

# MATRIZes

## Mediatic Visibility, Melancholia of the Unique and Invisible Violence in Cyberculture

Social-historical signification of a regressive cultural substrate of sociability in real time in the advanced mediatic civilization

Eugênio Trivinho <sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** This text focuses on understanding the social-historical signification of the desire for mediatic visibility in cyberculture. In the first section, the argumentation characterizes the *current axiomatic principle of the compulsory mediatic presence* as social capital, apprehending its fundamental and obliterated core, the *desire for uniqueness*, and glimpsing, in this desire, a complex regressive historical and imaginary layer, the *cultural melancholia of the unique*. In the second section, the reflection gleans the main theoretical consequences of the desire for mediatic visibility and of this regressive melancholia: *invisible violence (without malfeasance or guilt) in relation otherness*. The argumentation in the last section demonstrates why cyberculture contributes to disseminate and reinforce the logic of the aforementioned invisible violence.

**Keywords:** advanced mediatic civilization, cyberculture, glocal condition, mediatic visibility, desire for uniqueness, melancholia of the unique.

Signs are taken for wonders. "We would see a sign!"

T.S. Eliot

[...]Unnatural vices Are fathered by our heroism.

[...]With pungent sauces, multiply variety /

In a wilderness of mirrors.

T.S. ELIOT (1981: 77-79)

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor of the PEPGCOS-PUC-SP (Postgraduate Studies Programme in Communication and Semiotics of São Paulo Catholic University), Researcher of CNPq (National Council of Technological and Scientific Development) and General Coordinator of the CENCIB (Interdisciplinary Center for Researches in Communication and Cyberculture) (PUC-SP)

## Introductory note

The present study is dedicated to the social historical meaning of a fundamental substrate of real time sociability in advanced mediatic civilization. Our argument points out to an specific angle of the cultural historical kaleidoscope as to privilege exactly an undertaken dimension in the studies considering the object into question: that of the relationships *between the mediatic presence imperative as compulsory and the transpolitical social capital, desire for the unique as an instrumental symptom of a regressive cultural melancholy, agonistic logic of obliteration of alterity and the invisible violence related to it.*

On such circumscription the reflexive effort is focused on apprehending the social cultural meaning of the desire for evidence and self exposition in times of mediatic visibility. So the study gives in return the main consequences of the compulsive need for showing up in the media, of projecting the self and defining the appropriate field in some space of communicational visibility.

Being faithful to the object, our argument extends itself till the *processual phenomenology* of the two main contemporary tecnocultural macroconfigurations – the cultural industry scenario and the cyberculture, and it is worth resignifying, the *glocal mass condition and the interactive glocal condition* of human life (as it is organized, be it sedentary or nomad). In other words, the study is fixed in what crosses, in an unusual way, the two referred macroconfigurations. It happens at the point of their inextricable intersection with the multisided civilizatory process dragging them hopelessly with no determined endpoint, while the same point is trespassed and redesigned by them. The last part of the argument situates and emphasizes the main hypotheses considered in relation to the cyberculture *modus operandi*, here taken as a dated category, corresponding to the hypermediatic and *online* period of late capitalism.

The study expresses, as a whole, the concern with the structure of a systematic epistemology of tension regarding the linked presuppositions *a priori* from motivation to a *synergic epiphany of sociability in real time*, specially in cyberculture. That is something we believe to be situated, as to say, in the limits of the *foundings of the foundings* [to express it in the frame of Heidegger's phenomenological concerns (1986, 2008)] or in similar aprioristic reflexive *locus*.

Despite its priority focus, our argument does not exclude the conditioning of a theoretical and epistemological basis to the study of mediatized social relationships, signaling, even under all conjectural *fori*, the most relevant cultural and historical foundations that rule,

these days, in obliterated conditions, personal and group interactions in virtual communities, social networks or interactive contexts of participation and congeneric belonging (of textual, imagetic, audiovisual interchange), including businesses, related to the search for or the dispute for recognition among equals, segmented reputation, expanded prestige or diffuse fame.

The present study is a contribution to the theoretical criticism of cultural reproduction according to a civilizatory process given under glocal conditions and by historically regressive ingredients, regardless of how progressive the actions and social relationships implicated in this case may seem at first sight.

## **GLOCAL CONDITION, MEDIATIC VISIBILITY AND MELANCHOLY OF THE UNIQUE**

### **The imperative of mediatic presence**

The civilizatory process, as it has been settled during the XXIth century, – manufactured and redimensioned by the *glocal phenomenon* and by its derivative factorization, the planetary *glocalization* (cf. Trivinho, 1999, 2007: 239-320) – has forged and established *pari passu* a social imperative equation: that of an existence (personal, collective, governmental, corporative etc.) entirely conditioned by the insertion in mediatic visibility. According to the *autocratic phlegm of such a cultural axiom of an epoch*, hypostasized in daily undiscussed *habitus*, an existent (individual, group, object, brand etc.) does not subsist *per se*; it stands only in the media and through the media, be it massive, interactive or hybrid, fixed or mobile.

Regarding the present study, the glocal phenomenon is related to a mediatized and syncretic social process, neither global, nor local, taking place and being materialized far beyond as much as close to both realms. It goes as a third order path, heterodox and paradoxical as a whole, never reducible to its two constitutive elements. The glocalization process is, by presupposition, the social technical decentered consequence, endless, measureless of the existence of such *phenomenon of the bidimensional technocultural hybridization in real time*. It is set wherever the body is and wherever the mind can work and has been socially consolidated from the beginning of the past century. Few decades of diverse technological unfoldings, the glocal and its fabric shaped as network has become the heart and the lungs of every context of life in which the use of equipments set for network are predominant (cf. Trivinho, 1998). Its non stopping and progressive coverage over territories by cable has inserted humanity, not without historical originality, in an irreversible *glocal condition*.

Mediatic visibility settles, on its turn, the *communicational macropath for (over)exposition, circularity and signic recycling in real time* (of people and groups,

governments and enterprises, brands and goods etc.), trifolded as it goes: massive public sphere (newspapers, magazines, cinema, radio and television), interactive public scene (*sites, chats, blogs, photologs*, and social networks as *Orkut, MySpace, Second Life, Twitter* etc.) and hybrid public scene (*webradio, webTV, YouTube* etc.). As it is, mediatic visibility – in fact, intermediatic – represents the technosymbolic and imaginary mountain in the process of planetary glocalization for fast exchange of texts, images and/or sounds – of a glocal context to another, from one network to the other, from one medium to another, from one (cyber)cultural product -, most everytime guided by a thematic agenda longtime decided by (massive and/or cyberspatial) audiences.

The preemptory indexation of the *evidence of existence* to its mediatic implication includes the *ethos* of the entire contemporary civilization, expressed in an empiric injunction of generalized knowledge (beyond strictly commercial interests): it is necessary to make oneself present to the alterity (individual, collective or massive), regardless if it offers or not the required attention, or if it establishes itself as a simulacre in the mirror surfaces of its appearance (cf. Baudrillard, 1979, 1981). In one word, (over)exposition or to make oneself visible. That is understood not according to the reductionist sense, meaning to be captured exclusively by looking at, but to exist somehow (as simulacre) in face of the senses perceptive to alterity. In oriented epistemology, such fact is equivalent to colonize and populate glocal contexts and, from them on, to follow/project them into the intermediatic(s) path(s) of communicational visibility.

The insufficiency of existence *per se* in non-mediatic conditions, *vis-a-vis*, the seductive demand of an existence mediated by capable machinery in real time, presupposes a specific way of positioning oneself in the world [an (ex)position in the sense adopted by Heidegger's phenomenology (2001: 11-38, 61-86)]: giving oneself, in the quality of being, of acting and even of thinking and feeling, in a relational context – a dated model of presence -, corresponding to the needs for social historical reproduction of the advanced glocal civilization.

The sociotechnical matrix of such presence – and we should emphasize it *en passant* – is spectral, in the sense given by Guillaume (1982, 1989a, 1989b): it functions exclusively according to elementary signals (as we have noted: text, image, sound/voice or the blend of those elements), in which the materiality of the body and of the entire social life remain obviously *outside* the electronic frontier (i.e., as technological worry for the glocal condition), but injected in and represented by the mediatic visibility by its spectral equivalents.

So the success of the glocalization process in the social historical environment is understood to be connected with the institution of such *compulsory spectral presence as universal value*, so irreversible as much as socially indisputable.

# MATRIZes

Such *mediatic imperative* – most properly, the adherence to it – usually leads the subject to a permanent flirtation with the center of the scenario of collective acting. It makes him, then, sooner or latter, (want) to attract the priority focus of attention to himself (temporary, intermittent or long lasting), better yet, it makes him (wish) to be close to the *mediatic focus* (of massive networks and/or of the cyberspace), to prevail as axis of perception or attention by some audience. In other words, the assumption of *the imperative of spectral presence* leads the subject to twist the current mediatic symbolic and imaginary circulation, (to try) to interconnect them in this projective ambition in the recyclable land of spectral abstractions, to make them necessarily go through *the acting of oneself* and of his related belongings and interests.

## **Desire for the unique**

The imperative of mediatic presence is build over a multisided articulatory axis. The cultural substrate on the bottom of the relational principle implicated in it – basis for a silent social drama of alterity, its upcoming symbolic twilight (according to topic III and from this topic onwards) – presents itself as *desire for the unique*. Such desire, corresponding to the first overdetermination (anthropological) of the mentioned imperative specifies with radical precision the pulsional and proto-symbolic valve of the contemporary living being: the desire for control (with variable levels of intensity depending on individualities and circumstances) over some center of the mediatic scene and, within it, the recycling of oneself (identity, *persona*, profile, style, brand etc.), as a way to show and distinguish power over certain range of social influence. The metaphoric picture within the conceptual expression at stake gives us a perspective on the matter: dream of a mimesis related to the absolutism of the sun or even of the monotheistic<sup>2</sup> divine image.

On the present study, the desire for the unique has nothing to do – we should mark it – with the desire for unity (psychological, spiritual or anything similar) in the *gestalt* of an individuality. We are not comparing it to any ambition for being one with oneself, with its objectal and processual life on the immediate surroundings, with a more open environment, with the culture and history symbolic plan, with the Cosmos and so on.

---

<sup>2</sup> The expression desire for the unique or desire for being unique is regarded positively on corporative and marketing environments, on the fields of print media specialized in business, on the field of conservative psychotherapy, on the book market of self-help and in other contexts. It is clear that the object of the present study, and this reflexion is a proof of that, does not admit such an architecture of the subject, not even on its empirical processual trend, not to say on its more semantic inflection.

# MATRIZes

The desire for the unique involves the ordinary pulsion for solo acting, socially reputed in certain contexts of belonging (concrete or imaginary). As such, it is also a deaf dramatic manifestation, usually with unconscious causes and characteristics, destined to compensate some disturbing lack of power (real or sensed), destined to the fulfilling of an structural gap established inwards the symbolic dimension of a socially and politically impotent subject in the advanced technologic civilization.

## **The focus of mediatic spotlights – transpolitic social capital**

The previous appointments we have made do not indicate otherwise but that the present civilizational process, between the lines of its mediatic autopoietic and transpolitic unfoldings, does not only implies presence in the scene. More than that, build as a really worshiped social capital (cf. Bourdieu, 1980, 1982, 1983, 2002) it is the *continued production of a mediatic epicentric or the control over the mainstream focus of the established scenario*. It is only the spotlight of the scenario, object for social dispute, for exposition and recognition (cf. Honneth, 1995), that is in fact the generator and savior of relevant distinction in relation to the context (cf. Bourdieu, 1979, 1983: 122-155), a transpolitical type of social capital (for the present study), customary by nature. It escapes the management and ruling by the political instances inherited by the modernity of XVIIIth and XIXth centuries (cf. Trivinho, 2007).

The obvious empiry of such processual injunctions ends up involving viscerally a historic leftover desire for glory, pulsional-imaginary substrate of will to power [evoking Nietzsche (1947)] in the specific modality of an oriented will (in a reductionist and instrumental way) to recognition or prestige, to reputation or fame.

As it could not be different, the desire projected in the center of some ground of mediatic visibility presupposes an agonistic social dispute in two senses: the control over the transpolitical capital in the communicational spotlight (on mass media and/or interactive), while it builds its own subjectivity and redesigns its respective place for acting, the appropriate field (from now on broadened by the networks), which means, essentially, mediatic oblivious of the being [in a sense that restores, over new basis, the founding obliteration referenced by Heidegger (2001: 11-38, 61-86)] and of another possible standard of subjectivity and appropriate fields, as well as the social shadowing of alterity and its dignity – in one word, symbolic death of oneself and of the other. (We go back to this matter in the topic “Social historical meaning of the melancholy of the unique in the logic mediatic visibility of invisible violence”, with more profound repercussions.)

# MATRIZes

## Cultural melancholy of the unique

As a matter of fact, the desire for the unique is the instrumental symptom of something way more complex and vertical. It is tied to a dense and marshy social historical, anthropological and imaginary layer which is only apprehensible to a certain extent: the cultural melancholy of the unique. On its respect are valid, *tout court*, the subsequent reflexive arguments.

A transitory cultural trajectory sews up - making lines not quite straight and without substantial loss of substrate - the succession of time periods in western culture. More widely, the remains of ancient cultural traditions darn, in fact, the spirit of the eras. Losing or gaining strength here and there, not rarely in unpredictable ways, they are never gone, as an ontological social historical pulsion that, one way or another, follow the journey of the being and every time is set on different basis. Against all post-structuralist theoretical logic it is like the primary imaginary forces – these processual fossils constantly vivified, coming as from nowhere, necrotic by the inevitable unconsciousness of these days – ornamented the glocal civilization, as late remains of cultural ancestry flowing in the hearts of contemporary people.

Current technological civilization - with its practices for glocal projection in mediatic visibility and in face of the *modus operandi* of individual and collective expressions in the field of social relationships in real time -, seems to have in its bottom, not without unnecessary fleugm, something of the remote heroic cultures. It reestablishes, in this sense – like a rusty photogram but still worth the use -, the cultural logic of past mediatic eras and of its daily impositive worship, of divinized human personalities, of their fight for glory and immortality in the horizon of posterity – historical legacy from which they nurture themselves as well, according to contextual inflections, as central figures of all empire states (executive rulers or generals), of feudalistic strain, of the aristocratic court groupings and of the wealthy families of industrial bourgeoisie.

Marx (1976), worrying with the historical implications for a successful overcome of material conditions in the XIXth century, had included such matter in the agenda of its dialectic thought when he recognizes, not without irony, that the tradition of all the dead unappealably burdens – as a nightmare – on the minds of the living. The material resources – as the author recalled in another occasion – can be disorganized in a good couple of years. As the result of this process consolidation in the subsequent decades, in opposite direction, the symbolic dimension of economic life remains for long centuries, being difficult to completely dissolve it. A similar process seems to take place in the social imaginary about transitions along thousands of years or centuries. An unbearable mixture of hope in what is to come and a diffuse phobic disposition (regarding poorness and lack, epidemy and violence, at last, the signs of unstoppable

decadence) passes by, more strongly, under the custody of superstitions considered then, in the years with more zeros. It goes to exemplify something that in a representative smaller scale takes place to some extent every time in political and communication transition (cf. Duby, 1999; Lacey, 1999).

From the natural magic of the fetish-object to an incomparable human profile, based since the ballast of an enchanted cosmogony until the pagan contemporaneity, from the imperial macropolitics to the micropolitics of the last decades, the *archetypical figuration of the unique* reaches a high scale, to the level of the social imaginary: beyond the politician as personification of the State and of the monotheist divinity, it is present in the tribal totem, on the highest god of the Olympus, on the hero of long wars, on the supreme mandatary of the Church, on the owner of the means of production, on the legend of sports, on the celebrity of a mediatic folklore, on the CEO and on the standard worker of multinational enterprises, on leaders of all kinds and of all levels of influence – in one word, the satellization of social energies, to which contemporary history, democratic, ended up providing time periods every time shortened: not the sportsman anymore, neither the artist nor the thief of all times, but the personality of the last 50 years, the sportsman or politician of the decade, the entrepreneur or intellectual of the year, the top model of the season, the weekly success. At the same time, the recycling of the convenient signification flows, the intermittent leadership (already without a measure in time) and the great segmentation of social networks online, and so on. Such state of facts is, naturally, flourished by diffuse promotional discourses (more normative or prescriptive than made to explain, although always working its influence by means of convincing, seduction or repetition) of social instances of legitimation (regional, national and/or international) (cf. Bourdieu, 1980, 1982, 1983: 122-155).

It is known that the cultural industry, in all its ramifications (cf. Adorno; Horkheimer, 1970: 146-200), has capitalized the continuous building of the figure of the unique – and its typical folklore is nothing but the most complete example – and, not for any other reason, it has to contribute to the social preservation of the respective desire. It is then adapted to the reception of symbolic goods determined by exchange value.

### **Characteristics for the melancholy of the unique**

As a second overdetermination of the axiomatic principle of the compulsory mediatic presence, the melancholy of the other is, as to express it in very well known musical terms, the higher octave, the deepest and most subtle of the processual empiry we have mentioned before, focusing the desire oriented to the privileged zone of the mainstream.

Cultural collective evoking as an overweight on the shoulders of contemporary people – in their psychic disposition, in their ways of being in the world, of imagining it and imagining themselves in it, in their choices and actions. At last, in their ethos in full sense –, the melancholy of the unique is not, *stricto sensu*, an habitus, as established by Bourdieu (1982, 1983: 156-183, 2002), a social cultural structure that, always activated, projects itself over the social relationships with strength from the structuring of the objectal and processual condition implicated. The melancholy of the unique prevails over a category of habitus established as an obliterated nuclear ingredient, that gives shapes to their profile and expression, without risking current notations.

The melancholy of the unique is not the same as any collective cultural nostalgia, any mythic mourning, especially those nurturing a determined lost object or never attested object. It is related to an abyssal imaginary formation of previous historic time. And it pumps simultaneously from this black hole of cultural antiquity that we apparently would be over with.

As we accommodate mythic ancestrality in mediatic presentification – that if read backwards is also true: to subordinate present days to the most remote antiquity –, the melancholy of the unique, before involving a relevant internal contradiction, sews, nevertheless without complete harmony, times that unfold in directions supposingly diverse: being a historically regressive motivational strength such melancholy shapes, in fact, the nowadays *frenesi* of social relationships *online* (through the exclusive filter of the singularities involved), in permanent projection over the *devir*. The melancholy of the unique is – let us emphasize it from another angle – the way historical macroconfigurations of cultural heritage are set in contemporary subjectivity. From it, by autopoietic pressure of the *habitus*, it is organized according to the behavior and the action and then expands itself to the social relationship, reaching alterity.

We should remind, *en passant*, that the melancholy of the unique is not something that *happens* to the subject. It neither preexists as a pathology (and, not even can be considered like that), except if we think that, diluted in daily life, it is still present and codified in the pretense unsuspecting normality of the facts, as psychological and behavioral current tendency, catalogued as trivial in its irrevocable right to an existence free from disturbances, as any other social pathology.

## **Melancholy of the unique and mediatic visibility**

Obviously, social expression of the melancholy of the unique has been related for decades inexorably to the appropriation of an equipment set for networks, by the glocal condition of

existence and by mediatic visibility (massive, interactive or hybrid). Historical cultural vortex where most of the social actions in real time are framed, the melancholy of the unique however, today is in everything a communicational phenomenon, as it was not worth to think about something being processed in any other way. The social desire it endorses is based on the media, on its repercussions in daily culture, and turns itself to them exclusively in search for the accomplishment of the archetypical life socially visible (preferably by its success) and so strictly managed, suspecting that if it not so, far from the public image spectrum, dishonor will be experienced (clearly connected to the mediatic outsides, specialized shadow of a non-requested anonymity).

In particular, if the *interactive glocal context* (sedentary or nomad) is the last scape from social, cultural and political practices, the melancholy of the unique stands as its strongest spiritual engine, at the same time that it is occluded. Its spectrum is marked in cold, in an invisible place, in the imaginary of mediatized interactions. The melancholy of the unique is the hidden narcosis of the cybercultural dromoapts (cf. Trivinho, 2007), those spared by present time history not only of the fields of necessity and work, but also of infotechnological misery. Over their shoulders it has been laid much more, the privileges of access (the more private and complete as possible) to infotechnic passwords of access to cyberculture (Ibid.).

Regarding the repeated evidence of the melancholy of the unique today, a social cultural aspect worth the notice is the fact that it coincides relatively in historical terms to the late twilight of the individual and individuation processes in mass society (Adorno, 1969: 117-136, 137-160; Adorno; Horkheimer, 1970, 1973, 1979; Marcuse, 1967), after a long journey of rights of individuality as revolutionary conception anti-imperial, on the track of the social development of citizenship (Dumont, 1985); and with the consequent progressive weakening of the ego and its autonomy, since the historical experience of Nazism and of the emergence of the cultural industry at the middle of last century (cf. Adorno, 1969: 117-136, 137-160; Marcuse, 1967; Jacoby, 1977), simultaneously to the extenuation of the social and political left-wingers (the vanguard, the class, the party) (regarding his dialectic ability for seizure), on the trace of irreversible marcescence of religious, philosophical, political metanarratives (Lyotard, 1986; Trivinho, 2001: 39-91).

## **SOCIAL-HISTORICAL MEANING OF THE MELANCHOLY OF THE UNIQUE IN THE MEDIATIC VISIBILITY LOGIC OF THE INVISIBLE VIOLENCE**

From a reflexive perspective, all processual emptiness, from the most prosaic to the most sophisticated one, usually reserves deeper instructive lessons than one could think possible at first contact.

# MATRIZes

The melancholy of the unique traces back to the origin of the metaphysics of *relationship violence made subtile*, that the signic spiral of mediatic visibility, the growth of glocal interactive contexts and the frenesi of online sociability on the last four decades have created ramifications, as never before, in the social tissue. Such social-historical meaning of the axiomatic principle of compulsory presence – no doubt, of cultural seriousness – is, in guidelines, explained as follows.

The desire for the unique involves, in its core, an irresistible pulsion for *involuntary blinding ascendance* in face of authority. This fact connotes the totality of the implicated idiosyncratic authoritarian process: the imperative of presence and the ancestral motivation of the desire working within it correspond to an invisible violence. Such violence, for all its effects – as the expression implies -, does not exist, being, non rare, considered absurd, moreover through the point of view of functionalist and empiric theories, raising any question about it, because of its unknown physical location. The invisible violence is that covered and obliterated by all fori of common gatherings (while in presence or virtually), with specific nuances. Its level of coercion is none in the bosom of social relationships. That is why it is valid, as the rule goes, imperceptible not only to subjectivities in context (especially those more strongly articulated by the desire of the unique), but something to the eyes of external observers. Being immaterial, it redraws, in fact, to the frame of possible ways of symbolic violence (cf. Bourdieu, 2002). At most, on such path, it unfolds itself into a proto- or pre-symbolic zone: it is not included, direct or explicitly, in the language, nor necessarily takes profit of any other symbol. It is the kind of non-evident violence presented as a phenomenological result autopoietic and practical of a related presence with pulsion driven to the center of the context, of an instrumented desire focusing the unique.

Let us restore – useful as it can be – all terms: teleological pulsion of the unique for the acting of oneself in an appropriate field, the will to supposed power starting from the continuous domain of the mediatic scene focus, any desire historically remaining from the glorious *virtu*, that materializes the current communicational axiom of compulsory (over) exposition, are violence per se – without deceit or blame – regarding (never against) alterity. That's what leads to, in sum, the expression of the melancholy of the unique.

According to this perspective, if the desire for mediatic visibility and for control over the center of the scene is, on one hand, a legitimate search for success and distinction, on the other hand it corresponds nevertheless, to a certain extent, to the symbolic agony of the other, to its immaterial purge in potential and unappeable disguise. The curve of the process is of a relatively simple phenomenology. In empirical terms, while someone controls the social capital of the focus of public attention, the amount of contextual mediatic glory (long lasting or

ephemeral, on the massive environment or in cyberspace), its alterity (whatever it is, in special the opponent) must be shadowed. Any consideration over the fact that it doesn't happens in an isolated way or that it ends up being diluted and losing relevance in face of the simultaneous excess of similar events in the tissue of sociability contributes to undervalue the adequate comprehension on the essence of the problem.

The unconscious pulsion for the shadowing of the other takes place only because the desire for control of the center of the scene is, at the same time, diffuse sublimated fear (and always unfounded) of shadowing oneself, in one of its strongest aspects. The subtle attack – with zero hostility – to alterity is established, in general, through a procedure of anticipated defense, in face of the presumption that there are inhospitable social conditions, of latent competition, typical of capitalist reality.

So, the desire for controlling the center of the scene does not hide its basic denegatory inclination: the main objective is never the material annulment of the other or its image actual destruction – although such tendency, as we know, preexists in contexts of unqualified competition, as in conventional politics and in corporative market -, the goal is framing him into the shadow, shifting him (for as long as it is possible) to the outskirts of the mediatic scene. The precise vocalization of the melancholy of the unique has few variations: long live to alterity, as long as its blurred.

Such observations clear nothing but the unsearchable and inexpugnable belic implications of the melancholy of the unique. The principle of war – a principle of real or symbolic barbarism that shapes the civilizatory process since humanity's technical birth – remains intact where one would less suspect: the civil environment of daily life, starting from the inside out forgotten of democratic subjectivity (cf. Virilio, 1984; Trivinho, 1999, 2007: 279-320).

## **MEDIATIC VISIBILITY AND MELANCHOLY OF THE UNIQUE IN CYBERCULTURE**

The argument needs to be put in new context facing its specific inflexion in cyberculture.

According to our presupposition mentioned before, the upraising of such technocultural education has represented not an interruption of the described state of things, but really its social spread and deepening. More properly, cyberculture, which represented an unprecedented fragmentary hiperdilatation of mediatic visibility, radiophonic and print, meant a heady explosion of the desire for the unique, the possibility spread out, the actual right to an existence

# MATRIZes

within the masses, on the hands of common people, starting from every glocal context of access. What had prevailed for centuries as a prerogative of the few surrendered at last to the legitimate demand and to the attraction of the feverish multitude. What would be understood in the remote past (and is still so) as worship to an object, person or external data revealed itself in the individual and its actual possibility of he himself being the axis of the scenario.

If the melancholy of the unique surrounded before the dromoability receptive to the mass, now it instills cumulatively the dromoability named cybercultural (cf. Trivinho, 2001: 209-227, 2007). If common people before could eventually be excited with a casual insertion in some television show, for years now they see the possibility of satisfying the pulsion for exposition, recognition and distinction in virtual communities, in social networks (*Orkut, My Space, Twitter* etc.), in interfaces of audiovisual self-publication (*YouTube, blogs, fotologs, sites* etc.) and the tridimensional joyful acting (*Second Life* and other *videogames*), in contexts of textual exchange (*fori, mailing lists* etc.), and so on. The same impulse of the imaginary of the unique which has always strongly revisited mass culture drives, in this sense, with side variations, the appropriation of the dispositives and digital networks in cyberspace. The intention of making a parody with the absolutism of the sun, shining or ruling, for a relative amount of time, in certain range of interactions, prevails in the wish for visibility in the virtual domain.

Such organization of data does not points out otherwise but to how much the cultural model for social property of the mass media, after decades of a diurnal tone, is more settled than we can imagine. In this sense, one could say that the emergence of cyberculture, even if it is deeply set in such a peculiar individualization of the use of technological interfaces, did not bring nothing strictly new as it has at most revisited tradition. Nonetheless, under the endorsement of the glocalization process and of technological speed, with its shortened time reference, as well the generalized fragmentation spiral we can assert that interactive practices made the melancholy of the unique post-modern as it irreversibly atomized into the social tissue, providing it new historical perspectives, individualized of multiplication and materialization.

That is the state of the art of the matter in glocal civilization: cyberculture in present, as a whole, as late mediatic show of the cultural melancholy of the unique taken to the last consequences. On it, cultural ancestry rolls the dices as never seen before at the pagan phases of western history.

Not for any other reason, cyberculture, by all its forms of projections allowed in visibility of cyberspace, reproduces, more vigorously, under the primacy of the melancholy of

the other, the logic of invisible violence (according to the themes regarded here) in relation to alterity.

On this matter, the communicational structure of the Twitter represents another chapter to be studied apart. As an idiosyncratic network of virtual relationships, in which the social interaction power of individuals stays, by corporative authoritarianism form origin, constrained to 140 characters each post, Twitter represents the most developed edge and the fanciest example of the problematic addressed in the present study. The communicational structure of this relationship interface and the ways for social appropriation it has been under represents a fertile ground to the exaggerated and rosy conductivity of cultural melancholy of the unique. Following the track of the twilight of the 70's micropolitics – which has divided well the spirit of main leaders and distributed them to the endless myriad of local and regional leaderships – Twitter takes the materialization of the imaginary of the unique to an unbelievable extreme. It noisily sews the possibility of expressing the desire for visibility to the issue of a fake leadership that, under the reliable clause of friendship, lives paradoxally from the (illusion of) subordination of others (their followers, free and volunteer, nevertheless, regarding the effort of the acquiescence involved). They are under a fantasy of power that deviates from the deterioration of power and of freedom of the common citizen in western bureaucratic democracies. Due to sociotechnical injunctions the cybercultural structure of Twitter does not represent but the quintessence of the invisible melancholy of the unique.

## REFERENCES

- ADORNO, Theodor W. *Intervenciones: nueve modelos de crítica*. Caracas: Monte Avila, 1969.
- ADORNO, Theodor W.; HORKHEIMER, Max. *Dialéctica del iluminismo*. Buenos Aires: SUR, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (Org.). *Temas básicos de Sociología*. São Paulo: Cultrix; EDUSP, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sociologica*. Madrid: Taurus, 1979.
- BAUDRILLARD, Jean. *De la séduction: l'horizon sacré des apparences*. Paris: Galilée, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Simulacres et simulations*. Paris: Galilée, 1981.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. *La distinction: critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Minuit, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Le capital social. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, n. 31, Jan. 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A economia das trocas simbólicas*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1982. (Coleção Estudos.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. O campo científico; A economia das trocas lingüísticas. In: ORTIZ, Renato (Org.). *Pierre Bordieu: Sociologia*. São Paulo: Ática, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *O poder simbólico*. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2002.
- DUBY, Georges. *Ano 1000, ano 2000: na pista de nossos medos*. São Paulo: Ed. da UNESP; Imprensa Oficial do Estado de São Paulo, 1999. (Prismas.)

- DUMONT, Louis. *O individualismo: uma perspectiva antropológica da ideologia moderna*. Rio de Janeiro: Rocco, 1985.
- ELIOT, Thomas Stearns. *Poesia*. Tradução de Ivan Junqueira. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1981. (Coleção Poiesis).
- GUILLAUME, Marc. Téléspectres. *Traverses*, n. 26, Oct. 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. La signification sociale des nouvelles télétechnologies. *Comunicação & política*-Revista do Centro Brasileiro de Estudos Latino-Americanos (CEBELA), São Paulo, Oito de Março, v. 9, n. 2, 3 e 4, jun./dez. 1989a.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *La contagion des passions: essai sur l'exotisme intérieur*. Paris: Plon, 1989b.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. *Être et temps*. Paris: Gallimard, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ensaaios e conferências*. São Paulo: Vozes, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Marcas do caminho*. São Paulo: Vozes, 2008.
- HONNETH, Axel. *The struggle for recognition: the moral grammar of social conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.
- JACOBY, Russel. *Amnésia social: uma crítica à Psicologia conformista de Adler a Laing*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1977.
- LACEY, Robert; DANZIGER, Robert. *O ano 1000: a vida no final do primeiro milênio*. Rio de Janeiro: Campus, 1999.
- LYOTARD, Jean-François. *O pós-moderno*. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1986.
- MARCUSE, Herbert. *A ideologia da sociedade industrial*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1967.
- MARX, Karl. *O 18 de Brumário de Luís Bonaparte*. Lisboa: Estampa, 1976.
- NIETZSCHE, Federico [Friedrich]. *La voluntad de dominio: ensayo de una transmutación de todos los valores (estudios y fragmentos)*. Buenos Aires: M. Aguilar, 1947.
- TRIVINHO, Eugênio. *Redes: obliterações no fim de século*. São Paulo: Annablume; FAPESP, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Cyberspace: crítica da nova comunicação*. São Paulo: Biblioteca da ECA/USP, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *O mal-estar da teoria: a condição da crítica na sociedade tecnológica atual*. Rio de Janeiro: Quartet, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A dromocracia cibercultural: lógica da vida humana na civilização mediática avançada*. São Paulo: Paulus, 2007.
- VIRILIO, Paul. *Guerra pura: a militarização do cotidiano*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1984.