


COMMUNICATION AND DIFFERENCE: contributions of a brazilian named **Ciro Marcondes Filho**

COMUNICAÇÃO E DIFERENÇA: contribuições de um brasileiro chamado **Ciro Marcondes Filho**
COMUNICACIÓN Y DIFERENCIA: aportes de un brasileño llamado **Ciro Marcondes Filho**


Weberson Ferreira Dias

Graduated in Social Communication/Journalism, MBA in Business Communication and Marketing and post-graduated in Higher Education Teaching. Master in Social Sciences and Humanities by the Interdisciplinary Postgraduate Program Territories and Cultural Expressions in the Cerrado (TECCER/UEG). PhD student in Communication at PPGCOM/UFG. webersondias@gmail.com.

 0000-0003-3638-5590


Suely Henrique de Aquino Gomes

PhD in Information Sciences from the University of Brasília (1999); Master's degree in Library Automation - University College London (1991) and Bachelor's degree in Library Science from the University of Brasília (1987), Professor of the permanent staff of the Graduate Program (Master's and Doctorate) in Communication, Citizenship and Culture (PPGCOM/FIC), acting in the lines of research Media and culture and Media and Information. suelyhenriquegomes@gmail.com.

 0000-0002-5711-483X

Deyvisson Pereira da Costa

Doctor in Communication (UFMG/2014), Master in Communication (UFG/2009), specialist in Communication and Health (Fiocruz/2006) and Bachelor in Social Communication with specialization in Journalism (UFJF/2005). deyvissonpereiracosta@gmail.com.

 0000-0001-8401-7122

Received: 02.23.2023.
Accepted: 04.30.2023.
Published: 05.16.2023.

ABSTRACT:

This article stresses Deleuzean notion of difference and its consequences for Communication Sciences in Brazil. To this end, we rescue the contributions of the Brazilian researcher **Ciro Marcondes Filho**, who, in his theoretical-methodological path, outlines a unique concept of communication based on difference. A guiding thread is established between the thoughts of the Brazilian author and the ideas problematized by the French philosopher, in order to make an analysis of the contributions of the former to think about communication constituted as a difference in the context of the event. Finally, the relevance of the Brazilian **Marcondes Filho** is recognized, based on his epistemological work on communication, rethinking it as differentiating, capable of transforming by being an event and becoming.

KEYWORDS: Alternative Supply Chains; Geographical Indication; Convention Theory; Quality Turn.

Introduction

Thinking about communication is a task that has required efforts. The lack of consensus to conceptualize what communication is and to delimit a clearly communicational object seems to have no end. One of these thinkers in Brazil who stood out in the contemporary Brazilian academic scene was **Ciro Marcondes Filho**. His research seeks, amid the haystack of knowledge, to distinguish a singular and singularizing object: the communication needle from the perspective of the theory of difference, heating up the debate on the constitution of a possible communicational object and its respective field. He rejected, at the same time, the methodological and instrumentalized idea of communication and pointed out ways to get rid of the metaphysical decoy that crosses

part of the conceptions about communication and attempts to reduce it to the utilitarian and central notion of means (here in the sense of technical apparatus). Ciro approached the ideas of the French philosopher Gilles Deleuze, who proposes another perspective of communication to be discussed ahead.

The present article constitutes a recognition and an essayistic reflection based on a bibliographic review strictly on communication and difference in certain texts by Ciro Marcondes Filho – one of the few Brazilians who tensioned the notions of difference and event in communication.

In a first movement, we focus on the concept and relevance of difference for the understanding of communication, and then we articulate such notions in the thought of Ciro Marcondes, excavating in him the recognition of the notion of difference in his problematizations. In the end, we emphasize the potential contribution of Ciro Marcondes when thinking about communication from the apprehension of the event, of becoming, of difference.

Communication and difference

The first idea of this article is characterized as an effort to shed light on one of the various aspects that Deleuze's work touches on: the communicational act as an event and, at this point, as a producer of differentiating difference. In the order of his thinking, difference constitutes the access key to the event. It should be noted, however, as Araújo (2020, p. 7) warns us, that "Deleuze never systematized his own concept of communication, despite having spoken about the term at important moments in his work". Between the 1980s and 1990s, "he criticizes a specific concept of communication, linked to a philosophy of representation" and outlines "two distinct conceptions of communication in his work" (Araújo, 2020, p. 7): the first is that the communication is an emergency process that "goes between things, between words, between concepts"; the second considers communication as a process of inventing a plan that "takes place on the face to face of the differences, of heterogeneous sets" (Araújo, 2020, pp. 167-168). It is inferred from this point that communication would be in the field of incorporeal.

De Miranda (2019), when revisiting Gilles Deleuze's Philosophical Theory of the Event, highlights that, according to the idea of incorporeal developed by the Stoics, the event is the only one capable of removing the verb to be copulative from the proposition and the essential attribute of the body, which throughout its existence would not change. The event (non-being) is on the plane of difference, and, in this way, it is an incorporeal real. De Miranda states that everything that exists in the world and everything that is real is in the field of the corporeal, "even the qualities of being, such as virtues or passions,

are considered corporeal, insofar as they affect bodies.” Incorporeals, in turn, are the effects that affect bodies as a result of their events and only exist through them. It is characteristic of the body to enter into a relationship with other bodies, “and, in the midst of this relationship, they change, mix, however, they are not a cause for each other” (De Miranda, 2019, pp. 7- 8).

It is in the relationship between the bodies that the event takes place – this, as an attribute, is an incorporeal, it is not a body, even though it exists. Although the attributes carry the same power, what modifies them are the events. Given that all bodies are involved in events all the time, they are the ones that produce experiences that enhance the difference. Thus, Ulpiano (1989, pp. 13-15, emphasis added) observes that the body “can only be thought through difference”, that is, through its events, and never ceases to vary in the differences of the event, which concludes if dealing with “incorporeal modifications”, given that “the body is always the same”: always the power of new events. Therefore, the event is not on the level of representation, rather, it is placed in the order of difference (subjectivation), which is on the border of becoming.

Cordeiro (2007), based on Deleuze, observed that art is a privileged activity that can capture the event, due to the fact that art has a lasting nature, resist. By technically reproducing the event, language reduces it. Thus, communication would not be reduced to language, nor would it be synonymous with narrative, as there will always be aspects of the event that will not be registered (“invisible” in “visible”) or sayable. According to Cordeiro (2007, p. 45), people are not waiting to communicate with each other, in what he characterized as a “magical network of senders spread around the world”, because “language [he says] is not neither informative nor communicative, but the transmission of watchwords” (Cordeiro, 2007, p. 45).

The nature of communication is constituted as immaterial, incorporeal. It is in the event that communication happens; in the clash, in the touch, in the arrangement of heterogeneous bodies and in the clash of diverse ideas present in everyday trivial conversation. Masella Lopes, when suggesting communication as an event, analyzes that:

To be fulfilled, it depends on subjectivity, on the creation of a relational and operational space for transforming information and language. In this sense, the communication event radically differs from the recursive aspects of media communication [...]. The event presupposes the introduction of the new and the unforeseen and, in some way, the surprising [...], [the] unusual aspect that precisely establishes a break with the strength and ease of habit. The event, therefore, is instigating, inciting reflection, and only occurs under certain circumstances that, not infrequently, go unnoticed, invisible to the capture devices of the technical means of communication (Masella Lopes, 2014, p. 8-9).

At the same time, the communicational event is beyond the structures of language (codes and signs), because it never allows itself to be apprehended in its entirety by it and does not submit to the order of discourse. Language is insufficient to explain our relationship with the world, for sinning in the inability to demonstrate the involvement and experiences, which Santos (2007, p. 12) referred to as “encoded communication”. There is something about the event that is not apprehended by language. The event itself is pre-language.

Prado (2017) corroborates the idea that there are no discourses that deal with the event and, by distancing himself from the idea of the transmitter-receiver binomial, he argues that the subject emerges with the event - this happens in a living, vibrating, brusque, intense and in which the answer does not exactly come from a speaking mouth, but from a body that is the stage of drives. Thus, language, and consequently, narratives that limit the event, intend to reduce realities to expressive capacities.

In the event, there is the agency of heterogeneous bodies (human and non-human), understood here as lines of forces that organize and arrange these bodies. Just like the agency of meat and cleaver (Deleuze & Guattari, 1995), it is us. The sum of gestures, attitudes and feelings, for example, constitute us as an individual. Our existence is marked by the power of feeling and thinking, made possible through assemblages (Zourabichvili, 2004). In the corporal confrontation, we are, equally, transformed and, sometimes, involuntarily. Thus, it is clear that the power of the body is always to meet other bodies, to maintain assemblages with them in search of other powers, limited in the case of homogeneous bodies.

In time, Masella Lopes (2014, p. 14) observes that communication as an event can merge bodies, anticipate speeches, rebuild limits and welcome difference. The author places the human body as a perceptive complex and “organizing center of the different speeds with which our senses and thought flow in the perception of reality”, when he emphasizes that the technical means of communication exclude the body from the cognitive relationship between us and the world. However, by establishing this order of thought, Masella Lopes (2014) demonstrates breaking with the concept of symmetry of bodies, hierarchizing and privileging the human body in the communicational event, disfavoring the non-human by placing it on the sidelines. Although it deals with an event, it distances itself from the theory of difference, by establishing a primacy between bodies.

From a methodological perspective, Prado (2017) defines that communicative actions take place within the event, from the moment the discourses begin to dispute the meanings produced during the event. The event incites some statements, adjusts the

knowledge-power devices. It is these differences that are fundamental in the Deleuzian system. The difference is mainly communication, “the elements are involved in each other, transforming them” and, in the absence of communication, “differences would be lost in a kind of solipsism” (Araújo, 2019, p. 3).

Deleuze envisioned communication as the emergence of unforeseen connections and relationships, of the unusual (Araújo, 2019). The idea of communication in Deleuze “is what happens when you put together what does not seem to be able to be put together, a tense relationship that is temporarily established”, or even approximation between divergent ones, which produces new elements, new relationships and is capable of enabling the becoming and the creation of the new (Araújo, 2019, pp. 4-5). Communication, according to the author, only exists if difference is produced; it is a relationship between differences and between differentials.

In Deleuze, differences communicate to produce another difference, or “differences of differences”. Communication is what produces “second-degree differences”: it is the relationship between differences that does not aim at an identity or a prior commonality, but rather at producing and proliferating differences. [...] We enter into a relationship that differentiates the world, which always makes it strange. With Deleuze, we enter an immanent communicational world. [...] Differences need to be related: not to resemble each other in some respect, but to assert themselves as differences. This is why Deleuze uses terms like resonance, coupling, symbiosis and alliance to describe communication [...]. The bodies themselves, which are constituted by differences, penetrate each other and transform each other: differences relate to produce other differences (Araújo, 2020, pp. 64-5).

Araújo's quote (2000) is based on Deleuze's idea that escapes the representative idea in which the communicative process would be the reestablishment of order and the overcoming of differences. For Deleuze, if communication is an event, it does not stabilize, but, on the contrary, it inaugurates, produces the difference, the chaos. It does not mean that there is no momentary stability when there is reterritorialization. However, the body will always be involved in the event, which differentiates it and produces experiences in it and whose power produces new events. Hence the conception of the inexhaustibility of the event, as Deleuze would say (1974, p. 65), an “eternally infinite” splendor.

If differences are never overcome, one can speak of stabilization lapses, but the incessant production of difference is inherent to the body. Therefore, communication inaugurates *ad eternum* difference- it is not up to it to stabilize or overcome differences. Araújo (2020, p. 65) refers to the very bodies that are constituted by differences and, based on relationships, “penetrate each other and transform each other”. Differences, in

turn, give rise to experiences. Communication is the possibility of creation based on differences resulting from mutual contagion. According to Araújo,

No one leaves a relationship the same, we are always crossed by encounters that we have at our most fundamental level. [...] We are always on the verge of becoming something else, coming into contact with another composite of relationships that will completely undo us. And this is perhaps the strength of Deleuze's theory of communication: being the device through which we undo and re-do ourselves in what he calls becoming, in the process that things have to become other. [...] For one thing to become another, it needs to communicate. Communication is what guarantees that the things of the world have a transformation reserve, a constitutive becoming, when entering into new relationships: other symbioses, other alliances (Araújo, 2020, p. 75).

The event produces differences in those involved in the communicative process. Thesis reinforced by Santos (2007, p. 6) when he arbitrates communication as a multiplier process and rescues the idea that it occurs from the "friction of bodies", with a view to social, historical, cultural and subjective vectors. For the author, communication is something much more subtle and difficult to understand, which is both in the sphere of discourse, as well as in the field of feeling, based on the senses that together open us to contact with the other and with the world (Santos, 2007).

The idea of "body friction", explains Santos (2007), has nothing to do with deciphering the internal state of those who participate in the communication process. There is no interpenetration of the minds of individuals, but it highlights the magical character of the communication between two intentions that extract something new and unexpected from this encounter. For the author, communication is only possible through the existence of a single and intersubjective world based on the perception that we can have of the other as behavior and not as an object. According to her, we cannot feel how the other feels, but we can create common ground for our consciences based on these pre-personal experiences, which remind us of the peaceful coexistence of the child's world (Santos, 2007). But, contrary to what the author says, we understand that the event does not demand from us prior permission or intentionality from the subjects for it to occur, nor does it give us total control of what is happening or what is to come. In a relationship of deterritorialization, observes Lapoujade (2015), the event violates the bodies.

There is, therefore, a relationship of the set of forces of those involved in the communicational event. Because it is established in an idea of experience, it is not so common and does not occur all the time, but it becomes a possibility in the attempt.

Communication is conditioned to the body, it extends to the senses and returns to it (Santos, 2007). So, the

Communication, making common, is not the search for a single meaning or the homogenization of beings. If learning, tradition and the symbolic are closer to culture; communication, disregarding it, goes beyond it, being able to be perceived through the event. That is, something extralinguistic that allows the understanding of meaning [...]. The perception of communication takes place, in this way, from an event, from allowing oneself to be caught up in the movement, which comes from the mixing of bodies and whose meaning appears at a single stroke, when thing and word, inside and outside merge. Now, communicating presupposes going out of oneself and letting oneself be touched by the other through diving into one's being, through the friction of bodies. [...] Communication presupposes our openness to sensations, to the skin, to hearing, to seeing, to touching, to smelling, to tasting, knowing how to taste them, feeling them in the entrails of our being. Knowing how to feel, to perceive the world, ourselves and others, is letting ourselves be carried away by the body, not being afraid to interact with the world. Communication is born from our bodily contact with the world, [...] [and] it cannot be treated separately from our lived experience (Santos, 2007, pp. 11-12).

We agree that openness to the other and to the world is inherent to bodies and that communication takes place in the agency of these bodies, but that, likewise, it is beyond them. It is in the phenomena, in the senses, in the sensations, which produce change, which occur in the unexpected and give rise to novelty, a rupture of thought that has nothing stable, but uncontrollably moves towards the order of instability, chaos, the unpredictable that leads, to the creative experience. Communication is in the order of the incorporeal, in the order of potency and becoming, of provoking difference, of singularity. The event is communication as a difference and, thinking about it in this way, places it as "immediatic communication", whose event is apprehended, a posteriori, in subjectivity and never in the field of mediation, representation of thought and semiotics.

It is on this platform of ideas that *Ciro Marcondes Filho* walked.

Ciro Marcondes Filho: the transforming power of communication through difference

Thinking about communication as an event is a task that has required efforts and courage due to the theoretical collapses that such thinking causes. *Ciro Marcondes Filho* was one of those thinkers who rose to prominence in the contemporary Brazilian academic scene. For him, communication is the emergence of a difference that occurs in the measure of the event; the emergence of something sensorially new and unexpected, which transforms and surprises the bodies (not exclusively human) involved in an event,

episode, phenomenon or event. The phenomenon is the locus of the “shock”, of the “friction”, that is, the communication emerges in the event itself. Thinking about communication from this perspective is conceiving it as a process, not a product, and presupposes “the creation of a common environment, in which both sides participate and extract from their participation something new, unexpected, which was not in either of them and which changes the former status of both, although individual differences remain”. That is, during the process, the bodies maintain their properties, two bodies are not merged into one (Marcondes Filho, 2004, p. 15).

This conception links communication to the idea of a phenomenon “in process”, based on the Stoic “is being”, qualified by the author as “principle of reason during”, the durability in which the communicational event exists and has strength. For this reason, communication must be apprehended in the exact fraction of time it is carried out, in the “snap”, in the “magic instant”, “peak moment”, during “the unique and unrepeatable production of meaning”; to what he calls the “present time” (Marcondes Filho, 2004, p. 100).

For the author, the communicational event is understood as a contingent/episodic event, transitory and, therefore, provisional, unlike beliefs in the idea of constant, eternal and incessant communication. Marcondes Filho (2004) refuses any idea that tries to reduce it to an object or “thing”, a mistake made when the concept is instrumentalized, turning it to the devices, to the media; and when the concept reduces the event to language. In both cases, communication, as he says, is masked. According to the author, without considering both notes, we will be contributing to the lack of communication, in which communication escapes and the vitality of the phenomenon is emptied, becoming an innocuous and dead act.

The author guides us to think that communication takes place under very specific and determined conditions. Marcondes Filho (2013) admits three phases in communication: Signaling - production and emission of signals, noises, irritations that mark an existence, but we do not turn to it. It is within the scope of verification and, for Marcondes Filho, everything signals in the world; Information - participants are attracted, realize the existence of something and are not indifferent, even if it is against their will. It is the result of factors such as interest, concern or curiosity and becomes part of our own operating structure through perception and awareness (Marcondes Filho, 2013, 2014a); and Communication – in this stage, participants expose themselves to “violence” and do not leave unharmed: they reflect, evaluate, rethink, change their minds and transform their orientation. In this phase, the being breaks with impenetrability and dissolves in the other or in the thing; there is no exchange or transfer. “This change comes

at once: from now on I think differently. It creates meaning" (Marcondes Filho, 2013, p. 16, emphasis added). This clash upsets us, makes us leave the zone of indifference and produces the difference.

Considering the distinction between information, signaling and communication, Marcondes Filho defines difference as a relation of meaning that is established in the interaction between intentionalities; the similarity is limited to signage and information. The phenomenon of communication is the one that causes discomfort and produces confusion in the order.

Thus, in Marcondes Filho (2017, pp. 26-28), communication lies in the imbalance, in the countercurrent, in the "subtle sign that something in our mind has broken – or installed itself in order to change our previous status", which destabilizes. When one seeks to pull the other out of his indifference, his passivity, his "I don't care", a dimension of militant communication emerges, which slaps apathy and causes "the other to give birth to the feeling that not everything is lost", the hope.

To "communicate" it is necessary to observe, get in touch, feel, review positions and change them positively. The difference, in Marcondes Filho, is the result of the encounter with the unexpected, which, by the way, is (self)transforming; at that moment, communication is established. It is this aspect of the communicational event in his thinking that interests us. Being "open to the other, to the world, to the stranger" is the precondition for communication to take place. Otherwise, we continue "incorporating only the information that interests us, that reinforces our repetition, our sameness, our inalterability" (Marcondes Filho, 2013, pp. 19-22, emphasis added).

By welcoming the other in his difference, we allow ourselves to be crossed and, from this interpenetrability, learning with the strangeness of the other takes place. It is not about reaching the other, but breaking imposed barriers. In that instant, we transform ourselves before the world, things and ourselves. Despite this, because it requires a surprise, a transformation and learning, says the author, the communicational event is trivial, a very rare process, unique, alive, pulsating, rare, ephemeral and unrepeatable (Marcondes Filho, 2008, 2014b).

According to Marcondes Filho, communicating is being subject to openness and acceptance of the other in his difference, allowing the shock to transform them, without any pretense of domination, submission or reduction of the other. Alterity conveys exactly this strangeness, this state of complexity, this difference between bodies. According to the author, communication is only possible from the relationship with otherness – the other who is not me. "Any sign I receive from another will be transformed in my head into my own signals, into my sensations, into my own perceptions"

(Marcondes Filho, 2012, p. 45). Thus, “there is no object, my very being is already communication. [...] It is in me that communication opens” (Marcondes Filho, 2017, p. 25).

This is a process subject to continuous mutability that leads to the incessant production of difference; that's when communication takes place - friction of foreign bodies. Therefore, communication is “in the intermediate space, in the region of contact, the area between one and the other, where an incorporeal, subtle and unexpected element animates, vitalizes, energizes. [...] In the space between” (Marcondes Filho, 2013, p. 29, emphasis added).

There are methodological consequences for this way of thinking about communication. Starting from the “event-as-event” (Marcondes Filho, 2019), the author (2010, p. 263) proposes the metapore, “a path that paves its way” while “following its route without a demarcated path”, as a possibility of a methodology to conduct research on the aegis of communication as an event.

The spontaneous epistemology of communicational knowledge, says Marcondes Filho (2014a), always makes use of the researcher's subjectivity. In practice, it is to open the path of research, to make a sting. The “quasi-method” allows for sensitive experiences of the communicational fact itself, making “an immersion in it, feeling its effects, observing the reactions of others, taking in the whole atmosphere that surrounds the phenomenon” (Marcondes Filho, 2013, p. 10). It is through these pores to which Marcondes Filho refers, through which the singularities captured in it breathe and, eventually, experience communication, as observed by Rüdiger (2020).

The researcher's idea is to “capture” the event in its mobility, perceiving the emergence of the new at the peak of ecstasy (catharsis) and avoiding ethnography. For the author, researchers must place themselves in front of the communicational event as an act of allowing access, letting themselves be crossed, opening themselves to strangeness, difference, hosting the other in themselves. Thus, researching the transitory is trying to develop a new perspective on the communicational event, thinking about it and materializing this reflection through reports. In this tone, the author advises to apprehend to what extent the event alters the bodies and makes them think differently. Considering the new methodological proposal, Marcondes Filho (2013, p. 25) endorses that “only things that are current are effectively living things” and warns: “There is no a posteriori investigation, in this case it is history, sociology, anthropology, study of something past, therefore, dead” (Marcondes Filho, 2008, pp. 151-2).

In this way, Ciro Marcondes gives us insights from his definition of communication centered on the difference that it only exists when a difference happens in me and in the

other, as well as it is perceived both by me and by the other. For him, the proof that communication has taken place is when new reflections are mobilized and force us to act and rethink the world from another point of view, no longer that of the past. Communication is the suspended stage, the atmosphere, the scene or the situation in which we can incorporate something that transforms us (Marcondes Filho, 2008). Point of no return. And the metapore is the path indicated for conducting research based on this specific way of seeing communication.

Final considerations

Difference theory moves away from the line of thought that establishes structured worlds and positions itself in the pre-subject, pre-individual and pre-language world. Such rhizomatic structures are mobile, can form new connections and continuously produce new arrangements, changing the structure.

Although he recognizes three phases in the communication process, Marcondes Filho maintains that the communicational phenomenon is necessarily new, ephemeral and surprising. The idea of difference in Marcondes Filho is based on an idea that goes beyond irritation, provocation and seduction. For him, the difference creates meaning in the other, preserving their subjectivities.

The perspective of communication as an event places it as a power. The event is in the order of immediacy, it acts without intermediaries and in the immediate. It is not, therefore, in mediation and escapes the logic of the media. Every body has the power to meet the other (potency of bodies) and in this relationship of forces (agency) with other bodies, they differentiate and communication takes place.

Communication, therefore, is constructed in assemblages and, in this logic, it would not be probabilistic, but in the order of becoming (possibilities) that may or may not be updated. That is, Marcondes Filho and Deleuze have considerable similarities and both privilege the event: Marcondes Filho sees transformation as the essence of meaning in the event, while Deleuze (1974, p. 23) undertakes that we should not ask "the meaning of the event, [for] he is sense itself." To think of communication as an event is to adopt a rhizomatic thought, of chaos, of non-hierarchy and not only of the social and human order.

Deleuze and Guattari articulate the communicational episode, from the transgression, the improbable, the practices, the intersections, the encounters, which open up possibilities for the formation of subjects and objects, which are not exhausted in these relationships.

Ciro Marcondes was one of those Brazilian authors who left some clues, loopholes, to think of communication as a difference and, thus, situate the communicational act in the dimension of the happening, the event, the episode, the phenomenon. Communication as a process, therefore, is something that is happening, always in the provisional, in what is to come, it is in motion and can reveal traces and ways to understand communication. This effort is necessary: to seek what is specifically communicational.

The event, which is established in the logic of the unexpected and the unpredictable, is capable of causing discontinuity in the experience of the subjects who are affected and violated by it. In the event, there are a lot of meanings that are in the context, in the individuals involved, in the situation and in the variables of the phenomenon. When communication occurs, the heterogeneous approach, get involved, rub against each other, repel each other... In the scope of the senses, affections, experiences, the difference is triggered and the discomfort of the improbable can cross me so that my conceptions, before certain and static, are now changeable, fluid. These are the lessons so well elaborated by Ciro Marcondes.

References

- Araújo, A. (2019). Deleuze, filósofo da comunicação. *42o. Congresso Brasileiro de Ciências da Comunicação - Intercom*, Belém, PA.
<https://portalintercom.org.br/anais/nacional2019/resumos/R14-1712-1.pdf>
- Araújo, A. (2020). *Deleuze e o problema da comunicação*. [Tese de Doutorado]. Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.
<https://lume.ufrgs.br/handle/10183/212468>
- Cordeiro, E. (2007). Deleuze: comunicação, controlo, palavra de ordem. *Caleidoscópio*, Lisboa, s.v. (8), 37-49.
https://recil.ulusofona.pt/bitstream/10437/550/1/03_deleuze.pdf
- Deleuze, G. (1974). *Lógica do sentido*. Trans. de Luiz Roberto Salinas Fortes. Perspectiva/EdUSP.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1995). *Mil platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia*. Trans. de Aurélio Guerra e Célia Costa. Ed. 34.
- De Miranda, W. S. (2019). A teoria dos incorporais e a filosofia do acontecimento de Gilles Deleuze. *Revista Interdisciplinar em Cultura e Sociedade*, 5(2), 1-17.
<https://www.periodicoeletronicos.ufma.br/index.php/ricultsociedade/article/view/12998/7044>
- Lapoujade, D. (2015). *Deleuze, os movimentos aberrantes*. Trans. de Laymert Garcia dos Santos. N-1 Edições.
- Marcondes Filho, C. (2004). *Até que ponto, de fato, nos comunicamos?*. Paulus.
- Marcondes Filho, C. (2008). *Para entender a comunicação: contatos antecipados com a Nova Teoria*. Paulus.
- Marcondes Filho, C. (2010). *O princípio da razão do durante: o conceito de comunicação e a epistemologia metapórica: nova teoria da comunicação III: Tomo V*. Paulus.

- Marcondes Filho, C. (2012). A comunicação no sentido estrito e o metáforo: ou porque a Nova Teoria não é estudo de recepção, etnografia nem tem a ver com Edgar Morin. *21o. Encontro Anual da Associação Nacional dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Comunicação - Compós*, Juiz de Fora, MG.
<https://docplayer.com.br/211998635-A-comunicacao-no-sentido-estrito-e-o-metaporo-ou-porque-a-nova-teoria-nao-e-estudo-de-recepcao-etnografia-nem-tem-a-ver-com-edgar-morin.html>
- Marcondes Filho, C. (2013). *O rosto e a máquina: o fenômeno da comunicação visto dos ângulos humanos, medial e tecnológico*. Paulus.
- Marcondes Filho, C. (Org) (2014a). *Dicionário de comunicação*. Paulus.
- Marcondes Filho, C. (2014a). A nova forma de pesquisar a comunicação: a engenharia das emoções, o autômato espiritual e um campo de conhecimento que se constitui. In V. França, A. Aldé, & M. Ramos (Orgs.), *Teorias da comunicação no Brasil*. (pp. 63-78). EDUFBA.
- Marcondes Filho, C. (2014b). Ensaio sobre a incomunicação. *Alaic*, 9(17), 40-49.
<https://www.alaic.org/revista/index.php/alaic/article/view/440/251>
- Marcondes Filho, C. (2017). Comunicação e revelação. *Paulus*, 1(1), 17-28.
<https://fapcom.edu.br/revista/index.php/revista-paulus/article/view/5>
- Marcondes Filho, C. (2019). *Das coisas que nos fazem pensar, que nos forcem a pensar: o debate sobre a nova teoria da comunicação*. EdUSP.
- Masella Lopes, P. R. (2014). Comunicação: entre o espaço visível do meio técnico e o invisível do acontecimento. *Vozes & Diálogo*, 13(2), 5-17.
<https://siaiap32.univali.br/seer/index.php/vd/article/view/6530/3883>
- Prado, J. L. A. (2017). Reconhecimento tenso, acontecimento inaugural: na direção de outra comunicação. *E-Compós*, 20(1), 1-15. <https://www.e-compos.org.br/e-compos/article/view/1345>
- Rüdiger, F. (2020). A comunicação como aventura solipsística: sobre a “nova teoria” de Ciro Marcondes Filho. *Revista Eco-Pós*, 23(3), 253-277.
https://revistaecopos.eco.ufrj.br/eco_pos/article/view/27433
- Santos, T. (2007). O acontecimento comunicacional. *E-compós*, 8(s.n), 1-15.
<https://docplayer.com.br/87497675-O-acontecimento-comunicacional-1.html>
- Ulpiano, C. (2016). *O corpo e o acontecimento: curso regular Escola Senador Correia, 28 de março de 1989*.
<https://acervoclaudiuulpiano.wordpress.com/2016/11/10/aula-de-28031989-o-corpo-e-o-acontecimento-2/>
- Zourabichvili, F. (2004). *O vocabulário de Gilles Deleuze*. Trans. de André Telles. [Digitalização e disponibilização da versão eletrônica: IFCH/Unicamp].
<https://www.redehumanizadas.net/sites/default/files/deleuze-vocabulario-francois-zourabichvili1.pdf>

RESUMO:

Tensiona-se no presente artigo a noção deleuzeana de diferença e seus desdobramentos para as Ciências da Comunicação no Brasil. Para tal, resgata-se as contribuições do pesquisador brasileiro Ciro Marcondes Filho, que, em seu percurso teórico-metodológico, esboça um conceito singular de comunicação tendo como baliza a diferença. Estabelece-se um fio condutor entre os pensamentos do autor brasileiro e as ideias problematizadas pelo filósofo francês, a fim de que se faça uma análise das contribuições do primeiro para pensar a comunicação constituída como diferença no contexto do acontecimento. Por fim, reconhece-se a relevância do brasileiro Marcondes Filho a partir de sua empreitada epistemológica sobre a comunicação, repensando-a como diferenciante, capaz de transformar por ser acontecimento e devir.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Comunicação; Diferença; Acontecimento.

RESUMEN:

Este artículo destaca la noción deleuziana de diferencia y sus consecuencias para las Ciencias de la Comunicación en Brasil. Para ello, se rescatan los aportes del investigador brasileño Ciro Marcondes Filho, quien, en su recorrido teórico-metodológico, esboza un concepto único de comunicación a partir de la diferencia. Se establece un hilo entre el pensamiento del autor brasileño y las ideas problematizadas por el filósofo francés, con el fin de hacer un análisis de las contribuciones del primero para pensar la comunicación constituida como diferencia en el contexto del acontecimiento. Finalmente, se reconoce la relevancia del brasileño Marcondes Filho, a partir de su quehacer epistemológico sobre la comunicación, repensada como un diferenciador, capaz de transformarse en tanto que acontecimiento y devenir.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Comunicación; Diferencia; Evento.