, “kissed and hugged” (Amâncio et al., 2016). One excerpt accentuated that flirtations were happened during the manifestations, with one woman declaring that the place was “full of interesting people” (Boldrini et al., 2016). Despite the positive descriptions, the most important point to be highlighted in these reports, however, was the coverage of questionable attitudes of Fiesp, a Federation of Industries which was supporting the impeachment. The institution provided big screens on the streets of São Paulo to show the vote. *Folha* reported that the audio of the screens was cut when deputies criticized Eduardo Cunha or Michel Temer. Additionally, “references to new elections were also interrupted” (Ibid). Not a single one representative of Fiesp was heard about the silencing of inconvenient declarations. The detail is that, in this case, it might be possible to say that not to be questioned about it was more convenient to Fiesp. Thus, the disrespect of the principle of balance actually might have benefited somebody that was not heard in the report.

On the other hand, it can be said that the norms of the objectivity were followed in a report to make a biased distinction between supporters and objectors of the impeachment who were on the streets of São Paulo. *Folha* differentiated the “movements in favour of the impeachment” from “Dilma supporters” or “pro-government” (Bächtold, 2016). The problem is that those who

protested against the impeachment were not necessarily supporters of Dilma or pro-government. Many of them, for example, were criticizing her policies and were members of opposition parties. However, a nominalisation created a link between protesters and Dilma. It was not made clear, therefore, the demand of the protesters who promoted manifestations against the “coup” or in favour of democracy, for instance. The lack of precision may have contributed to the creation of a narrative in which what was being questioned was not the legality of the impeachment, but the impeachment of a person, Dilma Rousseff.

Alternative media

It might be possible to say that the alternative outlets had a relatively humble and discrete coverage of the vote. *Jornalistas Livres* published only one report about the session while *Mídia Ninja* had two articles. If the coverage of mainstream media was to be challenged, the alternative media should have, at least, dedicated more space to it. However, it is possible that structural limitations did not allow them to do this.

The article published in *Jornalistas Livres*, for example, was written by a defeated candidate to the government of São Paulo, Gilberto Maringoni. He is a member of PSOL, a party created by dissidents of PT. The party declared itself “opposition of left” against Dilma Rousseff when she was in power and its 6 members in the lower house of the Congress voted against the impeachment.

The report about the vote is emphatic already in the headline, in which is read that the impeachment was a “roguish coup” (Maringoni, 2016). The text continues with attacks against the Congress – mentioning briefly the discourses of the politicians - and says that “the government (...) is going to be stormed by what is more rotten and corrupt in the Brazilian politics” (Ibid). However,

there are also criticisms against the neoliberal policies adopted during the second term of Dilma Rousseff, “who threw always her promises” in the 2014 campaign (Ibid). The report ponders that Dilma committed an “electoral ploy” in order to be re-elected president in 2014 and this “amounted to a torpedo fired at the main pillar of democracy: the legitimacy of the vote” (Ibid). The text concludes that with this action, Dilma lost the support of movements on the left and permitted the advance of the right in Brazil. In this context, Maringoni adds, the “shortcut” of the impeachment was the solution found by the Congress in a coup supported by the judiciary, the police and the media. In the end, the report classifies the vote in the Congress as an “infamy” that will go down in History (Ibid). As it is clear, the report in form of an analysis has a clear stance against the impeachment. *Jornalistas Livres* did not try to be objective or impartial about the impeachment and expressed a clear opinion in relation to the vote. What is important to notice is that the outlet made harsh criticisms against the government of Dilma. However, apart from a different and transparent opinion, the outlet did not bring any kind of information that could trespass the limits of the so-called counter-public sphere in the direction to the mainstream public sphere.

Mídia Ninja, in its turn, published two reports about the vote. The first one, in form of a comment, stated that “the rats won the first round”, in a reference to the politicians who defended the impeachment. The lower house of the Congress was deemed as a “rotten” institution, “presided by a gangster”, in an allusion to Eduardo Cunha (Ninja, 2016a). Afterwards, the report affirms that the “majority” of the parliamentarians was “indicted for corruption” (Ibid). This information, however, is imprecise. It is true that the majority of the deputies has problems with the justice. However, many of them are not accused of corruption, but misdemeanours and even crimes similar to the one that Dilma Rousseff is being accused (Tardáguila et al., 2016). The report is replete of disparagements against the members of the Congress, who are attacked because of their discourses during the vote, in which families, God and properties were praised. “There was even tribute to the

torturer responsible for torturing the young Dilma”, referring to the discourse of Jair Bolsonaro (Ninja, 2016a). The analysis of the text allows us to infer clearly that the traditional norms of objectivity were not followed. It is possible to say that the position of the outlet is transparent with severe and pertinent comments against the noble Brazilian Congress. However, the text contained one imprecision about the number of members of the Congress indicted for corruption and, as the article of *Jornalistas Livres*, did not offer information capable of trespass the boundaries of the counter-public sphere.

The second text about the vote published in *Mídia Ninja* was also posted in an Argentinian website called *La Garganta Poderosa*. In the article, titled “A Coup of Misogynists and Reactionaries”, opprobrium are distributed to Michel Temer, classified as an “obscure conspirator” and “one of the architects of the coup in alliance with Eduardo Cunha” (Gentili, 2016). The then president of the lower house was also deemed as “one of the most corrupted politicians in Brazil” (Ibid). However, the taunts were mixed with information about the vote that were not published in any other outlet analysed, despite not being possible to say whether if the data was obtained by the author or copied from another source. The report states that less than 3% of the 367 politicians who voted in favour of the impeachment mentioned the alleged crime, “a debatable national budget management”, as the reason for the vote. It is read in the text that among the justifications cited by the Congress members was the willing of ceasing with “PT (...) with the left, with the sexual education in the schools and with the consumerism”. One of the Congress members, says the text, cited that he wanted to fight “the communism in North Korea” (Ibid). Furthermore, the text observes that “God, the family (...) and the Bible were 70 times more mentioned than the Constitution”. Finally, the text also notes that none of those who supported the impeachment “cited the popular sovereign, basis and fundament of democracy”. The conclusion made was that the “Brazilian Congress is simply repugnant, misogynist (...) and reactionary” (Ibid). Needless to say

that the text expressed a clear opinion and did not follow the principles of neutrality. It showed, for example, a disapproval of the Congress that the mainstream media was not capable or willing to do. The most interesting point to notice about it, however, was that the text also used information that could be considered objective. This article was the only one from the alternative outlets which offered information that could be used in the mainstream media, with statistics about the reasons mentioned by the Congress members for their votes. It might be even possible to say that all the adjectives used to describe the protagonists of the vote were based on a kind of scientific information. Therefore, it could be said that this text was balanced, but balanced between objectivity and partisanship.

CHAPTER 4 - DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The effort made by alternative media to offer a discourse different than the one provided by the mainstream media has to be recognized. In the reports published by the selected alternative outlets, it was common to read comments that the mainstream media did not have courage to do or, what can be worse, was not willing to do. However, the representatives of mainstream outlets can always argue that they reported everything, but it was not their function to make comments.

Yes, this is an acceptable answer for those who think that simply follow the norms of objectivity is enough. However, this affirmation can be very questionable. Firstly, because something might be wrong when a member of a Congress that represents a country with 200 million people make positive comments about a confessed torturer and the press does not take any action about it. A media that report objectively the discourses of a noble citizen who might be capable of making Donald Trump break in a cold sweat are not exactly defending the democracy. The same can be said when the media report objectively the scene of this honourable gentleman being cheered by crowds.

In fact, examples such as these were seen many times in this analysis. For example, the mainstream media also did not make any comment, even a disguised comment, when saw a certain censorship in a transmission of the vote of the impeachment in São Paulo. Or when saw deputies justifying their vote in favour of the destitution of Dilma Rousseff with references to Jerusalem and estate agents. There is nothing to be said against these people who spend their time working hard to sell properties or the Israeli city, but that might not have been the right moment to praise them.

What was seen in the coverage of the mainstream media was a selective objectivity. When the reports were about Lula and Dilma, it was common to see comments disguised under the veils of neutrality and impartiality. These reports followed the norms of objectivity, nobody can deny.

However, there was frequently a hidden detail in order to deride the discourses of the objectors of the impeachment. On the other hand, this selective objectivity permitted that Michel Temer, Eduardo Cunha e Jair Bolsonaro to continue unscathed. With rare exceptions, only the facts were reserved to these gentlemen in the mainstream media.

Now, if the media gives immunity to a congressman who passionately praises torturers in his vote against a woman who felt the pain of being tortured, something might be changing in the Brazilian democracy. Maybe, just maybe, the selective objectivity of the mainstream is contributing to making the idea of authoritarianism move from the Sphere of Deviance to the Sphere of Controversy in Brazil. In this case, the neutrality and impartiality mean contribution. Therefore, it is impossible to say that the mainstream outlets analysed in this work are following the norms of objectivity. One can argue that nothing is more partisan than keep silent when the voices of authoritarianism arise. In this sense, there is not objectivity anymore in the most important outlets of Brazilian mainstream media.

The worst thing, however, might be that those who were supposed to react might not be doing the right job. Even worse, the outlets of alternative media analysed in this work show hints that are being contaminated by some of the most despicable practices of the mainstream media. This happened when reports in the alternative media stimulated a certain division between “elite” and “workers” or between “defenders of democracy” and “fascists”. A media that feeds this division might be only contributing to make their opponents even stronger.

One comment that has to be made about the alternative outlets analysed in this work is that their journalists did not leave their comfort zone. It was not found any single report of the alternative outlets in the protests in favour of the impeachment, for example. The outlets analysed might be suffering from a certain egocentrism, in which are capable of looking to the “other side” only from a divisive perspective. In these cases, there was a flirtation of the alternative media with

the War Journalism described by Lynch and McGoldrick. In certain moments, the alternative media propagated a certain division between “us” and “them” that can be very dangerous, especially in times when men such as Jair Bolsonaro are cheered by crowds.

The alternative media, however, did not cross the wall that was separating the “coxinhas” from “petralhas” and, of course, did not see this scene, which was reported only by the mainstream media and its selective objectivity. Maybe, the alternative media should overcome these divisions in order to provide an account that the mainstream media might not be willing to provide. This should be done urgently, before the concept of democracy in Brazilian media is moved from the Sphere of Consensus to the Sphere of Controversy. Maybe, the first thing that might be done is to understand that there is not “other side”. What is seen in Brazil nowadays, perhaps, is a division of the same “side” in two different and unproductive poles.

Some aspects of the coverage made by the selected alternative outlets have to be praised, it has to be said. The alternative outlets offered a partisanship that can be useful to the defence of democracy. It is necessary to clearly denounce practices of parliamentarians that are unqualified, authoritarian and, simply, gangsters with all the available adjectives. These “swine”, as Hunter S. Thompson would deem them, must face the scrutiny of the society.

However, despite being efficient in providing pertinent comments about some of the most dark figures of a country that, unfortunately, can be classified as a “banana republic”, the alternative media has to learn with their counterparts from the mainstream media. If the mainstream media proved that their objectivity can be a certain partisanship, the alternative media has to do the same in the opposite way. Adopting partisanship does not mean giving up from objectivity.

If alternative media do not provide any objectivity account about the “other side”, the only available discourse will be the one provided by mainstream media, extremely characterized by a selective objectivity. It is necessary for the alternative media to immerse in the territory where the

“fascists” are. Maybe, what will be found is that the “other side” is full of people who just do not have any idea of what they are doing there. People who only need information that mainstream media outlets are not willing to provide.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation started with the aim to provide an account of how partisan alternative media outlets in Brazil challenged the objective mainstream media during the coverage of the impeachment of Dilma Rousseff. One of the answers that were pursued was if it was possible to distinguish objectivity and partisanship in this coverage.

After the discussion of the concepts of objectivity and partisanship and the subsequent analysis of the coverage, it might be possible to say that there is no such thing as objectivity practiced by mainstream newspapers in Brazil. In fact, these outlets still follow the strategic procedures that characterize objectivity, enumerated by Gaye Tuchman. However, they use these norms to convey partisan comments disguised as objective information.

This finding, in fact, might not be that surprising. The Brazilian mainstream media has a known history of cooperation with the authoritarian regime that feared the country between 1964 and 1985. It is also famous among those who studied journalism in Brazil the history of how the mainstream media contributed, in 1989, to elect Fernando Collor, a president that was impeached after accusations of corruption. In this case, he was facing serious accusations of corruption, not alleged breakings of the budget law.

It was predictable, therefore, that the mainstream media chose a position during the impeachment of the president Dilma Rousseff. Officially, neither *Folha de São Paulo* nor *O Globo* declared support or opposition to the process. Both of them claimed that would have a nonpartisan stance about what some call a coup. A coup, it is necessary to say, disguised as a legal procedure. However, it was clear after the analysis provided in this dissertation that, in some moments, the mainstream media showed a clear preference for the destitution of Dilma.

This work proved that, in certain occasions, the mainstream media deployed a selective objectivity that expressed a certain contempt for those who were against the impeachment. In the

pages of the mainstream media, the alleged “coup” was only a discourse created by the PT to mobilize people in favour of its perpetuation in power.

The alternative media, on the other hand, had another posture. The outlets analysed in this dissertation were clearly against the coup. The objectivity was dismissed in these vehicles in order to make people aware of the peril of a decline in the Brazilian democracy. There was not any lack of opinion about those who were considered by the outlets as the perpetrators of the coup.

Taking this into consideration, the alternative outlets used their explicit partisanship to offer comments not read in the mainstream media about men such as Michel Temer, Eduardo Cunha e Jair Bolsonaro. This might have been a precious contribution provided by the partisan journalism to the defence of the fragile Brazilian democracy. A contribution that the objective journalism, as aforementioned, was not capable or willing to offer.

However, this does not mean that this partisanship was effective. It might be possible to say that, in a country where the literacy levels are extremely low, the alternative media cannot restrict itself to the confinement of the counter-public sphere. Offering only opinions are not enough to make people understand that, currently, democracy is in danger in the country.

There are some ideas that can possibly help the alternative media to go beyond the borders of the counter-public sphere. Some of these ideas can come from experiences of writers such as George Orwell and Hunter S. Thompson. The Gonzo Journalism of the latter can be a productive source of inspiration for this alternative media.

What might be worth is to try to practice a New Gonzo Journalism. The ideas of Hunter S. Thompson are useful, true. However, it is necessary to adequate them to the current times.

A New Gonzo would not rely only on the subjectivity of the interpretation of events. It might be necessary to unite the acid comments that were characteristic of Hunter S. Thompson with the seeking for facts practiced by the objective media. Once more, adopting partisanship does not

mean despise objectivity. Richard Kaplan, for example, notes that the solution proposed by the critics of objectivity is always less bias and more facts, or more objectivity (Kaplan, 2012:26-27). It is true, more objectivity to some alternative outlets in Brazil is necessary.

However, it is also necessary more subjectivity. This subjectivity can be inspired by the immersion of Hunter S. Thompson in the routine of the Hell's Angels. The lessons that anthropological experiences such as that have to teach to journalism might be uncountable.

One difference between the New Gonzo and the Gonzo of Hunter Thompson, however, is the subject of the reports. The journalists of alternative media might be more productive if engage not only with people with whom they share the same views. No, it might be necessary for the alternative journalism to engage in the unfriendly territories. A journalist, it has to be said, has to be careful about cultivating friendship with sources. The watchdog sense of the journalists has always to be used. Otherwise, what will happen is the forgiveness for the "minor infractions" cited by Hunter S. Thompson.

However, this requires a lot of time and dedication. It is not an easy job, but, of course, it is not an impossible one. The example of the Canadian artist Chris Lloyd can be useful. Lloyd joined the Conservative Party in Canada and developed a political career that lasted 15 years. Lloyd declared that, actually, he was doing a performance in order to "mess with" the party (quoted in Noël, 2015). This case might show that dedication, discipline and courage to leave the comfort zone are traits that alternative media outlets in Brazil need.

These proposals might be pertinent. However, some discussion about the ethical issues involving this kind of engagement is necessary. This dissertation, nevertheless, was not capable of providing this answer, it has to be recognized. It is also needed to deepen the investigation of how literary and anthropological techniques can contribute to journalism. Another issue is how

alternative journalism can gather funds to invest in more immersive reports without having to rely on resources from advertising, for example.

Even if these or other answers might not have been given, it is necessary to state that the alternative media in Brazil need to take immediate actions in order to become more relevant and more effective in getting messages to the public opinion. Otherwise, the mainstream media in the country can, once more, help to move the democracy from the Sphere of Consensus to the Sphere of Controversy. No comments are needed to explain what can happen next.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Amâncio, T. et al. 2016. Atos Anti-Dilma no País têm Rojões, Food Trucks e Vuvuzelas. (Anti-Dilma Acts in the Country Have Firecrackers , Food trucks and Horns).). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/04/18/2/> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

Ammora, D. et al. 2016. Grampo de Dilma ocorreu depois de veto de Moro (Wiretap of Dilma occurred after the veto of Moro). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (17/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/03/17/2/> [accessed on: 19/08/2016].

ANJ. 2015 (Associação Nacional de Jornais - National Association of Newspapers). Os maiores jornais de circulação paga do Brasil, por ano (The biggest newspapers in Brazil considering the circulation, per year). In: *ANJ* (2015). Available at: <http://www.anj.org.br/maiores-jornais-do-brasil/> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

Arbex, T. et al. 2016. Especialistas citam obstrução da Justiça; outros contestam gravações (Pundits cite obstruction of Justice; others contest recordings). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (17/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/03/17/2/> [accessed on: 19/08/2016].

Atkinson, J.D. 2010. *Alternative Media and Politics of Resistance: a Communication Perspective*. New York: Peter Lang.

Atton, C. 2002. *Alternative Media*. London: Sage.

Atton, C. 2003. What is “Alternative” Journalism? In: *Journalism*. Vol. 4 (3): pp 267-272. Available at: <http://jou.sagepub.com/content/4/3/267.full.pdf> [accessed on: 08/05/2016].

Azeez, W. and Marshall, S. 2013. Why newsrooms need anthropologists. In: *Journalism.co.uk* (07/11/2013). Available at: <https://www.journalism.co.uk/news-commentary/-why-newsrooms-need-anthropologists-/s6/a554681/> [accessed on: 10/08/2016].

Bacha, C. 2016. Em Aton a UNIFESP, Intelectuais comparam o atual cenário a Golpe de 64 (In Act at UNIFESP, Intellectuals Compare the Current Scenario to the Coup of 64). In: *Jornalistas Livres* (15/04/2016) Available at: <https://jornalistaslivres.org/2016/04/em-ato-na-unifesp-intelectuais-comparam-cenario-atual-golpe-64/> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

Bächtold, F. 2016. Atos reúnem 250 mil na Avenida Paulista e 42 mil no Anhangabaú (Acts bring 250 thousand to Avenida Paulista and 42 thousand to Anhangabaú). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/04/18/2/> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

- Biondo, L. 2016.** Caxias do Sul realiza ato da cultura pela democracia (Caxias do Sul performs an act of culture for democracy). In: *Mídia Ninja* (15/04/2016). Available at: <https://ninja.oximity.com/article/Caxias-do-Sul-realiza-ato-da-cultura-p-1> [accessed on: 20/08/2016].
- Boldrini, A. et al. 2016.** Resultado da votação é recebido com buzinaço e choro na Paulista (Vote is received with honking and crying in Paulista). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/04/18/2/> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].
- Brito Junior, B.T. 2016.** O Golpe de Moro, o Assédio Moral e o Terror Político (The coup of Moro, the psychological harassment and the political terror). In: *Jornalistas Livres* (17/03/2016). Available at: <https://jornalistaslivres.org/2016/03/o-golpe-de-moro-o-assedio-moral-e-o-terror-politico/> [accessed on: 20/08/2016].
- Broersma, M. 2010.** The Unbearable Limitations of Journalism – On Press Critique and Journalism’s Claim to Truth. In: *The International Communication Gazette*. Vol. 72 (1):21-33. Available at: <http://gaz.sagepub.com/content/72/1/21> [accessed on: 06/08/2016].
- Carvalho, C. 2016a.** Da Favela Natal à Lava-Jato (From the favela Natal to Lava-Jato). In: *O Globo* (11/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160311> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].
- Carvalho, C. et al. 2016b.** Moro: é preciso saber o que fazem os governantes (Moro: it is necessary to know what the rulers do). In: *O Globo* (17/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160317> [accessed on: 19/08/2016].
- Carvalho, J. and Berta, R. 2016.** Procuradores temem desgaste institucional (Prosecutors fear institutional weakening). In: *O Globo* (11/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160311> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].
- Cortez, R. 2016.** Brasília: mulheres jovens na luta contra o golpe (Brasília: Young women in the fight against the coup). In: *Jornalistas Livres* (16/04/2016). Available at: <https://jornalistaslivres.org/2016/04/brasilia-mulheres-jovens-na-luta-contr-o-golpe/> [accessed on: 20/08/2016].
- Couldry, N. 2015.** Alternative Media and Voice. In: Atton, C. (ed.). *The Routledge Companion to Alternative and Community Media*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Cox, D. 2008.** Gonzo and Better Forgotten. In: *The Guardian* (22/12/2008). Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/film/filmblog/2008/dec/22/hunter-s-thompson-gonzo-and-better-forgotten> [accessed on: 11/08/2016].
- Crick, B. 1980.** *George Orwell – A Life*. London: Secker & Warburg.

Cruz, V. and Lima, D. 2016. ‘Agora vem a parte mais difícil’, diz Temer a aliados. (‘Now comes the most difficult part’, says Temer to allies). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/04/18/2/> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

Cunningham, B. 2003. Re-thinking Objectivity. In: *Columbia Journalism Review* (July/ August 2003). Available at: http://www.cjr.org/feature/rethinking_objectivity.php?page=all [accessed on: 28/07/2016].

Dantas, T. et al. 2016. Lula na Encruzilhada (Lula in the Crossroad). In: *O Globo* (11/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160311> [accessed on: 22/08/2016].

Davies, N. 2008. *Flat Earth News: An Award-winning Reporter Exposes Falsehood, Distortion and Propaganda in the Global Media*. London: Chatto & Windus.

Deacon, D. et al. 2010. *Researching Communications – A Practical Guide to Methods in Media and Cultural Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari. 2011 [1980]. *A Thousand Plateaus*. London: Continuum.

Downey, J. and Fenton, N. 2003. ‘Constructing a Counter-public Sphere’. In: *New Media and Society*. 5(2): 185-202. Available at: <http://nms.sagepub.com/content/5/2/185.abstract> [accessed on 12/04/2016].

Fenton, N. and Witschge, T. 2011. ‘Comment is free, facts are sacred’: journalistic ethics in a changing mediascape. In: Meikle, G. and Redden, G. (eds.). *News Online – Transformations & Continuities*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Folha de São Paulo. 2016a. Manifestantes pró-governo vão às ruas (Protesters pro-government go to the streets). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (16/04/2016). Available at: http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/resultados/buscade_talhada/?utf8=%E2%9C%93&fsp=on&all_words=mst+protesto+vias+&phrase=&words=&without_words=&initial_date=16%2F04%2F2016&final_date=16%2F04%2F2016&date%5Bday%5D=&date%5Bmonth%5D=&date%5Byear%5D=&group_id=0&theme_id=0&commit.x=60&commit.y=6&commit=Enviar [accessed on: 20/08/2016].

Folha de São Paulo. 2016b. Promotores de SP Pedem Prisão de Lula (Prosecutors of São Paulo request the prison of Lula). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (11/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/03/11/2/> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

Folha de São Paulo, 2016c. Presidente atuou para evitar a prisão de Lula, indica gravação (Recording indicates that presidente acted to avoid the arrest of Lula). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (17/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/03/17/2/> [accessed on: 19/08/2016].

Folha de São Paulo, 2016d. Dilma tentou atuar para evitar a prisão de Lula, indica gravação da PF (Recording made by the police indicates that Dilma acted to avoid the arrest of Lula). In: *Folha de*

São Paulo (17/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/03/17/2/> [accessed on: 19/08/2016].

Folha de São Paulo. 2016e. Protesto em Brasília tem bombas e ferido (Protest in Brasília has bombs and wounded). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (17/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/03/17/2/> [accessed on: 19/08/2016].

Folha de São Paulo. 2016f. Câmara dá aval ao processo de impeachment de Dilma Rousseff (Lower house of the Congress gives approval to the process of impeachment of Dilma Rousseff). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/04/18/2/> [accessed on: 23/08/2016].

Folha de São Paulo. 2016g. Como vota vossa excelência? (How do your excellency vote?). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/04/18/2/> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

Folha de São Paulo. 2016h. O futuro dos personagens do impeachment (The future of the characters of impeachment). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/04/18/2/> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

Folha de São Paulo, 2016i. Linha Editorial (Editorial Policy). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (2016). Available at: http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/institucional/linha_editorial.shtml [accessed on: 25/08/2016].

Franklin, B. et al. 2012. *Key Concepts in Journalism Studies*. London: Sage.

Gama, J. 2016. O desejo íntimo de um vice à espreita do poder (The inner desire of a vice lurking power). In: *O Globo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160418> [accessed on: 23/08/2016].

Garret, B. L. 2015. Why Gonzo Journalism is Crucial to Our Understanding of Cities and Their Tribes. In: *The Guardian* (20/05/2015). Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/may/20/gonzo-journalism-cities-tribes-ethnographer-hunter-s-thompson> [accessed on: 11/08/2016].

Gentili, P. 2016. Um Golpe de Misóginos e Reacionários (A Coup of Mysoginists and Reactionaries). In: *Mídia Ninja* (18/04/2016). Available at: <https://ninja.oximity.com/article/Um-golpe-de-mis%C3%B3ginos-e-reacion-1> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

Gergen, K.J. 1999. *An Invitation to Social Construction*. London: Sage.

Greenwald, G. 2016. Exclusive Interview by Glenn Greenwald with Former Brazilian President Lula da Silva. In: *The Intercept* (11/04/2016). Available at: <https://theintercept.com/2016/04/11/watch-exclusive-interview-with-former-brazilian-president-lula-da-silva/> [accessed on: 11/04/2016].

Greenwald, G. et al. 2016. Brazil is Engulfed by Ruling Class Corruption – and a Dangerous Subversion of Democracy. In: *The Intercept* (18/03/2016). Available at:

<https://theintercept.com/2016/03/18/brazil-is-engulfed-by-ruling-class-corruption-and-a-dangerous-subversion-of-democracy/> [accessed on 25/03/2016].

Guimarães, T. 2016. Conheça Temer, poeta chamado de 'charmosão' e de professor 'bonzinho'. (Know Temer, poet already called of “charming” and “good” professor. In: *Folha de São Paulo* (31/03/2016). Available at: <http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/poder/2016/03/1755944-temer-ja-foi-chamado-de-charmosao-e-de-mordomo-de-filme-de-terror.shtml> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

Habermas, J. 1989 [1962]. The Public Sphere. In: Seidman, S. *Jürgen Habermas On Society and Politics – A Reader*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. 2009 [1996]. *Between Facts and Norms*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hahn, M. 1997. Writing on the Wall – An Interview with Hunter S. Thompson. In: *The Atlantic Online* (26/08/1997). Available at:

<http://www.theatlantic.com/past/docs/unbound/graffiti/hunter.htm> [accessed on 18/12/2015].

Hallin, D. C. 1986. *The “Uncensored War”*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hansen, A. and Machin, D. 2013. *Media & Communication Research Methods*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Hedges, C. 2011. The Disease of Objectivity. In McChesney, R. and Pickard, V. *Will the Last Reporter Please Turn Out the Lights - The Collapse of Journalism and What Can Be Done to Fix It*. New York: The New Press.

Herdy, T. et al. 2016. Temos uma Suprema Corte Acovardada (We Have a Cowed Supreme Court). In: *O Globo* (17/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160317> [accessed on: 19/08/2016].

Huffington, A. 2015. A Note on Trump: We Are No Longer Entertained. In: Huffington Post (07/12/2015). Available at: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/arianna-huffington/a-note-on-trump_b_8744476.html?utm_source=API+Need+to+Know+newsletter&utm_campaign=502b448e

Need_to_Know_December_8_201512_8_2015&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_e3bf78af04-502b448e37-45820845 [accessed on: 03/01/2016].

Internet World Stats. 2015. Available at: <http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm> [accessed on 06/12/2015].

Jamieson, K.H. and Waldman, P. 2003. *The Press Effect – Politicians, Journalists, and the Stories That Shape the Political World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jornal Nacional. 2013. Estudante Preso Durante Manifestação no Rio não Portava Explosivos (Student Arrested During Demonstration in Rio not behaved Explosives). In: *Jornal Nacional* (24/07/2013). Available at: <http://g1.globo.com/jornal-nacional/videos/t/protestos-pelo-brasil/v/estudante-presos-durante-manifestacao-no-rio-nao-portava-explosivos/2713906/> [accessed on 18/04/2016].

Jornalistas Livres. 2016a. Seja Jornalista Livre! (Be Free Journalist!). In: *catarse* (2016). Available at: <https://www.catarse.me/jornalistaslivres> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

Jornalistas Livres Amazonas. 2016. Manaus é contra o golpe (Manaus is against the coup). In: *Jornalistas Livres* (17/04/2016). Available at: <https://jornalistaslivres.org/2016/04/manaus-e-contra-o-golpe/> [accessed on: 20/08/2016].

Jornalistas Livres Facebook. 2016. In: *Facebook* (2016). Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/jornalistaslivres/> [accessed on: 16/08/2016].

Kaplan, R. 2012. The Origins of Objectivity in American Journalism. In: Allan, S. (ed.). *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism*. London: Routledge.

Krakovics, F. 2016. Descrentes, petistas preferem olhar para 2018 (Unbelievers, PTists prefer to look to 2018). In: *O Globo* (15/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/busca/?tipoConteudo=pagina&ordenacaoData=relevancia&allwords=golpe&anyword=&noword=&exactword=&decadaSelecionada=2010&anoSelecionado=2016&mesSelecionado=4&diaSelecionado=15> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

Krippendorff, K. 2013. *Content Analysis – An Introduction to Its Methodology*. London: Sage.

Lima, D. and Cruz, V. 2016. Tão Longe, Tão Perto (So Far, So Close). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/04/18/2/> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

Lippmann, W. 1998 [1922]. *Public Opinion*. London: Transaction Publishers.

Litwak, L.E. 1967. ‘Hell’s Angels’. In: *The New York Times* (29/01/1967). Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/1967/01/29/books/thompson-1967-angels.html> [accessed on: 10/08/2016].

Lynch, J. and McGoldrick, A. 2005. *Peace Journalism*. Gloucestershire: Hawthorn Press.

Maringoni, G. 2016. Tem cara de legal e tem jeito de legal, mas não passa de um golpe velhaco (It looks legal, it has the aspect of legal, but it is not more than a rogue coup). In: *Jornalistas Livres* (18/04/2016) Available at: <https://jornalistaslivres.org/2016/04/tem-cara-de-legal-e-tem-jeito-de-legal-mas-nao-passa-de-um-golpe-velhaco/> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

Mariz, R. 2016. Polícia acha facões com manifestantes na Esplanada (Police finds machetes with protesters in the Esplanada). In: *O Globo* (16/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/busca/?tipoConteudo=pagina&ordenacaoData=dataDescendente&al1words=MST+PROTESTO+VIAS+&anyword=&noword=&exactword=&decadaSelecionada=2010&anoSelecionado=2016&mesSelecionado=4&diaSelecionado=16> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

McNair, B. 2013. Trust, Truth and Objectivity – Sustaining quality journalism in the era of the content-generating user. In: Peters, C. and Broersma, M. *Rethinking Journalism – Trust and participation in a transformed news landscape*. London: Routledge.

McNair, B. 2013. Trust, Truth and Objectivity – Sustaining quality journalism in the era of the content-generating user. In: Peters, C. and Broersma, M. *Rethinking Journalism – Trust and participation in a transformed news landscape*. London: Routledge.

McQuail, D. 1993. *Media Performance – Mass Communication and the Public Interest*. London: Sage.

Mello, R. C. 2016. Brasil, Argentina e Paraguai avaliam rebaixar Venezuela no Mercosul (Brazil, Argentina and Paraguay Assess Demoting Venezuela in Mercosur). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (05/08/2016). Available at: <http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/mundo/2016/08/1799542-brasil-argentina-e-paraguai-avaliam-rebaixar-venezuela-no-mercosul.shtml> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

Mena, F. et al. 2016. Promotoria pede a prisão de Lula no caso do triplex (Prosecutors request the arrest of Lula in the triplex affair). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (11/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/03/11/2/> [accessed on: 22/08/2016].

Menezes, M. 2016. Ação Contra a Justiça (Action Against the Justice). In: *O Globo* (17/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160317> [accessed on: 19/08/2016].

Mídia Ninja. 2016a. Support NINJA. In: *Mídia Ninja* (2016). Available at: <https://ninja.oximity.com/partner/ninja/donate> [accessed on: 22/08/2016].

Mídia Ninja. 2016b. Who we are. In: *Mídia Ninja* (2016). Available at: <https://ninja.oximity.com/partner/ninja/about> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

Mídia Ninja Facebook. 2016. In: *Facebook* (2016). Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/midiaNINJA> [accessed on: 16/08/2016].

Mindich, D. 2016. For journalists covering Trump, a Murrow moment. In: *Columbia Journalism*

Review (15/07/2016). Available at:

http://www.cjr.org/analysis/trump_inspires_murrow_moment_for_journalism.php [accessed on:

11/08/2016].

Murphy, D. 1989. Introduction to Down and Out in Paris and London. In: Orwell, G. *Down and*

Out and Paris and London. London: Penguin Books.

Ninja. 2016a. Nós Vamos Sacudir Este País. (We are Going to Shake this Country). In: *Mídia Ninja* (18/04/2016). Available at: <https://ninja.oximity.com/article/Um-novo-come%C3%A7o-1> [accessed on:18/08/2016].

Ninja. 2016b. Ato da Cultura Pela Democracia entra para a história na capital carioca (Act of Culture for Democracy enters History in the capital of Rio). In: *Mídia Ninja* (13/04/2016). Available at: <https://ninja.oximity.com/article/Ato-da-Cultura-Pela-Democracia-entra-p-1> [accessed on: 20/08/2016].

Ninja. 2016c. Líderes internacionais publicam declaração de apoio a Lula (International leaders publish declaration in support of Lula). In: *Mídia Ninja* (12/03/2016). Available at: <https://ninja.oximity.com/article/L%C3%ADderes-internacionais-publicam-d-1> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

Noël, B. 2015. A Canadian Conservative Politician Was Actually a Performance Artist Playing a Decade-Long Prank. In: *Vice* (13/05/2015). Available at: http://www.vice.com/en_uk/read/fake-conservative-candidate-running-against-justin-trudeau-resigns [accessed on: 25/08/2016].

O Globo. 2015. Cunha retalia PT e abre impeachment contra Dilma (Cunha retaliates PT and open impeachment proceedings against Dilma). In: *O Globo* (03/12/2015). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020151203> [accessed on: 23/08/2016].

O Globo. 2016a. Votação tem Grande Destaque no Exterior (Vote has great prominence abroad). In: *O Globo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/busca/?tipoConteudo=pagina&ordenacaoData=relevancia&allwords=golpe+argentina+venezuela+equador&anyword=&noword=&exactword=&decadaSelecionada=2010&anoSelecionado=2016&mesSelecionado=4> [accessed on: 20/08/2016].

O Globo. 2016b. Próximo Front (Next Front). In: *O Globo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/busca/?tipoConteudo=pagina&pagina=&ordenacaoData=relevancia>

&allwords=golpe&anyword=&noword=&exactword=&decadaSelecionada=2010&anoSelecionado=2016&mesSelecionado=4&diaSelecionado=18 [accessed on: 20/08/2016].

O Globo. 2016c. MP Pede Prisão de Lula; Oposição Sugere Cautela (Prosecutors request Prison of Lula; Opposition suggests Caution). In: *O Globo* (11/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160311> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

O Globo. 2016d. Diálogo Ameaça Dilma (Dialogue threatens Dilma). In: *O Globo* (17/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160317> [accessed on: 19/08/2016].

O Globo. 2016e. Festa e Planos (Party and Plans). In: *O Globo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160418> [accessed on: 23/08/2016].

O Globo. 2016f. Entre o Palácio e o Jaburu (Between the Palace and the Jaburu). In: *O Globo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160418> [accessed on: 23/08/2016].

O Globo. 2016g. Quero Agradecer a Deus, Minha Família... (I Want to Thank God, My Family...). In: *O Globo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/consulta-ao-acervo/?navegacaoPorData=201020160418> [accessed on: 23/08/2016].

O Globo. 2016h. Princípios Editoriais (Editorial Principles). In: *O Globo* (2016). Available at: <http://oglobo.globo.com/principios-editoriais/#isencao> [accessed on: 25/08/2016]

Orwell, G. 1989 [1933]. *Down and Out in Paris and London*. London: Penguin Books.

Rauch, J. 2007. Activists as interpretative communities: rituals of consumption and interaction in an alternative media audience. In: *Media, Culture & Society*. Vol. 29 (6): pp. 994-1013. Available at: <http://mcs.sagepub.com/content/29/6/994.full.pdf+html> [accessed on: 07/05/2016].

Raeijmaekers, D. and Maesele, P. 2015. - In objectivity we trust? Pluralism, consensus, and ideology in journalism studies. In: *Journalism* (December 2015) – pp. 1-17. Available at : <http://jou.sagepub.com/content/early/2015/12/04/1464884915614244.abstract> [accessed on: 09/08/2016].

Remígio, M. 2016. Em 1999, Temer foi contra a saída de FH; Lula, a favor (In 1999, Temer was against the removal of FH; Lula, in favour). In: *O Globo* (17/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.oglobo.globo.com/busca/?tipoConteudo=pagina&pagina=&ordenacaoData=relevancia&allwords=golpe&anyword=&noword=&exactword=&decadaSelecionada=2010&anoSelecionado=2016&mesSelecionado=4&diaSelecionado=17> [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

Reporting Before the Intifada. 2002. In: *Reporting the World*. Available at: http://www.reportingtheworld.net/Is_Pal_transcript.html [accessed on: 01/08/2016].

Reverbel, P. et al. 2016. Separados pelo Muro (Separated by the Wall). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/04/18/2/> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

Rossi, C. 2016. Collor não teve apoio nem de seu partido em votação (Collor did not even have the support of his party on the vote). Available at: http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/resultados/buscade_talhada/?utf8=%E2%9C%93&fsp=on&all_words=lindbergh+lava+jato+&phrase=&words=&without_words=&initial_date=17%2F04%2F2016&final_date=17%2F04%2F2016&date%5Bday%5D=&date%5Bmonth%5D=&date%5Byear%5D=&group_id=0&theme_id=0&commit.x=34&commit.y=8&commit=Enviar [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

Schudson, M. 1978. *Discovering the News – A Social History of American Newspapers*. New York: Basic Books.

Schudson, M. 2001. The objectivity norm in American journalism. In: *Journalism*. Vol. 2 (2): pp 149-170. Available at: <http://jou.sagepub.com/content/2/2/149.abstract> [accessed on: 08/08/2016].

Talento, A. et al. 2016a. Em grampo, petista reclama a ministro da Fazenda sobre investigação da Receita. (In recording, member of PT complains with Treasure minister about investigation of Receita). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (17/03/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/03/17/2/> [accessed on: 19/08/2016].

Tardáguila, C et al. 2016. Dos 513 deputados, 299 têm ocorrências judiciais; 76 já foram condenados (Of the 513 MPs, 299 have court cases; 76 have been convicted). In: Agência Lupa (17/04/2016). Available at: <http://piaui.folha.uol.com.br/lupa/2016/04/17/votacao-do-impeachment-no-plenario-da-camara/> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

Thompson, H. S. 2005 [1973]. *Fear and Loathing in the Campaign Trail '72*. London: Harper Perennial.

Thorsen, E. 2008. Journalistic objectivity redefined? Wikinews and the neutral point of view. In: *New Media & Society*. Vol 10 (6): pp. 935-954. Available at:

Uribe, G. et al. 2016. Assessores de petista já falam em levar o caso para o Supremo (Aides of PTist already talk of taking the case to the Supreme). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (18/04/2016). Available at: http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/resultados/buscade_talhada/?utf8=%E2%9C%93&fsp=on&all_words=golpe+&phrase=&words=&without_words=&initial_date=18%2F04%2F2016&final_date=18%2F04%2F2016&date%5Bday%5D=&date%5Bmonth%5D=&date%5Byear%5D=&group_id=0&theme_id=0&commit.x=24&commit.y=10&commit=Enviar [accessed on: 21/08/2016].

Valente, R. et al. 2016. Cunha é chamado de ‘ladrão’ e ‘gângster’ (Cunha is called ‘thief’ and ‘gangster’). In: *Folha de São Paulo* (18/04/2016). Available at: <http://acervo.folha.uol.com.br/fsp/2016/04/18/2/> [accessed on: 18/08/2016].

Watts, J. 2016. Dilma Rousseff: Brazilian congress votes to impeach president. In: *The Guardian* (18/04/2016). Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/apr/18/dilma-rousseff-congress-impeach-brazilian-president> [accessed on: 23/08/2016].