A R T I C L E

ORAL HISTORIES IN THE DIGITAL WORLD
human and more than human narratives

LEANDRO SEAWRIGHT
Universidade de São Paulo
São Paulo | São Paulo| Brazil
leandro.fflch@usp.br
orcid.org/0000-0001-9561-6390

The article analyzes some of the transformations of oral history in the digital age, addressing how technologies such as remote interviews, algorithms and artificial intelligence reconfigure its methodological practice. It discusses the tension between memory and the risks of trivializing testimony or digital coloniality, which reproduces Eurocentric temporal hierarchies. The text proposes a relational approach that includes not only humans, but also non-humans, emphasizing concepts such as "memory of oral expression", "community of destiny", "post-anthropocentrism" and "multiple temporalities". Oral history does not go unscathed in the digital context, demanding critical reflections on authenticity, ethics and memorial justice, without abandoning its potential for public policies or the protection of rights.

Oral history – methodology – post-antropocentrism – multiple temporalities

ARTIGO

HISTÓRIAS ORAIS NO MUNDO DIGITAL
narrações humanas e mais do que humanas

LEANDRO SEAWRIGHT
Universidade de São Paulo
São Paulo | São Paulo| Brasil
leandro.fflch@usp.br
orcid.org/0000-0001-9561-6390

O artigo analisa parte das transformações da história oral na era digital, abordando de que modo tecnologias como entrevistas remotas, algoritmos e inteligência artificial reconfiguram sua prática metodológica. Discute-se a tensão entre a memória e os riscos de banalização do testemunho ou da colonialidade digital, que reproduz hierarquias temporais eurocêntricas. O texto propõe uma abordagem relacional que inclua não apenas humanos, mas também não humanos, enfatizando conceitos como "memória de expressão oral", "comunidade de destino", "pós-antropocentrismo" e "temporalidades múltiplas". A história oral não passa incólume no contexto digital, demandando reflexões críticas sobre autenticidade, ética e justiça memorial, sem abandonar seu potencial por políticas públicas ou proteção de direitos.

História oral – metodologia – pós-antropocentrismo – temporalidades múltiplas

INTRODUCTION

Suppose oral histories derive from what is known as oral memory. Could it be argued that the composition of so-called *more-than-human history* would put an end to the possibilities of spoken histories? In other words, would *more-than-human* narratives represent a new form of methodological weakness for oral history and, above all, for the testimonial tone of memory itself? In what way, then, would oral histories and digital cultures extending beyond the human be consequential for the field of oral history?

I'll start by clarifying what I mean by *oral history* and what definition, among others, of posthumanism I consider appropriate. Such definitions do not, of course, invalidate the differences that are so desirable in the debate.

Oral history can be

> a set of procedures that begins with the preparation of a project and continues with the definition of a group of people to be interviewed. The project involves planning the recordings, specifying locations, duration, and other contextual factors, as well as determining the treatment to be applied, which includes establishing texts, reviewing the written product, and obtaining authorization for use. The project establishes parameters for the eventual analysis of the stories or making entire interviews available, as well as archiving or creating story banks and, whenever possible, publishing the results, which should first be returned to the group that generated the interviews (Meihy; Seawright 2020, 27).

In turn, the post-anthropocentric or more-than-human humanities can be defined as

> An institutionalized set of research topics, techniques, and interests that derives its *ethos* from the intellectual movement and ethical stance called posthumanism. This ethical stance can be understood as a variety of approaches that revive the legacy of the human sciences after humanism, seeking non-anthropocentric or anti-anthropocentric lines of inquiry (Domanska 2013, 10).

If oral history can also be a humanizing gesture deeply linked to verbalized memory, more than human history is an effort to overcome anthropocentrism: an attitude that presents humans as the "center of the world, enjoying hegemony over other beings and functioning as masters of a nature that exists to serve their needs" (Domanska 2013, 10).

Would it be possible to juxtapose both things in digital cultures? With Rodrigo Bragio Bonaldo, we need to conceptualize what more-than-human worlds are in terms of potential relationships with computers:

> The concept of "more-than-human" worlds has been used in fields such as environmental history, the sociology of technology and algorithms, as well as in cultural studies and theory of history [...] A more-than-human history would therefore not be a non-human history—as if the discipline could not be interested in human beings—but simply a history that, taking a relational perspective, is not limited to being a science of *humans* in time. [...] It is in the interaction between humans and computers—"human-computer interactions" or HCI—that I seek to understand the emergence of relational experiences that constitute what I call a "more than human" history (Bonaldo 2023, 3).

Bonaldo's excerpt suggests that the relationship between users and computers in more-than-human histories does not presuppose a specific adherence to a non-human history. In the case of computers, the interaction between humans and machines occurs through direct contact with the possibilities of the digital world. All of this happens when it is possible to outline the digital society as one that "emerges planetarily from the digital revolution that began in the last decade of the 20th century", and it is appropriate to consider that we have effectively entered the digital society when "the technological and computer resources spread by the digital revolution begin to reach most of the planet's populations and at all social levels in different ways and a widespread and decisive manner" (Barros 2022, 11).

Since the 1990s, the popularization of the internet, the spread of cell phones, and the advancement of accessible digital technologies have significantly contributed to the globalization process, accelerating the circulation of information and connecting diverse cultural and intellectual contexts. In this globalized scenario, some crises in the field of historiography have become more evident, especially concerning its traditional forms of producing and validating historical knowledge. Georg Iggers (2010, 106) observed that events such as the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet bloc not only marked significant geopolitical transformations but also had profound repercussions on historiographical practices. These transformations, mediated by new technologies and the logic of globalization, also had an impact on oral history, which began to grapple with new ways of recording, disseminating, and listening to memory, highlighting its crises linked to authority, mediation, and the multiplicity of voices.

The *first crisis* was associated with the chronotope of the late 20th century, namely, the dominance of the present over the past (Hartog, 2015). The *second crisis* was related to the saturation of the intellectual environment, shaped by the rise of the linguistic turn originating in the Anglo-Saxon world and the gradual "return to things", as Ewa Domanska (2006, 338) put it. The *third crisis* thus emerged from the "uncertainty about uncertainties", evidenced by the instability of representationalism or even narrativism as a sufficient analytical element in the human and social sciences (Kuukkanen 2015, 50; Simon 2019, 71–75).

For the disciplines of history and oral history, the challenge is to connect with the "other", which implies establishing broader relationships, both with humans and non-humans (Simon; Tamm 2021, 79-80). It also means understanding the technological environment, digital society, and artificial intelligence, which require rethinking the intersections with the material of the present. In the case of oral history, the homocentrism or anthropocentrism referred to by Chakrabarty didn't even need to be naturalized, and it wasn't necessary to make statements similar to Marc Bloch's (1952, 29) about the discipline of history: the "science of men in time".

For oral history, homocentrism has almost always prevailed as human beings are the ones who evidently *speak*, and if they *speak*, they have the primacy to tell their own story or the story of their "others". *Speech* would not be possible without its "other" and the "other" of its "other": the various forms of existence. And it wouldn't even be possible to think of oral history without the projection of speech, which is nothing other than a form of *future elaborated in advance*: from the inside out. In other words, it is a *projection* that becomes a *prospect* because, before *speech*, there is an expectation of *speech* about the experience heard by the *present* ears. Being a talking animal, however, shouldn't become a reason for neglecting other animals or things that don't talk at the risk of provocatively reinventing the unlikely formula: *I speak. Therefore, I am.*

Oral history is only possible because someone tells a story. However, it is crucial to emphasize that oral history goes beyond simply conducting interviews; it is not confined to the production of unpublished sources that are organized hierarchically. Nor is it currently established solely as a means of filling "documentary gaps". Oral history, of course, depends intrinsically on interviews. In light of the above, a crucial question arises: how do we incorporate references to non-human beings, nature, or technology into memories, which, by definition, involve human perspectives and projections?

When Jouni-Matti Kuukkanen (2015) posed the question of whether the intellectual climate following literary narrativism led to a post-narrativist atmosphere, he did not fail to tacitly draw attention to spoken narratives. The problem, at a glance, is no longer just one of "*listening*" *to* the "new subjects" of history or even proving that oral sources are reliable, as was often the case in the Brazilian debate of the 1990s.

If the argument of post-anthropocentrism and the decentralization of narratives is also reasonable in the field of oral history, it would be possible to raise the question of the potential end of oral history due to the inescapable human character of oral memory. However, if this is the case, what explains the growing success of life stories, even in the global South, and the expansion of memory in digital chronotopes?

Although there are sophisticated theoretical incursions into the possible relationship between oral history, digital humanities, and digital history—as per the introductory bibliographical review *in Oral History and the Digital Society* (Seawright; Maceno 2023, 507–510)—there is still the opportunity to question whether it would be conceivable to transcend the tacit idea that remote interviews exhaust the potential between oral history and digital cultures. With the advancement of digital society and ethical demands, would it be reasonable to set a limit on simply conducting remote interviews?

I recognize that, of course, remote interviews are still important in the case of spatially distant groups and that, otherwise, these groups would not be heard in dialogues provoked by oral history projects. Similarly, I understand the importance of remote interviews, both during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. While empiricist positions are no stranger to the field of oral history (I have often criticized instrumental thinking!), digital cultures make it necessary to rethink disciplined oral history from the perspective of the human being in conjunction with more-than-human components. Hence, I understand the application of applied oral history, which does not abdicate its involvement in significant social commitments.

It is involved because the digital society is a society of risks. It is worth mentioning Niklas Luhmann, for whom risks are forms of "present descriptions of the future under the viewpoint that one can decide [...] on the one or other alternative" (Luhmann 1998, 71). The issue of risks and threats following globalization has also been highlighted by Dipesh Chakrabarty (2009, 204): the latent risks and threats refer to "the question of human beings living together in a global world when technology transforms the planet into a network of connections".

There is a duration that cannot be elided from the risk society: after all, has there ever been a time in the history of the countries of the *Global South* when they were not under constant risk from coloniality itself?

ORAL HISTORIES AND MEMORIES IN THE DIGITAL WORLD

Oral histories are not always the result of oral history methodology since oral *sources* encompass a varied and alternating series of other sound possibilities. Oral sources, *in a broad sense, include, for example, sung rituals, recited poems, so-called traditional recipes, or even nursery rhymes,* which are not always part of modern oral history projects. On the other hand, although it is not far from the material of which the cultures echoed are made, modern oral history leads to interviews that are almost always planned. Although the presentification of the distant and the distancing of the present are possibilities of the digital, oral histories can articulate diverse ways of manifesting memory with digital cultures.

What is clear is that being interviewed at a distance presupposes a different relationship with the interviewer: an "oral history between screens", so to speak, does not yet presuppose *eye-to-eye* without the mediation of cameras, nor does it presuppose the smells, the experiences of physical space and the speech heard without the sonic consequences of capturing the human voice. The *speech of* those who *speak*, however, far removed from the solipsism of modernity, belongs to a particular *community of speech* that is nothing other than a *community of memory*.

When someone speaks to a camera, however, they are first and foremost addressing, among other devices, a computer or smartphone. Even if one might question the possible icy or watertight relationship with machines, the premise of human-computer interaction is something more than human. It's certainly not something less than human because, in addition, there is a dialogue and the mediated presence of the other. There are always scattered memories that gradually make their way into the chronotope of the digital world. In any case, the *community of memory* is insinuated in the presence of the interviewer and interviewee.

Under the consequences of the critical historiographical marker *of Les lieux de mémoire* (Nora, 1984), would it really be possible to infer that due to the supposed removal of living, oral, and collective memory in the manner of Maurice Halbwachs (1950), it has become possible to "create conservation strategies, archives, recordings, videos, and memory centers?" (Gagnebin 2020, 203). Is it only because of loss or the risk of loss that heritage is conserved, commemorated, and constituted? Or is it because of the repeated presence of "absences that are already absent"? It can be seen that the tension with the phenomenological matrix, which involves pondering objects and machines, does not dispense with the aesthetic or subjective relationships established in the living memory of humans.

Jeanne Marie Gagnebin (2020, 203) has argued that "this tendency towards exhaustive preservation is also that of an academic historiography whose sterile erudition Nietzsche has already denounced in the *Second Untimely Consideration* [...]". In this sense, the definition of the memorial gesture as a "gesture of preservation certainly attests to a concern for respect, even piety, but it tends to dry up the life force of this act, transforming memory into a practice of embalming" (Gagnebin 2020, 203). Concerning the preservation of data as a kind of attempt to "redeem memory" or "generalized rescue", a curious mnemonic coexistence has emerged: we forget for the sake of remembering, and we remember for the sake of forgetting. The sophistication of this movement was aptly captured by Harald Weinrich (2021, 281) when he recalled that, therefore, "stored means forgotten". In other words, the gesture of conserving can be closer to organized forgetting.

Without being embalmed, a matter of retention, cadaverous, *ars memoriae*, or even an *object*, "memory is not, in fact, a mere repository of data from which information is retrieved, but a process in constant elaboration whose modalities must be studied" (Portelli 2009, 3). It is clear that conservation, preservation, and patrimonialization do not undo the *communal cement of memory*, the amalgam that constitutes relationships; the French experience is not necessarily found in the rest of the world. There is no reason to "unpack memory" since the *mnemonic artifact* does not preserve the past as static, inertial, or immovable as the body of a dead person worthy of commemoration.

After writing about the intricacies of memory, Paul Ricoeur still considered its public dimension when he published *La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*: "I am disturbed by the disturbing spectacle presented by the excess of memory here, the excess of forgetting there, not to mention the influence of commemorations and errors of memory—and of forgetting" (Ricoeur 2007, 17). Thus, after his hermeneutic grafting via the long route, analyzed in detail by François Dosse, Ricoeur took on the "idea of a politics of just memory" as a civic theme.

I note, however, that *La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*, a work that was highly contested at the time of its release, did not dispense with arguments that were later presented in the article *La marque du passé* (2012). In his article, Paul Ricoeur (2012, 331) stated that

> Aristotle's formula, which I like to repeat: "Memory is of the past", doesn't need to mobilize the future to make sense of his statement. The present, it is true, is implicated in the paradox of the presence of absence, a paradox common to the imagination of the unreal and the memory of the past [...] However, the future is somehow placed in brackets. Isn't that what happens when we look for a memory, when we give ourselves over to the work of memory, to the cult of memory?

Defending that the investigation of the historical past, as he said, implies no more than three temporal positions: "that of the target event, that of the events interspersed between it and the historian's temporal position, and, finally, the moment of the writing of history", Ricoeur (2010, 332) maintained that there are three lapidary gestures: "two in the past and one in the present". Ricoeur (2010, 332) assumed more directly that, in this way, "we have nothing better than memory to signify that something happened, occurred, took place before we claimed to remember it. It was the not-so-subtle inversion of the matrix of history by the foundation and critique of memory.

I would point out that only an inattentive reading of *Temps et Récit* and *La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli* would suggest that Ricoeur did not deal with the future. His concern with the future is distinct in different writings, including *La marque du passé*, in which he said that he set out to "combine the triad past-present-future with the triad of the proper, the near, the distant" (Ricoeur 2010, 341). He went on to say that "debt is the burden that the past places on the future and that forgiveness would like to alleviate", but "this burden weighs on the future" because debt obliges (Ricoeur 2010, 341). Now, if a debt is something that was done in the past and whose effects operate in the future, it is possible to say that memory has an inescapable or prefigurative presence in the future.

Over time, oral history has dedicated itself to overcoming the vertical notion of *giving voice* to the voiceless in favor of a more nuanced inclination: giving ears to those who, although they have a voice, are not always heard. Debt first, then doubt: Is it still possible to listen in the digital world, or can we only hear voices as the product of a certain diffuse multivocality?

In this case, in addition to Ricoeur's civic concerns, the profound marks of memory and the concept of "just memory" or the problem of forgiveness, Pedro Telles da Silveira made a useful point that oral history in digital times is not suited to the perception that there is a war of people who don't listen to each other on the internet. Operating on the threads of forgetfulness—a more voluminous forgetfulness that is directly proportional to the manufacture of data (data, of course, being human traces)—it is essential to consider algorithmics as an incident in new social frameworks of digital memory. Algorithms do not fail to move political games based on economic, social, and political perspectives, among others.

When discussing the separation of history and memory throughout the disciplinary statute and after analyzing the *memorial boom of* the 1980s, María Inés Mudrovcic pondered that the

> Oral history, which emerged after World War II and gained significant momentum in the 1960s and 1970s, utilized personal recollections as the primary source for recording events. The function of the recollection was to provide information about the witness's experiences, and its epistemic status was similar to that of any document, whether written or material. The historian, therefore, transformed testimony into historical knowledge (Mudrovcic, 2024, 13).

Although various oral historians have utilized digital recorders and resources for storing digital media, just as they currently do with cloud storage, it is only in recent years that some exponents have begun to take a closer look at digital society (Seawright; Maceno 2023, 507-510). It is therefore worth highlighting Douglas A. Boyd and Mary A. Larson's phrase for understanding oral history in the United States of America, or even in Brazil: "It was technology from which oral history was born" (Boyd; Larson 2014, 2).

In this case, I propose that oral history - born of technology - should not be uncritically enthusiastic about the possibilities of the digital world, nor should it neglect the new manifestations of *narrative genres on the web*: *life stories*, *thematic oral histories*, *testimonial oral histories* and even *oral traditions* (of indigenous peoples or quilombolas).

Alistair Thomson, for his part, claimed the existence of a "digital revolution of the late 1990s and early 2000s" in the field of *verbalized memory* studies (2007, 50). Similarly, Anita Lucchesi emphasized the role of digital public history in its relationship with the present, orality, and the so-called *Information and Communication Technologies* (2022, 49). Although she acknowledged, in her own words, the existence of a "myriad of issues to be explored", Lucchesi chose as a priority the "growing mediatization of oral testimonies on the web" (2014, 40).

Reflecting on the "potential for widespread dissemination of these memories in the new public sphere of the internet" based on very concrete cases, Lucchesi said that the production of knowledge "does not come about through the mere existence and publication of these testimonies, but through a necessary historian's practice based on these testimonies, which he understands as evidence for a history—oral history that is" (2014, 49). It is therefore possible to value the experience of "digitizing interviews originally recorded on analog magnetic tapes", as Alberti said in the 3rd edition of his *Manual*, published in 2013. Similarly, born-digital media are exciting and don't even need procedures to become what they are from the start.

On the other hand, would it be sufficient to make oral histories available on the internet and disseminate them in abundance, or would cybercultures

encompass other forms of historical intelligence?[1] Of course, making stories available fulfills part of the public function of civic memory, but the possibilities widen when the possibility of algorithms and artificial intelligence becomes more evident.

The "set of techniques (material and intellectual), practices, attitudes, ways of thinking and values that are developing along with the growth of cyberspace" cannot do without memory, which, in turn, is no longer just about the past, but also about the *future* (Levy 1999, 264). Suppose remembrance is capable of making memory something more than mere information or storage, as Aleida Assmann (2011, 24) points out. In that case, its behavior is certainly not limited to spectral appearances, as in Ethan Kleinberg's (2017) fantological model, although the past is rooted in the present. Without naivety or adherence to the "progressive futurism" of yesteryear, to voracious developmentalism, oral history in the digital society even acts as a *prospect insofar* as it does not disregard the risks mentioned by Simon and Tamm.

Dominick LaCapra (2023, 131), when dealing with the intricate relationship between trauma, history, memory, and identity, proposed the path of correction in reverse: "historical research based on written sources and documentary sources related to them can contest or correct individual or collective memory, but the opposite can also occur". In this way, the first case "has generally been the often cogent emphasis of historians", but "without detracting from the value and importance of archival research", LaCapra (2023, 131–132) decided to "concentrate on the latter possibility, namely that of memory posing questions to history (or historiography)".

With restrictions on all sides, both in the name of a certain resistant empiricism and the lasting difficulties in consolidating the field of historiography and the study of *spoken memories*, it is considered equitable that historiography poses questions to memory, just as *verbal memory* poses problems to historiography. The complexity is accentuated when the theory of history and historiography converge with the digital society:

> [...] testimonies have gained special prominence as a genre that straddles the oral and the written. Video recording raises the question of the digital and its status as a source in which the oral and the written interact, for example, in the online article, video, or blog, which activates numerous comments made more or less on the fly, which often have the flavor of oral responses [...] A witness testifies or relates how he or she experienced events, and it is this experience, with its prima facie 'authenticity', that sometimes cannot be accessed in any other way. Oral testimonies are, of course, supplemented by written accounts, such as diaries and memorial texts, and the possible discrepancies between them constitute a special object of critical analysis (LaCapra, 2023, pp. 143–144).

It should, therefore, be emphasized that "along with the way in which memory can accurately complement or even correct written history and its standard archival bases, even the 'tricks' of memory and the reasons for their occurrence are themselves valid and valuable objects of historical and critical scrutiny" (LaCapra 2023, 144). It follows that sources derived from oral history are peculiar documents, and even more so when disseminated through digital resources.

ORAL HISTORY, POST-ANTHROPOCENTRISM, AND TEMPORALITIES

---

[1] It is known that the CPDOC/FGV has 200 funds, totaling around 1.8 million documents open to public consultation - containing around 1,000 interviews with approximately 5,000 hours of recordings.

However, the empirical voracity with which oral history is produced does not always include criticism of manuals or research protocols. There is a risk of misinterpreting the recognized empirical value of stories as empiricist, realistic, or even mechanistic attitudes: merely recording, transcribing, archiving, and producing an analysis, at best. Currently, the perception remains that people are increasingly interested in others' stories (Seawright, 2023).

It is often possible to overlook the fact that even the chronic arrangement of research—from recording to transcribing, textualizing, archiving, and producing a bank of stories, as well as generating an analysis—can become something linear and prescriptive. In touch with the possibilities offered by the digital world, the lure of conducting remote interviews can increase the number of stories and feed digital collections, making it easier to arrange publicized interviews. The *delivery of* testimonies with stimuli for the "consumption of the tragic" can, from another angle, occur at the same speed as ordering food through the app or making a purchase online. Hence, the risk of the precariousness of things or the trivialization of the story of pain made for "consumption".

However, the excesses of memory through digital means imply not only the risk of trivializing testimony when it is not treated critically but also the interdiction of listening caused by the surplus of voices. Who can listen when everyone is talking at the same time, all the time? Another threat that is often overlooked is the inclusion of different subjects in the heterogeneous field of oral history without understanding them as participants in more or less emancipatory projects.

I hypothesize that these risks arise because of the supervenience, or the *eternal return*, of the same linear, empty, homogeneous temporality described by Walter Benjamin but also by contemporary thinkers of history such as Mudrovcic and Mario Rufer (2014, 11–31); the *community* indistinction that perceives the other as if they were the same. If this hypothesis is substantiated, it is possible to infer that any deficits in ethical-political commitments to "just memory" can lead to the precariousness of the public impact of oral history.

While Hélio Rebello Cardoso Jr, Mudrovcic, and Achim Landwehr have said that "multiple temporalities" are tendencies of the "new metaphysics of historical time that stems from the prolific temporal theory of Reinhart Koselleck" (2023, 6), Marlon Salomon has tried to outline, in synthetic and careful lines, the history of chronology, of rectilinear approaches, and then of its ruins imposed by the emergence of the concept of heterochrony.

According to Salomon, "a few decades ago, historical time became pluralized" because "it declined from the singular through which historians have become accustomed to recognizing it and burst into new, multiple, varied, polychronic forms" (Salomon 2018, 9). As a corollary, Salomon argued that the "plurality of histories and temporalities could no longer be homogenized in global or general histories of civilization" (Salomon 2018, 9). When one reads Salomon's insightful text, its cohesive reasoning and developments around the concept of heterochrony make it possible to sense maturation in the temporal understanding of historical circuits.

Koselleck's temporal matrix, its virtues, and its developments, however, have been received in a plural way. It would be possible to refer to the works of different historians and theorists of history to understand the temporal matrix of multiple temporalities in Koselleck, such as Helge Jordheim (2014), Stefan Helgesson (2014), and Achim Landwehr (2012), as well as Zoltán B. Simon and

Marek Tamm (2023), Elías Palti (2019), Rodrigo Turin (2019), as well as Inclan and Valero (2017)—among others.

Helgesson criticized what he perceived as the Eurocentric elements of Koselleck's temporal matrix while simultaneously questioning the temporal homogenization characteristic of modernity (Cardoso Jr.; Mudrovcic; Landwehr 2023, 7; Helgesson 2014, 548). Landwehr criticized the synchronization of historical time presented by Koselleck for perpetuating, according to the author, a "diachronic dissonance" that imposes a Eurocentric and chronocentric view of modernity (2012, 22).

Simon and Tamm advanced the concept of "historical futures", a perspective that expanded the multiple temporalities proposed by Koselleck by affirming that the historical sphere is not limited to the past but decisively includes the future (2021, 11 and 131). They argued that, in the context of the crisis of modernity, the future cannot be understood as a simple continuation of the past but rather as a disruptive force. Similarly, "technical progress" has contributed to a new interaction between historical and natural time, generating the historicization of the latter by challenging the modern tendency to disconnect history and nature. By introducing the notion of "evental temporality", this theory proposes to reformulate the understanding of historical changes and aims to reorganize the relationship between past, present, and future. It thus proposes a renewed philosophy of history (Cardoso Jr; Mudrovcic; Landwehr 2023, 7).

Assuming that time is multiple, plurivocal, polysemic, and, consequently, more inclusive; that oral history is polysemic, heteroglot; and that in a digital society, it can be more inclusive and emancipatory, are not results of positions given *a priori*. From an epistemological perspective, it is reasonable for temporalities to be re-read in their multiplicity, which is no guarantee of the relationship. It would be a success if "technical microtemporality" participated in one of the forms of multiple temporalities, synthesizing the anguish or tensions arising from the notions of "controversies", "anger", and "forgiveness", as Silveira puts it in "*Remembering and forgetting on the internet*". But it's not like that. "Micro-temporality" initially belongs to technique.

"Technical microtemporality", elaborated by Wolfgang Ernst (2016, 661), refers to technological media that "always occur in time since they only become operative when updated" (Silveira 2021, 303). There is technical time, therefore, which is the operating time of the devices, just as there is social or historical time based on "continuity and duration", as well as the idea of "repetition", according to Silveira (2021, 303). If social time is "intersubjective", technical time is "interobjective" (Silveira 2021, 303). However, are these two different times, or are they dimensions of the *same* (Oliveira 2023)?

With Rodrigo Bragio Bonaldo, it is possible to understand human and non-human interactions or more-than-human interactions, considering also the interaction between human beings and computers from the perspective of temporal agency (2023, 3). Silveira, however, broadened his debate to include interaction between people, the "public sphere", and "forgiveness" by mentioning, among others, exponents such as Ricoeur, Vladimir Jankélévitch, and Berber Bevernage. I want to highlight not what was known in the prolific works of the authors mentioned but the slippery phrase—between people and machines—that Silveira hints at: "the politics of memory are also the politics of time" (2021, 316).

In this way, both memory and politics are articulated in the temporality between human beings and machines, raising the question of whether this multi-temporal articulation can guarantee greater emancipation or the criticism of

exclusionary temporal policies. Agreeing with Silveira, I refer the problem to Mudrovcic's reflection:

> Even when history becomes inclusive, through the multiplication of subjects, the political place they acquire through discourse is necessarily degraded. And if the demands for recognition are functional in this historiography, it is because the subjects themselves identify themselves in the discourse that constitutes them as excluded and subordinate. This means that, by constituting themselves as subjects of historiographies, they acquire, *ipso facto,* a subordinate political representation within the discourse itself; in other words, they are 'second-class' subjects. In this work, I begin with the conviction that this situation is produced by the intimate relationship between historical time and hierarchy, that is, the temporal presupposition underlying history is what enables it to operate politically, excluding the alterities that the history discourse itself makes visible (Mudrovcic 2023, 361).

The paradox is exclusion through inclusion: the "others", says Mudrovcic, the "subalterns, the racialized, the native peoples, nature, magic—become visible to the extent that they are excluded as a consequence of linear, homogeneous, absolute time, empty and external to the events in which history is inscribed" (2022, 361). The exclusion of relationships from the present—from this engaging, seductive and dangerous now that even translates into the digital world—is part of the "politics of time".

Under the chronic pedestal of the modern project, the "others" continue to be those who are "backward or primitive" *online*; those inhabitants of "colonized countries", "failed citizens", "transients", "racialized", and "mestizos" who were already *offline*. However, the simultaneity of the simultaneous (Western times) and the non-simultaneous (non-Western times), which subsists even in the digital, has the power to aggravate the chronic project of coloniality. It can be said, then, that coloniality can be digital (Faustino; Lippold, 2023). Therefore, temporal multiplicity arises from the "violence of wanting to 'read', to make others visible with the grammar of the same" through the synchronization of multiple temporalities but derived from a Eurocentric structuring matrix (Mudrovcic 2023, 361).

Understood as advances (and advances are teleological!), multitemporality highlights the alternating directionality of the *future*. What Salomon and the authors of "*Heterochronies*" masterfully salute, multitemporality, still bears the injunction of the Western matrix, which, subsumed by the digital, promotes the sensation of inclusion of the "other" established from the "center". The synchronization of temporalities occurs from the epicenter of Western Europe as if irradiating, in real-time, to the edges of the world or through the action of algorithms or more-than-human intelligence.

By mentioning Chakrabarty and other authors from the *global south*, Simon and Tamm directly addressed the core of the universalist matrix in *The Fabric of Historical Time*. As they put it: "In the third decade of the twenty-first century, it has become commonplace to recognize that a homogeneous conception of historical time, related to the experiences of Western countries, fails to capture the diversity of temporal experiences" (Simon; Tamm 2023, 4):

> The central normative question of today's debates on historical time is whether we should see only one "historical time" of global aspirations – one that is necessarily of the spatialized developmental structure of "first in Europe, then elsewhere" as Chakrabarty phrased it – or a multiplicity of localized historical times. The politics of both options have potential pitfalls. Whereas opting for the former risks denying a sense of historicity of their own from cultures outside the West, opting for the latter risks

considering practically any temporal configuration that relates past, present, and future in one way or another as "historical" (Simon; Tamm 2023, 6).

The solution to the second problem pointed out by Simon and Tamm lies in the subsumption of temporality lived in networks and in the networks that make up what I consider to be *communities of destiny*. The proposal to identify a more or less democratic chronocentric perspective raises the issue of how communities of destiny can operate in the digital environment through the testimony of memory reworked by groups or *communities*.

At another point, I argued that verbalized memories encourage reflections on community life. It's worth noting that the concept of community also implies communion, whether through shared suffering, common destinies, the creation of *ephemeral joy,* or collectively constructed meanings. Communities can also be constituted as survival collectives characterized by the experience of pain remembered together, without which the group would not be what it is or how it is:

> *Communities* are made of the stuff of people, and people are made of the warmth of memory. People, of course, are not only made of memory, but it is possible to argue in favor of humans being *mnemonic animals* par excellence. Belonging and social ties only exist because the *animal made of memories* is capable of remembering, imagining, wandering, and establishing horizons for insistent permanence in the world.
> Thus, the *community of destiny* is the part that remains in the link, even if it is broken, through the joint elaboration *of affections* of those affected, of those *shattered* (Seawright 2023, 17).

For Ecléa Bosi*, a community of destiny* "means suffering irreversibly, without the possibility of returning to the old condition, the fate of the subjects observed"—in this case, the people being listened to (1994, 38). When you're *online*, with oral histories disseminated via the *internet*, as Lucchesi demonstrated concretely in an article mentioned above, the *community of speech*, or *destiny*, is composed of the possible testimony of trauma, pain, or experiences of relational temporalities.

Mudrovcic's contribution is not intended to be immune to the metaphors of time. Now, however, it is the metaphor of the network in which relationships are made possible:

> Actor-network theory enables us to employ metaphors such as capillaries, nerves, threads, and fibers that interconnect, offering a more nuanced description of contemporary societies than metaphors of layers, levels, territories, spheres, categories, structures, or systems (Mudrovcic 2024, 45).

I gradually realized, however, that the *community of destiny* is possible because relational temporality underpins its existence. The combination of the notion of *community*, relational temporality, or the existence of people is possible when we return to the semantic meaning of contemporaneity that preceded modernity and has been taken up again in its crisis, reissued in the digital society: "living together" or "sharing the same time".

Between the temporality of technique, the internet of things, big data, the algorithm of the present that reorganizes a portion of human memory or even the capacity to store and transfer files from hard drives, Silveira addresses controversy and forgiveness, just as it would be equally possible to consider the original meaning of "contemporary" in which the "metaphor of the network was

implicitly present: those connected by filaments and networks of activities lived together" (Mudrovcic 2024, 49). This is the alloy, the cement, the *glutinum mundi of communities and gatherings of voices or manifestations of people in the digital society*.

In this way, I propose expanding the notion of a *community of destiny* through oral histories that originate from humans but also engage with digital cultures. This proposal becomes possible due to the post-anthropocentric turn, which tends to understand digital technologies or interconnections as indispensable for conceiving new relationships.

Just as it is possible to discuss overcoming speciesism and a non-homocentric oral history, since human beings are a minority on the planet, it is feasible to understand digital cultures or artificial intelligences as establishing characteristic chronotopes. Just as there is a climate emergency, we must also declare, for example, the emergence of the emancipation of the subject as a result of trained algorithms that do not fail to serve the interests of big techs or even proponents of authoritarian policies around the world.

In the same way, I propose mitigating the tripartite time of present-past-future in favor of relational time, in which relationships occur between human and non-human beings and in which contacts, with appropriate distinctions, take place between human beings and machines. Suppose oral memory is malleable, spiraling, not always directive, full of ups and downs. In that case, it is clear that operating in a network and the digital world, it cannot surrender to the paradox of exclusion through inclusion or to the conventional models of the Western matrix: "the historical past is not the other of the present, now that it happened at an earlier time, nor is the future a period after the present" (Mudrovcic 2024, 51). What's more, if "we understand it in this way, we will only be 'crossing' one of the 'strands' of time that make up the temporal community of those who live together", because the present appears as a consequence of "relationships that cross temporal processes" (Mudrovcic 2024, 51).

As for the *end of* oral history, I don't think that's the case at all. On the contrary, the decentering of narrative as an end is an opportunity for a human and *more-than-human* revival. This text is an incipient invitation to think more vigorously about the relationship between humans and other components of the posthumanist approach: "including artificial intelligence (AI), robots, genetic engineering, and the advent of futuristic possibilities (such as a possible takeover of humans by their most inventive inventions)" (LaCapra 2018, 64).

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Throughout the article, some of the transformations of oral history in the digital age were analyzed, highlighting how new technologies impact interviews, archiving, and the interpretation of oral narratives. It was therefore argued that digitization not only broadens access to sources but also reframes the relationship between historians and interviewees, challenging traditional conceptions of authenticity and "memory preservation". We also discussed how digital platforms enable new forms of interaction and collaboration, redefining the limits of authorship and curation of oral histories.

Another central point addressed was the influence of algorithms and artificial intelligence on the filtering or dissemination of oral histories. The impact of this mediation on the diversity of narratives was questioned. It is possible to argue that, although digitization facilitates the recording of memories to a certain extent, it also poses significant ethical and epistemological challenges: the manipulation of data, the decontextualization of information, the spread of

misinformation, and the need to ensure the integrity of sources. These aspects reinforce the importance of a critical and reflective approach to the use of digital technologies in oral history.

Finally, it was concluded that the digital turn in Brazilian oral history should not be viewed solely as a "technical advance" but rather as a process that reconfigures a significant portion of research practices. The relationship between orality, memory, and technology necessitates a nuanced understanding of the digital medium's possibilities and limitations, allowing for the preservation of the richness and complexity of oral narratives without compromising their authenticity and plurality.

There is a need for an ongoing debate on the role of technology in the construction of historical knowledge, demonstrating that oral history remains a dynamic and socially relevant field. Above all, the study presented here highlights issues related to post-anthropocentrism and overcoming approaches that are strictly homocentric or guided by the intransigence of the politics of time. Lastly, it is equally essential to be open to and self-critical of the empiricist tendencies that are deeply rooted in the culture of accumulation characteristic of the voracious "production of sources".

REFERENCES

ALBERTI, Verena. *Manual de História Oral*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 2013. Ebook.

ASSMANN, Aleida. *Espaços da recordação*. Tradução de Paulo Soethe. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2011.

BARROS, José D'Assunção. Revolução digital, sociedade digital e História. In: BARROS, José D'Assunção (org.). *História Digital: A Historiografia diante dos recursos e demandas de um novo tempo*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2022.

BLOCH, Marc. *Apologie pour l'histoire ou métier d'historien*. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1952.

BONALDO, Rodrigo Bragio. História mais do que humana: descrevendo o futuro como atualização repetidora da Inteligência Artificial. *História (São Paulo)*, v. 42, e2023037, 2023.

BOSI, Ecléa. *Memória e sociedade: Lembranças dos velhos*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1994.

BOYD, Douglas A.; LARSON, Mary A. Introduction. In: BOYD, Douglas A.; LARSON, Mary A. (orgs.). *Oral History and Digital Humanities: Voice, Access and Engagement*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

CARDOSO JR., Humberto R.; MUDROVCIC, María Inés; LANDWEHR, Achim. Tempos da História: Uma Visão Geral dos Estudos acerca do Tempo Relacionados à Teoria da História (Conceitos, Questões e Tendências). *Revista História (São Paulo)*, v. 42, n. 1, p. 1-20, 2023.

CHAKRABARTY, Dipesh. The Climate of History: Four Theses. *Critical Inquiry*, v. 35, n. 2, p. 197-222, 2009.

DOMANSKA, Ewa. Para além do antropocentrismo nos estudos históricos. *Revista Expedições: Teoria da História & Historiografia*, v. 4, n. 2, p. 10-25, 2013.

DOMANSKA, Ewa. The Material Presence of the Past. *History and Theory*, v. 45, n. 3, p. 337-348, 2006.

FAUSTINO, Deivison; LIPPOLD, Walter. *Colonialismo digital: por uma crítica hacker-fanoniana*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2023.

GAGNEBIN, Jeanne Marie. Os impedimentos da memória. *Estudos Avançados*, v. 34, n. 98, p. 45-60, 2020.

HALBWACHS, Maurice. *La mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1950.

HARTOG, François. *Regimes of Historicity: Presentism and Experiences of Time*. Tradução de Saskia Brown. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.

IGGERS, Georg. Desafios do século XXI à historiografia. *História da Historiografia: International Journal of Theory and History of Historiography*, n. 4, p. 10-25, 2010.

INCLÁN, Daniel; VALERO, Antonio. Reporte del tiempo: presente e historia. *Desacatos*, n. 55, p. 1-15, 2017.

JHORDHEIM, Hans. Introduction: Multiple Times and the Work of Synchronization. *History and Theory*, v. 53, n. 4, p. 498-518, 2014.

KLEINBERG, Ethan. *Haunting History: For a Deconstructive Approach to the Past*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2017.

KUUKKANEN, Jouni-Matti. *Postnarrativist Philosophy of Historiography*. Houndmills; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

LACAPRA, Dominick. *Compreender outros: povos, animais, passados*. Tradução de Pedro Fonseca. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2023.

LANDWEHR, Achim. Von der 'Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen'. *Historische Zeitschrift*, v. 295, n. 1, p. 1-25, 2012.

LÉVY, Pierre. *Cibercultura*. Tradução de Carlos Irineu da Costa. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1999. p. 264.

LUCCHESI, Anita. Conversas na antessala da academia: o presente, a oralidade e a história pública digital. *História Oral*, v. 17, n. 1, p. 45-60, 2014.

LUCCHESI, Anita. *História, internet e novas mídias: preocupações e questionamentos para historiadores do século XXI*. Recife: EDUPE, 2022.

LUHMANN, Niklas. *Observations on Modernity*. Tradução de William Whobrey. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998. p. 71.

MEIHY, José Carlos Sebe Bom; SEAWRIGHT, Leandro. *Memórias e Narrativas: História Oral Aplicada*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2020.

MUDROVCIC, María Inés. *Conceptualizing the History of the Present Time*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2024.

MUDROVCIC, María Inés. La trampa de las 'temporalidades múltiples': ¿se puede escrever sem cronologia? *Esboços*, v. 30, n. 55, p. 1-20, 2023.

NORA, Pierre (Org.). *Les lieux de mémoire. Tome I: La République*. Paris: Gallimard, 1984.

OLIVEIRA, Maria da Glória de. Espectros da colonialidade-racialidade e os tempos plurais do mesmo. *Esboços*, v. 30, n. 55, p. 310-325, 2023.

PALTI, Elías. Koselleck-Foucault: The Birth and Death of Philosophy of History. In: ROLDÁN, Concha; BRAUER, Daniel; ROHBECK, Johannes (orgs.). *Philosophy of Globalization*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.

PORTELLI, Alessandro. Un lavoro di relazioni: osservazioni sulla storia orale. *AISO – Associazione Italiana di Storia Orale*, n. 1, p. 1-15, 2009.

RICOEUR, Paul. A marca do passado. *História da Historiografia: International Journal of Theory and History of Historiography*, n. 10, p. 330-345, 2010.

RICOEUR, Paul. *A memória, a história, o esquecimento*. Tradução de Alain François. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2007.

RUFER, Mario. La temporalidad como política: nación, formas de pasado y perspectivas poscoloniales. *Memoria y Sociedad*, v. 18, n. 28, p. 10-25, 2014.

SALOMON, Marlon. Heterocronias. In: SALOMON, Marlon (org.). *Heterocronias – estudos sobre a multiplicidade dos tempos históricos*. Goiânia: Edições Ricochete, 2018.

SEAWRIGHT, Leandro. *Vidas Machucadas: História Oral Aplicada*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2023.

SEAWRIGHT, Leandro; MACENO, Leonardo. História oral e sociedade digital. *Projeto História: Revista do Programa de Estudos Pós-Graduados de História*, v. 66, p. 507-510, 2023.

SILVEIRA, Pedro Telles da. Lembrar e esquecer na internet: memória, mídias digitais e a temporalidade do perdão na esfera pública contemporânea. *Varia História*, v. 37, p. 287-321, 2021.

SIMON, Zoltán Boldizsár. The Transformation of Historical Time: Processual and Evental Temporalities. In: TAMM, Marek; OLIVER, Laurent (orgs.). *Rethinking Historical Time: New Approaches to Presentism*. London: Bloomsbury, 2019. p. 71-75.

SIMON, Zoltán Boldizsár; TAMM, Marek. Historical Futures. *History and Theory*, v. 60, n. 1, p. 79-80, 2021.

SIMON, Zoltán Boldizsár; TAMM, Marek. *The Fabric of Historical Time*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2023.

THOMSON, Alistair. Four Paradigm Transformations in Oral History. *Oral History Review*, v. 34, n. 1, p. 1-20, 2007.

TURIN, Rodrigo. Tempos de transição: aceleração e dessincronização social. In: VÁSQUEZ, Gabriela González; DENIPOTI, Cláudio (orgs.). *Tempos de Transição*. Porto Alegre: Editora Fi, 2019.

WEINRICH, Harald. *Lete: arte e crítica do esquecimento*. Tradução de Lúcia Schneider Hardt. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2021.