

DISCOURSE APPROACHES TO
POLITICS, SOCIETY AND CULTURE

What We Remember

*The construction of memory
in military discourse*

MARIANA ACHUGAR



JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

What We Remember

Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture (DAPSAC)

The editors invite contributions that investigate political, social and cultural processes from a linguistic/discourse-analytic point of view. The aim is to publish monographs and edited volumes which combine language-based approaches with disciplines concerned essentially with human interaction – disciplines such as political science, international relations, social psychology, social anthropology, sociology, economics, and gender studies.

General Editors

Ruth Wodak and Greg Myers

University of Lancaster

Editorial address: Ruth Wodak, Bowland College, Department of Linguistics and English Language, University of Lancaster University, LANCASTER LA1 4YT, UK
r.wodak@lancaster.ac.uk and g.myers@lancaster.ac.uk

Advisory Board

Hayward Alker†
University of Southern
California (USC), Los Angeles

Irène Bellier
Maison des Sciences de
l'Homme, Paris, France

Michael Billig
Loughborough University

Jan Blommaert
Tilburg University

Paul Chilton
University of Lancaster

J.W. Downes
University of East Anglia

Teun A. van Dijk
Universitat Pompeu Fabra,
Barcelona

Konrad Ehlich
Ludwig-Maximilians
Universität, Munich

Mikhail V. Ilyin
Polis, Moscow

Andreas H. Jucker
University of Zurich

J.R. Martin
University of Sydney

Luisa Martín Rojo
Universidad Autónoma de
Madrid

Jacob L. Mey
University of Southern
Denmark

Christina Schäffner
Aston University

Ron Scollon

Louis de Saussure
University of Genève

Volume 29

What We Remember. The construction of memory in military discourse
by Mariana Achugar

What We Remember

The construction of memory in military discourse

Mariana Achugar

Carnegie Mellon University

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Achugar, Mariana.

What we remember : the construction of memory in military discourse / Mariana Achugar.

p. cm. (Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture, ISSN 1569-9463 ; v. 29)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Discourse analysis--Psychological aspects.
2. Memory.
3. Soldiers--Uruguay--Language. I. Title.

P302.8.A24 2008

401'.41--dc22

2008028908

ISBN 978 90 272 0617 6 (Hb; alk. paper)

© 2008 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	IX
Introduction	1
CHAPTER 1	
The construction of memory	7
Remembering and memory	7
Collective memor(y/ies)	10
Memory and counter-memory	12
Institutional memory	15
Language and memory	18
Conclusion	21
CHAPTER 2	
Constructing memory through discursive practices	23
Macro-analysis	26
Micro-analysis	27
Social theory framework	34
Corpus	35
Coda	36
CHAPTER 3	
The construction of <i>accounts</i> of the dictatorship period (1976 & 1978)	39
Socio-historical context	40
Intertextuality	42
Genre: the explicative historical account	49
Textual analysis	53
Representation of the experience (ideational meaning)	55
Social actors	59
Orientation towards the message and the participants (interpersonal meaning)	64
Argumentative strategies: <i>topoi</i>	69
Conclusion	73

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of editorials of a military magazine, *El Soldado* (1986–1996) 77

Socio-historical context 79

Intertextuality 82

Genre: the editorial 85

Textual analysis 88

Construction of the experience (ideational meaning) 89

Representation of the relationships between social actors
(interpersonal meaning) 94

Argumentative strategies 97

Conclusions 98

CHAPTER 5

Individual memory: Analysis of the confession of a repressor 103

Socio-historical context 103

Genre: The confession 105

Textual analysis 107

Situational context 107

Frames of self-presentation 115

Use of personal pronouns as a sign of responsibility 119

Conclusions 121

CHAPTER 6

Struggles for memory: Dialogue between social actors (2000–2001) 125

Socio-historical context 127

Intertextuality 131

Genre analysis: The press release and opinion article 140

Textual analysis 145

Conclusions 164

CHAPTER 7

What is our story: Reconstructing the institutional grand narrative (2007) 167

Socio-historical context 169

Genre: The commemoration speech 171

Context of situation 172

Intertextuality 185

Conclusions 193

CHAPTER 8	
Conclusion	195
The construction of memory	195
Memory and discourse	197
What does it mean to come to terms with the past?	201
Final reflections	203
References	209
Corpus of texts analyzed	123
Appendix	225
Appendix 2	231
Author index	243
Subject index	245

Acknowledgements

The research presented in this book began as part of my dissertation work and continued afterwards tracing the most recent developments in the debates over how to remember the traumatic past of the last dictatorship in Uruguay. The work owes much to continued dialogue and collaboration with several people. In particular, I am thankful to Teresa Oteiza with whom I engaged in several conversations about discourse analysis and history. We both share an interest in understanding how language is used to construct history and how our countries deal with the dictatorship period.

I am indebted to Cecilia Colombi who introduced me to discourse analysis and the work of Halliday and encouraged me to pursue this topic. I have also learned a lot from Mary Schleppegrell who gave me the chance to explore more in detail the role of language in the construction of history.

I am especially thankful to Teun van Dijk whose work in Critical Discourse Analysis and socio-cognitive approaches to discourse served as crucial references in exploring the role of language in the construction of memory and the importance of investigating the discourse of the powerful. His comments and suggestions together with his prompt response and critical perspective on my work helped to expand my analysis. Teun's influence was also felt through the CDA-PhD class list that he organized, which provided a virtual forum to exchange ideas and receive suggestions from colleagues throughout the globe.

My dissertation research was supported by a Social Science Research Council grant from the Program Memory and Repression in the Southern Cone led by Elizabeth Jelin and Eric Hershberg. Participation in that program allowed me to do archival research, establish links with junior scholars investigating similar topics and engage in a multidisciplinary dialogue. I am very thankful for the opportunity to explore the construction of memory from different disciplines and for the comments I received from them. I am also grateful to Frances Ruiz for her help with the translations.

This book owes a lot to my family for their intellectual and personal support. My father Hugo Achugar read several chapters and commented on my work providing a careful and informed look from the insider's perspective. My sister Eleonora Achugar and my mother María Achugar also contributed by searching for documents and collecting materials for me. My husband Brian Carpenter helped

me to edit the work and provided a critical reader's perspective. I would not have been able to complete this without his help and support.

I am very appreciative of the comments from the anonymous reviewers who gave me clear suggestions and ideas on how to improve this work. As always, the mistakes are my sole responsibility.

Introduction

This book explores the discursive manifestations of the conflict over how to remember and interpret the military's actions during the last dictatorship in Uruguay (1973–1985). The meaning of these events is still being debated and negotiated in the Uruguayan political arena. Discussion about how to remember a traumatic past is not unique to Uruguay; South Africa, Guatemala and Argentina are countries, which have also struggled with similar issues. What is unique about the Uruguayan case is that even though it is one of the two Latin American countries characterized as a full democracy (The Economist 2007),¹ the military has not admitted any wrong doing and until the 2006 election the government had not created a context in which the judicial system could investigate crimes committed during the dictatorship (Skaar 2007). Until the left wing came to power in 2006, Uruguay had not prosecuted those charged with violations of human rights nor complied with international extradition requests.² Uruguay has lagged behind both Argentina and Chile in the prosecution of the military for violations of human rights during the dictatorship period.³

1. The Economist in 2007 surveyed 165 countries and ranked them according to a democracy index that incorporates electoral process and pluralism; civil liberties; the functioning of government; political participation; and political culture (Kekic 2007). The other Latin American country that appeared in the top 28 of the list was Costa Rica (which does not have Armed Forces), Argentina was ranked 54th.

2. Uruguay held its first human rights trials in September 2006, when it began the trial of six military officers and two police officials charged with human rights violations during the 1973-1985 military dictatorship. Since that moment several key political and military figures related to the dictatorship have been indicted, including former president Juan María Bordaberry and Gen. Gregorio Alvarez. Under the government of Tabaré Vázquez, Uruguay also complied with international extradition requests –as in the case of extradition to Chile of three military officers wanted for the murder of DINA secret police agent Eugenio Berríos.

3. In Chile there was an amnesty law passed in 1978 by the military regime. The first democratic government after Pinochet left power (Patricio Alwyn) created a commission to investigate the facts that produced a final report, report Rettig. In 1993, retired general Manuel Contreras, director of the DINA during Pinochet's regime, was convicted for the murder of Orlando Letelier (Allende's foreign affairs minister killed in Washington D.C. in 1976). In addition, in 1991, president Patricio Alwyn gave a public apology on behalf of the state to the families of the victims of human rights abuses. The case of Argentina is similar to Chile's in that there was an amnesty law passed by the military in 1983. During the first democratic government, Raúl

During the first three governments after the dictatorship, the amnesty given to the military through the Law of Expiry (*Ley de Caducidad de la Pretensión Punitiva del Estado*) was used to prevent the investigation of the past and the prosecution of those responsible for violations of human rights. It took almost 20 years from the end of the dictatorship for the government to investigate what happened to the disappeared and interpret the law in a way that has permitted the indictment of several emblematic representatives of the dictatorship (e.g. Gen. Goyo Alvarez in 2006).

The Uruguayan model of dealing with the past has been political, as reflected in the passing of amnesty laws, declaring days of national atonement or making monuments to remember the martyrs of both sides. Attempts to deal with the past via the judicial sphere have been stalled until recently. Uruguay is the only democracy where there was a popular vote that ratified an amnesty for the military for violations of human rights (Skaar 2007). The Law of Expiry ratified by this public referendum created a context where the government has the power to decide whether violations of human rights during the dictatorship should be investigated. The issue of how to interpret this law and deal with the responsibility of the state and the military in relation to human rights violations is still contested by those who want further investigations about human rights abuses and demand accountability, as well as by the ones who want to keep things as they are. The military has used this law to argue for the legality of their silence and avoid judicial indictments. On the other hand, those connected to the families of the disappeared, political prisoners, exiles and some of the left consider this a law that justifies impunity and contradicts international law agreements signed by Uruguay. This debate has not been resolved as of 2008. In 2007, a group of human rights organizations, unions and civilians began to collect signatures to have congress annul the Law of Expiry.

Alfonsín sponsored investigations of crimes committed during the dictatorship (CONADEP) and the justice system tried and convicted military officers responsible for human rights violations. And, more recently the military leadership (Gen. Martín Balza) has publicly recognized in 1995 the illegitimate character of the repression and systematic human rights violations carried out by the dictatorship. On the other hand, the case in Uruguay differs because the amnesty to those responsible for human rights violations during the years of military dictatorship was passed in 1986 during the democratic government and later ratified by public vote in 1989. In addition, there was no official report from the government investigating violations until 2000 with the creation of the Commission for Peace (except see Alvarez 1997). The first military officer trial in Uruguay was in 2006. These actions show a very distinct development at a much slower pace for things to change and come to terms with the past. See Roniger & Sznajder (1999) for comparative information among the Southern Cone, Acuña & Smulovitz (1997) for more information about the Argentinean case and Sutil (1997) for an analysis of the Chilean case.

Since the return to democracy in 1985 until today there has been a tension between the need to remember and the need to forget in order to move on. This tension reveals itself in the numerous debates over the dictatorship period, that continue to fill the political arena. Some of the most important debates over how to remember the period include: what dates to commemorate (February 9, 1973 when the military made a public announcement of their political position or June 27th 1973, when the military dissolved parliament; May 20th day of remembrance of the disappeared or April 14th day of remembrance of those *fallen in the fight against terrorism*); what monuments to build (for the disappeared or for the *victims of terrorism*); as well as if international law or national law should prevail in the resolution of human rights abuse cases. In this context of struggles over how to remember the dictatorship period, I explore the following questions:

1. How does the military construct a discourse about the past that allows it to justify the violation of the national and international laws which it is supposed to protect? In other words, how does the institution reconstruct the dictatorship period as a historical fact?
2. How does the military construct its identity in relation to ethical norms? Said in a different way, how does it present itself in connection to violations of social norms?
3. How is the discourse of the Other represented in the military's discourse? What aspects of the discourse of the Other are contested or questioned? That is to say, how does the dialogue between different social actors involved in this struggle over memory appear in the military's discourse?

From the discourse analytic perspective, the focus of the investigation is on the construction of memory as a discursive practice. This means discourse here is conceived of as a social practice, a particular way of making meaning of experience (Fairclough 1992). The social nature of discourse and meaning making situate this practice in particular communities that operate in particular socio-cultural and political contexts (Lemke 1995b).

By looking at memory as a social and discursive practice, I focus on the dynamic and socio-semiotic aspects of memory. The goal is to identify particular semiotic practices and linguistic patterns deployed in the construction of memory. This allows us to understand the mechanism through which the military constructed/s its memory of a traumatic period, how it naturalizes it, as well as how it responds to challenges from outside groups. The identification of these practices also allows us to look at how the military constructs a particular ideological interpretation of events, since these memories are used to maintain a difference in power between social actors in the Uruguayan political scene. From the discursive perspective we can describe linguistically what is remembered, how it is

remembered, and who remembers it in order to explain how the institution constructs a narrative explaining the past and in the process maintains an institutional identity of itself as a lawful state apparatus.

The case of Uruguay is particularly interesting because of the wealth of documents produced by the military to justify its actions during the dictatorship. In contrast to other military institutions in the Southern Cone, the Uruguayan military have tried to document and explain its actions to the national and international community. According to the Uruguayan historian Aldo Solari (1988):

all of the military in the Southern Cone have justified their actions. The central arguments are the same or almost the same. I believe, however, that there is a need to do a comparative analysis of the justifying texts. It could be the case that the common element, the doctrine of national security, could have made us lose sight of subtle differences that could be important. In that sense there is something unique in the Uruguayan regime that acquires a distinctive intensity. There are two traits closely connected: a) the obsession with self-justification; b) the tremendous intellectual display in that justification. I don't believe that in Chile or Argentina there are documents analogous of the type exemplified by *De la subversión a la paz* [From subversion to peace], *Testimonio de una nación agredida* [Testimony of an assaulted nation], etc. Those are long books that bear witness to that obsession and also to the intellectual effort to express it in a coherent philosophy.

(p. 236)⁴

The existence of this type of text allows us to trace the development of the military's discursive formation about human rights violations from the early 1970s until today, when the topic is still being debated.⁵ These texts represent a particular interpretation of the meaning and significance of these events that is influenced not only by the past, but also by the present political situation (Halbwachs 1992). The task of maintaining a collective memory of the dictatorship period for the military institution⁶ requires a constant negotiation of the internal needs of the

4. All translations are mine.

5. In December 2007, the military through its retired officers associations, *Centro Militar* and *Centro de Oficiales Retirados de las FF.AA.*, published a new book giving their version of the past, *Nuestra Verdad: La lucha contra el terrorismo (1960-1980)* [Our truth: the fight against terrorism (1960-1980)]. The authors state that it is their contribution to the current debate among political actors to introduce the voice of the military. According to the publisher the book has been sold out and is going into its fourth edition of a thousand copies each (Muro 2008).

6. It is important to point out that no institution is monolithic and as a result there are competing subgroups within any group. "Accounts of *the* collective memory of any group or society are usually accounts of the memories of some subset of the group, particularly of those with access to the means of cultural production or whose opinions are more highly valued." (Olick 1999a: 339) This has to be kept in mind when the term *collective memory of the military* is used

institution and the social situation in which it is immersed. Through this shared construction of memory the military maintains its sense of community, it reaffirms its institutional identity and it constructs a shared vision of the role of the institution in the future of the country. The investigation of Uruguayan military discourse of the dictatorship period provides an opportunity to capture the dynamic process of remembering and at the same time helps us understand the current debate over human rights violations.

The book is organized into eight chapters and two appendices (brief historical chronology of the period and sample texts from the corpus). The first chapter provides the theoretical basis for the analysis of memory as a social practice and the relationship between memory and language. The second chapter gives a description and justification of the methodology used in the discourse analysis. This description includes a detailed explanation of the tools used and how the findings are interpreted from a critical perspective. Chapters Three through Five give a chronological analysis of texts from different genres. These analyses include texts produced by the institution as well as by individual officers. Chapter Six provides a contrast between the position of the Armed Forces and the social actors aligned with it (the right), and the position taken by Others (Family of the Disappeared, and Left wing social actors). This contrast allows us to have a better sense of how the struggles for memory play out in the public sphere and the place of Military memory in this debate. Chapter Seven analyzes a speech given by the current Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and looks at its reception by other social actors associated with the institution and the opposition. This chapter provides an opportunity to document the fractures in the dominant military narrative about the past as well as its reception in the political sphere. The last chapter is a conclusion that summarizes the findings and shows how they relate to the questions posed in the introduction.

This analysis of military discourse can help us understand some of the reasons why the construction of memory of the dictatorship period continues to be a topic of discussion and political debate in contemporary Uruguayan society. Through the exploration of the discursive ways in which this powerful group represents past events and participants, we can trace the ideological struggle over how to construct a traumatic past.

throughout the book. The texts analyzed here come from the dominant voices within the institution, because those are the ones with more impact on the general discussion over how to construct a national memory of the dictatorship period. See Chapter 1.

CHAPTER 1

The construction of memory

This first chapter situates the approach to memory and remembering that will be used to analyze the case at hand: the Uruguayan military's collective memory of the dictatorship period. The approach outlined results from an interdisciplinary look at the topic that draws from previous work in a wide range of fields such as sociology, psychology, anthropology, cultural studies, history and semiotics. In developing this theoretical framework, I focus in particular on the role language has in the process of memory construction and remembering. The goal is to identify the particular discursive practices associated with this social activity, memory construction.

Remembering and memory

Memory is a central part of the brain's attempt to make sense of experience, and to tell coherent stories about it. These tales are all we have of our pasts, and so they are potent determinants of how we view ourselves and what we do. Yet our stories are built from many different ingredients: snippets of what actually happened, thoughts about what might have happened, and beliefs that guide us as we attempt to remember. Our memories are the fragile but powerful products of what we recall from the past, believe about the present and imagine about the future.

(Schacter 1996: 308)

The process of remembering integrates present, past and future in a single task through which we construct a discourse that allows us to objectivize our experience. Memories are the product of the fusion of diverse elements. The act of remembering and the product of this process are experienced by individuals, meaning that it is individuals who actually remember and have memories, but individual memory is always connected to the social through language.

It [individual memory] is not completely sealed off and isolated. A man often appeals to other's remembrances to evoke his own past. He goes back to reference points determined by society, hence outside himself. Moreover, the individual memory could not function without words and ideas, instruments the individual has not himself invented but appropriated from his milieu.

(Halbwachs 1980: 51)

This means that we can only represent individual memory through tools that are socio-historical in nature. Something similar occurs with language. Language exists in the speech community beyond the individual, even though it obviously requires the individual for its actual instantiation.

From a socio-cultural perspective, memory is socially distributed and culturally mediated. In order to remember we rely on cultural tools that mediate our remembering (Wertsch 2002). Remembering is not done by an individual agent alone, but with the assistance of cultural tools whose use enables the process to occur. Wertsch (2002) gives an example to illustrate what it means to say that memory is mediated by cultural tools. He recounts the story of how he wanted to recommend a book to a friend, but even though he remembered the color, the author and the content of it, he was unable to recall the title. In order to give his friend the reference he turned on his computer, went on the Internet, accessed the Amazon.com page and did a search using the name of the author. When he got a list of all the titles written by that author he was immediately able to recognize the title of the book from the long list. That was when he remembered the title of the book. The cultural tool Amazon.com assisted him in remembering, the process could not have occurred without the joint activity of the agent who knows how to use the tool and the tool. This shows that the process of remembering is socially and historically situated. It is the result of particular cultural and social circumstances that create the conditions necessary for the use of this strategy and this tool. It is in this sense that individual and social memory are seen as co-constitutive. The process of individual remembering is situated in a socio-historical context.

There is also another way in which social and individual remembering are interconnected. From a Vygotskian perspective, higher cognitive processes result from the internalization of what originally are socio-cultural processes. Individual memory is seen as a result of social experience. The internalization of this mental process originates as a social relationship that is historico-cultural in nature and later becomes individual (Vygotsky 1978).

The social nature of remembering has also been recognized by cognitive studies of memory. Bartlett's (1932) study defined memory as a social activity influenced by the attitudes and needs of the person remembering. Neisser's studies (1982) showed that the past is reconstructed using previous knowledge and schema to give sense to the remains of an episode available in memory. Neisser compared the process of remembering to the work of a paleontologist that reconstructs a dinosaur out of a few pieces of bone. According to Neisser (1982), people tend to remember the recurring themes and main features of the events recollected, not the details. Similarly, Tulving (1983) confirmed the idea that memory is a subjective experience that combines the stored information with the information available in the environment at the time of remembering. Neurological studies of

memory (Schacter 1996; Squire 1995) have also shown that the process of remembering is a construction.

A neural network, combines information in the present environment with patterns that have been stored in the past, and the resulting mixture of the two is what the network remembers. The same conclusion applies to people. When we remember, we complete a pattern with the best match available in memory; we do not shine a spotlight on the stored picture.

(Schacter 1996: 71)

This means that the process of remembering is a social practice influenced by contextual and individual aspects. In the process of reconstructing the past individuals can distort memory and even remember what never happened (Loftus 2000). Scientists have explored how false and distorted memories are created, and found that misinformation can produce “profound changes in people’s report about the past” (Loftus 2000: 108) even to the point of creating memories of things that never occurred. Memories are always complex constructions (Schacter 1995). “[P]eople can be led to remember their past in different ways, and they can even be led to remember entire events that never actually happened to them” (Loftus 2000: 109).

Cognitive studies have distinguished a variety of forms of memory.¹ The focus of this book is explicit memories (Schacter 1987) or episodic memory (Tulving 1983), the conscious recollection of past experience. Other terms that are particularly relevant for this case are the notions of flashbulb memories, field memories and observer memories. The first term refers to the importance of emotion in recollection. “A *flashbulb memory* is a subjectively compelling recollection of an occasion when we heard an important piece of news” (Neisser 1982b: 43). Flashbulb memories (Brown & Kulick [1977] 1982) can be remembered more accurately, but the most salient feature is that people are very confident in these memories even when they are inaccurate (Neisser & Harsch 1992). In these studies, psychologists investigated how and what people remembered about important historical events such as J.F. Kennedy’s assassination or the Challenger accident; these memories recall an occasion where public history and personal history intersect (Neisser 1982b). Memories of traumatic historical periods, for example, regardless of whether they are accurate or inaccurate, can be better retained.

There is another type of differentiation of memory in terms of the perspective from which remembering occurs. Cognitive studies of memory have distinguished

1. Some of the memory systems that cognitive psychologists have identified include: working memory (short-term retention), semantic memory (conceptual and factual knowledge), procedural memory (skills and habits), perceptual representation systems (form and structure of words and objects), and explicit or implicit memory (conscious vs. unconscious recollection) (Schacter 1995).

between field memory and observer memory (Neisser & Nigro 1983 in Schacter 1996).² Field memory situates the one remembering in the role of actor, and observer memory is constructed from an outside perspective. There exists a general tendency to remember our participation as actors in older/earlier memories, while we tend to re-experience more recent memories from a perspective closer to the original one. Neisser & Nigro's study found that when the person remembering is focused on emotional aspects he/she tends to remember from a field perspective (i.e. as an actor), on the other hand when the one remembering is focused on the objective circumstances of the memory the perspective tends to be that of an observer. The important point here is that memory implies a reconstruction from a particular perspective, not a direct retrieval of stored information. Another relevant issue for our case is that the type of event remembered influences the perspective from which it is remembered, more emotional experiences will be recalled from a personally invested point.

Here we see converging findings from socio-cultural and cognitive psychology that point to the socio-cultural situatedness of remembering. What we remember and how we remember it is framed by the socio-cultural context we participate in. This means that the process of remembering is determined by the time and place from which we remember. We remember as members of a group (family, nation, political party, institution, etc.), from our particular social role in a specific moment (as children or parents, generals or officers, etc.). This is why there are variations in different people's memories, even when they share membership groups or share an experience (this is dealt with in more detail in another section of this chapter).

The two questions we are left with are: if memories are constructed, how can we distinguish pure *fabrications* from *real* recollections; and how is individual memory similar or different from collective memory? These questions deal with issues of identity and veracity, and are important in trying to understand how an institution constructs a narrative about itself and contested past events. These issues will be addressed in the following sections.

Collective memor(y/ies)

History is not simply a record of these events, it is a justification for them.

(Walton 2001: xvii)

2. Freud had already distinguished memories by the perspective from which episodes were recollected. In *Screen memories* ([1899] 1956), Freud comments on the frequency of an observer perspective in childhood memories as evidence of the *reconstructed* nature of memories of the first period of life.

When dealing with cases that entail a moral or political dilemma it is important to make clear that there are *historical facts* even if they may be *provisional, consensual* and *open to revision*.³ These facts cannot be ignored when constructing a narrative about the past. Ethically it is important to maintain the difference between *what occurred* and *what has been said to occur* even when the difference between these is ambiguous and contingent (Trouillot 1995). The need to differentiate between these two types of narrative about the past is of political and moral significance. As researchers we cannot say that the only important thing is the interpretation of events when there are individuals that have been directly affected by these events.

What happened leaves traces, some of which are quite concrete –buildings, dead bodies, censuses, monuments, diaries, political boundaries- that limit the range and significance of any historical narrative. This is one of many reasons why not any fiction can pass for history: the materiality of the socio-historical process (historicity 1) sets the stage for future historical narratives (historicity 2).

(Trouillot 1995: 29)

Reconstructions of the past are limited by the objectivity of the events themselves. As Primo Levi (2001) states it, there are testimonies of third parties, written proofs, bodies of crimes, historically documented contexts that contribute to the delimitation of a possible universe. The motives and meanings of an action can be altered, but it is difficult to deny an action has occurred or has been carried out by a social actor.

Our experience as members of a society can be described as a combination of objective *facts* and at the same time, a subjective product resulting from human meaning making activities (Berger & Luckman 1967). This means our experience and knowledge of society is the product of the interrelation between actions and interpretations of the human beings that constitute it. This process is dynamic and requires the constant reproduction and action of participants to maintain society and what is accepted as *reality*. This process of reality construction occurs through the simultaneous externalization, objectivation and internalization of social experience and its meaning.

3. John Walton (2001) elaborates on this, showing how even from a social constructivist perspective that sees *facts* as the product of a scientific community's consensus (Kuhn 1962),

“[...] there are, of course, events that do not depend for their existence and perseverance on particular narratives. *Events*, historical facts, have no autonomous (objective) epistemological status but acquire their credibility from social consensus fashioned by time, negotiation, and corroboration. [...] History is more than narrative, even if it is socially constructed in a series of imperfect interpretations. Indeed, historical fact, like scientific fact, rests in the end on a consensus reached in a normative social process” (p. 289).

So there is a tension between the group consensus and the *actual events* that do not depend on consensus.

Collective memory is one of the social practices through which society transmits and reproduces the subjective interpretation of its past in a way that it is received by the members of the group as an objective fact. This means that the *construction* of memory is an active and dynamic process more than the mere reproduction of experience. This active construction of the past is done in the present and is motivated by present goals looking towards the future, but at the same time it is not totally determined by it (Schwartz 1982).

The construction of the past, as *history* as well as popular history, is the product of the interrelations between the events and the narratives that have been created about these events. According to the anthropologist Trouillot (1995),

Human beings participate in history both as actors and as narrators. The inherent ambivalence of the word 'history' in many modern languages, including English, suggests this dual participation. In vernacular use, history means both the facts of the matter and a narrative of those facts, both 'what happened' and 'that which is said to have happened'. The first meaning places the emphasis on the sociohistorical process, the second on our knowledge of that process or on a story about that process.

(p.2)

The interesting point then is to reveal the mechanisms through which these narratives are constructed and the ways in which they operate in history. How are *facts* prioritized or hidden? Who are those that appear as legitimate actors and authorized narrators and who are those that are de-legitimized? Who are those represented as responsible and who are those represented as *victims*? These are some of the questions that will be explored in connection to the process of construction of a collective memory or *public history* (Walton 2001) of the Uruguayan military as a participant in the events and as a social actor reconstructing the memory of the last dictatorship (1973–1985).

Memory and counter-memory

From an understanding of collective memory as a process that is situated in the present and that uses fragments of the past to create a narrative that will be used in the future, one possible extrapolation is that there will be different memories of a single event since memories will change according to the context and goals of the moment of production. If the social conditions or who is remembering them change, the result will be different. However, it is important to state that this proliferation of narratives about a past event does not mean that all of them are equally accepted by the community. Certain constructions of the past acquire more value and more legitimacy at the social level. Fluctuations in the *memory market*

affect the value and life chances of narratives about the past. These differences in power among memories have been conceptualized as *memory* and *countermemory*. In his article, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" (1977), Foucault uses the term *countermemory* to refer to the interruptions to the grand continuities of a collective mentality. The concept of *countermemory* is opposed to the traditional form of history that proposes a memorialized version of the past.⁴ The existence of an *official story* does not limit the existence of alternative or contesting histories. All collective memory has its counter-memory, which means that all attempts to memorialize the past leave discontinuities or interstices through which other memories can emerge.

In sociological and historical studies of memory the existence of the power differences between memories has been explored in terms of *hegemony* (Gramsci 1977; Williams 1977; Hobsbawm & Ranger 1983) or collective memory (Halbwachs 1992; Zerubavel 1995). The first group explains the existence of a hegemonic memory through cultural dominance. This means through the existence of mechanisms in civil society that ensure order, stability and power. These studies have focused on *tradition*, a series of ritualized practices that are intended to inculcate certain values and behaviors that mark a continuity with the past, as one of the processes through which groups maintain their social dominance.⁵ On the other hand, the second group, which follows Halbwachs' approach, explains the existence of different memories or competing memories through the existence of diverse social groups with particular characteristics. In this case study about the Uruguayan dictatorship, the analysis incorporates aspects of both approaches to the existence of official memories and countermemories. In this particular case it seems useful to explore how issues of power and social positioning contribute to the creation of different or contesting narratives of the same events.

4. In his analysis, Foucault uses the three modalities of history identified and critiqued by Nietzsche in *Untimely Meditations*: the monumental based on analogies, the antiquary that reveres the past and the critical that judges the past. Instead of these, Nietzsche proposes three modalities of history: the parodic, the disassociative, and the sacrificial which imply a cut with memory and a construction of a counter-memory that implies a transformation of history with a different relationship with time.

5. "From a whole possible area of past and present, in a particular culture, certain meanings and practices are selected for emphasis and certain other meanings and practices are neglected and excluded. Yet, within a particular hegemony, and as one of its decisive processes, this selection is presented and usually successfully passed off as *the tradition, the significant past*. What has then to be said about any tradition is that it is in this sense an aspect of contemporary social and cultural organization, in the interest of the dominance of a specific class. It is a version of the past, which is intended to connect with and ratify the present. What it offers in practice is a sense of *predisposed continuity*" (Williams 1977:115-116).

Understanding the processes through which a narrative of the past is constructed and contested implies paying attention to the characteristics of the social group creating the memory and to the socio-historical and political context where those memories are produced. However, this is not enough to explain why some narratives have more value or legitimacy in the community than others. The processes through which a society negotiates the insertion of new narratives into the social imaginary⁶ (Castoriadis 1987) entail considering the effects of political and social power in the public sphere.

The relationship between these competing memories is part of a political struggle. The battles for memory are carried out in the political arena and depend on group alliances (Zerubavel 1995). There are liminal periods in which conditions for contesting the hegemonic memory are created and there is an opportunity to change the dominant narrative about the past. According to Williams (1977) there is the possibility of resisting through counter-hegemonic practices or when there are conditions to breed the hegemony. Those are instances when a new vision of the past, which was not previously included in the dominant narrative, emerges. The maintenance of hegemonic processes requires the continuous renovation and the defense against forces that resist them. “[Hegemony] does not passively exist as a form of dominance. It has continually to be renewed, recreated, defended and modified. It is also continually resisted, limited, altered, challenged by pressures not all its own” (Williams 1977: 112). This is why in this book I look at how the *official memory* is reaffirmed and transformed in response to input from social actors and political events in which it operates. The analysis focuses on the periods where this *official memory* is questioned and as a result transformed to respond to outside inquiries. The interesting aspect of this case is that in spite of having been questioned in several instances, the official memory of the Armed Forces still maintains its hegemonic status within the institution and the moderate and conservative political groups (but see Chapter Seven). One of the possible explanations for the *success* of this narrative of the dictatorship period is that the discourse of the opposition has worked as counter-hegemony, which is within the parameters of what the hegemonic discourse presents as the main explanatory narrative. It seems that the discourse of the opposition has not been able to

6. In *The social imaginary of society* (1987) Castoriadis defines the *social imaginary* as the interface between the *natural* and the *social*. This means there is a plane of the imaginary in which society constructs the meanings of its social experience and creates possible futures. The role of the social imaginary affects individuals, groups and collectives, each individual defines himself/herself and others in relation to an *us*. A name is a symbol that denotes and connotes an imaginary. Nowadays the nation plays an important role in this imaginary identification (see Anderson's idea of the imagined community (1991)). However, globalization and other post-national processes are creating new forms of belonging and imagining (see Appadurai 2001).

construct a new interpretation of the situation that imagines the past and explains it without resorting to similar arguments to those of the hegemonic version (see Chapter Six for a comparison of these two discourses).

Institutional memory

Members of an institution share beliefs, values, rituals, and ways of making sense of the world. In the case of the Uruguayan Armed Forces, the beliefs and values that characterize the institution, according to its own documents⁷ include:

1. The institution was born before the country was, intervened in its formation and has participated in all aspects of the nation's development.
2. The fundamental role of the institution is the defense of the homeland against any type of threat, either internal or external. The Armed Forces are the last bastion where the ideals and characteristics of the homeland are protected.
3. The values of the nation are the same as those of the institution and are based in the philosophical principles of Western civilization (Greek thought, French revolution, Napoleonic code, progress, order, universal and humanist conception) and in monotheist religions, especially Christianity.

An institution transmits these values and beliefs through a socialization process in which the mentalities of its members are shaped (Rial 1990).⁸ Of interest in this case is exploring how these beliefs and visions of the world are transmitted from one generation to the next. In other words, how is institutional memory produced and reproduced through discourse (i.e. by way of the use of books as texts for military instruction and through the creation of arguments that permit the justification of institutional actions and that can be used individually by its members).

The transmission of the meaning constructed by an institution is based on the social recognition that the institution is a *permanent* solution to a *permanent* social

7. See *Institución Militar. Conceptos sobre su fundamentación doctrinaria*. (2001) written by Colonel Gustavo A. Taramasco and Published by the editorial department of the *Centro Militar*.

8. "It is important to note that the idea of the armed forces as an institution, which I address here, should not be confused with the concept of organization. The concept of institution is broader in scope and refers to an organization that shapes mentalities among its members. The members of an institution share values and visions in the world, myths, and rituals, many of them organized and others institutionalized by non-formalized routes and twists. What is essential for the existence of an armed force is a strong ideology, not merely the routine expression of it in the form of condensed doctrines and weak ideologies. Strong ideology is at the heart of the socialization process. It is transmitted to the members of the institution, so that even if there is change according to the circumstances (such as adoption of new organizational or technological guidelines), the institution itself remains unchanged and permanent" (Rial 1990: 9).

problem (Berger & Luckmann 1967: 65). In the case of a military institution, its role is that of the only entity authorized by the state to utilize force (Weber). Therefore the potential actors of institutional actions must be systematically familiarized with these meanings in order to be able to ensure the social legitimacy and continuation of the *solutions* that society has found for the problem of how to administer force within a state of law. This process requires a certain type of education or transmission of institutional knowledge and history.

The mechanisms that ensure the transmission of the web of institutional memories from one generation to the next include a variety of semiotic practices. Among the resources that an institution uses to express its history are: rituals, monuments, and narratives (see Connerton 1989, Wagner-Pacifi & Schwartz 1991; Linde 1999, 2000).

The construction of institutional memory -- in this case that of a military institution -- involves the use of semiotic systems, of which discourse is a principle one. Through discourse, an institution constructs its interpretation of history and the webs of connections with which it relates to other social actors. The collective experiences of the group represent the institution's mnemonic material. The collective group experiences of interest in this case are the institution's actions during the dictatorship and their shared representations, the social memory that the institution has of these events.

Generally, it is the support of a group that makes memory and remembering possible (Jelin & Kaufman 1999). This means that individual memory is supported by social or external cues that permit one to recuperate or maintain memories of concrete experiences. This social memory allows the social beliefs of a group to conglomerate. The social beliefs of a group can be taken as already known by group members and in this way serve as arguments or bases for the creation of an institutional discourse (van Dijk 1999). Belonging to the group supposes the sharing of a common history of experiences, interaction, and discourse.

Institutions organize practices and social actors. The transmission of institutional memory is carried out through the indoctrination of new generations, the monitoring of social practices, the adaptation of collective memory to contemporary social events, and through the distribution and formulation of institutional ideology (van Dijk 1999). In this case, the *official* memory of the military institution with respect to the dictatorship period is constructed from different places representing the institution. Military officers as social actors dominate a series of public domains that permit them to construct institutional discourse from various positions. The institution as such has its methods of diffusion of the group *line* (narrative/position/memory) built into the state apparatus (Althusser 1984) [see Chapter Three], but more informal organisms of transmission also exist, such as professional organizations and unofficial publications by different sectors of the

institution. This study focuses on how the social actor, the Uruguayan military, constructs its memory of the dictatorship period in books chronicling history; an unofficial method of diffusion, the magazine *El Soldado* (The Soldier); a letter to the editor of a newspaper (representing an example of the individual memory of a member who explains the events from his role in the institution); a press release by a social organization of retired military officers and a commemorative speech by the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. These written texts provide evidence of how institutional memory is constructed and transmitted over time.

Through analysis of strategies and discursive mechanisms it is possible to explore how the political situation influences both the construction of the memory of this period and the explanation and argumentation that these agents construct to justify their positions. The objective of this analysis is to see how agency is marked, how participants position themselves and how the vision or argumentation present in the texts materializes. Defining who is represented as reacting to what, how it is evaluated and with what types of judgments (Martin 2000) can be a revealing indication of how memory is constructed in this discourse.

Variations in the discourse allow the exploration of how the social actors of social situations are viewed and constructed. The institutional interpretation of this period is related to the development of the social situation. Therefore, the military's interpretation of the dictatorship period is dynamic and it is reconstructed in accordance with the internal needs of the institution just as it is with respect to the social situation in which it is produced.

All transmission of institutional meanings implies mechanisms of control and legitimatization (Berger & Luckmann 1967). Who is authorized to speak in the name of the institution, which channels are used to transmit institutional memory, and how institutional actions are justified to the institution's members and to the community at large are some of the relevant questions that will be addressed in this study. The process of legitimatization implies an explanation and justification of the institution. Additionally, it is important to keep in mind that no institution is monolithic and therefore different groups exist within the same institution.

[A]ccounts of *the* collective memory of any group or society are usually accounts of the memories of some subset of the group, particularly of those with access to the means of cultural production or whose opinions are more highly valued.

(Olick 1999a: 339)

Groups with the most power within the institution are those authorized to present the *official memory* of the institution and those that have access to the channels of diffusion that legitimatize this version above others. The official memory of the armed forces with respect to the dictatorship period is transmitted to new cohorts

and to the community at large by way of historical texts that aspire to be legitimized through pseudo-intellectual academic discourse and by way of informal methods that permit a less explicit transmission of institutional memory. That is to say that the mechanisms of meaning reproduction that the institution validates or authorizes permeate all the way from formal socialization contexts to the most everyday contexts.

New members of the institution, just as those who had an active role in the experiences recorded by the institution, incorporate the institutional narrative that gives meaning and value to the recorded experiences into their biographical memory (see Chapter Five as an example of this). Individual identity and collective identity are shaped by the history of the institution.⁹ Institutional tradition permits the incorporation of new members into the history of the group and at the same time reaffirms the group's identity as continuous in history and time.

Language and memory

Memory is an action: essentially it is the action of telling a story. (Janet 1928)

Language functions as a mechanism for a society to access its past (Castoridis 1987). It is impossible to directly access historical facts. Instead, we access historical facts through language. Because of this, the presentation and representation of facts implies different levels of mediation between experience and the narrative constructed of experience.

Language objectivates the shared experiences and makes them available to all within the linguistic community, thus becoming both the basis and the instrument of the collective stock of knowledge. Furthermore, language provides the means for objectifying new experiences, allowing their incorporation into the already existing stock of knowledge, and it is the most important means by which the objectivated and objectified sedimentation are transmitted in the tradition of the collectivity in question. (Berger & Luckman 1967: 63)

9. "The core meaning of any individual or group identity, namely, a sense of sameness over time and space, is sustained by remembering; and what is remembered is defined by the assumed identity. That identities and memories change over time tends to be obscured by the fact that we too often refer to both as if they had the status of material objects -- memory as something to be retrieved; identity as something that can be lost as well as found. We need to be reminded that memories and identities are not fixed things, but representations or constructions of reality, subjective rather than objective phenomena" (Gillis 1994: 3).

Language functions as representation and as action (designation and fabrication).

How is language used in the construction of social memory? Until now, examinations of this question have focused on narrative aspects of the transmission of memory. There are also those who view the topic from a more psychological perspective. The works of Zerubavel (1995) or Linde (1999) examine how the creation of *myths* or the construction of *non-participant narratives* (narratives in which the narrator has not participated in the related events) are the mechanisms by which collective memory is reproduced.

In the field of social psychology, the relationship between language and collective memory has been studied with an integration of individual and group memory. That is to say that remembering is part of a collective activity, the processes of collective remembering occur in the communication between individuals. For example, in discursive psychology (Edwards & Potter 1992) collective remembering is considered to be a cooperative activity in which personal reactions are mixed with the remembered material. From the perspective of action theory the communicative memory within an action is analyzed (see Bangerter, von Cranach & Arn 1997). In this line of research collective memory is approached by analyzing the verbal language of small groups from the conversational analysis perspective.

The trend in critical discourse analysis, in particular the studies by Ruth Wodak, is to approach the topic of discourse and collective memory on a socio-historical level with a principal focus on themes of national identity and intergenerational differences (see for example de Cillia, Reisigl, Wodak 1999 and Wodak 2006). This type of analysis centers on the study of the topics, discourse strategies, and linguistic elements that are employed in the construction of identities. Another angle of approach appears in the work of Breatriz Lavandera (for example 1985)¹⁰ on the political discourse in post-dictatorship Argentina, which places emphasis on discursive formations and intertextuality.

There has also been another group of critical discourse studies focusing on the construction of the past in traumatic cases (e.g. Anthonissen & Bloomaert 2006). These studies address how to integrate micro and macro analysis through focusing on text analysis and the context of production and circulation of texts. Martin and Wodak (2003) compile another set of studies exploring the re-readings of the past integrating critical discourse studies and systemic functional linguistics to the analysis of historical texts. The authors look at a variety of historical genres (from personal chronicles and reflections to institutional accounts of events in documents and textbooks) and focus on how text and context interact to construct evaluations and interpretations of the past. In addition, the work of Teresa Oteiza

10. See also the studies of her group that included Martín Salvio Menéndez, Alejandro Reiter and María Laura Pardo.

(2003, 2006) on the representation of the dictatorship in Chilean history textbooks looks at the debates over how to construct the past in multimodal texts using a systemic functional perspective. These studies have provided some information on the language of remembering and forgetting (Anthonissen 2006).

In this study, memory is approached as a discursive practice. This view implies an investigation of memory that acknowledges the interrelationships between experience and discourse. That is to say that discourse is investigated as a social practice in itself and also as a mediation or representation of other social practices (in this case the construction of memory). The analysis centers especially on the following discursive aspects:

1. intertextuality because it reveals the continuities over time in discourses, arguments, or cited evidence (figures, metaphors, other texts).
2. genre as a technology of memory and as a form of legitimization of discourse (i.e. the use of certain socially validated genres for the transmission of history and as a tool that shapes the construction of memory by creating links between different texts).
3. the linguistic options reflected at the lexicogrammar and discursive semantic levels (the selection and representation of events as forms of selecting the material that will constitute the *schema* for future remembrances).

I employ a longitudinal design to investigate the role of discourse in the construction and reconstruction of the memory of a controversial past. The study covers a period spanning from the beginning of the dictatorship until the present, in which texts produced by the military institution to justify its actions are analyzed. The period is divided into five stages that constitute the moments in which the military narrative of events is challenged. These moments are 1976–1978, 1984–1986, 1996, 1999–2001 and 2007 (see the chronology of the period in the appendix). Is the meaning of this military narrative of the past the same in 1976, in 1986, in 1996, or today?

The interest to perform a diachronic study results from the fact that in this way it is possible to capture moments of *silence*, or moments in which powers are exerted that allow certain versions of the past to prevail while others are excluded. According to Trouillot (1995):

Silences enter the process of historical production at four crucial moments: the moment of fact creation (the making of sources); the moment of fact assembly (the making of archives); the moment of fact retrieval (the making of narratives); and the moment of retrospective significance (the making of history in the final instance).

These moments are conceptual tools, second-level abstractions of processes that feed on each other. As such they are not meant to provide a realistic description of

the making of any individual narrative. Rather, they help us understand why not all silences are equal and why they cannot be addressed -- or redressed -- in the same manner. To put it differently, any historical narrative is a particular bundle of silences, the result of a unique process, and the operation required to deconstruct these silences will vary accordingly. (p.27)

The process of history construction involves the options of participants, processes and circumstances; these options do not appear only at the conceptual level or in the *facts* but also at the level of discourse.

The purpose of this study is to follow the development of the armed forces' constructions of the past over time and to see how these constructions are maintained or transformed. According to the political scientist Carina Perelli (1986):

The symbolic order is a social-historical order, capable of being modified, manipulated, controlled. It is, at the same time, the constant actualization of myth by way of ritual. And the intersubjective generation of new myths or of new elements to old myths, by way of interaction, on the one hand, and of discursive practice on the other. The symbolic order is therefore made up of shared significances, recognized, structural; representations that are participated in and refined. Therefore, its manipulation enters into the field of one of the following operations: resignification, accentuation, displacement, projection, silencing. (p.124)

By identifying the discursive resources that are used to realize these manipulations, this study aims to contribute more specific data about the role of discourse in the construction and transmission of memory.

Conclusion

[W]henver memory is invoked we should be asking ourselves: by whom, where, in which context, against what? (Davis & Starn 1989: 2)

The maintenance of memory is a collective task that involves communication and connections. By sharing experiences a group maintains the feeling of a community,¹¹ reaffirms its identity and constructs a future plan from its shared history. By studying the Uruguayan military memory of the dictatorship period from 1976–2007, I aim to capture the dynamic and collaborative process that remembering is. It is of interest to study this case of memory in the political field because it can provide

11. See Walter Benjamin (1969) *The Storyteller* for references to the value and importance of sharing experiences to a community. The concept of a nation is also related to the possession of a rich legacy in memories and the desire in the present to continue the tradition that has been received (Renan [1882] 1990).

us with data that can be used to understand the current situation and the role that this social actor plays in the debates over human rights today.

The construction of military memory occurs in the political field and in the private one, through both the institution and its members as individuals, as institutional narrative and as individual testimony. It is also formed in relation to other memories it competes with, contests, or tries to dismantle. As Olick (1999b) maintains:

each of these forms is important; it also means remembering that these differing forms of remembering are not always equally important for each other (for instance the personal experience of leaders, under some conditions, is more important than those of *ordinary* people, but not always), though it also means that they are always relevant to some degree (there is, as we have seen, no personal memory outside the group experience that does not take some stand on *official* and *unofficial* collective versions). (p.346)

Each of these types of memory is important because each type contributes different elements. We can use these different elements to assemble a version of the past that will be coherent with the traces left by events.

In this investigation of military discourse spanning the period from 1976–2007, I observe that certain patterns supporting official versions of events exist both on the level of group memory and on the level of particular members' individual memories. Some of these discursive patterns are:

1. The demonization of the Other through negative evaluation (in terms of moral judgments, judgments of capacity, and emotional judgments)
2. The use of two concrete examples (the laborer Pascacio Báez and the dead on the 14th of April, 1972) to support the argument that the country was experiencing a *state of internal war* and that the *enemy* was cruel and dangerous.
3. The evasion of responsibilities through the use of resources such as impersonalization, passivisation, and nominalization.

Discourse serves as a resource used to construct a meaning of the dictatorship period that reaffirms the official position of what occurred and that permits the justification of the idea that the topic is resolved.

Constructing memory through discursive practices

Language is a type of social activity in itself and at the same time it can accompany or form part of other social activities. That is to say, language has either a *constitutive* or *ancillary* character with respect to social activity. As a social practice language is the activity of meaning construction (semiosis). Language is a semiotic system among many others, but its particularity lies in the ability it has to reflect other semiotic systems and to be the medium through which other systems are learned.

The present study explores this duality of language by analyzing the linguistic patterns that characterize military discourse (how the military constructs meaning). At the same time this duality is explored by paying attention to how language collaborates in the construction of the military's memory as an institution (what meanings about the dictatorial past are conserved and transmitted).

A multidisciplinary approach is called for in the investigation of the relationship between discourse and social practices. Critical analysis studies of discourse -- such as those of Fairclough, van Dijk or Wodak -- incorporate instruments from different disciplines in order to explore the relationship between language and social phenomena. Such analysis permits us to pose questions that relate language to power and society. The objective of this type of analysis is "to provide a detailed description, explanation, and critique of the textual strategies writers use to 'naturalize' discourses, that is, to make discourses appear to be commonsense, apolitical statements" (van Dijk 1993 in Riggins 1997: 2). This type of analysis has a political dimension in addition to a theoretical one. In this case the political aspect of the investigation is the demonstration of how, more than 20 years after the end of the dictatorship, state decisions regarding issues of the period's human rights violations are based on an official version of the dictatorship that portrays the period as one of a *state of internal war*. In spite of the fact that discourses of the opposition have tried to denaturalize this version of the past, today this version is still the one that dominates. Although the new government, with a left wing orientation, is starting to challenge the general approach previous governments have had to this topic by investigating disappearances and allowing the courts to decide on international summons to try military officers accused of human rights violations. For this reason, a more detailed analysis that deconstructs the discursive mechanisms

with which this memory of the dictatorship is constructed will provide new tools to dismantle it.

Critical Discourse analysts aim to show how regular and systematic patterns at the level of textual meanings and discursive practices function in such a way that they constitute, maintain, and reproduce or change the social semiotic system or part of it (Thibault 1991). In other words, these researchers investigate the ways in which particular patterns of language use contribute to the formation, maintenance, and transformation of the social construct of *reality*.¹ This type of investigation implies realizing that the construction of social meaning always occurs within a social context of struggle and change. Social meanings are always dynamic and are always the product of socio-historical processes of discursive practices that are carried out from particular positions.

This type of analysis approaches two levels: macro and micro, with the aim of being able to establish relationships between the social and the linguistic. The articulation between the macro-analysis and the micro-analysis occurs through the analysis of hierarchical and dialectic relationships between different contextual levels (Bateson 1973). Socio-historical formations contextualize the specific social situation of which a text² is the product or trace.

In the case at hand, the discourse analysis progresses from a focus on the global perspective, analyzing intertextuality³ (the relationships between different texts on the thematic level), to an analysis of social activity structures (genre), and finally arrives at the textual level where clausal analysis shows how social activity is carried out at the local level (the discourse-semantic and lexicogrammatical realizations of aspects like topic, process selection, and evaluation). This analysis is later reinterpreted using social theories that permit the (re)establishment of a connection between the data encountered in the discourse analysis and the investi-

1. *The Social Construction of Reality* (Berger & Luckman 1967) holds that all human knowledge is produced, maintained, and transmitted in social situations. The authors outline two central concepts for the study of what constitutes *reality* in the common sense: *reality* and *knowledge*. *Reality* according to these authors is a quality of phenomena that we recognize as independent of our own volition. And *knowledge* is the certitude that certain phenomena are real and possess specific characteristics. The fact that reality is socially constructed is based on the observation of the social relativity of these concepts. Specific social contexts produce particular agglomerations of knowledge or reality.

2. It is important to point out that the notion of text used here defines it not only as the historical product of meaning construction practices. Texts are instantiations of *meaning potential* (Halliday 1978) and at the same time they are realizations of specific situational characteristics.

3. In this analysis the term *intertextuality* is used to refer to the co-thematic relationships between different texts. The co-actional relationships of meaning are analyzed through genre. See Lemke (1995a) for a definition of intertextuality in which the types of relationships between texts are differentiated using the categories: co-thematic and co-actional.

gated social practice, memory construction. In particular the concepts of hegemony (Gramsci 1977 and Williams 1977) and public history (Walton 2001, Trouillot 1995) are drawn upon to explain the ways in which a dynamic memory is constructed. A memory that is representative of a social heteroglossia and that is maintained or changed based on constant articulations, disarticulations, and re-articulations of different discourses.⁴

In addition, it is important to stress the diachronic aspect of this study. A historical focus is important because it allows us to notice the dynamic aspect of discourse and the importance of time in the construction of our knowledge of the past: memory. By focusing on how discourse is constructed and reconstructed over time it is possible to see continuities and discontinuities -- what changes and what remains, how the inter-psychological is internalized as intra-psychological.⁵

When texts are analyzed they are typically considered instances of a system and of one process in particular. By analyzing a series of texts related by belonging to the same discursive formation⁶ (Foucault 1982) the goal is to understand the interrelationships between different texts and how certain discourses are reproduced or reappropriated by others. In this way, the historical focus serves as a window that allows not merely the observation of the instances as finished products, but rather the observation of the construction processes of language and memory.

4. *Discourse* is used in the plural to differentiate it from the singular *discourse* or language in use. The term Discourse refers to the systematically organized forms and uses of language in which the meanings and values of an institution or social group are given expression (Kress 1989; Foucault 1982).

5. According to Vygotsky (1978) the process of *internalization* implies the reconstruction of an external operation as an internal one. Memory is one of these mental processes in which an operation that initially appears as an external activity is later reconstructed and starts to occur internally. That is to say that individual memory is constructed from social memory. This characterization of memory coincides with that proposed by Maurice Halbwachs (1980), regarding the relationship between group memory and individual memory. "It [individual memory] is not completely sealed off and isolated. A man must often appeal to others' remembrances to evoke his own past. He goes back to reference points determined by society, hence outside himself. Moreover, the individual memory could not function without words and ideas, instruments the individual has not himself invented but appropriated from his milieu" (p.51).

6. The term *discursive formation* comes from Foucault (1982) and refers to a systematic ordering of relationships of meaning (statements) and discursive practices that shape a group of social meanings. This term implies a coexistence, that is to say a series of meanings (statements) that exist in a certain manner. A selection of meanings (statements) that are transmitted, preserved, and valued at the institutional level is assumed..

Macro-analysis

Discursive practices consist of the production, interpretation, and circulation of texts. At the macro level, the focus of this study is the circulation of these texts. Therefore it is of interest to investigate how the representations of the past made by the military institution (specifically of the dictatorship period) are transmitted. This circulation in time and space can be explored at the level of language through the concept of intertextuality.⁷

Investigating the relationship between texts permits one to position a text beyond its situational context and in relation to the meaning construction practices that particular social actors regularly use. Therefore the analysis of intertextuality is a strategy of interpreting the heteroglossic relationships that are systematically established in a text. As Lemke (1995a) states:

This framework for the analysis of intertextuality does not presume that texts dictate to us their relationship, or that there *are* existing relationships objectively there to be found out. Relations of meaning are *made* in human communities, and made differently in different communities. Of all the possible meaning relations within and between texts and social events only some are foregrounded by the particular meaning-making practices of a community. (p.286)

In other words, patterns of meaning relationships are defined in connection with a social situation. In this study the recurring meanings and discursive practices in the memory construction of the military period are identified.

Fairclough (1992) distinguishes two types of intertextuality: the *manifest* and the *constitutive*. Texts can be explicitly incorporated or fused into background pre-suppositions without direct attribution. In a similar manner, Lemke (1985) recognizes two types of relationships that can be established between texts: co-thematic and co-actional relationships. The types of meaning relationships that can be found are definable in two dimensions: at the semantic level (co-thematic) and at the structural/genre level (co-actional). Because in this study it is of interest to discover the discursive or textual elements that facilitate these types of relationships between texts, this work focuses on the study of manifest and constitutive intertextuality and on the co-thematic relationships between texts.⁸ The transmission of memory over time is investigated with the exploration of how certain metaphors,

7. I understand through intertextuality the inclusion of other discourses/texts in a discourse (Kristeva 1986 based on the work of Bakhtin (1981); Fairclough 1992; Lemke 1995a; Martín Rojo 1997).

8. Co-actional relationships are studied separately through the concept of genre (see more below) because in this analysis the study of ideational and interpersonal meanings is prioritized since they have to do most directly with memory construction.

presuppositions, and anecdotes appear in the argumentation, such as direct reference to the discourse of the Other and other discourses in the military institution's constructions of the dictatorial past.

The texts in the corpus are *read* in relation to other texts that belong to the same discursive formation.⁹ A diachronic study of the heteroglossia¹⁰ is performed, and the meaning of different voices within the texts and their relationships to voices in other texts is analyzed. In this way the permanence and the dynamism of the interaction between content (what remains) and political events (what determines the re-accommodation of this discourse) can be investigated. Through intertextuality other texts are re-accentuated (Voloshinov 1973) and recycled. This type of practice reveals the struggle over meaning and the transformation or reaffirmation of different ideological positions with respect to the meaning of the dictatorial past.

Micro-analysis

The textual analysis of the corpus is carried out from a socio-semiotic perspective (Halliday 1994; Kress 1989) complemented with concepts and instruments from pragmatic (Wilson 1990), rhetorical (Aristotle) and socio-cognitive perspectives (van Dijk 1999; Wodak 1997). Therefore language is considered as a historically situated social practice and the relationship between the semiotic system and the social context is considered to be dialectic. This view reveals how language is constructed by and at the same time constructs the social context (Martin 1997). This dialectic relationship implies that both language and social context *internalize* the other element but cannot be reduced to it (Fairclough 2001).

Analysis of language in use from a functional semantics perspective implies the performance of textual analysis at the clausal level, conceiving clauses to be local instances of social activity. The Systemic Functional Model provides us with instruments to explore the multi-functionality of language. It also allows us to explore the relationship between discursive practices and the social events they form a part of or are inscribed in.¹¹

9. Discursive formations result from the use of linguistic resources in a regular manner, repeatable and with certain patterns in a community. That is to say, that the system gives us the *potential* meanings that we can construct and the discursive formation represents those meanings that are constructed in a regular manner or that are *favoured* by a community (Lemke 1995a, 1981).

10. The concept of *heteroglossia* comes from Bakhtin (1981) and defines the plurality of ideological and axiological positions that can be present at the same time in one statement or text.

11. According to the Systemic Functional Model the resources of language have evolved in relation to the social uses that these have had in human communities (Lemke 1981).

In this model, context is not considered as something material or cognitive, rather it is conceived of as a semiotic system. So what is considered as context is that which is relevant to the members of a group and that to which they assign meaning. Context is an abstract category. Language and context are interrelated semiotic systems. “meanings are created by the social system and interchanged by its members in the form of text” (Halliday 1982: 184).¹²

This model of context has been criticized, especially by van Dijk (2001a; b), for presenting vague categories and heterogeneous notions. Van Dijk also questions the model for not including cognitive categories such as knowledge, beliefs or speaker intentions. Another important criticism is the fact that the model assumes that *observability* is an objective condition (arising perhaps from the empirical British tradition). In spite of the above-mentioned criticisms, however, this theory offers instruments that allow textual analyses to be carried out that account for the different meanings that can be expressed at one time through language and that also account for the relationships between situation and text. That is to say it is very productive to use this theory in the performance of a *micro* analysis of discourse that examines the ways in which the relationship is established between functions of language and its lexicogrammatical and discourse-semantic realizations. It is important to emphasize that the categories of *transitivity* and *modality* (see definitions later in this section) have been adopted in various analyses of discourse with interesting results (see examples in the works of Critical Linguistics or of Fairclough, among others). What appears to need more clear development within Systemic Functional Linguistics is the relationship between language and the contextual aspects that go beyond the situation. The relationship between *cultural context* and language has still not been modeled in a useful way for discourse analysis.¹³ The problem lies in the fact that when we refer to context generically we

12. Translation from the following: “*los significados son creados por el sistema social e intercambiados por sus miembros en forma de texto*” (Halliday 1982: 184).

13. Martin (1999 and previous versions) has proposed the addition of two more levels to the model: genre and ideology. These two levels would not be directly related with language by way of any particular metafunction (as is the case for situational context by way of the concepts of *field, tenor, and mode*), rather they would represent the three metafunctions at the same time. This model has been questioned substantially within SFL (see Hasan 1999). Martin proposes the inter-stratus relationship as a type of *metaredundancy* (Lemke 1995b), meaning that each level represents a series of patterns of the other level that it includes. In my opinion this aspect of the model of context within the parameters of SFL does not supply clear tools to explain the relationship between language and *cultural context*, therefore in this analysis these categories are not used. It is necessary to develop other concepts that will permit the articulation of relationships between the higher contextual levels and the text. In this study the notion of *genre* as an instance of discursive patterns favored by the community for the realization of certain goals does respond to the definition that Martin uses but without relating that definition to the model of cultural context that he proposes.

neutralize social practices and social structures (such as Bourdieu's *habitus*) or we condense all of the complexity of the dynamic, historical, and interactional aspects of the relationship between language and social practices (see Scollon 2001) into a relationship of mediation between language and context (e.g. genre).

The model of *situational context* that is used in this analysis (Halliday 1978) is stratified, which means there are different semiotic levels (language and situation are two of these levels) and different meanings are constructed in different levels. By way of the concept of *realization* the complementarity between context and language¹⁴ is explained. *Realization* is an inter-stratic dialectic relationship (between semiotic systems, i.e. context and language). This model permits an approach to social practice from two angles: (1) as an institution or part of the social context, and (2) as a text or part of language.

14. The concept of *realization* comes from Hjelmslev (1984) who prioritizes the relationships over the substances on the level of linguistic analysis. According to Hjelmslev to presuppose the object [text, language] implies a naïve realism. “[T]he object subject to examination, like its parts, exists only by virtue of these dependencies [the mutual dependencies between its parts]; the totality of the object subjected to examination can only be defined as a sum total of the same; and each one of its parts can only be defined by the dependencies that unite it to other coordinated parts, to the whole, and to its parts of the near degree/adjacent parts, and by the sum of the dependencies that these parts of the near degree/adjacent parts contract between them. This recognized, it results that the ‘objects’ of naïve realism are only, from our point of view, intersections of groups of such dependencies. That is to say, they can only be described with the help of being defined or comprehended scientifically in this way. The dependencies that a naïve realism considers secondary, presupposing the objects, become from this point of view primordial, presupposed by the intersections. The recognition of this fact that totality does not consist of things rather of relationships, and that it is not the substance rather its internal and external relationships that have scientific existence, is not, of course, new to science, but it could be new to linguistic science” (p.40-41).

This note translated from the following:

“el objeto sometido a examen como sus partes tienen existencia sólo en virtud de estas dependencias [las dependencias mutuas entre las partes]; la totalidad del objeto sometido a examen puede sólo definirse por la suma total de las mismas; y cada una de sus partes puede sólo definirse por las dependencias que la unen a otras partes coordinadas, al conjunto, y a sus partes del grado próximo, y por la suma de las dependencias que estas partes del grado próximo contraen entre sí. Reconocido esto, resulta que los ‘objetos’ del realismo ingenuo son tan sólo, desde nuestro punto de vista, intersecciones de grupos de tales dependencias. Es decir, únicamente pueden describirse con su ayuda y ser definidos y comprendidos científicamente de este modo. Las dependencias que un realismo ingenuo considera secundarias, presuponiendo los objetos, se convierten desde este punto de vista en primordiales, presupuestas por sus intersecciones. El reconocimiento de este hecho de que la totalidad no consta de cosas sino de relaciones, y de que no es la sustancia sino sus relaciones internas y externas quienes tienen existencia científica, no es, por supuesto, nuevo para la ciencia, pero puede ser nuevo para la ciencia lingüística.”

Realization is complemented by another type of relationship, that of *instantiation*, which is a manifestation at a particular moment of the system's potential. According to these two types of relationships, the relationship between text and context can be understood as dynamic or static relationships. The dynamic description of the relationship between text and context characterizes the situational context as realized in language (and vice versa). On the other hand, the static description of the relationship between text and context looks at a text¹⁵ (seen as a product) as an *instantiation* of this relationship.

To explain how language is realized in context or vice versa, SFL uses the concept of register to refer to the probabilistic mapping of forms and functions in particular contexts. SFL postulates that one of the general properties of language as a semiotic system is that at the level of content¹⁶ all language is organized into three *metafunctions*: the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual.¹⁷ These metafunctions operate simultaneously at the clausal level, meaning that ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings coexist. The metafunctions of language tend to be associated with certain variables in context: the ideational metafunction with the *field* (how experience is represented), the interpersonal with the *tenor* (how the participants are related), and the textual with the *mode* (how information flows). This correlation between language and situational context refers to the patterns of social practice that have linguistic relevance: *register*¹⁸ (see Gregory 1987).

At the descriptive level the expression of these metafunctions in language is realized by way of lexicogrammatical and discourse-semantic categories belonging to each language. Analysis at the clausal level offers some indications of how these meanings are realized through grammatical structures such as: *transitivity*, *mode*, and *Theme/Topic*. The structure of transitivity comprises the patterns of processes

15. Texts are at the same time the *instantiation* of a certain paradigmatic system of relationships and the *realization* of social meanings that depend on the situational context (Thibault 1991).

16. The notions of *content plane* and *expression plane* come from Hjelmslev (1984). "The sign is an entity generated by the connection between an expression and a content" (p. 73). Original quote: "El signo es una entidad generada por la conexión entre una expresión y un contenido."

17. On the level of meaning the organization of the semiotic system is divided into three principle functions: ideational (logical + experiential), interpersonal, and textual in accordance with Systemic Functional theory. It is interesting to note that from a functional perspective the principal functions of language are three abstract but extrinsic functions. For example, from the anthropological perspective Malinowski speaks of the functions: active, narrative, and magical; from the psychological perspective Karl Bühler speaks of the functions: representational, expressive, and connotative.

18. J.R. Martin refers to this relationship between situational context and language as *register* (see Martin 1999). For M.A.K. Halliday *register* is the variation of language according to the type of situation (1982).

(verbs), participants (names), and circumstances (prepositional phrases and adverbs) that signal meaning at the level of message content. The structure of Mode includes patterns such as type of clause used (declarative, interrogative, imperative), *modality* (modulation and modalization)¹⁹ and the *polarity* (expression of negative or positive attitude). The structure of Theme marks the patterns of thematic selection in the text. That is to say, how the information is organized in the text. Another side of analysis at the discourse-semantic level includes non-structural organizational resources such as lexical relationships, uses of reference, and the rhetorical structure of the text.

At the level of lexical relationships, this study examines the lexical chains by which continuity is maintained in the text (repetition, synonyms or collocations) and the overlexification (the use of a large number of synonymous or almost synonymous terms) by which certain meanings are emphasized in the text. In this analysis, reference is investigated at the level of the use of first person personal pronouns (exophoric relation). With respect to rhetorical structure, the analysis focuses on the semantic structure of the text, that is the organization of meaning as configurations with aims that are persuasive, expositive, transactional, etc.

In addition, this study's analysis of experiential meanings incorporates the work of van Leeuwen (1996) on the representation of social actors.²⁰ In this study it is necessary to account for social actors that are not directly mentioned or do not appear in the function of a participant within the categories offered by the Systemic Functional Model. It is because of this fact that the work of van Leeuwen with the distinction of different ways in which social actors are included or excluded in text (by way of different linguistic resources such as transitivity, reference, nominal group, rhetorical figures, etc.) provides important tools to this analysis.

Also incorporated into this analysis is the notion of evaluative language (*appraisal* in SFL, Martin 2001; Rothery & Stenglin 2000; White 2001; Oteiza 2003; Martin & White 2005) that provides more data about the orientational meanings constructed in the text that evaluate the message and the participants at the discourse-semantic level. Evaluative language is defined by Martin (2000: 145) as "the semantic resources used to negotiate emotions, judgments, and valuations, alongside resources for amplifying and engaging with these evaluations."

19. The system of modality expresses the position of the speaker/writer with respect to the content presented. Modalization expresses the probability, frequency, or tentativeness of the information presented. Modulation expresses the obligation, necessity, or attitude of the proposition (Halliday 1994).

20. When speaking of *social actors* we refer to members of particular and complex communities organized in a variety of social institutions with a net of beliefs and moral values about the world (Duranti 2002).

Concepts from pragmatics appearing in this study include presupposition²¹ and the use of pronouns. These concepts are seen as elements that at the discursive level permit the recuperation of information that relates the *knowledge* or the situational context of the reader/listener with the text (see for example Wilson 1990 & 1991). From a more socio-cognitive perspective concepts used in this study include *discursive strategy*, the mental or interactional dynamic of the construction of meanings that explain what the social actors are doing by using language in concrete situations (van Dijk 1998a). This concept of dynamic focus serves to explain phenomena that occur at the discourse level, for example how arguments are constructed and how language of difference is organized (see for example van Dijk 1999 and Wodak 1996).

The textual analysis carried out in this study focuses principally on ideational and interpersonal meanings, although it also explores textual meaning in one of the chapters (Chapter Six). The focus is on these types of meaning because of the type of social practice investigated, memory construction, and due to the particular questions we ask about the military's construction of memory. What is of interest here about the memory construction of military discourse is: how the military reconstructs the dictatorship period (ideational content), how the institution and its members are presented in relation to these events, and how responsibility is attributed about these events (interpersonal relationships between different social actors).

In all of the chapters, the texts are analyzed also at the level of genre²² with the aim of marking the co-actional relations that articulate the relationship between text and socio-historical formation. In this way, I explore how textual structure at the macro level realizes a type of social activity. In this case, genre means a conventional form of text derived from the codification of functions, goals, and meanings of social situations (Kress 1989). Genres act as a catalogue of the conventional types of social occasions that characterize a community. In this study the type of genre used is identified as a framework in which meanings about the past are constructed. The genre determines how information is presented and creates certain expectations in the audience about the type of meanings that are going to be encountered in the text. In this analysis, the prototypical characteristics of genre are described (Martin 1997 & 2000; Coffin 1997; van Dijk 1988; van Leeuwen

21. In this study presupposition is defined as inferences that survive under negation. For example:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (a) The King of France has died. | (c) The King of France has not died. |
| (b) France has a king | (d) France has a King |

See Wilson (1991) for more information about different types of inferences.

22. The concept of genre is also used in SFL to name a contextual level that is more complex than that of register. "Genre is a pattern of register patterns just as register represents patterns of language patterns" (Martin 1999: 38).

1993, Bell & van Leeuwen 1994; Foucault 1978) and are later contrasted with the particular instantiations in the texts that compose the corpus.

The analysis of military texts permits the identification of the meanings that shape military discourse about the dictatorship. This discourse represents the group of propositions that give expression to the meaning and values of the institution, the genre represents the forms in which these meanings are realized, and the text is the particular instantiation of these meanings. “Texts are therefore doubly determined: by the meanings of the discourses which appear in the text, and by the forms, meanings, and constraints of a particular genre” (Kress 1989: 19). It is of interest to investigate how certain institutional meanings, those of the dictatorship period, appear constructed in conventional forms in concrete texts.

The lexico-grammatical and discursive elements selected for the textual analysis are those that realize ideational and interpersonal meanings because of their relationship with memory construction and the assignment of responsibilities. The type of textual analysis realized in each chapter is detailed below:

Chapter Three: The construction of *accounts* of the dictatorship period (1976 & 1978)

1. representation and agentivity (transitivity)
2. social actors (van Leeuwen 1996)
3. uses of metaphor, metonymy, passivization, nominalization, and adjectivization
4. modality (modulation, modalization)
5. evaluation (appraisal, Martin 2000)
6. discourse of difference (Wodak 1997, van Dijk 1993)
7. topoi (argumentative strategies, Aristotle)

Chapter Four: Analysis of editorials from the military magazine, *El Soldado* (1986–1996)

1. representation and agency (transitivity)
2. modality
3. overlexification (Halliday 1978; Trew 1979)
4. argumentation (van Eemeren et al. 1997)
5. uses of passivization, nominalization, impersonalization
6. discursive strategies (Wodak 1997, 2000)
7. social actors (van Leeuwen 1996)

Chapter Five: Analysis of the *confession* of a repressor (1996)

1. lexical chains
2. transitivity
3. modality

4. marks of selfpresentation (Goffman 1974; Morgan 1997)
5. use of pronouns (Wilson 1990)

Chapter Six: The struggles over memory: dialogue between social actors (2000–2001)

1. transitivity
2. modality
3. evaluation (appraisal, Martin 2000)
4. discursive strategies (Wodak 1997, 2000)
5. Theme (Halliday 1994)

Chapter Seven: What is our story: reconstructing the institutional grand narrative (2007)

1. Transitivity
2. Evaluation (attitudes and engagement; Martin & White 2005)
3. Modality and speech function
4. Pronouns, deictics
5. Reported speech (Voloshinov 1973)

The concepts defined above are explained in more detail as they are used in the analysis.

The objective of the micro-analysis is the detailed study of the patterns of lexicogrammatical and discourse-semantic selection that serve as a (grounding) base for the interpretation and successive explanation of how the memory of the dictatorship period is constructed and reproduced in military discourse.

Social theory framework

To articulate the results of the macro analysis with the micro-analysis, a critical dialectic perspective (Harvey 1990) is used to relate the data about discursive practices with the social context that surrounds them. This analysis aims to abstract categories that will be able to provide a historical and social explanation of how the memory of the dictatorship period is transmitted and constructed by the military institution. In particular, the relevance of the concept of a *state of internal war* is investigated in order to describe how it has been used, to explain what role it plays in the military institution's memory construction, and to later analyze how it appears in the struggles over memory in the discourse of different social actors that compose the current political scene.

The analysis of ideology supported by the texts is done following the model presented by van Dijk (1999) and selected concepts from Althusser (1984) and Hodge & Kress (1993). This type of analysis implies institutional ideology is

analyzed as a system of basic principles that underlie the social representations of a group (van Dijk 1999). For example, what are the *knowledge*, the attitudes, the norms and values that represent a group? How is ideology codified in language by way of rhetorical structures, modes of argument, topics/themes (macrostructures), evaluation and lexical selection? The ideological analysis permits the connection of the textual with the political (Lemke 1995b), and this connection permits an explanation of the uses of discourse in struggles over how to remember the past.

At the same time it is of interest to explore how a version of the past is converted into *the official history* or the hegemonic history (Gramsci 1997; Williams 1977) and how this hegemony is challenged by other versions of the past. The struggle over the meanings of the past is related to the distribution of power in society. It is because of this fact that the acceptance of one version of the past as more *natural* requires a process of continual reaffirmation and incorporation or disarticulation of the counter-hegemonies. The dominance of one memory over another is never total or permanent. This concept allows the present study to address and to seek an understanding of some of the changes and transformations in the military memory of the dictatorship period over the years.

The findings from the macro and micro analyses are also compared and contrasted with previous investigations by historians and sociologists who have studied military discourse, the role of the Armed Forces as a social actor, and the period of the last Uruguayan dictatorship.²³ Additionally, material from studies in sociology and history about memory construction, above all the works of Michel-Rolph Trouillot, John Walton, Maurice Halbwachs and Jeffrey Olick are used as an interpretive framework with which to analyze memory construction as a social practice (See Chapter One).

Corpus

The texts constituting the corpus of this study come from six main groups:

- a. historical accounts
- b. editorials from a military monthly publication
- c. a letter to the editor (*confession*)
- d. press releases
- e. a series of articles of Uruguayan periodicals.
- f. commemoration speech

23. Among the sociologists cited are Carina Perelli and Luis Eduardo González. The principle historians that are used as sources on the topic are: José Rial, Gerardo Caetano, Juan Rilla, María del Huerto Amarillo, Francisco Panizza and Selva López.

In addition to texts produced by military officers, texts produced by other social actors are included in the corpus with the aim of investigating the interrelationships between these texts and military discourse (see Chapter Six and Chapter Seven). These texts represent the discourse of both the left and the right political spectrum.

Of all of the material originally collected for the study, 21 texts were selected for a detailed and in-depth analysis that will allow the identification of the lexicogrammatical and discourse-semantic features that characterize them.²⁴ The texts were selected according to the following criteria:

1. selection of different genres in order to see if the form affects the presentation of content.
2. selection of texts produced by the institution for internal consumption as well as texts produced for consumption by the general public.
3. selection of texts that represent the authorized voice of the institution (the depositaries of formal power, Commanders in Chief and actors that participated directly in the dictatorship) as well as the voice of the institution at the informal level (individual members, social organizations of retired military officers and relatives of military officers).
4. selection of texts that emerge in key moments coinciding with this study's periodization of the period 1976–2007.

The periodization is based on the identification of moments in which the military memory about the dictatorship is challenged or contested by other national and international social actors. These moments are 1976–1978, 1986–1996, 2000–2001 and 2007 (the current moment). See a brief historical chronology appended at the end of the book in order to have a better idea about the events that shape the period studied.

Coda

We know nothing of Greece, if we do not know what the Greeks knew, thought and felt respect to themselves. But obviously, there were things just as important concerning Greece that the Greeks did not know and could not have known. We can see these things, but from our place and through our present perspective. And seeing is just that. I shall never see anything from all possible places at once; each time I see from a determined place, I see an *aspect*, and I see through a *perspective*.

24. One of the limitations of this type of analysis is that because of the depth and microlinguistic analysis it does not allow the use of a very large corpus. As Barker and Galasinski (2001) argue CDA is a time consuming task, labor intensive task which requires great attention to small details and thus difficult to apply to large corpus.

And *I* see signifies my whole life is there, incarnate in this vision, in this act of seeing. All this is not some 'fault' in our vision, it *is* vision. The rest is the eternal phantasy of theology and of philosophy. (Castoriadis 1987: 40)

This quote by political scientist Cornelius Castoriadis is useful to explain the methodology used in this study in two ways. On one hand, it explains why this study tries to understand military discourse through an analysis of its own constructions. On the other hand, it recognizes the importance of the fact that every intention to understand or explain is made from a certain position. Attempting to understand how the Armed Forces have constructed a memory about their participation in the dictatorship implies leaving judgment aside during the investigation and trying to understand *their logic*. At the same time because of the type of ethical questions this study explores it is not possible to only describe military discourse about these facts without interpreting them in relation to current political events or to what the Others (i.e. human rights organizations, political activists from the left) observe in this discourse. As Trouillot (1995: 146) states, "The value of a historical product cannot be debated without taking into account both the context of its production and the context of its consumption." This study aims to not only assist in the comprehension of the past but also in the comprehension of the present. In other words, it aims to understand why this discourse continues to be relevant today.

The scope of the study is conditioned by the intention to focus the topic from a multidisciplinary perspective while still giving particular relevance to discourse. Prioritizing discourse implies leaving aside or not paying attention to a multiplicity of aspects that constitute institutional memory construction, for example monuments and media representations,²⁵ which are not considered here because they have already been treated in other studies. In addition, my vision as a researcher is filtered by the fact that I am a Uruguayan, and daughter of Left-wing exiled parents. As Castoriadis articulately explains, these are not defects of the work rather particular filters with which the texts are approached and interpreted.

25. See the works of Aldo Marchesi (2001) *El Uruguay inventado*, Hugo Achugar (2003) *El lugar de la memoria a proposito de monuments* and of Isabela Cosse and Vania Markarian (1996) *1975: Año de la Orientalidad. Identidad, memoriae historia de una dictadura*. Montevideo: Ed. Trilce.

CHAPTER 3

The construction of *accounts* of the dictatorship period (1976 & 1978)

The necessity to explain the events that led to the involvement of the Uruguayan Armed Forces in the political sphere and its actions as *defender of the public order* appears soon after the coup d'état (June 27th, 1973). The texts analyzed in this chapter were written during the years of 1976 and 1978, and present themselves as historical accounts of the period. According to Perelli (1991a) military counter-discourse in South America,

begins to develop in the period as an attempt to explain the events that had been occurring, giving an alternative to the visions of the left on one side and the apocalyptic defensive discourses of the conservatives on the other. However, the military institution will only begin attempting to construct their own interpretation of the world after the coup, as a way of understanding and justifying the daily use of power.

(p. 12)¹

The military institutions of different countries in the region select to spread this military counterdiscourse in different ways. For example, in the case of Argentina the Military Junta contracts a Madison Avenue advertising agency to carry its message to the people and to the international public.² In the case of Uruguay the Armed Forces spread their position by way of a series of publications with theoretical pretences that are directed as much to the Uruguayan public as they are to the international public.

1. “comienza a elaborarse en el periodo como intento de explicación de los acontecimientos que se venían sucediendo, alternativo a las visiones de la izquierda, por un lado, a los discursos apocalípticos y defensivos de los conservadores, por el otro. Sin embargo, la institución castrense sólo se abocará al intento de construcción de una interpretación del mundo propia luego del golpe, como forma de entender y justificar el ejercicio cotidiano del poder” (p. 12).

2. See *A Lexicon of Terror* (1998) by Marguerite Feitlowitz. A campaign in defense of the dictatorship exists in the press, one of the examples cited is the magazine *Paratí* in which notices and editorials with de facto pro-government messages appear. The same book offers data from an interview with the head of the international advertising agency of the dictatorship. “the de facto leader [Videla] awarded a one-million-dollar contract to Burson Marsteller, the Madison Avenue PR giant to “improve [his country’s] international image” (Feitlowitz 1998: 42).

The institution is interested in constructing its own memory of the period. It expresses this objective in the following works: *Las Fuerzas Armadas al Pueblo Oriental (Vol. One and Two)*³ and *Testimonio de una Nación Agredida*.⁴ In this chapter, four selected texts from these volumes will be analyzed: the introductions of the three works and the first chapter of the last. This part of the book investigates how the Armed Forces construct the military discourse concerning their actions, how the Armed Forces position themselves, and how they construct themselves and their practices in this period.

Socio-historical context

According to a periodization by the Uruguayan political scientist Luis E. González (1984), the twelve years of the Uruguayan dictatorship (1973–1985) can be divided into three phases: the *policing dictatorship* phase; the *foundational attempt* phase, and the *democratic transition* phase. The first phase covers the years 1973 to 1976. The majority of the texts analyzed in this chapter were produced during this first stage (some were produced in 1978 but because of their characteristics they are considered part of the *policing* phase).

In this first phase of the Uruguayan dictatorship, the Armed Forces are concentrated on *putting the house in order*. The objective that guides their actions in the first years of the dictatorship is to control the chaos created by civil insubordination. This objective includes containing the actions of armed opposition groups (i.e. *Tupamaros* and others) as well as unarmed opposition groups (i.e. trade and labor union organizations, student movements, social organizations and intellectual publications).⁵ Starting before 1973, during the government of Pacheco Areco (1968–1971), the repression of the armed movement and of social and labor protests is systematically made. Accusations in parliament of cases of torture and violations of the individual rights of citizens by the government also begin at that time. However, it is only in 1971 when the new government of Juan María Bordaberry solicits the direct intervention of the Armed Forces.⁶ From that point on the police

3. *The Armed Forces to the Uruguayan People* (volumes 1 and 2), translation of title.

4. *Testimony of an Assaulted Nation*, translation of title.

5. See *Uruguay hacia la dictadura 1968-1973* by Hugo Cores (1999) Montevideo: EBO. Here the situation of labor and student movements before the coup d'état is described and also an analysis of the situation that led to the coup from a radical left perspective is offered.

6. By decree number 566/971 of September 9th, 1971, the Executive Power solicits the direct participation of the Armed Forces in the 'anti-subversive' fight (Castagnola, J.L. & P. Mieres 1989: 74).

and the Armed Forces shape the Joint Forces (*Fuerzas Conjuntas*) assigned to the repression of the *lack of internal control*. The parliament approves declarations of states of internal war solicited by the executive branch two times before promulgating an internal security law that grants the executive branch the power to declare a state of emergency without consulting parliament. From this moment on the participation of the Armed Forces in the political arena becomes definitive.

On February 9th 1973, the Armed Forces publish two press releases, 4 and 7, in which they evaluate the political situation and propose possible solutions to the problem of internal disorder. President Bordaberry negotiates a way to treat the topics mentioned in the press releases with the Armed Forces and with this action a greater political involvement by Armed Forces begins.

On June 27th, 1973, President Bordaberry dissolves the parliament. This dissolution is due to the denial of an impeachment request of one of the members of the House of Representatives for his alleged connections to *sedition groups*.⁷ A council of the state made up of top military officials forms, and the participants of an advisory council takes the place of parliament. At this point the majority of the members of the guerilla movement MLN (*Tupamaros*) are already imprisoned. There are accusations of torture of guerillas carried out by the Joint Forces.⁸

The labor movement and the social and political organizations that oppose the civic-military coup d'état are strongly repressed. From this point onward any type of opposition to the regime is considered an act of *subversion*. The Communist Party and other political groups with Marxist tendencies, as well as labor organizations are declared illegal. Publications are also closed and censorship is exercised over the press and other communications media and cultural forms of expression (e.g. carnival, popular music, etc.) The educational system is intervened and many professors and teachers are dismissed because of their political or labor affiliations. There is a *purging* of state owned businesses. In the next years the repression focuses on the members of other political parties, especially those of the Communist Party and the PVP movement (of anarchist origin).⁹ The regime of *fear* includes a classification of citizens by categories (A, B, C) based on their past record

7. The Armed Forces pressure for the impeachment of the Member of Parliament Enrique Erro, representative of the 26th of March Movement, political front of the MLN-T armed group.

8. The *Fuerzas Conjuntas* (FFCC) were made up of the police and the Armed Forces and their function was to combat the guerillas.

9. See *La era militar* Caetano, G. & J. Rilla (1989) Montevideo: EBO.

of political or organized labor activity. These categories are used to restrict their rights such as the possibility of obtaining a passport or receiving pensions.¹⁰

Political exiles are now added to the exodus that began in the sixties for economic reasons. These exiles join with organizations defending human rights and begin to spread the word about rights violations and excesses of repression in Uruguay. These testimonies, together with the foreign policy of Jimmy Carter's White House that emphasizes the defense of human rights, make international pressure on the dictatorship unavoidable.¹¹ It is in this moment that the Armed Forces try to respond to what they call *campaigns of national discredit*. During the period 1976–1978 a series of books are published along with a propaganda campaign organized by the National Department of Public Relations (DINARP)¹² that try to present a positive image of the regime. These texts are the ones analyzed in the present chapter.

Intertextuality

There can be no statement that in one way or another does not reactualize others.
(Foucault 1982: 98)

No text is read independently of the reader's experience of other texts.
(Eco 1984: 21)

What do these texts respond to? What do they anticipate? What discourses do they reaccentuate? What discourses do they try to shape? What other texts are used to construct these discourses and how are they used? How are they read today in the context of struggles over memory of the dictatorship? These are some of the questions that this section aims to address using the concept of *intertextuality* as it has been developed by Kristeva ([1966] 1986) from the work of Bakhtin and the subsequent reinterpretations of the concept in critical discourse analysis (see Fairclough 1992; Lemke 1995a; Martín Rojo 1997). Intertextuality refers to the inclusion of Other discourses/texts in one discourse/text. A text is the realization of a discourse in a particular instance, and investigating intertextuality in a text

10. See *La ideología política de la dictadura* Castagnola, J. L. & P. Mieres (1989: 94). Montevideo: EBO.

11. These actions of denouncement of human rights violations in Uruguay during the decade of the Seventies are made in the North American Congress, in the Organization of American States, in the United Nations as well as in the international press. These denouncements are followed by restrictions on economic and military aid that the United States offered to Uruguay. In 1976 the government of the United States suspended military aid to Uruguay.

12. *Dirección Nacional de Relaciones Públicas* (DINARP).

implies making explicit the relationships a text has with other texts and discourses that it evokes directly or indirectly. That is to say, that the history of the text is mapped in reference to the other texts with which it is linked and to the position of these texts in the new text. The web of relationships of these texts is not only with the texts that precede them but also with those that follow them. In other words, intertextuality is a dynamic process that continues occurring every time a text is interpreted or put into circulation. Upon analyzing these texts today we can establish chains of intertextuality that might not have been possible in the moment they were produced but that today are impossible not to consider when reading these texts in the context of the memory construction of the dictatorship period.

According to Fairclough (1992), intertextual relationships can be either manifest or constitutive. Manifest intertextuality can be recuperated in the text directly or indirectly through textual and contextual markers such as: discursive representation (direct or indirect discourse), presupposition, negation, metadiscourse (i.e. hedging, paraphrasing, reformulations or metaphors), and irony (Fairclough 1992). Constitutive intertextuality, also referred to as interdiscursivity, refers to the structural aspects of the text and its relation with other texts within the same genre, register, or style.

Important in the case of these texts is the identification of aspects regarding the dialogue of the texts with other discourses or grand narratives of both the period in which they were produced and the period in which they are analyzed. In other words, how these texts are related on the ideational or content level with other discourses is of most interest here. Also explored is how the authors position themselves with respect to the cited texts in relation to those texts that construct their own. The position with respect to the incorporated texts can be one of reconstruction, deconstruction, or acceptance of those texts. The position of the writer upon reconstructing a text implies a recontextualization of this text from the perspective of the one who uses the text. On the other hand, the position of the author upon deconstructing a text represents its incorporation into the author's discourse in a critical and partial manner. When the author accepts the incorporated text to his discourse in a verbatim manner, without modifications, the author's position represents the *normalcy* of the discourse. This type of analysis also permits one to indicate the level of awareness of the authors with respect to other discourses.

The following are some of the references to other texts or discourses that these military texts are in dialogue with:

a. *Metaphor of the nation as a human body and the war as a disease.*

In these texts, two metaphors appear, one of the nation as a body and the war as a disease. These two metaphors are later combined to create a new metaphor that serves as an argumentative strategy as the Armed Forces aim to advance their own

ideological position with respect to the events that led to the dictatorship and the subsequent human rights violations.¹³

The following example serves as an illustration:

- (1) All living things –and the Nation is a living thing—must, if they want to subsist defend themselves against all that could harm them, both from within themselves and from the outside. It is illusory to rely on a providential situation as if it guaranteed that the social body could never become ill.

Neither physical persons, nor moral persons, can rely on having the luck of such miraculous immunity.

Faced with subversive aggression, which constitutes a disease of the Uruguayan nation, [the nation] must conclude that the first role of defense is, and will always be, that of protecting the fundamental bases of the society, constructed and ratified by the people, against the perturbations that could threaten them, because the diseases of the social body are like those of human beings: it is necessary to prevent them and attack them when they manifest themselves.

The most grave threat against the body of the Nation is the danger of intrusion of strange ideologies to the popular mentality that, basing themselves in the power, be it mental or economic, of their adherents, strive to favor and justify the total destruction of that which exists as the price for a utopic tomorrow that is never well defined. The people must therefore assume the responsibility of their own defense to unmask and destroy the multiple forms of such kinds of aggressions.

*(The Armed Forces to the Uruguayan People: Vol. One, Subversion, Introduction)*¹⁴

13. “Metaphoric activity occurs at sites of difference, in struggles over power, whenever there is contention of an ideological kind, whenever an attempt is made to assimilate an event into one ideological system rather than another” (Kress 1989: 71).

14. “*Todo ser vivo – y la Nación es un ser vivo – debe, si quiere subsistir defenderse contra todo aquello que pueda dañarlo, en sí mismo, como desde afuera. Es ilusorio contar con una situación providencial tal que garantice que el cuerpo social no podrá nunca enfermarse.*

Ni las personas físicas, ni las personas morales, pueden contar con tal suerte de inmunidad milagrosa.

Frente a la agresión subversiva, que constituye una enfermedad de la nación uruguaya, debe concluirse que el primer papel de la defensa es, y será siempre, el de proteger las bases fundamentales de la sociedad, construidas y ratificadas por el pueblo, contra las perturbaciones que puedan amenazarlas, porque las enfermedades del cuerpo social son como las de los seres humanos: es menester prevenirlas y atacarlas cuando se manifiestan.

La amenaza más grave contra el cuerpo de la Nación es el peligro de intrusión de ideologías extrañas a la mentalidad popular que, basándose en el poder, sea mental o económico, de sus ad-

According to Sontag (1990) comparisons of the polis with a living organism and civil disorder with a disease are formulations that appear from Plato to Hobbes.

Throughout the nineteenth century, disease metaphors become more virulent, preposterous, demagogic. And there is an increasing tendency to call any situation one disapproves of a disease. Disease, which could be considered as much a part of nature as is health, became the synonym of whatever was 'unnatural'.

(Sontag 1990: 74)

The idea of disease would therefore be associated with that of an unbalance for which the reestablishment of balance and order would equal the cure. The use of this metaphor to represent the facts explains the lexical selection of terms that mark the absence of normalcy or the deviation of the Others (e.g. *subversives, the seditious, insurgents, extremists*). Additionally, the vision of the Other as a disease goes hand in hand with the vision of disease as something to be eradicated. According to Sontag (1990) this is a use in political philosophy of the metaphor of disease as punishment. That is to say, posing the argument of society as a human body and the deviation or alteration of order as a disease permits the justification of repression.

b. *Indirect and direct citation deconstructing the message of the Other.*

Through the use of direct citations and references to the discourse of the Other the Armed Forces construct a memory of the period in which their actions are justified and respond to the Other's narration of the events. They also create an institutional identity in opposition to that of the *subversion* or the *enemy*. By using the resource of direct or indirect citation the Armed Forces reappropriate the public voice regarding human rights violations and the assumption of power. The text of the Other is incorporated in order to be criticized and deconstructed with the aim of consolidating the principal argument of the Armed Forces: *they acted in defense of the nation and they were the only ones legally authorized to use violence in society*. This argument, gathered from the analysis of military texts from the period 1976–2007, functions as macro-proposition of the military discourse about the dictatorship.

The majority of the references to the text of the Other appear in the indirect style, meaning that the text presents a summary of the information it attributes to the Other. In this manner the authors of these texts control *what* from the text of the Other is considered most relevant and *what* meanings are attributed to the Other's words. This resource permits the creation of a double filter or a double

herentes, pretende propiciar y justificar la destrucción total de lo existente como precio de un mañana utópico nunca bien definido. El pueblo debe entonces asumir la responsabilidad de su propia defensa para desenmascarar y destruir las múltiples formas de tal clase de agresiones" (texto #1).

deconstruction of the inserted text, since the words of the Other are selected, interpreted and commented upon at the same time. For example, in *The Armed Forces to the Uruguayan People: Vol. One, Subversion*, Introduction:

- (2) The affirmation of the MLN-T located in the foundations of its 'general strategy', that in Uruguay there are objective conditions, but not subjective ones for revolutionary action, doesn't hold up against even the smallest analysis, whatever be the critical criterion that is adopted to consider it.¹⁵

In this case, the message of the Other's text is transformed into what the author thinks of that text "doesn't hold up", as opposed to a list of evidence about which the reader makes judgments.

On the other hand, when direct citations are made in the texts the commentary is presented before the citation. This presentation predetermines the reading of the citation as a previous interpretation has been made for the reader. For example, in *The Armed Forces to the Uruguayan People: Vol. One, Subversion*, Introduction the quote is preceded by evaluative adjectives:

- (3) Perhaps nothing more demonstrative of the "pseudo-intellectual and aristocratic" concept that prevails in the life of these movements, that the criterion sustained with respect to recruitment, arises in textual expressions contained in their own internal documents: "The existence of a certain level of quality is vital: who would want to do something more or less compromising with an open and insipid organization?"¹⁶

The authors also resort to commenting or adding information to the cited phrases. This commentary appears as an addendum to the phrase at the end of the citation so that it is more difficult for the reader to assign responsibility for the comment. For example, in *Testimony of an assaulted Nation*, Chapter One:

- (4) But we will leave it to the very communists to tell us themselves, from the OLAS, their purposes: "The first objective of the popular revolution in the continent is the taking of power through the destruction of the bureaucratic

15. "La afirmación del MLN-T recogida en las bases de su 'estrategia general', de que en el Uruguay hay condiciones objetivas, pero no subjetivas para la acción revolucionaria, no resiste el menor análisis, cualquiera sea el criterio crítico que se adopte para considerarla."

16. "Tal vez nada más demostrativo del concepto pseudo-intelectual y aristocrático que preside la vida de estos movimientos, que el criterio sustentado respecto del reclutamiento, según surge de expresiones textuales contenidas en sus documentos internos: 'La existencia de cierto nivel de calidad es vital: ¿quién se animaría a hacer algo más o menos comprometedor con una organización abierta y amorfa?'"

and military apparatus of the State. This objective is only obtainable through armed struggle, which will be ferocious and without quarter.¹⁷

In this case, the document is cited directly but at the same time modified to give it another connotation. Explicit citations and references to documents of the 'subversion' are used but they are manipulated with the aim of justifying the argument of the Armed Forces.

c. Direct citation with acceptance of the implicit discourse: appealing to discourse about the importance of memory.

In this case, another text is introduced as a form of validating the argument through the authority of another. Citing an expert on the topic gives more importance and validity to a text. This resource is characteristic of the academic genre to which the texts aspire. For example, in *Testimony of an Assaulted Nation*, Prologue, an authority is cited directly in order to justify the proposed task of the text: elaborating an account of the period in question.

- (5) The goal of this work, to compile these elements and present them in an ordered form is none other than an attempt to prevent the forgetting of our recent history (a forgetting that many are interested in promoting) and to reveal numerous episodes that until today have not received public attention.

A famous thinker used to say: 'Those who forget their past are condemned to re-live it'. This '*Testimonio de una Nación Agredida*' represents one more effort so that this tragic sentence doesn't fall on the new Uruguayan [*Orientales*] generations.¹⁸

This case is particularly interesting because one of the few discourses the text incorporates and accepts as part of the order it wants to reproduce is a discourse that refers to the importance of remembering or constructing a memory of the past. This very discourse is reappropriated by the human rights organizations in the period of democratic reopening and at present it is almost never used in military discourse. Another aspect to note here is that the direct citation of an indefinite

17. "Pero dejemos que los propios comunistas nos digan, desde la OLAS, sus propósitos: 'El primer objetivo de la revolución popular en el continente es la toma del poder mediante la destrucción del aparato burocrático y military del Estado. Este objetivo sólo es alcanzable a través de la lucha armada', que será feroz y sin cuartel."

18. "El propósito de esta obra, al recopilar estos elementos y presentarlos en forma ordenada no es otro que evitar el olvido de nuestra historia reciente (olvido que tiene tantos interesados en promoverlos) y revelar numerosos episodios que hasta hoy no han recibido tratamiento público."

Decía un célebre pensador: 'Los pueblos que olvidan su pasado están condenados a revivirlo'. Este "*Testimonio de una Nación Agredida*" representa un esfuerzo más para que esta trágica sentencia no recaiga sobre las nuevas generaciones Orientales."

authority functions as a marker of a pseudo-intellectual discourse; since a typical resource of academic discourse is used but in an inappropriate manner -- without signaling a specific authority.

d. *Presupposition: These texts presuppose that the reader is up to date on the 'great narrative of the cold war': communism is the enemy of western civilization.*

From this perspective, the world is conceived of in bipolar terms with the Armed Forces as defenders of the West against the *international campaign of communism*. This discourse arises in response to the left's perspective that aligns the country with the rest of the third world and views Latin America as a place where the unprotected, indigenous, black, and poor of the world reside. The discourse of the Armed Forces aligns itself with that of the United States in the decade after the Cuban revolution (the 1960s), as a way of signaling its moral affinity with the representative power of the modern and civilized world. However, evidence of a crisis in this discourse of defense of western civilization appears in the texts since during the seventies those who represented the leadership in this fight (the United States) started to change their discourse in favor of values supporting democracy and human rights¹⁹. For example, *The Armed Forces to the Uruguayan People: Vol. Two, The political process in Uruguay*, Introduction, mentions how the discourse of other friendly countries has changed.

- (6) In a tortured world like the present one, in which human rights are mocked and violated daily on a world and large scale, in a truly impressive range of arbitrary actions, transgressions, discriminations, and aberrations of which even many *developed* countries and even *super powers* are not free of, that ours, zealous defender of the liberty and dignity of man, never knew nor even conceived of, the selection of small Uruguay as a target of cruel accusations that have become accustomed to being employed and that have arrived even at being manipulated on certain occasions by the very Congress of a traditionally friendly country, sets the standards about *misinformation*, or the interested *bad information* that exists, and the enormous breach that the common enemy has been able to open in the front of free countries of the West, against which this campaign is directed, with the goal of destroying them and subduing them one by one.²⁰

19. During the government of Jimmy Carter the Latin American dictatorships lost the support of the United States and the agenda of the human rights became the driving force of the foreign relations policy of the United States. See C. Perelli (1991b).

20. "En un torturado mundo como el actual, en que los derechos humanos son diariamente escarnecidos y conculcados a escala mundial y multitudinaria, en una gama verdaderamente impresionante de arbitrariedades, transgresiones, discriminaciones y aberraciones de las que no están libres siquiera muchos países desarrollados y hasta primeras potencias, que el nuestro, celoso defensor de

In other words, that the Armed Forces in this period see themselves as the safeguard of ethos of order and of the values of western and Christian civilization.

e. *Metadiscourse, i.e. reformulation or paraphrasing: call for putting the house in order.*

The appeal to narratives or texts that justify the participation of the Armed Forces in the fight against *subversion* is what allows the validation of the role of the institution as *defender of the nation*. At the same time this appeal permits the construction of events as an *internal war*, a war that justifies actions that in other moments would be illegal. By indirectly paraphrasing or reformulating the actions and words of Others (in this case those of the constitutional government), the authors include facts about the period that serve as a contextual framework where the actions of the Armed Forces must be interpreted. For example, in *The Armed Forces to the Uruguayan People, The political process in Uruguay*, Introduction:

- (7) Many years had already passed in which the general state of the subversion, in its pathological expressions of the most unbridled violence, ate away at the Republic and threatened to drive it to ruin, when the Executive Power, impotent to confront it, called the Armed Forces to take charge of such a heavy responsibility.²¹

This narrative of events allows the presentation of the Armed Forces as a patient that receives the actions of another actor. This other actor, the government, is the one that does the deciding.

Genre: the explicative historical account²²

Discourse determines what is to be said ...; genre determines how it will be said in a contextually determined form. (Kress 1989: 29)

la libertad y la dignidad del hombre, jamás conoció ni siquiera concibió, la elección del pequeño Uruguay como blanco de truculentas acusaciones que suelen emplearse y que han llegado hasta ser manejadas en cierta ocasión por el propio Congreso de un país tradicionalmente amigo, de una pauta sobre la desinformación, o la interesada mala información existente, y la enorme brecha que el enemigo común ha conseguido abrir en el frente de países libres de Occidente, contra los que esa campaña está dirigida, con el propósito de destruirlos y someterlo uno a uno.”

21. “Hacia ya varios años que el estado general de la subversión, en sus expresiones patológicas de la más desenfrenada violencia, carcomía a la República y amenazaba conducirla a la ruina, cuando el Poder Ejecutivo, impotente para enfrentarla, llamó a las FFAA para hacerse cargo de tan pesada responsabilidad.”

22. In the literature of SFL the genre of *historical account* is characterized by giving a chronology of the events and at the same time presenting a series of explanations of those events. The

The texts analyzed in this chapter belong to two modes of constructing history: the narrative and the argumentative. They are hybrid texts, instances of a mixture of the genres of historical account and historical argument. At the same time they construct an account of the period they give meaning to this past, and they try to persuade the reader that this construction is closest to the *truth*. This genre is characterized by a chain of events marked principally with temporal and causal connections. The construction is incongruent and impersonal.

According to Coffin (1997) historical explication traditionally has three parts:

- a. background (summarizes preceding historical events that help give meaning to the events focused on in the body of the text);
- b. record of events (in which the sequence of historical events is recorded and elaborated).
- c. deduction (which is optional and functions as a space in which historical meaning is given to the narrated events).

According to Coffin (1997) the linguistic resources used to give meaning to the past are essentially part of the system of appraisal (the system of judgment and attribution). Appraisal can be made directly through lexical selections or indirectly by evoking concepts through discursive patterns that have historical meaning: for example, set phrases or representations of events associated with a certain version of history. The use of these two resources can lead to the construction of a record of the past that appears objective, factual and logical but in reality constructs one version or particular interpretation of history. It appears as if the writer lets the events speak for themselves but in reality at the same time he/she infuses them with an ideological meaning (Coffin 1997).

In this genre of historical account or explication, events more so than people appear as responsible for the judgments made. As stated by Coffin (1997) the judgments appear as nominalizations and are therefore less questionable than if they had appeared as locutions. At the same time, groups of events are nominalized and as a result they can later be described and evaluated without the voice of the author appearing directly. In this way a text maintains its air of objectivity.

Coffin (1997) also stipulates that in the genre of historical account or explication the groups of people and the things realized grammatically as generic human and non-human participants are focalized. The genre moves from concrete to more abstract (technical, institutional, semiotic, dimensional) or metaphorical (of

other genre with which this genre is combined is the *argumentative* or *of discussion* according to SFL. This last genre is characterized by considering more than one interpretation when constructing the argument. See J.R. Martin (2002) "Writing history: Construing time and value in discourse of the past."

process or quality). Human agency is 'masked' behind the events (Coffin 1997). This genre has an explicative function in addition to an informative one.

The argumentative genre or the challenge genre according to Coffin (1997) are characterized by trying to persuade the reader to reject the accepted interpretation of the past. The structure or parts of the genre include:

- a. presentation of the questioned position,
- b. opposing arguments (evidence against the position),
- c. antithesis (the alternative interpretation).

Some of the linguistic resources used to persuade are: the system of appraisal, especially modality and attribution, and the Hyper-new (the final generalization that consolidates the principal point of the paragraph).

In the texts analyzed in this chapter, the objective of this hybrid genre is to present an explicative historical account of the events and a refutation of the arguments espoused against the Armed Forces. These accounts and refutations serve as a referential framework that permits the interpretation of the rest of the material of the book. In other words, the texts present a vision of the events that led to the historical and political situation of the moment in which the texts were written. Additionally, the motivation that led to the creation of the work and how this motivation interacts with other texts on the same topic is presented to the reader. Introductions or first chapters were selected in order to obtain a general panorama of the works in which the writers present their arguments for producing their texts.

The following table (see Table 1) analyzes the texts by identifying their functional constituents. By virtue of being texts that compose introductions to larger works other constituents appear that were not detailed in the analysis of *pure* or *ideal* genres. Since the texts are hybrid genres of account-explication and historical argumentation in addition to *introductions* to books we can expect that differences with the previous analysis will appear. It is important to remember that genres are dynamic and in constant transformation. Because of this fact an abstract description of a genre serves only as a reference signaling the general characteristics of texts associated with that function within the same interpretive community. The analysis of the texts at hand reveals that all of them explicitly present a justification for their existence (thesis), an argument of response or antithesis in which the argument to be refuted (that of the opposition) appears directly or indirectly, and evidence that supports the proposed argument.

Table 1. Historical account (analysis of genre by functional constituents)

Text 1: The Armed Forces to the Uruguayan People: Vol. 1, Introduction	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. THESIS: motivation, sources and materials used in the construction of the text 2. STRUCTURE: (enumeration of the parts) 3. ASSESSMENT of the importance of the book (Objectives of the book and its function; response to the defamation campaign) 4. ARGUMENT against the armed struggle <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Foundation of the failure of the armed struggle b. Description of the principle characteristics of the groups of armed struggle in Uruguay c. Contradictions of the <i>sedition movement</i> 5. PRESENTATION OF THE OPPOSITE POINT OF VIEW (Explanation of the foundations and motivations of the propaganda campaign against the FFCC that is accused of violating human rights) 6. COUNTER ATTACK. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Response to accusations (description and exemplification of human rights violations carried out by the <i>sedition groups</i>). b. Criticisms of common justice and the <i>Tupamaro</i> penal code c. Questioning of the program of government and the <i>Tupamaro</i> philosophy d. Counter-argument of the political and social analysis of the <i>Tupamaros</i> e. Description and defense of the soldier in comparison with the <i>subversive</i>. f. Account of the activity of the <i>sedition</i> at the level of social organizations and labor movements. g. Questioning of the popular support for the <i>sedition movement</i>. h. Moral questioning of the <i>sedition</i> group 7. Reiteration of the MOTIVATION and FUNCTION of the work. 8. Reiteration of the CRITICISM OF THE OTHER SIDE (Questioning about the validity of the demands and the form of struggle of the <i>sedition</i>). 9. ANECDOTE (about the “fallen heroes in defense of the fatherland from the <i>sedition</i>). 10. EPILOGUE (directed towards the audience giving the motives of the Armed Forces for writing this text).
---	---

Text 2: The Armed Forces to the Uruguayan People: Vol. 2, Introduction

1. THESIS: presentation of the book's topic: principle political events in Uruguay since 1973.
2. STRUCTURE (sources and parts of the text)
3. JUSTIFICATION of the actions of the Armed Forces upon writing this text. (objectives of the text and function).
4. ARGUMENT regarding the accusation of human rights violations being carried out by the Armed Forces (criticisms and moral questioning towards those making the accusations)
5. DEFENSE of the fight against the *sedition*
6. RECAPITULATION of facts and events that led the Armed Forces to intervene in the political process.
7. ASSESSMENT of the work presented in the book
8. Reiteration of the MOTIVATION of the work (response to the campaign against the Armed Forces).
9. Reiteration of the JUSTIFICATION of the involvement of the Armed Forces in the political process.

Text 3: Testimony of an Assulted Nation, Prologue

1. PRESENTATION (authors and source materials of the book)
2. THESIS: aim of the work: recover the memory of the period for the internal public.
3. ANTITHESIS (the international defamation campaign)

Text 4: Testimony of and Assaulted Nation, Chapter 1, Preliminary Considerations

1. ACCOUNT (evidence against the opposition's arguments)
 - a. Presentation (geographical and demographic position of the country).
 - b. Historical position of the appearance of *Marxism-Leninism*.
 - c. Political Crisis (Traditional Parties)
 - d. Popular Opinion (lack of popular support of *Marxism*).
 - e. Role of the parliament in the crisis
 - f. Role of the communist party and *Marxism* in the *subversion*.
 2. Reiteration of the THESIS and the ANTITHESIS (recontextualization of the problem of *Marxism* in the framework of the propaganda campaign against the Armed Forces/the nation).
-

Textual analysis

Precisely because the characteristic ideological element of the Armed Forces for a long historical period had been defined as its *legality* (or better yet, its 'civil' nature), when they began to intervene politically the need arose for the military to construct a discourse of transition that would allow them to acquire a political

identity. What is more, this identity had to be at the same time political and different from that of the traditional political sectors.²³ (Panizza 1990: 181)

By trying to recontextualize its identity and mission in the new historical situation, the institution constructs a series of texts that demonstrate this change in practice. The institution constructs a memory of the past in which it redefines the identities of the actors according to the ideological position it defends. In these texts language is used in order to speak of the events that led to the coup d'état and the participation of the Armed Forces in these events. The role of language in this situation produces a spatial distance with respect to the events that it reconstructs and to the audience to which it is directed. The relationship between the interactors in the text is constructed as one in which a power difference exists. This power difference is caused by a difference in the control of information. The Armed Forces (author of these texts) dominates the information and presents it to the audience in order to clarify and instruct them, aiming to guide their judgments and evaluations of the political situation in Uruguay. The participants do not have frequent contact since the audience consists of either foreigners or the Uruguayan people who are not in contact with the Armed Forces. On the other hand, the affective involvement with the audience is low even though there are affective references made to the *people* as an abstract entity. The following table (Table 2) summarizes principal characteristics of the aspects of situational context that have linguistic consequences at the level of field (the activity), tenor (the relationships between participants) and mode (the function of language).

Each variable of social context can be associated with one of the following types of meaning: experiential/ideational, interpersonal or textual. The *field* is expressed through patterns of ideational/experiential meaning; *tenor* through interpersonal meanings; and *mode* through textual meanings. In order to explore the aspects related with collective memory and the assignment of responsibilities to social actors, the meanings that are of interest to us are ideational and interpersonal meanings. That is, how the experience or historical events in question are constructed, how the relationships between the participants are constructed, and how the social actors are evaluated. In the following section the ideational and interpersonal meanings of the texts selected in this chapter are analyzed in more depth.

23. "Justamente porque el elemento ideológico característico de las FFAA por un largo período histórico había sido definido como su 'legalismo' (o mejor aún, su 'civilismo'), en cuanto comenzaron a intervenir políticamente surgió para los militares una necesidad de construir un discurso de pasaje que les permitiera adquirir una identidad política. Lo que es más, esta identidad debía ser al mismo tiempo política y diferente a la de los sectores políticos tradicionales" (Panizza 1990: 181).

Table 2. Analysis of situational context (register)

	Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	Text 4
Field	Explanation of the events related with the subversion in Uruguay. Explanation of the socio-historical context in which the subversion arises in the sixties. Description of how the text was constructed and the motivation for giving this account.	Account of the principal political events that occurred in Uruguay after 1973. Response to the international propaganda campaign that was critical of the political process in Uruguay. Explanation of the goals of the Armed Forces.	Presentation of the motivation and goal of the book. Description of the material used to construct the text.	Presentation of the country and its characteristics. Account of the political process that led to the 'fight against sedition'. Response to the international propaganda campaign.
Mode	Texts written to be read. They are reflective texts written by an impersonal writer to be read by an unknown and distant reader.			
Tenor	Formal texts that reflect an unequal power between an expert and a novice in the subject matter. The texts are constructed with an academic tone that produces a distance and authority even though they try to create a type of solidarity that permits them to get closer to the audience. The participants are named and the Armed Forces are presented as the "hero" of the historical account.			

Representation of the experience (ideational meaning)

The representation of the events and the events' participating actors expresses the ideational or experiential meaning of the texts. An analysis of *Transitivity*²⁴ (see Table 3) in these texts illuminates how the authors construct the events that shape

24. The analysis of Transitivity shows how the processes (verbs), participants (nouns) and circumstances (prepositional phrases or adverbs) are selected and how through those choices a representation of experience is constructed. The processes (verbs) are classified according to their meaning in: material processes (express action, creation or transformation that requires an actor or agent that realizes it), mental processes (express a cognitive aspect or a feeling/emotional aspect that require a sensor as a participant), relational processes (establish relationships of equivalence, attribution or belonging/membership), verbal processes (express a report and require someone to be the narrator or reporter), existential processes (express the mere existence of something) and behavioral processes (express physical states that don't indicate volition, the participant only experiences them). See Chapter Two for a more detailed explanation of the concept.

Table 3. Table 3: Representation and agency (Transitivity)

Type of Process	Material	Relational	Mental	Verbal	Behavioral	Existential	N total
Text 1 (1976)	96	69	14	6	0	6	191
Text 2 (1978)	23	14	7	0	0	2	46
Text 3 (1978)	4	3	0	1	0	0	8
Text 4 (1978)	64	53	4	7	4	3	135

the interpretation of this historical period. Of the lexico-grammatical resources available in the system, the authors select mostly verbal, material, or relational processes. This selection matches the characteristics of the historical account genre to which the texts belong, since material processes permit history to move forward and relational processes establish relationships between the events that shape the account.

In spite of the fact that the majority of the verbs selected are material verbs, meaning they require that an agent take responsibility for the action, the responsibility for these events is disguised or hidden through the use of other linguistic resources. These linguistic resources include the passive voice and impersonal forms such as *se* and the use of nominalizations or general terms that do not point directly to any particular social actor. This interplay between resources that signal ideational meaning and resources that signal interpersonal meaning enables these texts to construct a version of the past without explicitly mentioning the social actors involved. The utilization of incongruent forms, such as the grammatical metaphor by way of nominalizations permits the texts to create the impression of objectivity to which they aspire although they are obviously laden with ideological content (it is important to note that specific agents do appear in certain moments but this is the least usual occurrence).

However, the analysis of Transitivity is not sufficient to explain how responsibility or agency is assigned or evaded. In the following table this aspect of evasion or assignment of responsibility is explored through identifying which participants or social actors appear in the role of *actor* required by the material processes.

Table 4. Participants (actor/‘agent’) selected with material processes

Texts	Military Officers	Opposition	Impersonal Passive Nominalization	Indefinite N total
Text 1 (1976)	9	8	18	58
Text 2 (1978)	3	1	4	6
Text 3 (1978)	1	0	0	2
Text 4 (1978)	2	5	5	49

This table (Table 4) shows how responsibility or agency is attributed primarily to undetermined agents through the selection of linguistic resources such as passivization, nominalization, and the use of indefinite constructions. For example, in text 1:

- (8) Nonetheless, even today, instead of gaining ground, *the truth* remains hidden, offering a distorted balance, above all in the international arena, in which information has been handled that is not always truthful and, on occasion, decidedly false.²⁵

In this example, one can observe the use of a nominalization *the truth* to which responsibility and volition as an actor are attributed by way of the verbs *gaining ground* and *offering*. Later the passive impersonal is used, *has been handled*, in order not to signal the actor responsible for the distribution of false information, the defamation campaign against the Armed Forces. In these texts a typical resource of the historical genres is used, the use of nominalizations that present periods and abstract concepts as participants, but as a difference from traditional texts of this genre appraisal is used to modify these abstract concepts. This appraisal represents a way in which the authors signal responsibility and judgment that do not appear in the construction of events by way of the selection of ideational aspects (transitivity). In spite of the very frequent use of impersonal lexico-grammatical elements (passive with *se* and nominalizations) it is possible for the authors to craft an interpretation in which the social actors with more responsibility for the events leading to the dictatorship are those of the opposition. This outcome is achieved through the resource of appraisal that will be developed further below.

When the military participants appear mentioned explicitly it is done in third person plural even though the books are written and published by the Armed Forces. Additionally, they appear as the object of processes produced by

25. “Sin embargo, todavía hoy, en vez de ganar terreno, *la verdad permanece oscurecida*, ofreciendo un balance distorsionado, sobre todo en el ámbito internacional, en el que se ha manejado una información no siempre veraz y, en ocasiones, decididamente falsa.”

circumstances. That is to say that the actions of the Armed Forces are never directly their responsibility. For example, in text 2:

- (9) The present circumstances, of the country and the world, and a strict sense of responsibility, induces them [the Armed Forces] to join the most modern criteria and in agreement with the need of maintaining the population informed, approaching the events which are reproduced immediately below, based on documents, testimonials, objective and direct judgments, susceptible to being clarified and impeding that they are deformed with impunity.²⁶

The military officers appear in the role of agents in processes that have positive connotations or that demonstrate their heroism. In text 4, one can observe this.

- (10) So the citizens were not surprised when *the constitutional president*, the 27th of June, 1973, *with the support of the Armed Forces*, last bastion of Uruguayanness [*Orientalidad*], ceased the functions of all of its members.²⁷

In this example, the Armed Forces appear as a nominalization *support of the Armed Forces* that modifies a directly named actor *the constitutional president*. Because of this structure the responsibility falls principally over the nucleus of the nominal group, *the president*, and classifies the actor the Armed Forces as an exemplar and representative of national characteristics, *last bastion of Uruguayanness [Orientalidad]*. This clause is also interesting because in addition to being one of the few instances in which the Armed Forces appear named explicitly in relation to a verb that indicates responsibility, it is part of the construction of the events of the coup d'état. Here the actors involved in the coup d'état are named but in its construction the experience is reduced to a *cessation* of the functions of parliament. This construction is all framed within an aura of legality by way of clear presentation of the actors as representatives of the established order, *the constitutional president* and the Armed Forces *last bastion of Orientalidad*.

The authors also use projection in the citation of other texts and sources. Projection allows an incorporation of judgments that in another manner would seem

26. "Las presentes circunstancias, del país y del mundo, y un sentido estricto de la responsabilidad, las [a las FFAA] induce a afiliarse al criterio más moderno y afín con la necesidad de mantener informada a la población, abordando los hechos inmediatamente después reproducidos, a base de documentos, testimonios, juicios objetivos y directos, susceptibles de esclarecerlos e impedir que se les deforme impunemente."

27. "Así la ciudadanía no se sorprendió cuando el presidente constitucional, el 27 de junio de 1973, con el apoyo de las Fuerzas Armadas, último reducto de la Orientalidad, cesa en sus funciones a todos sus miembros."

subjective and would therefore take away the *rigorousness* or veracity of the presented account. For example, in text 4:

- (11) But *we* [us, the Armed Forces] *will leave it* to the very communists to tell us themselves, from the OLAS, their purposes: ‘The first objective of the popular revolution in the continent is the taking of power through the destruction of the bureaucratic and military apparatus of the State. This objective is only obtainable through armed struggle’, *which will be ferocious and without quarter*.²⁸

In this example, the Armed Forces appear as the actor of a material verb *we will leave it* that indicates authority and power over others. Within this sign of unequal power between the reader and the writer, the authors try to give a sensation of equanimity by citing the words of the opposition directly. However, the words of the Other are commented upon and classified in an indirect manner, permitting the Armed Forces to maintain an image of a *just* actor while not having to directly assume responsibility for value judgments about the opposition.

Social actors

General ideas are always Generals’ ideas

(Virginia Wolfs’ dictum in van Leeuwen 1996: 47)

In order to perform an analysis of the social actors appearing in these texts, it is necessary to search for a common denominator between the different ways in which each category of social actor is represented (van Leeuwen 1996). In these texts the social actors that appear represented beneath some common denominators are: *the Armed Forces* (FFAA), *the subversives* (the opposition), *the politicians*, *the people* (the nation) and *the foreigners*. These social actors are identified through an analysis of lexical chains in which synonyms, almost synonyms, or hyponyms are used to represent the same actor. In the next section, the common traits of the forms in which these social actors are excluded or included in the texts are analyzed.

The social actors most commonly suppressed or put in the background are the Armed Forces and the representatives of the government that carried out the coup d’état. Linguistically this exclusion is realized by eliminating the agent in passive forms, the use of non-finite clauses with the function of participant, the exclusion

28. “Pero dejemos [nosotros, las FFAA] que los propios comunistas nos digan, desde las OLAS, sus propósitos: “El primer objetivo de la revolución popular en el continente es la toma del poder mediante la destrucción del aparato burocrático y militar del Estado. Este objetivo sólo es alcanzable a través de la lucha armada”, que será feroz y sin cuartel.”

of beneficiaries, the use of nominalizations and processes realized as adjectives, ellipsis in non-finite clauses, and the use of infinitive clauses and parataxis in which the social actor appears in the background, or does not stand out. For example, in text 1, the Armed Forces appear in one prepositional phrase introduced with *by* that modifies a nominalized process *accomplished*.

- (12) Its realization has been possible thanks to the self-sacrificing labor accomplished by the Armed Forces, Army, Air and Navy, together with the services of the Police in a fight without truce.²⁹

In this way, more relevance is given to the *action realized* than to *who* realizes it. In this way, due to the actor's appearance as a modifier of a nominalized process, more *appreciations* or evaluations of the event can be given that will be less questioned by the reader. The reason such evaluations will be less questioned is that they are very inlaid in the text. In the majority of the events in which the Armed Forces participate as agents they are represented by way of nominalizations or passive impersonal constructions. For example, text 2 describes how the book was made without mentioning who made it. However, it is possible to recover this information because the actor appears as part of an adjective phrase that modifies one of the nouns mentioned in the text.

- (13) Like the volume of which this is a continuation, the present book is based in reliable antecedents, many of them of public knowledge and others that have been guarded until now as secrets in the archives of the Armed Forces.³⁰

An example of the suppression of actors is encountered in text 3, in which the authors avoid mentioning the Armed Forces by using a nominalization.

- (14) The purpose of the work, to compile these elements and present them in an ordered form is none other than to avoid the forgetting of our recent history (a forgetting that many are interested in promoting) and to reveal numerous episodes that until today have not received public attention.³¹

29. "Su realización ha sido posible merced a la sacrificada labor cumplida por las Fuerzas Armadas, Ejército, Fuerza Aérea y Armada, juntamente con los servicios de Policía en una lucha sin tregua."

30. "Como el volumen del que es continuación, el presente libro está basado en antecedentes fidedignos, muchos de ellos de conocimiento público y otros guardados hasta ahora en calidad de secretos en los archivos de las FFAA."

31. "El propósito de la obra, al recopilar estos elementos y presentarlos en forma ordenada no es otro que evitar el olvido de nuestra historia reciente (olvido que tiene tantos interesados en promoverlos) y revelar numerosos episodios que hasta hoy no han recibido tratamiento público."

In some cases, the authors are able to include facts about events in a way in which the responsible actors can not be recovered. They achieve this result through the use of processes as adjectives. For example in text 4,

- (15) From then on the banned Communist Party –declared outside the law like all groups of Marxist origin—continues conspiring from the shadows with its armed apparatus, its political and economic organization, its organization of propaganda, and of foreign finances and even foreign relations.³²

In order to totally exclude the actors, suppression is achieved with the impersonal *se*. For example in text 1:

- (16) Much has been said and written about the subversion in Uruguay and in particular about the seditious organization that gave Uruguay notoriety within and outside borders, the Movement of National Liberation (*Tupamaros*).³³

In this way, a naturalization of the events is presented and is given as an *established truth* that is massively and publicly endorsed.

This type of discourse removes emphasis on the actors and places it on the events themselves. This resource is characteristic of the genre of historical account, but it also allows the institution to deemphasize its members as agents of actions that are being questioned by part of its audience. When the institution's members do not appear as agents it is more difficult for the reader to attribute responsibilities for the events to them.

On the other hand, it is important to explore which social actors are most frequently included in the text and how they are mentioned. The social actors that appear mentioned with most frequency are *the subversives* (the opposition). Generally the subversives are mentioned making reference to their functional characteristics, of classification or of evaluation. The nominalization *subversives* or *seditious* are the most frequent terms used to refer to these actors. This group includes members of organizations involved in armed struggles all the way to members of the left-leaning political parties. For example, in text 2:

32. “A partir de entonces el proscripto Partido Comunista – declarado fuera de la ley como todos los grupos de origen marxista – continúa conspirando desde las sombras con su aparato armado, su organización política, económica, de propaganda, de finanzas y hasta de relaciones exteriores.”

33. “mucho se ha dicho y escrito sobre la subversión en el Uruguay y de particular modo sobre la organización sediciosa que le dio notoriedad dentro y fuera de fronteras, el Movimiento de Liberación Nacional (*Tupamaros*).”

- (17) The subversion was a red light that signaled the incredible gravity of the danger that hovered over the Nation, awakening consciences and wills lethargic from years of political demagoguery and irresponsibility.³⁴

The adjective *marxist* is also used in order to refer to these actors. In other words, these actors are represented by identifying them directly with their ideas (classifying them). For example, in text 4:

- (18) Nevertheless, in that moment in which they tried to impose themselves with terror, the marxists didn't account for the support of the people.³⁵

Additionally, actors belonging to these groups are nominated directly. For example, text 1 makes reference to a long list of people that collaborated with the guerrillas or the 'sedition' and therefore are seditious by association. In text 4, Rodney Arismendi, a communist leader, is mentioned directly.

- (19) Rodney Arismendi, first secretary of the Uruguayan Communist Party, today exiled in Moscow.³⁶

The social actor that represents the public in general, *el pueblo* (the people), is mentioned in general and collective form and also with a metonymic reference of space for which the terms *Uruguayans* or *orientales* are used as synonyms for this group. By representing the citizenship as part of one same collectivity the authors signal a consensus between those who constitute this social actor. For example, in text 1:

- (20) The electoral results demonstrated the feeling of the Uruguayan people, that voted massively for the traditional parties [...].³⁷

The authors also individually identify those members of 'the people' that are considered *victims of the sedition*. In text 1, they are mentioned by first and last name as well as for their character as victims or rather their identification by classification.

The *political parties* appear defined collectively or metonymically with reference to the place their functions are carried out, *the parliament*. Also in some

34. "La subversión fue una luz roja que señaló la increíble gravedad del peligro que se cernía sobre la Nación, despertando conciencias y voluntades aletargadas por años de demagogia e irresponsabilidad políticas."

35. "No obstante, en ese momento en que trataban de imponerse por el terror, los marxistas no contaron con el apoyo del pueblo."

36. "Rodney Arismendi, primer secretario del Partido Comunista del Uruguay, hoy exiliado en Moscú."

37. "Los resultados electorales demostraron el sentir del pueblo uruguayo, que votó masivamente a los partidos tradicionales []."

cases individuals are named that the authors want to signal as examples of negative aspects of this collectivity. For example, in text 3:

- (21) it refuses to handover to Military Justice one of its members, senator Enrique Erro, elected by the 26 of March Movement (electoral group of the Movement of National Liberation *Tupamaros*) wielding circumstantial ruses.³⁸

In the case of the social actors belonging to the Armed Forces or associated with them, different resources are used to include them in the text although for the most part those resources not resulting in their agency are favored. One of the resources utilized in order to include actors without giving them much relevance is the use of indefinite or undetermined terms. Lack of definition makes a social actor more anonymous. For example, in text 3, the authors use undefined or indirect reference to mention actors that prefer not to be identified to take away the importance of polemic figures.

- (22) Who succeeds him must face the subversion, *Tupamaros* and the growing triumph of the marxist thesis of chaos and corruption.³⁹

The reader with knowledge of the history and the Uruguayan political panorama can recover the identity of this unnamed actor (president Jorge Pacheco Areco). However, it is interesting to note that in the previous clause General Gestido was mentioned by name, and he was the democratically elected president before the events leading to the declaration of a state of emergency unfolded. The social actor the Armed Forces also appears mentioned in the undetermined or general form with the use of the term *the soldier*. Here the authors of the texts refer metonymically to the group represented as one of its archetypical individuals. For example in text 1, this ideal actor is referred to.

- (23) But the Uruguayan soldier is not a mercenary, as the seditious mistakenly maintained, he has patriotic ideals, and the relationship between officials and troop is paternal, affectionate, familiar, without the diminishment of discipline.⁴⁰

38. “*se niega a entregar a la Justicia Militar a uno de sus miembros, el senador Enrique Erro, electo por el movimiento 26 de marzo (grupo electoral del Movimiento de Liberación Nacional Tupamaros) esgrimiendo argucias circunstanciales.*”

39. “*Quien le sucede debe enfrentar la subversión, Tupamaros y el creciente triunfo de la tesis marxista del caos y corrupción.*”

40. “*Pero el soldado uruguayo no es un mercenario, como lo sostuvieron equivocadamente los sediciosos, tiene ideales patrióticos, y la relación entre oficiales y tropa es paternal, afectuosa, familiar, sin mengua de la disciplina.*”

The last social actor that appears in these texts is the foreigner. This actor appears as an instigating agent of a propaganda campaign that defames Uruguay and the Armed Forces as violators of human rights. This social actor is represented both as an undefined/indefinite and general collective and as specific individuals mentioned by first and last name (see text 2). For example, in text 4:

- (24) Now [it] attacks in another direction, by way of their organisms of the screen in international reunions or with a well oiled propaganda machine, master or dominant in enormous chains of communications media, populated also by an amorphous multitude integrated by those who do not believe or who do not want to believe in the truth about communism.⁴¹

Here an indirect mention is made with the use of possessive pronouns and adjectives that permit the reader to identify the social actor as responsible for the international defamation campaign.

According to van Leeuwen (1996) the linguistic resources most utilized to manipulate the representation of experience and the social actors in it are the transformations of suppression (by way of passivization, nominalization and adjectivization), reaccommodation (transitivity) and substitution (reference and lexis and the mechanisms of metaphor and metonymy). The analysis of these military texts has permitted us to see these resources in action towards accomplishing the aim of constructing a representation of the past that favors one version of events in which the Armed Forces are not responsible for acts that violate law and order.

Orientation towards the message and the participants (interpersonal meaning)

The interpersonal meaning in these texts relates to how the roles of the writers and the audience are constructed, the expression of the writer's opinion regarding the probabilities and the writer's attitude towards the message. The goal of these texts is to transmit information to the public about the events that occurred in Uruguay immediately before and during the dictatorship. These texts offer affirmations that construct a historical account of the period (1970–1978). The validity of the information presented is signaled in terms of its probability or its frequency (usuality). In these texts, the emphasis is on signaling the probability of the information since this is what permits the reaffirmation of its veracity or legitimacy.

41. “*Ahora ataca en otra dirección, a través de sus organismos de pantalla en reuniones internacionales o de un bien aceitado engranaje propagandístico, dueño o dominante en enormes cadenas de medios de comunicación, poblados también de una multitud amorfa integrada por quienes no creen o no quieren creer en la verdad del comunismo.*”

Modalization is used in order to linguistically mark the probability that the information is true. For example, in text 1, it is said:

- (25) Divided in two parts, the first provides a preliminary idea of the subversion in Latin America –without which knowledge it is impossible to understand the true significance of internal subversion, in Uruguay or in whatever other Latin American country [...].⁴²

However, modalization is not the resource most used to signal the veracity of the affirmations in the texts. In general, the texts more often utilize other resources of *appraisal* to signal the degree of possibility of the described actions (see further below).

With respect to *modulation*, the obligation or inclination that the writer associates with the represented events, one can observe the sign of a high degree of obligation with respect to the actions in which the Armed Forces are agents. The events in which the Armed Forces participated in are represented as inexorable events in which they did not have any other moral or historical option. For example, in text 2:

- (26) this book is about the principle political events that occurred in Uruguay from February 1973 forward, and, in particular, of the intervention in these that the Armed Forces had to assume in complying with its incorruptible mission as custodian of the life and security of the Republic.⁴³

Modulation is also utilized to interpolate the audience and to summon its collaboration or incorporation into a struggle they are morally obligated to participate in. For example, in text 4:

- (27) Because we must keep close in mind that while the subversive delinquency is nurtured by erroneous ideology, it acts under the protection of an *accomplice passivity*.⁴⁴

The type of *modality*, modalization and modulation, used in the texts is also implicit, that is to say that clausal constructions are used –subordination, embedding – to express this type of commentary about the message and objective of the text. For example, in text 1:

42. “Dividido en dos partes, la primera suministra una idea preliminar de la subversión en América Latina – sin cuyo conocimiento es imposible comprender la verdadera significación de la subversión interna, en el Uruguay o en cualquier otro país latinoamericano [].”

43. “trate este libro de los principales sucesos políticos ocurridos en el Uruguay desde febrero de 1973 en adelante, y, de particular modo, de la intervención que en ellos debieron asumir las FFAA en cumplimiento de su insobornable misión de custodios de la vida y de la seguridad de la República.”

44. “Porque debemos tener muy presente que si bien la delincuencia subversiva se nutre de ideología errónea, ella actúa al amparo de una pasividad cómplice.”

- (28) It's exactly that dedicated always to their traditional activities, they lacked the political preparation and initial aptitude for the antsubversive struggle.⁴⁵
- (29) It is of interest, also, to formulate an observation with respect to what the subversion euphemistically refers to as the 'front of mass action.'⁴⁶

In this manner, the authors try to mask their responsibility for the evaluations made with respect to the message of the texts.

Another resource utilized to signal the opinion of the author about the represented events and their participants is appraisal of attitudes. Appraisal of attitudes is one of the lexico-grammatical and discourse-semantic tools most used to transmit interpersonal meaning in these texts. According to Martin (2000) there are three principal components in the system of appraisal of attitudes: Affect, appreciation, and judgment. This type of interpersonal meaning appears primarily through lexical selection, for example it appears masked as verbs *succumb*, nouns *the subversion*, adjectives *the seditious movement*, and adverbs *systematically dejected*. The resource of amplification also exists in the system of appraisal. By amplification comparative commentaries can be made, or commentaries of quantification (spatial or material).

The types of appraisal of attitudes most frequent in these texts are Judgment and Appreciation. Amplification also appears, and refers to the gradation of events or participants in terms of comparison, intensity, measurement, etc. The opposition is evaluated in terms of ethics, utilizing nominalization to refer to events as participants (e.g. the subversion) and quantification. The veracity of the historical account produced and the judgments made by the authors are evaluated,

- (30) all the truth is unveiled.⁴⁷

The qualities of the Armed forces are marked as participants in events that show their tenacity.

- (31) the self-sacrificing labor carried out by [the Armed Forces].⁴⁸

The actions of the Armed Forces are evaluated as normal and those of the opposition are evaluated as abnormal.

45. "Es exacto que dedicadas siempre a sus actividades tradicionales, carecieron de preparación política y aptitud inicial para la lucha antsubversiva."

46. "Es de interés, también, formular alguna observación respecto de lo que eufemísticamente la subversión denomina 'frente de acción de masas'."

47. "se desnuda toda la verdad".

48. "la sacrificada labor cumplida por [las FFAA]".

- (32) unleashed by miniscule groups of people that are irascible, resentful, and failures, without popular base nor support of public opinion.⁴⁹

The appraisals of appreciation give mostly valuations of the participants being talked about.

- (33) the truth remains hidden.⁵⁰

Appraisals are also made about the composition of the participants, always contrasting the quality and/or superiority of the Armed Forces' version to that of the opposition.

- (34) offering a distorted balance.⁵¹

Table 5. Appraisal of social actors (Us vs. Them)

Texts	Social Actor	Judgment		Appreciation
		Social Esteem	Social sanction	
Text 1 (1976)	Us (Armed Forces)	Tenacity (+)	propriety (+) veracity(+)	Valuation (+)
	Them (Opposition)	Normality (-) Capacity (-)	propriety (+) veracity(-)	Composition (-)
Text 2 (1978)	Us (Armed Forces)	Tenacity (+) Capacity (+)	propriety (+) veracity (+)	Valuation (+)
	Them (Opposition)	Tenacity (-) Capacity (-) Normality (-)	propriety(-) veracity (-)	Valuation (-)
Text 3 (1978)	Us (Armed Forces)	Capacity (+) Tenacity (+)	propriety(+)	Composition (+)
	Them (Opposition)	Tenacity (+)	propriety (-)	Valuation (-) Reaction (-) Composition (-)
Text 4 (1978)	Us (Armed Forces)	Capacity (+) Tenacity (+)		Valuation (+)
	Them (Opposition)	Normality (-) Tenacity (-)	propriety (-)	Valuation (-)

49. "desatado por minúsculos grupos de iracibles, fracasados, y resentidos, sin base popular ni apoyo de opinión."

50. "la verdad permanece oscurecida".

51. "ofreciendo un balance distorcionado".

The table above (Table 5) summarizes the categories that are used to appraise the participants and how the principal social actors (the Armed Forces and the opposition) are evaluated in the analyzed texts.

As can be seen in Table 5, the texts represent the Armed Forces as capable, tenacious, and as typical representatives of established social values. This representation coincides with the portrayal of the situation as a war in which the strategically *strongest* and *most astute* were the victors. Additionally the texts construct the actions of the Armed Forces, which include the analyzed works, as true and of high compositional quality. In other words, the Actions of the Armed Forces are portrayed as equanimous and balanced. In contrast, the social actors representing the opposition appear as incapable, with inappropriate conduct that is abnormal according to the norms of the status quo. Furthermore the opposition's texts or the phenomena which they are responsible for are characterized as having little value, consisting of poor and not rigorous composition and being instigators of reactions that demonstrate little quality.

The role of interpersonal meaning is put in close up by making moral evaluations and judgments about the information supplied, such as by establishing relationships of cause and effect between the presented events. This style is typical of commentaries of the mass media in which moral judgments or appraisals are made with a use of the semantics of intensification through lexical selection and comparison (White 1997).

Another relevant aspect that characterizes these texts at the interpersonal level is how they construct the identity of the Armed Forces by way of a *discourse of difference* (Wodak 1996). In this type of discourse the description of the other reflects the self-image of those who construct it. A distinction is made between an *us* and a *them*. This distinction is based in the selection of specific characteristics that are attributed to a group, and generally these characteristics refer to the difference, deviation, or threat of the other group. The construction of identity is accomplished through a process of differentiation of the group of *ours* with respect to the group of *the others* (Wodak 1996). In these texts the identity of the Armed Forces appears as a counterpart to a group of 'others' characterized by a lack of respect for authority, constitutional order, or national tradition. In other words, the Armed Forces appear as guarantors of order, democracy, and as followers of the traditions that founded the country. The example that follows demonstrates an instance of these two visions of identity of the two contrasting groups:

- (35) Many years had already passed in which the general state of the subversion, in its pathological expressions of the most unbridled violence, ate away at the Republic and threatened to bring it to ruin, when the Executive

Power, impotent to confront it, called on the Armed Forces to take charge of such a heavy responsibility.

The fight unraveling from then on demanded enormous sacrifices, efforts, materials, a considerable contribution in young and able human lives, ripped from the very entrails of the people.

This made the Armed Forces deeply aware, motivating a strengthening of ranks and a unity of thought each time more tightly fitted to the Artiguista ideology to which they are faithful and selfless depositaries.⁵²

However, it is worth pointing out that these texts try to maintain the objective character typical of the historical account genre and for this reason they do not speak of the Armed Forces in first person. Rather, they use third person as if the one writing the text is a voice without allegiance to any particular actor that observes the events from outside.

Argumentative strategies: *topoi*

Some of the lines of argumentation used to validate the aim of the text are the following:

- a. Anecdotes of victims of the fight against sedition as a form of proof [*pisteis*] to argue in favor of the historical vision of events presented in the texts.

These texts use of a few main anecdotes as evidence that supports the argumentation of the texts. These anecdotes are the same ones that appear in earlier texts and that are converted into commemorations of the institution during the dictatorship and that today continue as such. These anecdotes are about the *fallen heroes in the fight against the sedition* and they illustrate the opposition's cruelty and violence. In other words, the consistent strategy is to villainize the Other in order to justify the actions of the Armed Forces. In this way the actions of the Armed Forces appear

52. "Hacia ya varios años que el estado general de la subversión, en sus expresiones patológicas de la más desenfadada violencia, carcomía a la República y amenazaba conducirla a la ruina, cuando el Poder Ejecutivo, impotente para enfrentarla, llamó a las FFAA para hacerse cargo de tan pesada responsabilidad.

La lucha desde entonces desencadenada demandó ingentes sacrificios, esfuerzos, material una considerable contribución en vidas humanas jóvenes y útiles, arrancadas de las entrañas mismas del pueblo."

Ello sensibilizó hondamente a las FFAA, motivando un fortalecedor estrechamiento de filas y una unidad de pensamiento cada vez más ceñidos en torno a la ideología artiguista de la que son fieles y abnegados depositarios."

as responses to previous aggressions of the *enemy*. At the same time these anecdotes serve as a contextual framework in which to interpret the events that others have designated as being against the state of law or as human rights violations carried out by the Armed Forces.

These military texts mention the following anecdotes: (1) the 14th of April 1972, in which an official of the navy, two police officers and an ex-undersecretary of state are murdered in an attack by the *Tupamaros*, and (2) the 18th of May 1972, when four soldiers die in an armed encounter with the *Tupamaros*.

This argumentative strategy is characterized by the use of small histories or anecdotes in the context of a large topic/theme that spans the entire text. This type of narrative style incorporates the presentation of a macro topic that functions as a framework for the interpretation of events, and the inclusion of anecdotes supports the integrity of the topic and proves its validity (Stuckey 1992).

- b. Use of the opposition's arguments against them (e.g.: the Others violate human rights) 'turning what has been said against oneself upon the one who said it' (Aristotle).

This type of argumentative strategy consists of using the accuser's own arguments as proof of the position put forth in the text. The authors refute the arguments wielded against the Armed Forces by using examples that demonstrate the Other as protagonist of the events charged to the Armed Forces. It is in this manner that the authors respond to the accusations of human rights violations, by presenting examples of violations committed by the Others. For example:

- (36) Torture and sadism were also, the cowardly murders of Dan A. Mitrione, Inspector Héctor Morán Charquero, the victims of April 14th and May 18th, 1972, colonels Artigas Alvarez and Ramón Trabal and the horrible death inflicted by an injection of sodium thiopental to Pascasio Ramón Báez, humble field laborer.

These execrable crimes confirmed the homicidal coldness and the lack of all human feeling in the members of the terrorist group.

(text 1)⁵³

- c. Putting in evidence that the opponent does not value the same things publicly as it does in private; that is to say that it publicly promotes that which

53. "Tortura y sadismo fueron también, los cobardes asesinatos de Dan A. Mitrione, del Inspector Héctor Morán Charquero, de las víctimas del 14 abril y 18 de mayo del 72, de los Coroneles Artigas Alvarez y Ramón Trabal y la horrible muerte inflingida mediante una inyección de pentotal a Pascasio Ramón Báez, humilde peón de campo.

Estos execrables crímenes confirmaron la frialdad homicida y la carencia de todo sentimiento humano en los integrantes del grupo terrorista." (texto #1)

is just and beautiful while in private it desires that which is most convenient to it (e.g.: the *Tupamaros* demand the observance of the law and the fulfillment of constitutionally guaranteed rights at the same time they want to subvert the established order).

This type of strategy puts in evidence the contradictions of the Other as a symbol of their lack of character and credibility. This type of argumentative proof directly attacks the opponent at the same time as attacking their message. That is to say, it puts in question their version of events due to the lack of coherence between their actions and their preaching. Some of the examples used in the texts to delegitimize the Other are: the *guerrilleros* demand that their constitutional rights be respected in full although they want to subvert the established order; the *subversives* have inhumane prisons although they say they fight for justice; they kill people from the popular classes although they are with the people; they are an elite although they say they represent the interests of the common people.

For example:

- (37) Another reiterated attitude of the seditious, upon being captured was the insistent demand of all the rights and prerogatives that the legal order they aimed to destroy offers to citizens, looking to protect, in some way, the criminal and traitorous acts that against this order they had committed, without preventing them from having at their disposal an entire body of specialized lawyers, the majority of which were closely linked to the organization.

(text 1)⁵⁴

- d. A cause is established for both the false impression of the Armed Forces and the reasons why the prejudice towards the actions of the Armed Forces or the institution itself appears to be true (e.g.: The Armed Forces are accused of violating human rights by the international campaign of defamation organized by their enemies).

This strategy of argumentation consists of explaining why and how the accusations against the institution or its alleged actions are not true although they can appear to be so, rather they consist of prejudices. To refute these accusations, the authors discredit those that make them and show evidence that demonstrates it is the others who are responsible for actions similar to the ones they attribute to the

54. "Otra reiterada actitud de los sediciosos, al ser apresados, fue la del insistente reclamo de todos los derechos y prerogativas que el ordenamiento jurídico que pretendían destruir ofrece a los ciudadanos, buscando proteger, de tal manera, los actos delictivos y de traición que contra ese ordenamiento cometieron, sin perjuicio de disponer de todo un cuerpo de abogados especializados, la mayor parte de ellos estrechamente vinculados a la organización" (texto #1).

Armed Forces. The texts make direct reference to the actors that organize the *campaign of defamation* against the Armed Forces and as a corollary against the country itself. For example:

- (38) The supreme irony of the mendacious campaign is that from the outside it attempts to forge against our fatherland, basing itself in the hackneyed argument of the violation of human rights, and resides, paradoxically, in being led by the most exempt champion in this type of violations, international communism. Countries and institutions infiltrated and politicized by it [communism], by sophisticated organizations and instruments of façade, named Amnesty, Comisión de Juristas, Comités de Solidaridad con los Presos Políticos, Ramsey Clark, Rodney Arismendi, Michael Read, Edgard Koch, Wilson Inouye, Martín Weinstein, or whatever they are called.

(text 2)⁵⁵

- e. Accusing or defending based on the errors committed by one of the parts (e.g.: members of the FFCC; errors of the parliament on not doing what the government asked; errors of the subversives of measuring the forces or capacity to fight of the FFCC).

This argumentative strategy consists of defending itself or accusing based in errors committed by one of the parties involved in the events. In this way the Armed Forces removes responsibility from itself for having violated the constitution or having acted in an authoritarian manner since its acts were the consequence of errors made by Others. For example:

- (39) The urban *Tupamaro* guerrillas having been defeated by the firm action of the Armed Forces, called to the front lines by political power, Marxism took refuge in its last bastion, the Parliament of that time, that by way of a Byzantine dialectic it immerses itself in insignificant political discussions instead of taking charge of making the laws that the situation of the country required.

But it goes even further than that, and putting at stake an agreement that Marxism had drawn out of it, it refused to turn over to Military Justice one of its members, the senator Enrique Erro, elected by the 26th of March

55. “*La suprema ironía de la mendaz campaña que desde el extranjero intenta forjarse contra nuestra Patria, basándose en el gastado argumento de la violación de los derechos humanos, reside paradójicamente en estar dirigida por el más eximio campeón en tal género de violaciones, el comunismo internacional, países e institutos por él infiltrados y politizados, así como por sofisticadas organizaciones e instrumentos de fachada, llámense Amnesty, Comisión de Juristas, Comités de Solidaridad con los Presos Políticos, Ramsey Clark, Rodney Arismendi, Michael Read, Edgard Koch, Wilson Inouye, Martín Weinstein, o como quiera que se llamen*” (texto #2).

movement (electoral group of the Movement of National Liberation *Tupamaros*), wielding circumstantial ruses. The Parliament had stopped fulfilling its function and automatically it had been dissolved. Therefore the citizens were not surprised when the constitutional president, on June 27th, 1973, with the support of the Armed Forces, last bastion of *Orientalidad*, ceased the functions of all its members. (text 4)⁵⁶

In this way, the Armed Forces displace responsibility for actions that are not evaluated positively by international or national public opinion, attributing causality to events for which the Others are responsible. That is to say, the errors of the Others are those that led to the exceptional situation, not the actions of the Armed Forces in themselves.

Conclusion

The decodification of the patterns guiding the construction of military discourse concerning the institution's actions during the dictatorship allows us to identify some of the elements that are currently managed in the political debate about struggles over memory. The argumentative strategies, the evaluation of social actors, and the selection of linguistic resources in order to attribute responsibility for the occurred events represent a configuration of options that characterize the institution's ideological position with respect to this historical event and its political consequences. According to the political scientist Dan Smith (1998),

discursive choices reflect a combination of preferences about how to understand and explain the situation. Some elements of the choice derive from political calculation, others from ethical reflection, others from less calculating and less reflective sources. Through the choices of both terminology and explanation, a logic of sorts can be discerned, a chain of preferences. Short-, and long-term political

56. *“Derrotada la guerrilla urbana tupamara por el firme accionar de las Fuerzas Armadas, llamadas a primera fila por el poder político, el marxismo se refugia en su último baluarte, el Parlamento de entonces, que a través de un bizantinismo dialéctico se enfrasca en discusiones políticas intrascendentes en lugar de abocarse a la confección de las leyes que la situación del país estaba reclamando.*

Pero llega más allá y poniendo en juego un acuerdo que le había arrancado el marxismo se niega a entregar a la Justicia Militar a uno de sus miembros, el senador Enrique Error, electo por el movimiento 26 de marzo (grupo electoral del Movimiento de Liberación Nacional Tupamaros) esgrimiendo argucias circunstanciales. El Parlamento había dejado de cumplir su función de tal y automáticamente se había disuelto.

Así la ciudadanía no se sorprendió cuando el presidente constitucional, el 27 de junio de 1973, con el apoyo de las Fuerzas Armadas, último reducto de la Orientalidad, cesa en sus funciones a todos sus miembros” (texto #4).

implications of disputes over terminology, and emotional attachment to a particular depiction of the conflict, fit into a wider chain of associative connections, some of them logical, some not. Those associations fit together to make a more or less consistent discursive pattern. Each party to a conflict operates with some sort of a pattern of this kind. Decoding that pattern can give some hints as to what is necessary to avoid violent conflict. (p. 34)

Therefore, the analysis of military discourse can elucidate some of the reasons why the memory construction of the dictatorship period continues to be a topic of conflict in the Uruguay of today.

The previous analysis shows us that certain thematic cores exist that characterize military discourse about the period: permanent war, the defense of *western and Christian* values for the maintenance of society and the mission of the Armed Forces as safe-guarders of the nation and *typical* values of the society (see Perelli 1987 for more detail about this theme from the sociological point of view). The characteristics of this discourse include:

- a. the definition of the institutional identity in opposition to that of the Other.
- b. the Other is represented as all that is abject, different, and deviant.
- c. the participants are evaluated in terms of their capacity, normality, propriety (ethical) and tenacity.
- d. the Other is represented and appraised in negative terms compared with the military institution.
- e. the responsibility for the events described in the account is dissolved by linguistic mechanisms such as passivization, nominalization, and the impersonalization of actors.
- f. the military aims to make an objective record of the historical events through appellation to the discourse of the Other.
- g. metaphors related to war and disease are used to characterize the situation and the participants.

The representation in these texts of the order that the Armed Forces have to preserve is characteristic of the representation existent in the military discourses of the Armed Forces in South America. According to the sociologist Carina Perelli (1991a):

When it sees itself obligated to explicitly formulate this representation [that of the order to be maintained], the military institution tends to assimilate society with a living organism, in which all the parts are necessarily interrelated in order to complete its functions and in which the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. In this vision, the conflict tends to be perceived as an invasion, as an infection that must be stopped so that it does not extend to the rest of the social body. The similes are therefore systemic and organic. The degree of elaboration is not too high,

because what the force wants to defend is not so much Capitalism with a capital C but what it calls 'our style of living', a kind of idealized vision of the status quo corrected and bettered to promote a maximum harmony between the inhabitants of the republic. (p. 7)⁵⁷

So, in some way the military discourse seems to show the institution as a misunderstood defender of society. The society's misunderstanding creates the need to construct an argument that justifies the action of the body. A double discourse appears to exist in which on one side the institution is represented as a central and founding part of the nation and on the other side as a group that must look inside to strengthen and protect itself from external aggression. This discourse presented in the texts as a response to the *defamatory campaign* towards the country and the institution also functions as a discourse that reinforces the institution's identity as a body that strengthens the *sprit de corps*. What this means at the ideological level in the struggles over memory is that the Armed Forces as a social actor remains isolated from the rest of the political actors even though it continues to have political power by being one of the repressive state apparatuses (Althusser 1984). This dichotomy points towards how military discourse may have influence in the political discussions about themes related with the dictatorship even when legally the military officers do not have an authorized voice to participate in this discussion.

57. "Cuando se ve obligada a formular explícitamente esta representación [la del orden a mantener], la institución militar tiende a asimilar a la sociedad con un organismo vivo, en el que todas las partes están necesariamente interrelacionadas para cumplir su función y en el que el todo es superior a la mera suma de las partes. En esta visión, el conflicto tiende a ser percibido como una invasión, como una infección que hay que detener para que no se extienda al resto del cuerpo social. Los símiles son así sistémicos y orgánicos. Su grado de elaboración no es demasiado alto, porque lo que la fuerza quiere defender no es tanto el Capitalismo con mayúscula sino lo que llama 'nuestro estilo de vida', una suerte de visión idealizada del status quo corregido y mejorado para fomentar una mayor armonía entre los habitantes de la república" (p. 7).

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of editorials of a military magazine, *El Soldado* (1986–1996)

The Armed Forces remain firm and united against wind and sea.

El Soldado (August-December 1996)

This chapter investigates the Armed Forces as an institution, focusing on how the institution's beliefs and conception of itself are manifested in one of its internal organs of communication, the magazine *El Soldado*. The selected texts represent the voice of the institution that appears in the editorials of its representative organs without them being de-authorized by military authorities. It is important to remember however that dissident discourses exist within whatever political community – but these discourses do not constitute the institution's *official* discourse. According to Perelli (1987), in order to determine which is the official discourse of a political community, such as the military community,

one can assume that those discourses that emanate from officials and, especially, from the highest ranking officials, are “more official” than the rest of the messages emanating from the body.

On the other hand, in a community that acts with the spirit of a body, trying to cement internal unity and, at the same time, demonstrate a united profile towards the exterior, one can suppose, without fear of errors, that those discourses that appear in the representational organs of the armed forces form part of the discourse commonly accepted by them. In other words, such messages integrate the fabric of meanings shared by the members of the military community. This does not imply that within the forces there do not exist other types of discourse, including dissident discourses, nor that those discourses that appear in such organs are completely shared by all members of the military community. (p. 17)¹

1. “puede presuponerse que aquellos discursos que emanan de la oficialidad y, en especial, de la oficialidad de mayor graduación, son “más oficiales” que el resto de los mensajes emanados del cuerpo.

Por otra parte, en una comunidad que actúa con espíritu de cuerpo, tratando de cimentar la unidad interna y, a la vez, demostrar un perfil unitario hacia el exterior, puede suponerse, sin temor a errores, que aquellos discursos que aparecen en los órganos representacionales de la fuerzas armadas forman parte del discurso comúnmente aceptado de éstas. En otras palabras, tales mensajes integran el tejido de significaciones compartidas por los miembros de la comunidad militar. Ello no

So, when investigating the characteristics of the discourse in the publication *El Soldado* one can assume that what it represents is part of the dominant ideology of the institution. The constructions of the dictatorial past appearing in this publication therefore index the military institution's predominant ideological positions.

This chapter represents a critical analysis of Uruguayan military discourse in texts of the magazine *El Soldado*. The texts were produced in the period spanning from the latter part of 1986 to the middle of 1996 in the context of discussions about the military's role in human rights violations during the last dictatorship (1973–1985). An analysis of these texts illustrates the changes in the construction of the past and the representation of social actors in military discourse in relation to the variations in the country's socio-historical situation. However, what is most important to point out is the predominance of the Armed Forces' institutional message. This message appears even in informal spheres such as the magazine *El Soldado*, which would conceivably lend itself to the incorporation of dissident voices within the institution.

The Uruguayan military acted as a stratum or class during the dictatorship and still does so today when constructing the memory of this period. The analysis of Carlos Quijano (1989) about military action at the beginning of the coup illustrates this point.

As one might have noticed, this military enterprise, in contrast to others, does not have a face. There is no leader. There is no man that confronts, decides, and responds. The one that acts is the military stratum. Aguerrondo came and went, Cristi came and went, the Zubía family came and went and with them many others. And until very recently, until the ambition of general Alvarez could break the ring of peers in two, the stratum, in contrast to that which occurred and still occurs in Brazil and Argentina, maintained or put civil puppets in the presidency. The president doesn't fall within the organization, like a Pinochet. The despotism of a stratum that is subject to strict discipline is more solid and dangerous than the depotism of a man. And it must be recognized that the Armed Forces have known how to maintain their unity during these ten years. The task with the utmost priority is to break this stratum in order to transform it. Or we will know the road of other countries of our America: that of Bolivia, that of Argentina. (p. 373)²

implica que dentro de las fuerzas no existan otros tipos de discurso, incluyendo discursos disidentes, ni que los que aparecen en tales órganos sean plenamente compartidos por todos los miembros de la comunidad militar" (p.17).

2. *"Como se habrá reparado, esta empresa militar, a diferencia de otras, no tiene cara. No hay un caudillo. No es un hombre el que afronta, decide y responde. Es el estamento militar, el que actúa. Aguerrondo pasó, Cristi pasó, los Zubía pasaron y con ellos muchos otros. Y hasta hace bien poco, hasta que la ambición del general Alvarez pudo romper a medias el cerco de sus pares, el estamento a diferencia de lo que ocurrió y ocurre en Brasil y Argentina, mantuvo o puso en la presidencia a un civil títere. No cabe en la organización, al parecer un Pinochet. Es más sólido y peligroso el*

The military institution as a social actor continues defending its actions and participating as a collective agent. Institutional memory is created and recreated according to the needs of the institution in the new political panorama. Through its official and unofficial organs the stratum reproduces and transmits its social memory of the period to the institution's new members. Although these new members did not participate directly in the events, today they need to assume the group's history as their own in order to construct their identity as group members. The institution's collective action coincides with a discourse that tends not to explicitly signal social actors. Instead it dilutes responsibilities and constructs events as moral dilemmas more than as confrontations between groups with clear political interests.

Perelli (1986) maintains that military officers are the only sector that assumes responsibility for the events leading to the coup, opposite to what the rest of the political community does. In contrast, this analysis shows that the military officers in fact do not assume responsibility for the situation that led to the coup d'état in 1973. They do not assume responsibility because they maintain that they followed the orders of the constitutional government upon participating in *the fight against the subversion* (see the previous chapter). Neither do they assume responsibility with respect to the human rights violations that occurred during the dictatorship.

Socio-historical context

The following chronology of historical events serves as a contextualization to aid the understanding of the socio-historical circumstances in which the texts analyzed in this chapter were produced and interpreted.

After twelve years of the authoritarian regime in Uruguay (1973–1985) the democratic transition was loaded with significant debates about the process of prosecution and/or resolution of the responsibilities for human rights violations during the dictatorship.

During the first democratic government after the dictatorship a law was passed (Num. 15.737) that granted general amnesty for political crimes. This law, called "law of national pacification", explicitly excluded amnesty for those crimes committed by armed political functionaries. Article 5 of the law states:

Remaining excluded from the amnesty are offenses committed by police or military functionaries, equated to or assimilated to the institution, that were authors,

despotismo de un estamento sometido a estricta disciplina que el de un hombre. Y debe reconocerse que las Fuerzas Armadas han sabido mantener su unidad durante estos diez años. La tarea prioritaria es romper a ese estamento para transformarlo. O conoceremos el camino de otros países de nuestra América: el de Bolivia, el de Argentina" (p. 373).

coauthors, or accomplices of inhumane, cruel, degrading treatments or of the detention of persons later disappeared and for those persons who may have concealed any of said conducts. (Urioste 1986: 8)

This solution did not seem to totally satisfy the military institution, which felt its actions during the dictatorship were not being supported by the political power.

During 1986 when some military officers accused of human rights violations were called to face justice, these acted en masse and did not go to court. The military commanders resisted civil justice. This reaction of challenge to civil justice by the military institution was one of the first indications of differences in how to resolve the pending accounts of the dictatorship period in the new democratic environment. At the political party level, politicians tried to solve the problem by making legislation about how to treat the crimes committed by functionaries of the Armed Forces during the dictatorship. After various failed attempts at reaching a consensus between all political forces, law Num. 15.848 was approved, also known as the *Law of Expiry of the punitive aims of the state*. This law established a kind of amnesty for those responsible for illicit acts (inhumane crimes) during the dictatorship. On the 22nd of December, 1986, the Law of Expiry was approved, causing attempts to explain the crimes committed by military functionaries during the dictatorship to be abandoned. However, this law included an article, number 4, that indicated the responsibility and obligation of the government to investigate what had occurred with disappeared detainees.

After this law was passed, a campaign to collect the necessary signatures to call a referendum to suspend the law began. A multiparty commission that included family members of disappeared detainees, human rights groups, unions, and political personalities among others, organized this campaign and worked for more than a year to gather the required number of signatures (25% of those eligible to vote) to call a plebiscite to repeal the law. The plebiscite was carried out on April 16th, 1989, in the middle of a polarized campaign that was not divided according to traditional party lines. The discussion about which solution (repeal or amendment of the law) was the most adequate in the political situation of the moment created great controversies in all spheres of civic discussion. On the one side there were the supporters of the repeal of the law, green vote, who searched for the possibility of investigating and prosecuting the crimes committed during the dictatorship. On another side, there was the national government, the military institution and the citizenship that considered the topic exhausted, yellow vote. The debates about the resolution of this controversy, of how to come to terms with the dictatorial past and reach a joint reconciliation of society, were influenced by political events on the other side of *Río de la Plata*. During this period the crisis of Holy Week in Argentina occurred in which military demands put democracy in danger.

The plebiscite resulted in the ratification of the law but not by a very large margin (in the capital, the repeal of the law triumphed). The political system silenced the debate about human rights during the following seven years. In 1995, the topic again reappears through a demand for truth about the past instigated by Senator Rafael Michelini (son of Senator Zelmar Michelini, assassinated in Argentina in 1976). This demand coincided with events occurring in Argentina in which the Armed Forces, through the person of Gen. Balza, assumed responsibility for the human rights violations that occurred during Argentina's dictatorship. Added to this assumption of responsibility are the declarations of Scilingo that were the first acceptances on the part of the Argentinean military institution of its illegal activity during the dictatorship period.

In 1996, a series of events begin to arise, among them a complaint of the press (the magazine *Posdata*³ of February 16th) in relation to the observance of article 4 of the Law of Expiry that obligated the government to search for information about the disappeared. In April of the same year, the *Junta Departamental de Colonia* (state assembly) resolves unanimously for the placement of a commemorative plaque for six unidentified cadavers encountered in *Río de la Plata* during the dictatorship. This action is the first official recognition in Uruguay of the existence of the disappeared. Added to these events are declarations of various political groups demanding that the government comply with article 4 of the Law of Expiry. The highest military officials interpret these demands as a search of revisionism and revenge making explicit reference to these events in public ceremonies (i.e. the Day of the Fallen Heroes in Defense of the Institutions.⁴ The party of the government (Colorado party, president Sanguinetti) and some conservative sectors of the National party express the opinion that the topic has already been addressed by the law and the plebiscite and that there is no new information to resolve the issue.

Motivated by a report to ex-members of the services of intelligence of the navy (FUSNA) realized by the magazine *Posdata* (26th of April of 1996), one of those implicated in such declarations, Captain Tróccoli, responds publicly. His

3. The magazine *Posdata* was a weekly publication directed by Flores Silva, a journalist and ex-politician with liberal ideology that had a critical position towards his party (Colorado) and towards the social situation. This magazine was characterized by the style of political investigatory journalism. The magazine functioned for several years and was closed recently for problems of economic solvency.

4. The 14th of April is a date in which the *fallen in the fight against the sedition* are remembered according to military celebration, re-baptized as a remembrance of those *fallen in the fight for the defense of the institutions* during the first democratic government. Every year there is a commemoration in which the military participates and to which some functionaries of the government attend. See the work of Aldo Marchesi (2000 and 2002) about this commemoration.

declarations are the first on the part of non-dissident Uruguayan military officers⁵ in which participation in human rights violations is admitted. These events remobilize the population to again introduce the topic into the arena of political discussion. On May 20th, 1996, political sectors and social organizations call a march of remembrance for the victims of the dictatorship.

The three historical moments selected here to analyze military discourse are: the passage of the Law of Expiry, the plebiscite, and the demands for investigation into the fate of the disappeared. The topic of human rights violations and the military's responsibility for them is part of the public discussion in each of these historical moments. Five texts from the editorials of the magazine *El Soldado* were selected, published by the *Centro Militar*,⁶ a social organization that gathers functionaries of the army. The magazine appears for the first time in 1974 and is still published today. In its first editorial the publication presents itself as an organ of diffusion of interests, information, and culture related to the *profession and the fatherland*. It tries to respond to the needs of the period that the country lives in, a period in which they try to recuperate *lost values*. Its audience is *the soldier and the civil citizen*. It is a free publication that can be obtained in the *Centro Militar*.

Intertextuality

The citation or reference to other texts is in itself a political act that contributes to the formation of a community. Likewise, the *non-recognition* of the existence of other texts or voices in a discourse constitutes a political act. These decisions that signal how meanings are constructed in a community contribute to the formation of the institution's identity. According to Lemke (1995a: 10), "Each community within it has its own *system of intertextuality*: its own set of important or valued texts, its own preferred discourses, and particularly its own habits of deciding which texts should be read in the context of which others, and why, and how." In the case of the military community, established discursive practices exist that guide the institution's process of memory construction.

5. The first declarations of a dissident member of the Uruguayan Armed Forces were those of Daniel Rey Piuma, who realized denunciations in the 1980s about the human rights violations during the dictatorship. His testimonial was published in 1994 by TAE, *Un marino acusa*.

6. The *Centro Militar* represents the hard line within the Armed Forces. The majority of the authorities of this club were involved in the coup d'état of 1973 and participated officially in the military government. This club has made public declarations that challenged the position of the democratic government and vindicated military action during the dictatorship at the same time that they left clear that the corporation would protect its members.

The institution constructs its official discourse about the dictatorship (both the events and the institution's role in them) by way of the continual appeal to and re-contextualization of an argumentative line produced during the dictatorship (see Chapter Three). Therefore by way of direct and indirect references to other texts the social beliefs of the group can be taken as already known and in this way used as arguments or a foundation for the generation of institutional discourse (van Dijk 1999).

The analysis of these editorials from the *El Soldado* magazine provides information both about how the military discourse recontextualizes the institution's *official* memory and how the discourse is in dialogue with the discourse of Others. With respect to references to internal discourse, re-contextualizations are observed in the following aspects:

- a. Metaphors of the war (e.g.: the war continues at the ideological level).
- b. Recycling of argumentative strategies (the same anecdotes recur as evidence to support the argumentation. E.g.: the anecdotes about Pascasio Báez and the *fallen heroes in the fight against the sedition*).
- c. Use of presuppositions about the great narrative of the *cold war* (e.g. *the threat of international communism*).
- d. Reformulation of the constitutional government's call for action that led the Armed Forces to participate in the *fight against the sedition*.

This military discourse is also a response to the discourse of the left and of human rights organizations. It locates itself in the debate for memory together with the discourse of the right and the more conservative sectors of the traditional parties. The form of argumentation and the interpretations position themselves within the rhetoric of the War or of the *two demons* prevalent in the official discourse.⁷ The Maniquean or dualistic interpretation of the dictatorship period that distributed roles between *good* and *bad* is not superseded in this discourse, however, the appearance of other voices in this discourse shows that the interpretation of this period in the political debate is much more complex.

In the case of the texts analyzed here, the struggle for memory appears in the coexistence of different voices in the discourse. These different voices appear through direct or indirect citation of the discourse of others. The editorials are a product of intertextuality; they are a discourse within another (Voloshinov 1973). In these texts a weaving of connections occurs between different discourses across time. From the historical perspective the texts analyzed here are related to each other at the level of the topic they treat, the events they refer to, and the narratives they evoke. These

7. See the work for the Program of Collective Memory in the Southern Cone of the Social Science Research Council carried out by Alvaro de Giorgi (2000) about the rhetoric of one of the representatives of the traditional parties, Julio María Sanguinetti.

texts not only reflect the voice of the military institution and the *official history* of the period and its protagonists but also the conflictive discourses that contest this hegemonic vision. The discourse of the Other (for example that of human rights organizations or of supporters of the abolition of amnesty for military officers) appears in these texts in direct or indirect form in order to legitimize or serve the argumentation in the military's memory construction.⁸ The integration of these discourses in the texts is a demonstration of the social conflict present in the community about how to remember and construct the memory of the dictatorship period.

These editorials reflect a re-contextualization or pluri-recontextualization of diverse social discourses about the same event (Martínez Vizcarrondo 1999).

For example:

- (1) The so-called Law of Expiry of the punitive aims of the state, of the 22nd of last December, has tried to give a definitive solution to the grave situation provoked by the penal charges formulated against members of the Armed and Police Forces. (January-February 1987)⁹

In this example, the author makes reference to the judicial charges of human rights violations brought against the institution that military officers individually and as a group discounted, thereby challenging the judicial power and independence of the new democratic order.

8. This argumentative strategy is characteristic of the military institution from the dictatorship period when in order to justify its actions it utilized materials of the *enemy* as evidence for its argument. Texts like *Las Fuerzas Armadas al Pueblo Oriental* (1976) construct their argument utilizing materials produced by the *Other*, be they the *Tupamaros* or other Marxist groups. In the introduction to this work this argumentative strategy is specified as follows:

“The principal source of information consists of the seditious themselves, for what they are and for what they say in their documents, confiscated in countless procedures and that in objective form allow one to know the unspeakable nature of the organization from the theoretical point of view, since, from the practical point of view, the reality took care of doing it with unsurpassable eloquence.

It is the testimony of the very subversion that is permanently present in the pages of this work. They are the words of the insurgents, their ideas, their opinions, their appreciations/considerations, those that they gather. It is the seditious movement that speaks, through its multiple modes of expression, with its particular language and philosophy” (p. 1).

The difference in the editorials analyzed here is that as time passes the reference to the discourse of the other becomes more indirect, social actors or organizations are not named rather generic terms such as *subversive* are used or they appear as references to the actions of the other without mentioning them.

9. “La denominada ley de caducidad de la pretensión punitiva del estado, del 22 de diciembre pasado, ha procurado dar solución definitiva a la grave situación provocada por las denuncias penales formuladas contra integrantes de las Fuerzas Armadas y Policiales” (enero-febrero 1987).

- (2) Today we are attacked, we are offended, we are incriminated in events already resolved. They try in all forms to get us to break our silence...

(May-July 1996)¹⁰

In this case, the author makes reference to the petitions brought to the government on the part of the press and Senator Rafael Michelini, demanding compliance with article 4 of the *Law of Expiry*. This article stipulates that the government must investigate cases of citizens that disappeared during the dictatorship period.

As time passes and the discussion of the topic becomes more complex, the arguments pass from being direct references to actors and events to abstractions of the same actors and events. The conflicts between different social actors trying to construct the social memory of the dictatorship period are recreated, negotiated, and changed in the dialogue of one discourse with the other. The examples cited previously demonstrate how the discourse of the Other is incorporated and at the same time evaluated and criticized in the creation of the military institution's own argumentation.

The re-contextualizations that the editorials construct and integrate into the texts are utilized in the process of legitimization of military practice and of its discourse about the responsibilities in human rights violations during the dictatorship.

Genre: the editorial

Institutional memory appears in various aspects of military discourse; texts produced by the military being one of such aspects. Selected here, as the focus of analysis, are editorials from an unofficial military publication because they are a genre in which the author's opinion is most directly expressed. Another reason for this selection is that by being manifestations of the *civil façade* of the military officers these editorials could potentially show differences with the institution's official position.

According to van Dijk (1988, 1996) editorial opinions are explicit and dominant, formulated from the point of view of the journalist or the periodical. These opinions tend to be defended by a series of arguments, and therefore an editorial has an argumentative structure. This argumentation is not only defensive but also persuasive. The editorial aims to contribute to the formation of the reader's opinion (van Dijk 1996; Bolívar 1998). The editorials are one of the mechanisms of expression and reproduction of the institution's social memory of the dictatorship period.

10. "Ahora se nos ataca, se nos pretende ofender, se nos incriminan hechos ya laudados. Se pretende de todas formas que rompamos el silencio" (mayo-julio 1996).

A prototypical editorial, according to van Dijk (1996), aims to comment on current events and is constituted by the following sections: a summary of the event, an evaluation of the event (especially of the actions and the actors) and a pragmatic conclusion that includes a recommendation or a warning. The characteristics of this genre at the lexico-grammar level include (Bolívar 1994; 1998):

- a. the use of personal pronouns and markers that identify the writer
- b. the use of resources of modality to express the writer's opinion with respect to the events
- c. the use of evaluation
- d. the variation of verbal tenses (generally in this genre the last section returns to the present)
- e. the use of temporal adjuncts in order to organize the text (above all in the *summary* section)
- f. the use of rhetorical questions to give information in an evaluative manner or to evaluate information already given.

The selected editorials have as a goal the construction of a version of the historical events related to the dictatorship. The following table (Table 1) analyzes the functional sections by which these texts are organized.

Table 1. Editorials (genre analysis by functional constituents)

Text 1 January-February 1987	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation of the topic (principal argument): support of the Law of expiry. - evaluation of the argument: summary of the military institution's opinions. - recognition of the problems of the position supported by the principal argument: it doesn't vindicate the heroic deed of the Armed Forces - critique of the opposing argument: it creates a climate of chaos, does not search for reconciliation - evidence and support of the principal argument: moral validity, support of the Commander and Chief of the Army. - conclusion: reiteration of the motives to support the argument: identity of the aims of the institution and the nation. Mission of the Armed Forces
------------------------------------	---

Text 2 April-May 1987	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation of the topic (principal argument): questioning of the reactions against the law of expiry - evaluation of the law - counter-argument: response to the discourse of the Other. Through listing the effects of the questioning of the law in the military 'family' and questioning the opposition's actions. - conclusion: compromise with the institution and reaffirmation of its defense in adverse situations.
Text 3 April 1989	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation of the topic (principal argument): evaluation of the results of the plebiscite - evaluation of the results - chronology of the events that led to the plebiscite as support of the argument - evaluation of the meaning of the results - response to other interpretations of the results (counter-argumentation) - conclusion: skepticism about the future of the topic of human rights
Text 4 January-April 1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation of the topic (principal argument): memory construction, commemoration of the day of "the fallen heroes in the fight against the sedition" - anecdotes that support the principal argument - conclusion: reaffirmation of the importance of remembering this date and its meaning
Text 5 May-July 1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation of the topic (principal argument): the value of silence - evaluation of the silence - response to those that question these values or this position - supporting evidence for the principal argument: laws, support of the government and the citizenship - conclusion: exhortation to respect the results of the plebiscite and close the debate on the topic.

The previous table shows how a classic argumentative structure exists in these editorials, although there are variations in its instantiation. What these texts have in common on the generic level, in addition to having the same communicative aim, is that they are constituted by:

- a. a principal topic, an evaluation of the situation or the argument
- b. a counter-argument (optional)
- c. a presentation of evidence that supports the argument
- d. a conclusion.

This description of the editorials permits one to see their argumentative character at the macro-level. How this argumentative structure is realized at the discourse-semantic and lexico-grammar levels is investigated in the following section.

Textual analysis

Through discourse an institution constructs its interpretation of history and the webs of relationships it has with other social actors. The group's collective experiences represent the institution's mnemonic material. Here the collective group experience of interest is that of the institution's actions during the dictatorship and the shared representation of the dictatorship; the social memory the institution has of this event. The discussion about how to interpret the meaning of the events that occurred in the dictatorship, such as the actions of different social actors, is the thematic core that unites the editorials analyzed in this chapter. The relationship between the situational context and the linguistic options represented in these texts reveals the following characteristics:

- a. All of the texts treat different aspects of the same topic: the institution's actions during the dictatorship period.
- b. A closeness to the audience is constructed in which the relationship between the participants (the authors and the readers) is represented as one between equals (the writing is done for members of the military institution)
- c. Also the relationship between participants is represented as one based in a power difference (it is a hierarchical institution and those that write belong to a select group).
- d. The language is informal although it demonstrates a sophisticated vocabulary and in some cases it experiments with styles (text 5 aims to be more philosophical and universal in contrast to the other texts that are more direct and concrete in style).
- e. The language has a rhetorical style that brings it close to the characteristics of oral language.

In what follows, table 2, the characteristics of each text are described in more detail in relation to the contextual variables that affect the options at the linguistic level.

Table 2. Analysis of situational context (register)

	Text 1 January- February 1987	Text 2 April-May 1987	Text 3 April 1989	Text 4 January-April 1996	Text 5 May-July 1996
Field	Approval of the law of expiry	Questioning by the opposition of the law of expiry	Results of the plebiscite about the law of expiry	Construction of memory: commemoration of the day of “the fallen heroes in the fight against the sedition”	Importance of the maintenance of silence with respect to the questionings of the memory of the period
Tenor	Moderate distance between the participants. The reader is not directly interpellated, the text speaks impersonally in the name of the institution	Close/minimal distance between the participants They are “members of the military family”	Close/minimal distance between participants. They are “comrades”	Moderate distance between the participants. They are exhorted to action but they are not appealed to directly. Impersonal Discourse.	Moderate distance between the participants. Impersonal discourse with a philosophical tone. Members of the same group but with hierarchical differences.
Mode	Texts written to be read but with rhetorical characteristics that bring them close to the oral side of the oral-written continuum. They are reflexive texts with an exhortative character at the same time. Texts to be read by a reader that belongs to the institution.				

Construction of the experience (ideational meaning)

This part of the analysis proposes to investigate how the military discourse constructs the socio-historical reality and how it presents the social actors in relation to their participation in the events of the last dictatorship. These meanings are investigated in lexico-grammar and rhetorical aspects of the texts, specifically, by way of transitivity and mode (Halliday 1994), overlexification (Halliday 1978; Fowler et al. 1979), argumentation (Van Eemeren et al. 1997), and discursive strategies (Wodak 1997, 2000). In this way one can see how certain aspects of the discourse show the options of the agents that construct them – in this case the Uruguayan military officers. The marking of agency through the selection of predicates or syntactic constructions such as the passive voice; the lexical selection and strategies of

positive self-presentation or negative presentation of others, the arguments and rhetoric favorable or unfavorable utilized to present the social actors, represent specific characteristics of the discourse that express the institutional ideology.¹¹

This analysis identifies the types of verbal processes used in the five selected texts to describe actions and the type of participant to which these actions are attributed. Table 3 shows a summary of the process type selected in each of the texts. The majority of the texts select material verbs that express an action, creation, or event. For example:

- (3) the said law has reactivated the attack against the Armed Forces...
(April-May 1987)¹²
- (4) At the end of May before last, the *Consejo Arbitral del Sindicato Médico*, resolved to expulse Tte. Cnel. (SSM) Dr. Nelson Marabotto....
(April-May 1987)¹³

Table 3. Representation and agency (Transitivity)

Type of process	Material	Relational	Mental	Verbal	Existential	N
Text 1 January-February 1987	14	2	3	1	0	20
Text 2 April-May 1987	11	14	5	4	0	34
Text 3 April 1989	20	4	9	2	0	35
Text 4 January-April 1996	26	18	2	0	0	46
Text 5 May-July 1996	9	8	2	0	1	20

11. It is necessary to clarify here that discourse is not the only process of expression and reproduction of memory or institutional ideology.

12. "la ley referida ha reactivado el ataque a las fuerzas armadas..." (abril-mayo 1986)

13. "A fines de mayo próximo pasado, el Consejo Arbitral del Sindicato Médico, resolvió expulsar al Tte. Cnel. (SSM) Dr. Nelson Marabotto..." (abril-mayo 1987).

Material processes require a participant as an actor or agent of the action they represent. In spite of having selected primarily material process that require an agent, these texts utilize linguistic resources that signal impersonality (e.g.: passive reflexive, passive voice, nominalizations, etc.) in order to avoid directly naming the agent. For example:

- (5) Nowadays we are attacked, we are offended, we are incriminated in events already resolved. (May-July 1996)¹⁴
- (6) In effect our Armed Forces, victorious in the struggle against the unpatriotic forces of the Marxist subversion were accused of supposed Human Rights violations... (April 1989)¹⁵
- (7) The ethics of the National commission and its impartiality, will continue to be questioned... (April-May 1987)¹⁶

The use of these linguistic resources permits the dilution of responsibility for the historical events represented in the texts. Table 4 presents a detailed description of participant choices with material verbs in all texts.

The use of transformations, passivization and nominalization, permit the objectivization and lexification of actions in order to convert them into impersonal participants. In this manner the authors of the texts avoid direct reference to social actors. The effect of this type of text on the institutional audience is the reaffirmation of the assumed roles in the grand institutional narrative of the dictatorship. The military officers have the role of *defenders of the fatherland and the institutions* while the Others, absent participants in the text, have the role of *enemies of the fatherland and democracy*. By not directly mentioning the agents in the narrative the texts reaffirm the institution's official version. The authors take it for granted that the reader already knows which actors are responsible for the events.

14. "Hoy en día se nos ataca, se nos pretende ofender se nos incriminan hechos ya laudados" (mayo-julio 1996).

15. "En efecto nuestras FF.AA. victoriosas en la lucha librada contra las fuerzas apátridas de la subversión marxista fuieron acusadas de supuestas violaciones a los DD.HH. ..." (April 1989)

16. La ética de la comisión Nacional y su ecuanimidad, seguirán siendo cuestionadas " (abril-mayo 1987).

Table 4. Participants (actor/agent) selected with material verbs

Participants	We (the Armed Forces)	Inclusive we (+ audience)	They	Impersonal	N
Text 1 January-February 1987	1	0	1 (opposition)	12	14
Text 2 April-May 1987	4	0	3 (opposition)	5	11
Text 3 April 1989	2	0	1	17	30
Text 4 January-April 1996	5	2	4 (fallen heroes)	15	26
Text 5 May-July 1996	1	0	1 (opposition)	7	9

Although the historical events are described for the most part without directing the reader's attention to the responsibilities for them, this does not mean that responsibility is not attributed in the texts. Indeed there are specific examples in which the Others are blamed for aggressions towards the armed institution. For example in text 2 (April-May 1987) the *enemies* of the Armed Forces are mentioned directly,

- (8) The ethics of the National Commission [National Commission of Medical Ethics] previously mentioned and its impartiality will continue to be questioned as long as the murderers of the laborer Pascasio Báez are not brought to justice. Pascasio Báez was killed by a doctor and a medical student with an overdose of sodium thiopental, by the orders of the Commander of the Tupamaros Movement of National Liberation of the period (21-Dec-1971), who now has public professional activity in our society.
(April-May 1987)¹⁷

17. "La ética de la Comisión Nacional [comisión nacional de ética médica] referida y su ecuanimidad, seguirán siendo cuestionadas hasta tanto no juzguen a los asesinos del peón Pascasio Báez muerto por un médico y un estudiante de medicina, mediante una sobredosis de Pentotal, por orden del Comandante del Movimiento de Liberación Nacional Tupamaros de la época (21-Dic-1971) y que tiene ahora pública actuación profesional en nuestra sociedad" (abril-mayo 1987).

The Other social actors are the referents of institutional communication in an explicit or implicit manner.

The conversation directed to others [members of the institution] can be obliquely directed, in a wider social context, to the other social actors and in this way, be relevant not only semantically but also pragmatically... One can speak about the others as part of the group that is being spoken to or one can indirectly refer to them. (van Dijk 1999: 283)¹⁸

The military officers as *authors* of this social memory assign roles to the other participants in the events and evaluate their actions directly or indirectly.

The attitudes of the group with respect to its referents, the Others, can be seen in the lexical selection that is used to name the social actors present in the texts. Once the participants are identified, they are classified by a process of overlexification. This process represents the use of a large number of synonymous or almost-synonymous terms. Overlexification points to the areas of intense concern of the producer of a text (Trew 1979).

In text 1 (January-February 1987), the authors give priority to the terms referring to the Armed Forces, for example: *retired military officers, military institutions, military officers, military institution*, etc. This lexical selection coincides with the aim of vindicating military action during the dictatorship. Emphasis is placed on recuperating the bravery of the *heroic deed* of the Armed Forces in the war that the Constitutional Power would declare and that would commit the Armed Forces to face the conspiracy against the Fatherland. The institution's traditional argument¹⁹ is taken up again. This traditional argument emphasizes the professionalism and exploits of the military officers and their service to the fatherland and its institutions within the framework of legality.

Text 2 (April-May 1987) shows an almost equal number of terms referring to the Armed Forces and to the *subversives*. This finding could be explained as a result of the institution's interest in responding to the open judicial investigations against the Armed Forces through the realization of direct accusations to its *enemies*.

In text 3 (April 1989), synonymous or almost synonymous terms appear that refer to four participant social actors in the referendum for the repeal of the Law

18. "La conversación dirigida a otros [miembros de la institución] puede estar oblicuamente dirigida, en un contexto social más amplio, a los otros actores sociales y de esta manera, ser relevante no tan sólo semánticamente sino también pragmáticamente. [] Se puede hablar sobre los otros como parte del grupo que se tiene en la mira o indirectamente referirse a ellos" (van Dijk 1999: 283).

19. See the texts produced by the Armed Forces during the 1970s in which the perspective of the institution with reference to the events that led to the coup d'état are presented. *Testimonio de una nación agredida* and *Las Fuerzas Armadas al Pueblo Oriental* are clear examples of this type of argumentation in which the labor of the institution in the *anti-subversive struggle* is exalted.

of Expiry (green vote members, the Armed Forces, yellow vote members, and the people/nation). These terms are almost equal in number. This lexical selection could be related to the necessity of directly criticizing the opposition at the same time as focusing attention on the Armed Force's own message in favor of the maintenance of the law.

In text 4 (January-April 1996), terms referring to the Institution and its allies return to proliferate, in this case *the fallen heroes or victims of the sedition*. The authors return to citing the institutional narrative's most symbolic date, April 14th, to re-inscribe the institution's human losses in the collective memory and to demonstrate in this way that the institution's role in this period was one of *soldiers/warriors* that gave their lives for the *defense of the institutions*. The authors refer to the *enemy* indirectly, and in this way the text's emphasis remains on the victimization of the *comrades*, on demonstrating the losses of the military institution.

Text 5 (May-July 1996) is characterized by a return to the use of terms referring to the military institution. For example: *servants of the Fatherland, we*, etc. The authors make almost no direct reference to any social actor, instead the reference is impersonal and general. The *government* and the *sovereign* are mentioned as allies but the Others are not mentioned, not even by way of euphemisms or synonyms. The fact the authors do not name the Others also reiterates the politics of *non-recognition* of a problem and is at the same time a strategy of attack or defense. In this way then the institution's members are exhorted to maintain silence in response to public demands, such as those made by Senator Rafael Micheli and some organisms of the press that called for the investigation into the fate of the citizens who disappeared during the dictatorship.

As the socio-political context changes the references to social actors through direct lexical selection or by way of synonyms becomes less and less frequent. References to social actors move from being direct references to the participants to being abstractions. This shift is realized by way of the nominalization and impersonalization of the participants. The Other is substituted by categorizations according to the institution's evaluation of the Other as good or bad, for example: *subversives, enemies*. The Other is also substituted for characteristics related to its ideology or its profession, such as *Marxists, doctor, commander*.

Representation of the relationships between social actors (interpersonal meaning)

The attitudes of the institution towards itself and the other social actors referred to in the texts are also marked by way of discursive options. To construct the

relationships between the participants and the institution or its attitude with respect to the message itself, linguistic resources such as the following are used:

- a. the use of modal auxiliaries that express obligation, possibility or expectation
For example:

(9) The manifest legislative intention of ‘concluding the transition towards full effect of the Constitutional Order’, will now have to confront the actions of unconstitutionality brought before the Supreme Court of Justice and the agitation of those that proclaim themselves irreconcilable enemies of the national Armed Forces. (January-February 1987)²⁰

- b. The use of verbs that indicate the speaker’s attitude with respect to the message (seem, believe, feel, desire, etc.).

For example:

(10) We hope that these circumstances have not too greatly injured the ‘National being’ nor its GOOD SENSE, and that in the next editorial we will be able to comment that the citizenship’s decision made it possible for the process of pacification, that the Military Family has contributed to greatly and selflessly for the good of the Nation, to continue. (April)²¹

- c. The type of clauses that are chosen (statement, question, command, etc.).

For example:

(11) This 14th of April we must renew the gratitude, we must return to recognize the example, we must return to honor these men, victims for having the profound convictions that protect all of our people, convictions that they represented when their lives were taken away. (January-April 1996)²²

In the editorials of *El Soldado* analyzed here, information is presented with certainty. The audience is interpolated as an equal professional with the use of the inclusive *we* or as an equal citizen with the use of the term *the people* or another

20. “La manifiesta intención legislativa de ‘concluir la transición hacia la plena vigencia del orden constitucional’, deberá enfrentar ahora las acciones de inconstitucionalidad planteadas ante la Suprema Corte de Justicia y la agitación de quienes se proclaman enemigos irreconcilables de las Fuerzas Armadas nacionales” (enero-febrero 1987).

21. “Esperemos que estas circunstancias no hayan lesionado demasiado el “Ser Nacional” ni su SENSATEZ y que en el próximo editorial podamos comentar, que la decisión de la ciudadanía, hizo posible la continuidad del proceso de pacificación a la que la Familia Militar ha contribuido grande y sacrificadamente para bien de la Nación” (abril 1989).

22. “Este 14 de abril debemos hacer renacer el agradecimiento, debemos volver a reconocer el ejemplo, debemos volver a honrar a estos hombre víctimas por tener las profundas convicciones que abrigan a todo nuestro pueblo y que a él representaron cuando les quitaron la vida” (enero-abril 1996).

synonym. The antagonists are positioned as the Other, *them*, those that do not understand the people or who aim to advance political agendas representing *foreign ideas*. The texts justify or legitimize the discrimination or exclusion of the Others through discursive strategies that include (Wodak 1997):

d. the construction of a discourse of difference (a discourse of the *us*).

For example:

(12) in the last bimester, actions coming from different areas of the national life have been noted, actions that converge unfavorably on the military family that constitutes our social mass. (April-May 1987)²³

(13) Referring to the one who adjusts to his convictions, the ability to maintain silence is a true virtue, although not difficult to accomplish when the formative base of discipline of our profession imposes it of us. (May-July 1987)²⁴

A definition of the group as a *family* or as a team of *professionals* is constructed, evoking emotive and intellectual aspects in order to differentiate this group from the rest of the social actors present in the texts.

e. strategies of justification that allow the making of evaluations and assignments of responsibilities and blame.

For example:

(14) Thanks to it a chapter has closed in the life of the country, pulled by a historical milestone in which Uruguay has taken charge of rejecting the intent of Marxist initiative, that aimed to destroy its Armed Forces. (April 1989)²⁵

The institution is presented as a victim of discrimination and prejudice and the contrast between *us* and *them* is emphasized.

f. strategies of reference that permit the discrediting of the Other through the exaggeration and relativization of its narratives or discourse.

23. "Se ha notado en el ultimo bimestre, acciones provenientes desde distintas áreas del quehacer nacional, que convergen desfavorablemente sobre la familia militar que constituye nuestra masa social" (abril-mayo 1987).

24. "Referido al que se ajusta a sus convicciones, es una verdadera virtud el poder mantenerlo [el silencio], aunque no difícil de lograr cuando la disciplina base formativa de nuestra profesión, así nos lo impone." (mayo-julio 1996)

25. "Merced a ello se ha cerrado un capítulo en la vida del País, jalonado por un hito histórico en el que el Pueblo Oriental, se ha encargado de rechazar el intento de iniciativa marxista, que pretendió destruir sus FF.AA." (abril 1989).

For example:

- (15) because in addition to making affirmations and accusations about unproved events, it [the attack against the Armed Forces] is extended to the family members (April-May 1987)²⁶
- (16) In effect, our Armed Forces, victorious in the struggle against the unpatriotic forces of the Marxist subversion were accused of supposed violations of Human Rights. (April 1989)²⁷

Argumentative strategies

In the editorials of *El Soldado*, the audience is an actor or a spectator of the facts and political events involving the Armed Forces in the resolution of human rights violations committed during the dictatorship. The editorials intend to persuade the audience of a particular interpretation of the situation through the creation of sides and visions brought face to face with what is morally acceptable. The argumentation that exists in the public arena is recontextualized in these texts as a dispute about moral options more than about facts or historical events.

The arguments are presented as two opposing points of view. The protagonists are the social actors related with the Armed Forces and the *people*. The antagonists are the *Marxists* and those that accuse the Armed Forces of actions for which they do not assume responsibility. The texts also present implicit arguments, for example:

- (1) the existence of a *state of internal war* that justifies the institution's actions during the dictatorship
- (2) the continuation of the conflict between the opposing forces, the *patriots* vs. the *Marxists*
- (3) the identity between the will of the people and that of the Armed Forces.

This style of argumentation allows the creation of an institutional identity based in the social memory of the dictatorship period. The texts reproduce the institution's *official memory* through appeals to a common history that permits the integration of old and new members of the institution in a fight that continues in the present day. The texts portray a continuity of social roles, defenders and enemies of the fatherland, which were established during the dictatorship period. "A group and

26. "porque además de hacerse afirmaciones y acusaciones sobre hechos no probados, se extiende a los familiares [el ataque a las FF.AA.]"(abril-mayo 1987).

27. "En efecto, nuestras FF.AA. victoriosas en la lucha librada contra las fuerzas apátridas de la subversión marxista fueron acusadas de supuestas violaciones a los DD.HH." (abril 1989).

the others and their associated ideologies manifest and reproduce themselves precisely because of the *position* that their members take in situations of debate and conflict, and also in communication” (van Dijk 1999: 281).²⁸ The position that the institution takes in the public debate about how to resolve the dictatorship’s human rights violations reproduces its interpretation of the events as a conflict between two sides.

The editorials are the authorized voice of the institution that reaffirms its position and moral value. At the same time the editorials provide a space in which to respond to public criticisms of the institution while offering elements to the military community that could serve to form its argumentative discourse about the topic.

Conclusions

The Armed Forces is a social actor that reproduces the social memory of the dictatorship period as an *internal war*, where one of the aims is the maintenance of its place in the country’s political arena. The military discourse regarding the past changes structurally over time, but it maintains continuity at the level of the arguments it expresses. This continuity at the content level recontextualizes the institutional military arguments used during the dictatorship. But the presentation of this arguments includes a structural change (via transformations of passivization and nominalization) which is much evident upon contrasting the post-dictatorial texts with the dictatorial ones. That is to say that dictatorial texts make much more direct references to social actors and their persuasive intention is explicit. For example, in the text *Testimonio de una nación agredida* published by the *Comando General del Ejército* in 1978, the Communist Party and Rodney Arismendi, its principal leader, are mentioned directly as some of the agents responsible for the general deterioration of the social situation leading to the coup (see Chapter Three). In the editorials analyzed here references to the Others, even when they are sufficiently explicit, are not as direct. The *enemy* is never named only alluded to by its action or through references to particular historical events. Take for example the already cited case, example number 8, of assigning responsibility to the “commander of the *Tupumaros* Movement of National Liberation of the period” for the death of the laborer Pascasio Báez (text from 1987). In the last editorials not even these kinds of references appear and the authors only use impersonal constructions, for example:

28. “Un grupo y los otros y sus ideologías asociadas se manifiestan y reproducen a sí mismos precisamente por la “posición” que sus miembros toman en situaciones de debate y conflicto, y también en la comunicación” (van Dijk 1999: 281).

(17) we are attacked, we are offended ... (May-July 1996)²⁹

In the texts analyzed in this chapter, alliances appear between social actors that did not exist in the earlier texts. As the political context changes the military officers move from being *judges* and *critics* of the politicians and the traditional parties to being their *allies*. The first texts, that reflect the narrative prevalent in the dictatorship, isolate the institution from the rest of the political arena, which appears as *contaminated* or not morally equal to the military officers. The development of the events that follow the declaration of the *Law of Expiry* produce a change in alliances. The military officers begin to relax their rhetoric against political corruption and they encounter new *comrades* in the fight against *subversion*, a fight that is now re-encountered in the political left and human rights organizations. In this discourse constructing institutional memory, the historical facts that are cited as evidence to justify the argumentation of the institutional position are gradually silenced. The last editorials make reference to the necessity of maintaining silence and corporative discipline in response to demands for information about military activities during the dictatorship. This view could be the product of having realized that putting this information into circulation would not erase blame or clarify responsibilities, rather it would imply the need for additional excuses.

The diachronic perspective used in the analysis of these editorials in the magazine *El Soldado* reveals that changes in the socio-political context translate into transformations of the discursive practices utilized in the memory construction of the dictatorship period and of the military officers' responsibilities during the period. The argumentation is modified in relation to the changes in the political situation and these modifications can be perceived in the creation of new alliances that modify the roles of some protagonists. For example, the allies of the military officers vary according to how much more difficult the political situation makes it for the institution to maintain the argument that there were no human rights violations because the country was experiencing a state of war declared by the constitutional government. When the public debate delegitimizes this first argument, the argumentative strategy shifts towards an alliance with the political parties and the legislative solution instead of the antagonism with these participants that the earlier editorials exhibit.

It is also interesting to note the discursive strategies the texts' authors use (e.g. transformations like passivization, nominalization, and impersonalization) because these strategies realize ideological operations that make it difficult for a reader that does not share the institutional memory to perceive reality. These discursive strategies contribute to the construction of a text that requires an effort on

29. "se nos ataca, se nos pretende ofender ..." (mayo-julio 1996).

the part of the reader to recuperate absent information or presuppositions that permit the message's interpretation. As the message about the Armed Forces' responsibility in human rights violations during the dictatorship is recontextualized, the texts give different degrees of presupposition. The reader requires much more background information to be able to comprehend the messages presented in the most recent texts. The group's ideology is revealed by the editorial writers' choices of what to say, what to keep quiet, or what to take for granted as already known or understood by readers (Raiter 1999). This ideology emphasizes the moral evaluation of events over the definition of the same historical events. It wants to persuade the reader about how to evaluate the events more than it wants to explain what the events were.

The representation and selection of social actors also gives us information about which participants are considered relevant in these events and which participants have the right to a voice in this discussion. The fact that there is an almost complete absence of direct references to individuals or groups in connection with the construction of events related to verbal processes requiring an agent demonstrates the intention of not assigning responsibilities nor assuming them directly. The majority of social actors appear named as institutions (Armed Forces, the Government, the People) or indirectly by way of their characteristics or actions (subversive, Marxists, etc.). Since the texts are argumentative texts that try to enhance the military institution's image in response to the accusations received from the public arena, the majority of the texts portray the Armed Forces as participants and protagonists in opposition to various antagonists that do not even deserve to be directly identified. This linguistic resource allows the institution to dilute responsibility for events and to contrast itself with the discourse of its antagonists that tries to point out individual responsibility of members of the Armed Forces in addition to institutional responsibility.³⁰ No possible judicial solutions exist if the responsible individuals cannot be identified. In order to resolve this issue at the institutional or group level, political not judicial solutions are required. These characteristics of the argumentative development of the magazine *El Soldado* co-

30. It is interesting to stress here the difference in the argumentative style of one of the members of the institution that responded to the accusations at the individual level, the retired captain Tróccoli. In his testimony appearing as a letter to the editor of one of the periodicals of widest circulation, *El País*, this member of the institution resorts to the same material present in the collective institutional memory, the idea of a state of internal war that justified the actions of the institution. But the difference in this case is that instead of only holding the Other responsible for the occurred events he also held the institution responsible although justifying its actions through a situational ethics. Another important difference in this testimony is that human rights violations are admitted, a thing that is questioned in the institutional texts when they speak of *supposed violations of Human Rights*.

incide with historical and political analyses that have signaled the military's position as defender of the corporation and vindicators of the Armed Forces' action during the dictatorship. According to the historian Juan Rial (1986a: 35) "the messages coming from civil manifestations of military officers show that the defense of the corporative interests and of its autonomy are their principal objectives."³¹

The manipulation on the part of the writers of these editorials, as much for the information that they include as for the manner in which it is presented, indicates that memory construction at the institutional level is a process determined by time and social space in addition to politico-ideological interests. The memory construction in these texts represents a complex and dynamic process through which a social actor, the military officers, disputes the meaning of the past with other groups in order to legitimize its present positions.

In addition to showing how the institution's social memory is constructed, these texts demonstrate how an institutional identity is constructed that permits the definition of group membership. Belonging to the group supposes the sharing of a common history of experiences, interaction, and discourse. The transmission of the institutional memory is realized through the indoctrination of new generations, the monitoring of their social practices, the adaptation of the collective memory to contemporary social events, and through the distribution and formulation of the institutional ideology (van Dijk 1999). The magazine *El Soldado* functions as a political space, which transmits institutional discourse and reinforces group identity.

31. "los mensajes provenientes de manifestaciones civiles de los militares muestran que la defensa de los intereses corporativos y de su autonomía son sus principales objetivos."

CHAPTER 5

Individual memory

Analysis of the confession of a repressor

Monsters exist but they are too few in number to be truly dangerous; those that are really dangerous are the common men.

(Primo Levi, 2001)¹

This chapter presents a critical analysis of the discourse in a letter of confession by a retired captain of the Uruguayan navy. The text was produced in 1996 in the context of discussions about military officers' roles in human rights violations during the last dictatorship (1973–1985). Due to its testimonial style, the text can be classified as belonging to the genre of the confession. However, in this case the confessor evades his responsibility for the historical facts that he narrates presenting himself as a *common man* victim of the circumstances.

This text allows us to explore the connections between personal and institutional memory exemplifying how individual members internalize the military's collective memory. In this chapter, three discursive aspects are explored in order to investigate the theme of memory construction:

1. how the testimonial genre is manipulated in order to construct a historical memory that favors the image of the confessor;
2. how responsibility is assigned and/or evaded by way of discursive strategies;
3. what role the discourse has in the construction of collective memory.

Socio-historical context

The text analyzed here is a letter to the editor of the Uruguayan newspaper *El País*. The text dates from May 5th, 1996. The letter was written by retired Navy Captain Jorge Tróccoli, who was active during the last Uruguayan dictatorship (1973–1985). The Captain has been accused of human rights violations and of collaborating

1. “Los monstruos existen pero son demasiado poco numerosos para ser verdaderamente peligrosos; los que son realmente peligrosos son los hombres comunes.”

with death squadrons in Argentina during the dictatorship period.² The topic of human rights violations during the dictatorship is a complicated issue that remains unresolved and continues to form part of current political debate. Individual responsibilities for violations of human rights have been part of the political debates recently due to continued international requests for extradition of Uruguayan military officers that participated in joint activities with the military dictatorships of other countries in the region (*Operación Cóndor*).

During the period when this letter was written, the transition to democracy, the topics of human rights violations and other crimes committed during the dictatorship period were passionately discussed in the public sphere. At the time, Uruguay opted for not prosecuting the military officers responsible for crimes committed during this period (Law of Expiry [1986], ratified by the popular plebiscite of 1992). This controversial decision has colored subsequent democratizing processes and has kept this topic on the table in political discussions. Groups of citizens affected by the human rights violations still continue fighting for the right to prosecute and punish the military officers responsible for these crimes. Military officers as an institution have maintained silence and have avoided publicly addressing the topic of human rights violations. However, some individuals within the military body have not maintained silence. Tróccoli's confession is one of the few cases in which military officials have individually told their version of events.

This confession was made during the time when the possible extradition and trial of General Pinochet to Spain was being considered by the British and Chilean authorities. This moment then indicates a turning point in international and local politics when several countries in the region are considering bringing to justice military officers that acted during the dictatorships in the Southern Cone. The text's importance also rests in the fact that it is an example of a military officer's personal narrative in which responsibilities are assigned for the events that occurred during the dictatorship. This analysis of a text produced by an individual allows for a contrast with those analyzed in previous chapters, which represented the voice of the institution. Thus, in this chapter we explore the differences and similarities between individual and institutional memory of the military.

2. In December 2007, retired Captain Nestor J. Tróccoli was arrested in Italy for his involvement in *Operation Cóndor*. He is also being investigated by Uruguayan courts for his involvement in the *Vuelo* case.

Genre: The confession

This text belongs to the *testimonial* genre. Testimonials are characterized by being accounts of personal experiences that give a version of events from the perspective of someone who directly experienced them. Those that give testimony assign responsibilities to others and assume their own responsibilities. Confessions are a special type of testimonial genre, in which the author assumes the majority of the responsibility for the events represented in the text. However, this genre can be manipulated in order to evade responsibilities, and this is precisely what occurs in Tróccoli's text.

In addition to presenting himself in relation to the events, the author describes and evaluates the historical events that serve as a framework for his actions. Tróccoli's text combines the testimonial and historical genres. The construction of a historical account serves to reinforce hegemonic versions of the past in question. The text's account of events is accompanied by argumentation in favor of the *official* version of history. The author's argumentation attributes different degrees of meaning and relevance to different perspectives. History's central discursive practice is the interpretation and construction of social experience using textual forms and linguistic resources belonging to narrative, explication, or argumentation as ways of positioning oneself and persuading the reader to accept the interpretation as *truth* or *fact* (Coffin 1997). The use of this rhetorical resource allows the author to construct a version of history that appears to be the logical consequence of events previously presented in the text. Tróccoli uses discursive strategies in the text in order to construct a historical memory that favors his position and the position of the group to which he belongs.

The text represents an instantiation of a social process, the testimonial that includes a *personal confession*.³ This social process develops in stages. A confession is a social practice carried out to reconstruct a past event. It is an admission of guilt, a secret, or a sin. The confessional genre is associated with the testimonial genre in that testimonials recount personal experiences that give a version of past events from the perspective of someone who directly experienced them. Those

3. According to Foucault (1978) the confession appears during the counter-reform when the Catholic Church begins to demand that *sinner*s confess, not only revealing unacceptable actions but also their inappropriate thoughts. The confession is not only a question of saying what one has done and how it was done, but also of reconstruction around the events of the feelings, images, desires, and pleasures that animated these acts. Therefore the confession is converted into a "mode of production of the truth" (p. 58), and is a discursive ritual in which the speaking subject is also the subject of the utterance. Late in the 19th century the confession is secularized and is converted in part of the authorized discourse to gain admittance to the *truth* such as a therapeutic session or a psychiatric interview.

that give testimony assign responsibilities to others and assume their own. It is for this reason that the confession can be considered as a special type of testimonial in which the author assumes the majority of the responsibility for the incidents represented in the text. In addition to presenting him/herself in relation to the events the author describes and evaluates the historical events that serve as a framework for his/her actions. Lexico-grammatically, confessions are characterized by the use of the indicative mode, the first person, reference to the narrator as a topic and the use of verbs that denote action, thoughts, or feelings considered reprehensible in the specific context (van Leeuwen 1993). However, this genre can be manipulated or mixed with others in order to evade responsibility. This is what occurs in the text analyzed in this chapter.

Although this text does not exactly follow the sections of a traditional confession with respect to argument form, the rhetorical patterns utilized and the manners of referring to topics and specific social agents make it possible to consider this text part of the confessional genre.

This text mixes and re-accentuates the confessional genre (Voloshinov 1973) in order to produce a different effect in the audience about the image of the confessor. The writer utilizes the structural and functional elements that characterize a confession in order to obtain the audience's empathy. When faced with the impossibility of a social excuse one searches for a self-justification for a reprehensible action. One self-pardons without assuming any guilt. One searches for the empathy of the Other because one does not feel that he/she must be pardoned since there is nothing to be pardoned for. This is, according to Derrida (1998), the incredible contradiction of a confession⁴ to demonstrate an absence of regret or sorrow for the act.

Table 1. Confession (genre analysis by functional constituents)

1. Introduction to the problem (fictional narration to present the problem)
 2. Presentation/affirmation of the events (personal account of the historical events, confession)
 3. Proof (personal anecdotes, emotional narrative, historical parallels)
 4. Command (exhortation for reconciliation and rejection of the argument of the Other)
 5. Confession (limitation of personal involvement and responsibility)
 6. Warning (if the Others continue their argumentation there will be consequences)
 7. Accusation (refutation of the Other's point of view)
 8. Recognition and resolution
-

4. The analysis of Derrida (1998) is based in *The Confessions* of Rousseau (1781).

Textual analysis

The present textual analysis is based in the study of ideational and interpersonal meanings realized through mode and transitivity (Halliday 1994), evaluative language (Martin 1997; Coffin 1997), frames of presentation (Goffman 1974; Morgan 1997), and the study of self-reference (Wilson 1990). These areas of focus have been selected because they permit an exploration of the ways in which the text realizes the experience and interpersonal relationships. How the experience is represented is of utmost importance in the study of memory construction. What is remembered, who remembers it and under what circumstances are important elements in the analysis of memory construction as a social practice. Interpersonal meaning is relevant when considering the roles of social actors and narrated events. How Tróccoli presents himself in the text and how he attributes responsibilities for the text's narrated events permits an exploration into the ideological position that supports the text.

Situational context

The systematic relationship between language and its environment connects the text's situational context, linguistic system and social system. "The concept of register is the necessary mediating concept that permits us to establish continuity between a text and its socio-semantic environment" (Halliday 1994: 190).

In the case of Tróccoli's letter, the *field*, the described experience, is constituted by topics referring to the human rights violations during the dictatorship period and the military responsibility in these acts. In addition, the letter includes information of a more personal character about Tróccoli's direct participation in these events. The letter indirectly presents such information. The author utilizes an allegory⁵ related with the Inquisition to present his confession.

- (1) Finally Friar Tomas of Torquemada entered the history books, although not for his spiritual talents, that's for sure. History remembers him and will remember him as a mediocre friar who obtained an administrative

5. The term allegory in this case refers to the technique of personification, through which abstract qualities receive human form. An allegory can be conceived of as an extended metaphor of a structured system. In this case the allegory uses an image of the Inquisition to present a partially covered meaning behind the literal one. This second meaning relates the ideas of the search for justice and prosecution of the military officers with the personality of Torquemada, judge of the Inquisition. An analogy is made between the political situation regarding the human rights violations during the dictatorship and the Inquisition.

position thanks to a relative that was a cardinal, but above all things, it will remember him as the Great Inquisitor. The memory of Torquemada endures in the memory of the people as the friar that, in honor of maintaining a position most above his mediocrity, sent thousands of people to the stake. And I have said sent, because I do not believe that he would have had the bravery to personally burn anyone, and if he did, for sure the condemned individual would have had to have been tied up.

In the curious aptitude that culture has for replicating its characters, Torquemada appears again in our time, and in our country. The interests of Torquemada are the same as before: the maintenance of a level higher than his mediocrity. And for this he accused me of witchcraft.⁶

The topic is realized at the discourse-semantic level through lexical chains and conjunction. The main lexical chain is that related with the responsibility for acts:

Torquemada>*Great Inquisitor*>*Mediocre friar*
 (responsible for blaming the writer)
Sorcerer>*repressor*>*sorcerer's apprentice*>*professional sorcerer*
 (responsible for human rights violations)

The language used is not technical, but the usage of historical references and words that evoke specific moments and characters serve to make the text little accessible to people not familiar with these referents.

- (2) Us Uruguayans, like in the *Guerra Grande, like in 1897 and 1904*, one more time we hated each other, we killed each other, and we tortured one another.⁷

The author deploys his knowledge about world and national history by way of references to events and characters. The management of these referents permits the author to establish his authority about the historical field he refers to.

6. "Finalmente Fray Tomás de Torquemada pasó a la historia, aunque no lo hizo por sus dotes espirituales, por cierto, la historia lo recuerda y lo recordará como un mediocre fraile que obtuvo una posición administrativa gracias a un pariente que era cardinal, pero por sobre todas las cosas, lo recuerda como el Gran Inquisidor. El recuerdo de Torquemada perdura en la memoria de los pueblos como el fraile que, en aras de mantener un puesto más allá de su mediocridad, mandó a la hoguera a miles de personas. Y he dicho mandó, porque no creo que tuviera valor para quemar personalmente a nadie, y si lo hizo, seguro que el condenado estaba atado.

En esa curiosa aptitud que tiene la cultura para replicar sus personajes, Torquemada vuelve a aparecer en nuestra época, y en nuestro país. Los intereses de Torquemada son los mismos que antes: mantener un nivel más allá de su mediocridad. Y para ello me acusó de brujería."

7. "Los uruguayos, como en la *Guerra Grande, como en 1897 y 1904*, una vez más nos odiamos, nos matamos, y nos torturamos unos a otros."

The *field* is expressed at the lexico-grammar level by way of the grammatical system of *transitivity*. Transitivity, according to Halliday, refers to the selection of processes (verbal groups) and participants (nominal groups). The system of transitivity constructs the world of experience into a manageable group of processes. In Tróccoli's text the majority of processes the author uses to refer to himself are mental: *I remember, I assume, I confess, I recognize, I found out, etc.*

Mental processes refer to interior experience, but they include reduplication, record, reaction and reflection about exterior experience. Therefore the selection of these types of processes allows the author to comment about events at the same time as he presents them. Mental processes require two participants: the *experiencer* and the *phenomena*. These participants are not agents; their participation does not require the assumption of responsibility.

- (3) I remember the fear I experienced when with 14 armed sailors I had to aim at a multitude of workers that, if they had won the strike, would have represented a raise for my scant salary, such was the state of things.⁸

This separation between the actor and the processes is also achieved by way of the passive reflexive construction that also does not mark the agent.

- (4) I remember that in that strike certain strands began to be knitted, very tenuous, in order to be able to assume in the least hurtful possible way, the violence of the moment.⁹

Other impersonal constructions are also used, which gives a sensation of distance and lack of commitment.

- (5) It would have been more inhuman, morally erroneous, to send them to prison.¹⁰

Another resource that achieves the depersonalization and abstraction of events is the use of nominalizations in which periods, processes, and circumstances are transformed into nominal groups, allowing a greater distancing between events and their actors.

8. "Recuerdo el miedo que pasé cuando con 14 marineros armados tuve que apuntar a una multitud de obreros que, si ganaban la huelga, iba a representar un aumento para mi escaso sueldo, así eran las cosas."

9. "Recuerdo que en esa huelga se empezaron a tejer ciertos hilos, muy tenues, para poder asumir lo menos dolorosamente posible, la violencia del momento."

10. "Hubiera sido más inhumano, moralmente erróneo, mandarlos a la cárcel."

- (6) After the enemy's attack came, it had already been some time since the hostilities had commenced, to be more precise, I believe it was in 1961. But it was in '72 that they killed my friends.¹¹

The relationships between coder and decoder of the text is expressed in the *tenor*. A socio-semantic analysis of the text permits one to see how participants are located with respect to membership in determined groups or to the presented events. The degree of power, contact and affect between participants is realized lexicogrammatically by way of *modalization*. The organization of the message as interaction provides information about the character of the exchange and the degree of probability and inclination that the presenter of the information attributes to the propositions. Tróccoli's text expresses a high degree of power in the use of modulation and the imperative mode.

- (7) I understand those who wanted to kill me, I also wanted to.¹²
- (8) But please, for the dignity of the combatant, don't call them the disappeared anymore, we all know that they died defending their own ideas. Let's honor their memory with the homage of the warrior, let's not use their name anymore and let's respect their memory, wherever their bodies may be. To those that say that 'they never brandished a weapon', but that they did surveillance for attacks, were carriers or 'were navigating', I ask that you please don't shield yourselves in euphemisms, don't be ashamed of having fought as you were able and from where you were in that moment.¹³

Although a high degree of power is expressed, Tróccoli also demonstrates a degree of closeness and affect with the reader by interpolating his audience members as people that share his experiences. The use of personal anecdotes is another resource that the writer employs to establish his proximity to the reader.

- (9) I understand those who still suffer, I suffer as well.¹⁴

11. "Después vino el ataque del enemigo, ya hacía tiempo que las hostilidades habían comenzado, para ser más precisos, creo que fue en 1961. Pero fue en el '72 que mataron a amigos míos."

12. "Comprendo a quienes quisieron matarme, yo también quería hacerlo."

13. "Pero por favor, por la propia dignidad del combatiente, no los llamen más desaparecidos, todos sabemos que murieron defendiendo lo suyo. Honremos su recuerdo con el homenaje del guerrero, no usemos más su nombre y respetemos su memoria, sea donde sea que se encuentre su cuerpo. A los que dicen que "nunca empuñaron un arma", pero que hacían relevamientos para atentados, oficiaban de correos o "estaban navegando", les pido por favor que no se escuden en eufemismos, que no se avergüencen de haber combatido como podían y desde donde estaban en ese momento."

14. "Comprendo a quienes aún sufren, yo también lo hago."

- (10) One day, after everything had happened, I met an excellent man, with a way with people and a humanism few possess. We called him ‘Carlos Rama’, it doesn’t matter why, it is only for those that know him.¹⁵

The author’s perspective about the events he presents is signaled in the text in the modalization. *Modalization* represents the degree of probability and validity that the writer assigns to the proposals. Presenting information as if it does not indicate a particular perspective is one of the most effective ways of expressing objectivity. Tróccoli modalizes the events that he presents through the use of impersonal expressions and expressions that indicate more subjectivity.

- (11) In 1973 came the coup d’état, I assume I joined the coup excited by what later turned out to be the incredible lie of the famous press releases numbers 4 and 7, surely the youth of today doesn’t know what I am talking about, but if the mentioned press releases were to come out today, surely all the youths would join, in mass, as I did.¹⁶

However, the majority of the propositions that Tróccoli presents appear without modalization that indicates that Tróccoli is certain about the *truth* of the events that appear in the text.

- (12) This is ‘the truth’ that Torquemada demands.¹⁷

This single voiced discourse represents a universal truth and *the only possible* interpretation of these events. However, even though this part of Tróccoli’s text is mostly monologic and authoritative, the allusion to Other’s voices brings in the sense that this is a debate over an issue where there are various positions. He is interpreting the other’s voice and intention, but we as readers have room to question this interpretation.

Tróccoli is the one who recounts the history of what occurred. His text interacts and responds to other texts that present opposite visions of events. The evocation of other discourses in this discourse, intertextuality, represents a dialogue with an audience that has been exposed to the demands for justice. The discourse

15. “Un día, después que todo pasó, conocí a una persona excelente, con un don de gentes y un humanismo como pocos. Le decíamos ‘Carlos Rama’, no importa por qué, es sólo para los que lo conocen.”

16. “En 1973 vino el golpe militar, yo asumo haber adherido al golpe ilusionado por la increíble mentira que resultaron ser los famosos comunicados 4 y 7, seguramente la juventud actual no sabe de qué hablo, pero si los comunicados mencionados salen ahora, seguro que adhieren todos los jóvenes, en masa, como lo hice yo.”

17. “Esta es ‘la verdad’ que reclama Torquemada.”

of *counter-memory* that questions the hegemony of the *official history* is present in Tróccoli's discourse.

- (13) What I earnestly ask of you is that you do not listen to Torquemada, he does not want this, he does not want our children to play together nor that you and I begin a dialogue, not even with long faces. If we continue listening and applauding the bonfire of Torquemada, surely there will be another war, he feeds on it. If this is how it will be, I will not participate, know it friars and sorcerers, I am tired.¹⁸

The references and direct engagement with the Other, demonstrate the text's intertextuality with the discourse present in the socio-historical context in which the letter was produced. But since Tróccoli is the one who controls what appears and what does not appear in the text, he is the one that has more power over the interaction between the participants mentioned in the text. The writer presents the participants as members belonging to three groups: his group, the group of the interlocutors and the group of the Other, which Tróccoli judges.¹⁹ This separation of participants enables the writer to establish connections with different degrees of solidarity between the different groups. The separation of his interlocutors from the Other permits Tróccoli to establish a certain type of empathy or affective connection with the reader. The rage and frustration that the narration of the events produces are displaced onto the Other, the one that is judged.

These relationships and perceptions of different participants as *allies* or *enemies* are also revealed in the selection of processes and participants in the text.²⁰ A study of transitivity demonstrates that the majority of processes attributed to

18. "Lo que les pido encarecidamente es que no escuchen a Torquemada, él no quiere esto, él no quiere que nuestros hijos jueguen juntos ni que ustedes y yo empecemos un diálogo, aunque sea con caras de malo. Si seguimos escuchando y aplaudiendo la hoguera de Torquemada, seguro habrá otra guerra, él se nutre de ello. Si así fuera, no voy a participar, sépanlo frailes y brujos, estoy cansado."

19. In her study about the Waldheim case in Austria, Ruth Wodak identifies many strategies of justification among the argumentative strategies that serve to transmit evaluations and assign responsibilities and blames. Among the strategies of justification that she enumerates she presents how one of the most common is the division of the world into a dichotomy and the contrast between *us* and *them*. Another of the justification strategies that she mentions is the citation of others as bearers of prejudicial opinions, *disavowal of guilt*. Later she mentions the use of a *scapegoat*, in this text it would be *Torquemada*, who permits the speaker to project aggression and blame on the Other. And lastly she mentions the reversal of the roles of victim and victimizer, for which the victims are presented as responsible for the attacks to which they were subjected. See: "Das Ausland and Anti-semitic Discourse: The Discursive Construction of the Other", by Ruth Wodak in *The Language and Politics of Exclusion, Others in Discourse* (1997) S. Riggins (ed).

20. The analysis of *transitivity* was done separating the text into clauses and considering only the processes (verbal groups) at the level of the highest rank. The performative verbs are consid-

Table 2. Transitivity in the text according to its distribution across participants

	Material	Mental	Verbal	Relational	Existential	Behavior	TOTAL
Tróccoli+others	8	9	5	0	0	2	24
Others	17	13	6	12	1	2	51
Third person	19	13	4	37	4	1	78
Tróccoli	19	42	11	14	2	2	90
TOTAL	63	77	26	63	7	7	243

Torquemada and the Others are material processes, while for the most part Tróccoli presents himself as a participant of mental verbs. The marked difference between the types of processes assigned to the other participants indicates the author's intention of placing responsibility outside of himself. If we consider the fact that this text belongs to the confessional genre, Tróccoli almost never presents himself as *agent* or actor in any process compared to the rest of the participants that appear in the text. Therefore, by the way he selects verbs and participants to represent the narrated events, Tróccoli limits the degree of responsibility the reader can assign to him for these events.

According to Hill & Zepeda (1993), in accounts of personal experiences the speakers try to construct favorable representations of themselves and try to mitigate representations of experiences that tend to harm these favorable constructions. In the case of this confessor what mitigates his responsibility is not so much the manipulation of historical events as the distribution of roles and the *concealment* (by way of the use of verbal process that do not require an agent) of the actions that signal his direct participation in these events. Of a total of 63 material processes in which agency is marked, Tróccoli only assumes direct responsibility for 19 of them.

- (14) In 1967 I graduated, content to be a midshipman..., I became a professional sorcerer...²¹

This last phrase is the only one in which the author indirectly admits to having been involved in something *bad* or *negative*. He also assumes partial responsibility by including himself together with others (8 material processes) as responsible.

- (15) we killed each other, and we tortured each other.²²

ered as material verbs and the verbal periphrasis are considered as *modalizations* (the particle with most semantic content was used to determine the type of process).

21. "En 1967 me recibí, contento de ser guardiamarinas...", "Me hice brujo profesional..."

22. "[...] nos matamos y nos torturamos unos a otros."

In this case when the author speaks directly of the events he is accused of he does not assume individual responsibility for them. That is to say that he appears as agent in 27/63 material processes, and if we consider that this text is supposedly a confession, this number appears to be very low.

Tróccoli is accused of having directly participated in military activities that caused the deaths and disappearances of Uruguayan citizens; in his letter Tróccoli *assumes* having participated in a war and having inhumanely treated his enemies. He uses the verb *assume* that describes a mental process in order to refer to the events related with the accusations made against him. In this manner he becomes an experiencer of the events not the agent of the events. He only presents himself as an agent in relation to these events when he denies having participated in them.

- (16) I didn't kill anyone, neither do I know anything about the topic of the disappeared....²³

The assignment of the role of experiencer, syntactic structures that eliminate the expression of agency and the use of relational processes that show Tróccoli as the *product* of his socio-historical context serve as strategies to eliminate or diminish his responsibility for the events attributed to him.

The analysis of the meaning potential available to the writer demonstrates how the way in which Tróccoli turns to this potential when presenting the interaction between participants in his text is determined by his ideology. The social subjects are positioned according to the degree of responsibility the author attributes to them. "Representations include or exclude social actors to suit their interests and purposes in relation to the readers for whom they are intended" (van Leeuwen 1996: 38). The way in which an author chooses to socially represent these historical events is a manner of controlling the beliefs that the community has about the events themselves. At the same time, it is a manner of evaluating the beliefs that the community has about the social actors involved in the events of the reconstructed period.

Table 3 presents a summary of the general characteristics of the text with respect to relevant aspects of situational context (activity, uses of language, roles).

23. "No maté a nadie, ni sé nada del tema desaparecidos "

Table 3. REGISTER

Field	Justification and self-defense of human rights violations Allegory: Inquisition Personal account Excuse for his actions Questioning of the motivation of the “Accusers”
Mode	Mix of oral language and written language (style of classical rhetoric: persuasive) Language used for reflection and action (confession and exhortation to action) Interactive and monologic Distance
Tenor	Relatively informal Unequal power Expert/reader Non-authoritarian solidarity Academic distance Alternation of roles: Expert>participant>victim

Frames of self-presentation

personal identity is explained in terms of what is remembered or what is memorable, that is to say, in terms of memory.

(Eduardo Rabossi, 1989)²⁴

Writers project their self-images to the readers/recipients of their texts. Frames of presentation are multi-dimensional models that are rich in components and linguistic and cultural associations. The utilization of these frameworks of presentation permits one to produce presuppositions and implicatures about the interpersonal meaning of the discourse without the need of explicitness or direct assignment of responsibility. The frameworks of self-presentation function as *tokens of appraisal* (Morgan 1997), that frame the information at the interpersonal level. One of the lexico-grammatical resources used in the creation of these frameworks of self-presentation is evaluative language. Evaluative language appears in the text at the lexico-grammar level in the selection of evaluative vocabulary, modal verbs, modal adjuncts, pre/post numeration, intensification, repetition and characterizations of mode and manner. A study of this language serves to expand the analysis of interpersonal meaning and provides more information about the power relations expressed in the text.

24. “[] la identidad personal es explicada en términos de lo recordado o de lo recordable, es decir, en términos de memoria” (Eduardo Rabossi 1989).

Tróccoli uses many frameworks of presentation to place himself in the text: the *naval official*, the *sorcerer/repressor*, and the *human being/victim*. The movement from one framework to another in the text is achieved by way of metonymic transfers that associate features of one framework with the next. These transfers occur in spite of the fact that some of these frameworks are incompatible or contradictory. This ambivalence is present even in the very title of the letter “I assume...I accuse,”²⁵ in which the writer announces to the reader that he will present himself in both the role of the accused and the accuser.

The naval official. In this framework of presentation the author positions himself as a professional. His role in society is determined by his occupation.

(17) when I entered the Naval Academy, I found an empty school,...²⁶

(18) In 1967 I graduated, content to be a midshipman, full of hopes that spoke of seas, ships, and voyages.²⁷

(19) And I am going to talk as a member of the Armed Forces, which I was in that moment.²⁸

The search for features of inclusion allows one to see how Tróccoli positions himself with respect to his membership in the group of military officers, in this case the Navy. The lexical elements related with the navy such as *sailors*, *midshipman*, *Naval Academy*, *classmates*, *hopes of seas and voyages*; signal group membership. The description of this framework occurs while the author describes the situation before the dictatorship began. The evaluative language in this framework presents the writer as a member of a group that makes decisions for him and that puts him in a situation of confrontation with the rest of society.

(20) I admit being the product of a society that 33 years ago, when I entered the Naval Academy, showed me an empty school, where its students were in that moment occupying the UTE due to a strike. I, only 15 years old, used to see my future classmates arrive with their faces destroyed by the burns

25. Starting from the title of his letter Tróccoli proceeds outlining himself in the role of victim. This title “*Yo asumo...Yo acuso*” makes direct reference to the Dreyfus case about which Emile Zola wrote in 1898 under the title “*Yo acuso*”. Dreyfus was a French military officer unjustly accused of treason to the fatherland, after serving a long sentence he was declared innocent. This case produced enormous controversy in the France of the end of the 19th century, similar to the controversy that is occurring in the construction of the role of the military during the period of the last Uruguayan dictatorship (1973-1985).

26. “cuando entré a la Escuela Naval, me mostró una escuela vacía, “

27. “En 1967 me recibí, contento de ser guardiamarina, lleno de ilusiones que hablaban de mares, barcos y viajes.”

28. “Y voy a hablar como integrante de las Fuerzas Armadas que era en ese momento.”

from the booby traps that used to be put in the boilers. That was the start of my career. In 1967 I graduated, content to be a midshipman, full of hopes that spoke of seas, ships, and voyages. [...] I remember the fear I experienced when with 14 armed sailors I had to aim at a multitude of workers that, if they had won the strike, would have represented a raise for my scant salary, such was the state of things.²⁹

Tróccoli presents himself as an active member of the group but at the same time he signals his submission to the group's will. As soon as he begins to refer to the dictatorship period Tróccoli moves into the framework of presentation of the *sorcerer/repressor*.

Sorcerer/repressor. The change from the professional framework to a more mystical or *occult* one implies the transformation from the *professional* naval official to a more illegal character that lies outside of that which is recognized/accepted by society. The vocabulary related with this framework of presentation includes terms: *I worshiped the Devil, coven, sorcerer's apprentice, professional sorcerer, and sorcery*. The repetition of vocabulary related with *sorcery* serves to evaluate and amplify the magnitude of the change from a group that is part of society to one that acts outside of society.

- (21) but afterwards, in 1974, I became a professional sorcerer, I became a member of the combat forces against the guerrilla, this is my great confession....³⁰
- (22) I admit having combated the guerrilla with all the forces and resources at my disposition, I admit having done things I do not feel proud of, and that I did not feel proud of then. I admit having participated in a war, that is how I understood it in that moment.³¹

29. "Yo asumo ser el producto de una sociedad que hace ya treinta y tres años, cuando entré a la Escuela Naval, me mostró una escuela vacía, donde sus integrantes estaban en ese momento ocupando la UTE por una huelga. Yo veía, desde mis quince años, llegar a mis futuros compañeros con la cara destrozada por las quemaduras de las trampas "cazabobos" que se ponían en las calderas. Ese fue el comienzo de mi carrera. En 1967 me recibí, contento de ser guardiamarina, lleno de ilusiones que hablaban de mares, barcos y viajes. [] Recuerdo el miedo que pasé cuando con 14 marineros armados tuve que apuntar a una multitud de obreros que, si ganaban la huelga, iba a representar un aumento para mi escaso sueldo, así eran las cosas."

30. "pero después, en 1974, me hice brujo profesional, pasé a integrar las fuerzas de combate contra la guerrilla, ésta es mi gran confesión "

31. "Yo asumo haber combatido a la guerrilla con todas las fuerzas y recursos a mi disposición, asumo haber hecho cosas de las cuales no me siento orgulloso, ni me sentí entonces. Asumo haber participado en una guerra, así lo entendía en ese momento."

This framework elucidates the manner and degree to which the participant (Tróccoli) realized the events required by the group he belonged to. From this framework of presentation the writer moves towards the image of *human being/victim*.

The framework in which Tróccoli situates himself in the moment of writing the letter is that of the *human being/victim*. He is the victim of Torquemada, the inquisitor that wants to punish him for his past participation in *witchcraft*. Some of the lexical items that represent this framework are: *I am alone, comrades, enemies, I am not a hypocrite, injustice*. The events that contextualize this self-presentation are part of his accusation and request for reconciliation.

(23) I am tired. I want a new life.³²

(24) I didn't kill anyone, nor do I know anything about the topic of the disappeared, but not for humanitarian altruism, rather because (fortunately) I didn't happen to live that situation. But I am not a hypocrite, I recognize that the Armed Forces I belonged to, know about it and did it. Therefore, as one more member, I assume also the dead and disappeared.³³

Tróccoli intensifies his lack of responsibility for the events by using adverbs of manner and degree. His characteristics as an honorable *human being* and a *victim* are accepting the blame and actions of others. The repetition of the word "I assume" signals the affective load and the judgment with which the presented events are evaluated. The assuming implies responsibility for the events in contrast to the previous negation of that responsibility.

The writer presents himself with a high degree of affective involvement, utilizing the imperative mode with a character exhortative to action. His proposal includes all and solicits the view of the events as something over with that should not be revisited.

(25) Let us honor their memory with the homage of the warrior, let's not use their name anymore and let's respect their memory, wherever their bodies may be.³⁴

These frameworks of self-presentation operate in the context of a situation posed as an inquisition in process. Tróccoli accepts having been a *sorcerer*, but he signals

32. "estoy cansado. Quiero una vida nueva."

33. "No mate a nadie, ni sé nada del tema desaparecidos, pero no por altruismo humanitario, sino porque (afortunadamente) no me tocó vivir esa situación. Pero no soy un hipócrita, reconozco que las Fuerzas Armadas a las que pertencí, lo saben y lo hicieron. Por lo tanto, como un integrante más, asumo también los muertos y desaparecidos."

34. "Honremos su recuerdo con el homenaje del guerrero, no usemos más su nombre y respetemos su memoria, sea donde sea que se encuentre su cuerpo."

the passage of time and the change in the historical and social situation. Why does he appeal to the allegory of the Inquisition in order to contextualize his confession? Would it be easier for the reader to pardon someone being judged by an *irrational* juror/judge? The evocation of the Inquisition brings along with it the affective load related with the injustice that it represents.

The confessor presents part of the information indirectly by way of the fictitious narrative of the Inquisition, utilizing what van Leeuwen calls symbolization of social actors. A social actor or fictitious group appears in place of non-fictitious actors or groups in social practice (van Leeuwen 1996). This resource produces a distance that permits the connection of the negative connotations that this mythical social practice – the Inquisition – has, to current practices and social actors – human rights organizations.

Use of personal pronouns as a sign of responsibility

Social relationships and attitudes are also marked through pronominal choice. The manner in which pronouns are selected and distributed can be analyzed in order to understand the political and personal reasons that motivated this choice (Wilson 1990). The commitment and involvement of the speaker can be shown by way of the use of personal pronouns. According to Wilson (1990), pronominal selection varies in terms of context just as it does in terms of the individual. If a pronominal option exists in a given context, “any actual selection may be seen as carrying, potentially, an ideological loading within the framework of a specific presentation” (Wilson 1990: 61). For Wilson, the areas where different ideological manifestations reveal themselves by way of pronominal selection are the following:

1. self-reference (how the producer of the text presents him/herself);
2. relationships of contrast (how the pronominal system is used to compare and contrast to others);
3. reference to the Other (the use of pronouns to refer to individuals or groups that do not fulfill the role of producer or interpreter of the text).

The aspect of meaning that signals responsibility is agency (Hill & Irvine 1993). Linguistic resources are utilized in order to carry out the social practice of morally holding community members responsible for their actions. In addition to the lexico-grammar elements mentioned previously, linguistic markers of responsibility can be analyzed by looking at how the author selects to use the first person singular personal pronoun, *I*. The use of this pronoun in a confession can yield more information about the degree of responsibility the author of the confession is willing

to accept. Tróccoli uses the first person singular personal pronoun, *I*, to refer to himself when he makes affirmations for which he accepts total responsibility.

(26) I assume as an individual and as a product of a period.³⁵

(27) I accuse.³⁶

In Spanish, the presence of this pronoun, *I* (*yo*), is not required grammatically; its appearance is related with pragmatic and semantic factors. Studies about the appearance of the pronoun *yo* in spoken Spanish (Bentivoglio 1998; Silva-Corvalán 1977) have demonstrated that change of reference and type of verb class are the linguistic variables that contribute the most to the presence of the pronoun *yo*. In order to relate the attribution of responsibility with the pronominal selection in this text an analysis was made of the type of verbs that appear together with the pronoun *yo*.

In Tróccoli's confession, *yo* appears mostly with verbs that represent mental processes, in those that *yo* makes reference to an experiencer and not to an agent. The total appearances of the pronoun *yo* is very limited, it only appears 18 times in a total of 200 clauses of high rank (*yo* appears once in an embedded clause and two times in a group complex with verbs conjugated in first person plural). The cases in which *yo* appears along with a change of reference do not represent an ideological or personal motivation on the part of the confessor, rather they represent a pragmatic requirement. The confessor's degree of personal involvement is hardly ever marked in this text with the use of personal pronouns (there are only 7/18 appearances of *yo* due to the author's personal choice).

The use of personal pronouns in order to refer to the Others is also not significant. The Others are referred to indirectly through impersonal expressions or by their own names (real or fictitious). To distribute the load of responsibility the confessor uses the inclusive *we* and creates a third unidentified or fictitious person (*Torquemada*), in addition to a group of the Others.

Table 4. Use of the personal pronoun *I* [*yo*]

	Material	Mental	Verbal	Relational	Existential	Behavioral	TOTAL
<i>yo</i> (total #)	5	10	1	1	0	1	18
<i>yo</i> (change of reference)	3	5	2	1	0	0	11

Verbs conjugated in first person singular: 99

Uses of "yo": 18

Uses of "yo" for changes of reference: 11

35. "Yo asumo como individuo y como producto de una época."

36. "Yo acuso."

Conclusions

Tróccoli's confession has two levels: first, he exonerates himself by attributing the molding of his personality to the institution; on the other hand the confession coincides completely with the institution's objectives in the *internal war*, since Tróccoli maintains that he would have acted in the same way again if he had the opportunity to go back. Tróccoli represents the *rationality* of the institution.

The ideological level in which the letter of Tróccoli is inscribed represents a particular historical perspective. The writer provides an interpretation of the events from the perspective of those that were in power during the events, the military officers. The responsibility of the military officers for those events is questioned in the text. Tróccoli reinforces the dominant ideology by controlling the information and deciding how much is negotiated in the collective memory construction of this period. There are *secrets* that the writer does not want to divulge.

(28) Don't ask me for hurtful details.³⁷

The group in power at the time the letter was written was not interested in questioning the past, for them these events should be forgotten.

(29) This is the reality that day to day is being constructed this is the reading that we must make of our daily existence, in each one of those events, we are recovering them. We will not do it surely, by way of the mediocre (one more time) discourse of *Torquemada* that aims to freeze us in a past of pain...³⁸

In this way, Tróccoli naturalizes the *official* vision of events as if it were part of common knowledge (Fairclough 1989).

During the first government after the dictatorship a law was passed that prohibits the investigation and search for justice for the crimes committed during the dictatorship (Law of the expiry, 1986) [see Chapter Four]. Tróccoli's text supports this perspective, which considers the debate about how to remember the past as finished and at the same time threatens with the possible consequences of continuing to dig in the past.

(30) If we continue to listen to and applaud the bonfire of *Torquemada*, surely there will be another war...³⁹

37. "No me pregunten detalles dolorosos."

38. "Esta es la realidad que día a día se está construyendo ésta es la lectura que debemos hacer de nuestra cotidianeidad, en cada uno de esos eventos, nos estamos recuperando. No lo haremos seguramente, a través del mediocre (una vez más) discurso de *Torquemada* que pretende congelarnos en un pasado de dolor."

39. "Si seguimos escuchando y aplaudiendo la hoguera de *Torquemada*, seguro habrá otra guerra."

This clause makes the power difference that existed at the time in Uruguayan society crystal clear. Although the military officers were not part of the government they still maintained power over society through the mechanism of fear. They had the power to take the country back to a period of *internal war*.

The account of historical events in Tróccoli's letter does not modify the events that occurred in the dictatorship. His manipulation of the collective memory of the historical past is realized by way of the resignification of events (Perelli 1986). What changes is the interpretation that the author gives to the events not the events themselves. Although it must be stressed that this text does not provide new information about this historical period, in this *confession* the author only refers to events that are already part of the political debate. When he refers to events that are still contested material in the memory about the dictatorship, (e.g. the topic of the disappeared) the fact that he admits the disappearances is a way of validating the memory of the Others.

But this recognition of the events that occurred during the dictatorship period does not imply Tróccoli takes responsibility for these events. By way of thematization and nominalization the inevitability of the events and the power of the society of determining the life of an individual are emphasized.

(31) Society took charge of shaping me.⁴⁰

The situational context is characterized as chaotic and full of strikes, disturbances and confrontations between social groups. At the same time the morality of this period is described as governed by the ethos of a *state of war*.

(32) the situation of war... the values and norms that prevailed in that situation were guided and determined by that violence.⁴¹

Tróccoli tries to manipulate the evaluation and judgment of the events in order to expropriate the collective memory of the period and to benefit by constructing a vision of events that assigns a limited amount of responsibility to his role as participant. By way of the creation of a third group or actor *Torquemada*, the one who is trying to revise the official version of the dictatorship period, the author projects the agency onto a third person and in this way dilutes his responsibility for the events that occurred during the dictatorship.

The objective of the text would therefore be to create a tolerable self-presentation of the confessor (for which the author uses discursive strategies) and at the same time legitimize the official discourse about the period through the resource

40. "La sociedad se encargó de moldearme."

41. "[l]a situación de Guerra los valores y normas que imperaban en esa situación estaban pautados y determinados por esa violencia."

of objectivity (historical references, comparisons and focusing on the events and not on the participants).

Confessions as a genre have the potential to contribute to the reconciliation of *victims* and *repressors*. Public recognition of the events that occurred during the dictatorship allows the construction of a social memory of the period that is shared by all members of the community. However, the absence of taking responsibility for the events and the justification of the events through a situational ethics takes away the reconciliatory possibility of this confession. In spite of invoking a reconciliatory intention in his confession, Tróccoli does not demonstrate regret or an intention of personally taking on the weight of the acts of repression that occurred in the dictatorship period. That is to say that the *confession* produces an effect contrary to the desired one, instead of apologizing the confessor inscribes his guilt.

Memory is a form of knowledge that is objectified (Perelli, 1986). This object is what is fought for in the text. The struggle of powers exemplified in the text permits one to have an idea of how Uruguayan society struggles to resolve the fragments of a memory that does not allow its citizens to feel a part of a single community.

Struggles for memory

Dialogue between social actors (2000–2001)

The people that forget their past are condemned to relive it.
In memory lies redemption.¹

These quotes that affirm the importance of memory come from texts representing two opposite ideological positions, the right and the left² respectively. Interestingly, both sides recognize the importance of constructing a social and individual memory. The conflict of interests therefore does not arise from the need to remember rather it arises in the moment each side decides *what* to remember and *how* to remember it. That is to say that the social actors confront each other from the recognition of the importance of the past to their present political positions. The struggles for memory are unleashed because of a need to vindicate and reappropriate a space that legitimizes their voice in the political arena. It is also true that these struggles are framed within a need to incorporate events into individual and collective identity that go against the self-image of the citizens and the nation.

1. The first epigraph is a quote typically attributed to Santayana that appears in *Testimonio de una nación agredida* (1978) *Comando General del Ejército*. The second one is cited in an essay by Hugo Achugar (1995) “*La nación entre el olvido y la memoria. Hacia una narración democrática de la nación*” and is attributed to a thought by Baal Shem Tov at the memorial monument to the victims of the Jewish Holocaust in the city of Montevideo.

2. The difference between left and right, is based on the difference between the two in their conception of equality and inequality between people. According to Norberto Bobbio (1996) *Left & Right*, the principal difference that distinguishes these sides is that the left searches for greater equality between people and considers inequality to be the product of reversible social differences while on the other hand the right conceives these differences between people as natural and doesn't search to reduce the inequality between people. In our case the difference in these sides with respect to the topic of human rights violations implies that the left strives for all citizens to be equal before the law and that all citizens be subject to the same norms and laws. That is to say that the violation of the law and human rights (according to international agreement) should be valid for all and not relative to differences of power or hierarchy between citizens. For the right, differences between people exist and not all must be judged in the same way, those that belong to certain hierarchies have the prerogative of adjusting the laws to their needs.

This self-image is one of a nation with a liberal and democratic tradition.³ The violent events of the dictatorship represent an anomaly for both the left and the right that is difficult to incorporate into the democratic vision of the country. How then can this past be incorporated into the historical continuity that helps to construct national identity? What can be done with the burdens or inconclusive remnants that emerge in current society?⁴

The reestablishment of *public conversation*⁵ about the dictatorship makes it possible to recognize the permanence and the changes produced in both the reality and the social actors competing for power in the political scene. The ways in which accounts about the past represent and evaluate these actors permit an investigation of these actors' political roles in the nation's collective memory formation of the period. The struggle to impose a hegemonic construction of the past appears in the texts studied in this chapter. Different social actors use the past as material for the reaffirmation of their social and political identities. At the same time, they use the past as a presentation card that legitimizes their voice in the political scene. A positive aspect of the discussion of the dictatorial past in the current socio-political context is that the *chorus of voices* is broader. During this period not only social actors representing the ideological right, who have traditionally monopolized the discussion, but also actors of the left whose accounts traditionally did not form part of the *official history* (members of non-governmental organizations, for

3. This was the first coup d'état by the military of the 20th century in Uruguay, with the exception of the (self-coup) of *Terra* in 1933 (1933-1938). The social imaginary is constructed based on myths of respect for democracy, order, and the maintenance of a state of law and a high degree of culture, among others. Therefore the dictatorship represents an aberration, an abnormality in the self-image of this community.

4. The strategy of omission or forgetting of the dictatorship period was used in the period of *transition* to democracy but it failed in the present due to effects of the international historical and political context as well as for the national context. The trials in Europe of Latin American dictatorships for crimes against humanity, the trials in Argentina of the military Juntas, the documents of Operation Condor, etc. are some of the international incidents that affected the discussion of the subject in Uruguay. In the same way the change in the political panorama within Uruguay made it such that the left obtained more political power by gaining admittance to the municipal government of Montevideo for four consecutive terms and the presidency in 2005. These changes in the internal politics have opened spaces for the once *history of the losers* to be recognized. Today this translates into the construction of a monument to those who disappeared during the dictatorship and the naming of streets and plazas in remembrance of actors that opposed the dictatorship.

5. This is a complaint made by some intellectuals of the left in the 1990s when the topic of the dictatorship was for some an already resolved one after the plebiscite of 1989. See *Uruguay: cuentas pendientes, Dictadura, memorias y desmemorias*. Compilador Alvaro Rico (1995). Montevideo: Trilce.

example, relatives of disappeared detainees, FEDEFAM, and others) now have access to the struggle over the definition of the past and its meaning. In this moment the debate about how to construct an official history of the period takes account of contributions and criticisms from both sectors (left and right). In this sense one could say that the struggle for memory has democratized the political discourse since now a greater number of actors participate in its construction. However, these struggles for memory reflect a continuation of a Maniquean conception of *historical truth*. The majority of these texts distribute roles between *good guys* and *bad guys*, *victims* and *repressors/terrorists*. It is also interesting to see how society as a whole appears as a participant in the discourse since the idealization of a *nation* or *people* permits both ideological sides to construct an ally that reinforces its position. At the same time this ideal *people* or *nation* seems to have been on the margin of events since it appears in the texts as either a defenseless *victim* of whichever *side* or as a pure body that must be defended from the aggression of the Other.

The objective of this chapter is to present how the social actor, the Armed Forces and its discourse, is represented or cited in the discourse of the Others. The Others are the political actors that share the stage with the Armed Forces and who compete for the right to construct a collective memory of the past in question. As has already been established, the struggles for memory of the dictatorship period continue to have relevance in the current political scene: How then is the Armed Forces' version represented in the discourse of the Others? In what way is this discourse responded to or recontextualized? How can these struggles for memory be better understood by investigating a series of texts from the press that represent different ideological positions? Military discourse about the dictatorship must be interpreted in relation to that of the rest of society in order to fully understand its meaning and value.

Socio-historical context

According to Uruguayan historian Gerardo Caetano (2000), the model of Uruguayan democratic transition is characterized by avoiding conflict and considering negotiation as indispensable. The two-time President Julio María Sanguinetti (1985 and 1995) is a social actor that symbolizes this transitional model. The transition implies a gradualism in the treatment of the topic of human rights violations. In the agreement of the Club Naval (1984) the political actors of the right (*Partido Colorado* and *Unión Cívica*) and the left (*Frente Amplio*) negotiated an end to the dictatorship with the Armed Forces that implied not prosecuting human rights violations. The *Partido Blanco* did not participate because its leader, Wilson Ferreira Aldunate, was in exile and could not be a candidate in the elections.

Later in the Law of Expiry (1986) what was legislated was the attainment of impunity and the politics of forgetting. The president of this period, Julio María Sanguinetti of the *Partido Colorado*, represents the political interest of making it so that the politics of forgetting would have maximum scope (not even one prosecution or one investigation). However, in the end the Law of Expiry contains an article that opens up the possibility of investigations into the fate of disappeared detainees. The subsequent referendum to repeal the Law of Expiry (organized by the movement of relatives of the disappeared detainees and organizations of the left) transformed the debate about how to resolve human rights violations into something ethical and not only political.

After the victory of the maintenance of the Law of Expiry (57%-43%), the subject was considered settled. However, the subject resurfaced at the end of the 1990s (see Chapters Four and Five). During the second government of Julio María Sanguinetti the topic reappeared due to international factors (although internal factors also exist, see Chapters Four and Five). Human rights organizations and some politicians of the left (Senator Rafael Michelini) proposed the possibility of investigating the *truth* although there may be no chance of prosecution through the courts. These initiatives, along with unexpected episodes (e.g. the case of Tróccoli, see Chapter Five) caused the hegemonic argument about the topic of human rights to be questioned: *the logic of the two demons*. In other words, the idea that two *enemies* existed, the *Tupamaros* and the Armed Forces, who participated in a war incited by the actions of the *subversion* is no longer considered sufficient to explain the abuse of power.

In 1999 the international context again played an important role in the deconstruction of the *Uruguayan solution* to the topic of human rights violations. The Gelman case gave an international dimension to the topic and created a commitment on the part of the Uruguayan State towards the international community. The Gelman case refers to the search for famous Argentinean writer Juan Gelman's granddaughter, who was born while her mother, Gelman's daughter-in-law, was detained in an illegal detention center in Uruguay. Gelman's private investigations indicated that his granddaughter may have lived and been adopted by members of Uruguayan police. With the aim of reconnecting with his granddaughter the writer solicited the help of Uruguayan president Sanguinetti. In spite of great national and international support for the Argentinean writer's initiative the Uruguayan president said he could not help since there was no way to corroborate the writer's information.

In 2000, when Jorge Battle, also of the Colorado Party, became President he collaborated with Gelman and the writer's granddaughter recuperated her identity. This international episode signals the need to reopen the topic of human rights to the government. As a result of these events President Battle created the Peace

Commission, which was constituted by important figures from all political sectors, the Catholic Church, and human rights organizations. The goal of this commission was to investigate the cases of forced disappearance of Uruguayans in order to come to a *state of the soul*⁶ that would allow the construction of peace in Uruguayan society.

These events are accompanied by incidents in which the Armed Forces vindicate their defense of officers accused of human rights violations. The institution declared that it would take care of and support its members against any internal or external threat. In this way a scenario of conflict reappeared and was only increased by international events. Argentinean courts summoned various military and police officers: José Nino Gavazzo, Manuel Cordero, Jorge Silveira, Hugo Campos Hermida and the General Vadora, all accused of human rights violations in Argentinean territory under *Operation Cóndor*.⁷ The Uruguayan state responded

6. This phrase *estado de alma* comes from president Jorge Battle and refers to the need of creating a favorable environment for national reconciliation, which would allow the dictatorial past to be overcome.

7. According to passages published in the magazine *Brecha*, June 29th 2001,

“Argentinean judge Canicoba Corral defines *Operation Condor* as “a criminal plan” designed by “the maximum political and military level” of the dictatorships of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay, “all of which decided to have their operational headquarters in the Republic of Chile”. “The referred to political military agreement”, signals, “it was recognized indirectly by the United States State Department”. The action of *Operation Condor*, directed “to the illegal abduction of people, their disappearance, death, and/or torture, this without regard for the territorial limits of nationality of the victims”, was based in “the commitment of carrying out joint operations against the victims, supposedly terrorist targets, principally in Argentina, being (their objective) the obtaining, exchange, and ordering of the information of intelligence concerning the leftists, communists, and Marxists to eliminate their activities in South America. Additionally, it planned joint operations against victims in all of the member countries and, according to what is deduced from the contributed documentation, according to the presenters, these operations included also the transfer of victims from one country to another” (p. 3).

“el juez argentino Canicoba Corral define a la Operación Cóndor como “un plan criminal” definido “al máximo nivel político y militar” entre las dictaduras de Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Chile, Paraguay y Uruguay, “todos los cuales definieron tener su sede operativo en la República de Chile”. “El referido acuerdo político militar”, señala, “fue reconocido indirectamente por el Departamento de Estado de los Estados Unidos”. La acción del Plan Cóndor, dirigida “al secuestro ilegal de personas, su desaparición, muerte y/o tormento, ello sin importar los límites territoriales o nacionalidad de las víctimas”, se basó en “el compromiso de realizar operaciones conjuntas contra las víctimas, supuestamente blancos terroristas, principalmente en la Argentina, siendo (su objetivo) la obtención, intercambio y ordenamiento de la información de inteligencia concerniente a izquierdistas, comunistas y marxistas para eliminar sus actividades en Sud América. Adicionalmente se prevenían operaciones conjuntas contra víctimas en todos

to these requests by denying the extradition of the summoned parties based on the fact that Uruguayan society had already resolved these topics through the Law of Expiry of 1986.⁸

The political conflict translated as well at the social level into mobilizations and protests by groups such as the *Plenaria Memoria y Justicia* that carried out *escraches*⁹ in front of the social organizations of the Armed Forces, the Ministry of Defense and the *Palacio Legislativo* (Congress). The municipal government's decision to build a commemorative monument to the disappeared also generated conflict. Such events led to a new polarization of society with respect to the topic. However, it is important to point out that opinion polls of 2001 show that the great majority of the population, 64%,¹⁰ supported the creation of the Peace Commission and the investigation into what happened to disappeared detainees, although *radical* groups do exist that questioned the commission's activities.

This brief account of some of the socio-historical and political events gives a better idea of the context of production of the texts analyzed in this chapter. The texts selected for analysis reflect the different ideological sides that are confronting each other in this struggle for memory about the dictatorial past. Two press releases were selected, produced by social organizations representing the positions of the left and the right,¹¹ the (*Círculo Militar* and *Federación de Familiares de*

los países miembros y, según se deduce de la documentación aportada, según los representantes, estas operaciones incluían también el traslado de las víctimas de un país a otro."

8. This case is still open since the current Uruguayan government, from the Left, has allowed justice to consider the legality of the extraditions and does not consider they are covered under the Law of Expiry.

9. The *escraches* are a form of protest in which those accused of human rights violations are confronted directly. The verb *escrachear* means to put into evidence or *to mark*. The ways in which these individuals or institutions are *marked* is through slogans or fliers describing their crimes, or also making public their participation in crimes to neighbors and people with which these individuals are connected to socially. Also in these events there have been cases in which eggs or coins are thrown at the accused.

10. Data coming from a poll carried out in November of 2000 by Interconsult published in the newspaper *El País*, July 15th (Doyenart, 2001). In this poll it is also established that 59% of the citizenship think that joint actions existed between Uruguayan and Argentinean military officers and 49% think that there are individuals who should be extradited to be tried in Argentina. This data reflects the great division on ideological lines that still exists in the Uruguayan population in relation to the resolution of the topic of human rights violations.

11. The selection of articles and their inclusion within the left or right position is based on the constitution of social agents as discursive subjects (Thibault 1991). What is of interest here are the social and interactional practices that are typical of certain discursive subjects of one side or another. That is to say, how the meanings are constructed according to the positioning as subjects of the discourse of an ideological or political side. The selection of the texts is made then

Detenidos Desaparecidos (FEDEFAM). These organizations represent the social actors directly involved in the *events* in dispute: the dictatorship's human rights violations. The other texts are opinion articles of the written press that are affiliated or aligned directly with the left, the magazines *Brecha* and *Latitud 30 35*, or with the right, the periodicals *El Observador* and *Ultimas Noticias*. The texts selected for in-depth analysis are a demonstration of the public debate about the resolution of the topic of human rights violations during the dictatorship in the current Uruguayan political scene.

Intertextuality

All meaning is intertextual. No text is complete or autonomous in itself; it needs to be read, and it is read in relation to other texts. Which other texts? Each community, each discourse tradition, has its own canons of intertextuality, its own principles and customs regarding which texts are most relevant to the interpretation of any one text (cf. Lemke 1985). (Lemke 1995a: 41)

The texts analyzed in this chapter belong to two different ideological groups, the left and the right. Each group can be seen as opposite to the other in terms of interests and points of view. The differences between these groups appear not only in the values they support but also in the ways they represent the world/history. That said, a relationship does exist between the discourses produced by these groups. Their texts demonstrate that the authors are aware of the Other's discourse. Fundamentally intertextual *Thematic patterns* or *thematic formations* (Lemke 1995a) exist in these texts, although their orientation towards the thematic material is different. In spite of the differences it can be said that the texts belong to the same discursive formation.¹² Why can these texts be viewed as related to each other and able to be interpreted together? These texts are related because they concern the

according to the position of these social agents (*Círculo militar*, Ramón Díaz, Hugo Ferrari, FEDEFAM, Samuel Blixen and Pedro Cribari) in relation to the discourse of equality that distinguishes the left and the right (see endnote 2). As a paradigm in each of the ideological currents we have the *Círculo Militar* for the right and the FEDEFAM for the left. The other social agents in the right represent the defense of natural inequality, Ramón Díaz as neoliberal economist (ex-president of the society Mont Pelerin) and Hugo Ferrari as editor of the weekly *Disculpe* of militaristic leanings. For the side of the left those social agents that represent the search for equality, one of them is the ex *Tupamaro* (Samuel Blixen) and the other represents the Center Left (Pedro Cribari).

12. Discursive formation refers to the set of discourses related with the same topics or group of topics that as such construct a discursive reality that at the same time defines the theme or the groups of themes in a historical moment (Lavandera 1985).

same topic and they define the topic in one historical period. The intertextual relationships can be studied within one discursive formation because thematic patterns exist that permit the reading of one text in relation to the others.

The objective then is to understand how meanings are constructed and how discourses of the Other are evaluated. The aim is not to look for the *truth* of one discourse over the other but to try to understand the mechanisms by which one interpretive community tries to impose its construction of events. As Lemke (1995b) states “trying to understand how and why people make the meanings they do is more useful than fighting over the truths of their claims” (p. 156).

What is attempted in this analysis therefore is to recognize the thematic patterns and evaluative orientations that characterize the texts which form part of these discursive formations. How are continuities with the past constructed in such texts? How are alliances and oppositions established with other discourse? How are other discourses evaluated? What is desirable and what is guaranteed for the different social actors involved? There is an interdependence between the constructed meanings and the social and political positions that the actors occupy (Lemke 1995b).¹³

The focus of this analysis is manifest intertextuality (Fairclough 1992), meaning the cases in which other specific texts are turned to in the construction of the base text. Some of the ways by which the texts reveal this manifest intertextuality are: reported speech, irony and metadiscourse.

The reported speech or citation (direct or indirect) implies not only the selection of the cited text, but also how this text is presented (evaluated), and for what it is used. In other words, it is not only important to identify the ideational content of the cited texts but also to identify how the voices of these texts are interrelated with the voices of the base text representing them (Voloshinov 1973). In this case, the texts from the ideological right analyzed in this chapter tend to make direct reference or direct citation of the Other's texts with the aim of deconstructing them and using them to reinforce their own arguments (see analysis in chapter Three which demonstrates the use of the same strategy). For example:

(1) Like this the author [‘Che’ Guevara] pontificates:

‘We can only triumph over the Armies to the extent that we can undermine their morale; and this is undermined by ‘inflicting’ defeats on them (*sic*) and causing them repeated sufferings.’

‘The war must be taken to their house, made totally. They must be impeded from having one moment of tranquility, made to feel cornered fiercely every place they may pass.’

13. Of course also the social and political position of the person that analyzes the text affects the interpretation and reading of these texts.

‘Hate as a factor of struggle, the intransigent hate for the enemy, impels a man beyond the natural limitations of the human being and converts him into an effective, violent, selective and cold killing machine.’

Three quotes that synthesize the principles of a doctrine of an action to attain power; that has hate as the impulse of a fight without limits against the military, its enemy. Three quotes that in general terms outline what is happening. Three quotes that were the prologue to the movie we have all already seen. (Círculo Militar, 2001) ¹⁴

In this example, the text of the Other (the opposition) is cited directly, and is introduced with a verb of projection that indicates an evaluation of the presented statement. By presenting the words of the Other as a *pontification*, a messianism and a character of haughtiness or pretension of knowing the “truth” is attributed to the Other. The Other is presented as distant from the audience and as having airs of superiority. The commentary that follows the direct citation of the Other’s text newly evaluates the content presented in the citation. This message is characterized in affective terms, showing the actions of the Other as motivated by negative feelings and defining the relationship with the social actor of the Armed forces as one of antagonism.

The Other is the one that defines the relationship as one of war by designating the Armed Forces as the *enemy*. In this way the responsibility for creating a warlike situation is transferred to the Other, and for this reason the Armed Forces are portrayed as only defending themselves against the Other’s attack. The last commentary about the citation guides the reader to establish a relationship between the cited text, produced in the 1960s, and the left’s discourse in the current situation. The Armed Forces are again victims in a struggle for power.

Another way that direct citation of the Other’s texts is used is as a hypothetical case of what could have occurred if the subversion had *won the battle*.

14. “Así pontifica el autor [‘Che’Guevara]: ‘Solamente podemos triunfar sobre los Ejércitos en la medida que podamos minar su moral; y ésta se mina ‘infligiéndoles’(sic) derrotas y ocasionándoles sufrimientos repetidos.’

‘Hay que llevar la guerra a su casa, hacerla total. Hay que impedirle tener un minuto de tranquilidad, hacerle sentirse una fiera acorralada por cada lugar que transite.’

‘El odio como factor de lucha, el odio intransigente al enemigo, que impulsa más allá de las limitaciones naturales del ser humano y lo convierte en una efectiva, violenta, selectiva y fría máquina de matar.’

Tres párrafos que sintetizan los lineamientos doctrinarios de un accionar para alcanzar el poder; que tiene el odio como impulsor de una lucha sin claudicaciones contra el Ejército, que es el enemigo. Tres párrafos que en términos generales encuadran lo que está pasando. Tres párrafos que fueron el prólogo de una película que ya vimos”(Círculo Militar, 2001).

- (2) My memory drifts to *El Paredón*, the novel by Carlos Martínez Moreno, when he presents the case of the hundreds of dissidents executed in the initial phase of the Cuban revolution from Castro's point of view: 'What was the destiny of one man, what could the fate of 500 men mean – one for every 1000 of the deaths in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Fidel had said when speaking of the disciplinary actions – if what had been set in motion was a revolution, and in the belly of revolution grows, beyond death, a seed of happiness? Who comes out today in the streets to reproach the French revolution's hangings, who cries now for their paper deaths?' (pp. 243/4). A *paper death* is what they want Pascasio Báez to be. And he must not be allowed to become one. Paper is an ephemeral material; ink upon it pales progressively and eventually vanishes; it can remain hidden beneath thick stacks that do not contain even one word of truth. No, Pascasio Báez' is a true death. Nor are the other murders paper, the other dead, the living dead during long lapses, imprisoned in inhumane conditions, victims of insurmountable psychological traumas. Their suffering cries out to the sky, their spilt blood reaches to the sky, and the premeditated venom injected into the veins of my brother Pascasio, cries out higher than anything. It is not permissible that we allow them to be silenced.

(Ramón Díaz 2001)¹⁵

This example contains a projection of another projection presented as evidence of the strategy utilized by the left to keep a tight hold on the construction of a collective memory that includes the *victims of sedition* (among them the laborer Pascasio

15. "Mi recuerdo vuela hacia *El Paredón*, la novela de Carlos Martínez Moreno, cuando presenta el caso de los centenares de disidentes fusilados en la etapa inicial de la revolución cubana desde el ángulo castrista: '¿Qué era el destino de un hombre, qué podía significar el destino de 500 hombres – el uno por 1000 de los muertos en Hiroshima y Nagasaki, había dicho Fidel al hablar de los juicios sumarios – si lo que se echaba a andar era una revolución, y en el vientre de una revolución crece, más allá de la muerte, una semilla de felicidad? ¿Quién sale hoy a la calle a reprocharle sus pescuezos a la revolución Francesa, quién llora por sus muertos de papel?'" (pp. 243/4).

"Un 'muerto de papel' eso es lo que quieren que sea Pascasio Báez. Y no debe serlo. El papel es un material efímero; sobre él la tinta empalidece progresivamente y termina por desvanecerse; puede quedar oculto bajo gruesos folios que no contengan una sola palabra de verdad. No, Pascasio Báez es un muerto de verdad. Ni son de papel los otros asesinados, los otros muertos, los muertos en vida durante largos lapsos, presos en condiciones inhumanas, víctimas de traumas psíquicos insuperables. Sus padecimientos claman al cielo, su sangre derramada clama al cielo, y el veneno alevemente inyectado en las venas de mi hermano Pascasio, clama más alto que nada. No nos es lícito silenciarlos" (Ramón Díaz 2001).

Baéz as a symbol of the fallen innocents in this fight).¹⁶ The author of the text uses a novel written by a recognized Uruguayan writer of the left, in other words a fictional text, about real events that occurred in Cuba during the revolution. The citation maintains the indirect free style with which the author, Martínez Moreno, reports the words of Fidel Castro. In other words, the discourse represented by the writer of a fictional text attributed to Fidel is presented as *authentic*. Later this text is used as an analogy to the strategy used by the present day Uruguayan left to construct its discourse about the dictatorship period. In this text, the left's discourse is discredited by indirect association with Fidel, who is a questionable figure for the right. By comparing and equating the left with Fidel, the author indirectly discredits the discourse and the validity of the left's ethical argument.

In the case of the texts from the ideological left, the resource of reported speech appears through the citation of terms belonging to the Other's discourse. This citation is made with an ironic tone that marks the difference between the function of a term in the Other's discourse and the voice with which the text's author uses the term to construct his own meaning (Fairclough 1992). Through the use of quotation marks the difference between the meaning, which is echoed and the new meaning with which the term is used is marked. For example:

- (3) It is not enough to know that Aída Sanz was savagely tortured when she was nine months pregnant. It is not even enough to know that her child was stolen and that she was tortured again immediately after giving birth; it is necessary to know that she gave birth staked, on top of a torture table, in order to understand what kind of "war" was fought, what types of missions "defense of the fatherland" referred to, and what class of morals those "combatants" exhibited, some of whom today have command over troops and power of influence over their subordinates.

(Samuel Blixen 2001)¹⁷

16. It is important to mention that the anecdote about the laborer Pascacio Báez appears in recurring form in the texts of the Armed Forces. It is used as a counter-argument against the accusations of human rights violations made against the armed institution. This would be another example of intertextuality in which the same example recurs as a justificatory argument of the actions of the Armed Forces. See Chapters Two and Three.

17. "No alcanza con saber que Aída Sanz fue torturada salvajemente con nueve mese de embarazo. Ni siquiera alcanza saber que su hijo fue robado y que ella volvió a ser torturada inmediatamente después de parir; es necesario saber que dio a luz estaqueada, sobre una mesa de torturas, para comprender qué clase de "guerra" se libraba, qué tipo de misiones imponía "defensa de la patria", y qué clase de moral exhibían aquellos "combatientes", algunos de los cuales tienen hoy mando de tropa y poder de influencia sobre sus subordinados" (Samuel Blixen 2001).

This example recontextualizes the cited discourse of the Other (the Armed Forces) by way of key terms in which the dispute about how to construct the memory of the dictatorship period is based. The recontextualization of this discourse within the narration about the crimes committed by this Other gives an ironic tone to the Other's lexical selection. Additionally, when these lexical selections are seen in relation to the content in which they are immersed the Other's construction is discredited. Space is left to the reader so that the reader responds to the questions about the ethical and logical coherence of the argument of the Other (the Armed Forces).

The same strategy of citing terms that represent the center of the Armed Forces' argument with an ironic tone also appears in the following example.

- (4) Every day more and more are asking why this country has to continue tolerating an arrogant heart that looks down on us and puts pressure on us. Maybe the new generations of citizens are going to remain trapped by a supposed debt derived from a "military triumph" in which there was no more than a hunt done with a cattle prod and a hood that never merited a dictatorship of 12 years that bankrupted the nation and denigrated all of us?
(FEDEFAM 2001)¹⁸

In this example, the Other's vocabulary is again cited between quotation marks, indicating an ironic tone, but in addition this interpretation of history is discredited through the specification of the author's own interpretation of events. In addition to marking the Other's word with an ironic tone, the Other's position is criticized by way of a metonymy that represents the actions of the military institution during the dictatorship around the symbols of torture, the cattle prod and the hood.

Metaphor is another of the resources by which reference to other texts is made in the construction of a given text. In this case both actors, those of the right and the left, turn to the same metaphor to characterize the Other. The metaphor of mental illness as social deviation appears in the texts of the right and the left in order to modify the actions of the Other. The metaphor is realized in these texts by way of the selection of processes (verbs), adjectives and nouns that characterize the participants or the experience in terms of the vehicle of the metaphor.

For example:

- (5) If they believe like in their dictatorial delirium, that they can continue thinking like the king that *l'état c'est moi*, they are mistaken.

18. "Cada vez son más los que se preguntan por qué este país tiene que seguir aguantando a un cogollo prepotente que nos desprestigia y nos presiona. ¿Acaso van a quedar atrapadas las nuevas generaciones ciudadanas por una supuesta deuda derivada de un "triunfo bélico" en lo que no fue más que una cacería hecha a picana y capucha que jamás ameritó una dictadura de 12 años que fundió al país y nos denigró a todos?"(FEDEFAM 2001).

Since 1985 we have returned to be a democratic republic and those that exercise power are those that were elected and authorized by the sovereign [the people]. All of us must submit to these norms. Perhaps the Armed Forces, accustomed to the unlimited exercise of usurped powers may have great difficulty locating themselves in reality, but frankly, they will have to make the effort because the citizenship demands it, not only the times (of the country and the world that can hardly understand, and never justify the Uruguayan 'solution') but also its own future. (FEDEFAM 2001)¹⁹

- (6) And it must be recognized that this part so close to our history, that others wish to be unknown or to pass unnoticed by the minds of our descendants, in reality is indicating to us what could happen to us in the persistence of that insistence of relegating it to forgetting, all the more when those people who were the principal ones responsible for the sedition that devastated our country and put its institutions in danger in this period are permanently instilling in the consciousness of our youths 'their' own history, inciting them to a vengefulness that portrays 'them' as martyrs of a situation that they themselves wanted, initiated, and carried out, a situation which luckily would culminate in the failure of their crazed venture inspired and promoted by Fidel Castro and Che Guevara, as the first explicitly recognized it. (Hugo Ferrari 2000)²⁰

The metaphor of mental illness refers to a lack of control, an abnormality, and a bestiality in contrast to rationality.²¹ Defining the Other as the one that is deviant

19. "Si creen como en su delirio dictatorial, que pueden seguir pensando como el rey que *l'etat c'est moi*, se equivocan.

Desde 1985 volvimos a ser una república democrática y los poderes los ejercen quienes fueron electos y mandados por el soberano. Todos debemos someternos a estas normas. Tal vez las FF. AA. Acostumbradas al ejercicio ilimitado de los poderes usurpados tengan gran dificultad en ubicarse en la realidad, pero francamente, van a tener que hacer un esfuerzo porque se lo exige la ciudadanía, no sólo los tiempos (del país y del mundo que a penas puede comprender, jamás justificar la 'solución uruguaya') sino su propio futuro" (FEDEFAM 2001).

20. "Y debe reconocerse que esa parte tan cercana de nuestra historia, que otros pretenden que sea desconocida o pase desapercibida por la mente de nuestros descendientes, en realidad está indicándonos qué es lo que nos puede ocurrir de persistir en esa insistencia por relegarla al olvido, máxime cuando quienes fueron los principales responsables de la sedición que asoló a nuestro país y puso en jaque sus instituciones en ese período permanentemente están inculcando en las conciencias de nuestros jóvenes "su" propia historia, incitándolos a un revanchismo que los pone a "ellos" como mártires de una situación que fue querida, iniciada y realizada por ellos mismos, la que felizmente culminara con el fracaso de su alocada aventura inspirada y fomentada por Fidel Castro y el Che Guevara, como el primero lo reconociera explícitamente" (Hugo Ferrari 2000).

21. See *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* by Michel Foucault (1973) in which he makes an archeology of an experience of madness in different periods and

or irrational creates an image of the Other that permits their exclusion or their treatment under different ethical norms. Rationality cannot be applied to explain the conduct of the Other. Metaphors of insanity have also been used to represent the influence of evil or the diabolical in human beings. According to Foucault (1973), in the Middle Ages the idea of insanity was associated with sin or temptation. That is to say, these representations of the Other as exemplifying that which is deviant or irrational allows one to further attribute a relationship between the Other and that which is evil or wicked.

Another way in which texts of others are incorporated into a given text is through presuppositions. Presuppositions are propositions that are taken as given or already established in the text. Generally linguistic indexes exist that provide evidence of the mechanism in action (for example the use of definite articles) (Fairclough 1992). The presuppositions that are of interest to point out in the texts under analysis here, are those that refer to general ideas the authors assume are shared by the rest of the community. These presuppositions represent the self-image of the nation that the different social actors take as a base of the community. A community in which there is consensus about the values and ethical norms that should regulate the coexistence of citizens is appealed to. The texts of the right presuppose that ethical norms vary with the situation of *war*. On the other hand, the texts of the left presuppose that ethical norms and the justice by which the community must be ruled should apply to all citizens equally. For example:

- (7) Do they realize that we fought? Do they understand the danger that we faced? The last thing we must do is permit all the evils that that dark period threw at us to be perceived as concentrated in the repression of the tremendous threat that hovered over our freedoms, instead of identifying these wrongs above all with the insanity of the revolting ones, and their potential to transform us into another great prison. If there are unjust deaths to remember for which the repressors are responsible, we would have to keep in mind that history does not tend to show cases of countries that suffer from an internal aggression like the one we suffered without repression having fallen in excess. And, above all, we must keep the memory alive of the atrocities that we saw the subversion commit against innocent compatriots, for which whatever similar action in the future that could occur would have its adequate response; this time without hesitation.

(Ramón Díaz 2001)²²

how the concepts of rationality, animal nature and normality or control are related with this experience.

22. *“¿Se dan cuenta de qué nos libramos? ¿comprenden el peligro que corrimos? Lo último que debemos hacer es permitir que todos los males que aquella época oscura nos deparó se perciban*

- (8) The crimes for which those men are accused were not committed on Uruguayan soil, rather in Argentinean territory, under the sovereignty of the people and powers of Argentina. For the alleged, or not so, crimes perpetrated in Uruguay, sovereignty was expressed freely and its will must be respected. For the crimes committed outside of our territory, let the justice of the affected countries judge them.

But if what occurs is that the interpretation of the legal text is taken to the extreme in order to prevent alleged unrest, turbulence and instability, we must ask ourselves: What mistake did we Uruguayans make, the authorities mainly, for which 17 years after overcoming the nightmare of the coup, it continues influencing the acts of the government? Is our democracy that weak? Are the democratic convictions and institutions of our uniformed officers so fragile? Could it really be that four could accomplish more than three million? (Pedro Cribari 2001)²³

The examples presented above show how in general the argumentation of both the right and the left presuppose that the debates about the resolution of crimes involving human rights violations must be resolved. The right presupposes that we must take the situation of crisis into account and evaluate the period with a situational ethics since the *excesses* were committed in defense of democracy. On the other hand, the left aspires to the idea that a legal and moral norm exists that should be applicable equally to all citizens so that confidence in democratic institutions

concentrados en la represión de la tremenda amenaza que se cernió sobre nuestras libertades, en vez de identificarlos ante todo con la insania de los revoltosos, y su potencial para transformarnos en otra gran prisión. Si hay muertes injustas que recordar a cargo de los represores, habremos de tener asimismo presente que la historia no suele mostrar casos de países que sufran una agresión intestina como la que padecemos sin que la represión haya caído en exceso. Y, sobre todo, debemos mantener viva la memoria de las atrocidades que vimos cometer a la subversión contra compatriotas inocentes, para que cualquier brote semejante que en el futuro pudiese reproducirse tenga su condigna respuesta; esta vez sin dilación" (Ramón Díaz 2001).

23. "Los delitos por los que se acusa a estos señores no fueron cometidos en suelo uruguayo, sino en territorio argentino, bajo la soberanía del pueblo y los poderes argentinos. Por los presuntos, o no tanto, delitos perpetrados en Uruguay, el soberano se expresó libérrimamente y su voluntad debe respetarse. Por los delitos cometidos fuera de nuestro territorio, que sean las justicias de los países afectados las que juzguen.

Pero si lo que sucede es que se extrema la interpretación del texto legal para prevenir presuntos malestares, presuntas turbulencias e inestabilidades cabe preguntarnos: ¿En qué nos equivocamos los uruguayos, las autoridades principalmente, para que 17 años después de superada la pesadilla golpista, ésta siga presidiendo los actos de gobierno? ¿Tan débil es nuestra democracia? ¿Tan frágiles son las convicciones democráticas e instituciones de nuestros uniformados? ¿Será que cuatro pueden más que tres millones?" (Pedro Cribari 2001).

can be reestablished. Both presuppositions appear as a response or contestation to the discourse of the Other that questions the arguments they present.

Genre analysis: The press release and opinion article

Political discourse is a language of action, an argumentation for social action based in the appeal to social values (Lemke 1995b). The discursive practices of this domain, the political domain, are limited by cultural conventions. Depending on the objective that a group is trying to accomplish the culture has different genres to realize it. Genres are a type of social practice represented by a certain set of stable textual conventions, production conventions, and distribution and consumption conventions. It is important to remember that this generic stability is open to modifications and creative appropriations. Therefore we do not encounter identical realizations each time we identify a type of text or social practice as part of a given genre. Lemke (1995b) explains this concept clearly as follows,

At any given time the characteristic cultural patterns of action of a community must be enacted through material processes, by actual human organisms in interaction with each other and with other elements of the ecosystem. Each enactment of a ritual, each performance of a song, each making of a tool, each writing of a sonnet will be unique and different, but it will also re-enact criterial features common to a cultural formation. (p.125)

The texts selected for in-depth analysis in this chapter represent productions of social actors belonging to different ideological sides, the left and the right. Additionally, these texts correspond to social actors representing the different positions in the political discussion about how to resolve the topic of the dictatorship's human rights violations. The corpus is formed by texts belonging to a *macro genre, that of political opinion*. In other words, the texts belong to a type of social activity characterized by the transmission of a group or a representative individual of a group's position with respect to a political topic to the realm of public opinion. The genre is also characterized by trying to influence the audience's opinion about the topic. This macro-genre can be sub-categorized into other more specific ones, in this case, (1) the press release, and (2) the opinion article/editorial (Op-ed). According to White (1997) this type of genre can be classified as based in the communicative since it reflects the activity of constructing meanings or resignifying public debates or controversies about crucial affairs in the community.

This analysis focuses on genre as a type of text associated with a particular structural composition. In the case of the genres analyzed in this chapter, the press

release and the opinion article, certain participants and compositional structures associated with these social practices exist.²⁴

The press release is characterized by involving an organization in the position of subject that informs the audience, the general public, about a topic. This type of genre is organized sequentially in the following functional constituents:

- a. Headline (a heading that presents that which is essential of the topic, it is optional)
- b. A presentation of the topic (summary)
- c. Development (more detailed description of the favored argument with respect to the topic)
- d. Result (call to action).

On the other hand, the opinion article is characterized by being a type of social activity that includes a reporter or a columnist as participant (this figure is generally a recognized journalist, intellectual or professional that is clearly identified with an ideological position) and an audience with whom the opinion about the topic is shared. Additionally, the audience's affinity with the article's position is supposed. At the level of compositional structure, the opinion article genre is characterized by having the following functional constituents:

- a. a Headline (that summarizes the fundamental part of the article's topic)
- b. a thesis (summarizes the position of the journalist about the topic)
- c. a development (presents the argumentation and examples that support the article's position, sometimes includes a deconstruction of the opposition's argument)
- d. final outcome or consequence (sometimes accompanied by a call to action).

Of course, it is important to remember that these are the ideal characteristics of these genres and that therefore in their instantiations not all of the functional constituents described above always appear. It is also important to signal the fact that these formal structures are not developed in linear form. According to White (1997) one of the particular characteristics of this type of genre is its *orbital* structure. That is to say, that the rhetorical and informational objectives are realized by way of a non-linear structure in which dependent *satellites* elaborate, explain, contextualize, and evaluate a dominant nucleus at the textual level.

In what follows, the functional constituents of the texts analyzed in this chapter are described (it must be kept in mind that the graphical representation of these genres does not convey the *satellite* structure described above).

24. Few studies of discourse analysis of these sub-genres exist. Some of the studies with a perspective of discourse analysis about related genres are van Dijk (1988, 1993, 1995, 1996), Bolívar (1994) and White (1997).

Table 1. Press release and Opinion article (genre analysis by functional constituents)

<p>Text 1 (Press Release: Gacetilla del Círculo Militar)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Headline: “Demonstration of support of Mr. Commander in Chief of the Army”²⁵ 2. Introduction: Positioning of the event in which the text was produced (setting: act of support to the management of the Commander in Chief of the Military) 3. Report of the discourse (Projection) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. anecdote: the Lord of Venice b. thesis: support of the management in defense and vindication of the Armed Forces realized by the Commander in Chief c. Reasons for the support: institutional identity, evaluation of the political situation in reference to the Armed Forces d. Counter-argumentation: response to the accusations from sectors critical of the conduct of the Armed Forces with respect to the topic of human rights violations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> d.1. citation of the discourse of the Other (Che Guevara) d.2. citation of authorities (Mahatma Ghandi) d.3. Criticism of the government (Peace Commission, climate of permissibility) d.4. criticism of the actions of the groups of the opposition (<i>escraches</i>, taking over of secondary schools) e. warning: danger of the crisis of values in the society f. exhortation: continue defending the action of the Armed Forces 4. Coda: description of the finalization of the event.
<p>Text 2 (Opinion article: column by Ramón Díaz)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Headline “We must keep the memory alive of the atrocities that we saw the subversion commit against innocent compatriots. Disappeared and forgotten.”²⁶ 2. Introduction: anecdote (motivation for writing: case of Pereyra Reverbel) 3. Thesis: importance of not forgetting the events that led to the dictatorship

25. “Demostración de apoyo al Señor Comandante en Jefe del Ejército”

26. “Debemos mantener viva la memoria de las atrocidades que vimos cometer a la subversión contra compatriotas inocentes. Desaparecidos y olvidados.”

-
4. counter-argumentation
- a. concession (valid aspects of the claims of the Other: the disappeared)
 - b. criticism of the opposition's arguments
 - c) use of examples in order to refute the argument of the Other and support the article's own argument (anecdote of Pascacio Báez; citation of the case of Cuba, citation of Che Guevara)
5. Evaluation: justification of the repression
6. Exhortation: do not forget the actions of the subversives and remember the *victims of the sedition*
- Text 3** (Opinion article: Column by Hugo Ferrari)
1. Headline: "Why do I write like this?"²⁷
 2. Introduction: anecdote (motivation for writing: questions of family members and friends)
 3. Thesis: relationship between the country's past and future political history
 4. counter-argumentation
 - a. criticism of the opposition (that they don't *tell all of history*)
 - b. moral discrediting of the Other (manipulation of youth, negative moral evaluation)
 - c. precise anecdotes about illegal acts of the opposition without directly mentioning the actors involved in them (senator, journalist)
 - d. present criminal acts related with actors of the opposition
 - e. citation of a recognized political figure (Milka Barbato)
 5. reiteration of the thesis
- Text 4** (Press release of FEDEFAM)
1. Headline: "To the public opinion"²⁸
 2. Introduction: description of the situation in which the text is written (functioning of the Peace Commission)
 3. Thesis: what is needed for the Peace Commission to function
 4. Evaluation of the socio-political context
 5. counter-argumentation
 - a. moral discrediting of the Armed Forces for their past actions
 - b. questioning of the institution's role in the current time
 - c. anecdote (summons of Uruguayan military officers by Argentinean justice)
 - d. criticism of the reaction of the institution with respect to the human rights violations
 - e. reinterpretation of the events according to FEDEFAM

27. "¿Por qué escribo así?"

28. "A la opinion pública"

6. warning: do not return to tolerate the institution's immoral attitude with respect to the topic of human rights violations
7. exhortation: appeal to the government, the parliament and the younger generations of the institution not to support the actions of the Armed Forces with respect to the topic of human rights violations
- Text 5** (Opinion article: column by Samuel Blixen)
1. Headline: "Privatization of memory"²⁹
 2. Introduction: collective memory of *our people* (justification for remembering that which is painful in great detail)
 3. thesis: remember so as not to repeat
 4. counter-argument
 - a. anecdote of Aída Sanz
 - b. questioning of the history according to the Other (the Armed Forces)
 - c. questioning of the actions of the government with respect to the topic of human rights violations
 - d. concession of differences within the group of opposition
 - e. anecdote of Sara Méndez
 - f. moral discrediting of the actions of the government with respect to human rights violations.
 - 5) Conclusion: evaluation of the situation with respect to the resolution of the topic of human rights violations
- Text 6** (Opinion article: column by Pedro Cribari)
1. Headline: "Country Cost"³⁰
 2. Introduction: extension of the metaphor to the topic of human rights violations (*country cost*)
 3. thesis: effect of the past on the image of the country today
 4. counter argument
 - a. anecdote: summons of Uruguayan military officers by Argentinean justice
 - b. prediction of the resolution of this case by analogy to past cases
 - c. criticism of the logic employed by the government to resolve the matter
 5. presentation of a possible alternative to resolve the topic of human rights violations
 6. Conclusion: questioning of the democratic bases in relation to the resolution of the topic of human rights violations
-

Due to their communicative objectives the texts analyzed here function as expository texts in which a series of events and conducts in relation to the topic of the

29. "Privatización de la memoria"

30. "Costo País"

dictatorship's human rights violations and their resolution in current politics are interpreted and explained. They are texts that try to construct a social reality at the same time as they make calls for action to transform the social situation. They belong to what Martin (1989) calls texts of hortatory exposition and analytical exposition. Hortatory exposition aims to persuade someone to do something and it possesses some characteristics of oral language. On the other hand, analytical exposition aims to persuade the audience that something is correct, and therefore it is more impersonal. These characteristics of the texts are reflected in their lexi-co-semantic and discursive features. The next section describes how the communicative functions of these texts are linguistically realized.

Textual analysis

We use language to keep the past alive.

(Martin 1989: 3)

The focus of this section resides in the aspects of textual analysis related with the social construction of reality and social relationships. It is hoped that the writers' ideological differences are reflected in the way the texts are constructed. According to Martin (1989) the protagonists of the left who are trying to change the status quo tend to use hortatory exposition to persuade the audience of their point of view or position in the argument; the protagonists of the right on the other hand would tend to favor analytical exposition to persuade the audience that the status quo is correct and that nothing needs to be changed. Martin's analysis is based in a situational context in which there is a marked power difference and the right is considered to be in control. However, for cases similar to the one that is of interest here, the Uruguayan case in reference to the debate about human rights violations during the dictatorship, the distribution of power is not so uniform.

In spite of the fact that at the time the left continued to have a smaller amount of power, its access to the environment of municipal and parliamentary power had increased its possibility to question what until a few years ago was the hegemonic monopoly of the right. The textual constructions of the actors from different ideological sides reflect this change in power relationships. In the texts analyzed in this chapter a mixture of both types of exposition can be seen; both the more emotional and motivational hortatory exposition and the more impersonal and *fact-focused* analytical are present. Table 2 demonstrates the general characteristics of the texts in reference to the situational context (what is the topic, what is the relationship between participants and which is the mode in which language is used).

Table 2. Analysis of situational context (register)

TEXTS	FIELD	TENOR	MODE
Text 1 (<i>Círculo Militar</i>)	Reaffirmation of institutional identity and validation of the action of the Armed Forces in response to <i>attacks</i> received for accusations of human rights violations	Formal text that reflects an unequal power distribution between members of the same group. Solidarity with the audience and authority manifested in the selection of vocabulary that denotes belonging to the military institution. Us vs. them	Text written to be communicated orally to a present audience. They are reflexive texts written by a representative elected by the group as a spokesperson for an audience consisting of members of the institution. New information is not given, the evaluation at the ethical level is the new meaning presented.
Text 2 (Ramón Díaz)	Expression of the need to keep the memory of the <i>atrocities</i> committed by the <i>subversion</i> alive. Response to the opposition's discourse that demands the memory of the disappeared victims of the repression of the dictatorship.	Informal text that displays the writer's intention of establishing a tie of solidarity with the audience. A certain distance is maintained, however, due to the fact that the writer appears as an expert and the one who possesses the information. Us vs. them	Text written to be read by an unknown audience. It is a journalistic opinion article and so the author presents his position and reflection about the topics in a personal manner. New information is not presented, it is assumed the reader already has it. Instead the author tries to make it so that the reader remembers it and uses it in the evaluation of current events.

TEXTS	FIELD	TENOR	MODE
Text 3 (Hugo Ferrari)	Explanation of the need to write about the past and the actions of the <i>subversion</i> . Response to the version of the dictatorial past presented by the opposition.	Semi-formal style with little distance between the audience and the writer. The reader is appealed to directly through the use of questions. The similarity between the experience of the author and that of the <i>common citizen</i> is pointed out. The author appears as an authority because he is the one who has the information. Us vs. them	Text written to be read by an unknown audience. By being an opinion article the author expresses his opinion directly expressing judgments and evaluations. Supposedly new information is presented so that the reader makes a judgment about the political situation.
Text 4 (FEDEFAM)	Criticism of the Armed Forces with respect to the solution of topics related to human rights violations. Exhortation to the government and parliament that they not support the actions of the institution.	Formal text with a tone that is at times ironic and highly evaluative. Reader and writer are represented as distant. The writer dominates the information and separates the actors into two groups: us vs. them	Text written for a very extensive audience. Of impersonal character although very emotive. The information is taken as known, that which is new is its moral significance
Text 5 (Samuel Blixen)	Criticism of the government's management with respect to the topic of human rights violations, especially the Peace Commission.	Formal text of impersonal character. The third person plural is utilized and the evaluations are presented as <i>facts</i> . The distance between the audience and the writer is relative, solidarity exists but so does a power difference because the author has the space to socialize the information.	Text written to be read by a like-minded audience. The tone is reflexive and in moments ironic. Judgments are expressed and emotive language is used. It is an opinion article that is presented as <i>factual</i> or <i>objective</i> .

TEXTS	FIELD	TENOR	MODE
Text 6 (Pedro Cribari)	Effects of the government decisions with respect to the summons to Argentinean justice of Uruguayan military officers accused of human rights violations.	Semi-formal text. The author presents the information using a technical vocabulary. Solidarity with the audience is established through direct appeal by way of questions and the use of the inclusive second person plural (<i>we</i>).	Text written to be read by an audience that is constructed as neutral about the topic. Reflexive and evaluative text. It is a reflection about shared information. The audience is invited to take a position.

These texts represent the topic of human rights violations and the various responsibilities they entail in different ways by making different lexico-grammar and discourse-semantic choices. In what follows these choices are described. Using the analysis of Martin (1989) as a model, this analysis focuses on the following categories:

- a. selection of processes (verbs),
- b. use of passives,
- c. lexical density in the Theme (selection of topic Themes),
- d. experiential grammatical metaphor,
- e. reference to actors,
- f. interpersonal relation (selection of the type of clause),
- g. expression of attitudes (towards the participants/towards the truth or fiction of the argument),
- h. expressions of certitude or necessity,
- i. intensification (emphasis).

In addition to the above categories, an analysis is carried out of how the evaluation of social actors is realized and what discursive strategies³¹ are used to reinforce the arguments presented in the texts.

Analysis of the selection of processes (verbs) indicates a text's focus towards what is going on in the world or what is going on in the minds of the people. For example, the text could construct the topic around the *events* or around the actors that experience them, decide them, and realize them. By analyzing the texts' selection of processes, participants, and circumstances (transitivity according to Halliday

31. The concept of strategy is used following that of (Wodak 1996 & De Cilia, Reisigl & Wodak 1999) to refer to the plans of action with different degrees of elaboration that go from automatic to conscious and that are located in different levels of mental organization. The concept is used when considering its implications from a perspective of the cognitive process as socially constructed.

Table 3. Representation and agency (Transitivity)

Type of Process	Material	Relational	Mental	Verbal	Behavioral	Existential	N total
Text 1 (<i>Círculo Militar</i>)	32	14	6	11	0	8	71
Text 2 (R. Díaz)	30	26	14	12	1	2	85
Text 3 (H. Ferrari)	7	8	7	5	0	0	27
Text 4 (FEDEFAM)	22	21	13	1	0	0	57
Text 5 (S. Blixen)	22	15	7	0	0	0	44
Text 6 (P. Cribari)	8	11	8	3	0	1	31

1994) one can see how ideational meaning is constructed, or in other words the historical representation of experience. The following table demonstrates the distribution of verbal processes in each text.

As the table (Table 3) above demonstrates, all of the texts exhibit a tendency to construct the experience based on that which occurs in the world (material processes, existential and relational ones) more than as something constructed from the perception, feelings, thoughts or words of a participant (mental processes, verbal processes, and behavioral processes). The following examples illustrate the preference for verbs that denote an action, relationship or an existence.

- (9) The Armed Forces after having concentrated, making illegitimate (material), the judicial, legislative and executive powers – none of which belonged (relational) to them to exercise- maintaining them (material) in their hands during 12 years, suffer (mental) from a profound confusion: they believe (mental) that they are the country. It is (relational) good to tell (verbal) them that they are not (relational), they never were (relational) nor will they be (relational). (text 4, FEDEFAM)³²
- (10) A photo of Ulysses Pereira Reverbel that appeared last week in this same supplement, forced me to select (material) today's topic. In the photograph he appeared (relational) in a cell where he passed part of his long captivity.

32. "Las FF. AA. después de haber concentrado, bastardeándolos (material), los poderes judicial legislativo y ejecutivo –ninguno de los cuales les correspondía (relacional) ejercer- manteniéndolos (material) en sus manos durante 12 años, adolecen (mental) de una profunda confusión: creen (mental) que son el país. Es (relacional) bueno decirles (verbal) que no lo son (relacional), no lo fueron (relacional) ni lo serán (relacional)" (texto 4, FEDEFAM).

In the article it was recorded (verbal) that the legislators of the MPP –*Tupamaros* of the same that had him imprisoned- retired (material) from the room when a senator traced (material) his biographical sketch. The image and the anecdote mixed together (material) with the memory that the disappeared are going to be immortalized (material) in bronze.

(text 2, Ramón Díaz)³³

However, it is important to note that texts do exist from both ideological sides in which the experience of the participant has a high degree of representation. In text 3 (by Hugo Ferrari), for example, there is a relationship of 1:1 between the processes that reflect what occurs in the world and those that reflect what occurs from the perspective of a participant. The participant's experience is also represented to a high degree in the case of text 6 (by Pedro Cribari) where the relationship is 1.8:1. This means that the texts do not only present an *account* of events but they also give sufficient weight to the commentary the authors make about these events. These texts are obviously explanations of the events from the perspective of the author more than simply a representation of the events themselves.

An analysis of how the responsibility for the *events* represented in the texts is distributed reveals that the role of actor or agent is assigned to different social actors with differences between the constructions of one ideological side and the other. Table 4 depicts the selection of social actors with the role of agent in every text.

33. “Una foto de Ulysses Pereira Reverbel, aparecida la semana pasada en este mismo supplement, me forzó a elegir el tema de hoy. Aparecía (relacional) retratado en una celda donde pasó parte de su largo cautiverio. En el artículo se consignaba (verbal) que los legisladores del MPP –*tupamaros* de los mismos que lo tuvieron preso- se retiraron (material) de sala cuando un senador trazó (material) su semblanza. La imagen y la anécdota se mezclaron (material) con el recuerdo de que los desaparecidos van a ser immortalizados en bronce.” (texto 2, Ramón Díaz)

Table 4. Participants (actor/agent) selected with material processes^{34, 35}

Texts	Military officers/ right	Opposition/ left	Impersonal passive nominalization		Indefinite	N Total
Text 1 (<i>Círculo Militar</i>)	12	1	8	8	3	32
Text 2 (R. Díaz)	1	4	3	13	9	30
Text 3 (H. Ferrari)	3	2	0	1	1	7
Text 4 (FEDEFAM)	11	7 ³⁴	1	2	1	22
Text 5 (S. Blixen)	3	4 ³⁵	2	11	2	22
Text 6 (P. Cribari)	1	2	4	1	0	8

In all of the texts, with the exception of texts 3 and 4, a large number of impersonal and indefinite usages are observed (the average is 60% of the selection of participants for material verbs). These impersonal and indefinite usages do not directly attribute responsibility for the events to any social actor. However, this does not mean that the reader cannot use other means to recuperate the actor to whom responsibility is attributed. Other lexico-grammar and discourse-semantic resources are used to guide the reader towards a concrete participant, but in such a way that the author does not have to take responsibility for the accusation. For example, the texts evade the direct assignment of responsibility through the use of the passive with *se*:

- (11) However, more so than the failure of an ideology to reach power through armed struggle, terrorism and indoctrination; there are more profound causes for this hatred, questioning and revisionism to be extended throughout the national territory, at the same time that with similar characteristics it is revealed in other countries. (text 1 *Círculo Militar*)³⁶

34. Included in this group are the president and the parliament, since FEDEFAM distinguishes them from the group that forms the Armed Forces

35. Here included is a neutral actor, Gerardo, because he is not defined as a member of another side either.

36. “Sin embargo, más allá del fracaso de una ideología para alcanzar el poder mediante la lucha armada, el terrorismo y el adoctrinamiento; hay causas más profundas para que ese odio, cuestion-

In this example, in spite of not directly identifying any participant as an agent of the extension of hatred towards the Armed Forces, the author uses nominalizations that refer to the actions of the left and therefore the fact that these actions are being attributed to the left can be recuperated by the reader. The next example demonstrates how an impersonal tone is given to a process requiring an agent through the use of a nominalization.

- (12) The knowledge more complete and deep each time, the incessant recovery of the entire truth (even more so when this rescue must bend the relentless obstinacy to hide it) is a collective obligation, and also a right of all. (text 5, Samuel Blixen)³⁷

Framed within the rest of the text this example shows how the author indirectly marks his *side* as the one charged with this recovery. The nominalization that functions as subject of the verb refers to the actions being carried out by the left according to the rest of the text's construction of events.

Another tactic used by the authors is to turn to indefinite pronouns used in nominal function in order to evade the necessity of directly signaling responsibility for the narrated events. For example:

- (13) This can mean only one thing: the group attributed a Messianic role to itself in the history of our country. Someone can want to save humanity and with such a purpose preach universal love, even towards enemies, and go as far as to voluntarily offer his own sacrifice. This is divine reason in action; but for human reason it is all the reverse; if someone is sure he holds the salvation of all in his hands, the sacrifice of a few must be trivial to him. (Text 2, Ramón Díaz)³⁸

In the above example, an indefinite actor is selected as a way of generalizing the description of actions previously attributed to a Messianism of the actor of the left. When the proposition is generalized it is not necessary to directly name the actor.

amiento y revisionismo se extiende por todo el territorio nacional, al mismo tiempo que con similares características se revela en otros países" (texto 1, Círculo Militar).

37. "El conocimiento cada vez más acabado y profundo, el rescate incesante de toda la verdad (más aun cuando ese rescate debe doblegar la implacable obstinación por el ocultamiento) es una obligación colectiva, y también un derecho de todos" (texto 5, Samuel Blixen).

38. "Eso puede significar solo una cosa: el grupo se atribuía a sí mismo un papel mesiánico en la historia de nuestro país.

Alguien puede querer salvar a la humanidad y con tal finalidad predicar el amor universal, incluso hacia los enemigos, y hasta asumir voluntariamente su propia inmólación. Es la razón divina en acción; pero para la razón humana es todo al revés; si alguien está seguro de tener en sus manos la salvación de todos, el sacrificio de unos pocos tiene que resultar trivial" (texto 2, Ramón Díaz).

An analysis of the thematic distribution in the texts can reveal how the experience is organized by way of focalizing certain information and selecting from what starting point to present this experience. In these texts the thematic selection demonstrates a tendency towards the representation of processes as topics (except in texts 2 and 6 in which the participants are the ones selected as Theme with more frequency). This finding could be the result of the fact that in Spanish the verb indicates the person in addition to the process and therefore the process and the participants can be represented at the same time. This finding also demonstrates that the organization of the texts is guided by the construction of a social reality as historical *fact* more than as a construction based on the participants in it. This could indicate that both sectors want to take as given or already known by the audience the historical account about the interpretation of the topic in dispute.

At the level of interpersonal meaning expressed in the Theme some differences exist between the texts. In text 1, by the *Círculo Militar*, the interpersonal Theme is used to express negation only (polarity). This would indicate according to Halliday (1994) the authors do not need to modulate the information presented because they are certain of its truth, and they present it as *fact*. On the other hand, in the other texts interpersonal metaphors³⁹ appear through which the writer's attitude towards the presented information is expressed. The interpersonal metaphor orients the reader about how to interpret the message as subjective or objective in an explicit (example 14) or implicit manner (example 15). For example:

- (14) Above all we must keep alive the memory of the atrocities we saw the subversion commit against innocent compatriots. (text 2, Ramón Díaz)⁴⁰
- (15) Perhaps the Armed Forces, accustomed to the unlimited exercise of usurped powers, have great difficulty in locating themselves in reality, but frankly they will have to make the effort. (text 4, FEDEFAM)⁴¹

The differences in this level appear in the type of interpersonal metaphor selected. In text 2 only one interpersonal metaphor indicates that the opinion or attitude towards the information belongs to the author ("I believe..."). But in general the

39. The interpersonal metaphor is a type of grammatical metaphor. Halliday (1994) defines the grammatical metaphor as a type of metaphor in which the rhetorical transference is made principally at the level of the grammatical form although at times a lexical variation also exists. It is a variation in the expression of a meaning. There are two types of grammatical metaphor at the level of the clause: the metaphors of modality (interpersonal) and the metaphors of transitivity (ideational).

40. "Sobretudo debemos mantener viva la memoria de las atrocidades que vimos cometer a la subversión contra compatriotas inocentes" (texto 2, Ramón Díaz).

41. "Tal vez las FFAA acostumbradas al ejercicio ilimitado de los poderes usurpados tengan gran dificultad en ubicarse en la realidad, pero francamente van a tener que hacer un esfuerzo" (texto 4, FEDEFAM).

type of interpersonal metaphor that appears in the texts is impersonal. That is to say, the information is modalized without the author assuming responsibility for this modalization. Some of these interpersonal metaphors are: “In effect...”, “Without the smallest doubt...”, “Supposedly...”, “Maybe...”, “It is good...”, “Perhaps...”, “It is necessary...”, “It must be that...”, “It is possible and necessary...”, “The most probable...”. These are ways of concealing the fact that the texts present the opinion of the writer or someone in particular.

All of the texts, except text 3, have a high degree of lexical information packed into the Theme, which indicates that the main goal of the texts is to inform and to represent the information in a more metaphorical way. This metaphoricalization takes place at the semantic and grammatical levels.

The texts refer to events and participants in indirect form, using lexical metaphors to create analogies that permit the generalization and universalization of the presented arguments. For example:

- (16) a paper death (text 2, Ramón Díaz)⁴²

This metaphor uses an image attributed to Fidel Castro to interpret the meaning of the death of one of the *victims of the sedition*, Pascacio Baéz. The particular history of Pascacio Baéz is related with the more general history of executions of dissidents at the beginning of the Cuban revolution. The events are put on the same level and indirectly so are their participants.

- (17) the country cost (text 6, Pedro Cribari)⁴³

The lexical metaphor *country cost* is extrapolated from economic finance discourse and applied in another domain, that of human rights. The country’s image is affected by political decisions about the topic and these decisions affect all citizens in the same way economic decisions do.

In addition, the texts use grammatical metaphors to represent actions through nouns. This permits the defocalization of the participants and the presentation of the argument in terms of ideas and moral values with which one must be in agreement. Some of the types of nominal structures used in place of verbs to realize actions are: modification and nominalization of verbs. For example:

- (18) The thesis that until the present has been sustained to reject again and again the reiterated petitions coming from Argentinean justice.
(text 6, Pedro Cribari)⁴⁴

42. “*un muerto de papel*” (texto 2, Ramón Díaz).

43. “*el costo país*” (texto 6, Pedro Cribari).

44. “*La tesis que hasta el presente se ha sustentado para rechazar una y otra vez los reiterados peticionarios provenientes de la justicia argentina*” (texto 6, Pedro Cribari).

- (19) With the fall of the Berlin Wall, the Cold War ended, the real socialism entrenched in ideological lies with all that it had that was perverse, false, and rotten fell down.
(Text 1, *Círculo Militar*)⁴⁵

The analysis of thematic development together with its lexico-grammar characteristics provides data about the ideational and interpersonal meaning the texts construct. However, through this analysis it is also possible to recuperate information about how the authors organize experience in the texts and how the authors want to transmit and remember the presented meanings. “The textual metafunction thus enables people not only to exchange ideational meanings as information but also to organize them in such a way that they can be reconstructed and retained in systems they can be ‘learned’ and ‘remembered’” (Mattiessen 1995: 29). This is one of the discursive mechanisms by which the social activity of remembering is discursively realized.

With respect to the presentation of the social actors that appear in the texts it is of particular interest here how the principal actors are evaluated: the Armed Forces and the opposition of the left.⁴⁶ Understanding how the texts use evaluation to construct the image and identity of both the Other and their own group allows a better understanding of the ideology of the participant social actors in this debate about human rights violations.

Through the selection of modifiers (qualifying adjectives) and nouns that denote the activities or actions of the participants, functionalization (Van Leeuwen 1996), the principal social actors involved in the historical events represented in the texts are described.

- (20) How much longer will the country tolerate the maintenance of an institution that, like a monster, hides away the truth about people’s fates in its lair; that does not reflect about its past, that spurns the requests of citizens, that continues with Maniquean and confrontational thought processes defending bad gotten privileges? (Text 4 FEDEFAM)⁴⁷

45. “*Con la caída del muro de Berlín, se terminó la Guerra Fría, se vino abajo el socialismo real atrincherado en mentiras ideológicas con todo lo que tenía de perverso, falso y podrido*” (texto 1, *Círculo Militar*).

46. The actor of the Armed Forces is more defined than *the opposition of the left* however the comparison is possible since this is the distinction that is made in the texts themselves. Some actors appear represented in the form that they can be clearly identified and others appear in a more indefinite or general manner like *the Other*. Of interest here is to describe how the Armed Forces are evaluated in the different discourses and identify who corresponds to the “Other” for each ideological sector.

47. “¿Hasta cuándo va a tolerar el país mantener una institución que, como monstruo, secuestra en su guarida la verdad sobre el destino de personas; que no reflexiona sobre su pasado, que des-

This example divides the actors between *the country*, an objectification which metonymically constructs an imaginary community that represents the nation in terms of geographical space, and *the institution*, an objectification which represents the group of opposition in terms of its function in the State. These actors are described with impersonal characteristics that do not include human traces. This is what permits the later simile description of *the institution* as a *monster* that is then contrasted with the *citizens*. These mechanisms achieve the presentation of the social actor of the Armed Forces as deviant from the social norm and as inhuman and separated from the rest of the community.

Also used frequently in the texts is the identification of participants in interpersonal terms, meaning identification by their social value or evaluation, generally as a deviation from the social norm. In these texts in general the participants belonging to the *us* group are individualized and the Others are generalized or collectivized. In several of the texts the resource of indeterminacy is used (Van Leeuwen 1996) in order to represent the social actors without specifying them. The texts realize this indeterminacy with the use of indefinite pronouns (*someone*) used with nominal function and also through exophoric reference. In the latter, a kind of impersonal authority is assigned that in spite of not being present allows its force or responsibility to be felt. These social actors appear in the background, and although they are not directly mentioned, who they are can be reasonably inferred. They are not totally excluded from the narration rather they are de-emphasized (Van Leeuwen 1996). The next example contains some of these resources of representation of social actors.

- (21) How can we forget that he who joined the Provisional Executive that founded the *Movimiento de Liberación Nacional Tupamaro* in 1965, who participated in the assault on the city of Pando on October 8th, 1969 leading him to be detained and put in prison in *Punta Carretas* where he escaped, returning to join the Leadership of the MLN where he was one of those that gave the order of murder against the Lieutenant Commander Ernesto Motto, the Assistant Police Commissioner Oscar Delega and the Professor Armando Acosta y Lara in the so-called 'Hypolitic Plan' among other guerilla acts, could be occupying, as if nobody had brought these events to light, a seat in the Senate and presiding ironically over the Senate's Defense Committee? (Text 3, Hugo Ferrari)⁴⁸

precia los requerimientos ciudadanos, que sigue con el pensamiento maniqueísta y confrontacional defendiendo privilegios mal habidos?" (Texto 4, FEDEFAM).

48. "¿Cómo olvidar que quien integró el Ejecutivo Provisorio que fundó el *Movimiento de Liberación Nacional Tupamaro* en 1965, participó en el asalto a la ciudad de Pando el 8 de octubre de 1969 siendo detenido y puesto en prisión en *Punta Carretas* de donde fugó, volviendo a integrar el

It is interesting to note how in this example the reference to the Other social actor is in indirect form and characterized by the actions attributed to the Other. On the other hand, the social actors of the right, with whom the author associates, appear identified individually and differentiated by way of formal nominalizations that mention them by first name, last name, and title. Another particularity of this example is that the information with which the Other (of the left) social actor is characterized appears in an embedded clause which makes it difficult for the reader to contest or question the information since it is not the center of the message and it appears as a complement. Therefore the evaluation of the actor by way of his characterization as someone who participated in a series of violent and criminal events without suffering consequences is presented as new information that is unquestionable due to its position at the structural level.

The analysis of evaluation of social actors in the texts provides more data about how the relationship between participants is constructed and more evidence about the ideological positions favored by each sector. Evaluation is utilized to persuade the reader to see the actors in a particular way, for example as *subversives* or *combatants*. The analysis of evaluation here is an adaptation of Martin's (2000) system of appraisal in which an analysis at the discourse semantic level is made of the texts to identify how emotions, judgments and evaluations are negotiated. The systems that are relevant in this analysis are that of emotions or affect and that of judgments. The system of affect is the resource used to construct emotional responses (*happiness, sadness, fear, anger, etc.*). The linguistic realization of affect includes: qualities (epithets, attributes or circumstances), processes (mental or behavioral), and comments (modal adjuncts). The classification of the affective attitudes distinguishes the following factors:

- a. positive or negative connotation of the emotions in the culture
- b. construction of the emotions as a reaction to an external agent or as an experienced state of being/mood
- c. type of emotion: happiness/unhappiness (e.g.: sadness, anger, happiness, love), security/insecurity (e.g.: anxiety, fear, trust, security), or satisfaction/dissatisfaction (e.g.: curiosity, respect, dissatisfaction, weariness).

The following example demonstrates how these factors of the affective system are realized at the discourse-semantic level.

Ejecutivo de MLN donde fue uno de los que impartió la orden de asesinato contra el Capitán de Corbeta Ernesto Motto, el Subcomisario Oscar Delega y el Profesor Armando Acosta y Lara en el llamado "Plan Hipólito entre otros actos guerrilleros, esté ocupando, sin que nadie hubiera sacado a luz estos antecedentes, una banca del Senado y presidiendo irónicamente la Comisión de Defensa en el mismo?" (texto 3, Hugo Ferrari).

- (22) Trying to find an explanation and in search of the origins of this sad and worrying behavior by certain human groups, we find ourselves in the Directives of ‘Che’ Guevara, the point of the leading string that guides certain behaviors. (text 1, *Círculo Militar*)⁴⁹

In example 22, the use of attributes in order to construct an affective evaluation of *certain human groups*, meaning the social actor of the left, can be observed. This actor is evaluated with words that have a negative connotation in the culture and as something experienced by the writer because of the Other’s actions. These types of emotions belong to the group characterized as *unhappiness* and *insecurity*. That is to say that the writer presents the Other as the cause of the unhappiness or insecurity experienced by the community.

The system of judgment is used to construct moral evaluations of the behavior of the actors (*ethical, just, admirable, etc.*). The factors that are considered in the evaluation of judgments are:

- a. positive or negative connotation of the judgment in the culture
- b. Judgments that represent social esteem: normality (the degree of “rarity” of the actor), capacity (the degree of capacity of the actor), tenacity (the degree of resolve of the actor)
- c. Judgments that represent social sanction: veracity (the degree of sincerity or truthfulness of the actor), and propriety (the evaluation at the ethical level of the actor).

Positive judgments at the level of social esteem represent admiration for a social actor while negative ones criticize an actor. Positive judgments at the level of social sanction represent praise for a social actor while negative ones condemn. The following example from one of the analyzed texts exemplifies this type of evaluation of judgment.

- (23) How long are the new military generations going to tolerate this ignominity that separates them from their compatriots, that identifies them with the dictatorial indignity of their predecessors and that condemns the institution to a stagnated behavior without any other prospect than an ominous destiny? (text 4, FEDEFAM)⁵⁰

49. “*Tratando de encontrar una explicación y en la búsqueda de lo orígenes de este triste y preocupante comportamiento de ciertos grupos humanos, hallamos en las Directivas del ‘Che’ Guevara, la punta del hilo conductor que va pautando ciertas conductas*” (texto 1, *Círculo Militar*).

50. “*¿Hasta cuándo las nuevas generaciones militares van a tolerar esta ignominia que los separa de sus compatriotas, los identifica con la indignidad dictatorial de sus predecesores y condena a la institución a un comportamiento estanco sin otra perspectiva de un destino ominoso?*” (texto 4, FEDEFAM).

Example 23 demonstrates the evaluation of the Other, the Armed Forces, in terms of judgments of negative social sanction at the ethical level and in terms of a criticism of its conduct that destines them to abnormality in terms of their relationship with the community. In other words, the new generations of the Armed Forces are represented as opting for an *abnormal* path according to the values of the community and as electing to associate with a generation designated as ethically *inappropriate*. Therefore, the evaluation of this social actor is morally negative by association with another; the transitive property is applied (the characteristics of one of the members are transferred to the other members).

Table 5 presents a summary of the evaluations of the main social actors that appear in the texts. This table provides a synthesis of the way in which the different ideologies construct the Other.

The analysis of the information presented in this table reveals that both ideological tendencies turn to ethical judgments, judgments of normality, capacity, propriety or veracity, which imply an evaluation of the actors in terms of their social esteem and the social sanction that they receive for their conduct. In addition both tendencies turn to evaluations of feelings of the participants. The affects appear in the texts of the right marking the experience of the social actors facing that which is provoked by the Other. On the other hand, in the texts of the left the affects appear in order to describe the Others and to categorize them although what *we* in opposition to *them* experience due to the actions of the Other (the right) is also described. The fact that both ideological sides turn to affect in order to evaluate the social actors involved in the topic of human rights demonstrates the level of commitment and the importance that is given to the topic in the construction of personal and national identity. The topic is presented in terms of non-negotiable ethical values and as an affective experience that deeply marks a person. It can be said, therefore, that the topic is constructed as something universal and political, and at the same time personal due to the level of affective involvement of the actors in the topic.

At the level of organization of the argument similarities are observed in the type of resources used by the actors of the right and of the left. Among the argumentative strategies in the texts analyzed in this chapter the following can be distinguished:

1. Macro discursive strategies used to construct the identity of the actor and that of the Other. These strategies follow the schema described below (Wodak 1996; van Dijk 1999):
 - a. Strategies for the definition and construction of the group (*we* discourse)
 - a.1. use of personal pronouns (consensual *we*)
 - a.2. depersonalization
 - a.3. use of vague characterizations
 - a.4. strong description in terms of groups or *sides*

Table 5. Evaluation of Social Actors (Us vs. Them)⁵¹

TEXTS	Social Actor	Judgment		Affect
		Social Esteem	Social Sanction	
Text 1 (<i>Círculo Militar</i>)	Us (Armed Forces)	Normality (+) Capacity (+) Tenacity (+)	Veracity (+) Propriety (+)	Satisfaction (experiences)
	Them (Opposition)	Normality (-) Capacity (-) Tenacity (-)	Veracity (-) Propriety (-)	Sadness (produces) Insecurity (produces)
Text 2 (Ramón Díaz)	Us (the right)	Capacity (-)	Veracity(+) Propriety (+)	Dissatisfaction (experiences) Sadness (experiences) Insecurity (experiences)
	Them (Opposition)	Normality (-) Capacity (-) Tenacity (-)	Veracity(-) Propriety (-)	Insecurity (produces)
Text 3 (Hugo Ferrari)	Us (Armed Forces/the right)	Capacity (+)	Veracity (+) Propriety (+)	Happiness (experiences) Insecurity (experiences)
	Them (Opposition)	Tenacity (+) Normality (-)	Veracity (-) Propriety (-)	
Text 4 (FEDEFAM)	Us (Opposition)	Tenacity (+) Normality (+)	Veracity (+) Propriety (+)	
	Them (the Armed Forces)	Normality (-) Capacity (-) Tenacity (-)	Propriety (-)	Insecurity (produces) Dissatisfaction (produces)
Text 5 (Samuel Blixen)	Us (opposition)	Tenacity (+)	Veracity (+) Propriety (+)	Insecurity (experiences) Sadness (experiences) Dissatisfaction (experiences)
	Them (the State ⁵¹)	Normality (-)	Veracity (-) Propriety (-)	Insecurity (produces)
Text 6 (Pedro Cribari)	Us (Uruguayans)	Normality (+) Capacity (-)	Veracity (+) Propriety (+)	Dissatisfaction (experiences) Insecurity (experiences)
	Them (the State)	Normality (-) Capacity (-)	Propriety (-)	Dissatisfaction (produces)

51. The state corresponds to the government and the Armed Forces as an institution belonging to the government.

For example:

- (24) Do they realize that we fought? Do they understand the danger that we faced?
(Text 2, Ramón Díaz)⁵²

This type of discourse is characterized by the negation of individual responsibility and the displacement of this responsibility to the group as a whole (Wodak 1996). By representing the other a self-image or identity by virtue of opposition is also constructed.

- b. Strategies of self-justification
 b.1. normative evaluation of the other group
 b.2. adjudication of responsibility or blame to members of the other group or to the group as a whole

For example:

- (25) At the head of this recovery without concessions should be, in first place, the State, and after that all those structures that by their meaning can be decisive. There should be an obligation of the governments, and if these are complicit, due to weakness or to association, it should be the task of the parliaments and the judges. Of the political parties, of the University, of the press, of those that rely on the means to discover this truth. Not of the very victims or of their relatives, that must add up this torment to their tragedy. The president of the Republic put the Peace Commission in place and immediately marked the playing field, proof that the commitments with military officers that took part in the coup and torturers continues to enjoy good health. He defined absolute secrecy as the axis of the actions and that, in its most perverse extreme, presumes to leave in the hands of each family member the decision to communicate, or not, the result of the investigations and the state of knowledge of the truth.

(Text 5, Samuel Blixen).⁵³

52. “¿Se dan cuenta de qué nos libramos? ¿Comprenden el peligro que corríamos?” (texto 2, Ramón Díaz).

53. “A la cabeza de ese rescate sin concesiones debería estar, en primer lugar, el Estado, y después todas aquellas estructuras que por su significación pueden ser determinantes. Debería ser una obligación de los gobiernos, y si éstos son cómplices, por debilidad o por sociedad, debería ser tarea de los parlamentarios o de los jueces. De los partidos políticos, de la Universidad, de la prensa, de los que cuentan con los resortes para descubrir esa verdad. No de las propias víctimas o de sus familiares, que deben sumar este calvario a su tragedia.

El presidente de la República instaló la Comisión para la Paz e inmediatamente flechó la cancha, prueba de que los compromisos con los militares golpistas y torturadores siguen gozando

2. Macro justification strategies. This type of discourse is characterized by presenting the speaker/writer as victim of the prejudices of the Other (Wodak 1996).
 - a. strategies of *rationalization* of the justification
 - a.1. use of arguments based in the *facts*
 - a.2. construction of the situation as a *state of internal war*

For example:

- (26) Days ago, a group of officials cited by Argentinean justice to appear in front of the court in the case of crimes that took place in Buenos Aires, appealed to the Law of Expiry. If it were not tragic, it would be comical to see how those who trampled on all of the republican norms and institutions, have become devotees of the law. But let's not deceive ourselves, not of the constitutional law rather of the only law that favors them: that of expiry. They seize upon it with such vigor, that with their constrictive grip, they deform it. And even the said law – of forced and doubtful constitutionality – is of impunity, don't forget because it is not of amnesty. Neither does it pardon and even less does it authorize the hiding of the truth. Furthermore, in exact words, it proposes investigation. Neither does it have the international hierarchy of ethics nor treaties with which this eyesore is incompatible. (Text 4, FEDEFAM)⁵⁴

The *facts* are described in detail as a way of giving trustworthiness to the construction that is presented.

- (27) [the determining factors which would make the governmental aspiration to consolidate peace are not given] Because in the evaluation of the Civic-military period, it has priority, beneath a well orchestrated promotion, the localization of the disappeared, over the work realized with honesty and in all areas by the Armed Forces and the actions of the Army to save the

de buena salud. Definió la reserva como el eje de las actuaciones y ello, en su extremo más perverso, supone dejar en manos de cada familiar la decisión de comunicar, o no, el resultado de las investigaciones y el estado del conocimiento de la verdad” (texto 5, Samuel Blixen).

54. “*Días pasados, un grupo de oficiales citados por la justicia argentina para declarar en el caso de los crímenes realizados en Buenos Aires, apelaban a la Ley de Caducidad. Si no fuera trágico, sería cómico ver como quienes atropellaron todas las normas e instituciones republicanas, se han hecho devotos a la ley. Pero no nos engañemos, no de la ley constitucional sino de la única que los favorece: la de caducidad. Tanto se aferran a ella, que con su abrazo de boa, la deforman. Si bien dicha ley – de constitucionalidad forzada y dudosa – es de impunidad, no olvida porque no es de amnistía. Tampoco perdona y menos autoriza a ocultar la verdad. Más, a letra expresa, plantea la investigación. Tampoco tiene jerarquía internacional con cuya ética y tratados este adefeso es incompatible” (texto 4, FEDEFAM).*

democracy of the servitude.
(text 1, *Círculo Militar*)⁵⁵

The violence is not attributed to the dictatorship rather to the situation of chaos.

b. strategies of victimization

For example:

(28) Finally because they do not lead to peace, which is the path, -the ‘*escraches*’ brutally carried out against the Legislative Palace, the Ministry of National Defense, the Social Institutions of the Military Officers and Superior Officials, today have Uruguay as a prison. (Text 1, *Círculo Militar*)⁵⁶

3. Macro-Strategies of deconstruction of the opposition’s argument

a. strategies of discrediting the Other

a.1) ad hominem arguments

a.2) direct citation of the Other’s discourse in order to discredit it

For example:

(29) How is it possible not to remember that the journalist who was one of those that gave the order of death to Dan Mitrione and who ended Armando Acosta y Lara’s life from the temple of Constituyente street, could appear as a dedicated defender of human rights, remitting documentation to the promoted Spanish judge Baltasar Garzón in the cause that he pursued against Chilean General Augusto Pinochet? (Text 3, Hugo Ferrari)⁵⁷

These characteristics support the position of van Dijk (1998) who stipulates that the strategies in themselves are ideologically neutral. They are discursive resources

55. [no están dadas las condicionantes para que se cumpla la aspiración gubernamental de consolidar la paz] “Porque en la evaluación del período cívico-militar, tiene preponderancia, bajo una promoción bien orquestada, la localización de los desaparecidos, sobre la obra realizada con honestidad y en todos los campos por las Fuerzas Armadas y el accionar del Ejército para salvar la democracia de la servidumbre” (texto 1, *Círculo Militar*).

56. “Finalmente porque no conducen a la paz, que es el camino, -los ‘*escraches*’ contra el Palacio Legislativo, el Ministerio de Defensa Nacional, las Instituciones Sociales de los Militares y los Oficiales Superiores perseguidos con saña, que hoy tienen al Uruguay como cárcel” (texto 1, *Círculo Militar*).

57. “¿Cómo no recordar que el periodista que fue uno de los que impartió la orden de la muerte a Dan Mitrione y quien “remató” a Armando Acosta y Lara desde el templo de la calle Constituyente, apareciera como comedido defensor de los derechos humanos remitiendo documentación al promocionado juez español Baltasar Garzón en la causea que éste le sigue al General chileno Augusto Pinochet?” (texto 3, Hugo Ferrari).

that upon being laden with ideological contents can be used to satisfy the different objectives of each political group.

Conclusions

The negotiation of identity/difference, to use William Connolly's felicitous phrase, is the political problem facing democracies on a global scale. (Benhabib 1996: 4)

The dialogue between different social actors that has been established with respect to the resolution of the topic of human rights violations is an instance of deliberative democracy (Benhabib 1996) in present-day Uruguay. The new access of social movements and actors who used to be excluded from public discussion of the topic has opened spaces of negotiation about the meanings of the dictatorial past for the Uruguayan community. This type of deliberative dialogue about topics related to justice could be one way of reestablishing the legitimacy of the post-dictatorship Uruguayan democracy. The possibility of having a public space, in which to have a dialogue about topics of mutual interest and to which the different social actors have free access, is what can give legitimacy to a democracy (Benhabib 1996). In the case of Uruguay, it can be said that the discussion of the topic has reestablished the commitment of various social sectors to the democratic project in opposition to what was before a general apathy due to not feeling recognized as valid interlocutors in the public sphere.

From this perspective of the deliberative model social life needs conflicts of interest just as it needs cooperation. In a society where a high degree of difference at the ideological level or of interest exists it is difficult to arrive at an agreement about values. Therefore what remains is to use deliberation to arrive at methods that assume ways of articulating cooperation balancing or considering the present conflicts of interest. This would be a strategy to overcome the obstacle of democratic legitimacy that implies imposing the interests or values of the majority.

In the Uruguayan case in particular, the Peace Commission functioned as one process that was used to try to achieve cooperation to resolve a problem of mutual interest for all of the community's social actors. However, as the texts analyzed in this chapter show, a consensus about the effectiveness of this process has not been reached. A struggle still exists between sectors that continue trying to impose their vision and/or values on the rest of the community.

This type of ideological fundamentalism or *ideological inflation* according to Lechner (1988) could be the result of a transfer of religious characteristics to the political sphere. We can see in actors of both the left and the right a sanctification of political principles as absolute truth, the demonization of the adversary, the

strong collective identity, and the adherence to a totalizing vision that is translated into sectarian or totalitarian positions (Lechner 1988). This is evident at the discourse level in the analysis of the evaluation of social actors. This analysis shows how the Other is characterized in negative terms at the level of social sanction, ethically the Other is always represented as *amoral*.

Starting from a position of difference so extreme at the ethical level it is not feasible to think that the topic can be resolved on this level. It is for this reason that the idea of public deliberation about the topic opens spaces in which the dialogue between actors with such different interests can be established and can open possible paths to cooperation. This type of deliberative process, according to Benhabib (1996) is characterized by:

1. imparting more information about the topic
2. opening the possibility of critical reflection about one's own position and beliefs about the topic
3. creating the need to clearly and effectively argue one's own position with the aim of convincing the Other.

The previously presented analysis shows examples of some of these characteristics.

The analysis of the texts demonstrates that a certain level of awareness of the argument or position of the Other exists. The analysis of intertextuality reveals a recognition of the Other's position. Although this recognition does not mean that the Other's position is comprehended or accepted, at least it is recognized. This public debate also leads to more information being collected about the topic of human rights violations during the dictatorship. The different social actors provide examples, anecdotes, and references to other discourses and particular events that increase the available knowledge about the topic. And what is even more important is the fact that the presence of the topic of the disappeared is articulated as much in the discourse of the right as it is in the discourse of the left. In addition to what has already been said, the need of obtaining more supporters for their *side* makes the different social actors try to argue their positions in the most persuasive way. This last point is also evidenced by the selection of genres characterized by having the goal of persuading potential followers to their position.

This process, as Seyla Benhabib makes clear, is not ordered or pure. The deliberative process includes emotional and ideological reactions that can be rhetorically *messy*. This type of chaotic situation or situation outside of that which is considered "good order" can be evidenced in the type of evaluations and representations that are made of the different social actors in the texts. The high degree of affect in the texts demonstrates that the discussions are not rational dialogues about abstract moral values. However, what can be recovered is that there is a recognition of the Other as a possible interlocutor. The struggles over the meaning of the

dictatorship period represent an example of deliberative democracy in practice. If a space did not exist for this struggle the democracy would be *suspended*.

It is interesting to observe how the Uruguayan community is trying to resolve what has been defined as the problem of democracies today (in general Benhabib 1996; in particular for Latin America, Lechner 1988): how to construct a democracy in which pluralism is respected and incorporated. As was mentioned earlier it appears that the strategy in Uruguay at this moment is that of the deliberation through an opening up of the public sphere to groups that before did not have access to it. In comparison with this strategy, in the pre-dictatorship and dictatorship period the solution was the annihilation of the Other physically and symbolically. The dictatorships of the Southern Cone, as is described by Argentinean political scientist Guillermo O'Donnell (1986), tried to erase that which was different and impose a vision of *good order* that was homogenous and valid for all.

What remains now is to see if this experiment of deliberative democracy succeeds in the resolution of this problem. That is to say, is it possible to arrive through dialogue to conclusions about the topic that can be contested and challenged with good reasons?

What is our story

Reconstructing the institutional grand narrative (2007)

Yet the essence of a nation is that all individuals have many things in common, and also that they have forgotten many things. (Renan 1990: 11)

In the most recent discussions about how to deal with the role and responsibility of the Armed Forces during the last dictatorship, there has been an important shift in the way the military construct their memory of the period. Many things are forgotten or resignified in this new grand narrative about the dictatorship. Under the current Left wing president, Tabaré Vázquez, the government has begun to change its policy towards the military and the questions regarding violations of human rights during the most recent dictatorship period. These changes in policy have produced several moments of tension between the government and the military, which have resulted in repeated modifications in the military commanding structure.¹ These shifts of Commander in chief of the Armed Forces have brought to power younger generations, which were not directly involved in the dictatorship and are thus inheriting a problematic past that conflicts with their efforts to form a positive institutional identity. The inter-generational transmission of military memory results in modifications and adaptations of, the until now, dominant institutional narrative of the dictatorship period.

The focus of this chapter is on the commemoration speech by the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, General Jorge Rosales, on May 18 2007, to celebrate the origin of the military institution. This text and those produced in response to it serve as a window into how the military and civil society continue negotiating the meaning of the dictatorship period particularly in relation to violations of

1. The present Commander in Chief, Jorge Rosales, is only 52 years old and was promoted to General in 2006. His designation as commander in chief, as well as that of the previous Commander in Chief, general Carlos Díaz, did not follow the traditional order used in previous years by which seniority was considered a key aspect in the decision. Gen. Rosales' appointment skipped about 11–15 generals who were in line for the position due to their seniority. These changes in the way of assigning military officers for the position to command the institution seem to be a way of renovating the leadership of the force, since those officers skipped in the promotion have decided to request early retirement.

human rights. The texts enact the most recent struggles over the dictatorship's memory within and outside of the institution. The speech attempts to rewrite the past in order to construct a viable identity of the institution in the present socio-political context. However, the responses to this text show how hard it is to change the dominant or established ways of remembering the past.

Commemorations represent dates in which the past becomes present in public rituals that activate feelings while constructing and reconstructing memories of the past (Jelin 2002). This type of ritual establishes a rhythm and a historical trace that creates a path of remembering. Different social actors interpret and resignify events in relation to present political agendas and historical circumstances. For the military, these public ceremonies provide them with an opportunity to perform a ritual that celebrates their role as servants of the state. At the same time, during this type of event the military have access to a wider audience and communicate their political position in *authorized* form.² The commemoration of the origin of the institution provides also a space to rewrite history and make sense of particular events to integrate them to the larger group narrative that serves to define its institutional identity.

This particular date of commemoration, May 18,³ (origin of the military), is not one of the typically associated with the debate over how to come to terms with the traumatic past related to the dictatorship (e.g. April 14 or May 20th, cf. Marchesi 2002).⁴ However, as with the case of the emblematic commemorations of the past (e.g. April 14 and May 20), the commemoration of this date is part of the traditional government functions and is usually not marked by the absence of

2. The high discursive production in relation to the dictatorship period results in the trigger of political debates every time there is a public communication of issues related to the period. The Uruguayan constitution does not permit the military to voice any political opinions. Their role is to serve the government in power and defend the nation without considering political ideologies. However, the institution typically makes public statements about political issues regarding this period through various social organizations, retired officers or during public ceremonies.

3. The commemoration of the date May 18, originally referred to the Battle of *Las Piedras* in 1811. This was the first victory of the independence revolution in the River Plate area.

4. April 14 is the date the military and some civilians commemorate the *day of those fallen in defense of democratic institutions or in the fight against sedition*. This date remembers the death of sub-chief of police Oscar Delega, agent Carlos Leites, captain Ernesto Moto Benvenuto, Ex sub-secretary of Interior Armando Acosta y Lara killed by the MLN-T guerrilla movement on a special operation on April 14th 1972. May 20th is the date commemorated by those against the dictatorship and human rights groups to remember senator Zelmario Michelini and representative Héctor Gutiérrez Ruiz and two members of the MLN-T, William Whitelaw and Rosario Barredo. They were killed in Buenos Aires, Argentina by the coordinated repression groups of the dictatorships of both countries on May 20th 1976.

significant members of government. The commemoration being analyzed in this chapter, May 18th 2007, is unique because it occurred during a critical political moment in the debate over human rights abuses and the role of the military under a leftist government. This commemoration was marked by the fact that the Minister of Defense, Azucena Berruti, and the representative leading the Defense committee in congress, Luis Rosadilla, did not participate in the act as was the usual practice in previous governments. This fact is significant if we consider that the Minister of Defense attended the celebration of May 20th associated with those who fought against the dictatorship and demand the resolution of human rights violation cases (see note 2). Also it is important to note that the newly appointed Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces was replacing Gen. Díaz, who had been deposed for overstepping his role by carrying out political activities. In this particular context, the commemoration of the origins of the national military institution constituted more than a celebration of the past of the group, but also an opportunity for the government to signal the maintenance of law in society by displaying the subordination of the military to civilian authorities. For the military, the speech was a validated space for the institution to reaffirm its in-group identity and for self-justification in response to accusations of human rights violations. Public celebrations similar to this and their associated discussions highlight the fact that there are different memories of the past.

Even after more than 30 years since they left power, the military still maintain institutional resources to continue their commemorations (Jelin 2002). These legitimated spaces for commemoration give the institution an arena to participate in the political sphere in a constitutional way. This performance opens opportunities to establish political allegiances and reaffirm in-group identity.

The analysis of this particular discursive event, the commemoration of the day of the military, enables us to explore more in depth the ways in which the military maintain and adapt their narrative of the past as they negotiate political roles and construct their institutional identity. The analysis tries to answer the following questions: What image of the institution is being projected? How does the text construct an in-group identity and establish political allegiances? How is this text read/interpreted by other social actors? These questions will help us better document the changes in the military's grand narrative and investigate how it is interpreted by other social actors.

Socio-historical context

Since 2005, the Left has been in power and has radically shifted the approach the government has had to the investigation of the past (cf. previous chapters). This

new political situation has opened up spaces for human rights groups and more progressive sectors to demand justice and more information about the role of the military and the state in violations of human rights during the 1973–1985 dictatorship. The military is responding to this new political situation by expressing their opinions through speeches by their authorities and by retired officers participating in military social organizations (cf. Achugar 2007).

Under the leadership of Tabaré Vázquez, the government has changed its policy in dealing with the violations of human rights committed during the dictatorship. The government has created a special commission to investigate what happened to the disappeared and locate their remains. This new interpretation of article 4 of the Law of Expiry has given the judicial system the possibility to try military officers and civilians involved in the dictatorship. As a result, there have been several important indictments and prosecutions. One of the most important prosecutions was that of the former president Juan María Bordaberry, who led the coup d'état in 1973, and his foreign affairs secretary Juan Carlos Blanco. Even though these people are under arrest in special circumstances, their prosecution validates the view that the state was involved in illegal activities that violated human rights. More recently the judicial system has indicted several key military officers who have been accused of participating in the Condor plan, illegally bringing political prisoners from Argentina into Uruguay through undocumented flights (*los vuelos*). Several of the people who were brought to Uruguay in these flights later disappeared. At the end of 2007, there was a major indictment of retired Gen. Gregorio Alvarez, who had been the head of the military government at the end of the dictatorship. At the same time however, Tabaré Vázquez's government is trying to implement a reconciliation policy to overcome the past that divides Uruguayans. The most symbolic aspect of this policy is the declaration of a national day of atonement for all sides to come together looking towards the future. The celebration of a day of reconciliation, June 19, has received critiques from both sides of the political spectrum. There have also been several discussions regarding a law of reparations to the families of those who died *defending the democratic institutions*. This law originally proposed by the representative Daniel García Pintos and the families of the military and police officers who died in *combat* against the guerrilla movement in the 1960 and early 70s, was later taken on by the government and presented to congress for a vote. Those who criticize these actions say the government is trying to equate state terrorism and the guerrilla movement actions, which are very different phenomena, since the state is supposed to uphold the law not break it. Under this political context, the military speech analyzed in this chapter represents an instance where the military are voicing their opinion as an institution in the midst of internal changes. The military old guard is being replaced by a new generation who was not directly involved in the dictatorship. How

does this new generation make sense of the traumatic past of the institution? What are the possible political spaces for the military under a left wing government? These questions have to do with the discursive strategies the institution deploys to construct a positive in-group identity and position itself in relation to other political actors.

Genre: The commemoration speech

The political speech has been characterized as a communicative act that is part of a larger plan aiming at political campaigning, where the orator does not speak on a personal title instead he/she does so as a representative of a group or party addressing multiple audiences (Sauer 1996). In contemporary political speeches, the scope of the speech has enlarged to include not only the audience present during the event, but also the future recontextualization of the speech by the media. “The significance of a political speech depends not only on its own content and design, but also on a broad spectrum of other speeches, interviews, written texts, articles, news reports, in short: discursive practices” (Sauer 1996: 241). These speeches are designed for multiple addressees including supporters, opponents and more impartial audiences. The speech is still given in public in front of an actual audience, but it is interpreted in private by a larger audience that receives it through the media recontextualizations of it. Since the speech needs to have meaning for all audience groups, the design potentially includes two different strategies simultaneously addressing all groups or sequentially referring to each of the members of the audience (Sauer 1996). This feature is observed in the use of indeterminate keywords such as *government*, *democracy*, *reorganization*.

Commemorative speeches are a special kind of political speech. They are part of what classical rhetoric calls the *genus demonstrativum*, whose objective is to confirm or reconfirm how things are. The orator exposes on behalf of the group enunciating an evaluation of the situation. The orator reflects on the meaning of a particular historical event on behalf of an institution solidifying group identity and reaffirming the group’s values and norms. However, the orators are usually representatives without political authority.

Commemoration speeches are characterized by the use of some formulaic expressions and keywords such as the typical opening formula: “Today we commemorate...”. In addition, commemorations have a certain periodicity. There is usually a set moment to perform this type of speech, which creates a history and memory of commemoration. The content of this type of speech and its intertextual references respond to particular present contextual circumstances as well as to history.

Commemoration speeches are part of an ongoing discourse (Olick 1999b). These speeches respond to discourses that preceded them in one form or another. They produce images of the past and reactions to those images (Olick 1999b), which result in particular ideological effects. These types of speeches have a moral and political orientation using phrases and assertions that put into words the social memory of the group (Sauer 1996). Commemoration speeches try to achieve persuasion while establishing consensus regarding norms and values (Sauer 1996).

The previous description of the typological characteristics of commemorative speeches serves to situate the particular text being analyzed in this chapter, Gen. Rosales' speech of May 18, 2007. The following table presents the functional constituents that realize this speech.

Table 1. Commemorative speech May 18, 2007 (genre analysis by functional constituents)

Welcome: opening formula
Establishment of purpose of commemoration
Situating the commemoration in historical context
Describing the qualities of the celebrated
Recognition of particular members and actions
Response to other's critique
Explanation of future action
Appreciation of group/celebrated
Description of current situation
Exhortation to action
Uplifting group morale
Recognition to members of the group being celebrated
Closing
Exclamation of positive recognition and commemoration

The purpose of this speech is then twofold; on the one hand it is a celebration of remembering the origins of the institution, while at the same time offering the institution's assessment of the current situation and its position in relation to the political debate over how to remember the dictatorship.

Context of situation

The commemoration speech being analyzed in this chapter represents a text produced in a particular context of situation that affects the ways in which this particular institutional remembering practice is realized. Through the analysis of the text we can identify particular contextual features that characterize the socio-

Table 2. Register: Context of situation

Field	Commemoration of national army day Positioning of the army in relation to current political issues
Mode	Text written to be read
Tenor	Authority communicating with subordinate staff (institutional communication) Authority communicating with the general public (present and not present) Authority communicating with opposition (not present)

political situation where the speech was produced. Table two summarizes the main aspects of the situation that influence and are influenced by the speech: the topic and purpose of the text (field), the way language is used (mode) and the participants involved in it (tenor).

This discursive event fulfils two social purposes: on one hand it is a re-enactment and continuation of an institutional tradition (the celebration of the origin of the institution) and on the other hand it is an opportunity to put forth the institution's political views concerning the current debate over the role of the military in democratic society and the re-evaluation of their performance during the dictatorship. The lexical choices in the text index this dual purpose.

There is a lexical chain that revolves around the institutional narrative about the origin of the military. As seen in these choices:

National army> patriotic forces> Oriental army> army> foundational institution of the Nation⁵

Artigas>caudillos> head of the Orientals (Uruguayans)> the father of the fatherland> originator of the national spirit (nationality)⁶

This narrative of the origin of the military institution is metonymically related to the origin of the nation. This way of constructing the national history around war episodes (independence and civil wars) positions the military as a unique social actor that is at the same time a representative and a symbol of the nation. This narrative presents the foundation of the nation in an act of violence that is authorized by the new state (Ricouer 2000 in Demasi 2004). Through this parallelism between the origin of the nation and the origin of the institution the author creates a genealogy for the institution that positions it as a symbol of the nation. For example:

- (1) The patriotic mobilization that began with the 'Shout of *Asencio*' and extended through the fields of the mother country, had its important land-

5. *ejército nacional> fuerzas patriotas>ejército oriental>ejército>institución fundacional de la Nación.*

6. *Artigas> caudillos>jefe de los orientales>padre de la patria> forjador de la nacionalidad.*

mark the 18 of May of 1811, in *Las Piedras*, where the patriotic forces under the control of the then Tte. Cnel. Don Jose Gervasio Artigas faced the Royal forces (Spanish) under the control of the Commander Don Jose Posadas. The warlike triumph consolidated the military prestige of Artigas and heightened his figure as a human being, when he gave the order: ‘Mercy for the defeated ones, cures to the wounded, respect to the prisoners’, which was an unfathomable act for the habits and actions of that time. It is in that moment of the liberation movement that the Oriental Army was born.⁷

By identifying the institution with the national hero, Artigas, and the independence war the author establishes a genealogy, which validates the actions and characteristics of the military today. As it explicitly mentions in the following paragraph, see example 2. This integration of Artiga’s humanism into the military genealogy and ethos appears also in the implied parallelism between the moral qualities displayed after the war: “mercy for the defeated, cures to the wounded and respect to the prisoners.” This indirectly makes an analogy to the actions of the military during the most recent *internal war*. The moral evaluation and comparison of the institution’s humanitarian behavior towards the enemy is emphasized by the reference to the unity of the army across times, as seen in example 2.

- (2) the army is and has been one single group throughout time, and for that reason attentive to the past of our institution, we try to interpret the present and we try to construct a vision of the future that allows us to make previsions for the fulfillment of the assigned mission.⁸

The institution is then presented as a moral and unique representative of the national spirit. National history is appropriated as institutional history. Through this analogy between the origin of the nation and the origin of the institution the author also displays his authority as someone familiar with national history and positions himself as a qualified orator on topics related to the institution and the nation today.

7. “La movilización patriótica que se inició con el “Grito de Asencio” y se extendió por los campos de la patria, tuvo su hito trascendente el 18 de mayo de 1811, en “Las Piedras” donde se enfrentaron las fuerzas patriotas al mando del entonces Tte. Cnel. Don José Gervasio Artigas a las fuerzas realistas (españolas) al mando del Capitán de Fragata don José Posadas.

El triumfo bélico consolidó el prestigio militar de Artigas y realzó su figura como ser humano, al dar la orden de “Clemencia para los vencidos, curad a los heridos, respetad a los prisioneros”, en un hecho inaudito para las costumbres y el accionar de esa época. Es en ese momento de la gesta liberadora que nació el Ejército Oriental.”

8. “El ejército es y ha sido uno sólo en el tiempo, por eso atentos al pasado de nuestra institución, intentamos interpretar el presente y procuramos conformar una visión de futuro que nos permita realizar las necesarias previsions para el cumplimiento de la misión asignada.”

At the lexico-grammatical level, the topic of the text is realized through the system of transitivity that constructs experience in terms of processes, participants and circumstances. Most of the processes used to describe the institution are material (34) followed by mental and verbal processes (26) and finally by relational ones (25). For example:

- (3) In the fulfillment of its fundamental and subsidiary mission, the army constitutes itself as an active protagonist of the institutional life of the State, contributing its personnel and its operational capacity in support of the community, collaborating with different organisms from the State and public and private institutions in the search of solutions for the great problems that affect our society.⁹

These choices of material processes connected to the military as actor positions the institution as an active *doer* in the political life of the country. Its actions make a difference in the community and represent an active involvement in the workings of the State. This representational choice allows the military to appear also as a part of the solution to present *great problems* that affect society by choosing to actively participate in it giving it an important role in the future of the country.

The institution appears linked to mental processes also, which represent the preferences or positions of the group in the political debate. For example, one pattern that constructs this indirect political positioning of the institution is realized by the use of the verb *querer* [want] projecting passive clauses or non-finite clauses that present the other side's position indirectly without identifying the interlocutor.

- (4) The National army as an institution, does not want to be judged by possible incorrect individual actions carried out by some of its members, and it does not accept nor wants to be hostage of the untimely and biased historical interpretations of their actions that some try to claim...¹⁰

In this example, the choice of mental processes also denotes an attitudinal meaning of affect (*querer* [want]) that is later expressed with more precision through a judgment of social esteem (*to be judged*) and negative affect (*to be hostage*). We

9. "En el cumplimiento de su misión fundamental y subsidiaria, el ejército se constituye en un activo protagonista de la vida institucional del Estado, aportando su personal y su capacidad operativa en apoyo a la comunidad, colaborando con distintos organismos del Estado e institucionales públicas y privadas en la búsqueda de soluciones para los grandes problemas que afectan a nuestra sociedad."

10. "El Ejército Nacional como institución, no quiere ser juzgado por eventuales acciones individuales incorrectas desarrolladas por algunos de sus integrantes, y no acepta ni quiere ser rehén de las extemporáneas y parcializadas interpretaciones históricas que sobre su accionar pretenden algunos reivindicar."

also observe the use of negation (polarity) in order to position their views in relation to those of the other side. The views of the other appear indirectly mentioned through their denial and disqualification of the other's position (*possible incorrect or biased interpretations*).¹¹

Other mental process that appear in the text also have an evaluative connotation that reveals the author's and the institution's position with respect to the projected message displaying their preferences or their interpretation of the other's actions. For example, in the following excerpt the projecting verb implies the opposite has been the case.

- (5) The army of today tries to be fairly valued by the society from which its members come and to which they owe themselves....¹²

This mental process functions as a form of modulation orienting the reader to the speaker's position regarding the information being presented.

The assertion that the army is making an effort to be valued in a fair way by the society it belongs to positions the institution as a victim of society. These choice of mental process, *pretende* (tries), implies effort and good intentions which are later on qualified by the phrase that completes the verb *ser justamente valorado* (be fairly valued) that transfers the agency to challenges coming from the outside (other's evaluation). The institution is a victim of other's actions. Example 6, show another pattern of mental process selection that helps to displace responsibilities and construct a victim identity for the institution.

- (6) However, it would seem that hatred, revenge and incredulity had been united to avoid that as society we surpass revisionisms....¹³

In example 6, besides the use of a mental process (*parecería* [it would seem]) to project the other sides' position, there is the use of the subjunctive mood (*se hubieran* [had been united]) to construct a hypothetical scenario that allows for an evaluation of the actions of the other in an indirect manner. The use of *parecería* (it would seem) also works as a modal that constructs the author's degree of certainty in relation to the information presented. This configuration of resources

11. I analyze the interpersonal attitudinal meaning of the expression *eventuales acciones individuales incorrectas* on page 180. Here I am only focusing on transitivity (process, participants and circumstances).

12. "El ejército de hoy pretende ser justamente valorado por la sociedad de la cuál provienen sus integrantes y a la cuál se deben."

13. "No obstante, parecería que el odio, la venganza y la incredulidad se hubieran unido para evitar que como sociedad superemos revisionismos...."

functions as a way to construct the orientation to the message in a more incongruent manner.

The choice of relational processes reveals the intention of the author to define the institution and to describe it in positive terms. These clauses are in the present tense and construct a direct portrait of the institution and its political position in society. For example:

- (7) As an Institution of the Nation we are not ignorant of history...¹⁴

This example also shows the interplay of negation (polarity) and transitivity to construct a position by defining the identity of the institution by that which it is not.

In example 8, we see the use of a relational process to describe the qualities of the institution.

- (8) The institution that I have the honor of commanding is, among other things, serious, disciplined, organized, loyal and has a great service vocation.¹⁵

The use of relational processes establishes a relation of equivalence between the two terms related (the institution and its qualities). This representation of the institution in a positive light foregrounds its traits, which give it personal qualities typical of an individual such as: seriousness, discipline, organization, loyalty and service. The use of the present tense also highlights the factual character of the information. It is also important to point out that there is an embedded clause, which directly comments and frames the following description in moral terms presenting the author's evaluation of the institution ("*me honro en comandar*" [I have the honor of commanding]).

The relationship with the audience and the representation of the participants in the events are realized through lexico-grammatical choices including: appraisal (attitudes and engagement), speech functions and modality. We can also look at pronouns and deictics to track the way social actors and audiences are constructed. Here it is important to distinguish, following Jakobson (1971), the narrated events (what speakers are talking about) from the actual speech event (the interaction among participants: speaker and audience). The speech provides the author with an opportunity to position himself and the institution in relation to other social actors in the political arena. The following analysis points to the ways in which in-group identity and political allegiances are constructed through language.

The speech constructs an evaluation of the social actors narrated in the event that contributes to the ways in which the audience reacts and interprets the

14. "*Como Institución de la Nación no somos ajenos a la historia...*"

15. "*La institución que me honro en comandar es, entre otras cosas, seria, disciplinada, organizada, leal y posee una gran vocación de servicio.*"

meanings in the text. Most of the evaluations in this speech are done in moral terms (judgment). The speaker evaluates the behavior of others in terms of their value in social esteem or social sanction. Judgments of esteem provide an orientation to the reader in terms of how normal, capable and resolute these actors are. The social sanction judgments evaluate social actors in terms of their veracity and propriety (ethics). The evaluator in this text is either the general himself or him speaking as a representative of the group for the institution. The social actors evaluated include, from the most frequently evaluated to the least, the army/military, the nation and others (the opposition). The following examples illustrate how social actors are evaluated through judgments.

- (9) In the fulfillment of its fundamental and subsidiary mission, the Army constitutes an active protagonist of the institutional life of the State, contributing its personnel and its operational capacity in support to the community, collaborating with different organisms from the State and public and private institutions in the search of solutions for the great problems that affect our society.¹⁶

Through these series of judgments the army is presented as a dutiful, capable and trustworthy institution that supports society. The series of evaluations creates a prosody that constructs the army as a positive institution aligned and representative of ethical behavior and noble values.

The other social actor that appears evaluated through judgments that depict them in moral terms is the nation and its inhabitants. The nation is defined as different from the army, but in some instances the army is presented as a member and defender of the nation. This fluctuation in the ways the nation is represented do not affect the type of evaluation it receives. The nation or people of the country are always presented in a positive light. For example:

- (10) [A] society with clear democratic vocation like ours.¹⁷

The nation is judged as socially trustworthy, capable and ethically grounded. However, the representations and evaluations of the nation also present it as an ideal that has not been achieved at the moment, as seen in example 11. Through the

16. "En el cumplimiento de su misión fundamental y subsidiaria, el Ejército se constituye en un activo protagonista de la vida institucional del Estado, aportando su personal y su capacidad operativa en apoyo a la comunidad, colaborando con distintos organismos del Estado e instituciones públicas y privadas en la búsqueda de soluciones para los grandes problemas que afectan a nuestra sociedad."

17. "[U]na sociedad con clara vocación democrática como la nuestra."

selection of modal verbs, *permítala* (permit) and *puedan* (could), the author constructs a hypothetical scenario.

- (11) In this sense, this is an opportune moment to reiterate our concept that the supreme interest of the Nation is above and beyond any other intention, producing a climate of coexistence where freedom, peace and mutual respect, permit that all its inhabitants could develop as citizens, with equality of opportunities and considerations, particularly with respect to their individual rights.¹⁸

The use of the subjunctive mood marks the unreality of these social traits that would characterize a future or desired nation whose interests' the army supports. So the nation appears as socially valued space (*with democratic vocation*) while at the same time leaving room for the need to work on improving it to achieve the desired goal of *a climate of coexistence where individual rights are respected*.

The other social actor evaluated in moral terms is the opposition, which is not named directly in the text but alluded to through the use of epithets and references to historical events that enable the listener/reader to recover the identity of this Other. These judgments are all negative and present the Other as the opposite of the in-group, which is mostly depicted in positive terms. As seen in examples 12 and 13.

- (12) However, it would seem that hatred, revenge and incredulity had been united to avoid, that as a society, we surpass revisionisms and decontextualized realities that anchor us to the past and prevent us from undertaking the way that the country needs and demands, to avoid being left behind and to grow within the globalized world in which we live today.¹⁹

In this example, the Other appears as nominalized attributes and actions (hate, revenge, incredulity, revisionism, decontextualized reality) which points to the other's moral character and actions. This negative portrayal of an unnamed other enables the institution to construct a positive self-image as ethical and defender of the nation's desires in opposition to that of the Other who behaves immorally and against society's wishes. The other is an obstacle to the fulfillment of society's

18. "En este sentido, es propicia la oportunidad para reiterar nuestro concepto de que el supremo interés de la Nación está por encima de cualquier otro propósito, propiciando un clima de convivencia donde la libertad, la paz y el respeto mutuo, permita que todos sus habitantes puedan desarrollarse como ciudadanos, con igualdad de oportunidades y consideraciones, particularmente en el respeto de sus derechos individuales."

19. "No obstante, parecería que el odio, la venganza y la incredulidad se hubieran unido para evitar, que como sociedad, superemos revisionismos y realidades descontextualizadas que nos anclan al pasado y nos impiden emprender el camino que el país necesita y reclama, para evitar el rezago y crecer dentro del mundo globalizado en que hoy vivimos."

potential. The fact that the Other is not named allows the institution to state its position without engaging in a political debate with particular actors.

Example 13 shows another way in which the Other is evaluated in the speech without direct referent to a particular social actor.

- (13) [The national army]... does not accept nor wants to be hostage of the untimely and biased historical interpretations about their actions that some try to claim, forgetting that they responded to the action of those sectors of society that tried to overthrow Democratic Governments through arms.²⁰

In the previous example, the Other appears represented through its actions, which are evaluated as improper in terms of the moment and content of production (“untimely and biased”). The other also appears here as a third person plural demonstrative adjective, *aquellos sectores de la sociedad* (those sectors of society), pointing to a spatial deictic distance from the speaker and hearer. Added to the distancing effect produced by the deictic word choice, there is a negative evaluation that constructs “those sectors of society” as the ones that subvert the established order. There is also another interesting aspect in the characterization of the other in this example, the fact that it is mentioned as a *sector of society*. This is a diachronic change in the way the Other has been represented in military texts (cf. previous chapters and Achugar 2007). The Other is constructed here, as a member of society and society appears as diverse and not homogeneous in its political views. The acceptance of diversity within the group is an interesting change in the military’s narrative, since in the past those sectors of society that deviated from the established *approved* norms were considered to be *foreign* or representative of *foreign interests*. Another aspect of the evaluation of other’s actions is the implication that constructs a positive self-evaluation for the institution as the one qualified to assess the value of historical interpretations.

The evaluations in terms of appreciation and affect construct the institution’s evaluation of itself and the effect others have on it. These can be seen in the following example.

- (14) The institution that I am honored in commanding is, among other things serious, disciplined, organized, loyal and has a great vocation of service. It is also imperfect; a real characteristic of the human beings who conform it, but who also conscious of this limitation, work with much dedication, care and giving, trying day to day that our modest actions, thoughts and

20. “ [El ejército nacional] no acepta ni quiere ser rehén de las extemporáneas y parcializadas interpretaciones históricas que sobre su accionar pretenden algunos reivindicar, olvidando que las mismas respondieron a la acción de aquellos sectores de la sociedad que intentaron derrocar a Gobiernos Democráticos a través de las armas.”

decisions materialize in its actions, giving life to that vast legal, doctrine, prescribed and moral frame that structures and conditions our lives, like that of no other servant of the State.²¹

Here a nominal group represents a conscious participant in an institutional role using attitudinal lexis that can be coded as a hybrid evaluation of appreciation and judgment because it is evaluating an abstract participant in terms of social esteem and social sanction. There is a negative evaluation that appears to assess the qualities of the institution (*imperfecta* [imperfect]), but its force is downgraded by the following clause, which elaborates on the meaning of this imperfection. The imperfection is described as a reality of all humans (i.e. normal) and also overcome by the actions of its members to compensate for that weakness. There is also an example of affect in the positive feelings the institution produces in the general (*me honro* [I am honored]).

Evaluations of affect tend to appear as individual reactions of the speaker to the actions and qualities of the institution. For example:

- (15) I make this salute extensive to the personnel in situation of retirement, which with their rectitude behavior, their loyalty, honor, and demonstrated effort, constitute an example to follow, and a challenge for those who proud today must cover their positions recognizing particularly the effort of those who continue their action in personal form or through social or symbolic institutions pursuing the highest interests of our Force.²²

This example presents a more subtle description of who constitutes the institution by including those who have already retired evaluating them as capable, determined, honorable and moral. They and their actions produce in the general and in *those who have to cover their place* a feeling of pride. These positive feelings in relation to the current and previous actions of retired military officers connected to the dictatorship period implies a political alignment with the traditional leadership

21. “La institución que me honro en comandar es, entre otras cosas seria, disciplinada, organizada, leal y posee una gran vocación de servicio. Es también imperfecta; característica propia de los seres humanos que la conformamos, pero que también, conscientes de esta limitación, trabajamos con mucha dedicación, esmero y entrega, intentando día a día que nuestras modestas acciones, pensamientos y decisiones materialicen su accionar, dándole vida a todo ese vasto marco legal, doctrinario, reglamentario y moral que enmarca y condiciona nuestras vidas, como a ningún otro servidor del Estado.”

22. “Hago este saludo extensivo al personal en situación de retiro, a aquellos que con su rectitud de proceder, su lealtad, honor, esfuerzo demostrado, constituyen un ejemplo a seguir, y un desafío para quienes orgullosos hoy debemos cubrir sus puestos reconociendo en particular el esfuerzo de aquellos que continúan su acción en forma personal o a través de instituciones sociales o simbólicas en pos de los más altos intereses de nuestra Fuerza.”

of the military and gives continuity to their legacy of how to interpret the past. This is a very important political statement that is indirectly construed through attitudinal language.

There is also affect in exclamations and commands that exhort the audience to feel in particular ways or react in particular ways to certain circumstances. For example:

(16) Happy [be] those that work... and really our task of soldiers is worthy!²³

In example 16, we observe how feelings are attributed indirectly to the in-group by referring to it in an impersonal way using the third person plural demonstrative adjective, creating a distance that expands the group to include everyone who works to generate more solidarity with the in-group. Later on in the second part of the clause, the general points to the dignity of the soldiers duties foregrounding the in-group exceptional qualities and motivation to feel happy about what they do. This clause functions to rally and then to solidify inner group identity and construct a positive self-image.

These configurations of evaluations of judgment, appreciation and affect respond to the rhetorical arguments used in the speech which draw on ethos, logos and pathos to persuade the audience to share the interpretation and evaluation of the past and present the speaker is offering.

The political positioning of participants in the narrated events and in the speech event are also constructed through the choice of pronouns and deictic references that organize the political arena in groups, as well as through engagement resources (modality, projection, and concession). This inter-subjective positioning serves to negotiate the alignment or disalignment of social actors in relation to the human rights' debate. The organization of participants simultaneously serves the realization of the dual purpose of the speech: the commemoration (validation of in-group identity) and the communication of a political stance.

Table 3. Social actors positioning

Us	Them
General/active military officers	Government
Retired military officers	Other (unidentified opposition); individual military officers who behaved incorrectly
Nation/country/society	Sectors of society

23. "¡Felices aquellos que trabajan y vaya si es digna nuestra tarea de soldados!"

The choice of pronouns and verb conjugation morphology that points to particular group memberships describes the participants interactional positioning. The participation framework is transformed throughout the speech. In this speech, the three key social actors: the military, the nation and the Other appear in different roles associated with varying levels of responsibility and power in the political sphere.

The previous table (Table 3) presents the way in which social actors are positioned in relation to each other in the speech.

Through nominal, pronominal and deictic choices groups are constituted into two ideological camps: us vs. them. For example, the Us group is constructed by selecting first person singular pronouns (*yo* [I]) and by conjugations of verbs in the first person (*quiero destacar* [I would like to highlight]). The active military appears represented as first person plural pronouns (*nosotros* [we]), verb forms conjugated in the third person plural (“*concientes de que nadie actúa en busca de reconocimientos individuales, pero convencidos de que es justo...*” [conscientious that nobody acts in search of individual recognitions, but convinced that it is right...]) and other deictic markers (*nuestro* [our]), which indicate inclusion. However, the military is also referred to in third person singular forms that position it as distant from the speaker. This creates a sense of equanimity and fairness in the presentation of the information, since the speaker is distancing himself from the institution and presenting the information as someone else’s opinion. For example:

- (17) The Army of today want to be fairly valued... by ITS conduct and ITS actions....²⁴

Example 17, shows how the choice of a third person possessive adjective to describe and emphasize the difference between the institution and the others who evaluate it. This foregrounding of the owner of the actions, also creates an internal division within the army separating those of today from the ones who composed it in the past. This divide plays to the new rhetoric that wants to fracture the homogeneous way in which the military has responded to accusations of human rights. If today’s army wants to be valued by ITS actions only, what does this mean in relation to their responsibility regarding the institution’s actions during the dictatorship? What does this imply in the re-construction of the institutional memory of the dictatorship?

The construction of political alliances is also achieved through the deployment of linguistic resources that construct an intersubjective dialogue that opens or closes possibilities for the alignment of political positions regarding the past. The analysis of engagement in the speech reveals that concession, projection and modality are used to create a heteroglossic discourse that acknowledges the other

24. “El ejército de hoy pretende ser justamente valorado por SU conducta y por SUS acciones...”

side's position while contracting dialogue. This means that the clauses proclaim the military's position and disclaim that of others. For example:

- (18) We have our greater hope in that reconciliation of the Oriental [Uruguayan] people that Mr. President requests is achieved, an aspect on which already there has been legislation in our country, and we hope that this disposition does not finalize in a mere intention that can even be taken advantage of or accommodated to sectarian interests; since we considered it like a great step towards the necessity of overcoming the past...²⁵

This example acknowledges the president's position, thus, expanding the dialogue with the other side; but immediately contracts it by proclaiming that there has already been legislation to deal with the issue. This contradictory stance on the part of the military reveals the difficulty the institution has in respecting the established democratic government with which it disagrees, while maintaining its position on how to deal with past offenses of the institution. There is also a disclaimer that constructs the negative scenario where the Other's position is discounted and then countered by the institution's evaluation of the importance of overcoming the past. This discursive strategy generates a chasm in the Other's position displaying the differences between the government's policy and the opposition's views. The army does not agree with either one, but leaves some space to construct a positive in-group image by aligning itself with the democratic authorities.

These discursive patterns that close the dialogue are combined with some monoglossic instances of clauses that present information as given and without the possibility of challenging them. For example,

- (19) In the fulfillment of its fundamental and subsidiary mission, the Army constitutes an active protagonist of the Institutional life of the State...²⁶

Here the importance and the active role of the institution in democratic society are presented as given. This type of bare declarative statement helps to construct a positive self-image for the institution aligning it with the established order and democratic values.

As the previous analysis has demonstrated, this configuration of lexico-grammatical choices constructs a representation of the institution and of other social

25. "Tenemos nuestra mayor esperanza en que se concrete esa reconciliación de los orientales que pide el Sr. Presidente, aspecto sobre el que ya se ha legislado en nuestro país, y anhelamos que esta disposición no finalice en una mera intención que pueda inclusive ser aprovechada o acomodada a otras necesidades o intereses sectoriales; ya que la consideramos como un gran paso hacia la necesaria superación del pasado."

26. "En el cumplimiento de su misión fundamental y subsidiaria, el Ejército se constituye en un activo protagonista de la vida Institucional del Estado."

actors in relation to their different roles and political positions regarding the contested past and the future of the institution in a democratic society.

Intertextuality

Treating this speech as a discursive practice entails exploring how this text circulates and is interpreted in a particular socio-historical context. The reception of the speech is important because it reveals the ways in which the text is taken up by others and to what discursive formation(s) it is integrated. This means that we need to investigate the ways in which this text appears or does not appear in later produced texts. In this section, I look at how intertextual relations between this text and others produced by social actors associated with the right and left political ideologies reveal the struggles over how to remember the dictatorship period. I will focus on the inscribed forms of intertextual relations that are generated by directly referring to the source text through reported speech.

In reported speech, the utterance of another is integrated into one's text. So there is "an active reception of other's speech" (Voloshinov 1973: 117). This relationship between the two texts goes beyond the topics of the utterance, and well into the grammar of it. The analysis of the linguistic aspects of the integration of the general's speech to the texts of other social actors gives indications of how the speech was received and how it was manipulated. The question explored here is how do other texts respond to this speech?

The corpus analyzed includes two letters to the editor written by an indicted soldier and by the wives of military officers prosecuted for crimes committed during the dictatorship (the right),²⁷ an opinion article by a retired military officer (expelled from the army during the dictatorship for his opposition to the dictatorship and currently working with the Left wing government), and an article published in a left wing weekly newspaper associated with the most radical positions regarding how to deal with crimes of violation of human rights. All these texts were selected from a much larger corpus of texts that have an intertextual relationship, including the speech previously analyzed, and can be considered to be part of the same discursive formation (Foucault 1982; Lavandera 1985).²⁸ They

27. Even though this text was produced before the speech was made public, it is a statement of a public face of the institution that is making a political statement in relation to the commemoration of the Day of the Army, May 18th. So, this text is parallel to that of General Rosales providing an interesting nuance on the institution's political views in that particular political situation.

28. It is interesting to note that the organization of relatives of the disappeared, *Madres y Familiares de Uruguayos Detenidos Desaparecidos* (FEDEFAM Uruguay), did not make a public statement responding to the general's May 18, 2007, speech. There were only individual pronounce-

are documents that offer relations, regularities and transformations in connection to the interpretation of a particular historical moment. There is a constant theme with constant dispersions. The analysis explores the different patterns in ways of approaching these common themes in a particular historical moment.

These texts reveal a conflict over who has the right to speak and represent the past and reveals shifting and changing positionings of social actors within a common ideological interpretative frame. There is for example a shift in military discourse from institutional conditions of production of a narrative, to the more inter-subjective and contested production of narratives about the traumatic past from individual military officers and their relatives. This change in who is allowed to speak as representative of this group expands definitions of in-group identity by including the relatives of the military officers also.

The discourse of the Left about how to deal with the past has not changed much, since this discourse continues being a counter-hegemonic one. It is a reaction and response to the already dominant version of the past presented by the military and the right. However, the new political scenario with a Left wing government has created some fractures in this group's narrative about the dictatorship also. The government's reconciliation policy and its recognition of the rights of relatives of service men who died *defending the democratic institutions*, creates a point of contact with typical interpretations of the dictatorship produced by the right. The group in power has shifted its narrative about how to deal with the past, but not everyone in the Left accepts this new interpretation as seen in the ways the general's speech is interpreted by more radical Left wing members.

An intertextual analysis of these documents creates a web of relations between them that allows us to visualize the competing versions about how to remember the past and how to construct the future of the institution. The following analysis explores the intertextual relations between military texts and the source text and then the relations between the Left wing texts and the source text focusing on thematic modifications (content representation) and texture analyzing modifications (grammar and style) (Voloshinov 1973).

There are three main themes that emerge in the right wing documents. The main themes that recur in all documents are: individual responsibility vs. institutional responsibility for human rights violations, the nature of conflict between opposing sides and the reconciliation process. Table 4 compares the ways in which

ments of members of the association who responded to interviews in the media. For example, Javier Miranda son of Fernando Miranda disappeared in 1975 whose remains were found on December 2005, stated that the speech was "*desubicado, cerrado, corporativo y casi confrontacional*" [out of place, closed, corporate like and almost confrontational] (*El País, Sección Nacional*, May 21, 2007).

Table 4. Responsibility, conflict and reconciliation in military texts

Letter from relatives of indicted military officers	Letter from indicted officer	Rosales' Speech
Individual freedom of military officers lost because of violation of current laws.	Individuals prosecuted for following institutional orders.	<i>acciones individuales incorrectas</i> [<i>individual incorrect actions</i>]
Actions of the military during the dictatorship were a response to terrorism.	War of intelligence and perceptions. Irregular war. Actions of military were to save the nation.	Actions of the military were a response to groups who tried to uproot the democratic government.
Reconciliation is desired to end confrontations of the past. Time gap between today's generations and those directly involved in the dictatorship.	Reconciliation is something natural that occurred, but is being disturbed by the institutions response to political interests.	Reconciliation is possible and desired (alignment with president's policy), although there is a group who is challenging this possibility by questioning established laws and prosecuting military officers.

responsibility and the conflict are represented in the text produced by military officers in connection to the source text, the speech by General Jorge Rosales.

There are also several discontinuities and gaps within these military texts that need to be explained to better understand why Rosales' speech is representative of the ways in which the institution is struggling to construct a positive in-group identity. The discontinuities between these texts are observed in the topics and linkages some texts make that are not present in others. For example, there is direct reference to the source text in the one written by the indicted military officer, but not in the one written by the relatives of indicted military officers (because it was produced before the speech was given, even though it was published after the speech). The text of the indicted officer uses direct quotations to criticize the General's interpretation of the past and his current political positioning of the institution. For example,

- (20) In my personal case, it seems that I am imprisoned for 'incorrect individual actions'...²⁹

This direct citation of the general's speech is introduced by a comment modalizing the message that follows it, *parece que* (it seems that), constructing a position that challenges the source text and questions its validity. The words incorporated into the author's discourse are made strange and particularized (Voloshinov 1973), in a way that highlights the author's ironic attitude. The citation appears in a

29. "En lo personal parece que estoy preso por "acciones individuales incorrectas"..."

subordinate clause, which provides the reason for the imprisonment of the author. Here the words of the General are used to suit the author's purpose and argumentative needs: to question the fairness of his indictment.

The relationship between the text produced by the relatives and the source text is more indirect because of their conditions of production (simultaneous time period). However, there are still connections that point to a common military narrative that has already established a thread of meanings that these two texts draw on to construct their arguments. The text written by the relatives revolves around the issue of extraditions and unfair prosecution of military officers in connection to the government's reconciliation policy. The source text also makes explicit reference to the questionable extraditions and the new interpretation of the law (Law of Expiry) as background to discuss the reconciliation policy proposed by the government. So, there is a common chain of texts used to construct the argument of the military as victim of a sector of society and reconciliation as desirable for the military although questionable considering the previous legislation. For example:

- (21) We recognize the manifest voluntarism of the President of the Republic, to put an end to so many years of rancor and hatred between diverse sectors of the society, that were in the past confronted through the actions of some and the reactions of others, with the objective to finally obtain the national reconciliation. Nevertheless, we are conscientious that it is not enough to do this through manifest voluntarisms, but that it is necessary, at the moment, to try obtain the right balance of the situation.

(letter from military officers' relatives, May 14, 2007)³⁰

There is a parallelism between the two texts in the way they respond to the government's reconciliation initiative.

- (22) We have our greatest hope that the reconciliation of the Orientals [Uruguayans] that Mr. President requests is achieved, even if it is an aspect which has been legislated in our country, and we yearn that this disposition does not finalize in a mere intention that can even be taken

30. "Reconocemos el voluntarismo manifiesto del Presidente de la República, de poner fin a tantos años de rencor y odio entre diversos sectores de la sociedad, que se encontraron en el pasado enfrentados ante el accionar de unos y la reacción de otros, con el objetivo de lograr finalmente la reconciliación nacional. Sin embargo, somos conscientes que no alcanza con voluntarismos manifiestos, sino que es necesario procurar en estos momentos el justo equilibrio de la situación."

advantage of or accommodated to other needs or partisan interests; since we considered it a great step towards the necessity to overcome the past.

(Speech by Gen. Rosales, May 18, 2007)³¹

The speech of the general and the letter of the relatives use similar arguments to construct their position about how to deal with the past. They both agree with the government's goal of achieving reconciliation to overcome the past that divides Uruguayans. They also make reference to the dangers or problems with achieving this goal by pointing to biased interests that can affect the fair resolution of this problem. This similarity is also observed in the lexico-grammatical choices used to represent these ideas. Both texts begin by framing the position with verbal constructions that represent mental processes (*reconocemos* [we recognize] and *tenemos nuestra mayor esperanza* [we have our greatest hope]). This choice reveals the authors' position in a larger debate about the meaning and value of the government's reconciliation policy. The positive interpretation of the government's policy proposal is followed by a critique of it as *mere intention* or *voluntarism*. Both texts point to a disconnection between the government's position and that of other sectors of society who are not in favor of this reconciliation. The indirect reference to the opposing side appears as a clause complex where the main clause presents the questioning of the government's position by using negation and then follows this with a subordinate clause that elaborates on the reasons why the policy could be undermined if things do not change. These texts also frame the debate as having to do with the past and position the military, institution and individual indicted officers, as victims of the reactions to the actions of others. There is then a thematic and linguistic texture pattern that makes these texts similar and connected even though they do not directly refer to each other.

The three documents produced by authors' connected to the military also make reference to core values of the institution. All documents highlight the solid foundation of this self-image as *honorable, loyal, brave, disciplined and servant of the nation*. There is a clear definition of the institution in bare declaratives that state its main characteristics. However, the origin of these defining characteristics is not mentioned in all of them. There is no reference to the historical genealogy of the institution in the relatives' text, but the indicted military officer makes a connection to the past and also cites Artigas' words providing a different reading of them. For the indicted officer, *Clemencia a los vencidos* (Mercy to the defeated) is

31. "*Tenemos nuestra mayor esperanza de que se concrete esa reconciliación de los orientales que pide el Sr. Presidente, aspecto sobre el que ya se ha legislado en nuestro país y anhelamos que esta disposición no finalice en una mera intención que pueda inclusive ser aprovechada o acomodada a otras necesidades o intereses sectoriales; ya que la consideramos como un gran paso hacia la necesidad superación del pasado."*

cited to foreground the fact that they needed to be defeated first. This implies that there was a conflict and that the fight goes on. So both texts use the same argumentative strategy of constructing a genealogy that connects the institution with the origin of the nation, but with different purposes. For the source text, as mentioned earlier in the chapter, the origins in a period of war and the connection with Artigas are sources of pride that function as indices of the honorable and moral character of the institution. However, for the indicted officer, the genealogy serves as a way to justify the *internal war* and to validate his challenge to the current political situation that demands a change in the military's position regarding the past.

The texts that correspond to the left wing both make direct reference to the source text through reported speech and by connecting it to other texts to give it meaning. The following table (Table 5) presents the common themes addressed in these texts (responsibility, conflict and reconciliation) in comparison to the source text.

The article by the retired military officer from the opposition, Legnani, uses mostly indirect discourse to report the General's position and his words. This style of report produces a very analytic incorporation of the other's discourse to the text.

The other's text is considered mostly in its referential nature and as a symbol of a specific ideational position (Voloshinov 1973). For example:

- (23) It was in this way that he showed support for the designation of June 19 as the Day of Never More proposed by president Tabaré Vázquez, with the

Table 5. Responsibility, conflict and reconciliation in left wing texts

Legnani (retired opposition military officer)	Left wing journalists	Rosales' speech
Institutional responsibility of the Armed Forces.	Institutional responsibility, terrorism of state.	Institutional responsibility vs. individual responsibility of deviant members
Armed Forces gave a coup d'état and broke the laws.	Submission of society to a military apparatus	Actions of the military were a response to groups who tried to uproot the democratic government.
Reconciliation in line with the government's position.	Questioning of reconciliation policy as equating all crimes, those before and those after the coup d'état, as confrontations between Uruguayans.	Reconciliation is possible and desired although there is a group who is challenging this possibility by questioning established laws and prosecuting military officers.

hope that such a “day generates an attitude of positive social commitment.”
 (Raúl Legnani)³²

The words of the source text present the meaning of the message of the General’s speech through the author’s interpretation of it. This is also an instance where indirect discourse prepares the reader for the direct quotation to the discourse of the other. This type of reported speech separates and individualizes the other’s text from the author’s, making it more susceptible to the author’s explicit evaluation. Here we see how the citation of the source text is used to support the author’s interpretation of the meaning of the General’s speech, not just to transmit the speech itself.

The direct quotation of the phrase *eventuales acciones individuales incorrectas* (possible incorrect individual actions) appears in all three texts produced after the speech (all except the one produced by the relatives, see above for analysis of this phrase in the military officer’s text). The uptake by several social actors, both right and left-wing, shows that this utterance represents an important break in the dominant military narrative about the dictatorship’s past.

- (24) But simultaneously, he requested a ‘gesture’ and an attitude of ‘tolerance’ on the part of the sufferers of the dictatorship, yet at the same time he indicated that the Army does not want to be judged by ‘possible incorrect individual actions’.
 (Raul Legnani)³³

This text integrates the other’s text by constructing a narrative that retells the speech focusing on its ideational content. But it also uses direct discourse to integrate the source text by copying the words and phrases singled out by the use of quotation marks. This individualization of the other’s words provides a chance to get the content of the message as well as its texture. The direct extraction of that phrase mocks its awkward modification construction.

- (25) The qualification of ‘incorrect individual actions’ to which a good part of the society understands was terrorism of State, added to the crude justification of one decade of dictatorship, and not only infuriated an extended sensitivity of the Left; it also challenged the patience, perhaps for the opposite reasons, of military high commanders and errand boys in charge of the repression. The fact is that the thesis of Rosales reduces the submission

32. “Fue así que se mostró a favor de que el 19 de junio sea el día del Nunca Más propuesto por el presidente Tabaré Vázquez, con la esperanza de que esa jornada “genere una actitud de compromiso social positivo.”

33. “Pero a la vez pidió un “gesto” y una actitud de “tolerancia” de los sufrientes de la dictadura, a la vez que señaló que el Ejército no quiere ser juzgado por “eventuales acciones individuales incorrectas.”

of all society to the hands of the military apparatus of the State to the ‘possible incorrect actions’ of a band of deranged people that depended on a hanging flower.
(*Brecha* 25 de mayo, 2007)³⁴

This text from *Brecha* cites the phrase, “possible incorrect individual actions,” two times consecutively, integrating more words from the source the second time. It also cites the longer original clause at the beginning of the text. This repetition of the source text provides the authors with the opportunity to emphasize the inaccuracy and problem of this interpretation of the past by exploring its various meanings: euphemism for terrorism of state and exaggerated thesis to explain the dictatorship. In addition, we can observe how the authors modify the original text to serve their own purposes. The second quote is an incomplete citation of the source where one word is omitted in order to create an incomplete parallelism between the two citations. These partial repetitions give the authors the possibility to comment twice on the same part of the original text emphasizing the accuracy of their interpretation by using evidence from the source to support their arguments.

It is also interesting to observe what connections the text from *Brecha* makes and how it positions Rosales’ speech in the debate over how to interpret the past. The other texts cited in connection to the speech include some produced by retired Commanders in Chief in 2006 and the one by the indicted military officer analyzed above. The authors want to point out, by providing examples from other military texts, that the General’s interpretation of the meaning and responsibilities of the institution are different from those of the dominant military narrative about the dictatorship. This identification of the General’s interpretation as different from the norm is also achieved by the play on words in Spanish *mandos* (high commanders) and *mandaderos* (errand boys) that construct an ironic and mocking tone that discredits Rosales’ interpretation.

These texts that comprise the discursive formation reveal there is a diversity of opinions that goes beyond simple ideological positions on how to deal with the violation of human rights by military officers during the dictatorship. Alliances and oppositions of discourses about the past are constructed through intertextual relations. On the one hand, the military texts and the one by Legnani (the retired officer of the Left wing) construct a potential alliance with the government by agreeing with its reconciliation policy. On the other hand, the left wing texts and

34. “La calificación de “acciones individuales incorrectas” a lo que buena parte de la sociedad entiende fue terrorismo de Estado, sumada a la grosera justificación de una década de dictadura, no solo indignó a una extendida sensibilidad de izquierda; también sacó de quicio, quizá por razones opuestas, a mandos y mandaderos militares a cargo de la represión. Es que la tesis de Rosales reduce el sometimiento de toda la sociedad a manos del aparato militar del Estado a las “eventuales acciones incorrectas” de una banda de desquiciados que dependían del clavel del aire.”

the one from the indicted military officer question the General's position with regards to institutional responsibilities for past violations of human rights as the individual responsibility of deviant members. These discursive alliances go across and beyond ideological camps positioning a variety of social actors as challengers of the General's position regarding the past. The opposition to the General's new interpretation of the role of the military institution in relation to violations of human rights highlights the shift in the way the new generation of military officers is remembering the past.

There is also an alliance with the government's policy on reconciliation that goes beyond political parties to include military officers, their relatives and opposition military officers, but not the more radical members of civilian society. The need to overcome the past by reuniting opposing sectors of society is not considered feasible or desirable by all.

The intertextual analysis has shown how there are certain patterns of interpretation that remain constant while others are being changed. These changes also highlight the variation in the ways social actors debate the meaning and value of the past. The relationship between these texts also demonstrates the discursive complexity of memory construction processes.

Conclusions

The analysis of military discourse about the dictatorship presented in this chapter shows the fragmentation of the hegemonic military narrative. This fragmentation seems to result from the appearance of new social actors who have claimed the right to represent military views and the political circumstances resulting from the change in the interpretation of the Law of Expiry. The political scenario changed radically in 2005, when the left wing government created the necessary conditions for the judicial system indictment of several military officers and civilians involved in violations of human rights. These circumstances and the reconciliation policy favored by the government have also caused conflicts and fragmentations in the Left's narrative about the dictatorship. The Left now occupies a position in the order of discourse that allows it to deconstruct the hegemonic narrative of the past that structured the State's response to human rights violations. As government, the Left has the opportunity to reform the state, the same State who had been the repressor during the dictatorship. This requires having to negotiate how to assume responsibility for the past and integrate all sectors of the state (including the military) towards a common goal: the improvement of society.

The commemoration speech by General Rosas on May 18, 2007, worked as a trigger to bring to the fore the various views regarding the past within the military

institution and the left. We observed how the commemoration speech operated as a valid space for the general to communicate with the troops, his retired colleagues, the government as well as the rest of society. The discursive patterns that characterize this text include features already observed in previous chapters: the indirect reference to other's discourse through nominalizations and evaluations of their position and the appraisal of past events and their participants in ethical terms.

The dialogue this text opens and closes with others constructs a limited space to establish alliances with other social actors. Interestingly, it is the government that is directly engaged by the military to find a space for negotiation on how to deal with the past. While the military engages in dialogue with the Left wing government, it is still criticizing some of its decisions such as the reinterpretation of the Law of Expiry.

The texts that responded to the speech point to the political context where Rosales' text was produced and received. Most texts pick up one line, which is directly quoted in three of them ("*eventuales acciones individuales*" [possible individual actions]), that summarizes the change in military narrative. The attribution of violation of human rights to eventual individual deviations produces a new argument that repositions the military and validates other readings of the past. If there were incorrect actions, but they were individual, there is no need to ask for forgiveness as an institution. However, there is space for justice to act and try individual officers accused of this actions. Although this possibility is hedged by using the adverb "*eventuales*" (possible), which enables the General to position himself and the institution as potential allies of the government while maintaining the loyalty to the group.

This new interpretation has the same effect as the previous one: no recognition of wrong doing on the part of the institution. The difference is that in the past the argument was that what had been done was justified in the context of fighting terrorism and it had been requested by the state. The military had acted as a representative of the state and in line with its obligation. The new version put forth by Gen. Rosales challenges this, by admitting the possibility that these actions (i.e. violations of human rights) are not something the institution wants to deal with or integrate to its in-group identity.

The inter-generational transmission of traumatic memory is reworked by younger generations who did not directly participate in the dictatorship, represented by Gen. Rosales. These reworkings of collective memory result in the modification of the military's official grand narrative of the period to construct a positive in-group identity in a political context where the left is in power, and the rules of the game are being changed.

CHAPTER 8

Conclusion

To think is to forget differences, to generalize, to abstract. (J.L. Borges 1958)

In this chapter, I try to generalize from this particular case the mechanisms by which collective memory is constructed through discursive practices. At the same time, I will try to formulate relevant conclusions for the particular historical case at hand, since Uruguayan military memory about the dictatorship is still an important element in the national political debate over human rights violations. The reflections about the analysis and interpretation of the meaning of these texts will involve: (1) the identification of particular discursive practices and features that characterize the construction of memory, and (2) the socio-historical interpretation of this case in relation to the role of language in the construction of social memory. Finally, I will present my personal reflections as a researcher pointing to the challenges and next steps to follow in this type of investigation.

The construction of memory

Memory is a meaning making process. At the social and cognitive level one can say that memory is constructed. This process is characterized by the composition and organization of fragments that provide a base to reconstruct past experience. What we remember depends or is affected by our previous knowledge and experience. In addition, what is remembered is also filtered through the moral and affective evaluation that we associate with that experience. There is an intimate relationship between what is remembered and the person who remembers it (Tulvig 1983 in Schacter 1996). If at the moment of remembering the one remembering focuses on emotional aspects that memory tends to be constructed with the one remembering as a participant in it. On the other hand, when the one remembering attempts to construct an objective memory the perspective from which that memory is produced is that of an observer. This characteristic of memory construction is evident in the texts analyzed in this book, since the representation of participants depends on the orientation of those constructing the memory (i.e. texts). The memory of the dictatorship period is constructed in a different way by the military and by the opposition from the Left (see chapter Six). The memory of the

left takes on the perspective of participant more often than that of the military. In contrast, the memory of the Armed Forces favors more the observer orientation trying to construct an *objective* narrative in which there is an avoidance of direct marking of responsibility and agency. However, it is important to highlight the fact that all of the social actors whose texts were studied in this book had a strong commitment and emotional involvement in the discussion of violations of human rights. Thus the participant perspective is common to texts written by both sides of the political spectrum, including the military (see the analysis of social actors' evaluation in Chapter Six).

We remember because we construct an individual and collective narrative that gives meaning to the past and projects us into the future. In cases where these narratives have political importance, it is relevant to investigate how and in what way memory and reality are connected. Cognitive studies have found that the general characteristics of the past are usually remembered accurately, but when what is remembered is a specific situation, there is more possibility that our memories are affected by distortion and prejudice (Schacter 1996). In the case of Uruguay's memory of the dictatorship period, we can observe how the memories of the institution and that of the opposition agree on certain general aspects of the case, such as the fact that there was a coup d'état and that civil liberties were limited. However, there are major differences in the ways the military and the left assign meaning to these events by focusing on particular cases where there is no agreement. The memory of the military from 1976 until 2007 constructs the image of the Other as *deviant* or *irrational*, thus filtering all of the reconstruction of the events through that prejudice. Through continued reference to examples that illustrate the cruelty and inhumanity of the opposition (e.g. case of the laborer Pascacio Baez or of those fallen in the fight against *subversion* on April 14th), the military justifies its treatment of the Other in exceptional ways that violate ethical norms and international agreements. Military memory is constructed based on the prejudice against the other that allow it to construct an argument using moral overtones without acknowledging the contradictions between their actions and the situational ethics that support their argument.

The relationship between collective memory and individual memory is another aspect that needs mentioning based on the analysis presented. The transmission of memory at the institutional level is one of the mechanisms through which the group maintains its identity and its *raison d'être*. The memory of the group is internalized by the individual members of the institution. This is supported by the analysis of Tróccoli's confession letter (Chapter Five), where he integrates the institution's argument and justification for its actions during the dictatorship into his personal narrative. In his individual memory, we can observe how institutional memory is interconnected with biographical memory; that is, what is first

experienced as social later appears as individual experience (Vygotsky 1978). This means that memory is social, and this cultural storehouse of knowledge provides individuals information that they make use of to construct their identities as members of groups (Schudson 1995).

Another aspect that the analysis foregrounds, is the importance of the present in the reconstruction of the past. What we remember is motivated by our own present interests and our future goals; thus, the present works as a frame through which the past is interpreted. “Collective memory continuously negotiates between available historical records and current social and political agendas. And in the process of referring back to these records, it shifts its interpretation, selectively emphasizing suppressing, and elaborating different aspects of that record” (Zerubabel 1995: 5). The case of the Uruguayan military’s memory of the dictatorship period illustrates, Zerubabel’s point. The memory the military constructs of the dictatorial past is transformed and resignified in relation to the political context of the moment, but at the same time it remains constant in certain aspects. The continuities in the Military’s memory of the period mark a struggle to maintain an institutional identity as the defenders of the fatherland and the representatives of the true national ideals. On the other hand, the discontinuities in the military’s discourse of the dictatorship reflect the effects of the political context on institutional memory. These changes demonstrate the dynamic and fluid aspects of memory and identity, which allow the military to negotiate new ways of establishing allegiances with social actors and finding a role in the political arena.

The analysis presented demonstrates a double discourse in the military’s memory of the period. On the one hand, they want to remember the past and claim their role as defenders of the fatherland and representatives of the people’s will. While on the other, they request the forgetting of the past to overcome differences and move on with new and more pressing needs. This contradiction reflects the struggle of the institution to maintain its beliefs, history and identity as well as their role in the political arena. The following section describes the discursive practices through which this construction and reconstruction of memory is carried out.

Memory and discourse

Memories are not simply activated pictures in the mind but complex constructions built from multiple contributors... (Schacter 1996: 209)

Texts do not ‘have’ meanings; meanings are relations we make through practices in which we are never the sole participant, never the sole originator of the practice. (Lemke 1995b: 159)

Semiotic systems mediate between the experience and the memory of it. What is remembered is not the experience itself but its record through semiotic systems that allow us to attribute meaning to that experience. The process of remembering voluntarily is characterized by the use of semiotic elements that assist in the remembering. This process is dynamic and permeable to the context where it is constructed. The use of semiotic elements in the construction of memory makes the social always present even in individual memories.

From the analysis presented in this book we can identify certain discourse practices and linguistic resources that contribute to the process of memory construction. The analysis of discursive patterns that characterize the military's discourse about the dictatorship enables us to identify key argumentative strategies, evaluations of social actors and linguistic choices used to represent the events, and to assign responsibilities that represent a chain of options typical of the ideological position of the institution in reference to the dictatorship, its political meaning and effects.

The analysis revealed certain discursive patterns and linguistic choices through which these military narratives about the past were constructed:

1. frequent use of metaphors of illness and war.
2. recurrence of emblematic examples and anecdotes to illustrate the military's point.
3. use of direct and indirect projection as a strategy to unpack the other's discourse and authorize its own.
4. evaluation of social actors in moral or ethical terms.
5. use of argumentative strategies that rationalize the violation of human rights through the scenario of an internal state of war, the disqualification of the Other, and self-victimization.
6. avoidance of responsibility through the use of impersonal constructions (e.g. *se* passive, passive, and nominalization).
7. preference of processes that represent experience as something external (material, existential and relational processes).

Some of the changes observed in the way language was used as time passed and the socio-political context changed included: a. the increase in the amount of impersonal constructions and passive voice to dilute responsibilities; b. the overlexicalization of terms used to refer to the same social actor in order to focalize the message (use of synonyms and quasi synonym terms).

The condensation of the dictatorship period and its follow up to certain key events operate as a trigger for memory and evoke in the audience a series of associated judgments and evaluations without mentioning them explicitly. At the macro discursive level we observe that the representation of history in this discourse

implies a simplification with Maniquean tendencies that divides the actors between *us* and *them*. Even though alliances shift throughout time, the *us* group is always constituted by the military institution with close allegiances to the *people*, the *traditional political parties* and the *government*. The Other always includes the opposition from the Left and human rights organizations, and more recently also some of the military (see Chapter Seven). In the earlier texts even the traditional political parties are considered part of the Other group excluding everyone who is not a member of the institution. The *us* is represented as inside and the *enemy* as outside using metaphors of place and geographical connotations. There is also constant appeal to images of war to describe the situations and refer to the participants involved in them. These representations of the *us* versus *them* create, by opposition, an inside group that represents a continuity with national history and the independence leader Artigas in contrast to an out group of Others who are foreign and challenge the status quo. The following example illustrates how this positioning to construct a group identity operates in a particular text.

- (1) The military corps and all their senior officers, feel galvanized by the irrevocable determination to finish with the terrorist bands, that through the years have been decimating the people of Artigas and hammering their most important traditions.

*(Las Fuerzas Armadas al Pueblo Oriental, Tomo I, 1976)*¹

The military also use the same argumentative strategy in more recent texts when responding to accusations of human rights abuses by international laws or human rights organizations. Evoking the metaphor of war and of the Other as a foreign or strange body invading the national body, the military recovers the main argumentative strategy used in earlier texts to justify their actions during the dictatorship. For example:

- (2) When we hear that the events of the past should never repeat themselves, we assert emphatically that we share and wish that they never be repeated. But we also say never return to those who distorted the facts with spurious motive; don't ever come back to those who bet for disagreement, violence and confrontation; let it never again be those who try to implant imported theories based in violence, so foreign to our style of living. Because if that were to happen, they will find all the Uruguayans, without distinctions of class or condition, closing ranks trying to make sure that similar events to

1. "Los cuerpos Militares y todos sus cuadros, se sienten galvanizados por la determinación irrevocable de acabar con las bandas terroristas que durante años han estado diezmando al pueblo de Artigas y mancillando sus más amplias tradiciones" (*Las Fuerzas Armadas al Pueblo Oriental, Tomo I, 1976*).

those of the past don't happen again, neither in their genesis and causes, nor in their effects and consequences. (Gen. Daners 24/5/03)²

Here in a speech given by the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces at the time, we also find an indirect reference to the Other, and a presupposition of knowledge or shared interpretation of the pre-coup d'état situation as an internal state of war produced by the actions of *inadaptados violentos* (violent maladjusted people). The image of the Other is constructed as that of a foreign element penetrating the national body and causing an internal imbalance, an illness that had to be 'cured' by the military. This simplified dichotomy between *us* and *them* becomes a problem when a complex reality is confused with a simplification that tries to explain historical events (Levi 2001).

At the macro discursive level it is also interesting to note the use and transformation of genres as a resource to validate and authorize the military's discourse. There is a path that gives a typical way the culture has to realize the activity of narrating the past and engaging in memory construction. The genres selected to transmit the institution's memory of the period include: the historical account, the opinion article, the confession, the press release and the commemorative speech. These genres are associated with valued ways of narrating the past and constructing *factual* narratives.

The historical account seems to be one of the preferred genres by the military in Uruguay. There have been several historical accounts of the dictatorship period (see for example Chapter Three), including one published in 2007, *Nuestra Verdad* (Our truth). This attempt to engage in public dialog about the meanings of the past in an authorized form contrasts with the ways in which the military of other countries in the region have dealt with the construction of memory of the dictatorship period.³ Uruguayan military officers have a tradition of producing texts authored

2. "Cuando oímos que nunca más deberían repetirse los hechos del pasado, aseveramos en tono enfático que compartimos y anhelamos que nunca más se repitan. Pero también decimos que no vuelvan nunca más aquellos que distorsionaron con fines espurios los hechos; que no vuelvan nunca más los que apuestan al desencuentro, la violencia y la confrontación; que nunca más se pretenda implantar teorías importadas basadas en la violencia, tan ajenas a nuestro estilo de vida. Porque si ello sucediera, encontrarán a todos los orientales, sin distinción de clase o condición, cerrando filas, procurando que hechos similares del pasado no vuelvan a repetirse, ni en su génesis y causas, ni tampoco en sus efectos y consecuencias" (General Daners 24/5/03).

3. For example, in Argentina there have been several individual testimonies written by military officers (e.g. Ramón Díaz Bessone in 1986 *Guerra Revolucionaria en la Argentina (1959-1978)*, or the interview to Scilingo *El vuelo* by Horacio Verbitsky in 1995 and *Por Siempre Nunca Más* by Capt. Adolfo Scilingo in 1996). However, there is to the best of my knowledge only one account written by the institution as a group *La Evolución de la Delincuencia Terrorista en la República Argentina* in 1979, which was published as authored by the national government not the military

as an institution or group (e.g. *Junta de Comandantes en Jefe del Ejército* or the *Centro Militar*) that construct *factual* accounts that document events, participants and circumstances attempting to give causal explanations as well as chronologies of the past⁴.

Through operations of re-signification, accentuation, transference and silencing (Perelli 1986) the institution adapted its discourse and historical *facts* to construct a narrative that justifies the violation of human rights through a situational ethic. The question that emerges from the analysis is why has this narrative about the past been hegemonic. Why has the institution been able to maintain this narrative about the past even though it does not present a coherent argument based on the discrepancy between the actions of the institution during the dictatorship and the beliefs it is supposed to defend?

What does it mean to come to terms with the past?⁵

An attempt to answer this question and the one that finished the previous section could be framed in terms of the type of narrative that is done to work through a traumatic period. According to Mieke Bal (1999), “In narratological terms, repression results in ellipsis –the omission of important elements in the narrative— whereas dissociation doubles the strand of the narrative series of events by splitting off a sideline” (p.ix). Through the construction of a narrative of repression, the military evades the topic of human rights violations putting them in the background and foregrounding the representation of the situation as a *state of internal war* and the other as *deviant, strange or irrational*. On the other hand, the discourse

institution. And similarly in Chile, there are also some written individual testimonies, like Augusto Pinochet’s memoir *El Día Decisivo, 11 de Septiembre de 1973* (Santiago: Estado Mayor General del Ejército, 1982) and Gral Arancibia’s testimony (Roniger & Sznajder 1999).

4. More recently a group of retired military officers published a magazine called *La voz del Centro de Oficiales Retirados de las Fuerzas Armadas* [The voice of the Center of Retired Military Officers from the Armed Forces] where they make an explicit denial of their responsibility for violations of human rights during the dictatorship. The authors also make reference to the military officers that have been convicted as “political prisoners” and criticize the government for overstepping the law. “*Militares retirados editan revista con críticas al gobierno*,” *El Espectador*, January 28, 2008.

5. This question comes from the title of an essay written by Theodore Adorno (1959), “What does it mean to come to terms with the past?,” dealing with the Nazi legacy in post-war Germany. According to Adorno, the reluctance to confront the past at the individual, as well as the official level, points not only to the persistence of certain fascist tendencies that threaten democracy, but also to fascist tendencies within democracy. For Adorno to face the past requires work that demands self-criticism.

of the Left constructs a narrative of dissociation where the violations of human rights during the dictatorship are considered as particular cases without situating them in the larger authoritarian traits of larger society. By constructing a narrative about the violation of human rights during the dictatorship as an exceptional case carried out by monsters, the discourse of the Left particularizes its argument and loses the possibility of going beyond an affective response to their discourse.

The discourse of the military has been hegemonic until recently because it presents the issue in terms of a group or at the national level, thus transforming it into a political issue (but see Chapter Seven for changes in this hegemonic military discourse). The discourse of the Other, has been framed at the individual case level that needs to be resolved by the judicial system. These different approaches to the topic of human rights violations during the dictatorship have resulted in the creation of the Peace Commission, which addressed individual cases but not institutional responsibilities. More recently the search for the bodies of disappeared and the international requests for extradition of military officers accused of human rights violations have pointed to the continued treatment of the topic in piecemeal fashion. Until the topic is dealt with at the national level addressing institutional responsibilities, individual cases become the alibi for the whole (Adorno [1959] 1986).

The general population supports views that consider human rights violations an important issue to be dealt with by society (Equipos MORI 2005). It seems most Uruguayans are also in agreement regarding the need to try military officers involved in human rights violations.⁶ However, this survey of opinions presents the issue only in connection to the disappeared, which foregrounds the exceptional characteristics of the crimes pushing to the background discussions of authoritarianism and pluralism in society.

Authoritarian traits are observable throughout the history of the country, since violation of individual liberties began before the coup d'état and remain today.⁷ The Armed Forces are not an institution disconnected to the rest of Uruguayan

6. According to the survey carried out by Equipos MORI in 2005, 60% of those surveyed consider that military officers should be tried for crimes related to violations of human rights while 71% of the population considers the topic of the disappeared will continue being part of the political debate in the future.

7. The records from the senate meetings during December 2, 1969, document the creation of an investigative commission to follow up on accusations of torture on the part of the police. In the records of July 19, 1970 a report is presented by the commission in charge of investigating acts of torture and the inhuman conditions of detainees (Chenut, J., Del Corro, A., Díaz, J., & Garmendia, M. 1974a, 1974b). More recently the weekly publication *Brecha*, June 2 2000, reported on allegations of torture to achieve the confession by two youth incarcerated in Montevideo. In 2007, Fernando Masseliot was imprisoned for six months for the crime of *sedition* for

society, on the contrary, they embody many of the values shared and accepted by a large number of the population. The Uruguayan historian Carlos Demasi (1995) states, “the awareness of the existence of this essential community between the typical traits of the military dictatorship and some of the most entrenched Uruguayan traditions results fundamental, not to justify the dictatorship but to rectify our traditional attitude to differences” (p.36).⁸ The debate over how to remember this traumatic past opens the door to explore the authoritarian traits that characterize Uruguayan society. This debate can allow society to redefine the role of the Armed Forces in contemporary society and reflect on the value and need of authoritarian practices and traditions. To overcome the tendency to explain and imagine differences in Maniquean and dualistic terms, *good* versus *bad*, there needs to be a humanization of discourse that surmounts the irresistible tendency to repression (Demasi 1995).

Final reflections

The oppressor continues being it, and the same happens with the victim: they are not interchangeable, the first must be punished and condemned (but, if it is possible, he/she also must be understood); the second must be felt sorry for and be helped; but both, before the dishonesty of the act that has been committed irrevocably, need a refuge and a defense, and go, very instinctively, in the search for it. Not all, but most: almost always during all their life.

We have numerous confessions, declarations, admissions from the oppressors (I do not speak only of the German Nationalists, but of all those that commit multiple and horrible crimes to fulfill orders) obtained during trials, others in the course of some interview, others contained in books or memorials. It seems to me they are documents of much importance. In general the descriptions of the things seen and of the acts carried out interest little, they widely agree with whatever victims recount; very few times have they been denied, they have gone to the courts and they are already part of history. Often they are given by writing. But

his participation in the demonstration protesting George Bush's visit to Uruguay during which he broke the windows of a MacDonald's franchise. This arrest was highly symbolic since it is a Left wing government and the crime of *sedition* was instituted during the 1960s when the individual rights were curtailed to fight the guerrilla. The radical left wing groups like *Plenaria Memoria* consider Tabaré Vázquez government to be criminalizing protest.

8. “*La toma de conciencia de la existencia de esta esencial comunidad entre los rasgos característicos de la dictadura militar con algunos de los aspectos más arraigados de la tradición uruguaya resulta fundamental, no para justificar la dictadura sino para rectificar nuestra actitud tradicional frente a las disidencias*” (Demasi 1995: 36).

much more important are the reasons and the justifications: So why did you do it? Did you realize that you were committing a crime? (Primo Levi 2001: 23)⁹

Similar to Primo Levi, my interest in this topic derives from a need to understand the logic behind the actions of the Armed Forces. How was it possible that an institution designed to defend the nation acted against part of it? How is it possible that in the name of *order* and the *common good of the fatherland* horrible crimes were committed? I consider that even if the analysis cannot fully answer these questions, it has unpacked some of the discursive mechanisms and the rhetorical strategies used by the military to justify their violations of human rights and their actions during the dictatorship period.

During the re-democratization process that began after the dictatorship ended in 1985, the military had considerable political power and political allegiances to ensure the hegemony of their narrative about the past. Their strategy during the first 30 years after the coup d'état was to establish semiformal contact (Weeks 2003) with civilians to work on the maintenance of an *official story*. This semi-formal contacts included elite interactions with politicians, public demonstrations such as speeches or commemorations, statements or interviews to the press and professional gatherings. After the election of a Left wing government in 2004, the military have struggled to keep their story in place because they have lost public spaces to negotiate and communicate with society. Communication with civilians is now done through formal channels with well-defined rules, such as through the Ministry of Defense, and this has resulted in the strengthening of civilian society over the military. The military is now being subordinated to civilian authority and as a consequence its institutional discourse is being fragmented. Those retired officers who directly participated in the dictatorship are still trying to maintain their official narrative about the past through the publication of *their truth* (e.g. historical

9. “El opresor sigue siéndolo, y lo mismo ocurre con la víctima: no son intercambiables, el primero debe ser castigado y execrado (pero, si es posible, debe ser también comprendido); la segunda debe ser compadecida y ayudada; pero ambos, ante la impudicia del hecho que ha sido cometido irrevocablemente, necesitan un refugio y una defensa, y van, instintivamente, en su busca. No todos, pero sí la mayoría: casi siempre durante toda la vida. Disponemos ya de numerosas confesiones, declaraciones, admisiones de parte de los opresores (no hablo sólo de los nacionalistas alemanes, sino de todos aquellos que cometen múltiples y horribles delitos por cumplir órdenes) unas conseguidas durante un juicio, otras en el curso de alguna entrevista, otras contenidas en libros o memoriales. A mi parecer son documentos de mucha importancia. En general interesan poco las descripciones de las cosas vistas y de los actos realizados, que coinciden ampliamente con cuanto las víctimas cuentan; muy pocas veces se las ha negado, han pasado a los juzgados y ya son parte de la historia. Muchas veces se entregan por escrito, pero mucho más importantes son los motivos y las justificaciones: ¿Por qué lo hacías? ¿Te dabas cuenta de que estabas cometiendo un delito?” (Primo Levi 2001: 23).

account of the dictatorship published in 2007). The military has come to see public opinion as something to be won and considers that the current 'battle against terrorism' is being fought in the media. The following example from the military historical account *Nuestra Verdad* illustrates this point,

- (3) We do not believe that these are opportune times to write the history of those years, but the continued publications regarding that time coming from the left conduce us to face this task, which with difficulty will be objective. We have the honesty to recognize it, since it is not possible to expect objectivity from the protagonists; to write about those so recent events is not the task of historians but of journalists. Neither will it be **the** truth. But only **our** truth because, as it was pointed by Ortega y Gasset in his essay **Truth and Perspective**, << the truth... which is broken in innumerable facets, ... each one points to an individual. If this individual has known to be faithful to his point of view... what he will see is an aspect of the real world... reality, then, offers itself in individual perspectives>>.

In fact, no one is the owner of reality, and as a result much less of truth. Only those who have Messianic arrogant acts pretend to be [the owners of the truth]; truth is only achieved through the sum of all possible perspectives of reality. In addition, it is very difficult to write History when to be able to do so objectively, we are too close to the facts and to execute the memory, we are too far; particularly if all happened in such a peculiar context of humanity's history as it was with the Cold War. As a result, this work only pretends to be a contribution to that truth so difficult to reach, but to which we can attempt to approximate. (*Nuestra Verdad*, 2007)¹⁰

10. The bold and italics are in the original text. "No creemos que estos sean tiempos oportunos para escribir la historia de aquellos años, pero las sucesivas publicaciones al respecto provenientes de la izquierda nos llevan a encarar este trabajo, que difícilmente sea objetivo, tenemos la honestidad de reconocerlo, ya que no se puede pedir objetividad a los protagonistas; escribir sobre hechos tan recientes no es tarea de historiadores sino de periodistas. Tampoco será la verdad, sino tan solo nuestra verdad, pues como señalaba Ortega y Gasset en su ensayo *Verdad y Perspectiva*, <<la verdad se quiebra en facetas innumerables, cada una de las cuales da hacia un individuo. Si éste ha sabido ser fiel a su punto de vista lo que ve será un aspecto real del mundo la realidad, pues, se ofrece en perspectivas individuales>>.

En efecto nadie es dueño de la realidad, y por lo tanto, mucho menos de la verdad. Sólo aquellos con desplantes mesiánicos pretenden serlo; la verdad sólo se alcanza mediante la suma de todas las perspectivas posibles de la realidad. Además es muy difícil escribir la Historia cuando para hacerlo objetivamente estamos muy cerca de los hechos y para ejercer la memoria demasiado lejos; particularmente si todo sucedió en un contexto tan particular para la historia de la humanidad como fue la Guerra Fría. Por lo tanto, este trabajo pretende tan solo ser un aporte a esa verdad difícil de alcanzar, pero a la que sí podemos intentar aproximarnos" (*Nuestra Verdad*, 2007:6).

However, it is interesting to note that the military now acknowledge the possibility of having a plurality of truths and interpretations of the past. This is an important change in the institutional rhetoric, since a new space has been created for the Other. Yet, the problem remains not being able to break with the past by acknowledging guilt or repentance (Osiel 1997). They are still claiming that their actions should be judged in a particular context (that of the Cold war). This self-examination of the institution is not really a break with the previous narrative of the past, because doing that would threaten institutional continuity and the maintenance of a positive institutional self-identity.

It is very difficult to stop the analysis and make predictions about the future course of events in the Uruguayan case. The discussions, debates and government policies about how to come to terms with this traumatic period have increased recently during Tabare Vázquez' government.¹¹ In the current political scene, where the Left is in power (executive and congress), the military is feeling more pressure to accommodate their narrative and find a space in the political sphere in which they need to respect the authority of that Other they so much despise. It seems the current situation allows for the continued exploration of how this topic is negotiated by society at large. "We will not have come to terms with the past until the causes of what happened then are no longer active. Only because these causes live on does the spell of the past remain, to this very day, unbroken" (Adorno 1959: 129).

One important factor that remains to be addressed within the military, and in the larger society, is the extent to which political dissent is legitimate or whether political opponents are demonized (Alexander 1992).

In periods of tension and crisis, political struggle becomes a matter of how far and to whom the discourses of liberty and repression apply. The effective cause of victory and defeat, imprisonment and freedom, sometimes even of life and death, is often discursive domination, which depends on just how popular narratives about good and evil are extended. (Alexander 1992: 299)

The politics of remembering involve meaning making processes that include not only the representation of the past, but also the enactment of social relations. The way social relations among opposing sides are enacted serves to transform or maintain authoritarianism and intolerance in society. For example, the Left wing

11. In February 2008, the minister of Defense, Azucena Berrutti, presented a proposal for a law that would liberate military officers from keeping their silence regarding their actions during the dictatorship (1973-1985). The proposal opens up the possibility and responsibility of subordinates to challenge an order that goes against the law. This means that if officers want to come forth to declare they could not be punished by their superiors for doing it. ("*Berrutti propone liberar del "silencio" a militares*", *El País* digital, 2/26/08)

government of Tabaré Vázquez is being accused by the military establishment and the radical left of being totalitarian in its governing by decree. This means that even though policies regarding the investigation of human rights abuses during the dictatorship and the reconciliation efforts are supported by a majority of the population; the process by which these policies are carried out is being questioned as non-democratic.¹² The debate over how to come to terms with the past has to deal with the social processes to engage in a pluralistic debate not only with the content of it.

The dictatorship's discursive legacy is also relevant to current international discussions about the *War on Terror*. Another interesting aspect to consider is that the discourse developed to justify violations of human rights in Uruguay resonates with that used in contemporary cases in other parts of the world (e.g. Guantánamo Prison case and Abu Ghraib prison case in the U.S. context). In a socio-political context where there is a lot of emphasis placed on the threats to liberal democracy, it is important to investigate how these liberal democracies justify the violation of individual rights based on a situational ethic. The analysis of this particular case can help us compare and better understand how modern democracies deal with these contradictions.

12. See for example, the newspaper report about the government's decree establishing the elimination of the military's professional secret. "*Derogación del secreto militar sacudió el ámbito castrense*" in *La Republica en la Red*, February 27, 2008.

References

- Achugar, H. (1995). *La nación entre el olvido y la memoria. Hacia una narración democrática de la nación*. In A. Rico (Ed.), *Uruguay: cuentas pendientes. Dictadura, memorias y desmemorias* (pp.15–28). Montevideo: Ediciones Trilce.
- Achugar, H. (2003). El lugar de la memoria a propósito de monumentos (motivos y paréntesis). In E. Jelin & V. Langland (Eds.), *Monumentos y marcas territoriales* (pp.191–216). Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- Achugar, M. (2007). Between remembering and forgetting: Uruguayan Military discourse about human rights (1976–2004). *Discourse & Society*, 18 (5): 521–547.
- Acuña, C. H., & Smulovitz, C. (1997). Guarding the guardians in Argentina: Some lessons about the risks and benefits of empowering the courts. In A. J. McAdams (Ed.), *Transitional justice and the rule of law in new democracies* (pp. 93–122). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Adorno, T. (1986). What does coming to terms with the past mean? In G. Hartman (Ed.), *Bit-burg in moral and political perspective* (pp. 114–129). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. (Original Work published 1959)
- Alexander, J. (1992). Citizen and enemy as symbolic classification: On the polarizing discourse of civil society. In M. Lamont & M. Fournier (Eds.), *Cultivating Differences: symbolic boundaries and the making of inequality* (pp. 289–308). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Althusser, L. (1984). *Essays on ideology*. London: Verso.
- Alvarez, C. (1997). *Servicio paz y justicia-Uruguay Derechos Humanos en el Uruguay. Informe 1997*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Ediciones de SERPAJ.
- Alvarez-Cáccamo, C. (1996). Building alliances in political discourse: Language, institutional authority, and resistance. *Folia Linguistica*, 30 (3/4), 245–270.
- Amarillo, M. (1986). *El ascenso al poder de las Fuerzas Armadas. Cuadernos Paz & Justicia*, 64.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anthonissen, C., & Blommaert, J. (Eds.). (2006). Critical linguistics perspectives on coping with traumatic pasts. Case studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 5 (1).
- Anthonissen, C. (2006). The language of remembering and forgetting. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 5 (1), 1–13.
- Antze, P., & Lambek, M. (1996). *Tense past: cultural essays in trauma and memory*. New York: Routledge.
- Appadurai, A. (2001). *La modernidad desbordada. Dimensiones culturales de la globalización*. Montevideo, Buenos Aires: TRILCE and FHC.
- Aristotle (1991). *The art of rhetoric* (J. H. Freese, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Arocena, R. (1989). *Referéndum. razones y sinrazones. Cuadernos de Marcha*. Tercera Epoca, año IV, 3–7.

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: four essays* (edited by M. Holquist). (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bal, M. (1999). Introduction. In M. Bal, J. V. Crewe & L. Spitzer (Eds.), *Acts of memory: cultural recall in the present* (pp. vii-xvii). Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Bangarten, A., von Cranach, M., & Arn, C. (1997). Collective remembering in the communicative regulation of group action. A functional approach. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 16 (4), 365–388.
- Barker, C., & Galasinski, D. (2001). *Cultural studies and discourse analysis: a dialogue on language and identity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Bartlett, F. (1932). *Remembering: a study in experimental and social psychology*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Bateson, G. (1973). *Steps to an ecology of mind: collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution, and epistemology*. St Albans, Australia: Paladin.
- Bell, P., & van Leeuwen, T. (1994). *The media interview: confession, contest, conversation*. Kensington, NSW: University of New South Wales Press.
- Benhabib, S. (1996). *Democracy and difference: contesting the boundaries of the political*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Benjamin, W. (1969). The Storyteller. Reflections on the work of Nikolai Leskov. In H. Arendt (Ed.), *Illuminations* (pp. 83–109). New York: Schocken Books.
- Bentivoglio, P. (1998). *The presence of first person subject pronouns in Venezuelan spoken Spanish: The relevance of pragmatic and semantic factors*. IPra Conference, Reims, France.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: a treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Doubleday.
- Blixen, S. (2001). *Privatización de la memoria. Brecha*. N°808.
- Bobbio, N. (1996). *Left and right: the significance of a political distinction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bolívar, A. (1994). The structure of newspaper editorials. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in Written Text Analysis* (pp. 276–294). New York: Routledge.
- Bolívar, A. (1998). *Discurso e interacción en el texto escrito*. Caracas, Venezuela: Consejo de Desarrollo Científico y Humanístico, Universidad Central de Venezuela.
- Borges, J. L. (1958). *Cuentos*. Godfrey, IL: Monticello College Press.
- Brecha (1996). *Una confesión y muchos silencios. Hasta la verdad siempre. Brecha*, Año 11, N°545, 1–10.
- Brecha (2001). *Aniversario del golpe de estado. Los trabajadores coparon 18. Brecha*, Año 16, N°813, 14.
- Brecha (2001). *Fragmentos de la resolución del Juez Canicoba Corral. El exhorto tan Temido. Brecha*, Año 16, N°813, 3–5.
- Brecha (2001). *Marcha por verdad y justicia. Miles 'políticamente incorrectos'. Brecha*, Año 16, N°813, 15.
- Brown, R., & Kulik, J., (1982). Flashbulb memories. In U. Neisser (Ed.), *Memory observed: remembering in natural contexts* (pp. 23–40). San Francisco, W.H. Freeman. (Original work published 1977)
- Bühler, K. (1985). *Teoría del lenguaje*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Búsqueda (2001). *La Policía apelará a todas sus facultades ante los 'escraches' y denunciará los hechos a la Justicia. Búsqueda*, Año XXX, Issue 1.110, 1.

- Caetano, G. (2000). *La dictadura, la represión, la transición y la memoria. El caso de Uruguay*. La Lucila del Mar, Argentina; Social Science Research Council Seminario sobre Memoria Colectiva.
- Caetano, G., & Rilla, J. P. (1989). *La era militar*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental.
- Caetano, G., & Rilla, J. P. (1991). *Breve historia de la dictadura, 1973–1985*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Centro Latinoamericano de Economía Humana; Ediciones de la Banda Oriental.
- Caetano, G., & Rilla, J. P. (1999). *Historia contemporánea del Uruguay: de la colonia al MERCOSUR*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Editorial Fin de Siglo.
- Castagnola, J. L., & Mieres, P. (1989). *La ideología política de la dictadura*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental.
- Castoriadis, C. (1987). *The imaginary institution of society*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chenut, J., Del Corro, A., Díaz, J., & Garmendia, M. (1974a). *Las medidas prontas de seguridad en Uruguay. Actas de la cámara de senadores*. Caracas: Información Documental de América Latina (INDAL).
- Chenut, J., Del Corro, A., Díaz, J., & Garmendia, M. (1974b). *Tortura, libertad de prensa, y 'Tupamaros' en Uruguay. Actas de la cámara de senadores*. Caracas: Información Documental de América Latina (INDAL).
- Centro Militar & Centro de Oficiales Retirados de las FFAA. (2007). *Nuestra verdad: La lucha contra el terrorismo (1960–1980)*. Montevideo: Artemisa Editores.
- Círculo Militar (2001). *Demostración de apoyo al Señor Comandante en jefe del ejército. Gaceta del Círculo Militar*. Número 15, 31 de agosto. Retrieved September 2001, from http://www.artigas.org.uy/circulo_gacetilla_2001_15.html
- Coffin, C. (1997). Constructing and giving value to the past: an investigation into secondary school history. In F. Christie & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Genre and institutions: social processes in the workplace and school* (pp. 196–230). London: Cassell.
- Connerton, P. (1989). *How societies remember*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cores, H. (1999). *Uruguay hacia la dictadura, 1968–1973: la ofensiva de la derecha, la resistencia popular y los errores de la izquierda*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental.
- Cosse, I., & Markarian, V. (1996). *1975: año de la orientalidad. Identidad, memoria e historia en una dictadura*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Ediciones Trilce.
- Cribari, P. (2001). *Costo País. Latitud 30 35* (2), 51.
- Daners, C. (2003). Speech given by the Commander in Chief of the Army on May 24th.
- Davis, N. Z., & Starn, R. (1989). Memory and counter-memory -- Introduction. *Representations* (26), 1–6.
- De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse & Society* 10 (2), 149–173.
- de Giorgi Lageard, A. (2000). *La Política de memoria del Sanguinettismo (1980–1985): su fundación como tercera memoria*. Montevideo, Social Science Research Council, Collective Memory of Repression Program. Manuscript.
- Demasi, C. (1995). *La dictadura militar: un tema pendiente*. In A. Rico (Ed.), *Uruguay: Cuentas pendientes. Dictadura, memoria y desmemorias* (pp.29–49). Montevideo: Ediciones Trilce.
- Demasi, C. (2004). *Las luchas por el pasado: Historia y nación en Uruguay (1920–1930)*. Montevideo: Ediciones Trilce.
- Derrida, J. (1998). *The typewriter ribbon. Limited ink II*. Annual Conference of the Humanities Institute, University of California, Davis.

- Díaz Bessone, R. (1986) *Guerra Revolucionaria en la Argentina (1959–1978)*. Buenos Aires: Círculo Militar.
- Díaz, R. (2001). *Debemos mantener viva la memoria de las atrocidades que vimos cometer a la subversión contra compatriotas inocentes. Desaparecidos y olvidados. El Observador*. Montevideo, 5.
- Dirección Nacional de Relaciones Públicas (1983). *Transcripción de las actas correspondientes a las sesiones realizadas entre representantes de la Comisión de Asuntos Políticos de las Fuerzas Armadas y representantes de los partidos políticos habilitados -Partido Colorado, Partido Nacional y Unión Cívica- en el período comprendido entre el 13/5/1983 y el 5/7/1983 en el Parque hotel, en el marco del diálogo político para la reforma constitucional*. 6 de agosto. Document.
- Disculpe (1989). *Ante el referéndum del 16 de abril. Una opinión. Disculpe*. Montevideo, II, N° 91, 9.
- Disculpe (1989). *Las Fuerzas Armadas y la subversión. Disculpe*. Montevideo, II, N°84, 4.
- Disculpe (1989). *Lo dicho por el General Guillermo E. de Nava. Disculpe*. Montevideo, II, N°79, 8.
- Doyenart, J. C. (2001). *División sobre alcance de la Ley de Caducidad. El País*. Montevideo, 15 de julio.
- Duranti, A. (2002). *Linguistic anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Eco, U. (1984). *Semiotics and the philosophy of language*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.
- Eggs, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- El Espectador (2008). *Militares retirados editan revista con críticas al gobierno*. January 28. Retrieved in January, 2008 from <http://www.espectador.com.uy/>
- El País Digital (2007). *Polémico discurso del comandante en jefe del ejército, Sección Nacional*. May 21. Retrieved on May 2007 from <http://www.elpais.com.uy/>
- El País (2008). *Berruti propone liberar del 'silencio' a 'militares'*. February 26. Retrieved on February 2008 from <http://www.elpais.com.uy/>
- Etchemendi, S., & Vargas, C. (1989). Referéndum: ¿Y después qué?. *Cuadernos de Marcha*. Tercera Epoca, año IV, Issue 41, 41–70.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2), 133–68.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. London: E. Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *The dialectics of discourse*. *Textus*. Manuscript.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, I: Discourse as Structure and Process; II: Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 258–84). London: Sage.
- FEDEFAM (2001). A la opinión pública. *Comunicado de Prensa*. 23 de Julio. Retrieved in August 2001, from <http://www.tau.org/familiares/actualidad.htm>
- Feitlowitz, M. (1998). *A lexicon of terror: Argentina and the legacies of torture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fentress, J., & Wickham, C. (1992). *Social memory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Foucault, M. (1973). *Madness and civilization; a history of insanity in the Age of Reason*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Foucault, M. (1977). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In D. F. Bouchard (Ed.), *Language, Counter-memory, practice. Selected essays and interviews* (pp. 139–164). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982). *The archaeology of knowledge; and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: discourse and ideology in the press*. New York: Routledge.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and control*. London: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Freud, S. (1956). Screen Memories. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *Collected papers of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 5, p. 301). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1899)
- Fries, P. (1995). A personal view of theme. In M. Ghadessy (Ed.), *Thematic Development in English Texts* (pp. 1–19). London: Pinter.
- Gaetán de Ramas, R., Suárez e Maurente, M., Feijo de Soca, M., Medina de Rodríguez Buratti, R., Pascal de Silveira, L., Busquiazio de Gavazzo, M., et al. (2007). *Carta abierta a la opinión pública de las Señoras esposas de militares y policías privados de su libertad desde el pasado año 2006. El Bocón*, 24 de mayo, p. 30.
- Gatti, D. (2001). *Ramela en offside. Brecha*, Año 16, N°819, 12.
- Ghadessy, M. (1999). *Text and context in functional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gil, D. (1999). *El Capitán por su boca muere, o, La piedad de Eros: ensayo sobre la mentalidad de un torturador*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Ediciones Trilce.
- Gillis, J. R. (1994). *Commemorations: the politics of national identity*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: an essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gonzalez, L. (1984). *Political parties and redemocratization in Uruguay*. Washington, D.C.: Latin American Program Wilson Center.
- Gramsci, A. (1977). *Antonio Gramsci: selections from political writings, 1910–1920: with additional texts by Bordiga and Tasca* (Q. Hoare (Ed.), John Mathews, Trans). New York: International Publishers.
- Gregory, M. (1987). Meta-functions: aspects of their development, status and use in systemic linguistics. In M. A. K. Halliday & R. Fawcett (Eds.), *New Developments in Systemic Linguistics* (pp. 94–106). London: Frances Pinter.
- Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The collective memory*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory* (Lewis Coser (Ed.), Trans). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning*. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1982). *El lenguaje como semiótica social. La interpretación social del lenguaje y del significado*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1992). How do you mean? In M. L. R. Davis (Ed.), *Advances in Systemic Linguistics: Recent Theory and Practice* (pp. 20–35). London: Pinter Publishers.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: E. Arnold.

- Halliday, M. A. K. (1999). The notion of context in language education. In M. Ghadessy (Ed.), *Text and Context in Functional Linguistics* (pp. 1–24). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hartman, G. H. (1986). *Bitburg in moral and political perspective*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Harvey, L. (1990). *Critical social research*. London: Unwim Hyman.
- Hasan, R. (1999). Speaking with reference to context. In M. Ghadessy (Ed.), *Text and Context in Functional Linguistics* (pp. 219–328). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hill, J. H., & Irvine, J. T. (1993). *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, J. H., & Zepeda, O. (1993). Mrs. Patricio's trouble: the distribution of responsibility in an account of personal experience. In J. H. Hill & J. T. Irvine (Eds.), *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse* (pp.197–225). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hjelmslev, L. (1984). *Prolegómenos a una teoría del lenguaje*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- Hobsbawm, E. J., & Ranger, T. O. (1983). *The invention of tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hodge, B., & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (2000). *Evaluation in text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huyssen, A. (1999). Present pasts: Media, politics, amnesia. *Public Culture* 12 (1), 21–38.
- Israel, S. (1996). *El día en que la armada se opuso al golpe*. *Posdata*, Issue 74, 40–44.
- Israel, S., & Cesin, N. (2007). *El ejército regresa al Jurásico. A pesar de las concesiones del gobierno*. *Brecha*, 25 de mayo.
- Jakobson, R. (1971). Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb. *R. Jakobson, Selected Writings* (pp. 130–147). The Hague: Mouton. (Original work published 1957)
- Janet, P. (1928). *L'évolution de la memoire et de la notion du temps; compte-rendu integral des conferences d'apres les notes stenographiques*. Paris: A. Chahine.
- Jelin, E., & Kaufman, S. (1999). *Los niveles de la memoria: veinte años después en Argentina*. Manuscript.
- Jelin, E. (2002). *Los sentidos de la conmemoración*. In E. Jelin (Ed.), *Las conmemoraciones: las disputas en las fechas <<infelices>>* (pp.245–251). Madrid: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Kekic, L. (2007). The economist intelligence unit's index of democracy. *The Economist*. Retrieved on February 22, 2008, from www.economist.com/media/pdf/DEMOCRACY_IN-DEX_2007_v3.pdf
- Kress, G. (1989). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, G. (1993). Against arbitrariness: the social production of the sign as a foundational issue in critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society* 4 (2), 169–191.
- Kress, G. (1995). Moving beyond a critical paradigm: on the requirements of a social theory of language. *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 73 (3), 621–634.
- Kress, G. (1995). The social production of language: History and structures of domination. In P. Fries and M. Gregory (Eds.), *Discourse in Society: Systemic Functional Perspectives* (pp.115–140). Norwood: Ablex.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). Word, dialogue and novel. In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva Reader* (pp. 24–33). Oxford: Blackwell
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- La República. (2001). *Reclamo de verdad y justicia en La Teja al inaugurar Memorial de Desaparecidos*. La República. Montevideo, 6 de agosto, p. 3.
- La República (2008). *Derogación del secreto militar sacudió el ámbito castrense*. February 27. Retrieved on February 2008 from <http://www.larepublica.com.uy>
- Lavandera, B. (1985). Intertextual relationships: 'Missing People' in Argentina. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Languages and Linguistics: The Interdependence of Theory, Data and Application* (pp. 121–139). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Lechner, N. (1988). *Los patios interiores de la democracia*. Santiago de Chile: Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales.
- Legnani, R. (2007) *El comandante Rosales: discurso con limitaciones*. *La Onda digital*. Retrieved on May 28, 2007, from <http://www.laondadigital.com/LaOnda/LaOnda/339/A3.htm>
- Lemke, J. L. (1981). Semantics and social values. *Word* 40 (1–2), 37–50.
- Lemke, J. L. (1985). Ideology, intertextuality and the notion of register. In J. D. Benson & W. Greaves (Eds.), *Systemic Perspectives on Discourse* (pp. 275–294). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Lemke, J. L. (1995a). Intertextuality and text semantics. In P. Fries & M. Gregory (Eds.), *Discourse in Society: Systemic Functional Perspectives* (pp. 85–114). Norwood: Ablex.
- Lemke, J. L. (1995b). *Textual politics: discourse and social dynamics*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Lessa, A. (1996). *Estado de guerra: de la gestación del golpe del 73 a la caída de Bordaberry*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Editorial Fin de Siglo.
- Levi, P. (2001). *Los hundidos y los salvados*. Barcelona: Muchnik Editores.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Linde, C. (1999). The acquisition of a speaker by a story: How history becomes memory and identity. [Special Issue on History and Subjectivity]. *Ethos*. Manuscript.
- Linde, C. (2000). The transformation of narrative syntax into institutional memory. *Narrative Inquiry*. Manuscript.
- Loftus, E. (2000) Remembering what never happened. In E. Tulving (Ed.), *Memory, consciousness and the brain: the Tallinn conference* (pp. 106–118). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- López Chirico, S. (1997). *Las FF.AA Uruguayas en la democracia pos-dictatorial: Notas sobre misión y estrategias políticas*. In R. Diamint (Ed.), *Control Civil y Fuerzas Armadas en las nuevas democracias latinoamericanas*. Buenos Aires, Universidad Torcuato di Tella. Nuevohacer. Grupo Editor Latinoamericano. Manuscript.
- López Chirico, S. (1999). *Fuerzas Armadas y Democracia en el Uruguay: Mirada al pasado reciente desde el fin de siglo*. *Democracia e Forças Armadas no Cone Sul*. Rio de Janeiro. Manuscript.
- Loveman, B. (1999). *For la patria: politics and the armed forces in Latin America*. Wilmington, Del.: SR Books.
- Loveman, B., & Davies, T. (1997). *The Politics of antipolitics: the military in Latin America*. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources.
- Lowenthal, A., & Fitch, J. S. (1986). *Armies and politics in Latin America*. New York: Holmes & Meier.
- Malinowski, B. (1953). The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In C. K. Ogden & I. A. Richards (Eds.), *The Meaning of Meaning* (pp. 296–336). London: Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc., Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Marcha (1973). *7 días que conmovieron al Uruguay*. *Cuadernos de Marcha*, N°68.
- Marcha (1973). *El fin del principio (27 de junio de 1973)*. *Cuadernos de Marcha*, N°73.

- Marchesi, A. (2000). *Mientras enterramos a nuestros muertos*. Montevideo, Social Science Research Council, Collective Memory of Repression Program. Manuscript.
- Marchesi, A. (2001) *El Uruguay inventado. La política audiovisual de la dictadura. Reflexiones sobre su imaginario*. Montevideo: Editorial Trilce.
- Marchesi, A. (2002) *Guerra o terrorismo de estado? Memorias enfrentadas en torno al pasado reciente Uruguayo*. In E. Jelin (Ed.), *Las conmemoraciones: las disputas en las fechas <<infelices>>* (pp.101–148). Madrid: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Martin, J. R. (1989). *Factual writing: exploring and challenging social reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. R. (1997). Analysing genre: functional parameters. In F. Christie & J.R.Martin (Eds.), *Genre and Institutions* (pp. 3–39). London: Cassell.
- Martin, J. R. (1999). Modelling context. A crooked path of progress in contextual Linguistics. In M. Ghadessy (Ed.), *Text and Context in Functional Linguistics* (pp. 25–61). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Martin, J. R. (2000). Close reading: functional linguistics as a tool for critical discourse analysis. In L. Unsworth (Ed.), *Researching language in schools and communities* (pp. 275–302). London: Cassell.
- Martin, J. R. (2001). Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in Text. Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse* (pp. 142–175). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. R. (2002). Writing history: Construing time and value in discourses of the past. In M. Schleppegrell & M. Colombi (Eds.), *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: meaning with power* (pp. 87–118). Mahwah, N.J., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Martin J., R. & White, P. R. (2005) *The language of evaluation*. New York: Palgrave.
- Martin, J. R., & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Re/reading the past: Critical perspectives on time and value*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Martín Menéndez, S. (1999). *Ideology and lexis: discursive strategies in military and democratic discourse in Argentina (1983–1984)*. International Pragmatics Conference, Reims, France.
- Martín Rojo, L. (1997). Intertextuality and the construction of a new female identity. In M. Bengoechea & R. Sola (Eds.), *Intertextuality/Intertextualidad* (pp. 81–98). Alcalá, Servicio de Publicaciones. Universidad de Alcalá.
- Martín Rojo, L., & Whittaker, R. (1999). A dialogue with bureaucracy: Register, genre and information management as constraints on interchangeability. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 149–189.
- Martínez Vizcarrondo, D. E. (1999). *La recontextualización y la legitimación periodística de un acontecimiento y los procedimientos discursivos que entraña: el discurso científico en la cobertura noticiosa del periódico puertorriqueño El Nuevo Día sobre la guerra en el Golfo Pérsico*. *Revista Iberoamericana de Discurso y Sociedad* 1 (2), 7–43.
- Matthiessen, C. (1995). Theme as enabling resource in ideational ‘knowledge’ construction. In M. Ghadessy (Ed.), *Thematic Development in English Texts* (pp. 20–54). London: Pinter.
- Morgan, P. S. (1997). Self-presentation in a speech of Newt Gingrich. *Pragmatics* 7 (3), 275–308.
- Muro, F. (2008). *El Best-seller military*. *El País*, *Qué pasa*, Jan. 12, p. 15.
- Murphy, J., & Katula, R. with Hill, Forbes, Ochs, Donovan (1994). *A synoptic history of classical rhetoric*. Davis: Hermagoras Press.

- Myers, S. L. (1997). *Los años oscuros: Uruguay, 1967–1987*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Editorial Latina.
- Neisser, U. (1982a). *Memory observed: remembering in natural contexts*. San Francisco, W.H. Freeman.
- Neisser, U. (1982b). Snapshots or benchmarks?. In U. Neisser (Ed.), *Memory observed: remembering in natural contexts* (pp. 43–48). San Francisco, W.H. Freeman.
- Neisser, U., & Harsch, N. (1992). Phantom flashbulbs: False recollections of hearing the news about Challenger. In E. Winograd & U. Neisser (Eds.), *Affect and accuracy in recall: studies of 'flashbulb' memories* (pp. 9–31). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1983). On the uses and disadvantages of history for life. *Untimely Meditations*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*. *Representations* 26, 7–25.
- Núñez, T. (2001). *De las manifestaciones a los escraches y de la prevención a la represión. ¿Cambios de hábito?*. *Brecha*. Montevideo Año 16, N°818, 10.
- O'Donnell, G. A. (1986). Modernization and military coups: Theory, comparisons, and the Argentine case. In A. F. Lowenthal & J. S. Fitch. (Eds.), *Armies and politics in Latin America* (pp. 96–133). New York, Holmes & Meier.
- O'Donnell, G., Schmitter, P., & Whitehead, L. (1986). *Transitions from authoritarian rule: prospects for democracy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Olick, J. K. (1998). What does it mean to normalize the past? Official memory in German politics since 1989. *Social Science History* 22 (4), 547–572.
- Olick, J. K. (1999a). Collective memory: The two cultures. *Sociological Theory* 17 (3), 333–348.
- Olick, J. K. (1999b). Genre memories and memory genres: A dialogical analysis of May 8, 1945 commemorations in the Federal Republic of Germany. *American Sociological Review* 64, 381–402.
- Olick, J. K., & Robbins, J. (1998). Social memory studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the historical sociology of mnemonic practices. *Annual Review Sociology*. 24, 105–140.
- Osiel, M. (1997). *Mass atrocity, collective memory and the law*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Oteiza, T. (2003). How contemporary history is presented in Chilean middle school textbooks. *Discourse & Society* 14 (5), 639–660.
- Oteiza, T. (2006). *El discurso pedagógico de la historia. Un análisis lingüístico sobre construcción ideológica de la historia de Chile (1970–2001)*. Santiago, Chile: Frasis.
- Panizza, F. (1990). *Uruguay, batllismo y después: Pacheco, militares y tupamaros en la crisis del Uruguay batllista*. Montevideo: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental.
- Peralta, M. H. (2000). *No sólo el poder tiene amnesia. Los derechos humanos y el pueblo llano*. *Brecha*, Montevideo, Año 15, N°745, 3–4.
- Perelli, C. (1986). La manipulación política de la memoria colectiva. In C. Perelli & J. Rial (Eds.), *De mitos y memorias políticas: la represión, el miedo y después* (pp.117–128). Montevideo: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental
- Perelli, C. (1987). *Someter o convencer el discurso militar*. Montevideo: CIADE, EBO.
- Perelli, C. (1991a). *Desde los cuarteles: el discurso militar sobre la transición democrática en América del Sur*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Peitho.
- Perelli, C. (1991b). *El nuevo ethos militar en América Latina: las crisis existenciales de las fuerzas armadas de la región en los 90'*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Peitho.

- Perelli, C., & Rial, J. (1986). *De mitos y memorias políticas: la represión, el miedo y después*. Montevideo: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental.
- Pinochet, A. (1982) *El Día Decisivo, 11 de Septiembre de 1973*. Santiago: Estado Mayor General del Ejército.
- Poder Ejecutivo Nacional (1979) *Evolución de la delincuencia terrorista en la Argentina*. Argentina: Poder Ejecutivo.
- Posdata (1996). 1977–1979 *Testimonios de integrantes de servicios de Inteligencia de la época revelan 'cultura' de la represión. Secretos de la dictadura II. Posdata*, 12–31 & 86–87.
- Posdata (1996). *Capitán Tróccoli reconoce participación en acciones 'inhumanas' y en 'torturas', y explica así la muerte de desaparecidos. Posdata*, Issue 87, 18–25.
- Posdata (1996). *Preocupan en medios castrenses 'filtraciones y anónimos' hacia los medios. Ejército: Mermot llamó a 'mantener la verticalidad'. Posdata*, Issue 74, 28.
- Posdata (1996). *Secretos de la dictadura. Testimonio desde dentro brindado por el Gral. Alberto Ballestrino. Diario personal de Carlos Julio Pereyra: los días del vino envenenado. Posdata*, Issue 72, 12–26.
- Posdata (1996). *Zelmar Michelini-Héctor Gutiérrez Ruiz. Documentos para entender qué pasó. Posdata*, Issue 88, 12–21 & 92–96.
- Quijano, C. (1989). *Los golpes de estado*. República Oriental del Uruguay, Cámara de Representantes.
- Rabossi, E. (1989). *Algunas reflexiones... a modo de prólogo*. In E. Rabossi (Ed.), *Usos del Olvido* (pp. 7–11). Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión.
- Raiter, A. (1999). *Discurso y ciencia social*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
- Ramírez, G. (1971). *Las Fuerzas Armadas Uruguayas en la crisis continental*. Montevideo: Tierra Nueva.
- Renan, E. (1990). What is a nation? In H. K. Bhabha (Ed.), *Nation and narration* (pp. 8–22). New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1882)
- Rey Piuma, D. (1994). *Un marino acusa. Informe sobre la violación de los derechos humanos en el Uruguay*. Montevideo: Editorial TAE.
- Rial Roade, J. (1986a). *Las Fuerzas Armadas ¿soldados-políticos garantes de la democracia?* Montevideo: Ediciones Banda Oriental.
- Rial Roade, J. (1986b). *Militares y redemocratización. Cuadernos de Marcha*. Tercera época, año II, N°8, 26–39.
- Rial Roade, J. (1990). The Armed Forces and the question of democracy in Latin America. In L. W. Goodman, J. Mendelson & J. Rial (Eds.), *The Military and Democracy* (pp. 3–21). Toronto: Lexington Books.
- Rico, A., & Achugar, H. (comp.) (1995). *Uruguay: cuentas pendientes. Dictadura/memorias y desmemorias*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Ediciones Trilce.
- Riggins, S. H. (1997). *The language and politics of exclusion: others in discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Rodríguez, A. (1998). *Desaparecidos: El poder político 'protege' a las FFAA. La República*, Montevideo, 19 de abril, 10.
- Roniger, L. (1997). Paths of citizenship and the legacy of human rights violations: The cases of redemocratized Argentina and Uruguay. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 10 (3), 270–309.
- Roniger, L., & Sznajder, M. (1999) *The legacy of human-rights violations in the southern cone: Argentina, Chile and Uruguay*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rosales, J. (2007). *Discurso del comandante en jefe del ejército General Jorge Rosales; 18 de mayo de 2007 'Día del ejército nacional'*. *Voces*, 24 de mayo, 12–13.
- Rothery, J., & Stenglin, M. (2000). Interpreting literature: the role of APPRAISAL. In L. Unsworth (Ed.), *Researching Language in Schools and Communities. Functional Linguistic Perspectives* (pp. 222–244). London: Cassell.
- Rouquié, A. (1986). Demilitarization and the institutionalization of military-dominated polities in Latin America. In A. F. Lowenthal & J. S. Fitch. (Eds.), *Armies & Politics in Latin America* (pp. 444–477). New York: Holmes & Meier.
- Rousseau, J. (1990). *The confessions*. London: Penguin Books.
- Sauer, C. (1996). Echoes from abroad—speeches for the domestic audience: Queen Beatriz' address to the Israeli parliament. *Current Issues in Language & Society* (3), 233–267.
- Schacter, D. L. (1987). Implicit memory: history and current status. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition* 13, 50–518.
- Schacter, D. L. (1995). Memory distortion: history and current status. In D. Schacter (Ed.), *Memory distortion: how minds, brains and societies reconstruct the past* (pp. 1–43). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schacter, D. L. (1996). *Searching for memory: the brain, the mind, and the past*. New York: Basic-Books.
- Schudson, M. (1989). The present in the past versus the past in the present. *Communication* 11, 105–113.
- Schudson, M. (1995). Dynamics of distortion in collective memory. In D. Schacter (Ed.), *Memory distortion: how minds, brains and societies reconstruct the past* (pp. 346–364). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schuman, H., & Scott, J. (1989). Generations and collective memories. *American Sociological Review* 5, 359–381.
- Schwartz, B. (1982). The social context of commemoration: A study of collective memory. *Social Forces* 61 (2), 374–402.
- Scilingo, A. (1996) *Por Siempre Nunca Más*. Argentina: Editorial La Plata.
- Scollon, R. (2001). *Mediated discourse: the nexus of practice*. London: Routledge.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (1977). *A discourse study of some aspects of word order in the Spanish spoken by Mexican-Americans in west Los Angeles*. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Skaar, E. (2007). Legal development and human rights in Uruguay: (1985–2002). *Human Rights Review*, January-March, 52–70.
- Smith, D. (1998). Language and discourse in conflict and conflict resolution. In S. Wright (Ed.), *Language and Conflict* (pp. 18–42). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Solari, A. E. (1988). *Uruguay, partidos políticos y sistema electoral*. Montevideo: El Libro Libre/FUCCYT.
- Soldado, El (1987). Editorial. *El Soldado*. Enero-Febrero.
- Soldado, El (1987). Editorial. *El Soldado*. Abril-Mayo.
- Soldado, El (1989). *El pueblo dijo que no al agravio a las instituciones*. *El Soldado*. Abril.
- Soldado, El (1996). *El valor del silencio*. *El Soldado*. Mayo-Julio.
- Soldado, El (1996). *Estupor, dolor, resignación, memoria*. *El Soldado*. Enero-Abril
- Sontag, S. (1990). *Illness as metaphor; and, AIDS and its metaphors*. New York: Doubleday.

- Squire, L. (1995). Biological foundations of accuracy and inaccuracy in memory. In D. Schacter (Ed.), *Memory distortion: how minds, brains and societies reconstruct the past* (pp. 197–225). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stepan, A. (1986). The new professionalism of internal warfare and military role expansion. In A. F. Lowenthal & J. S. Fitch (Eds.), *Armies & Politics in Latin America* (pp. 134–150). New York: Holmes & Meier
- Stuckey, M. E. (1992). Anecdotes and conversations: The narrational and dialogic styles of modern presidential communication. *Communication Quarterly* 40 (1), 45–55.
- Sutil, J. C. (1997). 'No victorious army has ever been prosecuted...': The unsettled story of transitional justice in Chile. In A. J. McAdams (Ed.), *Transitional justice and the rule of law in new democracies* (pp.123–154). Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press.
- Taramasco, G. A. (2001). *Institución militar. Conceptos sobre su fundamentación doctrinaria*. Montevideo, Uruguay: Centro Militar.
- Thibault, P. J. (1991). *Social semiotics as praxis: text, social meaning making, and Nabokov's Ada*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Trew, T. (1979). Theory and ideology at work. In R. Fowler et al. (Eds.), *Language and Control* (pp. 94–116). London: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Trew, T. (1979). 'What the papers say': linguistic variation and ideological difference. In R. Fowler et al. (Eds.), *Language and Control* (pp. 117–156). London: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Tróccoli, J. N. (1996). *Yo asumo... Yo acuso*. *El País*, Montevideo, 5 de mayo.
- Trouillot, M. (1995). *Silencing the past: power and the production of history*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Tulving, E. (1983) *Elements of episodic memory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Urioste, F. (1986). *La amnistía perversa. Cuadernos de Marcha*. Tercera época, año II, N°11, 5–9.
- Urioste, R. (1987). *Ejército Uruguayo. Poco ruido y muchas nueces. Cuadernos de Marcha*. Tercera Época, año III, N°20, 21–25.
- Urruzola, M. (2001). *Quince años después de la Ley de Caducidad. Le llegó el turno al Poder Judicial. Brecha*, Montevideo, Año 16, N°813, 2–3.
- Uruguay, Ministerio del Interior (1972). *7 meses de lucha antisubversiva*. Montevideo: Ministerio del Interior.
- Uruguay. Ejército. Comando General (1978). *Testimonio de una nación agredida*. Montevideo: El Comando.
- Uruguay. Junta de Comandantes en Jefe (1976). *Las Fuerzas Armadas al pueblo oriental*. Vol. 1 & 2. Montevideo, República Oriental del Uruguay: Junta de Comandantes en Jefe.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society* 4 (2), 249–83.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Opinions and ideologies in editorials. Retrieved on December 9, 2001, from <http://www.discourses.org>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1996). *Discourse, racism, and ideology*. Tenerife, Spain: RCEI Ediciones.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction*. London, Sage Publications.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998a). Categories for the critical analysis of parliamentary debates about immigration. Retrieved on January 5, 2002, from <http://www.discourses.org>

- van Dijk, T. A. (1998b). Critical discourse analysis. Retrieved on October 6, 1998, from <http://www.discourses.org>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1999). *Ideología. Una aproximación multidisciplinaria*. Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa, S.A.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001a). The discourse-knowledge interface. Retrieved on December 9, 2001, from <http://www.discourses.org>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001b). Text and context of parliamentary debates. Retrieved on January 31, 2002, from <http://www.discourses.org>
- van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S. (1997). Argumentation. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction. Discourse as Structure and Process* (pp. 208–229). London: Sage.
- van Leeuwen, T. (1993). Genre and field in critical discourse analysis: a synopsis. *Discourse & Society* 4 (2), 193–223.
- van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and Practices. Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 32–70). London: Routledge.
- Vázquez, G. (2007). Letter to the editor. *Búsqueda*, Mayo 24, p. 46.
- Velázquez, J. (2000). Desde Suecia hasta el COMCAR ¿Confesión o tortura? *Brecha* [electronic version]. Montevideo, 2 de junio.
- Verbitsky, H. (1995). *El vuelo*. Buenos Aires: Seix Barral.
- Voloshinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. New York: Seminar Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wagner-Pacifici, R., & Schwartz, B. (1991). The Vietnam veterans memorial: Commemorating a difficult past. *AJS* 97 (2), 376–420.
- Walton, J. (2001). *Storied land: community and memory in Monterey*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weeks, G. (2003). *The military and politics in post-authoritarian Chile*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Weinstein, M. (1988). *Uruguay, democracy at the crossroads*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Wertsch, J. (1997). Collective memory: Issues from a socio-historical perspective. In M. Cole, Y. Engeström & O. A. Vasquez (Eds.), *Mind, culture, and activity: seminal papers from the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition* (pp. 226–232). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J. (2002) *Voices of collective remembering*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- White, H. V. (1973). *Metahistory: the historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- White, P. (1997). Death, disruption and the moral order: the narrative impulse in mass-media ‘hard-news’ reporting. In F. Christie & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Genre and Institutions* (pp. 101–133). London: Cassell.
- White, P. (2001). The origins of appraisal theory and the SFL model of tenor. Retrieved on May 7, 2001, from <http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/>
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically speaking: the pragmatic analysis of political language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Wilson, J. (1991). The linguistic pragmatics of terrorist acts. *Discourse & Society* 2 (1), 29–45.
- Wodak, R. (1996). The genesis of racist discourse in Austria since 1989. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and Practices. Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp.107–128). London: Routledge.
- Wodak, R. (1997). *Das Ausland* and anti-semitic discourse: The discursive construction of the other. In S. H. Riggins (Ed.), *The Language and Politics of Exclusion. Others in Discourse* (pp. 65–87). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R. (2000). ¿La sociolingüística necesita una teoría social? *Nuevas perspectivas en el análisis crítico del discurso. Revista Iberoamericana de Discurso y Sociedad* 2 (3), 123–147.
- Wodak, R. (2006). History in the making/The making of history. The German *Wehrmacht*' in collective and individual memories in Austria. *Journal of Language and Politics* 5 (1), 125–154.
- Wright, S. (1998). *Language and conflict: a neglected relationship*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Yerushalmi, Y. H. (1989). *Reflexiones sobre el olvido. Usos del olvido* (pp.13–51). Buenos Aires: Ediciones Nueva Visión.
- Zerubavel, Y. (1995). *Recovered roots: collective memory and the making of Israeli national tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zola, E. (1998). *Yo acuso. La verdad en marcha*. Barcelona: Tusquets Editores.

Corpus of texts analyzed

Chapter three

Uruguay. Ejército. Comando General (1978). *Testimonio de una nación agredida*. Montevideo: El Comando.
Uruguay. Junta de Comandantes en Jefe (1976). *Las Fuerzas Armadas al pueblo oriental*. Vol. 1 and 2. Montevideo, República Oriental del Uruguay: Junta de Comandantes en Jefe.

Chapter four

Soldado, El (1987). Editorial. *El Soldado*. Enero-Febrero.
Soldado, El (1987). Editorial. *El Soldado*. Abril-Mayo.
Soldado, El (1989). *El pueblo dijo que no al agravio a las instituciones*. *El Soldado*. Abril.
Soldado, El (1996). *El valor del silencio*. *El Soldado*. Mayo-Julio.
Soldado, El (1996). *Estupor, dolor, resignación, memoria*. *El Soldado*. Enero-Abril

Chapter five

Tróccoli, J. N. (1996). *Yo asumo... Yo acuso*. *El País*, Montevideo, 5 de mayo.

Chapter six

Círculo Militar. (2001). *Demostración de apoyo al Señor Comandante en Jefe del Ejército*. *Gacetil-la del Círculo Militar*. Número 15, 31 de agosto. http://www.artigas.org.uy/circulo_gacetil-la_2001_15.html. Accessed on September 2001.
FEDEFAM (2001). *A la opinión pública*. Comunicado de Prensa. 23 de Julio. <http://www.tau.org/familiares/actualidad.htm>. Accessed on August 2001.
Blixen, S. (2001). *Privatización de la memoria*. *Brecha*. 808.
Cribari, P. (2001). *Costo País*. *Latitud* 30 35. 2: 51.
Díaz, R. (2001). *Debemos mantener viva la memoria de las atrocidades que vimos cometer a la subversión contra compatriotas inocentes*. *Desaparecidos y olvidados*. *El Observador*. Montevideo: 5.
Ferrari, H. (2000). *¿Por qué escribo así?*. *Ultimas Noticias*, Montevideo, 16 de marzo.

Chapter seven

- Rosales, J. (2007). *Discurso del comandante en jefe del ejército General Jorge Rosales*; 18 de mayo de 2007 “Día del ejército nacional”. *Voces*, 24 de mayo, pp.12–13.
- Gaetán de Ramas, R., Suárez e Maurenre, M., Feijo de Soca, M., Medina de Rodríguez Buratti, R., Pascal de Silveira, L., Busquiaz de Gavazzo, M. I., Richard de Medina, S..(2007). *Carta abierta a la opinión pública de las Señoras esposas de militares y policías privados de su libertad desde el pasado año 2006*. *El Bocón*, 24 de mayo, p.30.
- Israel, S. & Cesin, N.(2007). *El ejército regresa al Jurásico. A pesar de las concesiones del gobierno*. *Brecha*, 25 de mayo.
- Legnani, R. (2007). *El comandante Rosales: discurso con limitaciones*. *La Onda digital*. <http://www.laondadigital.com/LaOnda/LaOnda/339/A3.htm>. Accessed on May 28, 2007.
- Vázquez, G. (2007) Letter to the editor. *Búsqueda*, Mayo 24, p. 46.

Chapter eight

- Centro Militar & Centro de Oficiales Retirados de las FFAA. (2007). *Nuestra verdad: La lucha contra el terrorismo (1960–1980)*. Montevideo: Artemisa Editores.
- Daners, C. (2003). Speech given by the Commander in Chief of the Army on May 24th.
- Uruguay. Ejército. Comando General (1978). *Testimonio de una nación agredida*. Montevideo: El Comando.

Appendix

Brief historical chronology of important events of the period considered in this case study (1973–2007)

- Before 1973* The armed guerilla group *Movimiento de Liberación Nacional Tupamaros* (MLN-T) emerges.
- High level of activity and organizing of labor and student movements.
- Pacheco Areco's government represses popular demonstrations
- Special security measures imposed by the government limit civil liberties.
- Declaration of an 'internal state of war' that creates the joint forces uniting the military and the police in the fight against the MLN-T
- The MLN-T is disbanded and the main leaders are imprisoned.
- 1973* Press releases 4 and 7 written by military officers criticize the actions of politicians with regards to national welfare and economy (February 9)
- Parliament is dissolved (coup d'état by President Bordaberry and the Armed Forces, June 27th).
- Beginning of the 'policing dictatorship phase' (height of repression)
- 1976* Boizo Lanza agreement. President Bordaberry resigns and leaves the Armed Forces in charge of the country.
- International campaign to denounce violations of human rights by the dictatorship (led by Amnesty international, Jimmy Carter's government, OAS and groups of Uruguayan exiles).
- 1980* Plebiscite to choose a new constitution that would allow the beginning of a national reorganization and project by the Armed Forces. The military's proposal is defeated.

- 1982 Beginning of transition period to democracy. Political parties and leaders are allowed to participate (there are still some black listed parties and leaders such as Liber Seregni from the Broad Front left coalition and Wilson Ferreira Aldunate from the Blanco Party).
- 1984 Pacto del Club Naval, agreement between military and political traditional parties to plan democratic transition. ‘Democratic’ elections to elect a non-military government.
- 1985 Julio María Sanguinetti of the Colorado Party takes on as new president.
Amnesty for political prisoners is passed into law.
- 1986 The Parliament votes the “Law of Expiry of the punitive aims of the state” (*Ley de caducidad de la pretensión punitiva del estado*). Through this law the state guarantees that the military accused of human rights violations will not be tried for those crimes.
Beginning of campaign to annul this Law of Expiry through a national plebiscite.
- 1989 Plebiscite for the annulment of the Law of Expiry, which fails.
- 1995 Topic of the disappeared emerges again due to requests by senator Rafael Michelini (son of a Senator assassinated during the dictatorship) and press investigations. *Operación Zanahoria*.
- 1996 Letter to the editor by a retired Navy officer accused of violations of human rights (Capitan Jorge Tróccoli).
“March for the Truth, Memory and Never Again”, May 20th, silent protest against the government for not looking into the fate of disappeared.
- 1999 Topic of disappeared reemerges through the case of Juan Gelman’s grand-daughter who was born while her Argentinean mother, who later disappeared, was captive in a secret detention center in Uruguay. Julio María Sanguinetti’s government (second term) does not collaborate with Gelman’s investigation to recover his grand-daughter’s identity. The next government, president Jorge Battle, collaborates with the private investigation, which results in the discovery of the child and the recuperation of her identity.

- 2000 Commission for Peace (*Comisión para la paz*) is created by president Batta in order to investigate what had happened to the disappeared. The commission is constituted by groups of several stakeholders: religious groups, political parties and non-governmental organizations like the Group of Families of the Disappeared (FED-EFAM).
- Simón Riquelme one of the disappeared children is found by his mother in Argentina.
- Civil Court Judge Jubette issues a sentence stating the government needs to fulfill its obligation to clarify the circumstances of Elena Quinteros' disappearance.
- 2001 An Argentinean justice summons three Uruguayan military officers and a policeman for their alleged participation in the *Plan Cóndor* (an organization between repressive apparatus of Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Bolivia during the dictatorships of the 70s).
- Some groups of relatives of the disappeared such as the organization HIJOS, carry out *escraches* (public events to discredit those accused of violations of human rights. In these events those military officers are singled out and 'marked' by detailing their criminal activities in front of their homes, work places or social organizations).
- A monument to remember the disappeared during the last Uruguayan dictatorship is constructed by private initiative and financed by private donations and funds from the City of Montevideo, which at the time had a Left wing government.
- First report from the Peace Commission.
- 2002 Juan Carlos Blanco, Minister of Foreign Affairs during the dictatorship, is indicted for the crime of deprivation of the freedom in the case of Elena Quinteros (taken from the Venezuelan Embassy by Uruguayan military officers and disappearing in 1976).
- 2003 Gen. Daners, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, criticizes the legal actions taken to encourage the search of disappeared in military battalions.

- 2004 Tabaré Vázquez, from the Left-wing coalition, is elected president. The search for remains of the disappeared begins in the 13th and 14th battalions.
- 2005 A report from the Armed Forces investigating what happened to the disappeared does not provide reliable information. The remains of two Uruguayans, Ubagenecer Chávez Sosa and Fernando Miranda, disappeared during the dictatorship period are found on military premises.
- 2006 The government grants an extradition request from Chile for three military officers accused of being involved in the death in Uruguay of Eugenio Berrios (former agent of the DINA under Pinochet's government).
- Argentina requests the extradition of seven military officers for the kidnapping and disappearance of María Claudia García Irureta Goyena (daughter-in-law of Argentinean poet Juan Gelman).
- Judge Luis Charles indicted the first military officers accused of violations of human rights in Uruguay (José Gavazzo, Gilverto Vazquez, Jorge Silveira, Ricardo Arab, Ernesto Ramas y Luis Maurente and two police officers Ricardo Medina and Pedro Sande). Some of them were already in prison due to the Argentinean government's extradition request. One of the military officers, who had been asked to give a deposition in the case, retired Colonel Antonio Rodriguez Buratti, commits suicide. Another indicted military officer, Colonel Gilberto Vazquez escapes. He is later captured and put in prison.
- Juan María Bordaberry, president that gave the coup d'état, and Juan Carlos Blanco, former Minister of Exterior during the dictatorship, are indicted for their involvement in the death of senator Zelmar Michelini and representative Hector Gutierrez Ruiz in Buenos Aires in 1976. This case is considered part of Operation Condor.
- 10 retired generals, former Commanders in Chief of the Armed Forces, write a public letter taking responsibility for the *excesses* committed during the dictatorship.
- 2007 Final report from the government's investigative commission regarding human rights violations and the fate of the disappeared in Uruguay.

Retired Colonel Manuel Cordero is captured in Brasil responding to extradition requests from Argentina for his involvement in the disappearance of María Claudia García Irureta Goyena and by the Uruguayan judge Luis Charles for his participation in the *Vuelos* case.

The government presents to congress a draft for a law of reparations to the families of those who lost their lives in *defense of the democratic institutions* (*Proyecto de Ley de reparaciones*).

Gen. Díaz, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, is demoted from his position for his political meeting with former president Julio Sanguinetti.

Gen. Jorge Rosas, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, gives a polemic speech during the commemoration of the day of the Armed Forces.

The government declares a national day of atonement, day of Never Again (*Nunca Más*), to be celebrated on June 19th (the day of the birth of José Gervasio Artigas the independence hero).

Retired General and former dictator Gregorio Alvarez is indicted for the crime of forced disappearance in 1977 and 1978 where 20 prisoners were transferred clandestinely from Argentina to Uruguay (*Los vuelos*). This is also considered part of the Operation Condor.

Retired Colonel Néstor J. Tróccoli is arrested in Italy for his participation in the Operation Condor. He is also required to appear in court by an Uruguayan justice for his participation in the *Vuelos* case.

Appendix 2

Sample texts from corpus

Text 1: Confession, Chapter Five

Published in *El País*, Montevideo, 5 de mayo, 1996.

Carta del capitán Jorge Troccoli

Yo asumo...yo acuso

Finalmente Fray Tomás de Torquemada pasó a la historia, aunque no lo hizo por sus dotes espirituales, por cierto, la historia lo recuerda y lo recordará como un mediocre fraile que obtuvo una posición administrativa gracias a un pariente que era cardenal, pero por sobre todas cosas, lo recuerda como el Gran Inquisidor.

El recuerdo de Torquemada perdura en la memoria de los pueblos como el fraile que, en aras de mantener un puesto más allá de su mediocridad, mandó a la hoguera a miles de personas. Y he dicho mandó, porque no creo que tuviera valor para quemar personalmente a nadie, y si lo hizo, seguro que el condenado estaba atado.

En esa curiosa aptitud que tiene la cultura para replicar sus personajes, Torquemada vuelve a aparecer en nuestra época, y en nuestro país. Los intereses de Torquemada son los mismos que antes: mantener un nivel más allá de su mediocridad. Y para ello me acusó de brujería.

Sí, Torquemada, confieso, fui brujo y adoré al Diablo, comulgué con la violencia, de eso hace veinte años. Yo lo asumo.

Yo asumo ser el producto de una sociedad que hace ya treinta y tres años, cuando entré a la Escuela Naval, me mostró una escuela vacía, donde sus integrantes estaban en ese momento ocupando la UTE por una huelga.

Yo veía, desde mis quince años, llegar a mis futuros compañeros con la cara destrozada por las quemaduras de las trampas “cazabobos” que se ponían en las calderas. Ese fue el comienzo de mi carrera. En 1967 me recibí, contento de ser guardiamarina, lleno de ilusiones que hablaban de mares, barcos y viajes. Pero una vez más la sociedad se encargó de modelarme: en 1968 estuve en la UTE y en la ANCAP, por huelgas y disturbios.

Recuerdo el miedo que pasé cuando con 14 marineros armados tuve que apuntar a una multitud de obreros que, si ganaban la huelga, iba a representar un aumento para mi escaso sueldo, así eran las cosas. Fue en esos días cuando empecé a ver a parientes y amigos del lado hacia donde apuntaban mis armas, y nos miramos a los ojos sin comprender, en el tenso silencio que existía en ese momento. En 1969 fue la huelga bancaria, y yo escuchaba decir que la huelga era hecha por banqueros para evitar pagar antigüedad, lo decían mis propios jefes.

Recuerdo que en esa huelga se empezaron a tejer ciertos hilos, muy tenues, para poder asumir lo menos dolorosamente posible, la violencia del momento. Seguramente, algunos trabajadores del Banco Pan de Azúcar Sucursal Centro, recordarán que en ese momento pudimos hablar y tratarnos como seres humanos.

Pero de todas formas, asumo haber sido un “represor” de las huelgas sindicales cuando tenía 21 años. Aprendiz de brujo.

Después vino el ataque del enemigo, ya hacía tiempo que las hostilidades habían comenzado, para ser más precisos, creo que fue en 1961. Pero fue en el 72 que mataron a amigos míos.

En 1973 vino el golpe militar, yo asumo haber adherido al golpe ilusionado por la increíble mentira que resultaron ser los famosos comunicados 4 y 7, seguramente la juventud actual no sabe de qué hablo, pero si los comunicados mencionados salen ahora, seguro que adhieren todos los jóvenes, en masa, como lo hice yo.

Ya era brujo desde entonces, para unos y para otros, pero después, en 1974, me hice brujo profesional, pasé a integrar las fuerzas de combate, contra la guerrilla, ésta es mi gran confesión, la que Torquemada espera anhelante, “en aras de la verdad”. Y voy a hablar como integrante de las Fuerzas Armadas que era en ese momento. Si a las Fuerzas Armadas no les gusta lo que digo, que me desmientan, no les voy a responder. Comprendo que la “alta política” y “la imagen de la institución”, y otros eufemismos le impidan pronunciarse, yo estoy solo, nadie me impide nada y no tengo más defensa que mi verdad.

Yo asumo haber combatido a la guerrilla con todas las fuerzas y recursos a mi disposición, asumo haber hecho cosas de las cuales no me siento orgulloso, ni me sentí entonces. Asumo haber participado en una guerra, así lo entendía en ese momento. Después de todo, la situación de guerra, es la mayor parte de las veces un estatuto jurídico, y la humanidad se ha visto envuelta en la violencia, con muertos y heridos, sin que una guerra haya sido declarada. Asumo, por lo tanto, haber estado sumergido en la violencia, solamente ahora, desde esta perspectiva, puedo comprender los valores y normas que imperaban en esa situación y que estaban pautados y determinados por esa violencia.

Yo asumo el haberme comprometido, nunca pude permanecer al margen, soy y seré brujo o fraile, pero nunca inquisidor. Y asumo haber tratado inhumanamente a mis enemigos, pero sin odio, como debe actuar un profesional de la violencia. No me pregunten detalles dolorosos. Pero todo eso lo puedo ver ahora, antes era imposible. Ellos y yo sabemos, que cuando fue necesario, muchos quedaron libres, aun cuando la justicia los reclamaba.

Hubiera sido más inhumano, y moralmente erróneo, mandarlos a la cárcel. Como todo uruguayo, tuve parientes y amigos presos, incluso un profesor que admiraba, me miré con unos y otros cuando ellos estaban en la cárcel, no podía comprender la situación, eran el enemigo, pero cuando el enemigo tiene cara e identidad, cuando lo conocemos íntimamente, es difícil odiarlo.

Yo asumo haber vivido todo eso, pero no puedo juzgar con mis valores y circunstancias actuales la conducta de una época. Torquemada sí que puede, es su trabajo.

Esta es “la verdad” que reclama Torquemada. Por lo tanto, esto no es un canto de arrepentimiento ni una confesión, es solamente la expresión de un dolor, por lo que fue, por lo que tuve que vivir junto con muchos otros, camaradas y enemigos. Los uruguayos, como en la Guerra Grande, como en 1897 y 1904, una vez más nos odiamos, nos matamos, y nos torturamos unos a otros.

Por favor, nunca más.

No maté a nadie, ni sé nada del tema desaparecidos, pero no por un altruismo humanitario, sino porque (afortunadamente) no me tocó vivir esa situación. Pero no soy un hipócrita, reconozco que las Fuerzas Armadas a las que pertencí, lo saben y lo hicieron. Por lo tanto, como un integrante más, asumo también los muertos y desaparecidos.

Pero por favor, por la propia dignidad del combatiente, no los llamen más desaparecidos, todos sabemos que murieron defendiendo lo suyo. Honremos su recuerdo con el homenaje del guerrero, no usemos más su nombre y respetemos su memoria, sea donde sea que se encuentre su cuerpo. A los que dicen que “nunca empuñaron un arma”, pero que hacían relevamientos para atentados, oficiaban de correos o “estaban navegando”, les pido por favor que no se escuden en eufemismos, que no se avergüencen de haber combatido como podían y desde donde estaban en ese momento.

A los que querían esta actitud por parte de las Fuerzas Armadas, ya lo tienen, a los que quieren más aun, sólo estarían buscando el odio, el escarnio y la venganza. La realidad, esa construcción que hacemos día tras día, y sobre la cual somos por lo tanto, responsables, merece otra lectura.

Un día, después que todo pasó, conocí a una persona excelente, con un don de gentes y humanismo como pocos. Le decíamos “Carlos Rama”, no importa por qué, es sólo para los que lo conocen. Me enteré que había sido tupamaro, pero para entonces nos habíamos hecho amigos. “Un día juré matar a todos los tipos como vos”, le dije. “Yo juré lo mismo”, me respondió, y nos abrazamos.

En otro momento de mi vida, mucho más reciente, me entero que los padres del mejor amigo de mi hijo habían sido tupamaros, y de los pesados. Mi hijo me lo dijo con cierto temor por mi opinión. “Los amigos son amigos, no metas lo que hicimos nosotros en la amistad de ustedes”, le dije. Tiempo después, ambos amigos andaban en malos pasos, cosas de muchachos, pero ambos matrimonios nos reunimos, brujos y frailes, tratando de ponernos de acuerdo sobre qué hacer con nuestros hijos, con la nueva sociedad.

Y muchos casos más. Con otros, tímidos saludos a la distancia en fiestas y reuniones, manteniendo la cara de malo, para “no aflojar tan pronto”, o simplemente el saber y no preguntar.

Esta es la realidad que día a día se está construyendo, esta es la lectura que debemos hacer de nuestra cotidianidad, en cada uno de esos eventos, nos estamos recuperando. No lo haremos seguramente, a través del mediocre (una vez más) discurso de Torquemada que pretende congelarnos en un pasado de dolor, tal vez buscando la reacción de quien no supo trasmutar su odio, para una vez más alimentarse de los cadáveres, de la carroña, y así seguir manteniendo su posición de Gran Inquisidor (o Gran Mediocre, si prefieren)... y así poder seguir ganando dinero. Como todo mediocre, como expresa el viejo dicho, “ni murió ni fue guerrero”.

Ya no me queda más odio, solamente una gran desilusión de una juventud en gran parte perdida, de la injusticia de noches de ausencia de mi familia, de tener que ocultarles y mentirles para su tranquilidad, de noches de aquelarre y días de temor, mientras otros cimentaban pacientemente su futuro político o su ascenso a general, brigadier o almirante. Ya no sé ni a dónde pertenezco.

Una palabra para quien fue el enemigo, no importa a qué fracción pertenecía. Ya no odio, incluso siento respeto por los que asumieron su condición de combatientes. Muchas veces me siento más cerca de ellos que de algunos de mis camaradas, no políticamente por cierto, no me queda lugar para la política en mi desengaño, sino como seres humanos que tuvieron el valor de pelear y morir por aquello en lo que creían, por haber soportado la muerte de amigos, la cárcel, la tortura, y asumirlo como cosa de guerra, como pasó en todas las guerras, a todos los soldados, como me pasó a mí.

Mi condición de militar, y fui profesionalmente bueno, me permite apreciar y juzgar su lucha. Yo hubiera peleado igual, y casi ganan, aun en inferioridad de medios. Si en algo se puede dignificar el aquelarre, digamos que fue una guerra sucia, pero no menos heroica que otras, de un lado y otro. Por lo tanto, sólo a vuestro juicio voy a prestar verdadero valor, aun cuando alguno pueda estar impregnado de odio, sabré comprenderlo.

Lo que les pido encarecidamente es que no escuchen a Torquemada, él no quiere esto, él no quiere que nuestros hijos jueguen juntos ni que ustedes y yo empecemos un diálogo, aunque sea con caras de malo. Si seguimos escuchando y aplaudiendo la hoguera de Torquemada, seguro habrá otra guerra, él se nutre de ello. Si así fuera, no voy a participar, sépanlo frailes y brujos, estoy cansado.

Quiero una nueva vida.

Yo asumo, como individuo y como producto de una época, de una sociedad, de generaciones pasadas, pero en el fondo, aunque no quiera expresarlo, también yo acuso.

Acuso a las generaciones que crearon al enemigo y me modelaron en la violencia.

Acuso a los mediocres, que desaparecieron en su momento, para resurgir con su dedo acusador apuntando hacia unos y otros.

Acuso a quienes escudados en pretextos jurídicos no quieren reconocer que la situación de violencia vivida era, para nosotros, una guerra.

Acuso a quienes son incapaces de comprender que no se puede juzgar un pasado con los valores y normas que hoy imperan.

Acuso a quienes no son capaces de dignificar la lucha, única forma de asumir un pasado, y continúan abriendo heridas para comerciar con el dolor.

Comprendo a quienes aún sufren, yo también lo hago.

Comprendo a quienes no pueden enjugar su odio, son humanos, necesitan tiempo.

Comprendo a quienes quisieron matarme, yo también quería hacerlo.

Yo he asumido y he acusado, asuman ustedes ahora.

No voy a hablar más sobre esto. Duele.

Jorge Tróccoli

C.I. 1.075.555

Capitán de navío (retirado)

Text 2: Commemoration Speech, Chapter Seven

Published in *Voces* 24 de mayo, 2007. Páginas 12–13.

18 de mayo de 2007 “Día del ejército nacional”

Discurso del Comandante en jefe del ejército General Jorge Rosales

Con mis primeras palabras quiero darles a todos, la más cordial bienvenida a nuestro estadio “Cnel. Álvaro Gestido”, para conmemorar los 196 años de existencia del Ejército Nacional.

La movilización patriótica que se inició con el “Grito de Asencio” y se extendió por los campos de la patria, tuvo su hito trascendente el 18 de mayo de 1811, en “Las Piedras” donde se enfrentaron las fuerzas patriotas al mando del entonces Tte. Cnel. Don José Gervasio Artigas a las fuerzas realistas (españolas) al mando del Capitán de Fragata don José Posadas.

El triunfo bélico consolidó el prestigio militar de Artigas y realzó su figura como ser humano, al dar la orden de “Clemencia para los vencidos, curad a los heridos, respetad a los prisioneros”, en un hecho inaudito para las costumbres y el accionar de esa época.

Es en ese momento de la gesta libertadora que nació el Ejército Oriental. El mismo surgió detrás de la figura del caudillo, siguiendo no solamente al hombre destacado por sus condiciones de estrategia y conocimientos tácticos, sino también destacado por sus ideales de Libertad, Independencia, República y Federación aún vigentes en el sentir de nuestro pueblo.

Sea entonces en este día, nuestro primer recuerdo para el “Jefe de los Orientales”, para el “Padre de la Patria”, para el forjador de la “Nacionalidad Oriental”.

El Ejército es y ha sido uno solo en el tiempo, por eso atentos al pasado de nuestra Institución, intentamos interpretar el presente y procuramos conformar una visión de futuro, que nos permita realizar las necesarias previsiones para el cumplimiento de la misión asignada.

Sin ánimo de ningún tipo de arrogante creencia de ser poseedores de una única verdad, tenemos la convicción de que el futuro de nuestra Fuerza, deberá basarse en los recursos humanos que la componen, caracterizados por los atributos morales y espirituales que, desde su nacimiento en aquel lejano 18 de mayo de 1811, están incorporados al ser militar: férrea moral; acendrado espíritu de cuerpo; sentimiento arraigado de pertenencia a una institución fundacional y fundamental de la Nación y clara vocación de servicio y altruismo que le permita llegar al extremo de ofrendar su vida por la Patria.

En el cumplimiento de su misión fundamental y subsidiaria, el Ejército se constituye en un activo protagonista de la vida Institucional del Estado, aportando su personal y su capacidad operativa en apoyo a la comunidad, colaborando con distintos organismos del Estado e instituciones públicas y privadas en la búsqueda de soluciones para los grandes problemas que afectan a nuestra sociedad.

Un aspecto relevante de estas actividades lo constituye la integración al Sistema Nacional de Emergencias, apoyando a la población en casos de desastres. Aprovecho la oportunidad para destacar y reconocer públicamente la encomiable labor desarrollada por los integrantes de las diversas unidades de la Fuerza que sin medir días, horas, medios ni esfuerzos, están aportando todo de sí, para colaborar en mitigar las consecuencias y daños ocasionados por las devastadoras crecientes, que han afectado a miles de compatriotas en diversas áreas de nuestro país, en los últimos días.

Como Institución de la Nación, no somos ajenos a la historia, ni a los acontecimientos que pautan la realidad nacional, completamente concientes del rol a cumplir en una sociedad con clara vocación democrática como la nuestra. En este sentido, es propicia la oportunidad para reiterar nuestro concepto de que el supremo interés de la Nación está por encima de cualquier otro propósito, propiciando un clima de convivencia donde la libertad, la paz y el respeto mutuo, permita que todos sus habitantes puedan desarrollarse como ciudadanos, con igualdad de oportunidades y consideraciones, particularmente en el respeto de sus derechos individuales. El Ejército Nacional como institución, no quiere ser juzgado por eventuales acciones individuales incorrectas desarrolladas por algunos de sus integrantes, y no acepta ni quiere ser rehén de las extemporáneas y parciales interpretaciones históricas que sobre su accionar pretenden algunos reivindicar, olvidando que las mismas respondieron a la acción de aquellos sectores de la sociedad que intentaron derrocar a Gobiernos Democráticos a través de las armas.

El Ejército de hoy pretende ser justamente valorado por la sociedad de la cuál provienen sus integrantes y a la cuál se deben; por SU conducta y por SUS acciones, en un marco de respeto a las Leyes y de las autoridades democráticamente constituidas.

No obstante, parecería que le odio, la venganza y la incredulidad se hubieran unido para evitar, que como sociedad, superemos revisionismos y realidades descontextualizadas que nos anclan al pasado y nos impiden emprender el camino que el país necesita y reclama, para evitar el rezado y crecer dentro del mundo globalizado en que hoy vivimos.

La Institución que me honro en comandar es, entre otras cosas, seria, disciplinada, organizada, leal y posee una gran vocación de servicio. Es también imperfecta; característica propia de los seres humanos que la conformamos, pero que también, conscientes de esta limitación, trabajamos con mucha dedicación, esmero y entrega, intentando día a día que nuestras modestas acciones, pensamientos y decisiones materialicen su accionar, dándole vida a todo ese vasto marco legal, doctrinario, reglamentario y moral que enmarca y condiciona nuestras vidas, como a ningún otro servidor del Estado.

Camaradas de armas, nos aprestamos a cumplir el próximo 19 de junio con una actividad dispuesta por el Sr. Presidente de la República, que implica para esta noble Institución, no solo la histórica celebración del nacimiento del Padre de la Patria, sino también un momento de reflexión ciudadana que permita a nuestra sociedad, aunar filas en pos de un futuro mejor y promisorio para nuestros hijos, al que adherimos plena y honestamente, por convicción y por mandato legal.

Lo haremos con la esperanza de que ésta iniciativa, sea también analizada, meditada y compartida por la mayoría de nuestro pueblo y genere una actitud de compromiso social positivo, con muestras concretas de actitudes patrióticas como forma de contrarrestar, algunas lamentables demostraciones recientes de rencor, odio y violencia.

Tenemos nuestra mayor esperanza en que se concrete esa reconciliación de los orientales que pide el Sr. Presidente, aspecto sobre el que ya se ha legislado en nuestro país, y anhelamos que esta disposición no finalice en una mera intención que pueda inclusive ser aprovechada o acomodada a otras necesidades o intereses sectoriales; ya que la consideramos como un gran paso hacia la necesaria superación del pasado.

Confiamos en la grandeza de espíritu y en el sentido común de nuestros compatriotas para animarse a transitar en forma responsable y comprometida por este camino, sin olvidos que son difíciles, pero también despojados del anhelo de cobros pendientes, de revanchas o de venganzas.

Con respecto a nuestra familia militar, vemos que lamentablemente, situaciones que afectan hoy a nuestra sociedad, inciden negativamente también en nuestro desempeño profesional diario.

Es difícil exigir que ponga límites a estas situaciones a un jefe de familia con doble empleo o demasiadas horas fuera de su hogar, como es el caso de la mayoría de los militares. Directa relación tienen con lo expresado anteriormente, la necesidad de dignificar los salarios de nuestro personal, aspecto sobre el cuál no me voy a extender porque nuestro gobierno conoce plenamente estas necesidades, y mantenemos

firme nuestra esperanza de que se les pueda otorgar una retribución que les permita acceder aun justo y decoroso nivel de vida, posibilitándoles atender los requerimientos básicos de su núcleo familiar.

Así como diariamente nos esforzamos por dignificar aún más nuestra profesión, es que adquieren mayor importancia que nunca las palabras, el ejemplo y guía de nuestros líderes, volcados especialmente hacia nuestro jóvenes oficiales y soldados de hoy, baluartes del futuro de nuestra institución.

¡Es verdaderamente feliz la persona que logra encontrar su realización en la tarea que realiza! A pesar de las contrariedades y dificultades que todos conocemos, continuemos valorando realmente nuestra profesión como una forma de crecimiento personal y profesional, descubriendo en ella un motivo de realización, de desarrollo social, que nos permita seguir sintiéndonos dignos y orgullosos de vestir con gallardía nuestro uniforme. ¡Felices aquellos que trabajan,... y vaya si es digna nuestra tarea de soldados!

Una prioridad de orden profesional es continuar con el acento especial en el apresto de nuestra tropa, atendiendo la instrucción y la renovación del equipamiento, que nos permita en lo posible, disminuir las carencias materiales y la brecha tecnológica que hoy vivimos.

El mundo actual, caracterizado por los intentos de resolver por la fuerza los diferendos internacionales, por las amenazas de conflictos interestatales y regionales, por el terrorismo y la proliferación del tráfico ilícito de drogas, armamentos y personas, entre otras tantas amenazas, exige el perfeccionamiento continuo de las estructuras castrenses del Estado; problemática cuya atención demanda una modernización de la organización militar del país (discutido en las mesas de debate sobre Defensa Nacional llevadas a cabo el año anterior) la que incluye entre otras medidas, la elevada disposición y preparación profesional para actuar cuando y donde sea necesario.

Quiero destacar la importancia que para la Institución tiene la participación en las misiones de paz. La información permanentemente recibida que da cuenta de la excelente actuación de nuestras tropas en las diferentes Áreas de Misión, pude constatarla personalmente en la visita que con el Sr. Vicepresidente de la República realizáramos a Haití hace pocos días.

Durante la misma recibimos múltiples elogios y agradecimientos de las autoridades de Naciones Unidas, del Gobierno de Haití y del Cuerpo Diplomático de los diferentes países participantes en la misión por la eficiencia, capacitación profesional y alto espíritu de solidaridad demostrado por nuestro personal.

También pude comprobar la magnitud de algunos problemas de orden logístico que inciden en la operatividad de nuestros Batallones, los que ya están en vías de solución. Estas dificultades propias de la distancia que nos separa del Congo y de Haití, sumadas a las múltiples tareas que nuestro personal desarrolla en aquellas conflictivas áreas, no han sido un impedimento para que los soldados uruguayos continúen haciendo falta de esa extraordinaria capacidad de extender generosamente su mano amiga al necesitado, o actuar con bravura y coraje cuando la situación lo demanda, como ha ocurrido en hechos recientes que han sido destacados por la prensa internacional a través del mundo, motivando inclusive agradecimientos institucionales como el recibido recientemente de su majestad el Rey de España.

Concientes de que nadie actúa en busca de reconocimientos individuales, pero convencidos de que es justo distinguir y premiar actos extraordinarios de valor, es que en esta ceremonia hemos otorgado algunas condecoraciones, las que a la vez de enorgullecernos a todos, enriquecen nuestro espíritu y alimentan nuestra mística militar.

Soldados del Ejército Nacional, de todas las jerarquías, la confianza en los mandos, la convicción y rectitud de procedimientos, la lealtad, la disciplina y el espíritu de cuerpo, son cualidades fundamentales cuyo ejercicio aparenta ser más urgente e importante que nunca, para poder seguir creciendo moral y profesionalmente en un escenario donde abundan las promesas de soluciones fáciles, opiniones de toda índole y mensajes de quienes supuestamente, se creen poseedores de las mejores decisiones que deberían ser adoptadas por el Mando.

Sepan que me siento muy orgulloso de comandarlos, y junto a mis felicitaciones por la fecha que celebramos, los exhorto a continuar en el esfuerzo diario, trabajando en la Instrucción y el entrenamiento, en las actividades de formación, capacitación y perfeccionamiento, en el cumplimiento de las diversas tareas que se desprenden de nuestra misión, con la seguridad de que éste es el único camino que nos permitirá día a día ser mejores personas y excelentes soldados, coadyuvando así a mantener el prestigio y respeto que nuestra Fuerza se ha sabido ganar dentro y fuera de fronteras.

Les agradezco sus convicciones, y valores morales, por actuar sin esperar recompensas, por su sentimiento del deber y por disfrutar de la insustituible satisfacción que otorga el deber cumplido.

Hago este saludo extensivo al personal en situación de retiro, a aquellos que son su rectitud de proceder, su lealtad, honor y esfuerzo demostrado, constituyen un ejemplo a seguir y un desafío para quienes orgullosos hoy, debemos cubrir sus puestos; reconociendo en particular el esfuerzo de aquellos que continúan su

acción en forma personal o a través de instituciones sociales o simbólicas en pos de los más altos intereses de nuestra Fuerza.

Nuestro reconocimiento y recogimiento está también dirigido a los integrantes del Ejército Nacional de todos los tiempos que ofrendaron sus vidas en diferentes lugares y situaciones, en cumplimiento del deber.

A nuestro soldados en el exterior en cumplimiento de nuestras Misiones Operativas, nuestro saludo en este día y la exhortación a continuar con la tarea emprendida en pos de la paz y seguridad internacional.

A nuestro camaradas extraditados a Chile, nuestro especial saludo ante la difícil situación que viven hace ya más de un año y nuestra confianza en que las permanentes gestiones realizadas, faciliten su pronto regreso al país el que, en caso de materializarse, contará Sr. Presidente, con mi garantía de asegurar, su presencia en todas las instancias y ámbitos que se les requiera.

Para finalizar, agradezco a las autoridades, camaradas, amigos y público en general que hoy nos acompañan, honrándonos y enalteciendo nuestro acto con su presencia, así como a los representantes de los diferentes medios de prensa que nos permiten llegar a los hogares de muchos compatriotas para enterarlos de nuestra celebración.

A todos: ¡FELIZ “DÍA DEL EJÉRCITO NACIONAL”!

Author index

- A**
Adorno, T. 201, 202, 206
Alexander, J. 206
Althusser, L. 16, 34, 75
Aristotle 27, 70
- B**
Bakhtin, M. 26, 27, 42
Bal, M. 201
Benhabib, S. 164–166
Berger, P. & Luckman, T. 11, 16–18, 24
Bobbio, N. 125
Bolívar, A. 85, 86, 141
- C**
Caetano, G. 41, 127
Castoriadis, C. 14, 37
Coffin, C. 32, 50, 51, 105, 107
- D**
Demasi, C. 173, 203
Derrida, J. 106
- F**
Fairclough, N. 3, 23, 26–28, 42, 43, 121, 132, 135, 138.
Foucault, M. 13, 25, 33, 42, 105, 137, 138, 185
Fowler, R. 89
- G**
Goffman, E. 107
Gramsci, A. 13, 25, 35
- H**
Halbwachs, M. 4, 7, 13
- Halliday, M.A.K. 24, 27–31, 89, 107, 109, 148, 153
Hill, J. 113, 119
Hjeldslev, L. 29, 30
Hodge, B. & Kress, G. 34
- J**
Jelin, E. 16, 168, 169
- K**
Kress, G. 25, 27, 32–34, 44, 49
Kristeva, J. 26, 42
- L**
Lechner, N. 164–166
Lemke, J. 3, 24, 26–28, 35, 42, 82, 131, 132, 140, 197
Levi, P. 11, 103, 200, 204
- M**
Marchesi, A. 37, 81, 168
Martín Rojo, L. 26, 42.
Martin, J.R. 17, 19, 27, 28, 30–32, 50, 66, 107, 145, 148, 157
- N**
Neisser, U. 8, 10
- O**
O'Donnell, G. 166
Olick, J. 4, 17, 22, 35, 172
- P**
Perelli, C. 21, 39, 48, 74, 77, 79, 122, 123, 201
- Q**
Quijano, C. 78
- R**
Rial, J. 15, 101.
Roniger, L. 2, 201
- S**
Sauer, C. 171, 172
Schacter, D. 7, 9, 10, 195–197
Shudson, M. 197
Sutil, J.C. 2
- T**
Trew, T. 93
Trouillot, R. 11, 12, 20, 25, 37
- V**
Van Dijk, T. 16, 23, 27, 28, 32, 34, 35, 83, 85, 86, 93, 98, 101, 141, 159, 163
Van Leeuwen, T. 31–33, 59, 64, 106, 114, 119, 155, 156
Voloshinov, V. 27, 83, 106, 132, 185–187, 190
Vygotsky, L. 8, 25, 197
- W**
Walton, J. 10–12, 25
Weeks, G. 204
Wertsch, J. 8
White, P. 31, 68, 140, 141
Williams, R. 13, 14, 25, 35
Wilson, J. 27, 32, 107, 119
Wodak, R. 19, 23, 27, 32, 68, 89, 96, 112, 148, 159, 161, 162
- Z**
Zerubavel, Y. 13, 14, 19

Subject index

A

- Agency 17, 51, 56, 57, 63, 64,
89, 90, 113, 114, 119, 122, 149,
176, 196
See also responsibility
- Argumentation 17, 27, 69, 71,
83–85, 89, 97, 99, 105, 139–141,
198, 204
- Argumentative strategies 73,
83, 97, 159
See also topoi
- Attitudes 35, 66, 93, 94, 119, 148,
157, 177
See also evaluation and ap-
praisal
- Appraisal 31, 50, 51, 57, 65–68,
115, 157, 177, 194
See also evaluation and at-
titudes
- April 14th 3, 70, 94, 168, 196
See also Fallen in the fight
against terrorism

C

- Collective memory 4, 7, 10, 12,
13, 16, 17, 19, 54, 94, 101, 103,
121, 122, 126, 127, 134, 194–197
See also Social memory
- Commemoration 69, 81, 168,
169, 171, 204
- Context 8–11, 14, 18, 19, 24,
26–30, 32, 34, 37, 42, 43, 49, 54,
70, 79, 82, 88, 94, 99, 103, 107,
112, 114, 118, 119, 122, 130, 141,
145, 169, 172, 185, 194, 197, 198,
206, 207
- Construction of memory 3, 5,
12, 17, 20, 26, 32, 33, 35, 37, 45,
47, 54, 74, 79, 84, 101, 103, 107,
136, 167, 193, 195, 197, 198, 200
- Counter-hegemony 14
- Counter-memory 13, 112
- Counter-discourse 39
- Critical discourse analysis 19,
24, 36, 42

D

- Direct and indirect dis-
course 43, 190, 191
- Discourse 3, 7, 14–17, 20–23, 25,
30–33, 35, 37, 42, 43, 47, 48, 61,
73–75, 82, 83, 85, 88, 90, 96,
98, 103, 111, 112, 115, 127, 133,
135, 140, 151, 154, 157, 161, 162,
165, 172, 186, 191, 193, 197, 198,
202, 207
- Discourse of the Other 3, 27, 42,
45, 68, 74, 77, 83–85, 96, 100,
111, 127, 131, 132, 135, 136, 140,
163, 165, 183, 190, 191, 194, 202
- Discourse strategies 17, 23, 89,
96, 99, 103, 105, 114, 122, 148,
159, 161–163, 171
- Discourses 23, 25, 27, 33, 42,
43, 74, 78, 82–84, 131, 132, 165,
172, 192

E

- Evaluation 19, 22, 24, 31, 35, 54,
60, 61, 66, 68, 73, 86, 87, 96,
100, 122, 133, 146–148, 155–162,
165, 174, 176–178, 180–182, 184,
191, 194, 195, 198
See also attitudes and ap-
praisal

F

- Fallen in the fight against terror-
ism 3, 52, 69, 81, 83, 87, 89, 92,
94, 168, 196
See also April 14th

G

- Genre 19, 20, 24, 26, 28, 32, 33,
47, 50, 85, 103, 105, 165, 171,
200
- Editorial 85, 86
- Explicative historical ac-
count 50, 51, 56, 57, 61, 69
- Commemoration speech 171,
172

- Confession 105, 106, 113, 123
- Opinion article 140, 141
- Press release 140, 141

H

- Hegemony 13, 14, 25, 35, 112, 204
- Human rights violations 1, 2,
4, 5, 23, 42, 44, 45, 70, 78–82,
84, 85, 97–100, 103, 104, 107,
126–131, 135, 139, 140, 145, 148,
155, 164, 165, 169, 186, 193, 195,
201, 202

I

- Individual memory 7, 8, 10, 16,
17, 125, 196
- Institutional memory 15–18, 37,
79, 85, 99, 101, 103, 104, 183,
196, 197
- Intertextuality 24, 26, 27, 42, 43,
82, 83, 111, 112, 132, 165

L

- Law of expiry 2, 80, 82, 85, 99,
104, 128, 130, 170, 193, 194, 226

M

- Memory 3, 5, 7–9, 12–14, 16, 17,
19–22, 24, 25, 34, 35, 40, 42, 73,
75, 79, 83, 85, 93, 97–99, 101,
103, 104, 107, 122, 123, 125, 127,
168, 171, 181, 183, 194–197
- Metaphor 20, 26, 43, 45, 64,
74, 83, 136–138, 148, 153, 154,
198, 199
- Metadiscourse 43, 49, 132
- Military discourse 5, 22, 23, 32,
33, 35–37, 40, 45, 47, 73–75,
78, 82, 83, 85, 89, 98, 127, 186,
193, 202
- Modality 28, 31, 51, 65, 86, 153,
177, 182, 183
- Modalization 31, 65, 110, 111,
113, 154
- Modulation 31, 65, 110, 176

P

Pascacio Báez 22, 134, 135, 143,
154, 196

Pronouns 31, 32, 64, 86, 119, 120,
152, 156, 159, 177, 182, 183

R

Recontextualization 43, 54,
83–85, 97, 98, 100, 127, 136, 171

Register 30, 32, 55, 89, 107, 115,
146, 147, 148, 173

See also situational context

Responsibility 32, 46, 56–59,
66, 72–74, 79–82, 91, 92, 97,
98, 100

See also agency

S

Situational context (context of
situation) 26, 28–30, 32, 54,
88, 197, 114, 122, 145, 172, 173
See also register

Social memory 8, 16, 19, 79, 85,
88, 93, 97, 98, 101, 123, 172, 195
See also collective memory

Systemic Functional Linguis-
tics 29

T

Theme 30, 31, 35, 70, 148, 153, 154

Topoi 69

Transitivity 28, 30, 31, 55–57, 64,
89, 90, 107, 109, 112, 113, 148,
149, 153, 175–177

In the series *Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture* the following titles have been published thus far or are scheduled for publication:

- 32 **RAMSAY, Guy:** *Shaping Minds. A discourse analysis of Chinese-language community mental health literature.* ix, 146 pp. + index. *Expected December 2008*
- 31 **JOHNSTONE, Barbara and Christopher EISENHART (eds.):** *Rhetoric in Detail. Discourse analyses of rhetorical talk and text.* vi, 325 pp. + index. *Expected November 2008*
- 30 **POWERS, John H. and Xiaosui XIAO (eds.):** *The Social Construction of SARS. Studies of a health communication crisis.* vi, 240 pp. + index. *Expected November 2008*
- 29 **ACHUGAR, Mariana:** *What We Remember. The construction of memory in military discourse.* 2008. x, 246 pp.
- 28 **DOLÓN, Rosana and Júlia TODOLÍ (eds.):** *Analysing Identities in Discourse.* 2008. xi, 204 pp.
- 27 **VERDOOLAEGE, Annelies:** *Reconciliation Discourse. The case of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.* 2008. xiii, 238 pp.
- 26 **MILLAR, Sharon and John WILSON (eds.):** *The Discourse of Europe. Talk and text in everyday life.* 2007. viii, 200 pp.
- 25 **AZUELOS-ATIAS, Sol:** *A Pragmatic Analysis of Legal Proofs of Criminal Intent.* 2007. x, 180 pp.
- 24 **HODGES, Adam and Chad NILEP (eds.):** *Discourse, War and Terrorism.* 2007. x, 248 pp.
- 23 **GOATLY, Andrew:** *Washing the Brain – Metaphor and Hidden Ideology.* 2007. xvii, 431 pp.
- 22 **LE, Elisabeth:** *The Spiral of 'Anti-Other Rhetoric'. Discourses of identity and the international media echo.* 2006. xii, 280 pp.
- 21 **MYHILL, John:** *Language, Religion and National Identity in Europe and the Middle East. A historical study.* 2006. ix, 300 pp.
- 20 **OMONIYI, Tope and Joshua A. FISHMAN (eds.):** *Explorations in the Sociology of Language and Religion.* 2006. viii, 347 pp.
- 19 **HAUSENDORF, Heiko and Alfons BORA (eds.):** *Analysing Citizenship Talk. Social positioning in political and legal decision-making processes.* 2006. viii, 368 pp.
- 18 **LASSEN, Inger, Jeanne STRUNCK and Torben VESTERGAARD (eds.):** *Mediating Ideology in Text and Image. Ten critical studies.* 2006. xii, 254 pp.
- 17 **SAUSSURE, Louis de and Peter SCHULZ (eds.):** *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century. Discourse, language, mind.* 2005. xvi, 312 pp.
- 16 **ERREYGERS, Guido and Geert JACOBS (eds.):** *Language, Communication and the Economy.* 2005. viii, 239 pp.
- 15 **BLACKLEDGE, Adrian:** *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World.* 2005. x, 252 pp.
- 14 **DIJK, Teun A. van:** *Racism and Discourse in Spain and Latin America.* 2005. xii, 198 pp.
- 13 **WODAK, Ruth and Paul CHILTON (eds.):** *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis. Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity.* 2005. xviii, 320 pp.
- 12 **GRILLO, Eric (ed.):** *Power Without Domination. Dialogism and the empowering property of communication.* 2005. xviii, 247 pp.
- 11 **MUNTIGL, Peter:** *Narrative Counselling. Social and linguistic processes of change.* 2004. x, 347 pp.
- 10 **BAYLEY, Paul (ed.):** *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse.* 2004. vi, 385 pp.
- 9 **RICHARDSON, John E.:** *(Mis)Representing Islam. The racism and rhetoric of British broadsheet newspapers.* 2004. vi, 277 pp.
- 8 **MARTIN, J.R. and Ruth WODAK (eds.):** *Re/reading the past. Critical and functional perspectives on time and value.* 2003. vi, 277 pp.
- 7 **ENSINK, Titus and Christoph SAUER (eds.):** *The Art of Commemoration. Fifty years after the Warsaw Uprising.* 2003. xii, 246 pp.
- 6 **DUNNE, Michele Durocher:** *Democracy in Contemporary Egyptian Political Discourse.* 2003. xii, 179 pp.
- 5 **THIESMEYER, Lynn (ed.):** *Discourse and Silencing. Representation and the language of displacement.* 2003. x, 316 pp.
- 4 **CHILTON, Paul and Christina SCHÄFFNER (eds.):** *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic approaches to political discourse.* 2002. x, 246 pp.
- 3 **CHNG, Huang Hoon:** *Separate and Unequal. Judicial rhetoric and women's rights.* 2002. viii, 157 pp.
- 2 **LITOSSELITI, Lia and Jane SUNDERLAND (eds.):** *Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis.* 2002. viii, 336 pp.
- 1 **GELBER, Katharine:** *Speaking Back. The free speech versus hate speech debate.* 2002. xiv, 177 pp.

sharing is caring!!!

