

"Who is sovereign in cyberspace?" Interview with Raquel Recuero

Jamir Kinoshita

Doctor and Master in Communication Sciences from ECA/USP. Pedagogical advisor at Uniced.

E-mail: jamir.kinoshita@alumni.usp.br. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4771-9181>.

INTERVIEW

Abstract: Raquel Recuero is a professor at the Federal University of Pelotas, where she coordinates the Media, Discourse, and Social Network Analysis Research Laboratory. She is also a researcher in the Postgraduate Programme in Communication at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul. In 2025, she won the Gaucho Researcher Award from the Rio Grande do Sul State Research Support Foundation. She was vice-president of the National Association of Postgraduate Programmes in Communication and a consultant for Google. In this interview¹, she discusses misinformation, the need for rules for the use of social networks, the presence of artificial intelligence and mobile devices in educational processes, and digital sovereignty.

Keywords: misinformation; education; platform companies; digital sovereignty; social networks.

Resumo: Raquel Recuero é professora da Universidade Federal de Pelotas, onde coordena o Laboratório de Pesquisa em Mídia, Discurso e Análise de Redes Sociais. É também pesquisadora do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Comunicação da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul. Em 2025, ganhou o prêmio Pesquisador Gaúcho da Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul. Foi vice-presidenta da Associação Nacional dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Comunicação e consultora do Google. Nesta entrevista, trata de desinformação, da necessidade de normas para uso das redes sociais, da presença da inteligência artificial e do aparelho celular nos processos educacionais e sobre soberania digital.

Palavras-chave: desinformação; educação; empresas de plataformas; soberania digital; redes sociais.

¹ The interview was attended by editorial assistant Leticia Lima Menon. E-mail: leticiamenon@usp.br.

Submission: 10/11/2025

Accepted: 11/11/2025

INTRODUCTION



Source: Personal archive.

When discussing disinformation on social media, one of the leading Brazilian names mentioned in studies on the subject is Raquel Recuero. She is quite direct in her critique of how this mechanism operates today: “Disinformation as we know it today goes beyond street gossip. It only exists because of the [digital] platforms, which provide the means and conditions for disinformation to exist and spread.” Starting from the premise that algorithms generate informational pollution, the researcher, who holds degrees in Social Communication and Law from UFPel, emphasizes the responsibility of platform companies for the content disseminated daily. To this end, she evokes the relevance of national sovereignty, which has returned to the forefront due to the taxation imposed on Brazil by the United States, to reinforce the need to regulate the activity of these large corporations.

They cannot have their own set of rules; they must be subject to Brazilian law like any other business and any other person operating within the national territory. It is not fair that people who own businesses have to comply with certain laws while platforms, which are much larger, do not (Excerpt from an interview with Recuero).

In a highly technological world, Raquel Recuero points out that more than limiting the use of artificial intelligence (AI) and cell phones in educational processes, it is necessary to discuss and prepare society, especially the younger population, for the use of these tools in everyday life, so that people

come to understand what it means to be online and have a profile on a social media platform. “AI can help [in several issues], but we need to be the actors, and not let it take center stage” (Excerpt from an interview with Recuero). A member of the INCT-DSI (National Institute of Science and Technology in Information Disputes and Sovereignities) and the advisory committee of CNPq (National Council for Scientific and Technological Development) in the area of Communication, she has no doubt about the role of science for the nation’s future: “It is the only way we have to generate knowledge and grow technologically. It is in science that technology is created, answers to complex problems, strategies to overcome the country’s challenges.” Therefore, she reiterates her concern about the allocation of resources to the sector. “Many governments and leaders still lack the understanding of how important investment in science is,” she says.

Communication & Education: In the early 2000s, during your master’s degree, you studied virtual communities based on computer-mediated communication, establishing a relationship with sociability. For your doctorate, you proposed a typology for these communities. From that period to the present day, what is your assessment of the changes that have occurred in the virtual world in light of the strong process of datafication and platformization?

Raquel Recuero: When I started studying, there was a much larger ecosystem of tools: things that were from universities, public institutions, and small businesses. Today, there are large conglomerates that dominate all digital communication, a giant shift towards the capitalization of data by platforms. When I started studying, these tools were based in various spaces, had multiple servers, a much more distributed structure. Today, there are very centralized structures, data cross-referencing on a much larger scale, which will be used for advertising, marketing, and the valuation of the platforms themselves. We’ve changed the focus, which was much more social, in the sense of having a space for cooperation, dialogue, and construction, to a purely commercial one, where people’s dream is to be an influencer. It’s not about being on the internet to discover new things and people and explore specific interests.

C&E: You worked at Google in the United States and India. What was that experience like, and how does it contribute to the research you’ve been doing?

RR: I worked as a consultant on two major research projects on the adoption of communication tools, that is, what social meaning the adoption of communication tools had for people, which were still in their infancy at a time when there were many spaces for interaction and platforms. We studied the cultural aspect of this appropriation. Adoption in India is completely different from what happens in Brazil. There, the issue of privacy was much stronger. They used far fewer photos because there was a whole concern. In Brazil, it was a different story: they used many more photos, more personal

inscriptions. At that time, the objective was much more to understand how people used the tools and how they could be improved than to actually monetize them. The idea of creating value from interactions, of interaction becoming capital for the company, is something more recent. We have a very savage appropriation of the social sphere by capitalism, which was something that capitalism couldn't appropriate before. Now, it can appropriate and create value from social interactions, from people's images. It's a completely different kind of alienation from work than what we have today. The perspective was very different because the field had many more companies. Twitter was just starting out; it was a company with a different communication model than, for example, Orkut. There was a desire to understand these different models, how they generated value for people, and how they contributed to communities. There was a much more utopian vision. There was even that "no harm" idea. There was a greater bias towards Californian ideology, seeing technology as something liberating rather than enslaving. We've turned to a much worse side, where capital speaks louder, and with that, thousands of new problems have arisen that didn't exist before. This idea of using technology as a social mediator to bring people closer together is kind of gone. It's fallen apart.

C&E: What is your analysis of the Digital Statute for Children and Adolescents²?

RR: It's a much broader law for adults in the sense that it addresses issues that should already be illegal. Again, it's the same old story: it seems people are losing their common sense. Things that weren't allowed before, we're having to say again: *Look, you can't do that, you can't publish a child's photo without authorization.* When can you publish a child's photo without authorization anywhere? I used to tell my students that if it's a photo you're not going to print and put in front of your house for everyone to see, it shouldn't be on the internet. It shouldn't be public for people to see, because you don't know who that audience is. The big issue, and this is a point that's always emphasized, is the lack of education. People don't understand, they don't perceive the internet as a metaphor for the theater: where they are on stage, only those in the front row can see. But the theater is much bigger, and you can't see who's in the back. You don't know who those people are, what their intentions are, what they're looking for. These are complicated issues because people don't have a clear idea of what it means to be online, what it means to leave these digital traces, how long they persist, and how much those traces can come back to haunt someone in the future. We need legislation, but above all, education. We need teenagers and children to be educated about being on the internet, because it's inevitable. We need to have this debate. My son is recording a little dance on his phone to put on TikTok, but does he know what that means? There's even a discussion with the parents, who also don't know, they think it's cute. It's the family

² Federal Law 15.211/2025, sanctioned by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, expands the comprehensive protection provided for in the Statute of Children and Adolescents (ECA) to the online environment, establishing rules for platforms, applications, and technology providers. The full text of the law can be consulted at https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2023-2026/2025/lei/L15211.htm.

that will see it, but it’s not just the family because it’s public. This requires educational work, primarily.

C&E: Isn’t it ironic that the law arose from a complaint by a young influencer³, from within the social network itself, without any monetization involved, and that this ended up piercing his own bubble of followers?

RR: There were already investigations underway at the Public Prosecutor’s Office regarding the cases presented. But it’s only when it generates public outcry that there’s a stronger mobilization. I think it’s ironic, but on the other hand, it’s characteristic of today’s technologies. We have exactly this point and the counterpoint, the rupture of the discourse within the very space where this discourse is constituted and legitimized.

C&E: How do you assess the creation of the National Data Protection Agency (ANPD)⁴? Is it possible to expect more precise rules to be established for content disseminated on major social media platforms? Wasn’t the LGPD (Brazilian General Data Protection Law)⁵ already sufficient to address this situation?

RR: Legislation always depends on the interpretation of legal experts, on how it is applied and how it will be understood. Today we have an essential problem regarding Brazilian sovereignty. The notion of the State is intrinsically connected to that of sovereignty; that is, a State needs a territory where it has power and, therefore, is sovereign in that territory. The question is, who is sovereign in cyberspace? It’s not a space, it’s not a territory. Brazilian legislation has power within Brazilian territory. What happens? These platforms are not in Brazil. They are not Brazilian entities. How do we regulate data that is in digital space, that is produced and stored in different parts of the world? How does Brazil regulate this? That is the big question. We need international regulatory treaties to achieve effectiveness. Because even if we manage to create legislation that is valid in Brazil, what does the platform do? It leaves the country, it no longer has an office here. And then what? What is the option? To remove the platform, to prohibit it from operating? We need more effective mechanisms. This discussion about platform regulation isn’t just national; it should also be international. Meta, for example, is the largest country in the world if we count the number of profiles as the number of people. How can Meta comply with Brazilian regulations? International regulation is needed, a treaty that will make the company adhere to certain ethical and moral principles, which are human principles. Brazilian regulation alone isn’t enough. We suffer pressure. Every time platform regulation is discussed, there’s international pressure, even from the platforms themselves. This isn’t in their interest. Because regulating platforms in different countries means a lot of money to adapt to each nation. And, obviously, they have no interest in that.

3 The Digital Statute for Children and Adolescents, also known as the Felca Law, was approved and enacted after a video warning about the risks of the abusive exposure of children, broadcast by YouTuber Felipe Bressanim Pereira, known by the stage name Felca, received widespread attention. The documentary is available at the link <https://youtu.be/FpsCzFGL1LE>.

4 The National Data Protection Agency, created by Provisional Measure 1.317/2025, replaces the National Data Protection Authority. With the status of a regulatory agency, it has decisional independence, a specific budget allocation, and a definitive institutional structure. Thus, Brazil aligns itself with the international community and becomes recognized by the European Union regarding data protection. To learn more, consult the link https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2023-2026/2025/Mpv/mpv1317.htm.

5 This refers to the General Data Protection Law (Federal Law 13.709/2018), which governs the processing of personal data stored in physical or digital format. The full text of the law can be found at the following link: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2018/lei/l13709.htm.

C&E: How do you analyze the discussion on the regulation of social media in Brazil and other countries? Is there any progress on this issue?

RR: Very little. Brazil is making very little progress. Every time this discussion is initiated, it gets blocked, there's an intervention of forces from outside the country. Brazil is unable to regulate the platform adequately.

C&E: Disinformation is one of your research topics. How can we understand this in the context of datafication and platformization, and in light of the transformations experienced by journalism?

RR: Disinformation as we know it today is a massive, large-scale thing that goes beyond street gossip. It only exists because of the platforms, which provide the means and conditions for disinformation to exist and spread. The platforms monetize disinformation. It's not that disinformation didn't exist before. But it was very different in an election to arrive at my polling station and find a bunch of mimeographed pages with nonsense about a candidate scattered on the floor, and to be actively bombarded with disinformation on all the social media channels I use against that same candidate. I can't escape this disinformation. It will affect me anyway, and on this scale, it has terrible effects on people. What comes online is very difficult to discern what is true and what is not, because anyone can create a profile and say whatever they want. There are several intertwined issues, and the platforms' responsibility for this is undeniable. The issue of journalism is different. This is a necessary element of modern liberal democracies. It mediates between communities, people, and the State. It acts as a platform for accountability and mediation, showing groups and the State which issues are relevant. Journalism shapes the social space, the hierarchy of important social content. What do people on these platforms receive? What catches their attention. What catches their attention? Entertainment, things that interest them, things they find funny. That's what catches their attention, what they spend the most time watching. That's not necessarily what they need to know to be a citizen. Journalism doesn't show them what they want to see, but what they need to know. On these platforms, they only see what they want to see. Obviously, many people don't want to see certain content. "Oh, I don't want to know about tragedy because I'm already fed up, I don't want to know anything more about war." So I don't watch it, and the platform doesn't show it to me, but that alienates me. Journalism is a completely different information mechanism from the algorithms of platforms, which want to make money off my attention, showing me anything that catches my eye. But that's not what I need to know. What I need to know needs to reach me; it's in the State's interest that I know there's a vaccination campaign in Rio Grande do Sul because there's a meningitis outbreak in several cities, which have coverage below 38%. Oh, but I don't want that. It doesn't matter, I need to receive this content. And that's journalism. It's impossible for journalism to compete with the logic of the platform

because they are absurdly different logics. The platform works as if I had a school, the children went in and only studied what they wanted. Oh, I just want to play soccer all the time. Okay, but in real life, the child has to study math. I don't like math, but it's necessary to study. I don't like Portuguese, but it's necessary to study. There's a difference between what distracts me, what catches my attention, and what I need. The platform doesn't care about what I need. Journalism and content on streaming platforms are not on the same level. To get good content on these platforms, you have to actively search, subscribe, and even then, the platform will still show you nonsense. It will keep showing it to you because your network likes to watch videos of children dancing on TikTok, even if you don't follow them. The algorithm actually works to promote informational pollution.

C&E: To what extent is society truly prepared to understand and combat misinformation? Is there a chance we can reduce the level of misinformation we see today? How?

RR: First, misinformation requires people to understand what information, knowledge, and opinion mean. We need to work with institutions that have their legitimacy recognized to tell people what they need to pay attention to. However, in this historical moment we are in, there are institutions and authorities with credibility saying nonsense. Especially outside of Brazil, now, there is terrible information about public health and vaccination being spread by authorities. Where did this come from? Only God knows. When we reach this level, there is institutionalization of misinformation. There is a discrediting of institutions, of democracy itself. Who do I listen to? Who is interested in my well-being? There is a breakdown of the social pact where the State must promote the well-being of people. The State wants to promote its own interests, so what kind of democracy is this? Where is it going? Therefore, misinformation becomes institutionalized, it becomes a tactic of power.

C&E: To what extent has the idea of engagement on social media stolen the space of the concept of social participation?

RR: The idea of engagement has nothing to do with participation. Engagement is the time I can capture your attention or influence you to take action. Participation is something I need to do. For example, I need to vote, so I need to participate in the decisions of the city, understand my role, what the platforms can contribute to this, the content that is there, what kind of content I need. Engagement is the hijacking of attention, which may or may not be on content that works for me. Engagement metrics simply mean how much time or how many interactions a person made with my content so that it can be monetized. It doesn't necessarily mean that this content is good, recommendable, or democratic. It can be any type of content, including misinformation. One thing is what we need to know to be citizens, another

is what we like to know because it makes us feel good, captures our attention, or we find it interesting and relevant. Engagement speaks directly to capital, capitalizing on someone's attention.

C&E: On social media, it's noticeable that there's a difficulty in separating leisure time, entertainment time, from professional time dedicated to producing work-related content. To what extent does this lack of distinction contribute to the purpose of social media?

RR: There's no opposition between professional and entertainment content, because entertainment content can be professional. Many people monetize humorous content. These people use platforms as professional tools. Many people monetize by, for example, doctors talking about medical topics. The issue isn't whether the content is professional or not. It's content that captures attention, but I don't even know if we can say that all of it is entertainment, because sometimes it isn't; it just generates curiosity. Sometimes we don't even want to watch it, but we end up watching it unintentionally.

C&E: We know that digital platforms capture all the data of their users, including bodily sensations in front of computer, laptop, and cell phone screens, and that this serves for monetization. If platform companies do all this, how and why don't they moderate disinformation and hate speech? How long will this intentional nonsense on the part of the platforms prevail?

RR: I understand that there's an operational difficulty in that not all content that's illegal in Brazil is illegal elsewhere. We have societies with different cultures and laws; some are more conservative, where certain content isn't allowed, and others where it is. Beyond very extreme limits, there are gray areas in between regarding content moderation. Platforms are largely based on the American idea of freedom of expression, and that's the most important thing in the world. But in most democracies, freedom of expression is a right limited by other rights. It's not an absolute right because that's the obvious principle of the rule of law. My right ends where the other person's right begins. If my right is absolute, nobody else's right is worth anything. There are some complicated issues; there are cultural relationships related to specific content. This really makes content moderation difficult. However, platforms need to have better measures because even at the extremes, they can't manage this moderation, whether due to lack of will, lack of investment, or because moderation teams no longer exist. Many of these teams have already been disbanded. Many investments in fact-checking have been dismantled recently. This makes the space increasingly chaotic for content creation. People say, "Oh, but fact-checking doesn't work." It does work, but it's not enough on its own. It already discourages the sharing of information because it's marked as potentially incorrect. People get the urge to share it, thinking, "*Oh my God, I need to send this to everyone!*" They think twice because they don't want that

content to affect their reputation. They’ll be more cautious when the content is already marked. But there are other forces at play, geopolitical issues that are quite important in this delimitation. I don’t know if it’s the platforms’ intention, but looking from the outside, we wonder why measures that are quite simple aren’t being taken.

C&E: Previously, the process of communication and education was conceived through the appropriate use of radio and television. This was even linked to an educational process that helped prevent violence in schools. How should we think about the relationship between communication and education today, given the landscape of social media, with its misinformation and the spread of hate speech, especially when the debate often revolves around the use of cell phones in the classroom?

RR: Cell phone use is a given. I can say it’s not for use in school, but students will continue using it outside of school. AI use is a given. I can say I don’t want it used, but people will continue using it. So, what’s the path of least harm? It’s discussing and preparing people, especially younger people, for what it means to be online, to use these tools, to have a profile on social media platforms. I would sometimes go to my students and do experiments. *Type your name into Google, ask what Google knows about you.* They were often extremely surprised because they didn’t remember that certain traces they left in the past, when they were much younger, were still there. *Wow, but how is this still here? I don’t want it anymore, but I don’t know the password anymore, I don’t know where it is.* What is this? It’s education. Everyone, but especially young people, don’t look at the long term; we’re looking at the present, at the advantage we have now, and we don’t realize how long this profile will remain online. That’s why education is important. We need to raise awareness so that people have a critical mind when using these tools and understand the impacts they have on their lives. I’m not saying not to use them because if we say “*don’t use them,*” that’s when things really fall apart. We need to be aware of the advantages and disadvantages, understand what it means to use this or that; this debate is necessary. Education is important not to tell people what they should or shouldn’t do, but to discuss and show the effects, problems, and advantages that people sometimes haven’t noticed in their daily use.

C&E: How can we conceive of a digital education process today, given the presence of ChatGPT and other AI techniques?

RR: We can use any tool, as long as we take ownership of it and don’t use it as someone who is only providing data and not using it critically. This applies to all tools. AI tools can greatly improve certain more mechanical processes. At the same time, they bring ethical dilemmas regarding the use of natural resources, such as the idea that if I use this, I will be replacing myself. We have to take ownership, understand how the business works, learn

how to use it in a way that benefits me as an individual, not the AI itself. The idea is not to benefit the AI, but to benefit the individual. The big problem with LLMs⁶ is that they take a leap every six months, and we can't keep up. Many entities have discussed the ethical use of AI, but this use will not be the same in six months because we will have another leap. On the other hand, not everything is chaos. There are many positive aspects, such as the use of AI in accessibility issues. For example, students who cannot read the text because they are blind, and the AI reads that text. There are more complex issues that need to be debated. AI can help, but we need to be the active participants, not let it steal the show.

C&E: For a time, the idea of technology in schools was tied to providing computers, laptops, and tablets for student use. With digital natives, who master new technologies from a young age, what becomes of the relationship between education and technology?

RR: The discussion about access to technology is more important than the access itself. It seems increasingly necessary to have these debates within schools. What constitutes access to technology and what constitutes using technology itself? Ideally, all schools should have access to technological tools so that students can experiment and develop skills in how to use that technology, even for their future professional lives. The trend is for them to have this digital literacy to achieve better professional opportunities. But there are limitations in terms of funding and physical infrastructure that prevent schools from having this.

C&E: How should teachers address the issue of technology, and specifically social media, within the educational process of student training?

RR: We need to have teacher training seminars because nobody is born knowing everything; it's not knowledge acquired by osmosis in humanity. We need to have this debate about the implications, including work issues, because teachers aren't slaves who are available 24 hours a day in any space. Labor relations are regulated by law. The use of WhatsApp, of social media itself, what they can or cannot do, what is advisable or not, these are discussions that need to be had, including in teacher training, which many times they don't even think about because they also don't have time. The teaching profession demands much more than the time for which they are paid. It's a central issue to debate the role of these technologies in the exercise of different professions because they can be allies, but also very problematic for a person's life, who deserves to have their leisure time respected. Most teachers complain a lot about the use of these platforms because they end up receiving demands from schools and students at any time. They are expected to read emails outside of business hours, to answer WhatsApp messages when they are not working.

⁶ The acronym stands for Large Language Model, which is an AI system trained on enormous volumes of text to understand, generate, and manipulate human language to perform tasks such as translation, summarization, and answering questions.

C&E: You have an extensive and consistent academic career. In that respect, do you believe that universities are prepared to deal with misinformation, datafication, and platformization?

RR: There’s a very important discussion about this in Brazil. It’s less a question of being prepared, and more about the debate that takes place in academic institutions. In general, Brazilian academic institutions have been having this discussion. Researchers have been bringing these issues to the debate. Brazil is second to none in terms of the debates that are taking place in international research centers. In many cases, we are pioneers, so much so that many of our researchers end up being hired to work abroad and never return to the country, which is a shame. We train people, making them specialists, and they leave because we can’t retain that knowledge. This debate already exists within the university. The problem is that it needs to leave the university, go to other spaces, and be appropriated by institutions. Look at Roseli [Fígaro]’s work at USP on labor issues⁷, which are addressed in depth. We keep debating as if no one had ever talked about it before. Researchers and research groups do science outreach work to take knowledge outside of universities. But sometimes it seems that what comes from abroad is more seductive, so people base their opinions on what someone from the United States says, and not on what is being produced within Brazil itself, which, incidentally, is of much higher quality for a specific context.

C&E: You are part of the National Institute of Science and Technology in Information Disputes and Sovereignities⁸. I would like you to comment a little on your participation in this group from the perspective of digital sovereignty.

RR: To talk about sovereignty today, it’s impossible not to talk about digital sovereignty. The Brazilian state loses power when it begins to be influenced by external factors that can enter and change minds in the country through platforms, influencing people, including towards wrong decisions. There is influence, for example, from groups that come together to cause electoral chaos, disrupt negotiations, and even carry out terrorist actions online. There are many extremist groups in Brazil that are fueled by platforms, and several violent events in schools are perpetrated by people who were formed through discussions and groups on these platforms. These are things that Brazil needs to say: *Look, this is not good, we don’t want it.* This is a matter of sovereignty, in the sense of debating whether Brazilian law should also apply to platforms. They cannot have their own regulations; they need to be subject to Brazilian law like any business and any person operating in the national territory. It is not fair that people who have their businesses have to submit to certain laws while the platforms, which are much larger, do not. Sovereignty is in the sense of the self-interest of society. What kind of Brazil do we want? What problems can we avoid? What is a crime for any Brazilian must also be a crime when it’s on the internet. It doesn’t make

7 The research conducted by the Center for Research in Communication and Work (CPCT), coordinated by Professor Dr. Roseli Fígaro, can be found on the website <https://comunicacaoetra-balho.eca.usp.br/>.

8 The INCT-DSI, which receives financial support from the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), is a scientific center composed of national and international researchers. Its objective is to analyze and propose public policies to combat disinformation and to study the circulation of information on digital platforms, algorithms, and data.

sense. It's a bit like the issue of child exploitation. It's obvious. Just because it's on the internet, inside a bubble where nothing bad can happen, doesn't mean I'm protected, that this is no man's land. There has to be a law that applies to everyone. That's the principle of the State.

C&E: You are a member of the CNPq advisory committee in the area of Communication. What is your analysis of research funding agencies in relation to this field of knowledge and, more specifically, regarding discussions in the digital world?

RR: There is a lot of interest, you can see the growth, the influence of this area in discussions that are extremely relevant to Brazil. On the other hand, there is also a certain deterioration of the science funding bodies in the country, and this, unfortunately, has persisted, although with some improvements. It is something we need to worry about. Science is the only way we have to generate knowledge and grow technologically. It is in science that technology is created, answers to complex problems, strategies to overcome the country's challenges. If we don't invest in science, there's no way to arrive at these solutions because no external solution will be as good as the one created within the contextual space of those involved who understand the idiosyncrasies of the issue, the details, the contradictions. This is still lacking for many governments and rulers: realizing how relevant investment in science and budgetary allocation for science is, which has unfortunately been decreasing.

C&E: What are your latest research projects and, perhaps, new book releases?

RR: I launched the book on misinformation⁹, which is the result of a discussion that has been going on for quite some time. We organized a seminar on misinformation and climate in Rio Grande do Sul because the southern region has been greatly affected by extreme weather events, which have become very common. This is a very important discussion that we need to have and prepare for.

REFERENCES

BRASIL. Lei nº 13.709, de 14 de agosto de 2018. Brasília: Presidência da República, 2018. Available at:https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2018/lei/113709.htm. Accessed in: 10 Oct. 2025.

BRASIL. Lei nº 15.211, de 17 de setembro de 2025. Brasília: Presidência da República, 2025. Available at:https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2023-2026/2025/lei/L15211.htm. Accessed in: 10 Oct. 2025.

⁹ This refers to the work "The Network of Disinformation – Systems, Structures and Dynamics on Social Media Platforms".

BRASIL. Medida Provisória nº 1.317, de 17 de setembro de 2025. Brasília: Presidência da República, 2025. Available at:https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2023-2026/2025/Mpv/mpv1317.htm. Accessed in: 10 Oct. 2025.

FELCA. Adultização. **Youtube**, 6 ago. 2025. 49min38s. Available at:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FpsCzFGL1LE>. Accessed in: 10 Oct. 2025.

RECUERO, Raquel. **A rede da desinformação** – Sistemas, estruturas e dinâmicas nas plataformas de mídias sociais. Porto Alegre: Editora Sulina, 2024.