

V!RUS13

para tempos difíceis
Boas notícias
Good news
for hard times

ano 2016 year
semestre 2 semester

revista do nomads.usp | nomads.usp journal
issn:2175.974x | CC BY - NC
DOI 10.4237/virus_journal

FORTRESSES OF THOUGHT CAN NOT BE DESTROYED BY BOMBS

Sérgio Amadeu da Silveira
Marcelo Tramontano

How to quote this text: Silveira, S. A.; Tramontano, M., 2016. Fortresses of thought cannot be destroyed by bombs. *V!RUS*, [e-journal] 13. Available at: <<http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/virus13/?sec=2&item=1&lang=en>>. [Accessed 00 Month 0000].

Sérgio Amadeu da Silveira is Doctor in Political Sciences and Professor Doctor at the Federal University of ABC, Sao Paulo, where he coordinates the research group Digital culture and Sharing networks. He has been president of the National Institute of Information Technology and a member of the Brazilian Internet Manager Committee. He studies relations between communication and technology, societies of control and privacy, collaborative practices on Internet, and the Theory of Intangible Assets Property.

Marcelo Tramontano is Doctor and Livre-Docente in Architecture and Urbanism, with a Post-Doctor degree in Architecture and Digital Media. He is Associate Professor and researcher at the Institute of Architecture and Urbanism of the University of Sao Paulo (IAU-USP), where he coordinates the Center for Interactive Living Studies, Nomads.usp. He is the Editor-in-chief of V!RUS journal.

Marcelo Tramontano: Sérgio, what is news?

Sergio Amadeu da Silveira: The news idea is born closely linked to the idea of press, simultaneously to the emergence of press in modern times. Press, for its part, is fundamental to mass society and to the emergence of national states. The news is thus the production of information held by someone. In general, in mass-media-dominated societies, news was produced by corporations that tried to prioritize some information rather than others. They decided what society should know and discuss. This is news.

The idea of news has being changed along with the development of online social networks. Indeed, even before that, when the Internet emerges, there was a reversal of the information flow. Those who once could have channels to speak broadly, such as radio, television, printed newspapers, go to compete with the Internet as a distributed network, that allows people also to create their own news. The most difficult thing, on the Internet, is not to turn a fact into news. The hard part is not to talk, not posting a video, is not to argue. The most difficult thing is to be heard, to be seen. We move then from an economy of dissemination and diffusion to an economy



of attention. The Internet reverses the game. Many begin to dispute the possibility of creating news. Of course we are not naive to think that big corporations which already existed in the industrial world did not reposition themselves, penetrating the networks and also managing to guide them more than a common citizen can do. There is a very large asymmetry in the distribution of information, although there has been a reversal of the informational ecosystem with the emergence of the Internet.

On the other hand, the mainstream media, ie. the great power groups, are no longer as easy to stifle and control information as they were in the industrial world, a world controlled by mass media. They now have to face a multitude of collectives, messages, and at any time an ordinary person or a small group can bring information that becomes news and ends up gaining huge impact on digital networks. Not even the mighty North-american State managed to prevent a small group of hackers, journalists and activists gathered around Wikileaks from releasing important documents that unmasked the official speech of the world's most powerful State. We thus have a news production game today on the Internet, much more rich and diverse than before, but that did not destroy power asymmetries.

In the universe of blogs, for example, before the emergence of some social networks, and particularly Facebook, the game was more democratizing and less controlled than the news production within these networks. Why? Because Facebook effectively controls information display. To reach the broader audience they want to reach, people have to rely on the benevolence of Facebook algorithms or have to pay for its service. Thus, within the Internet, which is a distributed network, this social network verticalizes again information flows. It returns to Capital the great power this latter had in the mass media world, in which large corporations with a huge amount of financial resources could make advertisements, placements, and buy newspaper editions.

In the case of Facebook, it is clear that large economic groups, big corporations, politicians with a lot of money, now pay for more information views. In this new terrain of social networks where news is produced, released, disseminated and shared, Facebook is guided by completely obscure criteria, by algorithms settings that we do not control, run by a private group that controls the platform where debates widely occur and information is disseminated. Today, news is disputed on the Internet, so the game has become more complex. As several groups dispute their truths in the network, including what to report and from what angle to report, we may have the feeling there are very intense clashes that did not exist before.

In a world dominated by mass communication, such sharp confrontations were actually not visible, as few people had the power of speech as they do today. We can not be romantic and find, as some want, that before the Internet there was a Habermasian debate, aimed at understanding, and that such debate has ceased to exist. In the mass media world there was no debate, or there was only consented debate. Now there are confrontations, or little debate and a lot of confrontation. But we must not therefore think that only hatred prevails in this present reality. We realize, yes, that we are living in a period in which values that many believed to be consolidated in society, in fact are not. And it is good to make that clear. I think it is extremely positive to realize that we still have much to advance in the so-called

defense of diversity, tolerance, and respect for the other. Tolerance and respect for other's opinion are key to establishing a democratic society, focused on diversity and not in a single way of thinking.

On the other hand, we are living in parallel the worship of the so-called single thought (*pensée unique*) and exceptional forms of power. Long ago, Italian theorist and philosopher Giorgio Agamben said we were living a new paradigm of government based on the exception. In his book "State of Exception," he begins by discussing September 11, and then comes to the *homo sacer*, a strange figure existing in Ancient Rome. He sees this figure arise all the time in our current daily life in various regions of the world. Agamben believes such figure is the exception and that, to defend the law, one must always violate it. To defend the constitution, to defend the good, the righteous, some believe that the government has to act exceptionally. This logic becomes a widely supported paradigm of government. We find that this State of exception logic gains strength in a particular thought that we currently have in Brazil - a kind of neo-fascism - and we realize that we never looked with due attention to a certain entertainment speech based on the crime spectacularization. Such discourse exaggerates the conflicts that occur in our society, supported by the understanding that a conflict is absurd and, therefore, if there is conflict, there is crime. We have to stop it.

There is a profusion of television shows on police violence that worship the logic of exception. "The law aims to defend bandits." This thought is being built since long time. Its aesthetic is of violence, of a police State, and every aesthetic carries values and brings ethics. Ethics such shows worship is completely totalitarian. It ignores conflicts, social confrontations, and is unaware of the matrices leading to clashes. It simplifies solutions, as if the cause of the existence of criminals was the fact that the police does not act with due rigor. That would mean that if we act with due rigor, there will be no more crime. Such simplistic logics proliferate along with societal values we also failed to consider in our reflections. Several scholars even considered them, but they stayed on the sidelines of the great social sciences philosophical debate, on the issue of our country having lived 400 years of slavery during its little more than 500 years. This issue left deep marks on our society, which we did not tackle.

During most of the twentieth century, we lived in our country with authoritarian regimes, coups and dictatorships, and now, in the 21st century, we have to face a new coup. Some say that what we are living is not a coup, because there is no military participation. Military for what? Military do not have to put tanks on the streets: police are already military. We have never faced the militarization that came from the military dictatorship, which remained in the streets dealing with peripheral areas as occupation areas, as if no population lived there but criminals covered in the slums, houses and tenements. This is how those policemen reason. No wonder they call their vehicles with four heavily armed men "tactical unit", ROTA, or something like that. They act as occupying forces in the peripheral areas. At no time this is police. Police is a civil activity, a defense activity of society, it is an activity that even faced controversy to settle in London, for example. There is, in short, a whole debate about what a police is. But in Brazil such debate does not exist. Police here is indeed an

occupation troop. If it has been necessary to put tanks on the streets in 1964, to spread the strength of militarism, it is enough today to put ROTA on the streets.

The governor of Sao Paulo sends the police on the streets to attack young students, and this creates a very interesting situation. Some judges did not allow the police to expel adolescents under the age of 18 from [public primary and secondary] occupied schools. In order to prevent such judicial orders from being issued, which would disrupt the government plans to close schools, the governor named a judge his Secretary of Education, a former judge of the Sao Paulo Superior Court. Why did he do it? Precisely because his political party, which organizes the main action of total market supremacy, of mercantilist totalitarianism today in Brazil, brings a new face of the old authoritarianism. They consider social issues as a case of police. All of this is rooted in societal values that we have not reviewed.

Of course we are living a conservative wave all over the world. US alternatives were not good: either Donald Trump or Hillary Clinton. The good, democratic alternative they had, to the left, failed to win the primaries. In Spain, we had a very great hope in the *Podemos* party but actually they have not been able to move forward as we believed they would. Right wing itself is being reorganized granting *Ciudadanos* and other groups a new face that also contend a new discourse. But we know that this new discourse is actually the old totalizing message. Worldwide, there has been a resurgence of anti-democratic values, let's say it this way. Therefore, there is no great surprise in the assertion that what we are experiencing in Brazil is the rebirth of discourses that may not even need to be reborn, since they were all the time with us. Our economically dominant classes - the middle and upper-middle classes - can not cope with diversity for a long time. They do not want rights, but privileges.

Marcelo Tramontano: There is, however, a certain surprise in the process you describe which resulted in a coup d'état this year in Brazil. I mean the support this coup received from historically oppressed social groups, including many residents of poor neighborhoods. On the other hand, there was - and there is - manipulation in the news construction and information dissemination by large communications companies in order to shape opinions, discredit opponents and induce public actions. Do you see a connection between these two facts?

Sérgio Amadeu da Silveira: Most of the population of peripheral areas did not get involved with what we are describing as a coup. What really happened was mostly a manifestation of the middle strata. At least in the places I accompanied it, such as Sao Paulo, Belo Horizonte and Rio de Janeiro, mobilization was fundamentally of the middle and upper middle classes. However, it is equally surprising that middle strata have adhered to this. Among the causes of this adherence, I see the fact that democratic values, coexistence with diversity, acceptance that work is noble and must be respected, even for those who perform manual labor, have not been very well incorporated by these social groups. They defend the idea of the "farmer house against the slave quarters", and that those who work do not deserve respect. The ennobling work discourse is only used in a mythical way. In everyday life, elites and middle classes just do not accept basic workers' rights.

Take the great turnaround in 2012 or 2013, when more concrete rights were granted to domestic workers in Brazil. It was a turning point for the middle class. Many people were outraged as they had that aristocratic understanding: "I belong to a certain social stratum, I pay someone as a servant, so we do not have a full working relationship: she does favors, I do favors." According to this way of thinking, domestic employer sees himself as superior to the maid and considers the fact of "even letting that person sleep in my house" is a concession. These are very strong things. When one start changing a country social structures, those middle classes that have rebelled against the minimum income distribution that took place in the country are affected. A little income distribution in a very short time period.

On the other hand, we saw a very high penetration of the idea, widely held by the Lula government itself, that we must include more segments of the population in consumer practices. In other words, market remained the epicenter of society. Important cultural movements were organized in the peripheries, but in a certain way they go in the same sense of market supremacy. For example, the ostentatious funk movement, which is the cult of money and consumerism. Some researchers see this movement in a positive perspective, periphery also claiming its rights. I tend to think that they do not exactly want rights, but money to consume. And the logic of consumption is not based on rights, but on merchandise, on purchasing power. One might ask: "But is this not the same than the union struggle?" Of course not! In the union struggle we seek reasonable remuneration rights so that all of us in our class can reach decent living standards, better living and working conditions. Ostentatious funk worships exacerbated individualism that believes in total power of money. This logic is not very positive for those who argue that we need to overcome adversity in our country, that we must have solidarity, that the market is not everything, and that not all logic should move to the competition context. Worshipping collaboration and sharing is also necessary.

I think many segments that joined the wave created by the Conservatives and strong media will quickly wear and gradually straying from it, as their living conditions will worsen. But today in the peripheries, organized leftists political work no longer exists. In the case of Sao Paulo, the discipline is imposed by the PCC [First Command of the Capital, criminal organization], which actually does small causes justice in peripheral neighborhoods. There are no more [catholic] basic ecclesial communities, but evangelical churches. These have a political control relationship with their faithful that Catholic Church never had. No confrontation of values there. It exists in the students movement of young people who are occupying schools, the movement for housing, even though they need to move forward harder.

Marcelo Tramontano: Let us dig that a bit deeper. On the one hand, for decades and particularly in Brazil, corporate press - television, printed, radio - has played a very important role in the constitution of the so-called public opinion. Mass communication, a "one-to-many" mode of communication, contrasts with distributed online communication "from many to many", which can be more democratic. However, State and its executive, legislative and judicial spheres agents has also increasingly used online networks seeking to shape public opinion.

Sérgio Amadeu da Silveira: My feeling is that we are experiencing a gathering of those who have the vocation to work for social change. We see, on the one hand, an offensive of the most reactionary sectors that managed to rally the middle class. Such sectors have great strength. They have extensively used techniques of [social online] networks, many advertising resources, and network mobilization languages. This is rather curious because some people had the illusion that digital networks were essentially collaborative, always in the democratic sense. This is not true. Online networks have been flooded by corporations and by single thought. We have no illusions about that: online networks are also a territory of the Capital.

Nevertheless, networks allowed the emergence of several rebel collectives, acting in the exercise of counter-power, confronting the State-established regimes of truth. But this has been done in an ambivalent environment with ambivalent technologies. We have, therefore, a confrontation in which traditional Left members realize only now they must be prepared for a discursive struggle of great intensity. A continuous clash, as it happens in the networks. What consolidates the current coup in Brazil is a merger between the judiciary - which in Brazil has long belonged to the colonels, fazendeiros children, bankers children, i.e. the elite of the elite - with a media operation. Without creating a thesis as of the domain of fact, without making a selection of what to look at and not to look at, without therefore promoting a selective posture, it would not be possible to implement all the operation that mobilized much of the country against an established government. It would not be possible to prevent population from rebelling in the streets, in a massive way, in favor of a government being deposed.

Because, in fact, the mobilizations of the majority of the population were of opinion. There was no massive outrage against the fraudulent mechanism they produced to overthrow the government. There was no indignation that put this attitude into question. A court-media operation was carried out, which included the rigging of the judiciary by the political group that controls the State of São Paulo, the Public Prosecutor's Office and the main positions of the judiciary in Brasilia. It included the [Supreme Court Judge] Gilmar Mendes, who, by mastering that machine, makes politics through the Judiciary. Brazil is one of the few countries in the world where judges are famous as political personalities. This means the bankruptcy of the democratic system. In the Judiciary, the judges must speak through the proceedings and the process. Not here: the prosecutor - who is not part of the Judiciary but plays an essential role in Justice - produces and conveys a motivational slide set [against a political opponent, the former President Lula] that does not contain a single concrete evidence. That prosecutor did not do it focusing on the case, and serious lawyers say it was a provocation. The slides set presented by [prosecutor] Dallagnol in Curitiba to demonstrate that the former president Lula was head of a gang immediately became a meme and even stimulated the emergence of similar ironic slides sets on social networks. Indeed, it was amazing to see, once again, humor being used as a political weapon in social networks. The prosecutor did not present any evidence because he did not want to speak to the process: he wanted to talk to the Globo television network. This is so true that Globo network interrupted its normal shows schedule to give voice to the promoter in his theatrical act.

What has been proven against the alleged "chief of the gang" [former president Lula]? He had his fiscal secrecy broken, his privacy was invaded and, as we have seen, only were found a countryhouse that is not his, an apartment that he was going to buy - but eventually he didn't - and a cheap metal boat. This articulation is typical of the dominant Brazilian strata. They have already done so in the coup of the Estado Novo, when Getúlio Vargas imposed a dictatorship and almost decided to support the Axis and the Nazism [in World War II]. We have a bad history with these elites. There they are today, in this perfumed boutique fascism, in which intellectuals such as [former president] Fernando Henrique Cardoso intend to produce a coup within the coup. Part of this coup perpetrators seem to will to bring Fernando Henrique Cardoso back to the presidency, now indirectly elected by the National Congress, to accomplish what is really their project: to be the vanguard of market totalitarianism.

I will better explain this expression. In the 1980s and 1990s, the world in general and Brazil in particular had highly profitable economic sectors, formed and maintained by the State: the telecommunications, energy, and transportation sectors. These three sectors are highly profitable to this day, and have been withdrawn from the State. The neoliberal argument was: "we have to get these sectors out of the state, because the state must be minimal and should not face financial loss". But these sectors were removed from the State's control and it did not downsized. Their percentages in relation to GDP remained roughly the same. What happened? Why was privatization necessary? Because Capital has an expansive tendency, it needs to reproduce more and more strongly, and the financial sectors have bet heavily on energy and telecommunications. Which frontier of privatization can now be highly profitable? The health and welfare sectors and also education, if the public education sector is dismantled. Their reasoning is: "After all, why keep funding federal universities if we can buy places in private structures of Kroton [educational] systems, as desires Mr. [Jorge Paulo] Lemann?". Neoliberals effectively target these sectors, no need to mention Social Security. By blasting off welfare system, they get a sector where they can profit enormously. And the State stands behind them, as it does anywhere in the world: when such companies break down, State comes to the rescue. Indeed, as several researchers say, the minimum state is the state of maximum support for capital.

This policy is implemented against those who want to distribute income. Someone living in a small town in the interior of Sao Paulo state, which is a well-developed state, whose father earns, let' say, a minimum wage or is a tiller. This person studies in a public rural school and has little prospect of social mobility. The school is underqualified, teachers' wages are low, and still the governor wants to close schools. The neoliberal Sao Paulo State's Governor does not pay decent wages to elementary school teachers and says that salary is not important - salary is only important for him, his family, for judges and capitalists, but for teachers, salary is not important. See the irony. This boy, this girl, who lives in the richest state in Brazil, has a little auspicious future because he or she will have no chance. Even if they do, the opportunities are not equal for everyone because there is a violent funnel. It happens that distributive policies, which also aim to give new subjective possibilities to young people, need to be built with the State too. The minimal state supporting the maximum market is against this. Therefore, it needs boutique fascists who are



operating this action against the creative awakening of our population. They act against collaborative practices that can build another kind of future, and against the search for new forms of coexistence. There they are, with this true noopolitics, in the words of Maurizio Lazzarato.

They no longer want to just control the body. They have not only a biopolitics that states have been doing since the nineteenth century. Now they have a policy for thought. And, according to this policy for thought, dissense and debate against it should be criminalized. No wonder that right-wing deputies support the project known as "School with no party," because they believe the debate must be demonized. Diversity is not good for the total market. The total market, in the words of Gilles Deleuze, is a matrix of thought, an axiomatics of Capital and we are living it. We have been experiencing this axiomatics since long time, but now we see its expansion. And it is very interesting to realize that it takes place on the social networking platform as well.

Authors like Guy Debord must be updated, as he dealt with the society of the spectacle, a visual society. What, in the end, was the master cog of spectacularization? In my view, it was the exaggerated mercantilization that Debord already perceived in the 1960s, imagine now! The Internet did not reduce the society of the spectacle: it expanded spectacularization. It strikes at subjectivities in a brutal way. As soon as we meet someone today, let's go to Facebook to see that person's profile. If she has no Facebook profile, neither Instagram nor Twitter, we already think she's a CIA agent, because she does not exist, she's a robot! This situation represents a pressure which is different from the Big Brother totalitarianism, because here it is a distributed totalitarianism. This is the question we are facing today and we need to confront.

On the other hand, a great wave of new perceptions has moved us. This is really good. Of course, we will suffer a lot, and the populations at risk, more impoverished, will also suffer greatly. But I think we will have to make profound changes in our country. We can no longer ignore changes in values, as we ignored changes in the ideas of rights, of respect. Nor have we eliminated the military police. I was in a demonstration recently where people were shouting, "It's not over / It's going to end / I want the end of the Military Police." Those parts of the population that do not have an approach to this logic may find that those demonstrators are against the police, since the police, for them, are the Military Police. They are actually saying that they are against the militarization of the police, not against the police. But this idea is not popular, people seemed uncomfortable when the protesters sang it. Why? Because we did not cultivate the idea that, in order to comply with the law, the police officer does not have to break the law. To fulfill the constitution, we do not have to torture people.

We can not accept this American logic of the state of exception. It is not only American, but that's where it is most intense. Nor can we accept extermination algorithms. They are in the drones [in USA], but here they are part of the imagery of many of the people who watch violence shows in the afternoon on television. Broadcasters should be sued for every absurdity the presenter and the anchor say. May a judge say that fundamental rights are not absolute? This is his opinion, but then I also want to give my own: fundamental rights are absolute, for sure. Nothing

can suppress them, but this judge says otherwise. He does what he wants because he has a pen in hand and a court above him that is articulating a coup in Brazil and gives him support. What is happening is an freak, and we will have to deal with it all. We will have to deal with the situation of black people in Brazil, and the situation of women. The great surprise, the great novelty in the midst of this whole tragedy, is that the three main centers of resistance we have seen on the streets are the feminist movements, the anti-racist movements and the youth movements that occupied schools in defense of Education. Among those three movements, those who first rose up against the narrow-minded right-wing in Sao Paulo were feminists. This is another logic that will profoundly change the values of our society. This is good news!

Marcelo Tramontano: Debate criminalization means, ultimately, criminalizing the production of knowledge and the exercise of free thought. Various spaces provided by the Internet - among them social networks, but not only - have constituted an agora where this exercise occurs, albeit often guided by the corporate press and agents of the State, and by groups and individuals with experiences and opinions absolutely varied. How the criminalization of the debate in this agora has been using militarizing strategies?

Sérgio Amadeu da Silveira: We are experiencing today a process of general militarization of the Internet. The Internet is monitored all the time through the great computing power of some agencies, such as the NSA [National Security Agency, of USA]. This agency considers us all as suspected of sympathizing with the enemies of American power expansion. Several liberal theorists, such as Joseph Nye Jr., and even US State Department theorists such as [John] Arquilla and [David] Ronfeldt say that, especially after 9/11, it is necessary to change the USA strategy of action. And they have changed it: the CIA has lost strength, the NSA has gained strength, it received more resources, and espionage, which was once focused on some individuals in some groups, is now massive on the network. It is done, for example, through the use of data mining, as [Edward] Snowden showed us in June 2013. In other words, this militarization aims at maintaining a global power scheme, that is the question. It must be made clear that, in order to maintain this scheme, the existence of an enemy is fundamental. The US security funds are equivalent to the Brazilian GDP. What's all this for? Because, supposedly, there is an enemy, a beast, a world canis, a brutal enemy that needs to be faced and which is everywhere, especially now with this distributed network.

Joseph Nye Jr. says that the power of monitoring the Internet owned by nation states is far less than the power they have to watch over the seas, airs and land. He says that [in the physical world] they have such power, but, on the Internet, they do not. Then comes a group like Wikileaks and puts that power in crisis. Security agencies operate through farces. Julien Assange is barred from leaving the Embassy of Ecuador in London because he is accused of a sex crime in Sweden. If he steps in a Swedish airport, extradition agreements [between Sweden and the US] take him to the US. The whole time we are watching a cynical game, the same cynicism that can be seen in Brazil of the coup. The international press has said that in Brazil, politicians wallowing in the mud of corruption say they are cleaning the country. This is absurd!



Cynicism is part of the politics we are experiencing today in Brazil, even though this politics of cynicism is not only Brazilian. Several of its components are found here, such as spectacularization, the totalizing market and militarization. Throughout the administration [of the former president] Lula, the military police sailed without any restriction because unfortunately it was not important for the Workers' Party to stir deeply in the machine of the repression, which comes from the military dictatorship. It was not that important to work on human rights, whose values should have been worked out. Those who dealt with values were considered silly, a minor figure, a naive. Now we can see the result of these policies. The so-called organized crime law and anti-terrorism law, misplaced and exaggerated, were projects of the Workers' Party under [President] Dilma's government. The ongoing coup does not break a constitutional structure and creates institutional acts because it does not have to do that. It is enough that the Federal Supreme Court, in breach of our Constitution, says that it considers a case passed and tried after the second sentence. Ready. They do not even turn red when they do that!

Marcelo Tramontano: Taking stock of all the issues you have pointed out, the achievements of Brazil before the coup, and also spaces of resistance that must be preserved, which must be fought: which of these issues, achievements and spaces of resistance could we consider good news for these hard times?

Sérgio Amadeu da Silveira: From the point of view of the mobilization of society, I think we have a very great advance. In movements that defend their sexual orientation, in anti-racist movements, in the various feminist movements. We also have a new youth movement. And we have a profusion of collective mobilizations that use digital technologies, which we could designate as hackers, makers, and that tend to expand in the coming periods. The more burly the state, the more it makes the market invade privacy, the more resistance there will be. I believe very much in the mobilizations that are happening in every corner of Brazil. There is a new movement on the left, also appearing in communications. Free journalists, Midia Ninja, many collectives as A Ponte among others begin to dispute narratives within the society. I am talking about several movements that represent a refreshing aeration. I see the possibility of a wide mobilization we have never been able to do before, in defense of the freedom of communication and the right to communicate.

I also think that there will be a series of remixing and mergers of critical thinking, which will have to change due to this new situation. We will discover new possibilities, new logics, because the very concepts we work with need to be updated in the world we are living in. To face smart city projects, we need city projects that respect people's rights. We do not yet have the qualification of these names, nor we have new concepts. But I believe they must be built. An evolution is underway in several places which will be concluded somehow. Resistance will increase. Critical thinking will invigorate. On the other hand, certain things that seemed old to us are not old at all. The concentration of income in the world has never been so great. This brings us to the question of equity thinking, justice for equity, as a crucial element along with freedom. Freedom, close to equity, is the great novelty that we are going to have to accomplish in the near future. We have to think hard and act a lot.



Marcelo Tramontano: Finally, a question about these coming times: does the future look promising to you?

Sérgio Amadeu da Silveira: The future seems promising to me, but it is a future of many battles, many defeats and many sorrows. However, we are building some fortresses of thought that, being virtual, can not be destroyed by bombs. I think this is a very big victory of those critical mobilizations, of an effectively advanced thinking. Between liberalism and totalitarian perspectives, we will find forms that are attractive to those who, in fact, can no longer live with such a unequal world and without freedom.

So I believe the future will be made of great victories, despite the defeats we are suffering now. Many of us have already discovered that from now on we are going to work strongly on values. This can not be done only with political speech, but with demonstration, with action, with hypertrophy of channels that mighty dominant people believe to work very well. In this sense I think there will be a mix of hacking with the knowledge of traditional communities, the experience of the peripheral collectives with the universities. We will have to try such mixes, such recombinant practices and thus have a different kind of future.

We can not stand still. We can no longer simply complain that "mighty dominant people have much strength." We always knew that. We deluded ourselves that this would not be true. But it is. Therefore we have to build another perspective, another technology, another project. And then, when we will have a confrontation of this size, we will achieve something better than we have today. Much better.