

Discursive Anatomy of Opinion in Journalism¹

Ionio Alves Silva²

Abstract

This article aims to enroll the argument in the journalistic field, specifically, on the opinionated journalism and present a possible *anatomy of opinion*, from the Aristotelian rhetoric justifying the values that shape it and the circumstances in which it is produced. It is considered that arguing is an act of communication, an action by the speech, whose goal is to persuade the audience to share a particular point of view. We intend to demonstrate, through an analytical grid that opinionated news text constitutes a whole that is divided into identifiable parts in its structure.

Keywords: Opinion, Journalism, Argumentation, Rhetoric

1. Introduction

Barthes (2001) considers that rhetoric was, over time, the "technique" of persuasion, set of rules and recipes which the application longs to convince the public about the delivered speech, even if not genuine ; became a "teaching", passed from person to person, from the mentor to his disciple or his client, up to school discipline; later, a "science", a delimited field of knowledge, being its most important brand in the figures of rhetoric, whence a series of treaties to which the matter is the argumentative language and the figurative language; acquired a "moral" sense, or a system of rules that is intended to allow and limit deviations of passionate language, considering the invasion of the rhetoric by the floating sense of discourse; and went then to be both a "social practice", to provide the ruling classes of rhetorical techniques, the power of the word, as "a playful practice" capable of institutionalizing a system of rhetorical games, in social life, in politics, literature and, it is believed, in journalism.

¹This article consists of a refinement of the previous two papers: the first, "Column of Castello: opinion in Brazilian journalism and the military coup of 1964", published in 2012 in the journal *Perspectivas de la Comunicación*; the second, "Argumentation in journalism: a proposed analysis of the opinion", presented in 2012 at the 11th National Meeting of Researchers in Journalism.

²Adjunct Professor at Federal University of Piauí, Brazil, booked in the Department of Social Communication. PhD in Communication Sciences from the University of Vale do Rio dos Sinos, São Leopoldo/RS, Brazil. Telephone: 55 (86) 3215 5965. E-mail: ioniosilva@gmail.com.

By publishing "The rhetorical empire," Perelman (1993) reports that there were not (as elaborating his theories about arguing in 1958) a specific logic of "value judgments", and fetched in the Aristotelian discourse the domains of persuasive practice to establish the "preferred", the "acceptable" and "fair", via reasoning. In fact, in his rhetoric, Aristotle (2012, 2013) presents two basic modes of thinking: analytical demonstration and dialectic reasoning. The first is related to the demonstration founded in evident propositions, which leads the thought to a true conclusion, where is based on formal logic; the second is expressed through arguments, probable statements, from which we could extract only credible conclusions, resulting in a distinct way of thinking. The analytical syllogism is evidence against what you cannot argue with and dialectical feeds from the abstract, leading to only probable conclusions, but by no means powerless to gain accession, corresponds to the values mentioned in journalistic opinion.

Dialectical reasoning is the basis on which this article aims to postulate that the opinionated journalistic text is a discursive anatomy, structured as a series of identifiable and possible to be analyzed categories. Aristotle's (2012, 2013) who ensures that the speech consists of three elements: the speaker, the subject of which speaks about and the person speaking, and persuasion occur thanks to the personal character of the speaker, who presents himself credible. It relies on good people, in a more fully and more readily way than others. This is true, no matter what the issue, and even more valid when certainty is impossible and there are divergent opinions. "Persuasion is achieved through the speech itself when we show the truth, or what seems to be the truth, thanks to the persuasive argumentation suitable to the case at hand" (Aristotle, 2013: 46). That's what makes the rhetoric theoretical anchorage of this article and the ideal framework of theories of argumentation, thus becoming a reflection on the means of addressing to a particular audience, since the invention of an argument to its acceptance or refusal of this, by the public.

2. Journalism and Opinion

Tobias Peucer (Sousa, 2003) is the first to attempt to explain the process of news production in presenting his thesis *De Novellisrelationibus*, to the University of Leipzig, in Germany.

Their study becomes relevant to define the role of newspapers and use contributions of rhetoric³, to address the circumstances of object, subject, time, place, cause and manner corresponding to the elements of news, which are at the root of theories of journalism: who, what, when, where, how and why (Silva, 2013: 1).

The Peucer study consists of 29 topics, makes a relationship between Journalism and History and deals with the types of reports used by ancient Western culture, discussing notions of authorship, news, truth and credibility and proposing selection and restriction criteria to what should be published or not. The "updates reports" reflect on the notification of various recent things that occurred in a certain place and takes into account the succession of events and their causes, merely a simple exposition, "for the sake of recognition of the most important historical facts, or even mix things from different subjects, as in daily life and how they are propagated by the public voice" (Peucer, 2004: 16).

Traquina (2005) reminds us that the study of journalism is a long tradition scientific field, although some journalists ignore this body of theory, preferring to value your logic of only observing and writing, convinced that they already know everything about its practice. The results of decades of research on journalistic phenomena cannot overcome the disagreement among scholars as to whether there was scientific and reflective knowledge or not can explain why the news are as they are.

To Sousa (2003), a unified theory of journalism and news is incomplete if not aggregate component of the effects of the news to it. The author argues that the division of two major areas of journalism, production and circulation, is to answer: a) why the news are as they are? b) why do we have the news that we have? c) how do the news circulate? d) how are the news consumed? e) and what are the effects of the news? The answer to these questions explains the news and its effects and predicts as any news will be built in the context of effects that will cause (even though they depend on each audience or receiver).

³Peucer already possessed referring theoretical of rhetoric, philosophy, history, of jurisprudence, ethics and morals that could be applied to the emerging journalism, some of his contemporaries, and others dating back to Greek and Roman antiquity. In the field of rhetoric, the author bailed up of ancient Greek and Roman philosophers and rhetoricians, as Fabius Quintiliano and Cicero who, among other contributions to journalistic studies, more than two thousand years ago have been securing for posterity the formula of "elementa narrationis" to tell news.

A unified theory of news results of this historical simultaneous interaction of forces from different origins: personal, social, ideological, cultural, physical environment of technological devices, "having cognitive, affective and behavioral effects on people, which in time takes effect of changing or staying and training of references on societies, cultures and civilizations "(Sousa, 2003: 9-10).

On the dimensions of the news, Sousa (2003) defines two: a tactic one that is depleted in the theory of journalistic genres, and other strategic, which sees the news like every journalistic statement. The latter is the perspective that matters to draft a method that aims to identify the form and the contents of the opinion in journalism. Taking the news in its strategic dimension, like every journalistic statement, and the opinionated text a journalistic product, it is reasonable to consider a discursive anatomy of opinion and assign it an organic quality, identifying the different elements that are the basis for the announciator can organize their opinion on a certain matter.

According to Sodr (2009), journalism is a communicative process more complex than the simple news and information, although it mobilizes different types of speech; its conceptual centrality is supported in the news. And argues that facts are presented in a rational manner when it comes to reporting the actual facts, while the act of giving an opinion is processed through an opinion on the real, even if the reality is presented in the viewpoint and the cultural landscape to which it manifests.

Lippmann (2008) considers that the news do not stand as a mirror of reality, but as the report of an aspect that is imposed. Events are either news, or are reported as personal matter and conventional opinions. The interest of the reader for what is published, or that arouses the reader's attention to the journalistic content, results on screening procedures on what items and what position should occupy in the newspaper, how much space each story deserves which emphasis should have. This is not only to present the news in the established perspective by journalistic practices. It is a matter of cause feelings to the reader, of inducing him to feel a sense of personal identification with the events aired. "The news does not offer the opportunity for someone to present in the struggle they represent cannot appeal to a wide audience" (Lippmann, 2008: 302).

The distinction between what is news and what is the truth is that news point towards an event and the truth is bound to produce light on the hidden facts, "put them in relation with each other and make a picture of reality based on which it can act" (Lippmann (2008: 304).

It can be assumed that the opinion feeds of the facts to assert a judgment of previous value, whereas the interpretation is a preliminary reading of the fact, a search for join and relate the various fragments that emerge at the time of the incident.

One must consider that the characteristics of subjectivity of opinion, the burden of truth it supports is indeed relative. Kant (1991) understands that having something as true implies a judgment with reference to the conviction, which has three levels: to opine, believe and know. "Opine" is the order of the subjective, the relative truth. The author believes that something is true because it is subjectively sufficient. And if it is subjectively sufficient, while being taken as objectively insufficient it is called "believing". When considering something true, this something, being both subjectively and objectively enough, has the "knowledge". It is the subjective sufficiency that generates the conviction for the person and the objective sufficiency is what makes a certainty for any individual to arise.

Kant (1991) advises not to venture into "opine" without at least "have the knowledge" something upon which the judgment, solely problematic in itself, acquires a connection to the truth. The opinion is based on the experience of knowing something about, not an arbitrary fiction, even if it is allowed to opine on judgments derived from pure reason. Kant explains why, from the moment that such judgments are no longer based on experience, we must have a priori all that is necessary for the connection, without which one cannot find any guide that leads us to truth.

Tarde (1992) considers, in the opinion, two things that mix, but that can be separated: the opinion itself and the set of judgments, the general will, the set of desires. It is the second meaning that matters to the understanding and the pretensions of the method that we want to present. The author advises not to confuse opinion with other two installments from the social spirit that both the feed and limit itself, and that are with it in perpetual border dispute: the tradition and the reason. The first is the summary of what was the opinion of the dead, inheritance imposed upon salutary prejudices which are costly for the living; the second represents the personal judgments, relatively rational, though foolish, most often, when it comes from a thinking elite that isolates and removes from the popular flowing, to try to run it, taking advantage of the tradition of individuals of submitting decisions of a reason judged superior.

On the three branches of "public spirit", the opinion is the last to develop, but is also more apt to grow. There are three forces that differ both by nature as well as by their causes and effects. "They contribute jointly, but very uneven and variably to form the value of things; and the value is quite different as it is first of all a matter of custom, fashion statement or question of reasoning" (Tarde, 1992: 80).

While practice journalism acquires four primary functions: to inform, interpret, guide and entertain. Its primary purpose is to provide information, maintaining a complete objectivity on the news, which is an assignment of the informative journalism; the necessity to interpret, guide and entertain is visible in formats that express ideas and critical judgments, which are pertaining to opinionative journalism, whose intention is to influence the reader, something that is tried by the media since the earliest times, through their editorials, cartoons and commentary on authored assumed.

There is a tendency to relate the informative journalism with the objectivity and objectivity with reality, assuming that the opinion is pure subjectivity. For Vargas (1999), newspapers allow more space for the information, identified as narrative journalism, leaving the argumentative and / or judgmental texts in the background, as if judgmental journalism was not journalism itself. This conception affects both the journalism making, as the people who are outside of the profession. However, Gomis (1991: 52) notes that "the news is born and grows with the comment." And Vargas himself (1999: 22) admits that "people who buy and read newspapers, according to opinion polls, value more positively newspapers that publish reviews and opinion articles."

Beltrão (2006) has the same understanding when considering that journalism is one of the oldest and necessary human activities to society, giving the newsmaking, the functions of informing, guiding and entertaining. Information is the pure and simple account of the events of the present or the past, acting in present situations ; the guidance, the effort to convince by the interpretation of facts, causing action for those to whom the message is addressed; the entertainment, a way to escape from the "everyday concerns". Journalism is, first of all, information of current events, which arouse the public's interest, but the information produced by journalism needs to be properly interpreted as a way to guide public opinion (Beltrão, 2006: 29).

3. The Argumentative Analyses of Opinion

In the journalistic field, it seems anachronistic to elaborate an argument about modalities of genres before a moment of crisis established by multiple processes, tools and platforms that journalistic language materializes (Henn, 2011). Marques de Melo (2003), one of the pioneers in the work of investigating the genres in Brazil, expressed his disappointment when he observes the chaotic picture is drawn by researchers who deal with the subject. He characterizes in his studies, opinionated modalities, adopting as a criterion of conceptualization, the usages established by media companies in the country, "situational legitimacy".

Marques de Melo (2003) describes the particularities of the message according to its form, content and theme, to continue examining the "socio-cultural relations", which he considers to be the relationship between sender / receiver; and understanding of the political and economic field that deals with journalistic institutions, of the state, of the mercantile corporations and social movements that permeate the entirety of journalism, with enormous power to determine the content of the media. However, he argues that the way to sort the reflection is from the notion of journalistic genre, since, historically, the distinction between informative and the opinionated journalism arises from the need to distinguish between the facts and their versions or "define the texts which contain explicit opinions "(Marques de Melo, 2003: 42-43). From the point of view of language, however, these distinctions are problematic, since the fact is always a semiotic construction that acquires substance through narrative (Henn, 2009).

By offering your point of view about a particular event, the journalist does something different from what is to inform. He argues, excluding everything that depends on immediate evidence, feelings, religion and scientific knowledge. Breton (1999) claims that argumentation is restricted to the area of discussion that could be called a "lay public space": the space of the world's representations shared with all human, of the metaphors in which we live and which structure the view of things and beings. Breton (1999: 43) believes that the argument creates and modifies the worlds: "It constitutes its essential dynamics, the machine which forms the raw material of beliefs, opinions, values."

In the need to observe *value judgments* that we propose to look journalism beyond the historical distinction between news categories, the distinction between facts and versions or classification of news, for containing or not explicit opinions. The aim is to debate about the form and content of the belief from the perspective of argumentation, which includes logic of discursive construction and interpretation, as it enters into the field of the believable, the probable and plausible. We sought to analyze the opinion as a discursive practice of defending the good, the true and fair without dwelling on ideological aspects, even though the ideology wrestles to manifest through personal point of view to whom opines. The defense of the good, of the true and fair should be sought as a manifestation of the desire of the enunciator and the public's interest to be achieved.

It is considered that the argumentative theories address on the same subject: "the operation or the process in which they provide reasons to convince an interlocutor, or the units themselves of this operation or this process, the arguments" (Breton & Gauthier, 2001: 14). And, just as the act of arguing demands the application of well elaborate discursive techniques in order to obtain from the reader attention and acceptance of what it is proposed to maintain "spirits" contact between the utterer and his audience, to "induce or increase the adherence of an audience to theses that are presented to their assent" (Perelman, 1993: 29)

Breton (1999) defines the argument as a man's own action that aims to share an opinion, using complex procedures that absorb all the richness of human behavior. Understand the field of argumentation implies conceptualize what is "arguing" from three perspectives: first, that arguing is a situation communication that requires partners, a message and a dynamic of its own; second, that arguing is not convincing at all costs, which implies a break with the classical rhetoric, by non-saving means to persuade; and third, that propose an opinion, offering to "the other" good reasons for joining, is to seize the reasoning upon communicative action.

Breton's (1999) argumentative model is divided into several levels: the speaker's belief, himself (the speaker), the argument, the auditorium and the context of reception.

The opinion of who enunciates is something that exists even before placed in the form of argument: a cause, a thesis, a point of view; the utterer is one who has an opinion to share with an auditorium; the argument is the opinion, set out in written or oral form, whose goal is to persuade directly or indirectly by the word; The auditorium can be a person, a public, or a set of public (it is possible that the speaker try to convince himself); and the context of reception, the set of beliefs, values and assumptions shared by the auditorium, pre-existing the act of argumentation and that plays a role in the reception of the argument: the acceptance, the refusal or variable adherence it causes (Breton, 1999: 28-29).

Both argumentative expression as its reading and interpretation are rhetorical constructions, because the rhetoric reading means unraveling how this construction is made, under what circumstances it is made, who presides it, why can we place the argument within a framework of analysis and theory of the speech that, in turn, also includes a system of broader significance. It is the way of reasonable, combined with an argumentation theory, which provides a practical use of reason, allows dealing with values, organize preferences and guide decisions without recourse to the formal logic.

The method we propose, hereafter called *argumentative analysis of the opinion*, the touches constitutive textual aspects of the speech, to privilege the *value judgments* that shaped it and the *circumstances* in which it is produced. It is a procedure that shows itself to interpreting opinionative journalistic text and that is to identify the evaluative assumptions that are accepted as the starting point of reasoning, as they develop from a set of binding processes and dissociation, and the social environment that surrounds them. Both the starting point and the development presuppose agreement with the audience, as the argumentative analysis turns to what is presumably accepted by the reception. The intent of argumentative analysis is to unravel the beliefs and desires of the arguer when trying to establish a resonance with the audience to elicit the assent to the values contained in the opinion that suggests to its audience without ignoring, however, the discursive operations that come into play in this process .

The notion of *value judgments* comes from Aristotle and the Greco-Latin tradition of rhetoric and topics. Even without a specific logic, Perelman (1993) takes the concept of values in the late 1950s, to note the distinction between the essential and the unessential, between the relevant and the irrelevant, it could not be done without using such judgments, something considered by him, at the time, arbitrary and logically indeterminate.

From then on, he dedicated himself to the task of figuring out how to ration about values and seek rationally acceptable methods, which would assist the preference of good to evil, justice to injustice, dictatorship to democracy.

When dealing with what is preferred, acceptable and reasonable (Perelman & Tyteca, 2005), reasoning they serve every kind of argument that seeks to gain the support of the "spirits". This is the technique of persuasive discourse that, postulate itself, is the essence of journalistic opinion, regarded as indispensable in the discussion prior to any decision making. Taking up the argumentation as the ability to act persuasively upon an audience to modify their beliefs or their provisions, through a speech wishing to gain adherence as an alternative to imposition of a will, by constriction or by domestication, be the person to whose opinion is assigned some value is being possessor of a nontrivial quality.

The values that sustain the arguments can be abstract (power, democracy, justice, freedom, equality) or concrete (the president, the parliament, the government, the nation) and are tied to a living entity, to a particular group, to a particular object, when viewed in its uniqueness. Hierarchies can also be concrete, such as the superiority of men over animals, gods over men, and abstract, when they express the superiority of just about useful for example.

It is noticed that adhering to values is admit that an object, a being or an ideal influences on the action and on the provisions to the action that can be claimed in the argumentative process, without considering, however, that this view is imposed to all. The values are used to "motivate the listener to make certain choices over others and, above all, to justify them, so that they become acceptable and approved by others" (Perelman & Tyteca, 2005: 84-85). However, the audience can disallow them if the premises are one-sided or biased, implying the need for agreement.

The *value judgment*⁴ are configured as seemingly simple opinions, but they can be quite elaborate, although only impressions on a private reality, because are derived from the subjectivity of certain ideals, the will and conscience of each individual. The values are also presented in the circumstances of place, way and time something similar to sociocultural context, however, outside the scope of the verbal unit.

In the analysis of the opinion, the *circumstances* in which the speech is produced are related to the social environment located in time and space and that interfere in how the utterer interpret them and if he is inclined to be the voice of collective life and the life of each one in particular. The use of "circumstances" and not "context" (although it is possible assign them the same sense) it is owned to the understanding that some have of that the context refers to the verbal environment. One cannot deny that the speech is an activity conditioned by context and that it plays a vital role in the functioning of the statements, both regarding the production and interpretation.

Within the rhetoric, however, the argumentation theory is not about the conditions of production of the theses submitted to the assent of the public, nor is it a method for producing ideas and opinions, but to defend and provide arguments for such ideas and opinions (Breton & Gauthier, 2000: 45). The rhetoric is consisted of the "faculty of identifying specifically what, in each case, may serve to persuade" (Aristotle, 2013: 44-45). It is enrolled, therefore, in a situation of argumentation in which the *circumstances* determine the procedures to be followed and *values* to be used in order to try to persuade the audience.

⁴For Weber (2001) the valuation is a properly human action: it ponders and chooses between the values in question, those who are according to their own conscience and their vision of life. In "Methodology of the Social Sciences" Weber refers to the possibility of profession of faith in these judgments: is undoubtedly true that precisely those most intimate elements of 'personality', in other words, the last and supreme value judgments that determine our actions and give meaning and purpose to our lives, are perceived by us as being objectively valid. There is a weberian concern in characterizing the value judgment as the field of belief, thus not having the possibility of objective validity. For him, "[...] any case, only the assumption of faith in values has felt the urge to defend certain values publicly. But to pass judgment on the validity of such values is the subject of faith [...] but certainly is not the task of an empirical science" (Weber, 2001: 111). In "The rules of sociological method" Durkheim (2002) calls the values "prenoções", ideas formulated in the context of moral practices, political and religious beliefs, in short, the practice of feeling. "We must be free from false evidence that dominate the mind of the vulgar [...] or, in some times there is necessary to use them, it is with little awareness of its value" (Durkheim, 2002: 54-55).

In this direction, the argumentative analysis extrapolates the textual surface, which means to immerse in search of other discursive resources that the enunciator is used to express his views about a particular event. By the characteristics of the object of study and the intended objectives, the method considers the argumentation an action by the speech and invests in the analysis of opinion produced, with the purpose of convincing the audience, and that is circumscribed in the relationship between the ethos of the enunciator, the provision of the auditorium to assent to the thesis that it is proposed and the speech itself. "When we use the terms 'speech' 'speaker' and 'auditorium', so to understand the argumentation, the one who presents and those to whom it is addressed" (Perelman & Tyteca, 2005: 7).

Actually to argue goes beyond designing arguments, assuming that all wealth comes from the interpretation precisely from the fact that there are several possible interpretations, which makes the process of convincing someone, other than by argument minimally reasonable even more complex. It consists in the valuation of things in themselves and in relation to others, given the necessity of choosing an opinion on aspects that become acceptable for public data. "The transformation of an opinion in arguments by reference to a particular auditorium is precisely the object of argumentation" (Breton, 1999: 32).

The construction of the method starts from the principle that the opinion has its own *discursive anatomy*, a whole in which its parts can be identified and dissected as persuasive resources, which contain a specific logic for rationing through technical action in relation to the "other" to influence by word and reason, in defense of the preferred, the acceptable and / or the reasonable. This conception is supported by the assertion of Perelman (1993), when he says that the arguments are argumentations that seek to gain the support of the "spirits" to the theses that are presented to their assent. Therefore, the analysis of opinion implies the existence of a speaker, a message, constituted by the opinion being shared and a public forming the traditional triangle studied in all its forms, by the communication sciences.

4. Analytical Categories

The proposed grid is inspired by the argumentative scheme⁵ of Breton (1999), contains six categories of analysis and is intended to establish a relationship between the proposed opinion (that is intended to persuade), the audience or the audiences to whom it is addressed the reception environment, namely, the state of mind of the audience, the arguments adopted for persuasion (values taken at the consent of the public or public), the discursive level (persuasive strategies adopted by the enunciator) and figures to support arguments.

It was nothing, it was nothing, and it was really nothing⁶

What the newspapers presented on Friday (05/16) as a portrait of what should be the broader mobilization⁷ against the World Cup is a true *chabu*. A popular expression is the fiasco of firecracker that fails to detonate, or any expectation that is not proven by reality. The fiasco of the protests is even more pathetic when one observes the poster carried by some protesters, which read: "World Day Against the Cup".

⁵Breton (1999) proposes a model of argumentative analysis that lies in understanding how the text is constructed so as to convince the audience of a particular opinion. He provides a roadmap to be followed and which involves ten stages: 1) identify opinion (that is intended to persuade), 2) observe whether the text is really argumentative, 3) knowing the argumentative dynamics, 4) identify the major arguments used, 5) which family arguments belong to, 6) their content, 7) what public are addressed 8) previous agreements that form the basis, 9) discursive plan adopted, 10) and the rhetorical figures support.

⁶The text is authored by Luciano Martins Costa, published on the website "Press information" in issue 798 of 17

May 2014. Available: http://www.observatoriodaimprensa.com.br/news/view/nao_era_nada_nao_era_nada_e_nao_era_nada_mesmo (September 8, 2014).

⁷The rise of mobilization is attributed to the Free Pass Movement of São Paulo, created against the attempt to increase the price of the bus ticket in the state capital, at R\$ 3.00 (three reais) to R\$ 3.20 (three reais and twenty cents). The initial manifestations surfaced a sense of challenge in much of the country, coming to the National Congress and the Government Palace in Brasília, with enlarged demands: fighting corruption, improving public services, more investment in health, education and security. Protests also happened against the expenses with the realization of the 2013 Confederations Cup and managed to interfere in some legislative polls, the example of the Proposed Constitutional Amendment. 37, which would limit the power of investigation of the Federal Prosecutors, the case was approved. With this, the expectation was that the spirit of Brazil was taken by a wave of revolt during the World Cup.

What happened, after all, was the parade of different groups in a dozen cities, each bringing their specific claims. In most of these demonstrations, the presence of signs against the Cup was rejected and the so called "black blocs" had to make their depredations far from the mass of protesters.

In the region of Itaquera in Sao Paulo, Corinthians fans treated to mingle with members of the homeless movement to avoid approaching the stadium. According to newspaper reports, a group of twenty protesters tried to get tires to burn near the arena, but the Corinthians fans threw the tires at a scrub. Subsequently, the police themselves made a barrier to prevent access to the gates. The press cannot quantify how many fans had infiltrated the demonstration because they all wore red shirts, as had been arranged between members of the club GaviõesFiel.

The episode shows how the correlation of forces between those who mobilize against the World Cup and those who wish only to cheer for the Brazilian team is very different than it does assume the news. In fact, there is an overestimation of the protests, as part of an artificial climate of hysteria - much more present in the news than this in real life. The daily routine of large cities where there were demonstrations did not suffer more disorders than those of the routine, and the variety of the slogans of the many settlements drowned the cries of those who think prevent the realization of the football tournament.

4.1 Suggested Opinion

The proposed opinion while synthesis the text is built with the intention of convincing the reader that the press had created an artificial climate of protest, asserting that what appeared to be a massive mobilization against the World Cup, it was just a big "Chabu". Excepting something wrought, overrated by the press, and that did not correspond to the perspectives of reality. It was identical to a firework that did not detonate and was heading for a "fiasco". This is what is observed from the proposal that presents itself in the title of the review: "It was nothing, it was nothing, and nothing was the same."

4.2 Audiences

When referring to the demonstrations, the review points to a desirable horizontal audience (universal), understood of two groups: those who were in favor and those who were against holding the World Cup in Brazil.

But it is also directed to the press, by the fact of referring directly to it, suggesting a critique of journalistic practices produced in Brazil. It is possible to realize the direction of the text to specific social groups: the so-called black blocs - who performed their depredations far from the mass of protesters - and the passionate and committed fans, " Gaviões da Fiel", a symbol of one of the most popular soccer clubs in the country, Sport Club Corinthians Paulista.

4.3 Reception environment

The text presumes a reception environment in which the argumentation would be received: a country where there was a balance of forces between favorable and those who were against the holding of the World Cup in Brazil, signified by the protests that took place in the streets of major Brazilian cities. It is also presumed the clash of state of mind among Brazilians who mobilized in order to express their outrage and those who just wanted to root for Brazil's team during the biggest celebration of soccer in the world. A real contrast to the daily routine of the population who sang their words of clamor in the streets of some cities

4.4 Argumentation

The review attempts to frame a reality with the argument that the "parade of diverse groups in a dozen cities, each bringing their particular claims." The argument shows that there was actually a set of feelings without any unit in the social body and the slogans of specific groups infiltrated in the demonstrations did not portray the general desires of people who were going to the streets in protest. Then, the opinion presents some arguments for the "example" (Aristotle, 2012, 2013; Perelman, 1993; Perelman & Tyteca, 2005; Breton, 1999) to assert a thesis: the "Corinthians fans tried to mingle with members of the homeless movement to avoid approaching the stadium ", " a group of twenty protesters tried to get tires to burn near the arena, but the Corinthians fans threw the tires in a scrub "and" the police themselves made a barrier to prevent access the gates.

"Those are the cases that show the "overvaluation of the protests, as part of an artificial climate of hysteria - much more present in the news than in real life."

It is on these grounds that the utterer tries to intervene in the receiving environment to try to convince that the demonstrations were not the features claimed by the press. Episodes were, as stated in the proposed opinion, showing a "correlation of forces between those who mobilized against the World Cup and only those who wanted to cheer for Brazil", very different from what was supposed to news reports, and he tried to introduce a climate of hysteria.

The review also presents the argument of "authority" of "testimony" (Breton, 1999) to also intervene in the receiving environment, reinforcing the idea that the protests were just a "Chabu" and that, in fact, the routine of the great cities where there was manifestation did not suffer from any other disorders than usual. The slogans uttered in various directions by protesters drowned out the cries of those who believed in preventing the realization of the most important competition in soccer world.

4.5 Discursive Plan

The strategy review is from the title, present a point of view contrary to speculations that were produced around the hosting of the World Cup, widely disseminated by the mass communication vehicles. As a category of analysis inspired by two of the four parts of rhetoric that Aristotle (2012) proposes the discursive level corresponds to the written text plan or the oratory plan⁸, in the case of spoken discourse.

From the point of view of the narrative, which is the internal organization of speech in which the utterer search arguments and other means of persuasion on the subject of the speech, the comment is used in an accessible language to the intended audiences and it structures clearly on their goals and beliefs that wants to be shared by readers.

On aspects of evidence, the strategy is to provide "formal categories of persuasion" (Aristotle, 2012) based on dialectical reasoning, produced according to the value judgments, the authority of the enunciator and vehicle part.

⁸The plan of the classical discourse of Aristotle (2012) consists of four parts: prelude, narration, proof, and epilogue, although the author himself acknowledges that the two categories are truly essential to storytelling and proof.

Reasoning that this works in the field of preferable, the acceptable and reasonable, trying to gain membership of the reader. The discursive level, therefore, meets the strategies adopted to build a speech to arouse the attention of the reader and assist in the acceptability of the proposed opinion.

4.6 Figures Supporting

Although hardly we make use of figures of support the comment seeks a distinctive way to show peculiarities, a way of saying not framed in the usual way, represented by "Chabu" popular expression. The meaning of the figure is seen as something that was announced as great without being a "chocho overflow" lot of talk for a little, but that is not in the text only as an ornament range. It is justified by the persuasive force, the circumstantial imposition, to say something relevant and not just be a manifestation of "rhetoric" in traditional terms, only an art of good to say. In this case, "Chabu" serves to support a discernible structure, the ability to unify the public's understanding of the text, a form that deviates from the normal way of expressing themselves and thereby to get attention. The term is therefore an argumentative resource because it proposes a shift of perspective in relation to the protests that took to the streets of major cities in the country.

5. Final Considerations

In response to the initial proposition can we concluded that the argument fits perfectly into the field of opinionative journalism, as the review analyzed serves to a particular discursive structure clearly identified with the persuasive speech seeking the consent of the public to whom it is intended. The grid of argument analysis allows one to see that it is possible an anatomy of opinion, from the proposed categories.

It is observed that the proposed opinion favors the identification of the public or audiences to whom the message is directed, suggests the state of mind of the audience and points to the arguments to be presented for the membership of the audience occurs to the view that is proposed.

The discursive level, in particular, allows saying that the opinionated text is a whole in that parts can be analyzed separately as persuasive resources that contain a specific logic of rationing by techniques of acting in relation to the "other" and influencing of the word.

If this is true, it is possible that we glimpse an opinion structure, a model of construction of opinionated text from the analytical categories presented. The opinion journalism, therefore, would consist of an argument based on the elaboration of arguments that emphasize value judgments, molded according to the circumstances that shape and according to the worldview of the intended audience. It favors, similarly to postulate that the classical rhetoric of Aristotle includes a dynamic and structure capable of accommodating the proposition that journalistic opinion has over there a possible source.

References

- ARISTÓTELES (2012). Retórica. (1st ed.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes, (Chapter 1).
 _____. Retórica. (2013). (1st ed.). São Paulo: EDIPRO, (Chapter 1).
 BARTHES, Roland (2001). A aventura semiológica. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, (Chapter 1).
 BELTRÃO, Luiz (2006). Teoria e prática do jornalismo. Adamantina, SP: Omnia,
 BRETON, Philippe (1999). A argumentação na comunicação. Bauru, SP: EDUSC, (Chapter 1 - 5).
 BRETON, Philippe & GAUTHIER, Gilles (2001). História das teorias da argumentação. Lisboa: Editorial Bizâncio, (Chapter 1).
 DURKHEIM, Émile (2002). As regras do método sociológico. São Paulo: Martin Claret, (Chapter 2).
 GOMIS, Lorenzo (1991). Teoria del periodismo. Barcelona, Espanha: Paidós, (Chapter 4).
 HENN, R. C (2011). Jornalismo em rede: crise do acontecimento. [Online] Available: <http://confibercom.org/anais2011/pdf/154.pdf> (July 20, 2014).
 KANT, Immanuel (1991). Crítica da razão pura. (4th ed.). São Paulo: Nova Cultural, (Chapter 2).
 LIPPMANN, Walter (2008). Opinião pública. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, (Chapter 7).
 MARQUES DE MELO, José (2003). A opinião no jornalismo brasileiro: gêneros opinativos no jornalismo brasileiro. (3rd ed.). Campos do Jordão: Mantiqueira, (Chapter 2).
 PERELMAN, Chaïm (1993). O império retórico: retórica e argumentação. (1st ed.). Porto, Portugal: Edições Asa, (Chapter 1 - 9).
 PERELMAN, Chaïm & OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, Lucie (2005). Tratado da argumentação: nova retórica. (2nd ed.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes, (Chapter 1 - 3).
 PEUCER, Tobias (2004). Os relatos jornalísticos. [Online] Available: <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/jornalismo/article/view/2070/1812> (July 12, 2014).
 QUÉRÉ, Louis (2005). Entre o fato e o sentido: a dualidade do acontecimento. *Trajectos Revista de Comunicação*, 6, 59-76.
 REBOUL, Olivier (2004). Introdução à retórica. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, (Chapter 1).
 SILVA, Ionio (2014). Argumentação no jornalismo opinativo: um estudo da Coluna do Castello no período de 1963 a 1969. 2014. 196 f. Tese (Doutorado em Ciências da Comunicação). Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências da Comunicação. Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos. São Leopoldo, (Chapter 2).

- SODRÉ, Muniz (2009). A narração do fato: noções para uma teoria do acontecimento. Petrópolis: Vozes, (Introduction).
- SOUSA, Jorge Pedro (2003). Por que as notícias são como são? Construindo uma teoria da notícia. [Online] Available: <http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/sousa-jorge-pedro-construindo-teoria-da-noticia.pdf> (July 10, 2014).
- _____. (2004). Tobias Peucer: progenitor da Teoria do Jornalismo. [Online] Available: <<http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/sousa-jorge-pedro-tobias-peucer.pdf> (July 15, 2014).
- TARDE, Gabriel (1992). A opinião e as massas. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, (Chapter 2).
- TRAQUINA, Nelson (2005). O estudo do jornalismo no século XX. (3rd ed.) São Leopoldo, RS, Brasil, Editora Unisinos, (Chapter 1).
- VARGAS, Natividad Abril (1999). Periodismo de opinión. Madrid, Espanha: EditotialSintesis, (Chapter 1).
- WEBER, Max (2001). Metodologia das Ciências Sociais. (3rd ed.). São Paulo: Cortez; Campinas: Unicamp, (Chapter2).