THE INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE MEMORY OF DECEASED PEOPLE IN DIGITAL SOCIAL NETWORKS

Danilo Morais da Silva[1].

ABSTRACT
The author Halbwachs (1968, p. 32) says that: "to forget a period of your life is to lose contact with those who surrounded you at the time". The grief of losing an important person(s) in life is not easy, but the memories remain and the good memories bring us the joy of having lived unforgettable moments with that person(s). The author states that in order to reconstruct the image of an event from the past in order to obtain a memory, it is necessary that this reconstruction operates common data or notions that are found in our minds and in that of others, because they pass from these to that reciprocally, so we can understand that a memory can be recognized and reconstructed at the same time (p. 34). On the internet, through digital social networks, people leave their records of moments lived alone or with a group of people. It can be said that they are building memories that will be accessed at some point so that a memory can be made, the algorithm of these digital social media itself does this by showing the memories. In relation to collective memory, the author points out that it does not explain by itself all our memories or that it explains the evolution of any memory: "nothing proves that all the notions and images taken from the social environments of which we are a part, and intervene in memory, do not cover like a movie screen, an individual memory". For Halbwachs (1968): "the whole question is to know whether such a memory can exist, whether it is conceivable". It would be enough for such a recollection to be produced only once to show that nothing prevents it from intervening in all cases. If the debate is about the memory of those who have gone, how can we respect it? Wouldn't it be better to let the memory fall into oblivion and build new memories with another person(s)? Would it be a disposable relationship? Impossible, memories stay in the subconscious and when we least expect them they are cut out. Halbwachs (1968) states that in the memory of a group, the memories of events, experiences that concern its members and that result in their own life, or relationships with groups that are closer, but in contact with them, stand out. Memories that concern fewer people and sometimes only one of their members, on the other hand, can be understood in their memory, since they produce within their limits and pass into the background. Now, we enter into a debate about common thought, people often miss group moments, a collective memory, and in order to promote a way to relive them, they end up gathering the members who are still alive and begin to fraternize remembering so-and-so, the good moments, the moments of tension, in short, several moments that he/she lived/lived together, it is possible to understand these limitations when the author states that we limit ourselves to observing that our past comprises two kinds of elements: I. those that we can evoke when we want; and II. those who do not respond to our appeal. It can be said that they are within the common domain in the familiar sense and easily accessible, just like that of others. Thus, the memories that are easier to remember are in the common domain because they are for "everyone" and that is why we are able to remember them, says Halbwachs, (1968). With the rise of mobile

---

[1] Federal University of Rondônia – Rondônia

technologies and having access to the internet democratized through the most varied types of connections, it is possible to build individual and collective memories that can be remembered with great joy or sadness, depending on how this memory was constituted. Through digital social networks such as Facebook and Instagram it is possible to leave records of these moments and, if there are social ties of association (Recuero, 2009) with the memorial profile of the deceased person, it makes it possible to remember these moments through the records made there. Therefore, it is not possible to go back in time, unfortunately, but it is possible to look at the past with nostalgia and build new memories so that life continues to be this remembering and recording moments. Gagnebin (1998, p. 218) says that: "memory experiences this tension between presence and absence, the presence of the present that remembers the disappeared past, but also the presence of the disappeared past that makes its irruption into an evanescent present". Living between the present and the absent is a challenge for living people, but who keep memories of deceased people. According to the author: "the poet's word of remembrance and praise corresponds, in its intention and in its effects, to the ceremonies of mourning and burial. Like the funerary star erected in memory of the dead, poetic singing also struggles to keep alive the memory of heroes." She also describes that the tomb and the word take turns in the work of memory which, in a battle against oblivion, is also implicit recognition of the strength of the recognition of the power of death. She also says that working with grief should help us remember the dead in order to live better today, so that "the concern with the truth of the past is completed in the demand for a present that can also be true." Pollak (1989) also reflects on how "at the moment when the eyewitnesses know that they are going to disappear soon, they want to inscribe their memories against oblivion". For the author, in the absence of the possibility of understanding, silence - unlike forgetfulness - can even be a necessary condition (presumed or real) for communication with the environment. (Pollak, 1989). Motta (2014) cites Portelli (1996) when he speaks of divided memory where "one should not think only of a conflict between the pure and spontaneous community memory and the 'official' and 'ideological' one, so that, once the latter is dismantled, the unmediated authenticity of the former is implicitly assumed" (PORTELLI, 1996, p. 109 apud Motta, 2014). In fact, we are dealing with a multiplicity of fragmented and internally divided memories, all ideologically and culturally mediated in one way or another. The idea that there are always memories is something that must be remembered, even before we question ourselves about those responsible for the transmission of a certain memory. It is important to highlight: what do you want to remember, and why? For Motta (2014) it is important to understand the different times of remembrance, since memories, which seem static, change with time and with the new demands of the present. Facebook "memorial" pages preserve the records of their users, it is very common to see that, even after death, on the day of the birthday, several people wish congratulations and so on. Perhaps because they do not know that they have passed away or simply have not shared a moment with this person: "the memory of a person only becomes a social fact when he expresses it verbally to someone" (Motta, 2014, 184).

Keywords: Memory, Deceased People, Digital Social Networks.

REFERENCES

1. Gagnebin, J. M. (1998). Verdade e memória do passado. Proj. História.

2. Halbwachs, M. (1990). A memória coletiva. Vértice.

3. Motta, M. M. M. (2014). História e memória. Cadernos do CEOM, 1(1). Available at: https://bell.unochapeco.edu.br/revistas/index.php/rcc/article/view/2196. Accessed on: October 13, 2024.

4. Pollak, M. (1989). Memória, esquecimento, silêncio. Estudos Históricos.

5. Recuero, R. (2009). Redes sociais na internet. Meridional.