



**Cibele Rizek** is a Social Scientist, Ph.D. in Sociology, and Full Professor at the Institute of Architecture and Urbanism of the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil, and the Graduate Program in Architecture and Urbanism at the same institution. She is a researcher at the Center for Citizenship Rights Studies, also at the University of Sao Paulo, and guides and develops research on the subjects such as cities, productive restructuring, housing, public space, and citizenship.

**Marcelo Tramontano** is an Architect, Master, Doctor, and Livre-docente in Architecture and Urbanism, with a Post-doctorate in Architecture and Digital Media. He is an Associate Professor at the Institute of Architecture and Urbanism of the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil, and the Graduate Program in Architecture and Urbanism of the same institution. He directs Nomads.usp and is the Editor-in-Chief of V!RUS journal.

How to quote this text: Rizek, C. S., Tramontano, M., 2019. To dispute the meaning of the world. *V!rus*, Sao Carlos, 19. [e-journal] [online] Available at: <[http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/\\_virus19/?sec=2&item=1&lang=en](http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/_virus19/?sec=2&item=1&lang=en)>. [Accessed: 13 December 2019].

**Marcelo Tramontano:** Cibele, thank you very much for accepting our invitation. I would like us to start this conversation by addressing some aspects of the expression "The construction of information." I propose to approach the notion of information considering its etymology and its meaning of "giving shape to" something. I understand that thinking of information as a social construct recovers consolidated understandings in the social sciences, such as the very concept of social networks – regardless of their current colloquial meaning.

**Cibele Rizek:** It is quite interesting to think that for philosophical anthropology, the issue of information is constitutive of the very production of cultural unity, at least in terms of form representation. There is no cultural unity without symbolic production. The dimension of the passage from nature to culture, from nature to history, assumes the ability that Marx, citing Aristotle's beautiful metaphor about the architect and the bees, would say that one can see a stool on a tree.

To give form supposes to trans-form, or the trans-formation of nature by human work. And this action transforms not only the object but the subject of this process. From the point of view of philosophical anthropology and the philosophical assumptions of this anthropology, which is at the origin of the social sciences, only in this relationship can the subject be thought of as a subject. Therefore, if the first information is language, language is necessarily a component of the human constitution process. There is no way to alter the language because there is no unity without a word. Consequently, there is no unity without information, without "giving shape to", without transforming, without information.

From this perspective, it is very exciting to think that today's new information production processes are also new production processes of these subjects. As these latter are no longer the same subjects. And if we consider the whole dimension of production, we will realize that production implies a historicization and a huge possibility of socio-geographical and socio-historical diversity. If the information being produced is different, it presupposes another subject and another subject-object relation. This is why we have been increasingly discussing more and more hybridized forms in a discussion that, incidentally, is not new either.

Donna Haraway, for example, says we are all already cyborgs. Precisely because we are already a subject that can no longer be thought without this new way of producing information, new objects of transformation and, therefore, new subject-object and subject-subject relations. I am here using ancient references because, in fact, this process of transformation of nature, which implies a symbolic production at the same time, does not happen individually. It is not something of the individual. Mediation is a mediation of social relations, which are born in this same context, in this same process. Everything is a process, nothing is given.

Thinking about this process today greatly enriches the conception of what is the subject-object relationship in the whole of social relations. They are much transformed, both for good and for bad, from the very high speed of production and online information transmission. I remember when we were at the 15-M rally, and you were filming the rally and your video came online in real-time during the act. This shows an extreme shortening of times and approximation of distances, in a mediated way.

This dimension is crucial for thinking about what is today the production of these subjects and objects, and social relations. The spatiotemporal anchor relations are greatly transformed. They are grounded differently because space and time mean other things. The here-now is something else. It is even hard to do social science right now because everything is moving so fast and accelerating.

Moreover, I think it is also important to point out, on the other hand, what is imagined as a kind of almost automatic and spontaneous attachment of the masses. Manuel Castells argues that there is a more or less spontaneous self-connection of the masses. I am not sure about that. I think so and not because there is a very important question that we must ask ourselves all the time about "who is the subject of this process". We are indeed the tip. We connect massively because we have a cell phone attached to each of us. We are all the time self-connected so that we can no longer see ourselves without this self-connection. This means that our image and our practice have been already completely transformed.

There is also a generational issue here, clearly visible in my generation, for whom self-connection has been less important but is becoming increasingly central. Why? Because there are no more public phones, for example. That is, a whole set of mediation equipment and technical instruments was densified and compacted in the cell phone.

On the one hand, this media dimension greatly enhances what we do. We can only write as much as we write, translate and send texts because we have computers and all the other digital means. I wrote my master's dissertation by hand, revised the versions many times, then sent the manuscript to someone who digitized the text on the computer, printed it – on a dot matrix printer – and that was a breakthrough. Notice the distance between this process and today, when I write a text and send it to a seminar, anywhere in the world, as soon as I have finished writing it. It immediately takes a digital form and to a large extent no longer exists on paper. Much of what I wrote does not exist and will never exist on paper.

It is not just a way of spreading, but another way of producing textual information. It is essentially another way of connecting and producing me as someone who writes, who thinks. We are talking about text, but so are images and videos, reminding the post-image and post-truth issue, and that of the relationship between signifier and signified, which also changed completely.

**MT:** As part of this reflection on the infiltration of digital media into our daily lives, you point out very well that mediation is not on the scale of the individual but of the collective because it operates at the level of social relations. Since this subject is transformed intimately, but also in his relations with others, can we infer that a new notion of the public sphere is being constituted?

**CR:** There is a very interesting text by Jürgen Habermas, written when his book "The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere" turned thirty, entitled "The Public Space, 30 Years Later". Habermas already pointed in that text to the issue of digital publishing and information media as a new public sphere. The notion of public space supposes and needs the notion of equality. In the public sphere, we must necessarily have the right to speak, to be visible, to act. And all of that has changed a lot. The June 2013 demonstrations in Brazil, for example, consolidated a big novelty that is the intermediation of social networks,

via Facebook, Whatsapp, and so on. About these phenomena – June 2013, the Arab Spring, Occupy Wall Street and others – it is interesting to think about the friction between the digital and the streets. This relationship rubs, tensions the street and information. Both are present simultaneously, in connection and friction. This is a tremendous novelty.

So it is possible to say that there is a change in the public sphere, provided that this friction is considered. Because it is debatable to say that Facebook is a public sphere, as it is a private company. It is debatable because it is free for users, but that doesn't mean that something is free in the big data realm, of course not. Does the Facebook platform equal me to all these other actors? Yes, but not to the company that accounts for it. The company has a key presence in mediation processes, and, more than that, it draws the way of interacting!

I find it interesting to return to the classic ideals of public space, through the bias of Hannah Arendt and others, recovering the beauty of Arendt's reflection. Why does she return to Greece to think about public space? Because Greece – the West – has made us a promise, which is the promise of politics. Arendt goes back to saying that without politics, the notion of humanity does not hold. She links the public dimension to the constitution of the human and what we inherit from this long western history.

What, then, is the point? The point is the ability to discern and to judge, which is not just about information because it involves criteria, which in turn have to do with training. We live a paradox that we have an immense amount of information at our disposal, a quasi-Borgean library – the Borges's idea of an infinite library – and at the same time, we have few criteria for discerning between the just and the unjust, the legitimate and illegitimate, and so on. This inability to judge puts the universe and the promise of the public dimension at risk, which is what Hannah Arendt called the banality of evil. When she follows Adolf Eichmann's trial and then writes the book "Eichmann in Jerusalem," she says she was expecting to find a monster but found a man who was obeying orders. An absolutely ordinary man who has adapted. This is what is terrible. This is the banality of evil.

I think Hannah Arendt would see today the Whatsapp bubbles or the flat-Earth bubbles, the gay kit ones, and all these manifestations, as the absolute banality of evil. Not only because they can lead to genocide, but because they can ultimately compromise our humanity. On the one hand, this is terrible. But, on the other hand, one must recognize a virtue in dealing with these manifestations when we search the Internet about other issues, for example, and find them scrambled with what we seek. Research tools are powerful, refined and wonderful. But all these nonsense barbarities that the search also brings us reaffirm that we already live in a hybridism of positions and worldviews. And this hybridity shows us the growing need to educate. Because, given the sea of information we have today, what does educating mean? It means building criteria.

What would it mean to preserve the public dimension? It would designate precisely to preserve the possibility of this encounter, of this dialogue, this presence and the constitution of criteria that may arise from it. What we are witnessing is the opposite. Because it is the absence of criteria that constitutes bubbles. Bubbles are formed because people don't want to judge. Of course, I'm thinking of Brazil, but not only. If you think about Brexit and all the nonsense that has been reiterated, or Marine Le Pen, Matteo Salvini, Viktor Orbán, or the way Donald Trump rules, that is how they act. This is a huge paradox, a huge contradiction, which poses an equally huge challenge for us: how to maintain that public, democratic dimension, with right and access to the word, to visibility, to difference, with this enormous amount of information and without criteria? Therefore, I think that the issue of educating is even more important today, given the maze of information we have at our disposal at any time.

**MT:** What you are saying brings me to the academic realm, in which new ways of doing research and new learning spaces have been tried, from the expanding access to information. If we compare how we used to research and handle sources and methods a decade or two ago with current practices, we will find major differences that ultimately converge on the need for judgment, and therefore criteria for discernment. What has changed in this academic construction of educating and production of scientific knowledge?

**CR:** The notion of truth has long been lost. By the early twentieth century, the notion of truth had already been lost. No serious scientist in any area of knowledge can since claim that anything is true, and period. What exists are regimes of truth, and we all know that. Thomas Kuhn wrote "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" long before the advent of the Internet, and he clearly shows in this book that there is a paradigm according to which there is a body of questions that will be illuminated, and another one which will be shelved. Where is the truth? In which of these bodies? Michel Foucault worked all the time unraveling questions and trying to understand which ones had disappeared, why they disappeared, and retrieving things and checking

what might come of them. He invented and recreated an entire archaeological and then genealogical dimension.

I think this dimension of the knowledge-building crisis is extremely rich and also extremely difficult. On the one hand, the construction of knowledge is questionable because all knowledge is provisional, and we all know it and agree. Does this mean that what we claim from minimally based scientific research is common sense? No! It turns out that both have the same status. If, for example, I ask a twelve-year-old boy what are the possible treatments for erysipelas, he goes online and tells me several treatment alternatives. This is very dangerous because it is at the root of the conservative movement that we are witnessing. Political scientist Esther Solano, who surveys poor Bolsonaro voters, reported that in one of her interviews, a lady told her, "You are a teacher and I am not. Why should I believe you? Because you are a teacher? That means nothing to me. I'd rather believe the pastor of my church and my family."

This is a complicated equivalence. It has a side that is the respect for popular knowledge, which is obviously knowledge, symbolic systems and, of course, side by side with the knowledge produced by academic research. But what is the difference between the two? The difference is that our productions are screened by the scientific community. We attend conferences, talk about what we are thinking and studying, make assumptions, make it clear that they are still hypotheses, and open ourselves to criticism.

I, for one, have a hypothesis of explanation for a social phenomenon involving violence. I have clues of certain events, but I have no evidence yet. I start from some proven facts, as localized phenomena, but I think the logic behind its actions has gone beyond. A researcher who specializes in violence may not agree with any word of what I am saying. And I may also disagree with some things he claims. This discussion goes through a sieve. He and other researchers discuss my text, which, in turn, is referenced in other texts. I am not the one who has done this other research, but we have dialogues in bibliography and I will submit my thoughts to a scientific community that will say: this is correct, or it is not, or it is under discussion.

Instead, an assertion as that the Earth is flat is absurd, and firstly because we know that the Earth is not flat. What lies behind such an assertion is a theological theory, which takes shape within a theocratic state proposal. So this equivalence is very dangerous. Are Newton, Einstein and Olavo de Carvalho<sup>1</sup> equivalent? No, they aren't! Now, how does Olavo de Carvalho build his theory? Through online social networks. The production of knowledge that we will call scientific, despite all our criticism of scientificity, goes through criteria. It goes through filters. You need to produce plausibility evidence, make arguments about it, and submit to an academic community. Precisely for this reason, it is not equivalent to this other kind of speech.

So the most consequential problem, the most significant danger, is this uncritical equivalence. The problem is again the absence of judgment criteria. One begins to admit a plausibility, which is a reduction and an absurdity. Olavo de Carvalho publishes his speeches on Youtube, states that the Earth is flat, and there are people who believe him, precisely because of a supposed equivalence of these different speeches. Is this information? No. Not in that sense of "giving shape to," and the production of subject and object. This is misinformation.

**MT:** I would like to ask you another question, still on this topic. The literary critic Michiko Kakutani, in her book "The Death of Truth: Notes on Falsehood in the Age of Trump", suggests that the leftist intelligentsia of the 1960s has a great deal of responsibility in the current discredit of scientific knowledge. Kakutani argues that those intellectuals began a process of systematic questioning of all that was being taught and researched at universities, including the practice of doubting science itself. It was said at the time that everything had to be reviewed, nothing was as it appeared to be, and so on. Would you like to comment on that?

**CR:** Undoubtedly, there was at the time a very deep questioning, including the questioning of all authority, in every way: in the author's sense, of the very idea of authority, and so on. This questioning process was somewhat healthy. It was, because so much had to be questioned, and broken. Some scholars say the twentieth century ended in 1968, and others say it ended in 1989, with the fall of the Berlin Wall. But the 1960s shook many established ideas, and intellectuals supported this movement. Foucault made things tremble, with no doubt. He revised the idea of state racism, the very idea of a state, and later Giorgio Agamben will also pull these threads, and generations of Foucaultians have been pulling these threads, destabilizing knowledge and power. In fact, this is a Nietzschean matrix, located in the nineteenth century, and Foucault takes it back and says that truth is a perverse form of exclusion. In the book "Microphysics of Power", Foucault is already announcing that truth is compromised and is a form of exclusion.

Does this help us to assimilate and equalize post-truths? I am not sure. If we think that the past is never at peace, nor could it be because the present produces and reproduces the past, we should review it in light of our present. This is what Michiko Kakutani is doing by saying that there is a responsibility of the leftist intelligentsia of the 1960s and 1970s. Thomas Kuhn himself says that these are historically constitutive paradigms. If you break the paradigm, this truth crumbles. But for what I replace it? And how do I replace it? Does recognizing that a certain truth is the product of a whole of power relations lead me to the equivalence of these different knowledge or not?

Is the production of democratically founded knowledge possible? I don't know. Foucault would say no, even if there are discourses and counter-discourses, powers and counterpowers, and information and knowledge are born of this tension. Jacques Rancière, who was very close to Foucault, says there is a sharing, a "partage" in French. He says that it is not about truth and post-truth, but an attitude of breaking the oneness of meaning of a particular speech of knowledge, and disputing the meaning of the world.

Now, to dispute the meaning of the world is one thing, and to assume the equivalence of all these forms of knowledge is something else, I believe. And I believe that because otherwise I would leave university, and stop writing and thinking. I still believe it makes a lot of sense to be here, and provoke, instigate, break, share, dispute. Because that makes a lot of sense against misinformation. It makes perfect sense to publicize academic production to dispute the meaning of the world, as Rancière would say, because I am absolutely sure that this is what it is all about. That is, the most conservative and backward forces are vying for the meaning of the world with us. And they cannot be left unanswered.

One of the weapons these forces have is the weapon of equivalence. What that lady said to Esther Solano — "Why would I believe you? I prefer to believe the pastor of my church because he is closest to me" — follows a logic that is the reverse of public space. It is not of the order of citizenship, but of the order of blood. It is Antigone and not Creon. It is not the city, it's the blood. This opens a dangerous door that leads us down a path we already know. When one begins to speak of the proximity of the blood, race purity, and to identify the inner enemies too easily, one opens the way for the use of real weapons to exterminate the differences.

**MT:** Cibele, let me include in our conversation another form of information construction that has something to do with this topic, even though it deals with some other concepts, such as the construction of citizenship and a place of speech. It is the insurgent production of data, in bottom-up actions, which has been widely discussed even as an act of resistance, as another possibility to produce and build knowledge collectively and communally, with a minimum of external control.

**CR:** I think there is a dispute over the possibilities of networking. It is possible to think, for example, the production of independent media, which was and is crucial, because it uses a very interesting set of data scraping procedures obtained through networks. This media has access to another kind of data, obtained in the underground rivers of the Internet, which allows producing another kind of knowledge.

In the Brazilian presidential elections of 2018, sociologist Adalberto Moreira Cardoso researched on political polarization in Brazil's metropolitan regions. He used Facebook to map and work information about the middle classes. He only used Facebook, and the result was amazing. In the same elections, I monitored the Supreme Electoral Court data, by breaking units. I did not want the votes by state, but by the municipality. By breaking down the state of Paraná data, which was released as having voted entirely for Bolsonaro, I was able to see if this was the choice of the entire state or just zones. Interestingly, even with a minimum knowledge of computer science and how to search the network, I could see that several zones in the state of Paraná did not choose Bolsonaro.

And what were those zones? These were areas where the Landless Workers Movement had a significant presence. Does that change anything? Yes, this alters a reading. If we have this instrumentation, we can get countless types of data because we are all connected. The middle classes are connected, the poor are connected, as are the Landless Workers Movement, the Homeless Workers Movement, and so many others.

Therefore, if we go beyond the most consolidated and visible layer of this information, and work with other types of data collection, it is possible to achieve unimaginable things. This way one can get a lot of quantitative data, so perhaps qualitative research is needed to better understand the meaning of practices and actions. Qualitative face-to-face research is almost irreplaceable because what the researcher perceives, he perceives with great wealth. But this does not mean that research via digital media is not precious. It can change the way we do social science today, even though I do not think we can reduce everything to the digital dimension.

It is my feeling that we still have a level of unmediated personal relationships and practices that must be understood in friction. We can go digital, but I think the hybrid dimension is very important. Digital research provides a body of data, but the meaning of this data needs to be excavated in a more face-to-face, less digitally mediated reality — which is also mediated but to a lesser extent.

Comparing the mapping of votes with the posts on Facebook in the 2018 elections, it was clear that the friction relationship between them may be more interesting than just either Facebook data or vote data. Because there is a discourse, a whole of representations, a whole of images, of space-time shortening happening in this relationship. This does not nullify the importance of mapping the vote, and the vote does not nullify what happened, because it is an event in this discursive sphere of representations and symbolic struggle. One thing does not nullify the other one, and the friction between them, the tension, the congruence, or the incongruity, is a matter of research that enriches me, and does not impoverish me.

**MT:** You mentioned two ways, or two principles, of information construction. One is voluntary when people went to the polls and voted, and the other one is involuntary when they posted on Facebook and their data was extracted by third parties. This makes me think of a fundamental issue which is the construction of information "despite". I mean an unauthorized form of information construction, but it ends up biasing behaviors, worldviews, as it induces constructions of other natures. I approach this idea by thinking of the processes in which the construction of information takes place through a compulsory assignment of data. An example is the subway's face or magnetic card recognition system, where the user is required to be mapped and recognized by the system. If you do not give in this data, you will not be allowed to use a public system. And yet we have the right to use it even without giving in data.

**CR:** This question of voluntary and involuntary is at the beginning of the work of anthropologists. The first chapter of an anthropology thesis is about the author. His whole process of arrival in the field, what he felt, the relationships he started, and how, all this is critical to understanding what kind of information he was able to build. This is a very interesting ethnographic dimension, because the researcher builds information from the place and from himself, and is affected by it. This is a classic issue in ethnography.

But there is something else, which is the way we become information. In a thousand and one ways. By shopping over the Internet, we become a marketable set of information. We are all negotiable information. This information, which makes up big data, is a valuable commodity. Someone becomes the owner of this information, whether authorized or not. I think this is part of a very contemporary form of financialized capitalism, as this information is financial assets, and they are therefore traded.

On the other hand, information produces preference, taste, behavior. There is research showing the illegitimacy of the results of the 2018 Brazilian election due to the actions of companies that were paid to spread fake news via Whatsapp. These are the algorithms producing bubbles. That is, they are not limited to understanding preferences and acting on those preferences, but they also produce preferences, facts, and behaviors. Here again, we have this dimension, which I will call dialectic, in which a subject produces information and information produces a subject. And this is strictly new.

This is very different from the theory of ideology, the fetish theory because it is not simply a representation of the world, but a practice. It is a concrete possibility of producing behavior. Who produces it? Who is the subject? This question we do not usually ask ourselves. We treat information as if it were self-produced or self-propagating. But there are subjects. They are invisible, but they are there.

This new way of producing information is not academic, it is not common sense, nor is it "Olavo-de-Carvalho". But about all the genetic information, biotechnology, behaviors, we need to ask ourselves "who has access to all this?" and "who produces those behaviors?". These are modes of production that relate to a kind of neoliberal rationality, in the sense of Dardot and Laval, because these companies do not produce objects but big data, and these data and information are financial assets. This worries me a lot because it reconfigures the relationships between companies, information, subjects, and behaviors.

**MT:** Sociologist Sérgio Amadeu da Silveira has a study that addresses this issue, in which he builds a hypothesis that seems very plausible to me. He perceives this data collection from populations of the global South as a kind of contemporary extractivism. Data is collected locally by companies and the state, which do not have the technical capacity to process it. They transfer this processing to large

international corporations in the midst of doubtful technology partnerships. This data will make up the astronomical volume of data needed to feed the huge databases of artificial intelligence companies. It is a flow that reinforces and repeats a historical process that, since the colony period, has extracted riches from the South towards the North of the planet. How do you see it?

**CR:** The way to prevent this would be decolonization. But this is almost impossible because, in order for this process to be decolonized, we must have access to and mastery of technical and technological production. This is something that we, in the South, clearly do not have. Seeking this decoloniality in history, for example in anti-colonial movements, we will realize that this asymmetry of the world dates from the eighteenth century. If before that there was a division between metropolises and colonies, in the eighteenth century the world has been divided between industrialized and non-industrialized countries, and later between countries that have access to technological production and those that do not. This culminates today in a major disinvestment movement in research and knowledge production, and in the attempt to transform the Brazilian economy into an agrarian economy without value-added. This is what it is about, and this phenomenon does not only occur in Brazil but throughout Latin America. In parallel, there is a de facto extraction of physical mineral wealth, absolutely potentiated.

In response, it may be necessary to create a possibility for communication and dissemination of information production independently of large data mining and communication companies. But this is difficult, almost impossible. Our university, for instance, has joined the Google system. This company now has direct and immediate access to everything we do here. So I think Sérgio Amadeu is right because, in a way, our colonial past remains perpetuated. It is redesigned, metamorphosed, modulated but perpetuated. How can we constitute independent media beyond the forms of disclosure? Where to go through? We don't know but we have to think about it. But what I know is that science and scientific production are part of this resistance movement. And I also realize that there is a resistance movement that goes through the online networks, which reminds us that we cannot do without the networks.

In Brazil, during the military dictatorship, the resistance was largely organized around militancy in clandestine organizations. People had fictitious names and circulated in a secret system that was based on secrecy. This would not be possible today, with the present degree of transparency traps, and such immediate and instantaneous communication that makes secrecy impossible. Zygmunt Bauman says that the ultimate crisis of modernity occurred when microphones were placed in the confessionals, that is, from the moment when there is no more difference between intimacy and publicity. I think this is exactly what is happening today. And that's why it is so hard to do social science today. Because the classic parameters, which framed a set of concepts, simply disappeared.

Recently, I taught a course with Christian Azaís based on the notion of gray zones, which considers that the binary has lost its meaning. Those frames dissolved and the gray zone issue became a challenge. The challenge is even cognitive because such zones refer to what is neither formal nor informal, neither legal nor illegal, neither public nor private. How to deal with it? The classical analytical categories do not account for gray zones.

**MT:** When I think of these forms of resistance in contemporary times, what strikes me is the contrast between, on the one hand, the conservative forces' use of information and communication technologies – no doubt utterly spurious by spreading fake news and hate discourses – and, on the other hand, the still quite conventional left-wing strategies to counter these attacks and place themselves in disputed territories. By publicizing secrets via networks, Snowden, Assange, and The Intercept help us think of new ways of acting supported by digital technologies, that might better match today's world and new ways of dealing with information. Resistance practices such as stoppages, pickets and street demonstrations, which are unquestionably still valid, powerful and necessary, may perhaps be expanded and rethought.

**CR:** I think we will have to invent. I think we are already making it up and in a very potent way. One manifestation that has greatly impressed me was that of the #elenão in September 2018, against Bolsonaro's candidacy. The demonstration was convened mainly by the black feminist movement, and it was one of the biggest demonstrations I have ever seen in the Batata Square, in the city of Sao Paulo. It had dimensions that combined the summonses and instructions posted on online networks, and face-to-face summonses. When looking at such a manifestation, it is impossible not to see strength. Participants ranged from small collectives to large political parties and trade unions, combining in a process that took place simultaneously on the streets and via online networks, where information was produced. An unimaginably large manifestation took place precisely because there is no secret anymore.

On the other hand, we have to think very seriously about how these messages of hatred and discrimination have been exchanged by Whatsapp. Many go beyond the limit of legality, they are crimes that can be punished with imprisonment. But who is responsible for that? There is a decrease in responsibility nowadays. You can invent whatever you want and spread it to anyone you want. There are no filters. And even from a legal regulatory framework perspective, the boundaries go gray.

The role of the academy is to think about it, to try to understand it. We have to seriously think about it, otherwise, we can not get out of this imbroglio. We are treated like a bubble, one more bubble, and we must to get out of that bubble, speak, write, talk, expose ourselves and our capabilities. We have been turned into an internal enemy of society, and curiously a part of the criminal groups are the internal friends. This reversal points to the absolute loss of judgment criteria that puts us on the level of what Hannah Arendt once called the banality of evil. And we need to have it as a horizon. It is difficult but necessary.

I always bet a lot on the university. Perhaps what we are doing here is just the intention of planting seeds, it may just be letters to the sea. But we are vying for a place we are trying to preserve, in a world that is reducing the production of knowledge to nothing.

The production of technology cannot be separated from knowledge production. Although at varying levels, the production of many types of technologies that allow us, for example, to avoid such data bleeding, implies research. It implies knowledge production, investment, and autonomy. And we can not give that up, at least as a horizon.

---

**1** Olavo de Carvalho is the chief intellectual mentor of the Bolsonaro government supporters.