

THE TINY BRAZILIAN PRESS AS RESISTANCE: FOUCAULT, THE ENEMY OF THE KING¹

In recent years, we have developed research about Michel Foucault's visits to Brazil in 1965, 1973, 1974, 1975, and 1976. This topic can be approached from many angles. In a previous analysis, one of us favored the constitution of an audiography understood as the ways in which Foucault occupied the speech places that were proposed to him.² This concept was used for the discussion of the relevance of Foucault's journeys to Brazil to the inflections of his thought and its seizure of the concept of *dispositif*. These parameters seemed appropriate. The dating of Foucault's visits in the 1960s and 1970s, which was a period in which we lived under a civil-military dictatorship, framed the exploration of the way the philosopher would eventually be able to alter the rigid discursive order in place at the time by speaking and acting in a South American country under the aegis of *dispositifs* such as press conferences, a university course, and journalistic interviews.

Today, however, we have decided to adopt another approach, given that we find ourselves in a historical-political moment after a state coup that dares not to speak its name. Changing the government but not the regime, which remains a parliamentary democracy, this coup in the form of an impeachment has nourished a "shielded democracy" that solemnly ignores or dissolves by non-lethal arms (for now) all resistance to the reforms that are said to be indispensable to the

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

immediate implementation of the neoliberal project.³ Paraphrasing Roberto Schwarz, who said that between the end of 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s the country was “unrecognizably smart,”⁴ Felipe Demier diagnoses the Brazil of late 2010s as “unrecognizably stupid.”⁵ He lists the following reasons for his diagnosis:

There has not been a week in which we have not been astonished at some huge budget cut in social areas; at some barbarity committed by degenerated military police; at some absurd anti-minority proposal presented in the chamber of deputies; at some incitement to hatred by histrionic political-religious leaders; at some crime motivated by sexism, racism, homophobia, transphobia and even xenophobia against Haitians; at some lynching of a burglar carried out by mobs animated by evening police shows on television.⁶

In these circumstances, we found a passage in our readings that guides our approach to Foucault’s visits to Brazil: “In times like these, there’s nothing better than rummaging history for a bit of antagonism. And particularly when we use some part of it in which men and women unite, with a touch of humor, irony, and courage, to try to dethrone the king.”⁷ The passage comes from an anthology of covers, cartoons, articles, and editorials of the anarchist newspaper *O inimigo do rei* (The enemy of the king), which was one of the exemplars of the *nanica* (tiny) press that flourished in Brazil between the 1964 civil-military coup and the 1980s. Its provenance and content compel us to explore this press as an analyzer of the dictatorial moment experienced by Foucault.⁸ This exploration is especially appropriate, given that the *nanicos* (tinies) got close to him and used

his concepts as analytic-political tools for the problems of that time.⁹ Our contribution will therefore appreciate the ways and effects of the encounter in body and thought between the tiny press and Foucault, foregrounding the anarchist tiny press in particular. Contacts between Foucault and the mainstream press will serve as a counterpoint, making it possible to explore agonistic games of resistance and/or submission to official powers.

GUARD DOGS, TINIES, AND THE RADICAL JOURNALIST

What we propose to explore refers to a moment in which, to use a very Foucauldian expression, “dividing practices” established a split between the “guard dogs” of the dictatorship and the “tiny” press within the larger context of the Brazilian press. The phrase “guard dogs,” which points to the mainstream press, comes from the title of Beatriz Kushnir’s *Cães de guarda: Jornalistas e censores do AI-5 à constituição de 1988*.¹⁰ According to Bernardo Kucinski, about 150 periodicals known as tinies were born and generally languished in Brazil between 1964 and 1980.¹¹ Kucinski authored the first thesis on this topic.¹² His thesis was quickly transformed into a book, which serves as one of our main sources.¹³

Let us begin with the numbers. Kucinski increased the number of tinies from 150 to 160 when he updated the introduction to his thesis.¹⁴ The work of Reinaldo Chinem, published a few years after Kucinski’s thesis, raised the number of periodicals characterized by “uncompromising opposition to the military regime” to three hundred.¹⁵ The catalog of the collection initially archived at the Center of Alternative Press

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

and Popular Culture of Rioarte reached 560 entries.¹⁶ Although the temporal limits varied a bit and the impact of “new discoveries” should not be underestimated, it is likely that the oscillation in numbers is due primarily to criteria adopted for a journal to be incorporated into the classification system.

Let us now go from numbers to names. In the pertinent literature, there is almost always talk of an “alternative or tiny press,” although some differentiate between the two adjectives. The catalog mentioned above refers to mimeographed or photocopied periodicals with small print runs as “tiny” and tabloids of a medium size with a national distribution sold at newspaper stands as “alternative.” Such a distinction, however, does not enjoy the preference of the analysts of this somewhat indefinite series. They most commonly use the conjunction “or,” adding that the “alternative press” emphasizes the struggle against information control whereas the “tiny press” prioritizes the commonly adopted tabloid format. Regarding this point, attention must be paid to detail. The first article to use the term “tiny” was in João Antônio’s “Aviso aos nanicos” (Warning to the tinies), published in 1975 in the tiny *O Pasquim*.¹⁷ For Kucinski, Antônio opened a discussion about what would be the correct adjective to qualify a press that had existed for more than ten years but was still called “marginal.” He compared it to underground newspapers that multiplied in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s. According to Kucinski, however, Antônio’s praise of the tinies was based less on similarities with other underground newspapers than on the fact that they were “the only press that dared to denounce abuses of power.”¹⁸ In 1975, as signs of a political opening began to appear, Antônio warned the tinies of a possible “loss of the

primacy of denunciation.”¹⁹ For his part, Kucinski stresses the paternalistic connotations acquired by the qualifier “tiny” when it fell in line with tastes of advertisers: the designation, however affectionate, would suggest “immaturity and littleness.”²⁰ However, Gileide Vilela et al. evoke Antônio’s article to explore the singular nuances of the qualifier “tiny.” In their words: “The term tiny . . . was probably a return to the Oswaldian idea of decolonizing our values, therefore, of the little that faces the big. The ‘roaring rat,’ a slogan adopted by *O Pasquim*, constitutes itself in a configuration very proximate to this original idea.”²¹ The authors above allude to this slogan in the title of their book about the alternative press in Bahia: *Os baianos que rugem* (The roaring Bahians).

On the other hand, Kucinski emphasizes the “semantic density” of the adjective “alternative.”²² This adjective simultaneously designates practices not linked to the dominant culture, a choice between two mutually exclusive things, the only way out of a difficult situation, and the desire to lead change.²³ Noting that the press is “all of this at the same time,” Kucinski definitely opts for the designation “alternative.”²⁴ He writes:

In contrast to the complacency of the mainstream press for the military dictatorship, alternative newspapers made systematic critique of the economic model . . . thus deviating from the triumphalist discourse of government echoed in the mainstream press. They reported torture and human rights violations whenever they could, while the mainstream press often avoided this issue.²⁵

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

Although the introduction of technological changes that facilitated offset printing should not be forgotten, those changes were not, of course, exclusive determinants. The emergence and expansion of the periodicals in question can only be apprehended on the basis of a multiplicity of correlated elements: the courage to take risks by criticizing (in deeds and words) the economic, cultural, and subjectivist models present in dictatorial practices, including those most extensively silenced in the mainstream press, such as torture and disappearances; a minoritarian character provided that it is rendered positive, that is, taken as a kind of guerrilla line capable of sometimes becoming victorious among hegemonic strata of an authoritarian character and then self-defined in terms of unique possibilities of life and thought. Thus, we opt for the adjective “tiny” to designate such a press, which we evaluate as a form of resistance in the Foucauldian sense and as “minor” or “minoritarian” in the Deleuzo-Guattarian sense. It should be added that we adopted the definition of a minority formulated by the gay tiny *Lampião da Esquina*: “a group on which the repressive society keeps its heels, even if it is not minor, as women . . . (are not).”²⁶

With these elements in mind, we bring up yet another controversy: could there have been the complacency of the mainstream press with the censorship imposed by the Brazilian dictatorship? A scholar and protagonist of this history, Kucinski highlights this complacency and even a possible complicity or, rather, the presence of self-censorship in the majority of the traditional media. He does so both in his thesis and in his already quoted book based on the thesis. And it was at the time of the updates in the book that the reactions were most audi-

ble. As an extreme example, it is fitting to quote the journalist Luiz Maklouf Carvalho:

Kucinski should have been on another planet Self-censorship as a category must be seen in the historical framework of total destruction of the rule of law – torture, National Security Law, Institutional Acts, seizures of newspapers, censors in newsrooms, journalists in the prisons, etc. etc. – and not subjectively. To say that it has determined the pattern of information control during the 15 years of authoritarian regime is to lick the boot of the dictatorship.²⁷

We do not know of any response from Kucinski to Maklouf. However, like us, Maurício Maia agrees with Kucinski and disagrees that the empire of silence was only “exogenous” and “vertical.” In order to demonstrate the latter point, he first highlights the official control of the information in each of the presses:

Preventative censorship reached its peak in weeklies like *O Pasquim* and *O São Paulo*. Official control over the weekly *Movimento* began with the first edition. In the case of *Opinião*, censorship pressure was one of the main reasons for the closing of the newspaper. Tax evasion, legal proceedings (through the National Security Law and the Press Law), seizures and terrorist attacks complete the repertoire of actions against these outlets. . . . In the mainstream press, preventative censorship was used in a parsimonious way. The newspapers *O Estado de São Paulo* and *Jornal da Tarde* lived with preventative censorship between September

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

1972 and January 1975. *Veja* was under censorship in 1972 and then between 1974 and 1976. . . . It is worth remembering that the presence of military censors in the editorial offices of newspapers, such as *Correio da Manhã* and *Jornal do Brasil*, lasted a few weeks after the publication of the Institutional Act No. 5 in December 1968.²⁸

Then, with the support of research conducted at the National Archives/Ministry of Justice, Maia refers to a veiled surveillance of the mainstream press through notes and phone calls from the Federal Police. This surveillance had the goal of preventing the disclosure of news contrary to the regime. With regard to its effects, Maia remarks: “In the eyes of the operators of this type of censorship, the degree of obedience was extremely high. . . . The efficiency . . . is translated by the few episodes (only 7) in which there was noncompliance with some of the 80 federal orders dispatched between 1971 and 1973.”²⁹

But Maia’s strongest argument in favor of Kucinski’s perspective lies in the transcription of texts from the mainstream press in which there is declared support for dictatorial politics. Although Maia offers numerous reactions to international denunciations of repression and torture published in *O Globo*, *Jornal do Brasil*, *O Estado de São Paulo* and *Folha de São Paulo*, it suffices to cite an editorial from the first of these newspapers. In spite of considering itself an adversary of torture, *O Globo* disqualified international denunciations of it as the mere expedients of political opponents. In the words of the editorial, “We do not allow terrorists and their sympathizers to transform the accusations of torturers into a campaign of demoralization of the authorities now engaged in the defense of the Brazilian

family threatened by these monsters linked to foreign organizations.”³⁰

In light of the contrast between the “guard dogs” and the “tinies,” we shall now turn to Foucault’s visits to Brazil. Even though the first of these visits dates from 1965, we will privilege his visits in the mid-1970s due to the problem that animates this inquiry. At the time, Foucault expressed his intention to abandon the sacralized place of the intellectual in order to dedicate himself to the diagnosis of the present through the exercise of radical journalism, sometimes evoked under other denominations, such as pyrotechnics, explosives, and fireworks.³¹ Inspired by this minoritarian attitude, we will now turn to the historical narrative, which draws from one of Foucault’s insights. As he explained in a 1977 interview: “History is fictionalized from a political reality that makes it true; a politics that doesn’t yet exist is fictionalized from a historical truth.”³² For some have wanted and many still want, like Foucault and the tinies, “to dethrone the king.”

UNPLANNED DISCONTINUITIES

In October 1975, Foucault returned to the University of São Paulo (USP), where he had been ten years earlier. Shortly before his departure to Brazil, he had traveled with Yves Montand, Régis Debray, Costa-Gravas, Jean Lacouture, Father Ladouze, and Claude Mauriac to Madrid to protest the death sentence of eleven anti-Franco militants. The group even read a protest statement in the presence of the international press. As a consequence, Foucault and his fellow protestors were immediately escorted by the police to the airport and dispatched back to Paris. His work project at the School of

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

Philosophy, Literature, and Human Sciences (FFLCH) at USP was to involve lecturing on psychiatrization and anti-psychiatry but it apparently bored him because it did not at all resemble the kind of political engagement that he had just experienced in Spain. “Freud and Marx to infinity,” Foucault complained to Daniel Defert.³³

His initial impression of the sterility of academic life did not last. Spurred by the regime’s targeting of persons merely suspected of connections with the Brazilian Communist Party (PCB), Foucault went to a student assembly on October 23. The following day, *Folha de São Paulo* reported:

At noon, a meeting of USP students was held on the premises of the School of Architecture and Urban Studies, in protest of the arrest in recent weeks of students, teachers and journalists. . . . Professor Michel Foucault . . . attended the student assembly. . . , and made a statement of solidarity with the students. He also said that he intended to suspend the classes he is giving.³⁴

On the same day as the publication of this report, security agents went to the headquarters of a television station to arrest the journalist Vladimir Herzog. He obtained permission to present himself at the headquarters of the Detachment of Information Operations and Internal Defense Operations Center (DOI-CODI) the following day. Elio Gaspari chronicles what transpired after Herzog arrived at DOI-CODI:

He was hauled in with two colleagues. He denied that he belonged to the PCB and was alone with an interrogator in a room downstairs. The two colleagues, in

a contiguous corridor, heard his screams and the order for the electric shock machine to be brought. A high-volume radio muffled the sounds. At one point the news reported that Generalissimo Francisco Franco . . . had received the extreme unction. . . . In the middle of the afternoon there was a great silence in the jail.³⁵

Vlado, as Herzog was known, was dead. On October 27, a strike broke out at USP after Vlado's funeral. Foucault cancelled his course. He also attended an ecumenical mass for Herzog. Years later, in a book of interviews with Thierry Voeltzel, Foucault evoked the mass to stress that revolts are never useless and that their defense constitutes one of the elements of an anti-strategic ethic. As he recalled:

The Jewish community didn't dare hold a funeral service. It was the Archbishop of São Paulo, Dom Evariste [*sic*], who organised the ceremony, which was moreover inter-denominational, in memory of the journalist in the cathedral of St. Paul. It drew thousands and thousands of people into the church, on to the square and so on, and the cardinal in red robes presided over the ceremony, and he came forward at the end of the ceremony, in front of the faithful, and he greeted them shouting: 'Shalom, shalom.' And there was all around the square armed police and there were plain clothes policemen in the church. The police pulled back; there was nothing the police could do against that.³⁶

FOUCAULT AT *VERSUS*

Although he considered himself to be under police surveillance, Foucault remained in Brazil until November 18. He was at UERJ almost informally and at the State University of Campinas at the invitation of the student Academic Center. What interests us specifically, however, is his contact with the tiny press. *Versus* published an interview with Foucault titled “Asylum, sexuality, prisons” in its first issue, which appeared in October 1975. In the interview, Foucault offers the following response to a question about the need for a synthesis of knowledge and struggles: “What makes a synthesis is the historical process, the synthesis is made by the collectivity. If the intellectual wants to synthesize these various activities he will resume his old solemn and useless role.”³⁷ He went on to clarify, “I did not speak of the lack of synthesis as something that is missing, but of an achievement: at last, we are freeing ourselves of synthesis, of totality.”³⁸ Nothing better than this radical rejection of synthesis could be offered to *Versus*. The newspaper had started as an effect of the event of the assassination of Herzog. Barros Filho recounts, “Herzog’s drama in prison coincided with the printing of the first edition. . . , around 12,000 copies. . . . Distributed precariously from hand to hand, in newsstands in São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Porto Alegre, and a few other cities, . . . it resonated deeply with readers, and would go further than expected.”³⁹ In the same perspective that we have adopted to characterize the tinies, Barros Filho elaborates, “We were more than 100 newspapers, I read in some statistics, but we made the noise of a thousand.”⁴⁰

In spite of (or perhaps because) of these minoritarian conditions, *Versus* published thirty-three regular editions, three

extra editions of comic books, and two special editions, one related to the Chilean coup and another on May Day in the greater industrial region of São Paulo, between 1975 and 1979. But as much as these numbers, which sound almost far-fetched today, we are interested in an approach to *Versus* as an analyzer of the perspectives then present in the sphere of political struggles. Maria Paula Araújo tells us that the first half of the 1970s brought about a new tactical definition for the Brazilian left: the “resistance struggle” as a self-criticism of the armed struggle and its defeat.⁴¹ This attitude, linked to the daily defense of freedoms, did not, however, enjoy unanimity: “a new polarity was established . . . on the one hand, those who agreed with a resistance struggle . . . on the other, militants and organizations that considered this proposal a replica of the reformism of traditional Brazilian communism.”⁴² Linked to the new polarity was the action of minorities, such as movements of women, blacks, and homosexuals, which then emerged (or resurged). While those who supported the resistance struggle embraced these initiatives, with or without attempts at partisan “rigging,” the (now) traditional perspective of political action claimed that they divided the opposition, leading to unwanted fragmentation. According to Araújo, this debate can be traced in the legal space of the pages of the tiny press because “the political discussions began to leave the strict scope of clandestine organizations and gained a greater space and a larger public audience.”⁴³

In its first two years of existence, *Versus* did not lack reasons for participation in resistance struggles. The worker Manuel Fiel Filho was murdered in 1976 on army premises. In the same year, the fashion stylist Zuzu Angel, who had been

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

denouncing the massacre of her son in the cellars of repression, died in a suspicious car accident. At the same time, bomb attacks began against large organizations that were critical of the regime, such as the Brazilian Press Association and the Brazilian Bar Association. Other attacks followed that were directed at small spaces that sold the tiny press, such as newsstands.

The language of *Versus* was a summary of that moment. Araújo writes: “The newspaper sought a form of expression that represented the terror and anguish. . . . On the other hand, intellectually, it was . . . close to the French May 1968, viewing politics as an aesthetic manifestation.”⁴⁴ Regardless of its emphasis on themes such as panic and death, *Versus* was considered an extremely beautiful publication. It expressed “both beauty and tension, using all resources, from the comic to the photo, . . . differing aesthetically from everything that had been done before.”⁴⁵ According to Marcos Faerman, editor of *Versus*, this political aesthetic aimed to introduce the Brazilian public to a still unknown Latin America made up entirely of fear and terror. “It was all the past,” he observes, “we used the past to speak of the present.”⁴⁶ The phrase evokes a procedure adopted by Foucault in Brazil, namely, the use of an encoded historical discourse to perform a critique of the present.

Young journalists soon joined an initial nucleus of journalists who had signed promissory notes to finance the newspaper. The first number of *Versus* fascinated them. They also collaborated with veteran intellectuals and artists as well as a new generation of designers and comic book creators. There was no concern about copyright. *Versus* “stole” texts from foreign magazines or received them as gifts from its counterparts. It

also attracted exiles from elsewhere in Latin America and even housed them in its headquarters.⁴⁷

The synthesis, when it exists, is made by the collectivity, as had occurred at the time of Herzog's murder. It should be added, however, that supposed syntheses do not always lead to something desirable. In 1977, *Versus* reached its apogee. It sold about thirty-five thousand copies per edition, brought together people from all left-wing parties, and obtained funds through ticket sales for a show attended by about fifteen thousand people at the Alternative Congress of the Brazilian Society for the Advancement of Science. At that same time, *Versus* took in (through exiles) the Workers' League, which launched the Socialist Convergence movement within the newspaper. It was a journey full of incidents, which we will not detail here. We will simply limit ourselves to depicting it (perhaps with a bit of exaggeration) as a confrontation between a *fragmented* utopia and a *totalizing* utopia or, to use Foucauldian categories, between *heterotopia* and *utopia*.⁴⁸ Kucinski summarizes the outcome of this confrontation: "With amnesty, [Socialist] Convergence no longer needs *Versus*. . . . In October [1979], the last edition of *Versus* comes out."⁴⁹

REVOLUTIONS AND CONFESSIONS

It is worth remembering that Foucault gave another interview to the Brazilian press in 1975. It was with *Jornal da Tarde*, which we would describe as a hybrid newspaper. Launched in 1966 with the pretension of being a graphically revolutionary evening paper with great reporting, it was, in fact, a byproduct of *O Estado de São Paulo*, a circumstance that defined its limits. As for *Jornal da Tarde's* revolutionary forms, it is opportune to

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

cite the most famous one, even though aesthetic daring did not exactly distinguish it. In the years of preventative censorship, the newspaper published cake recipes in the spaces where the scissors of the censors worked.

Evaluating this strategy, Frei Betto, who collaborated with the *Jornal da Tarde*, said that it mitigated complicity, “the cut before the cut.”⁵⁰ The public reception of the strategy is debatable. Some report that people phoned the newspaper complaining that the recipes did not work. Others assert that over time the sense of maneuver as a form of resistance became clear. It is true that *Jornal da Tarde* was known as less rightwing than its rival, *Folha da Tarde*. Since Institutional Act no. 5 (AI-5) the latter served as a ferocious “guard dog,” to the point of being considered the newspaper with the largest *tiragem* (circulation), which is to say, the newspaper with the largest number of *tiras* (slang for cops).⁵¹

It is impossible to say how much Foucault knew about the connivance and resistance of the Brazilian press. But the interview given to Cláudio Bojunga and Reinaldo Lobo allows us to appreciate both the discursive order that prevailed in *Jornal da Tarde* and the possible disorder that Foucault introduced in it. In the lower left corner of page twelve, one finds a box with the following title: “The history and culture seen by a deep, intelligent, original, devilish thinker. I give the floor to Michel Foucault.”⁵² But Foucault does not have the floor. Lobo has it. After indulging in some ironic statements, such as “Michel Foucault is a star” and “Some have gone so far as to read his books,” Lobo explains the meaning of an already distant *The Order of Things* to readers.⁵³ Only then does he announce, “We need to give him the floor.”⁵⁴ Foucault answers the interview-

ers on the right of page twelve and on the next page. The subjects of the interview do not differ much from those in *Versus*. But they are formulated in an almost scholarly format rather than following a lively conversation, as in the case of the tiny. Foucault, however, knew how to bend the questions in his direction. Thus, when asked to clarify the meaning of confession in his genealogical research, he aims at the (Brazilian?) present. “If it is true,” he notes, “that the wild extortion of confession is a habitual practice of the police and that justice, in principle, ignores it . . . it is also true that, by attributing such a privilege [the production of truth] to confession, the judicial system is a little complicit in this police practice, which consists in extracting it at any price.”⁵⁵ Foucault himself does not escape the necessity of repeatedly confessing to (or atoning for) the boldness of attacking the sacrosanct figure of man. The interviewers ask, “What about man? Does he exist?” Foucault patiently replies, “Of course he does. What has to be destroyed is the set of qualifications, specifications and settlements by which some human essences were defined from the eighteenth century.”⁵⁶ The answer opens the way to a final provocation. Knowing that Foucault was a tireless advocate of minorities, the interviewers ask him if such a position could escape humanism. Looking at his present, the philosopher closes the dialogue with the following statement: “If these struggles are conducted in the name of a determinate essence of man . . . I would say that they are lost struggles. Because they will be conducted in the name of the abstract man, the normal man, in good health, which precipitates a series of powers.”⁵⁷ Foucault concludes, “To make a political critique in the name of a humanism means reintroducing the very thing we fight into the weapon of combat.”⁵⁸

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

Shortly after his interview with *Jornal da Tarde*, Foucault went to New York, where he attended a conference on schizo-culture hosted by Sylvère Lotringer. At a roundtable on “Medicine, Violence and Psychiatry,” which brought together Ronald Laing, Howie Harp, and Judy Clark, Foucault reminded the attendees of us:

Forgive me for this digression that seems to speak only incidentally of asylums and not at all of medicine, except that, in fact, this new technique of torture introduced a new character now constantly present in the ritual of torture: this character is the doctor. In practically all important tortures, a doctor is present whose function is, firstly, to say which are the most effective tortures; secondly, he takes medical tests to see if the patient is at risk of dying – Herzog, who died in prison ten days ago, had not been adequately examined – and, thirdly, the doctor gives different kinds of injections to reanimate the patient so that he can physiologically and psychologically tolerate the tortures.⁵⁹

SIGNS OF SUSPICION AND NEW ALLIANCES

So many demonstrations in Brazil and abroad would not have gone unnoticed by censors of all shades, from official information services to guardians of order in the press.⁶⁰ After the murder of Herzog, Foucault feared that a return to our country would be forbidden. However, he came back once again, under the auspices of Alliance Française. Foucault avoided the so-called great metropolitan centers on that occa-

sion. He restricted his lecturing to Salvador, Recife, and Belém in 1976.

In these circumstances, Foucault's last visit to Brazil would tend to be ignored were it not for the split between "guard dogs" and "tinies." So far, we have located only one mention of Foucault's last trip to Brazil in the mainstream press of the Rio de Janeiro-São Paulo axis. That mention can be found in an article signed by Renato de Moraes in the *Folha de São Paulo*. Moraes indulges in poorly disguised prejudices to disqualify Foucault. In his words:

Wrapped in a purposeful anonymity, the 'maître à faire' Michel Foucault landed days ago in Salvador. . . . And there he continues, unconcerned, without explaining the real motives (if any) of this new incursion into Brazil. The most recent excavations of the 'archaeologist of knowledge' are now turned to another of his curious theories, the differentiation between erotic art (typically oriental) and erotic practice (typically Western). . . . In Bahia, it is known, things happen in a unique and different way. Born an iconoclast, the Frenchman Foucault is not settling for less in his Bahian footloose: the only company he has deemed convenient in his moments of relaxation has been a *guapo* guy, cultured and handsome, known in those lands as Paulete. Elementary, I would say, for a guy who claims to have an almost erotic pleasure in his 'craftsmanship.'⁶¹

Though it did not announce the arrival of the philosopher to the city, the local press of Salvador gave some prominence to

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

his lectures at the School of Philosophy and Human Sciences (FFCH) of the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA). *Tribuna da Bahia*, *A Tarde*, and *Jornal da Bahia* published articles respectively entitled “Foucault talks about repression in Western society,” “Michel Foucault finds journalism today’s philosophy” and “Psychiatry is linked to power.” The first and the last articles attempt to summarize the content of the lectures. The second article is most proximate to our own concerns. In it, Foucault re-introduces journalism as a weapon in struggles of the present, which are often absent in traditional philosophy.

Coverage of Foucault in Salvador, however, will mainly be the responsibility of the tiny press. *Opinião*, which followed Foucault’s presentations at the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro in 1973 and continued to mention him in the following months in articles critical of the institution of psychiatry,⁶² concentrated on his stay in Salvador. *Opinião* published the article “Interlocutors or Enemies?,” which ignited a controversy with Marxism and revealed disagreements with Lacanianism.⁶³ The paper also includes an article by the Brazilian psychoanalyst Chaim Katz about the forthcoming *The History of Sexuality: Volume I: An Introduction* and the translation of one of Foucault’s articles that was unpublished in Brazil.⁶⁴

With regard to the scope of the coverage of Foucault’s passage through Salvador, it is necessary to mention the tiny *Invasão*. A single issue of this periodical was published in March 1977, well after the departure of Foucault. His name does not appear in the headlines of the cover, the most outstanding of which turns to the denunciation of the lead contamination of workers in the municipality of Santo Amaro. It

reads: “*Chumbo neles* (Lead on them)! The Brazilian Company of Lead is poisoning the workers’ blood.”⁶⁵ The story about Foucault occupies three pages. It is composed of a long interview, intertwined with excerpts from the lectures at UFBA and a cartoon by Laerte in which Foucault is portrayed with a ponytail. The first question of the interviewers is predictable: “What does your thinking consist of in general terms?” The answer is not predictable: “I have absolutely no thought, I do not function as a classic philosophical thought. . . . I have no thought, I have obsessions.”⁶⁶ A little later, when asked about historical materialism, the sharpness of the rejoinder leads one to suppose that Foucault only repeated what has often been said but perhaps what was impossible to hear in the contentious Brazil of the 1970s, when any restrictions directed at Marxism implied the possibility of being accused of reactionary tendencies. In his words:

We can make two different uses of dialectical or historical materialism, or, if you will, two uses of Marxism – one that consists precisely in recoding all history to reproduce a philosophical representation of it, and a methodological, almost technical, use of a certain number of concepts. . . . In the first case, you have Marxism as it is practiced in universities . . . and in the second case, you make a tactical and strategic use of Marxism, a number of fundamental concepts of Marxism that allow you to decipher a situation, analyze a historical time, etc.⁶⁷

After 1975, as we have been attempting to show, Foucault had been exposed to something quite different from the large news conglomerates that had followed him with invasive flashes and

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

headlines.⁶⁸ On his last trip to our country, young anarchists with their tinies were primarily the ones who approached him in body and in thought.

We will now turn our attention to the exploration of two Bahian periodicals, *O inimigo do rei* and *Barbárie*, given that they belong to the focus of the present article and do not usually receive a lot of attention from researchers focused on the general theme of the resistance press. Almost all of these researchers reveal a clear preference for supposedly more serious publications, founded (or appropriated throughout) by Marxist tendencies and/or parties. Even Kucinski's research mentions only two anarchist periodicals, *Dealbar* and *O Protesto*, among the 150 cited.⁶⁹ This omission is a clear effect of his classification scheme, where "predominantly political publication" and "anarchist publication" are mutually exclusive categories.

O INIMIGO DO REI AND BARBÁRIE

With the support of João Henrique C. Oliveira's dissertation, it is possible to say that between 1964 and 1980 at least seven "evil flowers" flourished in Brazil, which is to say, seven anarchist periodicals in association with the counterculture: *O Pasquim* (*Underground* column), *Tribo*, *Soma*, *Autogestão*, *Utopia*, *O inimigo do rei* and *Barbárie*.⁷⁰ *O inimigo do rei*, a newspaper that people said had a "strange name," appeared in 1977 at the initiative of UFBA students linked to the group The Phantom of Freedom. The name of the group, taken from Luís Buñuel's film, referred to a list of candidates created to run for the elections of the Academic Directory of Philosophy. It expressed the dissatisfaction of a part of the student move-

ment with the centralist paths taken by the National Union of Students, which was still illegal but had been reconstituting itself since 1974. Or, in perhaps more precise terms, the list expressed the opposition to authoritarianism on the part of the entire university left, including professors and students. Other groups with equally suggestive sobriquets, such as *Um estranho no ninho* (A stranger in the nest – Economy), *Ovelha Negra* (Black Sheep – Communication) and *Fim de festa* (End of the party – Social Sciences), soon joined the The Phantom of Liberty.

In this context, it was not long before *O inimigo do rei* surpassed both the university circuit and the geographical boundaries of Bahia, and attracted the attention of libertarian collectives from several states, especially São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and Rio Grande do Sul.⁷¹ With regard to the singular contributions of the periodical, Daniel Aarão Reis Filho observes: “It stood as a milestone in the good anarchist tradition of a sense of humor and satire against the government, the church, conservative right and left.”⁷²

The reader will certainly have noticed the resonance between the risky manifestations of truth on Foucault’s part, as in the case of his comments about Herzog in New York, and those of the anarchist tiny. Perhaps because of this courage (and its inseparable humor), *O inimigo do rei* remained active until 1988, albeit with an irregular periodicity. Early on it adopted the tabloid format and dedicated itself to themes such as the history of the anarchist movement, revolutionary syndicalism, direct action, federalism, critiques of elections and parliamentary democracy, the rejection of centralism and party practices, self-management, and struggles for liberties among

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

women, blacks, homosexuals, drug users, and prisoners. Against this backdrop, the September and October 1979 issue of *O inimigo do rei* deserves special consideration. With the topic of amnesty on the agenda, the periodical criticizes the distinction between political prisoners and common law prisoners maintained by the Marxist left. Consequently, it demands the immediate freedom of common law prisoners. On the cover, there is a photo of a man behind the bars and, next to the cover, captions in bold letters read: “Common prisoner: I want to leave too!” The headline on the cover also happens to announce the publication of Foucault’s “As Manhas do Poder” (The Ploys of Power), which was an excerpt from his Collège de France course from 1975 to 1976, “*Society Must Be Defended*.”⁷³ According to Gustavo Simões, “as anarchists, [the editors of *O inimigo do rei*] did not make the distinction [between political and common law prisoners]: imprisonment is for those who threaten property with actions and ideas.”⁷⁴ By bringing the common prisoner’s voice closer to Foucault’s own ideas, *O inimigo do rei* is linked to post-68 thoughts and movements. For although the criticism of the split between political prisoners and common law prisoners (heroes *versus* proletarians in rags, virtual traitors) has been a constant theme in anarchist literature since the nineteenth century, the presence of this same criticism in *Discipline and Punish* was not so well known in Brazil. In the book, it is important to remember, Foucault explores the contrast in the early decades of the nineteenth century between socialist newspapers, which increasingly called for the imprisonment of non-workers, and the Fourierist *La Phalange*, which was the only publication on French soil to problematize the split between “good citizens” and “criminals.” Moreover, Foucault associates the utopian socialism of

the Fourierists with anarchism and (more implicitly) with the libertarian struggles of the present. The Prisons Information Group (GIP) began with a protest of political prisoners and then extended (through criticism and self-criticism of differentiation of the political *versus* common law) to all incarcerated.

As for *Barbárie*, it emerged from a noisy little spin-off of *O inimigo do rei* and ran from 1979 to 1982. The themes covered were very similar to those of its companion in the struggle against the governance of life: anarchism, self-management, the labor movement, libertarian pedagogy, minorities, direct action, and the conflict between anarchism and Marxism. *Barbárie* showed a strong interest in contemporary philosophical currents that analyzed power, the state, and institutions. It therefore featured Foucault but also Félix Guattari, Gilles Deleuze, and Noam Chomsky.

The title of the magazine deserves special consideration: what *Barbárie* (*Barbarism*) is it about? The one we will necessarily experience if we do not reach socialism in the future? The introduction of the collective editor in the first issue rejects this overly orthodox assumption:

In contrast to the destructive barbarity of the present world, we counterpoise another, libertarian and creative one. . . . Instead of enslaved and routine work, we propose the ‘right to laziness,’ and free, voluntary and self-managed work. To the control of our bodies by powers (parents, educators, doctors etc.) we suggest the right to dispose of our bodies and to withdraw all pleasures from them. In opposition to

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

modern, bureaucratic and hierarchical civilization, we propose creative (and libertarian) ‘barbarism.’⁷⁵

Born in the context of “openness” and “amnesty,” this (creative) *Barbárie* did not fit within the narrow limits of defense of “democratic institutions.” This lack of fit is evident in an article entitled “Who is afraid?”⁷⁶ A passage from the article conveys a deep distrust of both bourgeois parliamentary democracy and the dilution of rage toward the dictatorship. “Today,” the passage reads, “the same regime that tortured and crushed the majority of the Brazilian people speaks of ‘democratic openness’ and even ‘amnesty,’ as if nothing had happened.”⁷⁷

It was precisely *Barbárie* that maintained (however belatedly) the record of Foucault’s passage through Salvador. In 1981 and 1982, the tiny published his lectures “Sexuality and Its Control in Western Societies” in two parts under the title “The Mesh of Power.”⁷⁸ The new title derived from the suggestion of the anarchists of *Barbárie*. According to Cláudio Luiz Pereira, the lectures had a restricted circulation at the time, due to the reduced distribution of the magazine. However, “[‘The Mesh of Power’] continued to be reproduced through photocopies, becoming for some students of FFCH a kind of *cult* text, which occasionally enchanted those who discovered it . . . ; it continues to be rediscovered by young people, today more than ever.”⁷⁹

SILENCE AND WORDS

The news about Foucault’s visits to Recife and Belém was scarce in the mainstream press of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. But the memories of his visit help us understand what trans-

pired.⁸⁰ In Recife, many of the meetings with Foucault, which were arranged by the organizers of his visit, were suddenly canceled, apparently due to the fear among intellectuals and professionals of having their names associated with the philosopher and, consequently, becoming persons suspected of subversion.

Professor Benedito Nunes eloquently recalls the events that followed the lectures Foucault delivered at the Federal University of Pará in Belém.⁸¹ In his words:

Less than a week after Foucault left, I was called by the director . . . [who told] me that the SNI was asking for the roster of attendees. I said, ‘I will not give the roster.’ I left and went directly to the dean. He was very decent and even courageous. He told me not to give the roster. . . . There was a surveillance up to that point. It was not a fantasy to say that the SNI had informants.⁸²

Therefore, if Foucault apparently had no trouble returning to Brazil in 1976, those who approached him might have experienced difficulties, had it not been for the ethical conduct – “the courage of silence,” we dare say – of some faculty members in Belém.

At this point, it is worth once again revisiting the conduct of the mainstream press through Maia’s analysis. As we have seen, it never endorsed international denunciations of human rights violations in Brazil, opting instead for the use of euphemisms (“lack of politeness by the police,” “inevitable disturbances of police action”) or even the vehement denial of violent practices by the political police (“fantastical stories about torture,” “rejection of public opinion by subversives”).

As Maia notes, “even though the newspapers were forbidden to touch on the subject (which would become the most striking feature during the ‘years of lead’), they simply denied its existence.”⁸³ Unlike some faculty members in Belém, mainstream newspapers therefore practiced what we would call “the cowardice of the word.”

CONCLUDING REMARKS

During his visits to Brazil in 1975 and 1976, more or less ferocious “guard dogs” besieged Foucault. But, as we have seen, tinies of various shades also approached him. They not only used Foucault’s tools of analysis but also echoed his own reflections about these tools through interviews and the untimely reproduction of his lectures.

To conclude, we want to draw attention to two recent developments. Today in Brazil, contrary to what Foucault so longed for, the naturalization of the humanistic-subjectivist split between good and evil and the innocent and guilty gains traction as the idea of managing illegalisms, which he sought to highlight, is increasingly ignored. At the same time, the intensification of a punishing furor without any end and prospect beyond that of revenge lumps together corrupt politicians, petty burglars, and lives considered abject by groups that consider themselves overseers of the world. Reactivating the anarchist critique of prisons and parliamentary democracy is therefore essential in our country today.

At the same time, some nostalgia for the tinies of the 1970s invariably affects us, due to the boldness they demonstrated. We forget, perhaps, that the definition of the place of *dispositifs* in our lives is always to come. What will, after all, be

the effects of the global computer network, alternative digital media, news portals, social networks, search engines, and blogs in the ethical-political construction of our present and our future? Without any illusion as to the enlightening potential of this rapidly changing series, whose innovation-invention we may be part of, it becomes interesting to recall the title (and associated content) of an already dated book by Mark Poster, *Foucault, Marxism, and History: Mode of Production Versus Mode of Information*.⁸⁴ In it, Foucault's thought is associated with the analysis of the mode of information without forgetting that this mode is an indispensable condition for the eventual transformation of the (capitalist) mode of production. The importance of the discussion of resistance media is therefore not limited to academe: the possibility of forging libertarian lifestyles or, rather, enemies, like Foucault, of any king depends at the present time on this media, as it did in the period we have studied.

NOTES

- 1 Diana de Oliveira Dias translated this article.
- 2 Heliana de Barros Conde Rodrigues, *Ensaio sobre Michel Foucault no Brasil: Presença, efeitos, ressonâncias* (Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina, 2016).
- 3 The category of “shielded democracy” comes from Felipe Demier, *Depois do golpe: A dialética da democracia blindada no Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro: Mauad X, 2017).
- 4 Roberto Schwarz. “Cultura e política no Brasil (1964-1969),” in *O pai de família e outros estudos* (Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1978), 9.
- 5 Demier, *Depois do golpe*, 90.
- 6 Ibid.

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

- 7 Carlos Baqueiro and Eliene Nunes. “Introdução,” in *O inimigo do rei: Imprimindo utopias anarquistas*, ed. Carlos Baqueiro and Eliene Nunes (Rio de Janeiro: Achiamé, 2007), 12.
- 8 The concept of analyzer comes from French Institutional Analysis and it refers to the events that condense forces at play in social processes, favoring their collective analysis and eventual transformation by the agents involved.
- 9 Although the Portuguese word *nanico* (tiny) is an adjective it can also function as a noun, referring either to the persons, such as journalists, editors, and cartoonists, involved in the tiny press or to the newspapers themselves.
- 10 Beatriz Kushnir, *Cães de guarda: Jornalistas e censores do AI-5 à constituição de 1988* (São Paulo: FAPESP/Boitempo, 2004).
- 11 Bernardo Kucinski, *Jornalistas e revolucionários: Nos tempos da imprensa alternativa* (São Paulo: Edusp, 2003), 13.
- 12 The thesis was presented at School of Communications and Arts at the University of São Paulo (USP) in 1991.
- 13 The publisher Scritta published the first edition of Kucinski’s book in 1991. We use the revised edition. See Kucinski, *Jornalistas e revolucionários*.
- 14 Bernardo Kucinski, “A aventura alternativa: O jornalismo de oposição dos anos 70,” in *A síndrome da antena parabólica: Ética no jornalismo brasileiro* (São Paulo: Perseu Abramo, 2002), 178.
- 15 Rivaldo Chinem, *Imprensa alternativa: jornalismo de oposição e inovação* (São Paulo: Ática, 1995), 7.
- 16 Sandra Alves Horta, “Imprensa alternativa – comentários sobre o acervo,” in *Maços na gaveta. Reflexões sobre mídia*, ed. Beatriz Kushnir (Niterói: Eduff, 2009), 102. The archive was donated to the City Archive of Rio de Janeiro 1992, where it is open to public consultation.
- 17 João Antônio, “Aviso aos nanicos,” August, 1975, 5.
- 18 Kucinski, “A aventura alternativa,” 178.
- 19 Ibid.

- 20 Ibid., 179.
- 21 Gileide Vilela et al., eds., *Os baianos que rugem. A imprensa alternativa na Bahia* (Salvador: Edufba, 1996), 17. Oswald de Andrade was one of the creators of the anthropophagic movement in 1928.
- 22 Kucinski, “A aventura alternativa,” 179.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 Ibid.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 “Lontras, piranhas, ratos, veados,” *Lampião da Esquina*, April 1978, 11.
- 27 Quoted in Maurício Maia, “Henfil e o império do silêncio,” in *Perfis cruzados: Trajetórias e militância política no Brasil*, ed. Beatriz Kushnir (Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 2002), 188.
- 28 Ibid., 188-189. Institutional Act No. 5 (AI-5) started the *anos de chumbo* (years of lead) through an increase in the powers of the repressive apparatus.
- 29 Ibid., 189.
- 30 Quoted in Maia, “Henfil e o império do silêncio,” 191.
- 31 The interviews with Roger-Pol Droit in 1975 stand out in this regard. See in particular, Michel Foucault, “Eu sou um pirotécnico,” in *Michel Foucault – entrevistas*, ed. Roger-Pol Droit (Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 2006), 67-100.
- 32 Michel Foucault. “Les rapports de pouvoir passent à l’intérieur des corps,” in *Dits et écrits 1954-1988*, Vol. 2, 1976-1988, ed. Daniel Defert and François Ewald with the assistance of Jacques Lagrange (Paris: Quarto/Gallimard, 2001), 236.
- 33 Daniel Defert, “Chronologie,” in *Dits et écrits 1954-1988*, Vol. 1, 1954-1975, by Michel Foucault, ed. Daniel Defert and François Ewald with the assistance of Jacques Lagrange (Paris: Quarto/Gallimard, 2001), 65.
- 34 *Folha de São Paulo*, October 24, 1975.

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

- 35 Elio Gaspari, *A ditadura encurralada* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2004), 174.
- 36 Michel Foucault, “On Religion (1978),” in *Religion and Culture*, ed. Jeremy R. Carrette (New York: Routledge, 1999), 107.
- 37 Michel Foucault, “Asiles. Sexualité. Prisons,” in *Dits et écrits, 1954-1988*, Vol. 1, 1954-1975, 1650. For the Portuguese version of this interview, see Michel Foucault, “Hospícios, sexualidade, prisões,” in *Versus: páginas da utopia. Antologia de reportagens, narrativas, entrevistas e artigos*, ed. Omar L. Barros Filho (Rio de Janeiro: Beco do Azogue, 2007), 34.
- 38 Foucault, “Asiles. Sexualité. Prisons,” 1650.
- 39 Omar L. Barros Filho, “O Versus nosso de cada dia nos dai hoje,” in Filho, *Versus*, 10-11.
- 40 Ibid., 15.
- 41 Maria Paula Araújo, *A utopia fragmentada: As novas esquerdas no Brasil e no mundo na década de 70* (Rio de Janeiro: FGV, 2000), 124.
- 42 Ibid., 124.
- 43 Ibid., 128.
- 44 Ibid., 132.
- 45 Kucinski, *Jornalistas e revolucionários*, 255.
- 46 Quoted in Ibid., 256.
- 47 Ibid., 259.
- 48 For this counterpoint, see Michel Foucault, *O corpo utópico: As heterotopias* (São Paulo: N-1 edições, 2013).
- 49 Kucinski, *Jornalistas e revolucionários*, 267-268
- 50 Frei Betto, *Batismo de sangue* (São Paulo: Casa Amarela, 2000), 99.
- 51 Kushnir, *Cães de guarda*, 274.
- 52 Michel Foucault, “As respostas do filósofo,” *Jornal da Tarde*, November 1, 1975.

- 53 Ibid.
- 54 Ibid.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Ibid.
- 58 Ibid.
- 58 Ibid.
- 59 Quoted in Defert. “Chronologie,” 65-66.
- 60 The National Information Service (SNI), which was an intelligence agency created under the dictatorship, monitored Foucault’s participation in the student assembly at USP. For the details of this episode, see Conde, *Ensaíos sobre Michel Foucault no Brasil*, 113-121. For a firsthand account of the experience of participating in the assembly with Foucault, see José Castilho Marques Neto, “No taxi com Michel Foucault: Memórias de um estudante de filosofia aos 22 anos,” *Cult*, no. 225 (July 2017): 21-23.
- 61 Renato de Moraes, “Foucault na Bahia, atrás de Eros,” *Folha de São Paulo*, November 19, 1976.
- 62 Wilson Nunes Coutinho, “O contestador na universidade,” *Opinião*, June 11, 1973; Laymert Garcia Santos, “Para despisiquiatrizar a loucura,” *Opinião*, October 1, 1973.
- 63 José Júlio Costa Amaral, “Interlocutores ou inimigos?,” *Opinião*, November 19, 1976.
- 64 Chaim Samuel Katz, “Reich, sexo e poder,” *Opinião*, November 19, 1976; Michel Foucault, “O ocidente e a verdade do sexo,” *Opinião*, November 19, 1976.
- 65 The expression “*chumbo neles*” literally translates as “lead on them.” However, its most common meaning is “to open fire” against someone.
- 66 Michel Foucault, “As obsessões de Michel Foucault,” *Invasão*, March 1977, 25.
- 67 Ibid.

The Tiny Brazilian Press as Resistance

- 68 From this standpoint, the year 1973 was important. *Jornal do Brasil* published excerpts of a roundtable discussion of Foucault's lectures "Truth and Juridical Forms" in Rio de Janeiro. See "Em torno de Édipo," *Jornal do Brasil*, May 26, 1973. In Belo Horizonte, the mainstream press alternated almost scholarly articles about the work of Foucault with gossip columns that describe him as poorly dressed and impolite. On this coverage, see Heliana de Barros Conde Rodrigues and Adriana Maria Brandão Penzim, "Cronos, Kairós, Aión: Temporalidades de uma visita de Michel Foucault a Belo Horizonte," *Cadernos Brasileiros de Saúde Mental* 6, no. 3 (2011): 16-40, <http://incubadora.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/cbsm/article/view/1501/1723>
- 69 Kucinski, *Jornalistas e revolucionários*, 337-340.
- 70 João Henrique C. Oliveira, "Do underground brotam as flores do mal: anarquismo e contracultura na imprensa alternativa brasileira (1969-1972)" (master's thesis, Federal Fluminense University 2007), http://www.historia.uff.br/stricto/teses/Dissert-2007_OLIVEIRA_Joao_Henrique_Castro-S.pdf
- 71 "Libertarian" here refers to a commitment to direct democracy as well as radically anarchist and anti-statist positions.
- 72 Daniel Aarão Reis Filho, "Anarquismos, anarquistas," in *História do anarquismo no Brasil*, ed. Rafael Borges Deminicis and Daniel Aarão Reis Filho, vol. 1 (Niterói: Eduff; Rio de Janeiro: Mauad, 2006), 19.
- 73 Michel Foucault, "As manhas do poder," *O inimigo do rei*, September/October 1979, 8-10.
- 74 Gustavo Simões, "Por uma militância divertida: *O inimigo do rei*, um jornal anarquista," *Verve*, no. 11 (April 2007): 172, brackets added.
- 75 "Apresentação," *Barbárie*, July 1979, 2.
- 76 "Quem tem medo," *Barbárie*, July 1979, 3.
- 77 Ibid.
- 78 Michel Foucault, "As malhas do poder," *Barbárie*, Summer 1981, 23-27; Foucault, "As malhas do poder (final)," *Barbárie*, Summer 1982, 34-42. Ubirajara Rebouças translated this lecture from the original French into Portuguese. For the translation of both parts of the

- lecture back into French on the basis of the Portuguese version, see Foucault, “Les mailles du pouvoir,” in *Dits et écrits 1954-1988*, Vol. 2, 1976-1988, 1001-1020. For a translation into English on the basis of the French translation, see Foucault, “The Mesh of Power,” *Viewpoint Magazine*, September 12, 2012, <https://www.viewpointmag.com/2012/09/12/the-mesh-of-power/>.
- 79 Cláudio Luiz Pereira, “Apontamentos sobre os devaneios soteropolitanos do arquivista feliz,” *Primeiro encontro dos Programas de Pós-Graduação da UFBA*, Mimeograph, 2010, 8.
- 80 For Foucault’s visit to Recife, see Fabiana Moraes, “Na ‘gaiola de ouro’ da nossa consciência,” *Pernambuco: Suplemento cultural do Diário Oficial de Pernambuco*, April 2012, 10-13. See also Roberto Machado, *Impressões de Michel Foucault* (São Paulo: N-1 edições, 2017), 206-211, 223-229.
- 81 Nunes was the first to publish about Foucault in Brazil. The local press covered Foucault’s visit to Belém. See “Michel Foucault chega a Belém para ministrar seminário,” *O Liberal*, November 8, 1976. For a documentary about Foucault’s visit to Belém, see Grupo de Estudo Mediações (GEDAI), *Michel Foucault em Belém*, YouTube video, 20:50, posted by “Breados1,” December 2, 2015, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_FZuv0OvAas
- 82 Benedito Nunes, “Entrevista com Benedito Nunes,” Interview by Márcio Benchimol de Barros and Ernani Chaves, *Trans/Form/Ação* 31, no. 1 (2008): 22, brackets added.
- 83 Maia, “Henfil e o império do silêncio,” 195.
- 84 Mark Poster, *Foucault, Marxism, and History: Mode of Production Versus Mode of Information* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987).