

## **A memória midiática: projeções e sujeições no ambiente digital**

### **The mediatic memory: projections and subjections in the digital environment**

*Diogo Andrade Bornhausen<sup>1</sup>*

*Norval Baitello Junior<sup>2</sup>*

**Resumo:** *O propósito deste estudo é investigar como a memória é assimilada e disponibilizada pelos meios digitais. Esta interrogação parte do valor que a memória possui para a cultura, para a comunicação e para o como é reconhecida na atualidade, projetada por sua totalidade e plenitude. Em razão disso, nota-se que sua presença ultrapassa a funcionalidade tecnológica cumulativa ao se formar como agenciadora das estratégias dos meios em narrativizar e gerenciar os saberes. Estas ocorrências, observadas a partir do Google e do Facebook, serão ainda vistas como determinantes para a formação deste ambiente comunicativo, que centra as experiências de memória a partir do automatismo e do excesso, o que ressignifica suas compreensões coletivas e subjetivas, principalmente.*

**Palavras-Chave:** *memória midiática; memória no Google; memória no Facebook*

**Abstract:** *The purpose of this study is to investigate how memory is assimilated and made available by digital means. This interrogation starts from the value that memory has for culture and for communication as it is recognized today, projected by its totality and fullness. Because of this, it is noted that its presence exceeds cumulative technological functionality by forming as an agent of media*

1 Fundação Armando Alvares Penteado (FAAP). São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6854-5240> E-mail: [diogobornhausen@gmail.com](mailto:diogobornhausen@gmail.com)

2 Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo (PUC). São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7814-7633> E-mail: [norvalbaitello@pucsp.br](mailto:norvalbaitello@pucsp.br)

*strategies in narrativizing and managing knowledge. These occurrences, observed from Google and Facebook, will still be seen as determinants for the formation of this communicative environment, which centers the experiences of memory from the automatism and the excess, which mainly re-signifies their collective and subjective understandings.*

**Keywords:** *mediatic memory; memory on Google; memory on Facebook*

## Introduction

The use one makes of memory, in this or  
that social or technological context,  
The genre of functioning that in  
this case characterize it,  
The idea that this forms individuals,  
Determine to a great extent the  
type of culture in question.

*Paul Zumthor*

The study presented here has as main goal to ask oneself about how the memory is manifested in contemporality, focusing on how it is assimilated and provided through digital media. That is because we observe that these technologies, in addition to their archivist resources, agglutinate deep communicational and cultural meanings that bring them a mnemonic fascination of full performance when they promise to store everything. In this study, we believe that, through reading this scenario, it is possible to elucidate the construction of a specific communicative environment, praised for their capacities, and potentially building a peculiar model of thinking. In order to do that, we propose to think of this phenomenon through the employment given to memory, of the meanings it has on culture, in the way the access and apprehension of information are measured through these systems and how the participant subjects are involved with this offer.

## Memory in Culture and Communication

Looking to understand the meanings employed to memory in digital, this research face, in its beginning, with a wide array of meanings involved with the idea of “memory”. A problem that gained growing attention nowadays in different fields of knowledge and, especially in Communication Sciences, mainly when related to the crescent development of information technologies and their storage capabilities.

Sometimes taken arbitrarily, memory can be designated *lato sensu* as “the faculty of conserving and remembering past states of conscience and everything you find associated to them” (HOUAISS, 2009) which, beyond being a conclusion, it problematizes two capabilities of the human being: the retention and recovery of content. Two categories that create an opportunity to think how the human being sought to control, conquer, recreate and unify their individual and collective past and give analytical background to the quoted difference of interpretations. In addition to that, there is the varied scientific uses of the concept - which in its diversity go from macroscopic meanings until the complete subjectivation of mnemonic systems. Beyond that, there is the wide diffusion of common sense, which increases its plurality while participating the everyday scope produced individually or socially. With that, its use, at times abusive, makes believe everything is memory, making it impossible to have any reflexive approximation.

Because of that, we will not consider it as an univocal instance of humans, but, on the contrary, as a permanent conceptual challenge. An object marked by a profound epistemological mobility that requests a look that consider it a problem, a quicksand where humans always wanted to set foot in. Proposing not to entangle in extreme concepts nor invalidating oneself in generalization, this study chooses to think memory through its conflicts and its conceptual interdisciplinarity. In order to do that, it considers a nodal point of human intellect, taking into account their neurological and psychological functions, but also extending it as a producer of cultural representations, that seek to apprehend it as a complex field tensioned by disputes of meaning. That is because, when thought through its participation in the history of thinking, it's possible to observe the meanings linked to it have always involved in different processes of cultural production and appropriation. Therefore, through memory, the human being sought to detain and conquer his world to understand himself, genealogically, on this environment he built.

In this sense, his coverage is originally allied with theogonic representations, deified in the emblematic image of Mnemosyne, mother of

Muses, recurred and manifested in Greek poetry and chanting. For this reason, memory first had its action linked to the presentification of origin and the universal knowledge, being a sacred gift reserved to few people (ELIADE, 2013; VERNANT, 2012). In this conception, the goddess meant “everything that was, everything that is, everything that will be” as Hesiod says in *Theogony* (2011, p. 32), through which Alethea (truth) was revealed. This terminology clarifies that, under the opposition prefix *a-* of the radical *léthe*, has as contrasting *par* *Lete*, name of the river that gave oblivion to the soul of the dead and to what wasn't true.

Its transcendental nature - Greek mythology attributed a superhuman role, having their power mentioned in interpretations made by Plato<sup>3</sup> and Aristotle<sup>4</sup> - allowed memory to be, in the end, assimilated by two other fundamental fields of western thinking, Judaic and Christian. Either for considering its participation in Judaic folklore, which has in it the conservation of its origin and base of union of their people (HERSCHEL, 1995) or in rites of Christian remembrance, extended to exhausting exercises of *ars memoriae* (YATES, 2007), memory detains an essential psychological function to the constitution of self, of social and of time, which always needed to be dominated and conquered, as Jean-Pierre Vernant (1990) said.

For this reason, parallel to its deification, the concept of memory was appropriated for other uses, linked to great narratives and their capabilities of creating a social unification based on the collective time, such as understood by Social Sciences in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century. In Social Sciences, with special mention to the studies of Maurice Halbwachs (1990), “collective memory” served to political and ideological constructions created about these societies. Its laicization, as Jacques Le Goff (2003) observes, has contributed for the historic scientific base,

- 3 For Plato, memory is the ability of accessing pure and absolute knowledge that the soul found amongst their many passages through the Earth and forgot to reincarnate in the moment he drank the water *Lete*, because of that, it occupies a privileged place in his Theory of Ideas.
- 4 Aristotle (2012) understandings disconnect the ideal of memory from immortality by approximating it from a limited, incomplete body. According to him, the source of knowledge is linked to the senses, your perception is linked to imagination, in which memory would respond this mental image.

controlling and fictionalizing of a past that does not stop being uncovered and evidenced.

This effort in raise a comprehension and a dominion over memory is verifiable at least in other two perspective that sought to guarantee continuity and the permanence of knowledge and social experiences. One surrounded by the variability of meanings belonging to individual memory, focus of scientific competences that thought it as base in their neurological, psychological and philosophical qualities, counterposed with other, with specific temporality, determinist and chronological, influenced by social and historic discourse.

For the first, more than a social conditioner, memory is configured as an open phenomenon in dependence to the way individual experiences are generated and managed. For this reason, mnemonic functions are allied to the body, as a place with the purpose of conserving it not only to reinvent it through its own temporality. With highlight to interpretations performed by Sigmund Freud (1996, 1989) and Henri Bergson (2011), we can observe, in its different focuses, the preoccupation in seeing that this type of memory is the result of the way reality is abstracted and articulated to images the subject narrativizes to self. It is, according to Lev Vigotsky (1987) a phenomenon resulting from an intense imaginative exercise of production - and also covering - experiences, that determine especially the way the individual apprehends his world.

When they are capable of imagining what isn't visible, when they can conceive what they personally and directly experienced, based in stories and descriptions from others, the human being is not restricted to the strict circle of their own experience, but they can go beyond their limits appropriating themselves, based on imagination, of historic and social experiences of others (VYGOTSKY, 1987, p. 21)

This variation naturally does not guarantee full conservation of information, because before it Is subject to constant re-modelings, performed both by subjective experiences and biologic change, exemplary

approached in pathology described by Alexander Luria<sup>5</sup> and Antonio Damásio<sup>6</sup>. Facing this, attempting to guarantee the perennality of information, a fourth focus about possibilities of memory was thought, serving the modern project of accumulation of knowledge. The “places of memory”, as studied by Pierre Nora (1993), represented in archives, libraries, museums and patrimonies, begin to be holder of the past of societies. Even if permeated by historical perspective, this consolidation is institutionalized as a space where, at first, would have immunity to the fallibilities that other memories had, because it would guarantee the security of information and would collaborate for its enlargement. Under the responsibility of Sciences of Information - area that comprise many other subjects like Archivology, Library Science and Museology -, which is in charge of “production, collection, organization, storage, recuperation, interpretation, transmission, transformation and utilization of information” (BORKO, 1968, p. 3), memory gains a different meaning to what History gave them. For this field, memory, contrary to other conceptions, are not explicitly referred to the past, even if it is based on the past, but rather it is an “information to be revitalized”. Past works solely to be potentialized through its various representations of informative inter-relationships, which form a fully available “informational loom”.

Although it is succinct, this presentation allows the confirmation of the information given to memory in these different stages was not linked to a unique conception, but rather a concept allied to the way it responded to the different forms societies sought to narrativize and spatialize their past. These comprehensions, fundamentally linked to the sacred, the social, to subjectivity and to archive, demonstrate its action contributed to a project which the man sought to guarantee the security

5 In one of the most emblematic cases of neurological reading, the doctor Alexander Romanovich Luria (2006) describes his patient S., who had a inexhaustible, unlimited memory, being able to remember in detail all experiences he already had.

6 Counterposed to the pathology of Luria's patient, Damásio (2000) describes the case of the patient David, who had a severe encephalitis which took his memory, making him lose the factual sense of things around him, which meant his perception of the world was established without any reference with the past.

of these pieces of information. In this process, memory went through a gradual rationalization in the way it was observed.

Under this perspective, Vilém Flusser (2014) links this passage of comprehensions to the different models of communication and thought lived by humans. According to the author, who defines communication as the “storage, processing and transmission of acquired information” (FLUSSER, 2014, p. 33), memory has a central place in communication and culture while highlighting that is in that that is observed the permanent denial of entropy.

In view thereof, memory is observed by Flusser as an ideologic field capable of indicating the different assimilations made by the man about his reality. According to him, thus, memory is divided into three main moments: the mythical storage, determined by the oral culture; magical storage, manifested in the material culture of objects holding memory; and in the historiographical storage, figured in writing and in search of trans passing problems linked to ephemerality that the other two had. Flusser highlights while synthetizing the previously seen readings that even if always contrasted with the risk of oblivion, those dispositions reveal the memory to be the biggest project ever created by the mankind:

All of our buildings will fall into ruin, all of our books, paintings and music compositions will be condemned to oblivion, and probably numberless cultures of the pest disappear without leaving a trace. The entropic tendency of the world is obviously more powerful than human’s negatively entropic deliberation. However, declaring war to the absurdity of the world is human dignity (FLUSSER, s. d)

However, still according to the author, precisely in response to this impulse for “dignity”, the contemporary times is surrounded by a new mnemonic configuration, cumulative of cultural precedents and propositional of a new cognitive scenario. To him, the current technological advance offers the men the feeling of achievement of being reached the desired dream of full memory, and consequently, having won the above-mentioned absurdity.



There's an ongoing network connectivity that spreads out like a brain around the globe, the channels are the nerves, and the knots are peoples and devices: this network that lies over the biosphere, as the biosphere lies over the hydrosphere, this collective brain that is rising, that does not know geography, or history, because it suppressed (aufgehoben) in itself geography and history. Your function is a crossover of competences to secrete new information and increase total competence of the brain. This is the model of telematic society (FLUSSER, 2014, p. 276).

Under this image of an electronic brain - which brings Flusser in dialogue with the classic conceptions made by Marshal McLuhan (2012), of "media as extension of mankind" and Pierre Levy (2011), regarding "collective intelligence" - the media would be responsible for archivistic realization and also for complying other cultural idealizations. That is because, due to the suppression of space and time, these would enable to create a memory that would guarantee security, unity and trust in the access of information.

When evaluated the denominations that seek to express the current technological achievements, such as "knowledge society" "information democratization culture" and "culture of sharing" it is possible to notice the memory that is being propagated is directly involved with the mentioned ideologies. Because it is a quality offered for its completeness and perennality, apparently free from any barrier and for everyone, this digitally promoted memory actually receives a magical character, proper of a mythical memory, promoting supernatural fascination. A "technological reason", as denominated by Eugenio Trivinho (2001), which cancels any critical capacity that it may have over its mechanisms.

Technologic reason in the sense of a daily reason, pragmatic-utilitarian, immediatist, in relation to a machine. Implicitly ideological and nationalist [...] In relation to the technological society, this reason always presents a happy re-enchantment facing achievements and potentialities of technology. As such, it is about a matter not mediated by symbolism, in other words, lacking critical self-reflection about their own exterior and practical manifestations, particularly those in relation to technological objects (TRIVINHO, 2001, p. 88).

When we analyze these projections in action, in digital platforms of provision and exchange of information, such as Google and Facebook, it is possible to notice the feeling of fascination appears in them precisely because they overcome the merely cumulative data functionality. In the first case, not only in their research portal, but also throughout its system, Google describes that their main motto is: “Organizing world information and make it universally accessible and useful”, which means to become the “perfect search engine”, “something that understands exactly what you mean and takes you exactly where you want to go” (GOOGLE, 2016). A hyperbolic intention, if you think about the quantity of data that should be included but it transforms it in an influent mediator of content currently disposed on the net. As observed by Steven Levy, this motto ensures that Google has a variety contained in answers, which brings the feeling of “if you looked on Google you really researched it.” (LEVY, 2012, p. 78).

The same way, even it has specificities in the dynamic it proposes, Facebook seeks to conglomerate and articulate information available in the network, with the difference that there, the contents are not referring to the constitution of a full memory, but rather a memory built with their user’s participation. The users, under the question “What are you thinking about?” are invited to the interaction<sup>7</sup> and led to the role of authors of their own ideas and experiences, which makes this platform an instrument primordially geared towards individuality - which will only then be disposed in connectivity. For that reason, Marion Strecker (202) indicates that Facebook ended up becoming a “catalogue for the whole earth”, being capable of gathering “people’s experiences, memories and narratives about the world”.

Narratives and memories that, notwithstanding, have specificities, because their contents are produced in the instantaneity of the experiences

7 It is worth mentioning that, with all everyday information, who uses the system is also required to inform name, e-mail, gender and date of birth, followed by another list of data, like education, where and when you studied, profession and where you work, place of residence and birth place, Family members and their degrees of kinship, marital status, religious beliefs, political affiliations and cultural tastes, mainly.

that happen and the insertion of registers happens almost at the same time of what happens. With the presentification of memory, who effectively builds the mnemonic ballast, transforming the archive in memory experienced where the past is manifested in the present, is not the user, but Facebook itself, which is responsible for the storage and provision. The user, involved in the production of content, expressing their ideas, experiences, collecting collective acceptance in “likes” and comments they receive, is led to the role of contributor of the raw-material used by this platform. These data collaborate for the objective of creating “the story of your life and has three parts. Your apps, your stories and the way to express who you are. We WANT to make the Timeline a place where you proudly call ‘home’, according to Mark Zuckerberg (2011).

Both for the function of accumulation and narrativization, both platforms illustrate the offering potential of organizing and providing information. Naturally, those dynamics aim at sustaining the business success of both companies, denoting that the accumulation of content is a clearly monetizable asset to those systems. However, precisely because they have their value centered in memory, it is possible to question how much of these engines - and all the allure they have - are not also creating effects about the communication established with their participants and their memories.

### **Media Memory**

When we think about the assimilation performed by digital media, as indicated in the analyzed platforms, it is possible to notice that the memory and its diverse representations are led to respond some specific necessities of this time. These include the sum of its meanings in favor of an idealized realization, but mainly, and from that, being technically appropriate to deal with the information diversity currently produced. However, the situation also allows to think that something that initially make these media have a successful functionality and a performance seemingly efficient in the universal articulation of knowledge is not developed through the literal absorption of the aforementioned

mnemonic faculties, but rather through the conversion of these in efficient strategies for their purposes.

In this sense, Harry Pross (1980) clarifies that those strategies do not come only from technical peculiarities of these media, but reflect potential forms of domination, supplied by their own symbolisms originated from culture. According to the author, the mediatization of communications implied in the rise of directive referentials, “verticalized”<sup>8</sup>, capable of outweigh masses and legitimate in their hierarchic posts. In this position sought after by those who intent to detain the power, the media are apt to project themselves more easily through a “signal economy”<sup>9</sup>, which guarantee them a coverage and timely optimization in the divulgation of their messages.

Still according to Pross (2004), the increasing acceleration of transmissions propelled the gradual loss of proximity of the participants in communication. The “tertiary media”, as the author calls it, when they win the spatial and timely limits, get responsible for the emission and reception of information, which gives them the continuous importance in intermediating reality. These issues become sensitive for the formation of memory, since its operation is marked by the immediate presentification of the past, adding still a control employed to the media of imposing their participants of this immediatism, both in the access and the retention of content.

The mediatization of memory, therefore, is established in the way mnemonic values are appropriated by the dynamics inherent to those media and how they serve to legitimate themselves as concentrators and dissipators of these contents. It’s the media, after all, that pre-establish how this memory will be experienced (BORNHAUSEN, 2016, p. 98).

- 8 According to Pross (1980), the rise of the vertical is found in the search for the erect body in edifications and hierarchic structures of communication, which intend to control and conquer the physical and social space.
- 9 Pross (1999) says that as the ritualized sequence brings confidence to the social and subjective time, the mediatic system acts as a “social synchronizator”, which by repetition and ubiquity operates over Society in order to coordinate it.

When they detain control over the management and availability of this memory, media makes it manipulable according to their own intentions. Either for the monetization of its possession, as mentioned, but mainly for inserting it into its dynamics of exposure. However, if we evaluate the conditions where it occurs, it is possible to perceive an inherent contradiction. The same way information excess is the primordial condition for the consolidation of the totalizing offer of data, the exploitive dynamic of media also values novelty, which confronts the value that no longer occupy the space of attention. Thus, their contradiction is found in a speech that praises the access to information and that, in fact, continuously value only the new, therefore, contents that will get the status of holding visibility. To Norval Baitello (2005) this situation leads to what he calls “visibility crisis”, defined as:

The visibility crisis is not an image crisis, but a rarefaction of its capacity of appeal. When appeal enters a crisis, more and more images are necessary to reach the same effects. O que se tem então é uma descontrolada reprodutibilidade (BAITELLO, 2005, p. 14).

The dynamics referred by Baitello, being investigated on Google and Facebook, is perceived as intrinsic to the way these systems deal with content. In both cases, the algorithmic tools that regulate access show that, if a page does not have an expressive number of views or do not adhere to the mechanisms that enable them to be in the top results, they gradually lose importance, to the point of even never being shown in a more profound search.

In Google’s case, the tool responsible for that control is called PageRank™. Its functioning, credited to the machine and because of that, advertised as impartial, operates like a “spider”, that tracks and privileges the most relevant information<sup>10</sup>. They are also ranked in the order they believe to be the closest to intention of searching. In a test performed to

10 According to Google (2016), when the company explains their algorithm, “Important, high quality websites, receive a higher score, which google stores at every research made (...) Thus, Google combines high-quality results with the search you are looking for so that the result is as relevant as possible.”

check this operation, it was observed that the composition of this offer is followed by the expressions “Did you mean...” And “I’m feeling lucky”, as well as “auto-fill” and the ranking of pages exposed, insinuating which one of these pieces of information is ideal. However, in order to check this dynamic, we researched<sup>11</sup> the tag “google” on Google itself, which allowed us to arrive to the value of seven billion three hundred and eighty million possible results, spending 0.41 seconds to get to them. Seeking to understand system operations, we’ve decided to go until the end of the search results. In the first attempt, it was possible to go until the 16<sup>th</sup> page, each page adding 10 links, totalizing 162 possible pages to be visualized, because in the end the following message appears: “to show more relevant results, omitted some entries very similar to 162 results already exhibited.” If you want, you can repeat the research including the omitted results”. With the intention of keep proving the efficacy of researches, we chose to repeat the procedure, which in the second time allowed us to get to page 53, with a total of 530 available results, after this point, Google does not allow more research extensions. Thus, we perceive the value of the data informed in the research and the real access you have, considering the second search, it is 0,000071816% of the total announced, evidently far inferior to the promised result.

In a similar relation on Facebook the algorithm is called EdgeRank, through which the concentration of its functioning is in what the program believes to be valued to be seen and accessed, operating through the relation between Affinity/Familiarity, Weight/Relevance and Time/Depreciation of content (FACEBOOK, 2017). In the first case, the algorithm measures the level of relationship between the user and the information they access, therefore, the amount of times a certain person or brand is “liked”, commented and viewed by the user. Allied to this criterion, the weight or relevance of contents are determined by Facebook based on how engaging an information is, how comments are worth

11 When looking for information supplied by Google, this research consider the data analysis supplied by this platform when the researches are done. The values related to time and quantity of data available and the affirmations related to relevance are informed by the system, which proves the aforementioned directioning of content.

ARTICLE

more than “likes” or images that gain bigger notoriety than texts. And, finally, the time of publication or how much it is depreciable, similarly to the novelty criterion proposed by Google, characterized by the valorization of the latest information instead of the old ones, stimulating a bigger quantity of access. To include the selection of what will be seen in the scroll bar that does not stop updating, it’s clear the incumbency disposed and conceived to Facebook to guide the validity of information, remembering and narrativizing user’s experiences. As proven by Chris Ingraham (2015) in a study performed for the Washington Post, this resource makes approximately 60% of the content that would be available there are not possible to visualize. The occurrence denotes that, facing the vast field of information, the system tends to funnel certain contents, personalized to specific users and groups, always according to their own interests. These contents obey the view disposed on their layout, that due to functioning in a scrolling system, tends to cover past information due to latest, freshly published news.

In this sense, the memory of these media is led by its opposite, the obsolescence, because it participates in an oscillation between what has more or less chances of being accessed among the information that will appear and disappear according to the intention of the programs. As a consequence, the user himself also begins to deal with this variation, since they are the ones linked to the information, either depositing them or accessing them. And it is them who recur to the search of visibility in order to raise the exposure.

To Flusser, being ahead of this mnemonic outsourcing promoted by the digital, the user would face two possible outcomes: a) the extreme informative redundancy resulting from an excess of available content; tb) the des-ideologization of memory, which would allow the full human creativity, in which all need of possession would be linked to the machine, conceding the man the free articulation of knowledge. One situation or another would depend on the way they keep the relation with this information and the way the machine and the user are corresponding.

If thought from Flusser's (2011) contributions, the relationship established between the machine that intends to perform a mnemonic project and its users, named by the author as "employees", is that the first aims to be a "toy that simulates a type of thought" (FLUSSER, 2011, p. 17). Thus, memory would be available in a way that the rules inscribed in the workings of the machine itself in its program, and in how these regulate the way their participants will act, according to what is demonstrated by the algorithmic features. To those, according to the author, would remain to play with it through what was pre-established.

In this type of game, disguised in the informational exaggeration proven in both platforms presented, the participant subject believes he's in charge, because he is the one who choose which memories he wants to access or which he would voluntarily put inside the system, that only has the role of giving access to all of that. Under this sense, Flusser glimpses the creative path to deal with the available knowledge. However, as Baitello (2010) observes, closer than autonomy, is the automation of the way this access is built and projected:

A mark gets thus underlined not only of technical apparatus, but also from all contemporary social and media apparatus: the dispensation of thought and desire, because this task of thinking and wanting is simply taken away by the apparatus, freeing the employee of such heavy and hard onus, allowing him to only enter the game of possibilities of the apparatus, an attitude of surrender, therefore, of letting oneself be devoured (BAITELLO, 2010, p. 21).

In both readings the issue on knowledge acquisition proves to be an important participant element of this memory. According to Nicholas Carr (2011), when reflecting about the brain effects caused by the speed in which the information is presented, there's a possible saturation of the individual in retaining everything that is exposed:

The influx of messages competing among themselves, which we always receive when we are on-line, are not only an overload of our working memory; it becomes very hard for the frontal lobes to focus our attention on only one thing. The processes of memory consolidation cannot even be



initiated. The more we use the web, the more we train our brain to be distracted (CARR, 2011, p. 264-265)

In this situation, even if theoretically the creative alternative presented by Flusser was possible, the readings presented help to detect that the own mnemonic action, originally a concern of the man, can be put in second level, at least when this subject is the responsible for it. This is a condition also proven in the recent study promoted by the psychologists Betsy Sparrow, Jenny Liu and Daniel M Wegner (2011). Symptomatically called “Google Effect”, they suggest that the internet is seen nowadays as a “personal database”, a type of “external memory” that influences user’s capacity of retaining information. According to them, this occurrence is developed because the trust given to the system overlaps the exercise of searching and attaining different results.

According to Baitello (2012), when you observe the underlying meanings of these dynamics, this condition is expressed by a perceptive sedation conditioned by the own environment in which the individual is put in. Not only due to the physical position of the individual of interacting technologically, but for the perceptive settling of receiving information the way they are available, its numbing confirms how this conditions deeply affects their own memory, since the software controls the ideal contents of access.

The numbing or its lethargy, from the same radical leth- of forgetfulness, confront themselves, thus, with many philosophical and psychoanalytical presuppositions [...] In which the memory was seen as an extremely complex process, which involves the permanent perception and re-elaboration of the way the individual is related to their surroundings, as a result of their experiences, practices and observations they had. Consciously established or not, memory is referred to an individual’s learning skills, not limited to the immediate retrieval of memories - like a file - but involved with the permanent influence of emotions and its own imagination (BORNHAUSEN, 2016, p. 110).

In this same sense, Dietmar Kamper (2016), going against the readings that exalt the mnemonic outsourcing, clarifies that is under the

“strength of the imagination” (*Einbildungskraft*) that memory fundamentally, historically and psychologically. It, contrary to this media memory, is in permanent renewal, since it is based on internal images thought and re-worked in the body (*KörperDenken*) According to the author, it is precisely this imaginative capability that is decreased with the crescent abstraction created by the media. Facing this situation, immediate responses offered by this memory imply the effective non-generation for the individuals, but rather a literalization of knowledge and the apprehension of the world, increasingly mediated by these types of software.

### Final considerations

Under this perspective, it is possible to conclude that the media environment in charge for this memory, product of every cultural idealization, which would provide a freeing articulation of information - mentioning Flusser’s affirmation - seems not to correspond the goals it was initially thought of. That is because he sees himself covered by conditions, as the saturation of contents and the automatization of availability, which direct it to another configuration. As showed throughout this analysis, memory appears more as an ideal image conquered by these technologies than an effective accomplishment. Its main consequence, therefore, is in the clear alteration of the way the information is received and apprehended, with a clear impact over the communication that is being generated.

### References

- ARISTÓTELES. *Parva naturalia*. São Paulo: Edipro, 2012.
- BAITELLO, N. *O pensamento sentado*. Sobre glúteos, cadeiras e imagens. São Leopoldo: Unisinos, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A serpente, a maçã e o holograma: esboços para uma teoria da mídia*. São Paulo: Paulus, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Las capilaridades de la comunicación. In: SARTORI, R.; MUÑOZ, B.; VALENZUELA, V. *Diálogos culturales. Interdisciplinas para la comunicación*. São Paulo: Annablume; Valdivia: Universidad Austral de Chile, 2007. p. 20-55.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *A era da iconofagia*. Ensaios de comunicação e cultura. São Paulo: Hacker Editores, 2005.
- BERGSON, H. *Memória e vida*. São Paulo: Editora WMF Martins Fontes, 2011.
- BORKO, H. Information science: what is it? In: *American Documentation*, Chicago, v. 19, n. 1, p. 3-5, 1968.
- BORNHAUSEN, D. A. *A Mídia e a Memória: Projeções, regulações e sujeições no ambiente digital*. 2016. 147f. Tese (Doutorado em Comunicação e Semiótica). Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo. 2016.
- CARR, N. *A geração superficial: o que a Internet está fazendo com nossos cérebros*. Rio de Janeiro: Agir, 2011.
- DAMASIO, A. *O mistério da consciência*. São Paulo: Companhia das letras, 2000.
- ELIADE, M. *Mito e Realidade*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2013.
- FACEBOOK (2017). *Noções básicas de privacidade*. Disponível em: <<https://www.facebook.com/about/basics#toptopics>>. Acesso em: 11 set. 2018.
- FLUSSER, V. *Comunicologia: reflexões sobre o futuro*. As conferências de Bochum. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Filosofia da caixa preta*. Ensaios para uma futura filosofia da fotografia. São Paulo: Annablume, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Memória*. [Sem Data] 2683\_MEMORIA [V.2]. Arquivo Vilém Flusser São Paulo.
- FREUD, S. Uma Nota Sobre o Bloco Mágico. In: *Obras Psicológicas Completas de Sigmund Freud. Vol XIX*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago Editora, 1996. p. 320-385
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Lembranças encobridoras*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1989.
- GOOGLE (2016). *Sobre o Google*. Disponível em: <<http://www.google.com/about/company/>>. Acesso em: 20 jan. 2017.
- HALBWACHS, M. *A memória coletiva*. São Paulo: Ed. Revista dos Tribunais, 1990.
- HERSCHEL, A. J. *A passion for truth*. Nova York: Jewish Lights Publis, 1995.
- HESIODO. *Teogonia*. São Paulo: Martin Claret, 2011.
- HOUAISS, A. *Dicionário Houaiss da língua portuguesa*. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2009.
- INGRAHAM, C. What you don't know about Internet algorithms is hurting you. (And you probably don't know very much!). *The Washington Post*, 2015. Disponível em: <[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-intersect/wp/2015/03/23/what-you-dont-know-about-internet-algorithms-is-hurting-you-and-you-probably-dont-know-very-much/?noredirect=on&utm\\_term=.5e83cdd295f7](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-intersect/wp/2015/03/23/what-you-dont-know-about-internet-algorithms-is-hurting-you-and-you-probably-dont-know-very-much/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.5e83cdd295f7)>. Acesso em: 22 ago. 2018.
- KAMPER, D. *Mudança de horizonte: o sol novo a cada dia, nada de novo sob o sol, mas...* São Paulo: Paulus, 2016.
- LE GOFF, J. *História e Memória*. Campinas: Unicamp, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Enciclopédia Einaudi*. Vol. 1 Memória – História. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional; Casa da Moeda, 1997.
- LEVY, P. *A inteligência coletiva: por uma antropologia do ciberespaço*. São Paulo: Loyola, 2011.
- LEVY, S. *Google: a biografia*. São Paulo: Universo dos Livros, 2012.

- LURIA, A. R. *A mente e a memória: um pequeno livro sobre uma vasta memória*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2006.
- MCLUHAN, M. *Os meios de comunicação como extensões do homem*. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2012.
- NORA, P. *Entre memória e história: a problemática dos lugares*. São Paulo: EDUC, 1993.
- PLATÃO. *Teeteto*. Belém: UFPA, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Fedon: diálogo sobre a alma e morte de Sócrates*. São Paulo: Martin Claret, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Menon*. São Paulo: Loyola, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *O banquete*. Porto Alegre: L&PM, 2009.
- PROSS, H. Aceleração e perda. In: CONTRERA, Malena Segura; GUIMARÃES, Luciano; PELEGRINI, M.; SILVA, M. (Orgs.) *O espírito do nosso tempo: ensaios de semiótica da cultura e da mídia*. São Paulo: Annablume; CISC, 2004. p. 65-89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Atrapados en la red mediática*. Orientación en la diversidad. Hondarribia: Argitaletxe Hiru, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *La violencia de los símbolos sociales*. Barcelona: Anthropos, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Estructura simbólica del poder*. Barcelona: Editora Gustavo Gili, 1980.
- PROSS, H.; BETH, H. *Introducción a la ciencia de la comunicación*. Barcelona: Anthropos, 1987.
- SPARROW, B.; LIU, J.; WEGNER, D. M. Google Effects on Memory: Cognitive Consequences of Having Information at Our Fingertips. *Science Magazine*, v. 333, Issue 6043, p. 776-778, 2011. Disponível em: <<http://www.sciencemag.org/content/333/6043/776.full.pdf>>. Acesso em: 4 out. 2017.
- STRECKER, M. Novo Catálogo da Terra Inteira, Facebook transforma pessoas em marqueteiros de si mesmos. *UOL Tecnologia*, 2012. Disponível em: <<http://tecnologia.uol.com.br/noticias/redacao/2012/05/18/novo-catalogo-daterra-inteira-facebook-transforma-pessoas-em-marqueteiros-de-si-mesmos.htm>>. Acesso em: 4 out. 2017.
- TRIVINHO, E. *O mal-estar da teoria: a condição da crítica na sociedade tecnológica atual*. Rio de Janeiro: Quartet, 2001.
- VERNANT, J. *Mito e religião na Grécia Antiga*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mito e pensamento entre os gregos: estudos de psicologia histórica*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1990.
- VYGOTSKY, L. *Imaginación y el arte en la Infancia*. Cidade do México: Hispánicas, 1987.
- YATES, F. *A arte da memória*. Campinas: Ed. Unicamp, 2007.
- ZUCKERBERG, M. Facebook muda página pessoal para linha do tempo e altera botão 'curtir'. *Globo Tecnologia*, 2011. Disponível em: <<http://g1.globo.com/tecnologia/noticia/2011/09/facebook-apresenta-linha-dotempo-para-registrar-vida-do-usuariouosite>>. Acesso em: 22 ago. 2018.
- ZUMTHOR, P. *Tradição e esquecimento*. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1997.

## About the authors

*Diogo Andrade Bornhausen - PhD in Communication and Semiotics at Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, professor at Fundação Armando Álvares Penteado, Vice President of Arquivo Vilém Flusser São Paulo and Researcher at CISC (Centro Interdisciplinar de Semiótica da Cultura e da Mídia).*

*Norval Baitello Junior - PhD in Communication Sciences at Universidade Livre de Berlim. Professor at the Post Graduate Program of Studies in Communication and Semiotics at PUC-SP and Scientific President at Arquivo Vilém Flusser São Paulo.*

---

Data de submissão: 17/12/2017

Data de aceite: 20/09/2018