

PREFACE

Parallel to the increase in value of the information statute, at least since the end of the nineteenth century, different moments of its analysis, use, and comprehensiveness were articulated. It is possible to say that the path of questions and answers about information co-responded, in the sense that they responded together and at each time, to the modes of sociability, production and distribution of goods and knowledge, as well as to the technological innovations and to the philosophical thinking. Nietzsche's (1994, p.100, translation by presenter) statement that "[...] it is only possible to define what does not have a history", seems to imply, as it is the case with information, a historicity specific of concepts, which condense, present and conceal disputes in the construction of reality by meanings.

Innovations in the field of communication, computation, and electronics in the post-wars brought prominence to the term "information" that somehow resulted in greater value provided by science, its power and velocity brought by technology, its significance in social and political control, and its role as economical resources and market monitoring, that is, of an object available for human usage. However, it is also in the twentieth century that the so-called "linguistic turning point" in philosophy would disclose the possibility for studies of information, in philosophical reflections, as a human linguistic phenomenon, which constructs social reality and is, in turn, constructed by it.

It is possible to say, like it was before, that currently the conceptualization of information co-responds to its time, comprising diversity and dialogue in its meanings and where its double face, "of humans" and "for humans", raises questions that go beyond its technical possibilities, of ethical and political character, in all areas of life.

The second issue of *Logeion* presents five articles in which aspects of information for humans and of what is human in information are articulated in questions and proposals making us think that comprehension, concept, and meanings of information, in the sense of "being" of information, co-responds to its time and , therefore, do not escape questions and propositions whether ethical, political or related to power, set by the authors in this issue.

Harry Kunneman, researcher and professor at the University of Utrecht/Faculty of Humanities, proposes the way he calls "humanistic studies of information", aiming at articulating techno-scientific studies of information, as a phenomenon of social transformation, with a critical reflection about the ethical and political aspects linked to this kind of dynamics. Kunneman considers the proposal of some authors of a Mode 3 of



knowledge as revealing an interesting way to introduce, besides what is already identified intervening and legitimating the course and production of knowledge – researchers, position, economical system – a counterpower rooted in communities and in local cultural resources. It is about a transitional zone formed by institutions and professional organizations that mediate, in a Habermasian sense, the divergences between the logic of the systems with its economical, political, and technical interests, and the logic of the lifeworld. This transitional zone that is formed little by little constitutes, in the author’s point of view, a privileged place to the flourishing of the humanistic studies of information, which can favor communicative and dialogic practices between the systems and the lifeworld. His proposal to bring them near sets forth a question to the information professionals about the role of mediation, not considered as a bridge to transfer from one side to the other, but as a means to negotiate conflicts, which is what the term also suggests.

The second article, from IBICT’s researcher and professor Clovis Ricardo Montenegro de Lima, focuses on the role of communication and information in one the most fundamental aspects of life, health, or its absence. His report on experiments in the field of health presents and questions successes and failures in the manner of articulating three different kinds of logic: the logic of the medical knowledge, the logic of the administration of health organizations, and that of patients. The medical logic is mediated first by scientific and administrative models, which empty its human dimension. Information and communicative action (in a Habermasian sense) are presented, in case of reports, as fundamental in this process, allowing the reconstruction of not only medical rationality, but of ethical actions and public policies as well. In those reported cases, an increase in complexity in these organizations was observed corresponding to an opening in space for producing and reproducing characteristics of humanity for those who work there, expressed by their speeches, their arguments, and their organizational practices. Thus, the article highlights information in its discursive, linguistic, and dialogic aspects, therefore human, along with, and not against, technical information.

The article written by Ronald Day, researcher and professor at the Department of Information and Library Science of the University of Indiana, analyzes the discourse of activists Aaron Swartz and Queen Norton, called “spirit of information”, as opposed to the documentary tradition of western modernity, based on the notion of representation in documents (metaphysics), as contents in continents. According to Day, the expression “freedom”, present in revolutionary discourse throughout modernity, in these activists’ discourse can be understood as a post-documentary demand (or anti-documentary),

where Internet appears as a locus of opposition to modern institutions, notably the State. Analyzing the modern State not only as founded in a documentary reality, but being itself documental, Day counterpoints the notion of Internet of these activists, as a place where the dynamics of expression does not aim at containing or coming to a stable representation or a truth, to the notion of content and continent typical of the modern documentation and the modern State. If in modern times each one is a citizen of a State, the Internet would be a place out of control in the sense of without limits (dynamics) and not controllable, hence, it would not be a document (continent and content), but expressions. The innumerable questions closing the article introduce ways to rethink what we understand as information, what we ignore as information by documental tradition and to question, from then on, what the field of Information Science has considered less, or even left out of its searches, when discussing information.

The article written by Miguel Angel Rendon Rojas, professor and researcher at the Institute of Library and Information Science Research of the National Autonomous University of Mexico, presents, beginning from its logical-dialectic bases, the field itself. Starting from the primitive category of the document, which contains all contradictions, he infers the rest of its elements, considering, however, that there is not a synthesis, an ending movement, (like in Marx or Hegel), once reality is, historically, in continuous construction. In the relationship between the document, material and concrete, as objectivity (socio-historical) of information (material and abstract), and the subjectivities in search of it, professionals of information have to participate in building knowledge as well. The dialectic analysis stresses the user's satisfaction as the essence of Library Science, appearing in services offered by concrete reality such as the Documental Informative System. From an epistemological perspective, the author suggests the inmost importance of the document, whether in its conceptual characteristics or in the tasks that are part of Library Science, however it indicates the Documental Informative System as the object of field work.

The article written by Marcos Gonzalez, technologist of Rio de Janeiro's Botanical Garden Research Institute, starts from socio-cognitive linguistics to examine the prevalent terminology in IS, *vis-à-vis* "common sense" understanding, designating the concept of information as transmissible through a channel like a mechanical way of indicating communication, which exists throughout the centuries in common sense. On second thoughts, he deepens his analyses beginning by mapping the connection between origin domains (concrete) and the target domain (more abstract) of metaphors, sets forth his doubts about the universality or non-universality of the channel metaphor, asking: [...] what

sort of historical context could motivate such a “mechanistic” and “dehumanizing” belief as this one?”. Considering the fact that in the world, before written representation, communication did not separate words from people, his research work indicates that the notion of content would be associated to sliding in the sense resulting from the passage of the precedence of oral tradition to the precedence of writing. Its human origin was weakened when the text, not man, became known as the carrier of messages, of content. If the precedence of writing weakens the human origin of information, what will it happen to our humanity when handwriting is substituted by a digital version? The author's questioning, pointing to a sometimes forgotten “human in information” leads us to the question again, also implicit in the articles of the other authors of this issue, of non-documental (Day's expression) information and its relations (of consequence to some, of origin to others) with documental information.