Encontros Bibli

NOTES FOR A CRITICAL DISCOURSE THEORY OF INFORMATION

Notas para uma teoria crítica discursiva da informação

Clóvis Ricardo Montenegro de Lima
Instituto Brasileiro de Informação em Ciência e Tecnologia
Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil
clovismlima@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6337-3918

Márcio Gonçalves
Instituto Brasileiro de Informação em Ciência e Tecnologia
Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil
marciog.goncalves@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5773-2139

Mariangela Rebelo Maia
Instituto Brasileiro de Informação em Ciência e Tecnologia
Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil
mariangelasaude@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9769-0885

A lista completa com informações dos autores está no final do artigo

RESUMO
Objetivo: o artigo apresenta anotações iniciais para uma teoria crítica discursiva da informação.
Método: a teoria parte de Habermas, que considera o Discurso uma forma especial de Agir Comunicativo para construção de entendimento intersubjetivo. O Discurso é o meio que os sujeitos usam para resolver conflitos sobre algo no mundo, e para construir acordos teóricos e práticos. O Discurso entre sujeitos tem função de validação pragmática de expressões e representações do mundo da vida. Habermas observa que acordos por argumentos devem ter correspondência com o mundo objetivo.
Resultado: a partir desses pressupostos se faz o esboço de uma teoria crítica da informação. A informação é construção de significado e representação, mas é também acordo intersubjetivo sobre algo que existe no mundo.
Conclusões: assim, não existe informação fora, antes ou depois da comunicação. A informação faz parte da comunicação, nas interações mediadas pela linguagem.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Teoria crítica discursiva. Informação. Agir comunicativo.

ABSTRACT
Objective: the article presents initial notes for a critical discourse theory of information.
Methods: Stems from the elaboration of Habermas, which considers Discourse a special form of Communicative Action to build intersubjective understanding. Discourse is the means that subjects use to resolve conflicts over something in the world, working to build theoretical and practical agreements. Discourse between subjects has the function of pragmatically validating expressions and representations of the lifeworld. Habermas notes that agreements reached by argumentation should correspond to the objective world.
Results: based on these assumptions, a critical theory of information is outlined. Information is the construction of meaning and representation, but it is also an intersubjective agreement about something in the world.
Conclusions: thus, there is no information outside, before or after communication. Information is part of communication, in interactions mediated by language

KEYWORDS: Critical discursive theory. Information. Communicative action.

1 INTRODUCTION

This article presents initial notes for a critical discourse theory of information. This theory stems from Habermas's theories, who considers discourse a special form of

communicative action for building intersubjective understanding. Habermas's theory of communicative action, after its linguistic turn, brings forward significant cognitivism and constructivism elements.

This is the first article produced as an outcome from a long term research project with a specific objective of developing a critical discursive theory of information at Brazilian Institute of Information in Science and Technology (IBICT). Since 2009 and still in progress, we seek to develop this theory. Two doctoral theses at IBICT: Gonçalves (2014) and Maia (2019) were carried out with this approach.

Discourse is the means that subjects use to resolve conflicts over something in the world, working to build theoretical and practical agreements. Discourse between subjects has the function of pragmatically validating expressions and representations of the lifeworld, while creating social bonds. Habermas notes that agreements reached by argumentation should correspond to something existing in the objective world (SIEBENEICHLER, 2010). Based on these Habermasean assumptions, a critical discourse theory of information with cognitive, constructivist and pragmatic elements is outlined.

Information is the construction of meaning and representation, but, also, an intersubjective agreement about something existing in the world. Thus, there is no information outside, before or after communication. Information is part of communication, of interaction mediated by language. Through language the distinction between uncertainty and meaningful information is communicated reflexively, and the consequent codification may be changed without becoming confused (LEYDESDORFF, 2000).

Starting with Jürgen Habermas's elaboration, a discourse theory of information stems from a special form of communicative action oriented toward the construction of intersubjective understanding. Information as addressed by Habermas in his argument configures itself as a component of communication, in which information gains a character that is associated with communicative action. Information is treated according to the communication bias, not having a dedicated theoretical development. In the theory of communicative action, information stands as a star in the constellation of elements evoked by Habermas for rebuilding the conditions of the communicative intent free from the constraint of systemic advances.

As information appears residually in the face of the communicative purposes, this text aims to reflect upon the theoretical role of information for the consensual intents of communication as sought by Habermas. In this sense, we analyze information from the perspective of Discourse, as it is in its theoretical advent that the previous informational

content of the communicative activity is challenged. In Discourse, information operates in choosing meanings and in building validity claims that, if accepted, will contribute to the formation of communicative consensus on the things existing in the world, the norms of society and the intelligibility of expressions. In Discourse, information has no form; it is a power in the recursive and linguistically structured instability of the lifeworld.

It is clear that, in relation to the previous generations of the Frankfurt School Institute for Social Research, Habermas's theory of communicative action is intertwined with the linguistic turn of philosophy and brings forward significant reconstructive elements of semantic cognitivism and pragmatic constructivism. Discourse is seen as a nearly transcendental meta-plan through which subjects confront one another to resolve conflicts and controversies about something objective, subjective or normative in the lifeworld. The linguistic arena of universal speech is where theoretical and practical agreements for coexistence (and survival) are built. In the plan orchestrated by the meta-means of language and human dignity, Discourse between subjects has the function of pragmatically validating expressions, representations and norms of the lifeworld.

In linguistics, distinction is made between the studies of formal linguistics and discourse linguistics. Discourse linguistics addresses the use of language in real situations and the existing relationships between form and function, not limited to the use of language as a formal system. It is considered that "language has a formal structure that is permeated by subjective social and historical realities that influence the system and vice versa." (SANTOS; SANTOS, 2016, p. 40, our translation).

Based on these assumptions, the critical discourse theory of information is outlined, having cognitive, constructivist and pragmatic elements. Information emerges as a social representation based on a selective construction of meaning experienced among the pain and delight of intersubjective agreements about something existing in the world. In Discourse, information is integrated with communication as part of the interaction mediated by language.

2 COMMUNICATIVE ACTION, COGNITION AND CONSTRUCTIVISM

Habermas's theory of communicative action, after its linguistic turn, brings forward significant cognitivism and constructivism elements. The theory is a gigantic intellectual effort to reflect upon the construction of individuals, socialization, the formation of groups, based on interactions mediated by language. First, however, it is necessary to understand

the difference between the concepts of linguistic turn and pragmatic turn. It is important to understand that "turn" is nothing more than a radical change in the philosophical question about the central elements of our experience, which, therefore, starts to develop differently.

The linguistic turn constitutes a supersession of the introspective or speculative method typical of modern philosophy, which focused on the matter of consciousness, by the propositional analysis. The first step in the linguistic turn is to prioritize the logic of propositions (a rigorous syntactic-semantic analysis), believing that this is a previous step that is indispensable for any philosophical study.

In regard to the pragmatic turn, which occurs subsequently in the linguistic turn, it can be said that it occurs due to an exhaustion of the mere propositional analysis of language. After the pragmatic turn, on the contrary, the truth of a statement can also be demonstrated on the basis of reasons that can be recognized by a community of individuals participating in communication. The role, which was attributed to consciousness in the old paradigm, passes on, in the new paradigm, to communication mediated by arguments.

Habermas moves apart from the idea that individuals can base their action monologically, and toward interaction and cooperation. Communicative action is the interaction in which the people involved agree to arrange their plans, the agreement reached in each case is measured by the intersubjective recognition of the validity claims. In the case of linguistic processes of mutual understanding, the actors, when agreeing about a matter with the others, raise validity claims from their speech acts, more precisely truth claims, rightness claims and sincerity claims, as they refer to something in the objective world (as the totality of existing states of affairs), to something in the common social world (as the totality of experiences to which they have privileged access).

Communicative action is the form of social interaction in which the action plan of several agents is coordinated through the exchange of communicative actions – by means of verbalized language or corresponding extraverbal expressions – aimed at achieving an understanding (GONZÁLEZ DE GÓMEZ, 2009a).

In the strategic action, a subject interacts with the other to motivate a desired continuation, but in the communicative action, one is rationally motivated by the other toward an adhesion action – and this is due to the compromising effect that the offer of a speech act raises (HABERMAS, 2003).

Habermas recognizes the force of argumentation by showing the differences between assertibility and truth: the formal qualities of argumentation between assertibility and truth. Because, "at the last minute", conclusive evidence and convincing arguments fail

and well-founded opinions can be false, only the quality of the discourse truth-verification process underlies the rational hope that stronger fundamentals and accessible information are truly available and, in the end, also "count". Perceived inconsistencies, which arouse the suspicion "that nothing is argued here", are first manifested when relevant participants cease to be included, relevant contributions are repressed, and yes and no positions are taken and are not manipulated or conditioned through other types of influence (HABERMAS, 2002, p. 69).

Speech acts have validity claims and are subject to a validation process until they acquire validity. Discourse validation is the process of communicative action aimed at the mutual understanding achieved by the Habermasean idea of human emancipation and discourse. The process involves the use of language, which promotes advances in the validity claims when discursively justified (GONÇALVES; LIMA, 2014).

In "Pedagogy of the Oppressed", Paulo Freire builds a theoretical-philosophical construct on the conditions of interaction through language and its central role for a liberating education. Freire revives the tradition of dialogue as a dialectical and inquiry-based process, and believes that, by means of it, we are able to look at the world and our existence in society as a process, of something under construction, as an unfinished and constantly changing reality.

Interaction mediated by language impels critical inquiry-based thinking in relation to the human condition in the world. It is through this interaction that we can see the world according to our perspective. Furthermore, interaction mediated by language implies a social praxis, which is the compromise between the spoken word and our humanizing action. Doors are opened for one to rethink life in society, to discuss our culture and our education, and the possibility of behaving otherwise, which transforms the world around us (ZITKOSKI, 2010).

Interaction mediated by language is the seal of the cognitive act, in which the cognizable object, mediated by cognoscent subjects, surrenders to its critical unveiling (FREIRE, 1981). In the cognitive dimension, the senses of individuals are social constructions. Belkin (1990) notes that information is understood as communicated knowledge and that it generates transformation in the mental structure of the subjects. Based on a cognitive perspective, the way information is received by subjects is analyzed taking into account the mental processes performed by them. Information, therefore, would be what causes change in the individual's mental state. Capurro (1992, p. 82) says that "the

cognitive turn asks for the intrinsic relationship between the human knower and her/his potential knowledge."

Belkin (1990) proposes a cognitive approach to informational issues. The facilitation of communication between human beings is what is in question, as information is capable of modifying structures, which are general forms of organization. It is in intersubjectivity and negotiation with others that the relationship between individuals with freedom of action is established. "The treatment of social cognitive theory in the Information Science literature as pertinent to two themes is thus elaborated below: (i) information seeking behavior and use (including information literacy) and (ii) knowledge sharing." (MIDDLETON; HALL; RAESIDE, 2018, p. 1).

Cognitivism studies the central processes of human beings, such as the organization of knowledge, processing of information, styles of thinking, in addition to group and individual behaviors. "In fact, knowledge comes from neither the subject [...] nor the object [...], but from the interactions between subject and object." (PIAGET, 1973, p. 39-40, our translation). Social Cognitive Theory is a psychologically derived theory that explains how individuals within social systems enact multiple human processes, including the acquisition and adoption of information and knowledge. Its main focus is processes of learning, and the interplay between multiple factors therein (MIDDLETON; HALL; RAESIDE, 2018).

"We humans find ourselves in the world, with the world and with others, as concretely situated beings and in a process of mutual construction", says Freire (1987, p. 39, our translation). The world to which Freire refers allows the "intending" of our consciences. We can act based on the purposes that we establish. This way, we create new ideas, produce the unprecedented and transform our surroundings.

The construction of knowledge is sustained in interactions mediated by language. Language is not a reflection of an action, it is the very action of a subject who puts it into practice. Constructivism is a rule that governs Discourse, justified by the idea that individuals go through stages to build and acquire knowledge. The construction of Discourse is a social production, the communication of which allows subjects to make sense, not only of themselves, but also of the outside world (CAMPOS, 2014).

3   DISCOURSE, PRAGMATICS AND TRUTH

Discourse is the means that subjects use to resolve conflicts over something in the world, working to build theoretical and practical agreements. Discourse between subjects

has the function of pragmatically validating expressions and representations of the lifeworld. Habermas highlights the need for discussion and argumentation to ensure that participants are aware of the issues and implications of discussion topics. The different needs, interests and opinions of all parties concerned should be discussed in public so that others can debate, question and analyze each other's perspectives.

Discourse according to Habermas is an argumentation exercise, a communicational process that, in relation to the purpose of a rationally motivated agreement, has to satisfy improbable conditions (HABERMAS, 2003). Habermas highlights that the ideal communication community is counterfactual. Capurro (1992) agrees that communication in the sense of sharing together a common world is a specific trait of our being-in-the-world. Here lies the existential foundation of Information Science. Information, in an existential-hermeneutic sense, means to thematically and situationally share a common world.

The Discourse theory does not have a clarification perspective, in a dialectical sense, but an interactive dynamic perspective that alludes to learning. Therefore, an important distinction can be made between dialogue and Discourse: the former operates toward clarification and the second toward construction.

In Portuguese, the semantic use of the word Discourse according to Habermas is established in an intensely neological manner or at least, in a manner that is not usual in the common sense. The "preliminary translator's note" written by Guido Antônio de Almeida (1989) in the pre-text of "Consciência Moral e Agir comunicativo" addresses this matter. Habermas uses at least three words in German to refer to the discursive matter of communication: Diskurs (Discourse), Rede (discourse, speech) and Diskursiv (discursive).

In Portuguese, these words have strong similarities in their contexts of use. However, the word Diskurs, which we have spelled with a capital letter, is used by Habermas as a technical term that heralds a concept. In German, Diskurs is an old-fashioned word, the semantic-pragmatic uses of which according to its history are established in the constellation of meanings that Habermas brings, that is, Discourse as "a lively conversation or a detailed discussion, or even the arguments or explanations that one conveys to the other" (HABERMAS, 2003, p. 111, our translation).

This textual observation is valuable as Habermas introduces an aspect regarding the uses of Diskurs that is not common among Portuguese speakers, namely: the intersubjective aspect. The semantic-pragmatic aspect of subjectivity of speeches, of the liveliness with which subjects deliver their speeches, in public speaking pieces, for example,

as well as the logical-conceptual aspect linked to explanatory arguments and confrontations of opinions, are found in the significant stanza of the word discourse in Portuguese.

Discourse as Diskurs, in its intersubjective dimension, loaded with significant controversies and disputes, which takes place in the course of a conversation, discussion or arguments on different points of view, has no common use in Portuguese. That said, in order to stress the meaning of Habermas's use, the word Discourse should be emphasized as a kind of communication aimed at appreciably substantiating the validity claims of the subjective and normative expressions on which the communicative action oriented towards understanding is based.

Dialogue and discourse, Hermann (2012) clarifies, refer to different modes of language-mediated interaction that can be clarified by the etymology of the word. Dialogue comes from the Greek dia-logos, which means through conversation, that is, a reciprocal conversation between two or more people. Unlike dialogue, Discourse stems from the Latin term discurs, which means to run apart, to run here and there, to disperse. It constitutes a conversational situation in which the contributions of one and the other are related and oriented to understanding. While philosophical dialogue takes place between two participants, Discourse seeks understanding by means of a public discussion of separate participants in an uncomfortable polyphony, typical of pluralistic societies.

Discourse goes beyond personal encounter, it is not private, as it takes place in a public sphere. Habermas's choice for Discourse is attributable to his skepticism about a Platonic-metaphysical dialogue and his interest in the non-existential structure of a public political sphere that goes beyond the personal level. Discourse is a special form of communication in which participants react to a particular disturbance (HERMANN, 2012).

In communicative action, speakers are motivated by others to act rationally due to the effect of compromise caused by the speech acts. A rationally motivated agreement between all those involved can be understood taking into account Austin's studies, which provide speech with a sense of act, which is not assertoric (that describes something), but pragmatic, that is, it leads the other to accept pragmatic assumptions of communication. The conditions of Discourse and the rational agreement reached depend on an ideal situation of speech, which is characterized by the symmetry of opportunities of those taking part in the dialogue (HERMANN, 2012).

Discourse can be understood as the reconstruction of the intuitions of everyday life that support an impartial assessment of conflicts of action and only those that can be accepted by all parties concerned can be considered valid. Argumentation is based on the

pragmatic assumptions of argumentation in general, with the specification of the meaning of the normative validity claims, that is, the universal validity of the principle of universalization goes beyond the perspective of a particular culture, basing itself on pragmatic and transcendental validation of universal and necessary assumptions of argumentation (HABERMAS, 2003).

Habermas (2010) explains the validity claim based on statements: truth is a validity claim that we associate with statements as we make them. Affirmations belong to the class of constative speech acts. In affirming something, I attest the claim that the statement I have made is true. I can affirm this claim legitimately or illegitimately. Affirmations can be neither true nor false, they are, indeed, legitimate or illegitimate (HABERMAS, 2010).

It is possible to clarify what a validity claim is by using the example of legal claims. A claim can be asserted, that is, enforced, it can be challenged and defended, rejected or recognized. Claims that are recognized are valid. The circumstance of validity claims being truly recognized can have many reasons (or causes). However, if and as long as the "thing itself" provides sufficient reason for a validity claim to be recognized, we say that it is recognized because it is, exclusively, legitimate (or it appears legitimate to those who recognize it). A claim is considered legitimate if and insofar as it can be sustained. "It is that the legitimate validity of a claim ensures the reliability with which the expectations resulting from a given claim are met" (HABERMAS, 2010, p. 183, our translation).

Habermas distinguishes between true and false statements with reference to the assessment of others – namely, the judgment of all of the others with whom one could ever interact by means of language. The condition for the truth of statements is the agreement to reach a rational consensus on what is said (HABERMAS, 2010).

In his linguistic turn, Habermas criticizes philosophy that focuses on the relationship between subject and object, and moves apart from the paradigm of philosophy of consciousness toward that of philosophy of language. However, in "Truth and Justification", Habermas criticizes the idea that the main function of language is to unveil the world – the formative power of this function – considering that the core of learning processes is the resolution of problems, in which the interlocutors can reach mutual understanding about something

> [...] The objective world is no longer something to be portrayed, but only the common reference point of a process of mutual understanding between members of a communication community who understand one another about something in the world (HABERMAS, 2004, p. 234, our translation).

The discursive concept of truth should take into account that the truth of a statement – given the impossibility of direct access to uninterpreted conditions of truth – cannot be measured by "peremptory evidence", but only by justifying reasons. The idealization of certain formal and procedural properties of the praxis of argumentation should highlight a procedure that, by means of a sensible consideration of all relevant voices, themes and contributions, does justice to the transcendence of the truth in relation to its context, as claimed by the speaker for their statement. Therefore, truth is claimed for statements about things and events in the objective world (HABERMAS, 2004).

The conditions of communication are exposed when Habermas establishes a universal pragmatics. It means that Habermas's theory of truth states that when language is used, advances are made in validity claims that must be justified by means of discourse. For this reason, the discourse theory of truth is a discourse process of understanding with the purpose to reach an understanding supported by reasons or arguments amongst people. In view of this argumentative process, the best argument prevails.

Habermas (2004), states that different languages can produce different worldviews. He believes that language is a constitutive element of experience and identity, but argues that the means of action constituted by a linguistic worldview operate in the light of a communicative rationality that imposes on participants an orientation based on validity claims.

In the Theory of Communicative Action, there is tension between Contextualism (based on the category of lifeworld) and Universalism (anchored in the idea that a validity claim constitutes a universal claim). In "Truth and Justification", Habermas states that the revival or validity claims of a speech act, is always linked to an intersubjective question of justification through Discourse.

4 COMMUNICATIVE ACTION AND INFORMATION

Based on the assumptions of the theory of communicative action, particularly Discourse, a critical theory of information is outlined, having cognitive, constructivist and pragmatic elements. Information is the construction of meaning and representation, but it is also an intersubjective agreement about the world. Therefore, there is no information outside, before or after communication. Information is part of communication, of interaction mediated by language.

González de Gómez (2009a) states that information is what constitutes two points of difficult suture, in which the integrating function of language is confronted: between linguistic representation and abduction and between the systemic and administrative uses and the communicational uses of language. Capurro (1992), considers that information is neither a mentalistic nor just a mind-related concept but expresses a characteristic of our pragmatic way of being. It points to the dimension of sharing with others thematically different practical and/or theoretical possibilities of world disclosure.

According to González de Gómez (2009b), information has a double basis – socio-cognitive and instrumental-strategic. On the one hand, information would be based in a temporality that links body and culture in a differentiated configuration of aesthesis and allows the opening of multiple perspectives on the world. Associated with some of the plural – everyday and specialized – heuristic possibilities of actions, information designates the difference that lies within the experiences of confrontation between our previous expectations and what happens in our current relations with the world. On the other hand, information, while codified, is reconstituted through means, in the areas of exchange and negotiation between the systems and the lifeworld – mediation, however, constituted in a historical and not "logical" relationship, therefore, plausible, of ambivalences and transformations (GONZÁLEZ DE GÓMEZ, 2009b).

Thereby, information constitutes a negotiation area between the lifeworld and the world. Intersubjective communication, however, would be dependent upon what the world "decides" to communicate, whether on the existence of the objects to which the information refers, or on the states of affairs in the world described in assertoric propositions (GONZÁLEZ DE GÓMEZ, 2009a).

Discourse designates the form of communication in which the validity claims that are constituted in the process of seeking mutual understanding, but which have become problematic and which will be examined in the light of argumentative processes, are conceptualized. In Discourse, there would be no exchanged information (which refers to objects or states of affairs in the world), but arguments would be expressed, which would serve to justify or reject inquiry-based validity claims (GONZÁLEZ DE GÓMEZ, 2009a).

Every social use of language includes the dialogical matrix of the we-other (or ego-alter) relationship. In Discourse contexts, formal logical relations between propositions and the hypothetical-deductive structure of verification discourses are not imposed (GONZÁLEZ DE GÓMEZ, 2009a). In order for people in different cultural contexts to understand one

another in a conversation, they must reciprocally adopt the positions of speaker and listener (GONZÁLEZ DE GÓMEZ, 2009a).

From the linguistic turn of Habermas, the discourse theory of truth was proposed as an attempt to withdraw from the dilemma of the theory of truth by correspondence and to offer the attempt to combine the understanding of transcendent reference in relation to language with an understanding, immanent to the language, of truth as an ideal assertiveness. Capurro (1992) emphasizes cognitive turn. This view abandons the idea of information as a kind of substance outside of the mind and looks for the phenomenon of human cognition as a necessary condition for the determination of what can be called information, but fails to consider the pragmatic dimension of human existence.

In this sense, the concept of truth as an ideal assertiveness does not consider the possibility of our justifications being fallible. For this reason, convincing objections were raised to the discourse theory of truth and the idea that what can be rationally accepted in ideal circumstances is true (LIMA; CORBO, 2013).

Habermas changed his conception of truth to a pragmatic conception of truth that preserves justification as a process of verifying the validity of the claim of truth of the propositional content of speech acts. Analyzing the cognitive function of language in the dimension of a discourse practice and of reference and truth of the statements, Habermas develops a pragmatic conception of cognition – the cognitive function of language is associated with the contexts of experience, action and discursive justification. The result is the assumption that the representational and communicative function of language presupposes one another, that is, they are equiprimordial.

Habermas wants realism that presupposes objects that have an extralinguistic existence, but the truth claims in speech acts that describe this world can only be challenged within language.

The matter of truth in documents is challenging, as it is necessary to assess what is the relationship between access to information through the speech acts of the testimony and the documents that would arise in the sphere of communicative action, discourse arguments and learning. In this sense, the concept of truth according to Habermas contributes to the reflection between information, documents and truth.

Lima e Corbo (2013, p. 63, our translation) consider that the "reformulation of the concept of truth opens a new possibility for approaching information in the context of the practices of social actors, since information is evidenced as a link between the objective world and discourse."

5 FINAL NOTES

The critical theory developed by Habermas in his first phase, inspired by Hegel's thinking, devises the construction of society from the dialectics of the construction of being through language, interaction and work.

From the linguistic turn, Habermas moves apart from the philosophy of consciousness and toward the philosophy of language. Language-mediated interactions overlap like scaffolding from which the social fabric is built.

Most authors attribute a dual function to language: representing and interpreting things and events (signifier and signified, form and content). Habermas states that language has a third function: it is also a constitutive element of society. It is with and within language that society is built.

This way, a relationship is established between the use of language and the building of personality, of social groups and society. In the theory of communicative action, an important element is the co-originating relationship between subjectivity and intersubjectivity. I am because we are.

Subjectivity does not exist outside of communication between subjects. There is no distinction in the formation of subjectivity and intersubjectivity. The way that each person transforms the things that are seen in information takes place within the interactive dynamics that is established between subjects. Information is the attribution of meaning.

It is understood that information is constituted in the communicational dynamics. Information exists only in the context of communication. Habermas believes that when individuals express their views, there may or may not be conflict.

Discourse is only necessary when individuals come into theoretical and practical conflict about something in the world. When there is conflict, there is demand to continue the interaction mediated by a specific type of communicative action: Discourse, in which the subjects strive to rebuild rational understanding by means of discussion. Discourse is the means to revive the understanding that was lost due to the continued use of language.

Arguments are raised in order to rebuild the rational understanding between subjects. Habermas's theory facilitates the understanding of the simultaneity of the formation of subjectivity and intersubjectivity. From understanding, the interpretation and representation of things are built.

Another important matter in regard to developing a critical discursive information theory is analyzing the consequences of Habermas's pragmatic turn. In it, the author attempts to respond to criticisms of his theory of understanding regarding the correspondence between theoretical and practical agreements with the lifeworld.

It is not enough for subjects to understand one another. Understanding must be based on the objective world. Sincerity and rightness are necessary, but they are not enough to validate the veracity of a speech. Correspondence with things and events is also necessary.

In Information Philosophy, this is essential in discussing the relationship between information and documents. The understanding between subjects is reached by means of Discourse, but it cannot turn its back on the world.

It is concluded, therefore, that information is not mere individual processing, but the intersubjective construction about something in the lifeworld within the communication process.

REFERENCES

ALMEIDA, Guido Antônio. Nota preliminar do tradutor. *In*: HABERMAS, Jurgen. **Consciência Moral e Agir Comunicativo**. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1989.

BELKIN, Nicholas J. The cognitive viewpoint in information science. **Journal of Information Science**, [*S. l.*], v. 16, p. 11-15, 1990. Available in: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/016555159001600104. Access at: 23 nov. 2022.

CAMPOS, Milton N. Integrando Habermas, Piaget e Grize: contribuições para uma Teoria Construtivista-Crítica da Comunicação. **Revista FAMECOS:** mídia, cultura e tecnologia, Porto Alegre, v. 21, n. 3, p. 966-996, 3 fev. 2014. Available in: https://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/revistafamecos/article/view/18777. Access at: 23 nov. 2022.

CAPURRO, Rafael. What is information science for? A philosophical reflection was published. *In*: Vakkari, Pertti; Cronin, Blaise (ed.). **Conceptions of Library and Information Science**: historical, empirical and theoretical perspectives. London: Taylor Graham 1992, p. 82-98.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Ação cultural para a liberdade**. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1981.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Educação como prática da liberdade**. 18 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987.

GONÇALVES, Marcio; LIMA, Clóvis R. M. Validação discursiva da informação. **Linguagem & Ensino**, Pelotas, v.17, n.3, p. 901-925, set./dez. 2014. Available in: https://periodicos.ufpel.edu.br/ojs2/index.php/rle/article/view/15319. Access at: 23 nov. 2022.

GONÇALVES, Marcio. **Wikipédia**: discurso e validade da informação. 2014. 175 f. Tese (Doutorado em Ciência da Informação). IBICT/UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro, 2014.

GONZÁLEZ DE GÓMEZ, Maria N. A informação no pensamento contemporâneo: aproximações à teoria do agir comunicativo de Habermas. *In*: BRAGA, Gilda Maria; PINHEIRO, Lena Vania Ribeiro (org.) **Desafios do impresso ao digital:** questões contemporâneas de informação e conhecimento. Brasília: IBICT: Unesco, 2009a. p. 177-204.

GONZÁLEZ DE GÓMEZ, Maria N. Habermas, informação e argumentação. *In*: PINZANI, A.; LIMA, C. R. M.; DUTRA, D. V. **O pensamento vivo de Habermas**: uma visão interdisciplinar. Florianópolis: NEFIPO, 2009b. p. 115-138.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. **Agir comunicativo e razão descentralizada**. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 2002.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. **Consciência moral e agir comunicativo**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Tempo Brasileiro, 2003.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. **Verdade e justificação:** ensaios filosóficos. Tradução Milton Camargo Mota. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2004.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. **Fundamentação linguística da sociologia**: obras escolhidas de Jürgen Habermas. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2010.

HERMANN, Nadja. **Conferência sobre Jürgen Habermas.** Rio de Janeiro. 2012. Aula ministrada em 25 abril e 9 mai. 2012. Instituto Brasileiro de Informação em Ciência e Tecnologia/Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. Apostila.

LEYDESDORFF, L. Luhmann, Habermas, and the Theory of Communication. **Systems Research and Behavioral Science**, [*S. l.*], v. 17, p. 273-288, 2000.Available in: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/%28SICI%291099-1743%28200005/06%2917%3A3%3C273%3A%3AAID-SRES329%3E3.0.CO%3B2-R. Access at: 23 nov. 2022.

LIMA, Clóvis R. M. de; CORBO, Dayo D. S. Comissão da verdade: os documentos e a validez do discurso. **Informação@Profissões**, Londrina, v. 2, p. 45-65, 2013. Available in: https://brapci.inf.br/index.php/res/v/63817. Access at: 23 nov. 2002.

MAIA, Mariangela R. **Informação sobre saúde bucal nas plataformas digitais**: entre crença e ciência. 2019. 137 f. Tese (Doutorado em Ciência da Informação). IBICT/UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, 2019. Disponível em: https://ridi.ibict.br/handle/123456789/1054.

MIDDLETON, Lyndsey; HALL, Hazel, RAESIDE, Robert. Applications and applicability of Social Cognitive Theory in information science research. **Journal of Librarianship and Information Science**, [*S. l.*], v. 51, n. 4, 2018. Available in: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0961000618769985. Access at: 23 nov. 2022.

PIAGET, Jean. **Biologia e conhecimento**: ensaio sobre as relações orgânicas e os processos cognitivos. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1973.

SANTOS, Fabiana, S; SANTOS, Thais S. Linguística formal e linguística do discurso: continuidades e rupturas teóricas. **Linguística,** Rio de Janeiro, v. 2, n. 2, p. 31-49, abr. 2016. Available in: https://www.linguisticario.letras.ufrj.br/uploads/7/0/5/2/7052840/santos_e_santos.pdf. Access at: 23 nov. 2022.

SIEBENEICHLER, Flávio B. Razão comunicativa e técnicas de comunicação e informação em rede. *In*: GONZÁLEZ DE GÓMEZ, M. N.; LIMA, C. R.M de. (org.). **Informação e democracia**: a reflexão contemporânea da ética e da política. Brasília, DF: IBICT, 2010.

ZITKOSKI, Jaime J. Dicionário Paulo Freire. *In*: STRECK, Danilo *et al.* (org.). **Dicionário Paulo Freire.** São Paulo: Autêntica, 2010.

NOTAS