



Memory and its Relations with Cronos and Kairós

Memória e suas Relações com Cronos e Kairós

Solon Eduardo Annes Viola

(PhD in History/UNISINOS, Professor in the Social Sciences Graduate Program at UNISINOS, Brazil)

E-mail: solonviola@yahoo.com.br

Paulo Peixoto de Albuquerque

(PhD in Sociology/Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, Professor in the Health Education Graduate Program at UFRGS, Brazil)

E-mail: albuquerque.paulo@gmail.com

Abstract

The article intends to show the vibrant and constant relationship between memory and the experience of the present; taking care to bring memory, truth and justice closer to the contemporary assumptions of human rights. Based on an analysis of the resurgence of an ultra-conservative ideology in Brazil in the last decade, we seek to demonstrate the importance of not forgetting the recent past in the country to point out relevance and paths that expand our network of meanings, and help us to recognize the risk of present and future experiences that attempt to suppress political and civil rights.

Keywords: Memory; Human Rights; Cronos; Kairós.

Sumário

O artigo tem a intenção de mostrar a relação viva e constante entre a memória e a experiência do presente; cuidando para aproximar a memória, a verdade e a justiça dos pressupostos contemporâneos dos direitos humanos. Buscamos, a partir de uma análise do recrudescimento de uma ideologia ultra-conservadora nesta última década no Brasil, demonstrar a importância do não esquecimento do passado recente no país para se apontar relevâncias, caminhos e percursos que ampliem nossa rede de significados, e nos ajudem a reconhecer o risco de experiências presentes e futuras que intentem em suprimir direitos políticos e civis.

Palabras-chave: Memória; Direitos Humanos; Cronos; Kairós.



1. Introduction

The title of this article serves as a trigger for thinking. It has to do with temporalities that seem to be interwoven and indistinct. An individual time, whose reference is only the experienced and another, more diffuse, a time of life that in recollection seems unreal.

It is as if there is a magic of power that tends to stunt the critical vigilance of individuals, diverting attention to what really should be discussed - the rights of individuals and social segments - sacralizing processes of exclusion that, in appearance, we consider to be normal. Articulating temporalities – Cronos e Kairós - relates the discussion of these processes from the world of life and its link to the reason to be of the University.

Knowledge can be seen as a large web of meanings that cannot be fragmented, because it results from a process and from a time that does not return: it happened / it happens. However, the web of meanings rebuilt at each generation is paradoxically, not only rebuilt but other elements are added, causing the memory - not oblivion- to produce in the exercise of updating the socio-historical processes possibilities of change or preservation of ways of organizing society.

It is not about a mental action, driven by the desire for abstract and detached discovery. That is why our intention is to establish a living and unsettling relationship between Cronos and Kairós: taking care to bring memory, truth and justice closer to the contemporary assumptions of Human Rights.

It is not about renewing the look and putting in other analytical frames what we already know, but to reflect about time trying to understand it from the references that take it as an objective (chronological time) and subjective (lifetime) elaboration, that is, as a data that has no reality outside the subject.

Seen in this way, time is a constitutive part of the human condition (subjective) of organization and its understanding is an indispensable component due to the multiple narratives that memory can reconstruct. It is not our sensitive intuition that is regulated by the nature of objects, but the facts experienced, individually and collectively, that are regulated by the cultural universe that forms our culture making possible multiple ways of theorizing them.

For this reason, (our working hypothesis: care with the oblivion of memory) - the experience of mapping past time and experienced times allows us to indicate relevance, paths and routes that can expand the network of meanings of human rights which, if not reminded daily, dissolve into oblivion.

The polysemy of Human Rights can be based on liberal assumptions, but it can also mean projects of collective resistance beyond the announcements of an individual unable to guarantee the full survival of most contemporary society. They can also feed a discourse that,



at the limit, denies the theoretical and ideological assumptions that underlie contemporary thought. On the contrary, it demonstrates how much the plurality of thought calls into question the permanences - Cronos - and the transformations - Kairós - of time.

The plural meanings of Human Rights are sharpened when the political context acquires complexity as occurs from the social and economic crisis that has worsened since the impeachment in 2016. The socio / historical events experienced in recent years: coup d'etat 2016, - judicialization of political processes - seems to make sense only in its information component insofar as the media that presents and proposes to be the key to a hegemonic logic to give credibility to historical times, especially those that, in their intensity, change forms of socio-economic organization and cultural policies, especially to expand or jeopardize the organization of societies and their systems.

This fact not only proposes the existence of unique ideological territories, but also reinforces extreme positions that, under specific historical conditions, generate a universe of political beliefs capable of producing an illusory perception of consensus and non-conflict in the public and citizen space. This detail is particularly complicated for those who think and have Human Rights as one of the fundamental components of democracy.

The facts that until now have been - and are being - shown by the media, are presented in a reductionist way, inducing people to focus their attention on the “corruption” discourse and obscuring the dismantling of what has always been the differential mark of a republic. In other words, a State that, in its republican form, intends to be plural and capable of guaranteeing, via Human Rights, commitments to and between different social groups.

This is why it is necessary to be careful with the oblivion of memory, because hysteria and the anxious gear for changing the appearance, and the actual preservation of the system announce projects that do not go beyond the act of taking a party of state control:

- a) Appearances are deceiving, the essentials of the Rule of Law are not invisible to people and, even if people are not deliberately looking for it, experiencing it typically implies an effort to reflect and recover memory - March 64 also started with media exploration;
- b) The discourse of “morality” has always been an argument to annul and hide the ethical assumptions of dignity and respect for the laws, making room for exception and its excesses. The "fora Dilma" presents itself to the majority of those who voted for president, self-styled hostage to the media, as the only way out, but it presents itself as a type of chosen path, debatable in its own capacity to produce the desired results, even because it does not take into account the foundations of a democracy established in the Constitution of 88;
- c) Finally, this anxious desire for change, unlike discourse, does not involve the act of rethinking the political process or the legitimacy of proposing another way of reorienting political action beyond party spaces (in appearance we all forgot about June 2013). Or, when it does, it does in order to contain the tenuous advances of recent democracy.



Therefore, it becomes pertinent to ask: What human rights practices are these? Are these practices guided by a plural culture that bears in mind the challenge of contemporary issues in times of crisis? Or, are practices that enhance overall the class distances, inequalities and social exclusion?

Or even are they practices that hide the gap between the discourse of equality and the profoundly unequal socio-economic reality that impose itself like a fog to cover the universe of exploitation, separating and deepening inequality and putting at risk the ideas of civil and political freedoms?

This article is divided into two parts. The first seeks to reconstruct some elements of recent history, a time that important social sectors seek to keep in oblivion. They carry with them the certainty that oblivion eliminates the experience of both, the distant past and the near past, erasing the memories of their forms of domination and production of fear.

The second part aims to demonstrate the importance of movements for the reconstruction of memory through historical processes - Kairos - in search of emancipation - and ways of not emancipation - Cronos - existing in historical assumptions that keeps oppression. Overcoming oblivion policies is not limited to overcoming acts of preservation of bitterness or hate, but to demonstrate that overcoming the past will not occur until the reasons that enabled it are overcome.

2. The Aegis of Cronos

The presence of human rights in Brazilian society is still tenuous and undefined. Tenuous because, over time, under Cronos¹ aegis, it did not get an explicit form. Undefined because it has always been the subject of manipulation or attacks by the dominant social sectors. The dawn of the third decade of the 21st century demonstrates that the principles, even those that constituted the modern liberalism that have founded - equality, freedom and fraternity - human rights are far from composing the culture of Brazilian society.

When we look at the recent past, the 1930s faced a historical process characterized by two dictatorial periods - the first in the Vargas period and the second in the military period from 1964 to 1985. In both periods, social and economic transformations modernized Brazilian society and the dominated sectors remained under permanent control and the rare benefits obtained would - in a short time - be subtracted by measures from the executive branch, sometimes with the support of the other branches.

In addition to the more than 30 years of formal dictatorships, we also find attempts at coups that did not materialize, reaching an average of “one coup or attempt for every three

¹ In this text we follow Fernando Braudel's understanding of time. From his conception the eternal time is a myth. Also the time of events, so considered in some historicist and human sciences currents, is a myth. The times of the structures of societies is what the author names as “long lasting” and this is the time we call “Cronos”. The short time - which we call Kayros - is called time of the conjuncture or time of average duration.



years, from 30 to 90”, (Oliveira, 2000, 60). The constant attempts to break democracy demonstrate the practices of preserving privileges and the difficulties in building a society capable of recognizing collective and individual rights. Human rights were always treated as a risk for economic growth and a threat to political stability. Even in the second decade of this century, human rights were seen with suspicion and sometimes accused as defense of subversive and terrorists and sometimes designed as “manure of banditry”. Such accusations from the dominant sectors - often from the State – and disseminated by the media produce new cultural and psychological foundations that serve to restrict participation through prejudice and fear. Such actions are aimed to restrict freedom, undermining the possibilities of equality and curbing collective rights and the assumptions of democracy. They also aim to involve the grammar of human rights in a dense fog air that hides its principles and its corporate projects.

A foggy air able to cloud the past, placing it under a dense fog that makes it difficult to perceive intricacies, lairs and basements. It is able to break the bonds between people, between generations, while elites reject equality and citizenship for others. Unsuccessful attempts insofar as confronted with the principles of human rights - and the actions of those who follow them - put themselves in permanent defense of a dignified life.

There are a variety of reasons, the time of Cronos, for Brazilian society to build a culture of human rights so slowly. The colonial past, the economic dependence - the rarely manifest feeling of sovereignty - built a culture of privilege and denial of freedom. Among them, the heritage of long centuries of slavery with its tragic component of denying to the other the condition of human being.

The socio-economic organization remains demanding from individuals, and even from different social sectors, “Depending on material conditions in relation to relationships in which they are powerless, as well as to remain in a situation of non-emancipation” (Adorno, 2010, 43). When subjected to such conditions, both individuals and social sectors need to live “... they have nothing left but to adapt to the existing situation, to conform; they need to give up that autonomous subjectivity to which the idea of democracy refers... (Adorno, 2010, 43). Ultimately, passing from generation to generation, slavery “within men” aims to hide that in racial relations, even today, a society is produced in which racism is the cultural basis of domination. This is demonstrated by the increasingly high rates of urban violence victimizing black childhood and youth in urban peripheries.

To Arendt “Racism as an instrument of domination was used in this black and white society before imperialism exploited it as a political idea. Its basis and justification were still the experience itself, a terrible experience of something so strange that it was beyond comprehension and imagination: for whites it was easier to deny that blacks were human beings” (Arendt, 1976, 106)².

² Although Arendt's theoretical elaboration refers to the European presence - especially British and Dutch in Africa of 19th century – therefore already in the period of European imperialism of that century it applies perfectly to the period of the European colonies of America from the 16th century. In the case of Brazil, the legacy of slavery remains intense and is manifested in the material conditions of life of Afro-Brazilians and in the extermination practices of black youth from urban peripheries.



Even when oppression reached the limit of no return and the anti-colonial and anti-slavery rebellions - habitual in the colonial period and in the Empire - demanded for freedom and equality, the reaction of the dominants were to repress with iron and fire, eliminating the rebels physically or coercing through the denial of their rights to fight against injustice. – When no longer devoured his children, Cronos privileged the colonial elites allowing, in addition to the lands and men, to exercise control over others by excessive force and by the abusive use of an abusive application that, officially, is called the justice of the King -.

The Empire did not change the political framework and avoided confronting the social drama. The sovereign Prince delegated small spaces of citizenship to no more than 3% of white men with income and capable of governing their regions as masters of a law that in their daily lives had more power than the Empire's own Constitution. When manifestations of discontent came from society, there were the forces of coercion of the State, and the militias of the lords of the land, to put things back in their place and allow Cronos³ to continue to command a time without changes.

Even with the proclamation of the Republic, citizenship remained a privilege - patrimonialist, eminently white and literate. The narrow paths of representative democracy were restricted to 5% of the population. The others were left to face the dense glass air. The 1891 promise remained as vain promise and the possibility of finding Kairós⁴ remained restricted, again, the manifestations came from the oppressed sectors and still socially and politically excluded.

The expression "human rights" was not yet part of the lexicon proper to workers' movements, even in the first agendas of social demands produced in strikes for social and economic rights, and also for civil and political rights of the first unions⁵. The State responded to all these movements with the superiority expressed in the sentence: "*The social question is a question of the police*".

The modernizing changes of the second half of the 19th century did not produce a Republic capable of absorbing the liberal ideals typical of the international republican experiences of that historical period. Similarly were the economic transformations of Brazil in the first decades of the twentieth century "we are facing a historical evolution in which the "old sector" of the economy has not been transformed or destroyed to generate the "new sector" (Fernandes, 2005, 104).

³ Cronos is one of the gods who symbolize time in Greek mythology. In Greek mythology, guided by the mother Gaia (the earth), he castrated the father Uranus (the sky) and became the first king of the gods. His reign was prosperous, but he was threatened by the prophecy that he would be defeated by one of his sons. So that this prediction was not fulfilled, he devoured his children as soon as they were born. But Zeus was saved by his mother Rhea and, dethroned his father, expelled him from Olympus and freed all his brothers. For this reason, Cronos is seen as the time that inevitably leads everything to death.

⁴ Kairós is also one of the time gods in Greek mythology. It indicates a special moment. Kairós demands attention and promptness. There is no room for procrastination, carelessness and indifference. Kairós demands wisdom, indicating a special moment in time. An appropriate occasion that requires wisdom and discernment so that the possibility of meetings that are life-changing is not missed.

⁵ Although these demands were characteristically claims that have been linked to human rights since the universal declaration of 1789 and inserted in the proclamations of the Haitian Republic (1804), the workers' movement did not announce its struggles as struggles for human rights.



The Republic preserved patrimonialism and the republican revolution contained its impetus while the republican ideals were absorbed "... gravitated towards the internal reproduction of the economic order of the advanced nations, which exercised economic, cultural, political and diplomatic hegemony over the country"(Fernandes, 2005, 105). The ideal modernization of the Republic, especially linked to the assumptions of liberalism, contributed significantly to legitimize the "bureaucratization of patrimonialist domination and, consequently, the type of democratization of the political power that it included" (Fernandes, 2005, 107). Liberalism forgot the promises of equality, freedom and brotherhood that in the eighteenth century was as a universal promise. On the contrary, the nineteenth century would be in charge of demonstrating that freedom and equality meant a dense fog to justify the prominence of Cronos to safeguard the privileges of the elites. Which, in Brazil, became urban without breaking the ties that united the agrarian elites from the colonial period.

During this period, Brazilian political experiences oscillated between brief and limited experiences of representative democracy (1934-1937; 1945-1964) – interspersed with periods of dictatorships⁶. Kairos announces possible cyclical changes while Cronos watches over the preservation of structures and privileges. At the same time, the developmental modernization urbanized and industrialized Brazilian society requires not only the State reorganization with the institutionalization of relations between the different social sectors through the enactment of laws, but also the incorporation of new forms of representation of work sectors. Policies that at the same time benefit and disciplined the political action of unions and organizations of the underprivileged sectors.

The brief trials of democracy were followed by times of limitless authoritarianism. The first (1937-1945) was based on national developmentalism; the second (1964-1988) was hegemonized by international capital and committed to the political canons of the Cold War⁷ and the control of the economic policy was made by international financial organizations.

The limit between fragile democratic experiences and rigorous periods of authoritarianism has always been linked to the fine line between cooptation and citizenship control that Oliveira (1999, 63) called "imposed consensus".

In the 1937 dictatorship, the restriction of workers' citizenship was achieved through the persecution of unions of anarchist and communist origin, and even mutual aid associations in the military authoritarianism of 1964 chased and closed unions, in addition to prohibit the functioning of student organizations and suppress peasant organizations.

⁶ According to Bobbio (1985, 173) in contemporary times, people began to speak "of dictatorship regarding Italian fascism: after German National Socialism, Stalinism, and finally all governments, including the Greek colonels and General Pinochet (Chile), whose previous constitutional regime was forcibly removed, and where, after the conquest of power by an armed group, the government continued to exercised with violence, undermining all civil and political freedoms".

⁷ According to Chomsky (2017, 21), in 1962 John Kennedy made the decision to change "... the mission of the Latin American military from" hemispheric defense "to [...]" internal security ". In fact, war against the domestic population - if it raised its head. [...] A major initiative was a military coup in Brazil, backed by Washington and implemented shortly after Kennedy's murder, which instituted a murderous and brutal State of National Security. Then the plague of repression spread throughout the hemisphere, including the 1973 coup that installed the Pinochet dictatorship in Chile and, later, the most perverse of them all, the Argentine dictatorship - Ronald Reagan's favorite Latin American regime."



For Fernandes (2005) the political and economic transformations of the Republic - caused by the industrialization that capitalism caused in the social relations of production - were unable to break, in a revolutionary way, from the landowners and even from the ties of international dependence. Beyond these two limits, the Republic remained permanently vigilant, preventing the promises of liberalism - announced by the international declarations of human rights: liberty, equality and fraternity - from being accessible to urban workers and allowing the peasants to free themselves from the inheritances of slavery heritage.

The legacy of slavery persists not only as a culture of denial of social rights and political rights, implying not only the denial of formal rights, but human rights recognized as an inherent condition of a just and democratic society. On the contrary, the first two decades of this still young 21st century have an annual average of more than 5000 peasants released from work in conditions similar to slavery. Cronos remains vigilant guaranteeing the privileges of the elites and refusing rights to the oppressed.

The efforts to produce a democratic society, the process of consolidating democracy "took place almost entirely by the action of the dominated classes [...] to claim the portion that has no plot, the claim of speech ..." (Oliveira, 1999, 60). In the contemporary historical process at each period in which society came closer to overcoming basic rights, capable of responding to the needs of dignified life, it faced setbacks that broke constitutional legality through the use of force, or even by legal devices. Thus, disregarding legality while projecting "bridges to the future" that carry within them the denial of the right to think and express thought.

The second decade of the 21st century adds historical heritage to an economy hegemonized by competition of large companies and submitted to the financial system but willing to rebuild monopoly alliances that control the market by disciplining the flow of goods and submitting the aspirations of emancipation of nations and countries thus reversing the logic of the 19th and 20th centuries. In the logic of 20th century globalization (Belluzzo, 2004), the virtues of competition are celebrated while, like a fog, the prevalence of international companies over local companies is hidden. In this way, international capital and technology are praised and the inefficiency of the local industry, especially the state ones, stands out.

Once internationalized, the developmentalist alliance incorporated the most conservative social sectors, among them the heirs of the agrarian structure of the large property - now renamed as agribusiness - and the sectors averse to the cultural changes typical of advanced urban societies.

Alliances between dominant sectors have been remade and internal pacts were notably those that projected a society in search of social justice, human rights and democracy.

Polysemic expression gradually incorporates new concepts. Thus, the expression "human rights" responds to multiple interests; a) in the 1960s it is announced as a component of the American civilization model, taking the assumptions of market rights and the of way of life of the rich nations of the North. For Santos (2014, 96) human rights discourse makes it



possible to destroy life in order to save life”. In these shadowy periods, the polysemy of human rights takes multiple forms different from those of the last century: – “defense of subversives and terrorists” in the 1970s and 1990s, rights of right humans in the 2000/2010 decades, “bandit manure” in the 2010/2020 decade. Multiple expressions that serve as a dense fog and hide the way Cronos refuses to implement the assumptions of equality and freedom for the majority of the population. They can also compose a glass air assuming a “...false ideological universality that masks and legitimizes the concrete policy of imperialism and domination, military interventions and the Western neo-colonialism” (Zizek, 2014, 121).

Just in the 1970s - and already as an inheritance of the 1968 movements - the grammar of human rights assumed positions of denouncing the crimes of colonialist wars, especially in movements in defense of peace after the Vietnam War, "against torture and the restriction of fundamental freedoms, claiming validity beyond the sovereign autonomy of nation-state" (Moyn, 2013, 111). The UN Universal Declaration itself, which announces in its article 5 “*No one shall be subjected to torture, nor to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*”. In Latin America and especially in Brazil, the assumptions of human rights have enabled the reorganization of civil society and the democratization of political society.

As in 1937 and 1964 the coups d'état represent the validity of the “imposed consensus”, and the denial of the speech of the dominated means the suppression of human rights as a result of democracy (Bobbio, 1992). The democratization movements organized against authoritarianism that contributed to defeat it are produced through broad movements that in the 1980s made the impression, perhaps naive, that from the end of the military dictatorship everything could be different. Or as Elias (2005) highlights when recovering a sensation present in the French population after the death of Louis XIV, the feeling that with the passing of the King “Now everything will be better” (Elias, 2005, 29).

3. Kairós under the Shadow of Cronos

Kairós, in Greek mythology, corresponds to a precise moment of time, which also means the opportune moment. And it was also the name of one of the chariot horses of a mythological hero who had two horses, Kairos and Cronos. Cronos was the horse that kept the pace, and Kairós was the horse that, at the moment of the attack, pulled the chariot. As a metaphor, it is important to highlight that the opportune moment, the significant moment in the face of the exception time of political life, and the rescue of Human Rights was the redemocratization (it is linked to movements for the conquest and guarantee of social justice and the maintenance of the principles of a democratic system that goes beyond representation).

In the face of horror, civil society slowly reorganized itself from the spaces that the military could not control, among them are the spaces of the Christian Churches, the daily gatherings of intellectuals, humanists, academics and workers, the almost clandestine



meetings of exiles family and people in search of amnesty. The end of the economic miracle with the first oil crises and the oscillation of the foreign market and the flow of capital turned away sector of economic elites that perceived the benefits of military power being exhausted. Unhappy, they started to defend participation in the planning and execution of the economy.

The middle classes were also reorganizing, seeking to reestablish individual freedoms, end censorship and the redemocratization of the regime. While that, popular sectors articulated themselves in base and in specific collective protests movements such as the feminist movement, the new unionism, the The Homeless Movement, the Landless Movement (MST) and the Movement Against Carestia (MCC).

Beyond the decisive internal social movements, the military government was also pressured by the change of US along the Carter government (1977 - 1981). It's external policy aimed to regain control of the human rights discourse that begun to crumble with the crimes committed in the Vietnam War and the dictatorships in South America.

The military governments had no way to contained the demands from civil society, since they were weakened by the pressure of civil society, by international criticism and threatened by independent actions of the military groups, that coordinated political repression and broke the rigor of hierarchy. Kairós found spaces to the movement that Cronos could no longer contain.

The opening project sought to contain specialist of the repressing practices of information community and to preserve the repressive apparatus as a guarantee of risk-free redemocratization.

However the liberalization measures and further redemocratization would not have been taken by the regime if civil society had not produced the forms of resistance, as it was able to create, and if the social movements did not present alternatives to society. It is a matter of recognizing that the control of the process of redemocratization was under hegemony, sometimes from political-military society, sometimes from political forces associated to social movements. While the first tried to extend the military's political presence, and the second was advancing towards redemocratization under the command of civil society, that could no longer support the regime of terror and oppression.

From social movements, civil society⁸ exerted pressure and proved that it understood that democratization and the demand for human rights was a central element in the construction of a democratic, socially just.

At this juncture, the movements in defense of human rights began to act in pursuit of consolidating citizenship and social justice. Among the promoted the rights were: the defense of individuals against the arbitrariness of the State, such as illegal arrests and torture, the freedom of information and communication and the recognition of crimes committed by State

⁸ The year of 1979 was marked by strikes, by wage recovery in almost all economic sectors, which acquired a national character. It was suppressed the Decree-Law 1632 which eliminated the right to strike by public servants and services considered essential.



agents⁹. The social and economic rights, so necessary for the construction of social justice, two different interpretations emerged, one argued that these rights would naturally occur due to the free functioning of the laws of the market, and the other that understood that such rights should be demanded by civil society and guaranteed by the State.

The political heritage of the redemocratization period brought the strange desire to break free from the past without acknowledging it. With no consciousness, or even with relative conscience, it was demanded the forgetfulness - and the forgiveness - of crimes against humanity committed by state agents not recognizing the rights of those who suffered injustice. More than that, in some sectors of society it was preserved a relative consciousness, or unconsciousness able to assign to the former government the ability to solve the current difficulties.

In the period of democratization it was important to highlight that for the social movement, the culture of human rights meant guaranteeing the very identity of the principles of a social democracy as a way of knowing itself. While from 2015 social movements linked to national and international elites requested for military intervention and treated tortured people like national heroes. The social movement understood that being naively part of the international campaign for the defense of human rights could mean adhering to the game rules of international capitalism¹⁰.

4. Final Considerations

The past is not a lesson and the future is not complete when forgetfulness is induced. When manifestations against reforms need to be violently repressed and citizenship is permanently threatened as criminalization. And also when social movements are no longer recognized for the defense of rights and are treated - with the support and consent of the mass media - as criminals, vandals, troublemakers and, ultimately, terrorists.

The return to the past is necessary to oppose the versions of a hegemonic media of large corporations about the daily events. The streets and the public space remain the most evident place for the manifestations of a participatory democracy (the street demonstrations of the years 2013/2018/2019), which denies old practices of institutional politics. They are very different from the demonstrations that took place between 2015 and 2016, because the

⁹ For Clarice Herzog “One thing I have always advocated is that death by torture is murder. There is nothing political about it” (Herzog, 2008, 194).

¹⁰ Leonardo Boff stated on July 25, 1979 that “... the global campaign for human rights, headed by President Carter, (...) has great merits (...), but it can mean a deception for what it hides (the social rights). In the name of human rights, rich countries have rightly criticized the serious violation that occurs in the various military regimes in Latin America; however, they present themselves as honest and clean regimes, where the fundamental rights of the citizen are respected. This is the ideological deception, because only the individual rights were seen while violations of social rights in our countries were hidden. The rich countries were the primarily responsible for this crimes. Due to the exploitation relations they maintain with our countries, they generate economic and political crises that oblige our governments to maintain the minimum of social order, to repress relentlessly and, at times, barbarians”.



protesters that are on the streets are an example of diversity and differences, whether aesthetic, cultural, ethnic or sexual.

The polysemic concept of human rights becomes a political foundation for the choices between the past and the future, especially when historical time goes through a period of intense acceleration with multiple meanings. A time that mixes Cronos' zeal by eliminating hypocrisies and making apologies for what previously suited to remain hidden while Kairos realize how much the privileges eliminate dignified life opportunities for most humans. But that is not all. The insatiable powerful people of the world do not seem to realize that their exploitation puts at risk the life living beings.

When memory is preserved, it is able to guide the present and immediately alert to the risks of the experiences that in the recent past have served to suppress civil and political rights.

In this way, the memory announces that the neo-facist adventures of this brief 21st century must be recurred. The recent experience of Brazilian society and everything that puts the assumptions of democracy at risk demonstrates - as this article also seeks to do - that the assumptions of "never again" are non-negotiable.

In order to consolidate democracy, it is necessary to break the dense mists that intend to forget what we have in memory. Preserving memory and making it a constant presence is the main way to preserve the heritage of movements that in the past - even in the most recent past - sought to produce a critical dimension of human rights. Not only to go beyond the denunciations of crimes committed against democracy, but, especially, through memory, to contribute to the reconstruction of a culture of participation and emancipation. Bring them to the attention of everyone and incorporate them into Kairos' efforts to overcome a long time of privilege and oppression.

5. Bibliography

ADORNO, Theodor W. Educação e Emancipação. Educação e Emancipação. São Paulo, Ed. Paz e Terra Ltda. 2010, 5ª reimpressão.

ARENDT, Hannah. As Origens do Totalitarismo: Imperialismo, a Expansão do Poder. Rio de Janeiro, Editora Documenta, 1976.

BELLUZZO, Luiz Gonzaga M. Ensaio Sobre o Capitalismo no Século XX. São Paulo, Editora Fundação UNESP, 2004.

BOBBIO, Norberto, A Era dos Direitos. Rio de Janeiro, Campus, 8ª edição, 1992.

BOBBIO, Norberto, A Teoria das Formas de Governo. Brasília, DF: Ed. Universidade de Brasília, 4ª edição, 1985.



BOFF, Leonardo. Direito dos Pobres. Folha de São Paulo, São Paulo, 25 de julho de 1979, pg. 3.

CHOMSKY, Noam. Contendo a democracia. São Paulo. Rio de Janeiro. Record. 2003.

CHOMSKY, Noam. Quem Manda no Mundo? São Paulo, Editora Planeta do Brasil Ltda, 2017.

ELIAS, Norbert. A Peregrinação de Watteau à Ilha do Amor. Rio de Janeiro, Jorge Zahar, 2005.

FERNANDES, Florestan. A Integração do negro na sociedade de classes, (completar)

FERNANDES, Florestan. A Revolução Burguesa no Brasil, São Paulo, Ed. Globo, 2005

HERZOG, Clarice. A Tortura Não é Crime Político. IN: *Brasil Direitos humanos; 2008 A Realidade do País aos 60 Anos da Declaração Universal*. Brasília, Secretaria Especial de Direitos Humanos. 2008.

MOYN, Samuel. Entrevistado por André Rangel Rios. Rio de Janeiro, Editora da Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro, 2013.

SANTOS, Boaventura S. SE Deus Fosse um Antivista dos Direitos Humanos. São Paulo, Ed. Cortez, 2ªed. 2014.

ZIZEK, Slavoj. Violência. São Paulo, Boitempo Editorial, 2004.

ZIZEK, Slavoj. Como Ler Lacan. Rio de Janeiro, Editora Zahar, 2010.