

Scientific Journal of Applied Social and Clinical Science

HATE AND POLITICS IN HYPERMODERNITY: ORIGINS OF ELECTORAL SPEECHES IN MEDIA POSTS

Júlio César Barreto Rocha

Doctor in Neo-Latin Letters, professor at the ``Universidade Federal de Rondônia`` (UNIR), in the Department of Vernacular Letters, Porto Velho Campus. Leader of the Philology and Modernities Research Group

Patrícia Helena dos Santos Carneiro

PhD in Law, professor at UNIR, Department of Foreign Languages, Porto Velho Campus. Deputy leader of the Philology and Modernities Research Group

Livia Samila de Oliveira Pinto

Researcher of the Academic Master's Degree in Letters at UNIR (PPGML), Porto Velho Campus. Member of the Philology and Modernities Research Group

Michele Sarmiento dos Santos

Researcher of the Research Project "The self-criticism of political and judicial authorities on the discourses of digital media in the Logic of Hypermodernity" (PIBIC, from 08/30/2023 to 08/31/2024), worked on the Research "Language and Argumentation in Logic of Hypermodernity" (PIBIC, 09/04/2022 to 08/31/2023), both from the Philology and Modernities Research Group. Student of the Spanish Literature Course at the ``Universidade Federal de Rondônia`` (UNIR). Porto Velho Campus

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: It is already possible to say that the main political milestone at the beginning of the 21st century will have been the discourse emanating from hate offices, passed on in an industrial way to digital social media and also to traditional journalism. It is no longer necessary to map the concrete origin of these discourses, presumably the responsibility of their beneficiaries, but rather it is important to interpret them in their argumentativeness beyond the easy polarization between left and right. It is necessary to observe differences between arguments over time, understanding the original arguments that led people to group together, in addition to those who started to love fake news because they were in favor of their personal or class interests. To work beyond the left and right duality, as well as to understand the historicity experienced between political faces distant from this singular discursive functioning, it was necessary to take into account a procedure capable of appropriating historical temporality, as well as culturality, through which they flowed. Clearly the hateful arguments that began to rage from the second decade of this century onwards. Unveiling a model to understand how hatred and politics in this century began to be used based on the experience of previous decades, reaching original historicity, that is, the sophists of more than two thousand years ago, it is possible to obtain in a convincing way close, distant and distant origins of this distorting Logic of what we call the Age of Hypermodernity.

Keywords: Hate speech; electoral arguments; media technologies; Democracy; Political Philology.

INTRODUCTION

It is common saying that “people increase, but do not invent”. This simple philosophy ascends to the condition of totalizing common sense of a contemporary electoral situation that has overwhelmed Brazilian society and has been experienced by families, politicians and major parties. However, the phrase says very little about what has been happening since the second decade of the 21st century, with regard to insurgency and the media penetration of hateful ideologemes in public debates, capable of blocking the sun of reason, with the dispute in the media traditional or in hypermodern digital social media, an apparently silly monotheme and a tiring ramble, but used quite effectively for its electoral or simply electoral objectives.

This text is based on several research projects, institutionalized at `Universidade Federal de Rondônia`, and presents summaries of some research results carried out by more than two dozen people since 2015, members of FiloM, the Philology and Modernities Research Group (of the *dgp. CNPq* directory). There are fruits arising from projects in Scientific Initiation and Initiation in Technological Development and Innovation (PIBIC and PIBITI), as well as studies carried out or working on master's dissertations at PPGML/UNIR. Some of the ideas were discussed at events and written for other publications, such as the text “Hate against women: combating misogynistic discourse in public posts on social media”, defended at the II International Symposium on Feminist Criticism and Female Authorship, whose general coordinator it was Professor Dr. André Rezende Benatti. We note a highlight in his introduction, when he says that “the political environment is usually devoted almost exclusively to men”, with this he wants to bring an important highlight, but indicating that there are several other biases that need to be critically raised.

It must be noted, however, that this approach must be the most likely to be applied in a generalist manner and to various cases, as scientific procedures require. In the case of that Symposium, it was found that there was no other reason for there to be laws in favor of quotas for women, without which it is not possible for a political party to close ideological ranks in favor of any nominee without noticing the reaction of men, elderly and white, contesting, openly or silently, the idea of equality that the norms must defend.

With this prevention requirement, it is explained that the particular case of there being an effective concerted action of hate in politics in these times of the end of the 20th century and beginning of the 21st century, which we call the Era of Hypermodernity, is an objective of the This text seeks to understand the origins of hateful electoral speeches, ultimately disseminated in media posts, even by people who would, theoretically, have no interest in these disseminations of ideologemes of a proto-fascist nature, responsible for enchanting a huge portion of the societies where such posts were imposed.

There is no doubt that the main political milestone that emerged in the second decade of the present 21st century was established by some typical speeches, generated by a scheme that later became known as the “hate office”, passed on in a pyramid to digital social media, which after all they conquered by flood, that is, by the so-called herd effect, affecting traditional journalism itself, unable to overcome the dominant spotlight of new digital trends, created fundamentally over the previous decade.

This text will deal with details of this situation, technological, discursive, political, social, which characterizes the main political framework at the beginning of the 21st century. After all, it was the discourse emanating from hate offices, passed on in

an industrial way to digital social media and also to traditional journalism, that defined the path of discursivity in many planetary homes. Therefore, it is believed that it is necessary to map, if not the concrete origin of these speeches, because presumably they will be the responsibility of their beneficiaries, but certainly their argumentativeness, in the interpretation beyond the easy polarization between left and right. It is necessary to observe differences between arguments over time and their continuities, understanding the original arguments that ultimately led to people coming together, in addition to those who started to love some fake news because they were in favor of their personal or class interests.

A LITTLE BIT OF METHOD

This proposal for analyzing the origin of types and discursive contents hopes to prove the need to locate bases of interpretations that go beyond partisanship, today, more than yesterday, polarized between left and right, generating forms of understanding not only aimed at a social awareness of the causes of this unhealthy discursivity, but also bring an incentive to give new meaning to the differences between the argumentative functioning of yesterday and the day before yesterday, in thought whose most distant sources reach classical Greco-Latin antiquity.

To work on the left-right duality, as well as the historicity experienced between faces so far from a singular discursive functioning, it is necessary to take into account a method capable of appropriating historical temporality, as well as the culturality through which hateful arguments flow clearly. or hateful from one side to the other, in this *ad populum* invasion of conspiracy theories in post-truth spaces, in a process in which (dis)information and (in)communication technologies replaced the utopia of the growth of ICTs, which, in

A globalized world without borders would be an ocean of full information. Today, this flourishing future has clearly become an entelechy and a fantasy, lost in the rubble of a democracy badly shaken by uncontrolled media and in countries dominated by bigtechs, which little by little become leaders in guiding the standards to be maintained. a world increasingly without borders and without control of political violence.

It is important here to highlight the different origins of electoral speeches, sometimes considered as created *ad hoc*, that is, to trigger an immediate effect, when in reality they have solid foundations originating from a past of different temporalities. Their arguments were raised to the status of dominant, on social media, expressed in this second decade of the 21st century, mostly in media posts, especially aimed at highlighting themes that could be converted into warlike objects thrown at random and at the will of the aggressor against enemies of liberalism or neoliberalism.

Our theoretical framework that helped to examine this temporality, which is triple, brings contemporary authors and a philological reading perspective in which themes are treated in cultural terms, highlighting the political backstage revealed by agents who benefit from the discursive model that generates passion. and intuition, relegating reason and some alternative thinking to the unreasons of loss of meaning in the lack of argumentative alternatives on both sides. Through an abundant collection of theoretical or factual materials, in the form of recognized publications or digital media posts, collected on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, WhatsApp or Telegram, it was possible to analyze the argumentative bases set out in these media, and then *interpret* the post-truth values (D'Ancona) presupposed in them, subject to criticism of various types.

The entire intention of the hate speech

was apparently aimed – and only – at reaching the real or presumed political opponents of liberalism or neoliberalism, investing in electoral-type arguments, which insist on Manichaeic, reductionist labels (against communists, corrupt, abortionists, antichrists) or in favor of slogans to escape the programmatic reality of general interest, because this old argument does not yield the dividends of hatred today.

As a result of these studies and this rich survey, as part of the development of the result, we obtained two larger texts, both prepared for the defense of two master's theses, in the Postgraduate Master's Program in Letters at the ``Universidade Federal de Rondônia`` (PPGML/ UNIR), and thus the existence of paths was proven that revealed, through the elucidation of this type of hateful political speeches, some ways of describing and combating hatred, implicit and explicit in posts created with the emphasis placed on the idea of "criticizing" the society, but being, in reality, with concrete intentionality in the construction of barriers to the fullest functioning of democracy as an intertemporal model capable of allowing the alternation of power between different political fractions based on different socioeconomic theories, in each country.

SOME CONCEPTS

As a first derivation of the data collection, we uncover a model for understanding how hatred and politics in this century have used much of the experience of these first decades, favored by bases given in previous origins, in fact much earlier: since more than two thousand years ago, which they went to closer origins, making it possible to understand electoral speeches in media posts as capable of becoming the great argumentative entity of the present beginning of this century. Coming from the research "Near and Far Origins

of the Logic of Hypermodernity”, ¹whose results were transferred to four other cycles of work, it appears that there was the creation of a complex network of criticism, tinged with verbal violence simulating indignant contention, and a knowledge shallow (but superb) collection of renowned authors, making Brazil an easy pasture to gather an audience that is an intense user of digital social networks, without mastery of adequate content for the average person who will be the audience and who would be victims of this very curious time of ours.²

It is necessary to clarify that the treatment of facts using sources whose cut considers determining the tracing of periods of time according to the importance of the facts itself was devised by the historian Fernand Braudel, who concretely used it, within the scope of what was called the Annales School (led by Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre), when studying the world around the Mediterranean Sea, its trade and given the development of major lines of civilizational action, launching a ³manifesto on the subject, known as *La Longue Durée*, published in 1958, with the ideal of this possibility of having a long duration or, alternatively, a brief duration and another intermediate duration.

Therefore, the idea of a short, medium or long duration is not new in the analysis of historical facts, and although it is not exactly a question here of considering Braudel's thesis, in the present text, this quality occurs because the present text does not represent a

understanding of highlighting a perspective on History. However, we admit the interest in a by-product of Braudel, who launched his manifesto contrary to the tendency of many historians to prefer Structuralism, wanting this procedure as something decaffeinated from politics, theoretically more exempt, and which had been promoted by Lévi-Strauss, an ideal that spanned the entire 20th century, as one of the most important alternatives, since Ferdinand de Saussure, who would have used it without ever mentioning it by name – in addition, of course, to the fact that this author did not write his best-known libel, the *General Linguistics Course*, as we know, but left it in the referential account of disciples.

According to Lévi-Strauss, thinking terminologically approximately like Noam Chomsky in Psychology, “deep structures” or “logical” are general formats required by Science, and which will be much more important to detect, compared to what appears to be more important, in its most immediate, the one that stands out the most.⁴

Here we have, in a different way, a method of objective approximation in something more distinct from the idea of there being slow and fast movements depending on the historical and technological era. We intend to collect arguments of certain types at times more or less close to the events we want to understand, but whose problematic nature (greater or less connection to the truth value, greater or lesser connection to the interest of the arguers) will be suspended by the thread of reality

1. Project PVN276-2020, PIBIC CNPq 2020/2021 (01/09/2020 to 31/08/2021), UNIR. Philology and Modernities Research Group. Line Interculturality and Critical Discourse Analysis c/c Languages, education and media.

2. Some summaries promoting the research were published on Facebook profiles, such as this one: https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=pfbid0SFQK5J63dzSuZe71YuVE52uMMYYCwheohApTCbExzZScgLBCXL2SdxgLPHPQ25cLl&id=100015271204757&mibextid=Nif5oz

3. The manifesto, called “History and social sciences: the long duration”, was published in the Annales magazine “*Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*”. Cf. **The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Time of Philip II**. 2 Volumes. São Paulo: UNESP, 2016.

4. In Brazil LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude. **Structural Anthropology**. Translated by Chaim Samuel Katz and Reginaldo Pires. Rio de Janeiro: Brazilian Time, 1985. Lévi-Strauss (1958). **Anthropologie structurale**. Paris: Plon. See also the text dealing with this phase of the History of Historiography by ARMITAGE, David; & GULDI, Jo. **Manifesto for History**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, 2018.

circumstantial aspect of the discursivity under analysis.

The most important contribution, however, that we make use of and that we can highlight at the moment, is the ideal of interdisciplinarity. It can be said that Braudelian durations are applied with greater interest to historiographical perspectives, while structuralist theories may be more successful in ethnological, or even anthropological, investigation or ethnographic evaluation. In the present case of our commitment and study, it is an approach to the culturalist area, in which Philology, part of the area of Linguistics, Letters and Arts, has its centrality inducing results required by the nature of the object argumentation, discursivity or majority preference for a Logic, due to the interest of certain sectors of a population whose elites ideologically make the themes and the treatment of themes follow an unavoidable agenda.

If we want to call this the ideology of the time, the “spirit of the times” or the imposition of economic sectors, we will not consider this in this text, given that this epistemological prospecting is not central at the moment. Of course, the questions that might be raised regarding the methodological values of preferences and terminological priorities would be the feet of clay of a given theory, if there is no attention to its limits. However, the results achieved already demonstrate that there is proof of the correctness of the technical measure raised because, in a clear way, it served to detect the discourses and their origins for the imposition of these arguments of the Distorting Logic of Hypermodernity.

By Hypermodernity, we want to characterize, based on Gilles Lipovetsky, ⁵a preference for the intensification and

acceleration of technological means and political, social and cultural experience, driven by the advancement of technique, with regard to communication, and processes linked to the ideal of globalization (or globalization, in another alter-capitalist ideological tone). Thus, with the presence first of electronic mail (invented by Ray Tomlinson in 1972, but only disseminated after the popular advent of the internet) and then of digital social networks, not only did information spread with greater speed and quantity, but it also triggered There is another logic in the process of forming public opinions, not forgetting that there is no public opinion, but rather “published opinion”, according to Winston Churchill’s well-known rhyme.⁶

CULTURE AND SPIRIT OF THE TIMES

It is known that certain themes are likely to become central, as they become more important for the civilizational or socioeconomic advancement of important segments of a given population. The debate is public because the opinions expressed are instituted in public spaces, not exactly created or managed by a certain public, but taking place in spaces that are accessible by a public, through public replication and indefinitely, in an uncertain way, almost automatically, after the first flick that propelled him. Therefore, whether or not public opinion exists as an exempt entity, we will not discuss, because it seems a fallacious use after the famous motto of the British Prime Minister, since, once a debate has started, its topic becomes appropriated by singular interests. of each society, with a view to employing them, argumentatively, to resolve the redirection of both singular situations, one’s own interest

5. Hypermodernity would be the typical situation of “a liberal society, characterized by movement, fluidity, flexibility, indifferent as never before to the great structuring principles of modernity, which need to adapt to the hypermodern rhythm in order not to disappear” (Lipovetsky, 2004, p. 25).

6. See Rocha, 2003, p. 123.

and the mobilizing interest of the first topic of the debate. There is the expression not of a feeling or an expectation of a turnaround in society's situation, but a desire for change that combines two or more facts, the manipulated and the actually important for social advancement.⁷

For Lipovetsky, less than the contemporary experience, at the turn of the 20th century to the 21st, in which it was imagined that we were at the gates of the Era of Post-Everything, we would be, we say, more prone to the life of hyperesthesia and turned to hyperbath, to fruence of "hypercapitalism, hyperclass, hyperpower, hyperterrorism, hyperindividualism, hypermarket, hypertext", states our author, and asked himself, after all: "What else is not hyper? What else doesn't expose a Modernity elevated to superlative power?"⁸Hence the Hypermodernity that dominates this present time. The Internet, in the last decade of the last century, delivered millions of websites to the public from all social spheres, whose technological education has become greater than civic education. Planetary inhabitants, at any latitude, felt able to access documents, images, books and videos that could explain everything. It was a decade of optimism and great expectation, on the verge of total knowledge, anticipating an Era of Utopia realized!

Throughout the first decade of the 21st century, the residents of the planet Brazil, without much reading of the millions of references available on the network, and protected by the multitude of strangers to whom they had relative access, in order

to diverge, above all, received the "tools of the Logic of Hypermodernity" one by one, starting training in lies and hatred, and in political marketing, more than in the first objectives that were thought such media war machinery could be used. This ten-year period was characterized by the arrival of new (dis)information and (in)communication technologies, digital social networks, Facebook (2004), YouTube (2005), Twitter (2006), WhatsApp (2009) and Instagram (2010), breaking with the optimism of achieving the full totalization of people's communicability and informativeness. Its use in electoral marketing would turn the networks into a privileged space of hatred and lies, in which the belief in the Flat Earth became a mere illustration of the great argumentative and post-truth distortion in which we began to live, at any planetary latitude. Although there was exceptionally intense furor here and there, no one stopped taking care of these issues, with the public reached being divided by yes or no, according to the interest of each person and the environment in which the argument that accompanied the fake news and the discourse was inserted. of hate.

It can be said that, in Brazil, we were in a certain way privileged, in the second decade of this century, because electoral marketing training had previously been carried out in several experimental and frustrated elections, but it came to fruition even in 2016, the starting from the success of Brexit, in the United Kingdom of England and Northern Ireland, with the inhabitants of the latter country to this day being unhappy

7. In order not to waste time on this singular journey of spurious union of themes, a couple of examples: It was attempted to link, a few months ago, the lack of hospital beds to the payment of housing assistance for judges, which was clearly little more than an argumentative use hateful and contrary to judges, given the complex network of justifications that each case (hospitals and judges' homes) could trigger. Hence we can still remember the preaching "There won't be a World Cup!?", contrary to an event that would and has brought billions of reais to the country's economy – and resulted in several lawsuits against the overpricing of football stadiums, in Brazil during the World Cup. FIFA 2014. Again, complexity must rationally prevent these thematic units created materially solely for hateful political purposes.

8. Lipovetsky, 2004, p. 53 et seq. It must be noted that, in *Nicomachean Ethics* (in Book I), Aristotle highlights only three types of experience: the enjoyment of pleasures, the honor and benefits of political life and contemplative living.

with the result obtained through a spurious argumentative method, benefiting English arguers. In the United States, with Donald Trump's victory, the experiment of the "chaos engineers",⁹ with the support of Vladimir Putin's counter-information machine, proved to the Americans that their democracy was not inviolable, nor was it refractory to hatred, when, four years later, on January 6, 2020, the Capitol, where the votes for the election of the future new president were being counted, was invaded, under the auspices of hatred and fake news from the then President of the Republic Donald Trump himself.

In Brazil, the language of hate in fake news converted a small but noisy percentage into perpetrators and victims, some condemned, in this year 2023, to serve as painful examples to Brazilians for the rest of the century, some "patriots" of sign on the contrary, who disrespected democracy, destroyed major symbols of the national public heritage, at the headquarters of the three powers of the Republic, shouted "for AI-5" and for "coup!" at the top of their lungs, calling for the help of extraterrestrials, as negative models, if not of pure hatred, but of advanced political stupidity, and almost all by the mobilization of a few interested in spurious election results on one side of the eternal coin duality of democracy.

POLITICAL PHILOLOGY

It is clear that the typical method of Political Philology (Rocha, 2013) is our main support, not least because it is supported by decisive contributions from Terry Eagleton, for whom there are versions of culture capable of perceiving that "from an etymological point of view, culture is a concept that derives from nature".¹⁰ However, it has become even contradictory to admit worship as more

9. See EMPOLI, Giuliano da. **The Chaos Engineers**. Translation by Arnaldo Bloch. 1st ed. São Paulo: Vestígio, 2019.

10. Culture, for Eagleton, is compliance with rules, the "interaction between regulated and non-regulated", which does not mean "obeying a law of Physics", but rather choosing to follow a certain rule (Cf. Eagleton, 2003).

linked to nature, when it is known that people who are considered cultured or cultivated are those who are experts in knowledge of some "superior" art or possess greater knowledge in the traditions of a given people or collective, knowledge and traditions increasingly sophisticated and elaborated far from nature, in an educational system more filled with information and wisdom derived from the artificial society and endowed with artifice than with elements of automatic perception.

Rocha made use of excerpts from his doctoral thesis ("Análise Intercultural de Argumentos", 2004), for whom a phrase prevailed, in command of this new facet, and we are now diving into the phase of the close origin of this Logic of Hypermodernity: "The life is an argument", which can be understood as the possibility of diverting the focus of the argument to any side you want, being able to bring to the fore elements never before included in the debate, as well as exacerbating their significance, through the dissemination of (mis)information, multiplied by bots, causing certain argumentative functions, dysfunctional or not, to be activated, and bring about a participation that could be considered decisive in the manipulation of the masses.

Interestingly, Eagleton's most promising framework for resolving this new squaring of the circle comes from a few centuries ago, as it served in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, the epigraph to *A Shakespeare's storm, which flirted with the new in the old*. Eagleton brings Act IV, scene IV of the "Winter's Tale", by that same English author, as the first poetic phrase was pronounced by Polixenes:

There is no better way to improve nature

Than what nature makes form; therefore, in addition to this art

What do you say to add to nature, there is

an art

What nature does... It's an art

That fixes nature – or rather, changes it.

Art itself, however, is nature.

In addition to this historical, poetic, rational, I would say sensational observation, in scope and limitation, culture is (or has always been) in crisis, due to a permanent “defensive solidarity”, at the same time busy disseminating “this admirable new cosmopolitanism” (Eagleton, 2004, p. 87). At this point of equalization of all cultures, the sophistry of Steve Bannon and Roger Mercer, whose first company Cambridge Analytica managed to deal serious blows with digital media to democratic processes around the world, each country with its electoral structures shaken, will come to the fore. In the face of the fallacious argument multiplied by digital social networks.¹¹ After the success in the Brexit plebiscite in the United Kingdom, state delegates in the direct-indirect election in the United States became Donald Trump voters. Digital social networks started to revolt and replace the population raised in arms through the History of the people; or replacing public protests in Spain or in the spring in Arab countries, always, however, in the same key of breaking with the traditional ways of predicting and justifying the vote, now based on less balanced information and communications and with faster time margins difficult to obtain answers and difficult to retain rationality, capable of criticizing it in its entirety – but this interest was never very clear to the authorities on duty.

Cultural wars began to be implemented, in the last decades of the 20th century, and in

the first decades of the 21st century, less as a direct interest in less controversial issues, than as an indirect need to compose arguments against political rivals. Hatred against abortion appeared less as a defense of life than as an attack on presumed enemies who would blindly support it. Manichaeism cut off the way out of complexity, in a *Fla versus Flu* of low human rationality, falling back on animality where “fear is the generator of hate”, in the much repeated but little reflected musical phrase.

To work beyond the left and right duality, as well as to understand the historicity experienced between political faces distant from this singular discursive functioning, it was necessary to take into account a procedure capable of appropriating historical temporality, as well as culturality, through which they flowed. Clearly the hateful arguments that began to rage from the second decade of this century onwards.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Our goal was to explain how we can rationalize our time, unveiling a model to understand how hatred and politics in this 21st century began to be used based on the experience of previous decades, reaching original historicity, that is, the sophists of more than two thousand years ago. With this understanding, it is possible to propose as decisive for the identification of any totality of arguments admitted over time, in themes managed (sometimes manipulated) to obtain political hatred, directed against a partisan, ideological, regional facet, whatever. The fable of the fox and the lamb, which drinks from the river against the current, resolved this issue of motives centuries ago.

11. See KAISER, Brittany. **Manipulated.** How Cambridge Analytica and Facebook invaded the privacy of millions and put Democracy in check. Translated by Roberta Clapp & Bruno Fiuzza. Rio de Janeiro: Harper Collins, 2020. Activist and linked to the company owned by Robert Mercer and Steve Bannon, the author was one of those responsible for the plot that led to fake news and hate speech against the Democratic candidate for the United States government in 2016. After, the author became worth reading on this topic because she “changed sides”.

The current issue is to obtain arguments that convincingly follow some of the pitfalls of relative linkage. Furthermore, the center of attention for educational awareness may be the possibility of mapping the origins, near, far and away, of this new distorting logic of what we call the Era of Hypermodernity.

The task of finding argumentative similes in the past that explain the functioning of

Logic now depends on understanding the moment in which invasive procedures were hypertrophied by technology, hypostatized as a function of hatred, necessary to counteract a hegemonic discourse of growth in concord in favor of globalization “for all”, which no longer supported growth, which was the real reason for the revolt reaction.

REFERENCES

ARISTÓTELES. **Arte Retórica, Arte Poética**. Tradução de Antônio Pinto de Carvalho e Estudo Introdutório de Gofredo Telles Júnior. São Paulo: Ediouro, s/d.

BERECZKEI, Tomás. **Mentes maquiavélicas**. A Psicologia da Manipulação. Tradução Renan Marques Birro. Petrópolis: Vozes / Nobilis, 2019.

CARVALHO, Olavo de. **A Nova Era e a revolução Cultural**. Fritjof Capra & Antonio Gramsci. 4. Edição revista e muito aumentada. Campinas: Vide Editorial, 2014.

D'ANCONA, Matthew. **Pós-verdade**. A nova guerra contra os fatos em tempos de fake news. Tradução Carlos Szlak. Barueri: Faro Editorial, 2018.

EAGLETON, Terry. **A ideia de Cultura**. Tradução Sofia Rodrigues. Lisboa, Actividades Editoriais Ltda, 2003.

HERÁCLITO. **Fragmentos contextualizados**. Tradução, Apresentação e Comentários de Alexandre Costa. Rio de Janeiro: DIFEL, 2002.

KAISER, Brittany. **Manipulados**. Como a Cambridge Analytica e o Facebook invadiram a privacidade de milhões e botaram a Democracia em xeque. Tradução Roberta Clapp & Bruno Fiuza. Rio de Janeiro: Harper Collins, 2020.

KAKUTANI, Michiko. **A Morte da Verdade**. Notas sobre a Mentira na Era Trump. Tradução André Czarnobai & Marcela Duarte. Rio de Janeiro: Intrínseca, 2018.

LIMA, Paulo Butti de. **Platão: Uma Poética para a Filosofia**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2004.

LIPOVETSKY, Gilles. e CHARLES, Sebastien. **Os tempos hipermodernos**. São Paulo, Barcarolla, 2004.

MACDONALDS, Hector. **Verdade**. Treze motivos para duvidar de tudo que te dizem. Tradução Flavio Chamis. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2019.

MAGNUS, Ariel. **Oda al Odio**. Madrid: Adriana Hidalgo, 2015.

PERELMAN, Chaim. **Retóricas**. Tradução Maria Ermantina Galvão Pereira. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1999.

PLATÃO. **Parmênides**. Texto grego estabelecido e anotado por John Burnett. Tradução, Apresentação e Notas Maura Iglésias & Fernando Rodrigues. 2. Edição. São Paulo: Editora PUC / Editora Loyola, 2005.

PRATA Filho, Ricardo & CASTRO, Thais de Bakker (Org.). **Lendo Judith Butler**: apropriações teóricas e políticas interdisciplinares. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. PUC-Rio, 2021.

ROCHA, Júlio César Barreto. **Análise Intercultural de Argumentos**. Tese Doutoral. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago, 2004.

_____. **Análise Intercultural de Argumentos**. 2004.

ROSLING, Hans. **FactFulness**. O hábito libertador de só ter opiniões baseadas em fatos. 2. Edição. Tradução Victor Paolozzi. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2019.

SANTOS, Laymert Garcia dos. **Politizar as novas tecnologias**. O impacto sociotécnico da informação digital e genética. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2003.

SCHOPENHAUER, Arthur. **A Arte de Escrever**. Organização, tradução, prefácio e notas de Pedro Sússekind. Porto Alegre: LP&M, 2008.

SCHOPENHAUER, Arthur. **El Arte de tener razón**. Expuesto em 38 estratagemas. Tradução e Estudio de Dionisio Garzón. Madrid: Biblioteca EDAF, 1996.

TRIGO, Luciano. **Guerra de Narrativas**. A Crise Política e a Luta pelo Controle do Imaginário. Rio de Janeiro: Globo Livros, 2018.