

Among slits and nocturne fissures: educators' memories in Recife in the dictatorial years (1964 1977)

André Gustavo Ferreira da Silva^{*}

Cassiana Maria Farias^{**}

Thalita Grazielly Silva^{***}

Abstract: Memories of three educators in their respective social positions, in the city Recife-PE are shown in the present study. Methodologically, the insertion in the oral history is justified by the possibility of achieving the everyday perceptions, approaching the subjective creation of consensus and subjective modes in response to the coercive environment brought by Civil-Military Dictatorship. It is about the concepts of force, coercion and consensus based on Gramsci. It was concluded that among the waves of domination by the dictatorship, the educators developed deviation and resistance strategies in relation to coercion. Through the precariousness of the quotidian domination – the regime's gaps - educators preserved the critical view on the dictatorship and performed actions directly against the supposedly hegemonic interests.

Keywords: dictatorship, education, gender studies, historical memory

-
- * Universidade Federal de Pernambuco. Mestre em Filosofia; Doutor em Educação. Professor do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da UFPE, vice-coordenador do Núcleo de Teoria e História da Educação do PPGEduc-UFPE. E-mail: andreferreira@ufpe.br
- ** Mestranda em Educação; Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação (PPGEduc) da Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (UFPE). E-mail: cassiana.farias@yahoo.com.br
- *** Professora; Instituto Capibaribe; Recife-PE. E-mail: thaligraz19@hotmail.com

Entre brechas e vagas noturnas: memórias de educadoras em Recife nos anos ditatoriais de 1964 a 1977

André Gustavo Ferreira da Silva
Cassiana Maria Farias
Thalita Grazielly Silva

Resumo: Apresenta-se a memória de três educadoras em seus respectivos lugares sociais na cidade de Recife (PE). Metodologicamente, a inserção na história oral se justifica tanto pela possibilidade de se atingirem percepções do cotidiano quanto pela de se aproximar da formação subjetiva do consenso e dos modos subjetivos de reação ao ambiente de coerção impetrado pela Ditadura Civil-Militar. Os conceitos de força, coerção e consenso são tratados da perspectiva gramsciana. Conclui-se que, em meio às vagas da dominação exercida pela Ditadura, as educadoras desenvolveram estratégias de desvio e resistência em relação à coerção. Em razão das precariedades do exercício cotidiano da dominação - as brechas do regime -, as educadoras preservaram em seu dia-a-dia o olhar crítico sobre a ditadura e realizaram ações na contramão dos interesses supostamente hegemônicos.

Palavras-chaves: ditadura, educação, estudo de gênero, memória histórica

Por entre rajadas y nocturnas grietas: memorias de educadoras en los años dictatoriales de 1964 a 1977

André Gustavo Ferreira da Silva
Cassiana Maria Farias
Thalita Grazielly Silva

Resumen: Muestra la memoria de tres educadoras en sus respectivos lugares sociales, en la ciudad de Recife. Metodológicamente, la inserción en la historia oral se justifica por la posibilidad de alcanzar las percepciones cotidianas, acercándose a la creación subjetiva de consenso y modos subjetivos en respuesta al entorno de coacción interpuesto por la dictadura cívico-militar. Trabaja con los conceptos de fuerza, la coerción y el consenso en el campo gramsciano. Llegamos a la conclusión de que entre las olas de dominación por parte de la dictadura, las educadoras desarrollaron estrategias de desviación y de resistencia en relación a la coerción. Debido a la precariedad de la dominación en su ejercicio diario, es decir, por las rajadas de la dictadura, las educadoras conservan en su cotidiano la visión crítica de la dictadura y realizan acciones directamente contra los intereses supuestamente hegemónicos.

Palabras clave: dictadura, educación, estudio de género, memoria histórica

Introduction

According to the Gramscian perspective, the construction of consensus within a dictatorial regime is extreme fragile. In the case of the individual, acceptance of the project is a survival strategy in the wake of coercive power, rather than an ideological engagement or appreciation of the regime.

The weakness of the construction of consensus within a military dictatorship occurs due to the fact that domination is introduced, inversely to the ideological pathway. In current paper we are forwarding the memoirs of three educators, each within her social position in society.

The paper is methodologically inserted within the field of oral history (Matos & Senna, 2011; Montenegro, 2010a, 2010b; Thompson, 1992) without discarding the methodology and the limits in the use of memory. So that we may attain the procedures of oral witnessing as a source of historiographical production, we have to gain access not only to documentary sources but to daily feelings and sentiments. On the one hand, we may come close to the subjective formation of consensus and, on the other hand, to the subjective ways of the coercion environment. Current paper comprises the analysis of the impact of the civil and military dictatorship within practices related to education in Recife PE Brazil; underscore the importance of oral witnesses within the historiographical composition on the practices mentioned above; make visible feminine activities through the reactions and resistance to domination imposed by the military regime.

The above is the methodological milieu in our approach to the memoirs of three educators. M.N.S.L. took a post-graduate course in the USA and worked at the Regional Center of Pedagogical Research in Recife (close the Fundação Joaquim Nabuco, Recife PE Brazil); M.S.L.C. worked as a teacher; she graduated in Sociology and in Pedagogy; L.H. is Afro-Brazilian teacher after graduating in the 1960s and lived in a residential district. Period analyzed ranges from the start of the civil and military dictatorship in 1964 to the reference period registered by the witness of the third educator in 1977, featuring the emblematic 'April package'.

Strength and consensus

The debate on consensus is a discussion on legitimacy. While developing an investigation from the legitimacy point of view and inspired

on Weber's contribution to the theme, Maria Rezende (2013) analyzes the regime's activities to put into practice a determined system of ideas and values, presumably legitimating a supposed democracy: the Brazilian dictatorship invented a supposed ideal of democracy which did not correspond to the dictatorial world view. According to the author, the dictatorial regime in its need to foreground its activities elaborated a symbolic system in which democracy "[...] was shown to be the basis of the entire process propped by the new conditions" (Rezende, 2013, p. 35).

Nevertheless and always keeping in line with the Weberian perspective for the vast problematic field on investigations on the Brazilian military dictatorship, we acknowledge that Gramsci's theoretical framework provides us with the most adequate conceptual view to analyze the tension between the types of acquiescence to the orders of a determined political agent and the coercive force practiced by the same agent. Our preference is to investigate at the level of the daily perception of the three teachers the mechanisms of molding or subjection which the military regime put into practice for the imposition of hegemony, rather than the symbolical representations that foreground a supposed legitimacy.

The Gramsci-inspired debate on the establishment and maintenance of hegemony requires a reference to two other concepts: force (coercion) and consensus. According to Bianchi and Aliaga (2011, p. 28), "[...] the combination and equilibrium between force and consensus determine hegemony". Specifically referring to Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks*, the above authors underscore that, within a hegemonic stance, coercive force is exercised through a consensus. "Consensus allows that a given class acts as an elite class, whereas force makes it dominant" (Bianchi & Aliaga, 2011, p. 28). Since in Gramsci's view the State is an organism between political and civil society, the philosopher shows that the 'mechanisms' of civil society are added to the administrative-coercive apparatus: hegemony is the agreement condition provided by civil society to the use of force derived from the administrative-coercive apparatus. However, Bianchi and Aliaga (2011, p. 30) admonish that consensus is neither exclusively related "[...] to the moment of civil hegemony" nor a force strictly related "[...] to the moment of state authority". In fact, Jacob Gorender (1988, p. 58) commented that, although consensus/coercion dynamics is not limited to one or to another, both are inversely related: "[...] consensus and coercion are a set in which one factor increases to the detriment of the other". Consequently, a minimum condition of coercion corresponds to maximum

consensus and, conversely, minimum consensus corresponds to maximum coercion.

Commenting on the Italian philosopher, Bianchi and Aliaga (2011) underscore their idea of corruption-fraud defined as the situation between consensus and force. Such situation is characterized by the difficulty in the exercise of the hegemonic function and, due to the absorption or elimination of the leaders, antagonisms are weakened and defeated. If the corruption-fraud condition is emptied of its tactic and strategic energy, it exceeds in the primacy of coercion over consensus at the level of civil society or of the bureaucratic dynamic of the administrative apparatus.

The supremacy of coercion within the hegemonic condition causes the State's gradual loss of its 'education' characteristic. According to Gramsci (1981, p. 37), if coercion is to be acknowledged as legitimate, "[...] all hegemonic relationship will necessarily be a pedagogical relationship". However, its excess breaks up its legitimacy and the hegemonic condition gradually loses its 'pedagogical' characteristics. In other words, it loses its ability in forming a consensus. The relapse to coercive force means that domination saturated the consensus capacity and brings to naught the very exercise of domination. The effects of the difference between coercion and consensus evidently bring about a crisis of hegemony. Tension establishes a pernicious circle for consensual hegemony of the dominant segment since the loss of consensus triggers the use of force. In its turn, the recurrence to coercion wears out more and more the legitimacy of its use. In the process, the solid structure of domination is breached.

Consensus: daily adjustments to the military regime

After the deposition of the Goulart administration and the detention of his closest political allies, the coercive action of the military regime made an attempt to have the support of a legal representative. Consequently, it required the consensus of the people. The task was the special role of the sector of civil society that supported the military coup. The coup was pushed by the military, specifically and foremost by the generals from the state of Minas Gerais (Gaspari, 2002a; Skidmore, 2000), and by state governors, especially by Carlos Lacerda (Guanabara) and Magalhães Pinto (Minas Gerais), supported not merely by US external policy but also by important national agents. Their collaboration is a highly relevant factor since recent Brazilian historiography on the dictatorial period (Araujo, Silva & Santos, 2013; Reis, 2012; Rezende,

2013) has widened its perspectives on the period, with special reference to the ambiguous character of the Brazilian political elite class and the conservation stance of Brazilian society¹.

However, we must also acknowledge such contributions as that of journalist Elio Gaspari (2002a, 2002b). From a Gramscian perspective (Semeraro, 2006), intellectuals must be perceived according to the social relationships and, consequently, the groups that brought about such relationships and in which they inserted themselves². Although mitigating the wily leadership of the coup makers, coupled to US interference, when he referred to João Goulart as “[...] an easy going and hesitating nobody” (Gaspari, 2002a, p. 84) in the wake of facts occurring on the 31st March 1964, the journalist who exhibited an intellectual viewpoint within a determined political force in Brazilian society, and became a legitimate witness of what we underscore: the ambiguity and conservatism of certain political sectors. We report Gaspari’s information within the above perspective:

On April 1st, 1964, former president Juscelino Kubitschek supported the deposition of Goulart. Some week afterwards, he had accepted that members of his own party would be suspended from their political rights. It was a tremendous sacrifice but compensation was attractive: JK believed that a presidential election in October 1965 would conduct him to the Planalto Palace in Brasília (Gaspari, 2002b, p. 226).

Besides the above political agents, other sectors of Brazilian civil society collaborated directly to overthrow the Goulart administration, especially the entrepreneurs, the press, the big landowners, the Catholic Church and “[...] wide sections of the middle class” (Araujo, Silva & Santos, 2013, p. 16) for whom the Goulart administration represented the Red peril. The arrival of the military to combat the so-called Cubanization of Brazil coincided with the representatives of the moral guardians and the tutors of national order. This myth was popularized by common political sense since the period of the Caudillos and reinforced by Brazil’s

¹ On the theme society and the dictatorial period within the cultural milieu, see: Silva (2009) e Napolitano (2001).

² His insertion was beneficent especially with regard to the Geisel administrations due to the fact that he had access to highly important archives of the period.

participation in World War II (SKIDMORE, 2000). We have to bear in mind that, within such representations, Castello Branco, Golbery do Couto e Silva and Cordeiro de Farias, key military men of the regime, participated in the Brazilian Expeditionary Force (Gaspari, 2002a; Skidmore, 2000).

In short, the term 'force' within hegemony conditions conquered by the military was translated into persecution and forfeiture of civil rights, whereas 'consensus' was translated into commitment of several sectors of civil society.

The building of a consensus that would legitimate a task force against the Goulart administration developed prior to the coup through several mobilizing instruments among which the Catholic Church may be inserted.

Since the Catholic Church is one of the main institutions in Brazilian civil society, it took part in the de-establishment of the Goulart administration, assuming a 'pedagogical' role with regard to society as a whole. The memoirs of educator L.H. report the adhesion of people to the mobilizations and showed the feasibility of the coup:

Mother took us to participate in the March for the Family. A US priest was present and he used to come frequently to Brazil. Mother took us to the May Thirteenth Park (downtown Recife). Since the religious aspect was emphasized, I went too. Probably I was there too to give support to the dictatorship, although I did not grasp this aspect. I rather grasped my Rosary. Hours and hours reciting the 'Rosary'. He used to come to tell all the families to recite the Rosary every day so that the family may remain together [...] (emphasis added).

The educator is referring to the 'March of the Rosary by Families to pray for Peace' established by the US father Patrick Peyton who traveled around the world preaching against 'communism'. According to Antônio Cechin³ (2014, p. 02), "Marches were held in all the main Brazilian cities. In fact, they were a massive act that legitimated the civil-religious support on behalf of the coup that was on the way".

³ A Marist brother, advisor to Base Ecclesial Communities in the state of Rio Grande do Sul and coordinator of the committee of the Regional Episcopal Council. He was detained and tortured twice.

According to Cechin:

The General Assembly of the National Conference of the Bishops of Brazil (CNBB) held in 1964, went against the opinion of a small group of more aware bishops and thanked the military ‘for saving the country from communism’ through the coup. In the wake of the same event, they celebrated a Thanksgiving Act to God and the Virgin of Aparecida, patron of Brazil (Cechin, 2014, p. 02, author’s emphasis).

The execution of the military coup was effectively supported by civil political leaders who initially closed ranks to ratify the political regime that was installed (Reis, 2012).

During the regime’s first phase, coercion was meted out to those directly linked to the national-developmental project of the Goulart administration, even though it allowed a relative continuity of the life rhythm of the administration. In fact, a feeling of normality and order had to be conveyed to society. Several projects and activities developed prior to April 1st, 1964, by the former administration, were continued without much ado. The apparent normality of the State’s dynamics under the aegis of the new regime continued to achieve a consensual acknowledgement of the new administration and consequently for the legitimation of the military regime.

The role of US technicians in Brazil, established strategically for both governments since WWII, should be underscored. Escalation of the *Alliance for Progress* in the early 1960s triggered an increase in the number of technicians which exceeded that proposed by US officials. Merwin L. Bohan (1974), a member of the foreign relations service and specialized in economic relationships between the USA and Latin America, gave his opinion on the heavy presence of US technicians in northeastern Brazil between 1962 and 1964:

US presence was big enough. You should have seen the northeastern region of Brazil [...] We had recommended not more than seven or eight US technicians to be dispatched to northeast Brazil. [...] Seven or eight. Within a year there were more than 150 in a small town in northeastern Brazil (McKinzie, 1974).

There was a constant US intervention in Brazilian education. In fact, several agreements and activities at the pedagogical level had been signed

by the US government before the coup, especially those related to the *Alliance for Progress*. For instance, the emblematic literacy campaign in Angicos RN Brazil, proposed by Aluizio Alves and coordinated by Paulo Freire in 1963 (Freire & Guimarães, 2010; Scocuglia, 1999), was foregrounded on such conventions.

In the politically sensitive field of popular education and literacy for adults in northeastern Brazil, the most successful activities (MCP, *de pé no chão se aprende a ler*, CEPLAR) were hunted down during the first days of the coup. However, education campaigns for young people and adults still flourished and engaged relevant segments of civil society, especially Protestant churches and schools. The 'Cruzada de Ação Básica Cristã' or 'Cruzada ABC' is a typical case (Scocuglia, 2002).

After the coup, the regulation and the broadening of agreements with USAID were undertaken even though they had already been forwarded. Agreements on primary education occurred in June 1964; secondary education in March 1965; agreements for the broadening and reformulation in the training of university professors occurred in June 1966, coupled to the modernization of higher education administration; the MEC-SUDENE-CONTAP-USAID agreement that established the Center for Educational Training of Pernambuco was signed also in 1966 (Cunha & Goés, 2002).

The formation of professors for national education in the USA was followed by a cooperation venture established prior to the coup. The educator M.N.S.L. was a researcher at the INEP and worked for the Pernambuco government immediately after the deposition of Arraes. Recently arrived from a post-graduate course in the US early in 1968, she started her activities in the Regional Center for Pedagogical Research of Recife whose principal was Gilberto Freyre, one of the main intellectuals who helped in the overthrow of the Goulart administration and the loss of civil rights of Miguel Arraes, the governor of Pernambuco. Research works developed at the Center were broadcasted throughout northeastern Brazil and gave support to pedagogical practices in the region. M.N.S.L. describes:

I returned from the US in the 1960s and started working with the technical team of the Secretary of Education in Pernambuco. My job was the coordination of the educational section of the government-run Teachers Training Colleges. I was extremely lucky because at the same period that I

worked at the Education Department I also frequented the Regional Center for Pedagogical Research of INEP. Many people of INEP, mind you, not all the team members, or rather, the researchers on education trained by the updating course were people who were close to Paulo Freire; they had a truly solid knowledge [...] I developed several research works with the Experimental School of the INEP which could be employed by other schools. [The school] lay where there is at present the research Institute of the Fundação Joaquim Nabuco. The school was visited by many people. In fact, it was a reference even for foreigners in Recife. The Regional Center was administered by Gilberto Freyre and the school was precious in his eyes. It was like a visiting card. Several chiefs of state went there to see for themselves what occurred in the school, influenced by the ideas of Anísio Teixeira. The INEP centers in Rio de Janeiro, Bahia, Minas Gerais and São Paulo were influenced by the ideas of Anísio Teixeira. I was admitted as a researcher at the Regional center and I worked as a researcher and as supervisor of activities. I went there when I arrived from the US. There I had developed an experience of a method of a scientific research focusing on the pedagogical section. My research united the clinical and the scientific and the results were published in the INEP journal. In fact, it was influential on the education of other centers run by the Education Departments. Frequently the people who attended the regional courses were those from the state's Education Department. In fact, the whole northeast of Brazil became involved and we had a great influence on the educational practice of the region.

The community's perception was also mentioned by the former primary school teacher M.S.L.C. working at the School Ageu Magalhães⁴. She remarks that the coup occurred precisely when she was attending a capacitation course in Popular Education organized by the Arraes administration:

We were attending the course up to the 30th and on the 31st we were informed of the 'revolution'. The teachers returned to their schools. We could not maintain any contact with the teachers and the teaching sector of the Education

⁴ Current Colégio Dom Bosco in the Casa Amarela district, Recife, Brazil.

Department was closed. We continued our work. Since I had no intention of stopping, I continued teaching in adult education (emphasis added).

At the moment of consensus construction within the new political order, still seeking an agreement with civil society, the feeling of the educator mentioned above was to continue uninterruptedly in the activities of state administration and daily activities. M.S.L.C. narrative goes on:

I remember that the Education department published a handout called *Leia & Pense* [...]. It was highly interesting since it started discussing the whole social and political context [...] I still remember that the first section said: 'Man works; woman works and the children work'; no [...] 'All work'. From this point, a discussion ensued since not everyone had a job; there were no jobs available; the family was there, the family, father, mother and the children. The family was also a theme, and other themes to discuss. It was not precisely within the Paulo Freire's line ⁵, we couldn't do that, but we used a publication within this perspective; some words triggered the teacher to work not within a harmless but within a critical one. You pass from the harmless aspect to the critical one which is within a more contextualized form. We worked a lot in this vein even after the revolution [...] (emphasis added).

In other words, up to that moment, life was still going on within an apparent continuity. Several activities which had been planned many years before were continued uninterruptedly within the educational field. The military regime was still seeking the support of civil society and the acknowledgement of the international community through the compliance to the interests of the civil partners in the coup.

⁵ When the educator refers to the Freire pedagogy, she places in the past more contemporary information. Although Freire applied in Angicos the so-called Paulo Freire method, it was only during his exile abroad that he published his two classics *Education: the practice of freedom* and *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. At this period the Freire line was not so divulged in popular pedagogical culture as occurred in the 1970s to the 1990s. The critical aspect that the teacher refers to is probably an glimpse of the populist pedagogical environment produced by the MCP and by the Regional Center.

Force: the establishment of fear

The most ominous period of the military regime occurred in 1968. The emblematic AI-5 (published on 13th December 1968) crashed all expectations even of the civil society that participated in the coup. On the other hand, civil society was the sector with the highest capacity in leading society to materialize the projects of the military regime. The loss of civil rights against two highly notorious supporters of the coup, namely, Adhemar de Barros on June 5, 1966 and Carlos Lacerda on December 30, 1968, two weeks after the publication of the AI-5, are typical of the distancing from the civil sectors.

According to Elio Gaspari:

The coercive process of political demobilization unleashed in 1964 against the Left now leaned against part of the liberal supporters; after that, against the conservative leaders that wanted to prop up independent personal and political projects (Gaspari, 2002b, p. 226).

Failure in consensus is the incapacity of perceiving the different other. At this second moment and in the light of Gramsci's theory, we may infer that, in its radicalization, the military dictatorship quitted the civil bases which some years before had shared leadership when the coup was undertaken. There is no hegemony by consensus but domination by force. The force condition indicates the weakness of the project especially when defense tactics were limited to the elimination of divergent ideas: hegemony with regard to other projects is domination.

In its attempt to legitimate things by terror – the elimination of diverging people or projects – one of the strategies was the stigmatizing of any divergence as the most heretic immorality: any divergence was labeled 'communism'.

Oral sources favor the composition of a comprehensive framework of the daily force activities triggered by the regime. According to Chartier, "[...] within the witness of memoirs, in the memory of the witness, History finds the truth in the existence of a past which disappeared and which historiography intends to represent adequately within the present" (Chartier, 2013, p. 02). Oral witness illuminates the impressions and adjustments of individuals to cope with the objective reality during the darkest period of the dictatorship.

One should remember that the higher the coercive level in repression, the less is the consensus available. We may thus infer that the less the consensus, the higher is the dispersion with regard to the official ideal suggested by the regime. In other words, more divergent strategies will appear against its heavy hand, more acts will break out through the loopholes of its repression.

The above theory is revealed by the memoirs of the educators that did their job in the dark years of recent Brazilian history. This is the undercurrent that lies beneath the text: the acceptance and dispersion of several individuals within the objectivity of the military dictatorship.

M.N.S.L., at that time the coordinator of the Education Department of the state of Pernambuco, comments:

Several situations occurred when we had the elections for student representatives. Yes [...] Everybody was dubbed communist. It was easy to label people communist. As if the different was an antagonistic reality. Really it was not antagonistic, it was merely different. This was my conviction. My strong conviction. At that time, everything and everybody that failed to comply with the perpetrators of the dictatorship were called communists. It was very easy: when you wanted to dispose of somebody, you just dubbed him as communist [...]

M.N.S.L.'s narrative registers that, in spite of her post-graduate course in the USA and working in the state's administration, she felt the dark mist of coercion falling on her daily life. Regarding to another social dimension which was weaker when compared to the heavy hand of the regime, teacher M.S.L.C. states:

I was at the end of my course in Social Sciences. Immediately afterwards, the 'revolution' occurred. The period tended to be chaotic. Since I had a graduation in Social Sciences, I just couldn't say so because all sociologists were labeled communists [...] (emphasis added).

The supremacy of force to the detriment of the construction of a consensus constitutes a singular condition with regard to hegemony that Gramsci (1989) defines as domination: the recurring use of the coercive apparatus shows fragility in the capacity of intellectual and moral

direction. In this situation, it was the loss of legitimacy of direction due to the loss of consensus with regard to the project and the capacity of materializing one's own project.

Since domination is the weakness of consensus, the establishment of force within daily life spreads coercion and disseminates fear even in university day-to-day living. Decree 477⁶ was published in February 1969, and according to Luiz Antônio Cunha, "[...] represented the most perfect set of threats in political and ideological repression against higher education in Brazil" (Cunha & Goés, 2002, p. 38). With regard to tensions at the University, diploma-holding M.S.L.C. remarked:

My colleagues and I attended the course of Social Sciences [Universidade Católica de Pernambuco - UNICAP], consequently, a group of people in the limelight. We studied every Saturday; we had lessons in Statistics. We were forbidden to do so [...] They asked us not to study Statistics there since we studied as a 'team'. But there was a nuance to that [...] We discussed other social themes which were not specific on the Dictatorship; so every sociologist was a communist...It was a problem [...] and a military man may have intruded within our team. We do not know [...] I cannot bring any proof to that.. I say that it was possible. We started suspecting others [...] (emphasis added).

The feeling that one was being monitored was a mist that covered everybody. Reports described the situation as uncomfortable since it was not a 'pedagogical' process that appreciated the dictatorial project. On the contrary, what actually existed was an environment imbued with coercion which did not specify what effectively would be 'divergent' or 'of what'. One simply could not diverge, in general. As a university professor, M.N.S.L. reports:

⁶ The following articles are highly significant: Art. 1 A disciplinary transgression is committed by the professor, student, civil servant or employee of the public or private school who:

I - fosters or incites a movement that aims at stopping schooling activities [...] III – Practices acts in favor of subversive movements [...] IV – Makes or manufactures, prints, conserves and distributes subversive material of any type [...] VI – Uses the school premises for subversion [...].

At the faculty, we had to be wary whether the colleague who was at our side was really a colleague, who had the same opinion, or whether the colleague beside you was only observing to report on you.

The dense repressive environment was greater when the person's protection was less. Consequently, students of the lower social classes were more susceptible to the coercive force of the military regime. The situation was a blow to professors who were in direct contact with these students. L.H. states the concern for the more engaged students in the activities of the school association and in the Worker's Pastoral work:

Frequently I was afraid that something would happen to the students. I was not afraid of detention since I was aware that one would not be capable of changing so much in the school [...] I was a civil servant by a competitive exam and no one would quit me without much ado. I was afraid that something would happen to the students.

Loss of capacity in the 'pedagogical' construction of consensus is revealed by the subject who has to cope with the conflict caused by discrepancies between the need to submit oneself to coercion impenetrated in daily life and the dissatisfaction with the daily impenetration of coercion. In the case of another social dimension, with a different experience from that lived in the classroom of primary schools or in the schooling of young workers, M.N.S.L. narrates the tension within the Regional center even though it was under the direction of Gilberto Freyre.

You had to do your job [...] You know that you may help that child but you may be impaired in doing so if you merely mentioned a name. Therefore you had to do your job. You knew what you were doing according to that line of thought. The most important thing was that the child learned and you knew what you were doing. However, yes [...] there was an issue: I think it was a lack of courage to say openly, but it was a sort of protection; sometimes I asked myself: is it a question of ethics or is it a question of good sense? One had to be very careful.

The dense mist of the dictatorship disseminated itself even within the preparation of a research project on pedagogical practices for the

Education Department. As a researcher at the Regional center, M.N.S.L. comments:

I started a research project. Mind you, a research project without any mention of Paulo Freire. The project was based on a method conceived by a physician who came here to work with children and teenagers who had learning difficulties. The method comprised games. I thought adopting the method within the classroom. I prepared the project. Due to a name in the bibliography, the whole project was almost forfeited, without funding. The project required funding due to equipments and materials used [...] The material was specific and had to be bought. Without it, the project would flop. People who analyzed the project and approved it almost lost their job since they gave a positive assent to the project.

Between gaps and fissures

Since domination is not synonymous to consensus and certainly it is not the best way in constituting legitimating subjectivities of a determined political project, one may say that, in the face of discrepancies between subjection adjustments and daily coercion, the subjects will trigger disruptive or resistant or contesting practices and strategies with regard to the determinations and projects insisted upon by the military regime. Through the establishment of fear, several strategies were developed to enhance survival, dissatisfaction and contestation. In her narrative, M.N.S.L. reveals her evaluation of the coercive condition at that time and the daily strategies employed for survival:

[The civil-military coup] hindered faster development; it could not do everything. Human beings are born free and they seek freedom by all means. So one has to pretend being dead and I think that many people shammed death.

The repression milieu requires that subjects uses strategies to continue inserted and seek alternative on their jobs that satisfy their vital needs. Consequently, changes in a working milieu less focused upon may be an option for the consumption of daily material requirements such as food, home, clothes and others, even if one had to quit a cherished profession. M.S.L.C. states:

I graduated in Pedagogy so that I may not reveal that I was a Sociologist.

The loss of the 'pedagogical' capacity of the regime reveals the daily dissatisfaction of the subjects with the imposed milieu. M.N.S.L. remarks:

During that period I was astonished, I could not comprehend, why the [persecuted people] were treated in that manner, when their efforts were dedicated for a better Brazil [...] One had to be wary and on the alert and even pretend being dead to recover time. It was also important that in that period one would be prepared so that, at the right moment, one would serve better. In spite of the dictatorship, it was a period that fired back. Instead of destroying the idea of one's country, it was extremely focused upon, you know what I mean. I will defend the country at all costs, so I have to work between the lines [...]

The coercive force of fear was not able to 'educate the mind' to comply oneself to the regime. Therefore, since the subject did not have any protection, he adopted the strategy of resistance. If on the one hand violent repression impaired a more contesting and vehement reaction, on the other hand, it did not make feasible the subjectivity mechanisms that established consensus. With regard to such ideas, L.H. remarks:

There was fear, fear, fear, fear; even so, I did not endure much fear since I perceived that there were many commitment levels. People only came my way up to a certain point [...] Other meetings were held in which I did not participate and I felt that several people were sounding me and I perceived that my awareness level was not revolutionary and that I could not risk my life. They felt so [...] I then felt that I was not being invited and not [...] Perhaps [...] I would not go beyond that, I kept on my own.

Once more we should underscore that, according to Gramsci, constructing consensus passes through important institutions among which the school and the church may be mentioned. Consequently, the fragility in constructing consensus and the establishment of the historical and political situation, called domination by the Italian philosopher,

correspond to the non-commitment (at least of some sectors) of civil institutions to the imposed project.

The role of the Church changed through the military period and progressive sections had a significant resistance role against the regime. If in March 1964, many church institutions, even though linked to social activities, supported or appreciated the coup against the Goulart administration, the same compliance was true by the end of the 1960s. Alignment of the more socially involved sectors of the Catholic Church with the military was ruptured on the occasion of the death in 1969 of Father Henrique, a helper of Dom Helder Camara in the Archdiocese of Olinda and Recife. It was actually one of the most tragic events. The pastoral teams of the Catholic Church were informed that the Church was not constructing a consensus with the military regime. The educators mentioned in current paper found space to graduate and share their knowledge through disrupting pedagogical practices against the dominant regime.

In the wake of such possibilities, M.N.S.L. says:

In the 1960s and 1970s, the Catholic Church had several radio programs on literacy and culture. She used to make people reflect on the contents of songs. She knew that beneath everything the spirit was alive and aware. One had only to detect the gaps and express oneself.

Behind the Church's umbrella, several resistance activities developed during the dictatorship. In the specific case of Pernambuco, Dom Hélder Câmara and his collaborators were the most contesting people with regard to official policy. They made possible that church sectors become resistance spots against the military hegemony. L.H. narrates:

The coordination of the Youth Pastoral Movement was established at [Jeriquiti]. It was established there where there is now the Shopping Mall Boa Vista [Av. Conde da Boa Vista in Recife, Brazil]. The Youth Pastoral had a room and meetings were held there. During the Saturday mass, father was saying Sunday was Youth Day and that a great march was going to be held in the Aldeia area, in Camaragibe. I remember that it was, I guess, a tremendous march at that time on the occasion of Youth Day. The March left Cajueiro, near Beberibe, and went to the Conceição Hill; we passed through the

Beberibe Avenue, went up the Alto José do Pinho and came down to I don't remember where. People, there were many, many people. The Federal Police were monitoring all since it always said that when there were many people, subversives were present. And there were!. We did not know we were, but we were. We were not pleased with what was happening, so we were subversive people, we wanted to subvert constituted order. We shunned armed struggle and other things but we wanted to subvert the order. We tried to subvert order and they were right. The press was also present, many things, and we wanted more people to join us. We were bonded to Archdiocese. The true Gospel on the streets. We did not have any other intentions and this was the theme for many days afterwards. The March was immense; an impressing event and we walked till we reached the hill. Dom Helder was in front. He was a may person who, by himself, by his charisma, by his feelings, mobilized all. Highly sensitive to what the people felt. He mobilized the people a lot.

Under the aegis of Dom Hélder, the premises at the Rua Jeriquiti (Recife, Brazil) became an important formation center of the progressive Church, a resistance spot against the military regime. M.S.L.C. comments on the environment:

I gave lessons in a private school called Escola Castro Alves. The principals of the school were Catholics. So we participated in the meetings at Rua Jeriquiti where at present stands the Shopping Mall Boa Vista. At the Rua Jeriquiti we had lectures on democracy, justice, solidarity and on other items [...]

However, it should be emphasized that the social network under the aegis of the Church and Dom Hélder was only relative, according to reports. Instilled fear was not dissipated. M.S.L.C. comment further:

One terrible rainy day, I was driving my car in the Manguinhos area [the headquarters of the Archdiocese of Recife] and there stood a person, under an umbrella, totally soaked: he was Dom Helder. I asked him: 'Do you want a lift?' He entered the car and I took him to the Rua Jeriquiti. I was somewhat concerned; I will not say that I wasn't (laughter), since it was not so long before that they kidnapped Father Henrique from Parnamirim and things went

wrong [...] We left him at Rua Jeriquiti, I do not have any doubt about this [...] (emphasis added).

The density of coercion imposed by the military regime was not enough to close all the possibilities for dissonance and possible reaction of individuals in their daily life. Referring to the nightly protection of the church walls in an elitist district in Recife, M.S.L.C. reveals her commitment and the adoption of professional activities which diverged from the hegemonic stance:

I was transferred to the school in the district of Espinheiro. It was the parish school of Espinheiro. I did not want to give lessons in the lower junior school. I had finished an educational course for young people and adults. I went to the Education Department and talked to the secretary Lúcia do Jordão, but she did not want me to quit the primary school. She said that a young teacher lowers her status when she passes from the Primary School to the education of young people and adults [...] I argued that I had frequented courses and then she understood and let me go and teach adult classes. I used to teach for 5 to 9 pm, more or less. Behind the Espinheiro church, in the last hall and the hall was filled with students. We first advertised the course. We were some 6 teachers. We broadcasted the course and many students came forth, easily, very easily. When we advertised through the morning students of the primary school, their parents transmitted the start of the course. My class had 36 students, with a frequency between 12 and 16.

In her didactic and pedagogical activities, the teacher used to take to the classroom the sort of idea which, although not directly criticizing the military regime, it at least challenged the perspective of consensus and legitimacy of the political situation. M.S.L.C. states that she used to introduce her deviating stance in the teaching of young and adult workers:

I used to ask each one of them to narrative his story; each student used to tell his or her story and I used to underline the appropriate words. I had no specific guideline. We were our own guides. Thus, we had a series of words [...] we selected the words: work, family, health, education, recreation [...] So, we chose one word, let's say, work. Then they started: 'What's your job?' Everybody narrated what one did, how one worked, where they worked.

Everybody narrated this and that and I recorded everything on the blackboard. I also wrote the words in my exercise book, in my planning book, and we produced, transformed the text on work into a text 'how one works', 'no work', 'why does one work?' and then they used to discuss: one has a job; the other is unemployed; why? They contextualized the situation; many were employed as home servants or maids. In the Espinheiro district, many people did not complete their studies: many were maids. They used to attend classes and we used to give them assistance [...] Every Friday we had round tables, tables where we studied and made our cuttings. For instance, if we study 'work', we selected the word in the newspaper [...] I remember that, on the occasion, we had foolscaps, we stapled a notebook the size of a small book so that each student had a handbook and material, and in the material they found the word 'work'; suddenly they formed a new word. So the so-called handbook or the book was totally formed by new words, only with new words. If the students found a word accompanied by a picture, they patched the picture. We used the handbook, newspapers, reports. There was a magazine which I considered marvelous, called *Realidade brasileira*. The social, political situation of the period was all there (emphasis added).

Within the general context rife with difficulties coupled to the precariousness of the State's administration, the teacher could identify gaps in which she could act against the hegemonic situation.

During the dictatorship, there was a sort of freedom in the classroom. It was not that type of liberty [...] (gesticulating) It was [...] Mind you, when the dictatorship was there, we were giving lessons to adults; the teacher was autonomous in the classroom and there was no strict monitoring of our activities since it was education for adults, in evening classes; there was no monitoring and we have a sort of liberty. Things were different at the university since many people used to pass along the halls [...]

[...] There was no specific monitoring on the premises where we worked, no, there was none (laughter). During the period I stayed there, sometimes a supervisor appeared there. I think there were few supervisors and they did not accompany closely what the teachers were doing [...] We have a sort of freedom; I was autonomous in my classroom, in the elaboration of the lesson,

in exams. We had a mimeograph machine at our disposal and we mimeographed the lessons we prepared. In education for adults, we were autonomous in the elaboration of exams, a simple test on what we taught.

The teacher refers to the silent reading of the world and revealed that many daily school practices signifying resistance and non-compliance.

A highly interesting process was called ‘Silent Reading’ done in the classroom. We selected a text, for instance, on democracy: the government of the people, for the people, by the people. The text read: ‘Perhaps it’s better to make conscience-raising [...]’ The young student read the text and tried to answer. We then sat around a circle – at that time, we did not know whether it was a culture circle (a reference to the Freire method), but we made a circle and studied. [...] there were plenty of history books at school; the library was pretty good, the Ministry used to send us the books; we could read, for instance, a text on Independence. We gave the magazine to the young student to read as if he were against the Independence of Brazil, focusing work for the people. We used to stop reading and started discussing; every student read a different book on the Discovery of Brazil, on Independence. It made the students learn. I do not know whether we had politics in mind. It was not so strong as may be supposed [...] A critical conscience, a conscience [...] First there was the conscience-raising process on the importance of work, and we did this [...] the importance you have on your job. There were no social movements, the social movements weren’t there. Everything was silenced [...] we used the instruments we had: the lessons we received (emphasis added).

The activities of M.S.L.C. were certainly no force that would place a risk to the domination executed by the military regime and even less attack the dominating agents. M.S.L.C. was no guerrilla fighter or an underground political leader. However, the daily non-compliance of the teachers within the primary school milieu, within young people and adult education, within higher education and even in academic research was a challenge against the military regime at its most sensitive spot: the construction of consensus. No hegemony has a long life without it.

Final considerations

Daily manifestations of dissatisfaction, resistance and contestation reveal the weakness of the construction of subjectivity by domination and shows that coercion does not subjectify consensus. We may infer that, within a coercive milieu, the accommodation of the subject to the dominant group is a strategy of self-preservation in the wake of coercion forces. It is not necessarily characterized as an authentic ideological commitment or a feeling of appreciation by the dominator.

We have seen that hegemony is defined by the combination and equilibrium between force and consensus with inverse proportions: a low coercion corresponds to a higher consensus; the minimization of consensus is equivalent to maximization of the use of force. We have also seen that after the initial force against the Goulart administration, the military regime desired to satisfy its civil agents who concocted the coup and to show themselves judicially legitimate before the international community. Civil society supported the task. According to the teachers' witness, within the initial phase, the orderly continuation of life was preserved, with the relative continuation of pedagogical and educational activities elaborated even prior to the coup.

We have also perceived that after the early years, the military regime radicalized repression and disseminated fear and tension. Witness in the memoirs of the educators proves the existence of past coercion and repression that was established within the daily educational environment in the country. The constant exercise of force revealed the saturation of the capacity for the reproduction of consensus, laying bare domination and establishing the hegemony crisis to the point that the solid dominating basis was slowly breaking up.

Within the midst of domination employed by the military regime, or rather, of the precariousness of domination at the daily plane, the teachers developed deviant and resistance strategies against coercion. Through the gaps and fissures in the dominant regime, they preserved in their daily life a critical stance on the dictatorship and practiced acts against the supposedly hegemonic interests.

References

Araujo, M. P., Silva, I. P., & Santos, D. R. (Orgs.). (2013). *Ditadura militar e democracia no Brasil: história, imagem e testemunho*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Ponteio.

Bianchi, A., & Aliaga, L. (2011). Força e consenso como fundamentos do Estado: Pareto e Gramsci. *Revista Brasileira de Ciência Política*, (5). Acessado em: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0103-33522011000100002>

Cechin, A. (2014). *Igreja, entre o apoio e a resistência ao golpe civil-militar de 1964 / entrevista especial com Antônio Cechin*. São Leopoldo, RS: Instituto Humanitas Unisinos. Acessado em: <http://www.ihu.unisinos.br/entrevistas/529710-igreja-entre-o-apoio-e-a-resistencia-ao-golpe-de-1964-entrevista-especial-com-antonio-cechin>

Chartier, R. (2013). Para ler Bourdieu. In 7º *Curso de Extensão do Instituto Ricardo Brennand*. Mimeografado.

Cunha, A., & Goés, M. (2002). *O golpe na educação* (3a ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Jorge Zahar.

Farias, C., & Silva, T. G. (2010, setembro 31, 2010, outubro 01). *Entrevista com Leocádia da Hora*. Compilado por Thalita Grazielly da Silva. Mimeografado.

Farias, C., & Silva, T. G. (2010, setembro 16-17, pt. I, 2010, outubro 20-22, pt. II). *Entrevista com Maria Solange Lira Correia*. Compilado por Thalita Grazielly da Silva. Mimeografado.

Freire, P., & Guimarães, S. (2010). *Aprendendo com a própria história*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Paz e Terra.

Gaspari, E. (2002a). *A ditadura envergonhada* (6a ed.). São Paulo, SP: Companhia das Letras.

Gaspari, E. (2002b). *A ditadura escancarada* (6a ed.). São Paulo, SP: Companhia das Letras.

Gorender, J. (1988). Coerção e consenso na política. *Estudos Avançados*, 2(3). Acessado em: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0103-40141988000300004>

Gramsci, A. (1981). *Concepção dialética da história* (4a ed.). Trad. C. N. Coutinho. 4. ed. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Civilização Brasileira.

Gramsci, A. (1989). *Maquiavel, o Príncipe e o Estado Moderno* (7a ed.). Trad. Luiz M. Gazzaneo. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Civilização Brasileira.

McKinzie, R. D. (1974, June 15). *Oral history interview with Merwin L. Bohan*. Dallas, TX. Acessado em: <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/bohanm.htm#>

Matos, J. S., & Senna, A. K. (2011). História oral como fonte: problemas e métodos. *Historiae*, 2(1), 95-108.

Montenegro, A. T. (2010a). *História oral e memória: a cultura popular revisitada* (6a ed.). São Paulo, SP: Contexto.

Montenegro, A. T. (2010b). *História, metodologia, memória*. São Paulo, SP: Contexto.

Napolitano, M. (2001). *Seguindo a canção: engajamento político e indústria cultural na MPB (1959-1969)*. São Paulo: Anna Blume.

Reis, D. A. (2012). O sol sem peneira. *Revista de História da Biblioteca Nacional - RHBN*, 7(83).

Rezende, M. J. (2013). *A ditadura militar no Brasil: repressão e pretensão de legitimidade (1964-1984)*. Londrina: Eduel.

Semeraro, G. (2006). Intelectuais “orgânicos” em tempos de pós-modernidade. *Cadernos Cedes*, 26(70), 373-391. Acessado em: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/ccedes/v26n70/a06v2670.pdf> 03/11/2014

Scocuglia A. C. (1999). *A história das idéias de Paulo Freire e a atual crise de paradigmas* (2a ed.). João Pessoa: UFPB.

Scocuglia A. C. (2002). Alfabetização, política e religião: o caso da cruzada de ação básica cristã (1965-70). In *Anais da 25ª Reunião Anual da Anped*. Caxambu, MG. Acessado em: 25reuniao.anped.org.br/afonsocelsoscocugliat02.rtf

Silva, J. P. (2009). *Um Brasil em pílulas de 1 minuto: história e cotidiano nas publicidades das décadas de 1960-80* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife. Acessado em:

http://repositorio.ufpe.br:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/7438/arquivo776_1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Silva, T. G. (Comp.). (2010, maio 08). *Entrevista com Maria Nayde dos Santos Lima*. Compilado por Thalita Grazielly da Silva. Mimeografado.

Skidmore, T. (2000). *Brasil: de Getúlio Vargas a Castelo Branco*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Paz e Terra.

Thompson, P. (1992). *A voz do passado: história oral* (3a ed.). Trad. Lólio Lourenço de Oliveira. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Paz e Terra.

Submetido em: 15/12/2014
Aprovado em: 27/06/2015