

The “course of recognition” in communication studies

O “percurso do reconhecimento” nos estudos da comunicação

LAAN MENDES DE BARROS^a

Universidade Estadual Paulista “Julio de Mesquita Filho”. Bauru – SP, Brasil

ABSTRACT

The displacement “from the media to mediations” proposed by Martín-Barbero in the formation of a communicologist communicator and his path of recognition based on Paul Ricœur’s reflections on the “course of recognition” and on questions of identity, ipseity and otherness in understanding “oneself as another” brings self-reflections on my intellectual course and recognition as a communicologist, discusses communication studies within society mediatization, and invests in articulations between communication and aesthetic experience, “socializing the sensible” and “sensibilizing the social,” as per Herman Parret, and as “sensitive strategies,” in the words of Muniz Sodré.

Keywords: Mediations, mediatization, course of recognition, communication, aesthetic experience

^a Professor and researcher at the School of Architecture, Arts, Communication and Design at Universidade Estadual Paulista “Julio de Mesquita Filho” (FAAC-Unesp). Post-doctor in Communication Sciences from Université Stendhal - Grenoble 3, France. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2429-9716>. E-mail: laan.m.barros@unesp.br

RESUMO

O deslocamento “dos meios às mediações”, proposto por Martín-Barbero, na formação de um comunicador comunicólogo e seu percurso de reconhecimento são tratados neste artigo a partir das reflexões de Paul Ricœur sobre o “percurso do reconhecimento” e sobre as questões de identidade, ipseidade e alteridade, na compreensão de “si-mesmo como outro”. Traz autorreflexões sobre o percurso intelectual do autor e seu reconhecimento como comunicólogo, discute os estudos de comunicação no contexto de midiatização da sociedade e investe nas articulações entre comunicação e experiência estética, para “socializar o sensível” e “sensibilizar o social”, nas palavras de Herman Parret, como “estratégias sensíveis”, na linha do que propõe Muniz Sodré.

Palavras-chave: Mediações, midiatização, percurso do reconhecimento, comunicação, experiência estética

*Y así nos reconocemos
 Por el lejano mirar
 Por la copla que mordemos
 Semilla de inmensidad
 Atahualpa Yupanqui*

RECOGNITION. MORE THAN a stage of communication studies and knowledge construction, my stay at the Graduate Program in Communication Sciences of the School of Communications and Arts at Universidade de São Paulo (PPGCOM-ECA/USP) represented, for me, the opening to a course of recognition, a term I would come to know by Paul Ricœur’s work a few years later. This idea of recognition can be applied to the very concept of communication, if taken as an interactional phenomenon in which active subjects find themselves in dialogue, consensus, and oppositions. Especially when I observed that the current society is in an increasingly intense process of mediatization — as Braga (2006) and Hjarvard (2014) problematize by analyzing the social and cultural changes of our times —, I found that the construction of knowledge implies dynamics of recognition by these subjects in their processes of communication interaction.

In the early 1990s, during my PhD at PPGCOM at ECA, the readings Professor Maria Immacolata Vassalo de Lopes proposed led me “from the media to the mediations,” as proposed by Jesús Martín-Barbero (1987) to identify and define the “cultural mediations of communication,” a theoretical-epistemological conception that unfolded into several maps and even into a second formulation: the “communicational mediations of culture” (Martín-Barbero, 2004), which joins the first. The History of Communication Theories classes with the late Professor João Aloísio Lopes made me recognize myself not only as a communicator but also as a communicologist. The questions Professor Cremilda Medina presented challenged me to think about communication from a plural, dialectical, and interdisciplinary perspective. The meetings with the also late professor Jerusa da Pires Ferreira reinforced the connections I had already rehearsed between communication and popular culture, literature, music, and arts in general. The dialogues with professors Ismar de Oliveira Soares, Mauro Wilton de Souza, Adilson Odair Citelli, and the late professor Elza Dias Pacheco renewed my interest in reception studies and my commitment to education which I had brought from my master’s degree, conducted under Professor Luiz Roberto Alves’ guidance (who is still at Universidade Metodista de São Paulo). During that period, I had contact with several teachers,

in addition to many classmates with whom I interact to this day and who serve as references and readings.

I recognize that the PPGCOM at ECA-USP is a matrix for my education, as it is for many people; a place in which I could build knowledge and the bases to draw my course of recognition as a communicator interested in articulating communication and aesthetic experience (Barros, 2014a) and think of “communication without anesthesia” (Barros, 2017), as I was later able to elaborate. In recent years, I have sought to base articulations between communication, aesthetics, and politics.

I had already been working with Communication Theories when I joined PPGCOM at ECA-USP, but it was from my PhD onward that I was able to understand the delimitations of our field of study and the always transitory specificities of our objects of study in a more dense, broad, and complex way. My experiences and interactions with teachers and colleagues with whom I was able to share my day-to-day life in the classroom led me to build during those years and throughout my long teaching career the awareness that the recognition process is continuous and demands the constant rediscovery of oneself. Thus, that study experience between 1989 and 1994 is very present in my professional career, always renewing itself given the opportunity I have to meet and live with new students every academic period given the diversity and constant updating of research themes I have advised.

As I recall my passage by PPGCOM at ECA-USP – a program that completes 50 years of age and has created so many frameworks –, I recognize its importance in building Brazilian communication thinking. In narrating a little of this history, I highlight two of my theoretical-epistemological bases from readings of Jesús Martín-Barbero and Paul Ricoeur, briefly articulating them with other authors and dialogues with researchers who have occupied themselves with both authors’ ideas and serve as a counterpoint to problematize and question our field of studies. In narrating my readings, I narrate and recognize myself in a way, as Paul Ricoeur proposes when he discusses the idea of seeing, saying, narrating, and recognizing oneself.

FROM MEDIATION TO MEDIATIONS, “FROM TEXT TO ACTION”

The epistemological displacement proposed by Martín-Barbero (1987) brought me new perspectives to understand communication studies and eventually strengthened my Latin American identity. It also troubled me, a salutary retreat from our comfort zones, forcing us to overcome the linearity of the most

fatalistic criticism to the “cultural industry” and the superficiality of the functionalist instrumental vision so we could bet on the possibilities of emancipating the spectator, as Jacques Rancière (2012) proposes and had already featured at the basis of Martín-Barbero’s thought due to his proximity to Paulo Freire’s libertarian pedagogical propositions.

More than a watertight category model, the mediations Martín-Barbero mapped were configured as dynamic keys to examine phenomena that are constantly changing, such as those we engage in communication. Thus, I understand that it is inappropriate to use the term in the singular, as a label and mere classification. It is not about mediation this or mediation that. These are cultural and communicational mediations that feedback and tension each other. They should be thought “*from mediations to mediations*,” as Girardi Júnior (2018) suggests when discussing the issue of technicality in Martín-Barbero’s maps. The use of the term in the singular impairs the idea of displacement to mediations; maintaining the emphasis on the media as if it were talking *from the media to mediation* or even *mediation to mediation*. Mediations lie beyond media even if taken as “communication mediations of culture” (Martín-Barbero, 2004)¹. They should be considered as devices modulating and giving nuance to communication interactions and acting in processes of meaning production either in either production poetics or in the plane of “reception aesthetics,” as per the thinkers of the Konstanz School.

As Maria Immacolata Lopes (2018, p. 51) well identifies, “Barbero’s cartography concerns a strategic-rhizomatic method and the mediations should be seen as devices that intersect in a constant movement of mutation, renewal, and updating.” Whether from the perspective of “cultural mediations of communication” (the first maps) or “communication mediations of culture” (which emerged later in the context of questions about a possible return of mediations to the media), Martín-Barbero offers us a consistent strategy to think of communication and culture in mediated society. If we find “cultural mediations of communication,” i.e., if culture models, modulates, and tensions communication processes and are within the meaning production of production dynamics and media reception, on the other hand, we must acknowledge the “communication mediations of culture” since communication is a structuring component of contemporary culture. This happens not only in the infrastructure but also in the superstructure since it marks the idea of society mediatization. In fact, the second movement of Martín-Barbero’s theory — “communication mediations of culture” — holds a certain synonymy with society and culture

¹ In fact, here too, the translation of Martín-Barbero’s (2004) “mediaciones comunicacionales de la cultura” as “mediações comunicativas da cultura” (communicative mediations of culture) in the Brazilian edition of *Ofício de Cartógrafo*, compromises the understanding of the displacement proposed by the Spanish-Colombian thinker. Rather than devices or mechanisms that produce communication, they constitute structures and devices that take place in communication.

mediatization. As Gislene Silva (2012) explains, we could reconcile the concepts of mediation and mediatization based on Muniz Sodré's (2002) reformulated concept of "*media bios*."

Navigating Martín-Barbero's maps led me, like many, to establish articulations with the cultural studies of the New English Left. We have to delve deeper into Richard Hoggart, Raymond Williams, Edward Palmer Thompson, Stuart Hall, and their Gramscian heritages. Ana Carolina D. Escosteguy (2018) details these affinities between thinkers of the Birmingham School and Martín-Barbero and other Latin American authors' propositions. Among them, I highlight Guillermo Orozco Gómez's (2005) classifications, based on Martín-Barbero's cartography, who helped me in application exercises with communication students; namely, technological, cognitive, situational, reference, and institutional mediations.

The paradigm of mediations presented to me at PPGCOM at ECA-USP almost 30 years ago still serves as a theoretical-epistemological basis for my research, advisories, and teaching. Thinking about communication based on culture and British and Latin American cultural studies (Lopes, 2014) constitutes an exercise which mobilizes me and a perspective in which I recognize myself, integrating my communicational thinking-doing.

However, something caught my attention when I began to study Martín-Barbero's work more closely: he had been a student of Paul Ricœur in France. Beyond British culturalists' sociology of culture, it seemed I needed to study a little of that French thinker's vast work. After all, much of mediation theory applies to the debate on the processes of interpreting media discourses and to studies on the production of meanings from the perspective of reception. In addition to the contributions of a cultural anthropology, I had to understand the contribution of hermeneutics to mediations theory – whether regarding the production of meaning related to production and reception perspectives or identity and otherness issues – to fully grasp the idea of mediations worth articulating to Paul Ricœur's hermeneutic reflections, which are closely associated with Martín-Barbero's thought. Moreover, the very displacement "from the media to mediations," giving his paradigmatic work its name, approaches Ricœur's (1991) unfolding "from text to action" in his homonymous book. When the production of meanings goes beyond *poiesis* continents (the products conveyed in the media) and unfolds into an aesthetic experience of perception within *aisthesis* (the dynamics of reception marked by cultural and communication mediations), the text unfolds into action and an experience of recognition and affirmation of active subjects in society.

When subjects narrate, they narrate themselves, thus building their subjectivity and becoming authors, i.e., more than passive spectators. When aesthetic experience becomes poetic experience (Barros, 2019a) – a continuum between *poiesis* and *aisthesis* – subjects construct the recognition of themselves and the other, of “oneself as another” (Ricoeur, 2006). The educommunication researchers at ECA-USP, mentioned at the beginning of this text, followed Mario Kaplún and invested in a new communication praxis which implies giving voice and access to media devices so subjects (who are often silenced) could narrate their stories and themselves, thus authoring their course of recognition. This narrative, marked by concrete temporalities and territorialities and a range of cultural mediations has the power of empowerment. Identities constructed via narratives – or “narrative identities,” as Ricoeur defines it (1988, 2010) – can be thought of as a place articulating affection and politics, which Rancière (2005) calls “distribution of the sensible.”

In the case of educators who admit themselves “ignorant schoolmasters,” according to Rancière (2015), once again, the possibility of emancipating spectators and forming communicologist communicators (Barros, 2014b) who articulate and tension doing and thinking communication configures a challenge and a commitment.

Times of hate speech, cancellation, and disinformation require betting and investing in a *communication without anesthesia*, stated as an aesthetic experience that configure, as Parret (1993, p. 174) proposes, that “the social is sensibilized and the sensible socialized” at the same time. We should, of course, avoid working these relations in a romantic and irenic way. Distributing the sensitive consists of consensus, oppositions, harmonies, dissonances, negotiations, resistances, and assimilations within culture and politics. It takes place in “transculturation” relationships, as Octavio Ianni (2000, p. 107) defines the result of conquest and domination or even interdependence and accommodation processes; sharing that transforms reality, changing the polis; sharing that takes place in the plane of the common and in its plurality, enabling us to understand the diversity of the others with whom we live not in search of equality but of otherness in diversity. For Muniz Sodré (2006, p. 69) “the common is the sensitive harmony of singularities capable of producing a harmonization of the diverse.”

PRODUCTION OF MEANING, IDENTITY, AND ALTERITY

The question of recognition, so dear to Ricoeur, brought into question in this text, and its articulations between narrative and time, identity and otherness,

and the power of narrating and the power of acting are close to the foundations of Martín-Barbero's mediation theory.

Understanding Paul Ricœur's dimensions of recognition at conferences held in 2001 and 2002 in Vienna and Freiburg and gathered in *The Course of Recognition* (Ricœur, 2006) can help us articulate these mediations, production of meaning, and recognition. For this, I briefly return to a text I called "O 'Percurso do Reconhecimento' para Tempos de Ódio: Estesia e Produção de Sentidos em Paul Ricœur" (Barros, 2020). His book contains three studies. The first one refers to, as I wrote, "identifying something as something that is already part of the repertoire of those who recognize, of identifying the other as someone already known. To recognize, in this angulation, is to put again in mind, is to re-elaborate what was once mentally elaborated" (Barros, 2020, p. 191). In terms of a practical judgment, it is a question of distinguishing, of recognizing that one is not the other, of a classification exercise, of selection. Ricœur identifies this recognition dimension in the plane of "sameness" or of "*idem* identity."

His second study brings the idea of recognizing how to recognize oneself as self-identification. "In this angulation, subjects recognize their idiosyncrasies and abilities and recognize themselves as individuals. In it, subjects recognize their singular identity" (Barros, 2020, p. 191). Ricœur calls this dimension *ipse* identity since it involves recognizing subjects, their I, and make oneself recognized. In this perspective, "recognition happens in the dialectic between 'being able to narrate and narrate oneself' in a narrative identity that places the *idem* identity in a dialectical relation to the *ipse* identity, of *I am*" (Barros, 2019b, p. 44). This dimension significantly marks the relations between time and discourse, which Ricœur (2010) addresses in *Time and Narrative*. The second chapter of *The Course of Recognition* treats recognition as a movable identity, considered in its historical temporality and, due to the changing nature of the being in a situation, in action. Recognizing this dimension relates to being in time in an expression of *ipseity*.

Ricœur completes his course with *mutual recognition* in another dialectical tension, "now between identity and otherness, a dimension he had already worked in *Oneself as Another*" (Barros, 2020, p. 192). This perspective expresses the first meaning of communication, found in the "*making common*" of the Latin verb *communicare*. It involves "recognizing the other and recognizing oneself in the other, recognizing an I in the diversity of the Other, in a relationship of reciprocity and mutuality which implies the recognition of equal rights between the subjects of a society" (Barros, 2020, p. 192).

My course of recognition, marked in a defining way by my PhD at ECA-USP, brought this dimension of intense otherness and led me to recognize myself as one who carries many others, as Ricœur teaches us in the whole of his work. Others with whom I currently live, near and far, which affect and transform me and with whom I discuss and dispute times and spaces. Others I bring from the past which preceded me — my ancestors, my ethnic-cultural roots, the coexistence I had and what I read — are in me; many who have formed me and continue to form me and others still who are yet to come but are already in my expectations about the future, in my commitments to tomorrow.

Ricœur’s *mutual recognition* leads us to recognize ourselves as different subjects, in our dissymmetrical constitutions, in the other. This dimension of recognition leads us to break with logics of individualism and to recognize ourselves as part of the collective. He challenges us to think and communicate in interaction, dialogue, and dialectics. And so, we can converse, co-work, and co-live. We can talk *with* the other, rather than *to* the other, as this text will soon discuss, from a dialogue perspective. As Merleau-Ponty elaborates:

In the experience of dialogue, there is constituted between the other person and myself a common ground; my thought and his are inter-woven into a single fabric, my words and those of my interlocutor are called forth by the state of the discussion, and they are inserted into a shared operation of which neither of us is the creator. (Merleau-Ponty, 2002, p. 413)

When considered from the perspective of dialogue, communication occurs between subjects in dialogue rather than in relations between active subjects and objects suffering those actions. If we recognize ourselves thus within our temporalities and territorialities, we share meanings and sensitivities as ever-changing human beings. As Lévinas (1993, p. 49) states, “the relationship with the Other questions me, empties me from myself and never ceases to empty me, discovering me with ever new possibilities.”²

As I wrote in “O ‘*Percorso do Reconhecimento*’ para *Tempos de Ódio*”, when communication is thought from the perspective of otherness, “the production of meanings takes place beyond the mere exegesis of what is contained in messages. It takes place in the plane of recognition which arises in exercises of interpretation.” The question of understanding “does not take place from the perspective of explanation but from understanding because it implies the interpretation and appropriation of meanings that are revealed in a process of

²This and other translations, by the author.

recognition and dialogue between interlocutors” (Barros, 2020, p. 193). Thus, in fact, communication arising gives rise to communication.

By discussing issues of identity in a dialectic between *idem* and *ipse*, Ricoeur also confronts identity and otherness and maintains that the issue of identity has “a double, private and public, aspect.”

Although Ricoeur advocates complementarity or even a reciprocity between explaining and understanding, when he works hermeneutically with the interpretation of texts within communication and mediated narratives – combining languages and triggering cultural mediations – the production of meaning seems to better lie within understanding. If we take spectators as emancipated and active subjects in their experience of perception, meaning goes beyond the text but unfolds into spectators’ contexts circulating narratives and appropriation processes. Thus, understanding seen as grasping seems to better correspond to the dynamics of interpretation in a semantic-pragmatic plane, in a time-space in which the perception and distribution of the sensible take place.

This emphasis on understanding and communicational flows and mediations puts us, once again, in the face of the ontological question of *oneself* as the other, presented by Ricoeur in articulations with Martín-Barbero’s mediation paradigm. Thus, the semantic-pragmatic discussion, refined by a complex of cultural and communication mediations, is projected on the ethical-aesthetic plane. According to the French thinker:

It is finally on the ethical plane that the affection of the self by the other displays the specific features that belong as much to the properly ethical plane as to the moral plane of obligation. The very definition of ethics that we have proposed—living well with and for others in just institutions— cannot be conceived without the project of living well being affected by solicitude, both that which is exerted and that which is received. (Ricoeur, 1995, p. 330)

In this context, Ricoeur (2014, p. 391, my emphasis) asks us: “The question here is that of determining what new figure of otherness is called for by this affection of the ipse by the other than self and, by implication, what dialectic of the Same and the Other replies to the demand for a phenomenology of the self affected by the other than self.” These shared affections in communication processes, in movements of meeting the other, lead us to the plane of understanding, of the distribution of the sensible taking place in the sphere of the common, the community. Moreover, the idea of otherness challenges us to think about “living well,” as the original peoples practice and teach us,

in addition to an anthropological logic brought by the colonizers and cultivated by the market, in which human life is sensibly shared with other forms of life and with nature itself.

***SENSUS COMMUNIS* IN THE CONTEXT OF SOCIETY MEDIATIZATION**

Our contemporary mediatized society has multiple and complex mechanisms and possibilities for communication interaction. This context precludes both the simple opposition between media and society (as in the criticism of the “cultural industry”) and the definition of the media as a mere infrastructural instrument of social dynamics. We must think media, as we have said, within the superstructure. Communication processes go beyond transits between senders and receivers. As Braga (2006, p. 22) proposes in *A Sociedade Enfrenta Sua Mídia*, beyond instances of sending and receiving, we find a “system of social interactions above the media,” which he describes as a third system.

Thus, we propose to develop the finding of a *third system of media processes* in society which completes the procedurality of general social media, making it effectively function as *communication*. This third system corresponds to productive and directed *response activities* by society in interaction with media products (Braga, 2006, p. 22, my emphasis).

It constitutes, Braga (2006, p. 27) claims, a “system of social interaction about the media (its processes and products),” a “deferred and diffuse circulation system” in which “mediatically produced meanings reach society and begin to circulate in it and in people, groups, and institutions, impregnating and partially directing culture.”

Several authors have worked this conception — which Eliseo Verón (1971, 2004) had explored between 1960 and 1970 — in recent years. Stig Hjarvard (2014), for example, turned his attention to institution mediatization, working at the *meso level* of cultural and social processes. An active group of researchers at Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos unfolded the theme of mediatization into theoretical and empirical articulations. Muniz Sodré brought the human being to the center of the discussion by proposing the existence of a *media bios*; a derivation of Aristotelian social bios categories, i.e., our existential spheres: knowledge, pleasure, and politics. Sodré proposes the existence of a fourth sphere — the *media bios*. Thus, he suggests that the media are more than mere information transmitters, but a way of life. For him:

Sociocultural practices, known as communicational or mediatic, have been establishing themselves as a field of social action which corresponds to a new way of life, which we propose to call the media bios. These practices — a kind of ethicist anthropotechnique — do not exhaust or systematize the linking problem since they more directly relate to the relationships socially managed by media devices and, therefore, the market. (Sodré, 2002. p. 233)

Given this context of society mediatization, of the “deferred and diffuse” circulation of media products, they spread and entrench themselves in social tissues, giving rise to symbolic disputes take place and constructing consensus and opposition. From the mediation perspective, already discussed in this article, these negotiations take place both at the macro social level, in the formation of what is known as public opinion and in community spaces and communities of appropriation. Thus, we must problematize the idea of common sense in communication and aesthetics studies to grasp the appropriations taking place in the real spaces of institutions, movements, and communities. People acquaint themselves and recognize each other in this sphere of everyday life. Moreover, this space is also structured in the mediatization logic — or the communication mediations of culture.

When this recognition and sensible experience occurs in daily life and community relationships (appropriation groups), we find more than a social consensus, more than a *sensus communis*. We should think of culture communicational mediations as a place of affirmation and recognition, of affections and knowledge produced from a “*sensus communalis*,” as Herman Parret (1997) suggests in *Aesthetics of Communication*. For him, “*sensus communis* is the *sensus* of a community [...] which is not argumentative or consensual: it is affective” (Parret, 1997, p. 197). Hence, then, his question-provocation: “why not aestheticize the political on the basis of the essential temporality of the affective community?” (Parret, 1997, p. 199).

In this dialectical context, Ângela Salgueiro Marques (2011, p. 30) asks:

Would not aesthetic experience also be a problematizing experience? Would not the actions of “indulging in something, being touched by something, and exercising something” show an experience of the order of fruition, transformation, and the production of something new? Experience thus acts as a mediation that helps subjects to have access to an understanding produced about themselves, about others, and about the world in which they live.

Thus, the researcher from Minas Gerais considers that this experience — one’s recognition of oneself and the other — may be called aesthetics since the

³Based on *A estética da recepção e a crítica da razão impura* by the Portuguese author (Cruz, 1986), which I studied in my doctoral classes at ECA-USP and gave me my first contact with the theses of the Konstanz School which, to this day, help me to value reading as a privileged place of production of meaning.

perception of oneself is marked by affections and an understanding of the sharing of life with others. As Maria Teresa Cruz (1990, p. 63)³, defines it, the aesthetic experience “offers subjects a way of experiencing an awareness of oneself and the horizons of their experience of the world.”

IN CONCLUSION

What I learned during my doctorate at PPGCOM at ECA-USP enabled me to understand communication as sharing far beyond transmission. As I stated in *Vozes Que Dão Voz* (Barros, 2018, p. 185, my emphasis), “communication itself is interaction, a relationship of otherness,” thus appropriate to think “in the sense of *speaking with the other*, not in *speaking to the other*.” After all, “this is the original meaning of the Latin term *communicare*, which suggests to us the idea of sharing, of making something common.” In this perspective, interactional relationships ground themselves in recognizing the existence of an Other who is a subject and not just the object of my action, and who, although unlike me, is my peer for they carry an I in them. It constitutes, as I argued, “a game between ipseity and otherness, a process that takes place in the sphere of the common, of shared senses” (Barros, 2018, p. 185).

In line with what I discussed in that text, this autobiographical reflection retrieves two quotations by Paul Ricœur that tension these recognition dimensions: ipseity and otherness. The second, from the book *Oneself As Another*, further develops this speculative dimension of recognizing the Other that exists in I and the I that exists in the Other. For him, “the other is not condemned to remain a stranger but can become my counterpart, that is, someone who, like me, says ‘I.’” (Ricœur, 2014, p. 390).

Thus, we can think-do communication as understanding and break with systems that deny diversity and annihilate the different, building otherness in times of “othercide.” As Achille Mbembe (2017, p. 10) claims, “the constitution of the Other not as similar to oneself but as a menacing object from which one must be protected or escape, or which must simply be destroyed if it cannot be subdued.” When he discusses “the racial subject,” the Cameroonian thinker confronts the culture of hatred that marks our times; times in which lack of communication is unfortunately predominant and disputes space with anesthetizing communication, in which subjects fail to recognize themselves.

If we think and practice communication as an aesthetic experience from the perspective of interaction, we can recognize ourselves as diverse and alike

or similar subjects at the same time. It is in this perspective that the distribution of the sensible of these lines takes place. To recollect and celebrate is something that constitutes us collectively. To recollect is also an action of resistance and (re)existence. It is an opportunity to recognize ourselves in projects common to many, as is the case of PPGCom at ECA-USP. ■

REFERENCES

- Barros, L. M. (2014a). A questão da experiência estética nos debates de epistemologia da comunicação. *Questões Transversais*, 2(3), 2-11.
- Barros, L. M. (2014b). Por uma práxis da comunicação na formação de um comunicador comunicólogo. *Comunicação & Sociedade*, 36(1), 133-155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15603/2175-7755/cs.v36n1p133-155>
- Barros, L. M. (2017). Comunicação sem anestesia. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências da Comunicação*, 40(1), 159-175. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-5844201719>
- Barros, L. M. (2018). Vozes que dão voz: Mobilização, reconhecimento e alteridade na web. In M. R. Silva, C. M. C. Mendonça, C. A. Carvalho, J. E. O. Menezes, & M. G. P. Coelho (Orgs.), *Mobilidade, espacialidades e alteridades* (pp. 185-199). Edufba.
- Barros, L. M. (2019a). Experiencia estética y experiencia poética: La producción de sentidos en la cultura mediatizada. *Revista Iberoamericana de Comunicación*, (37), 131-148.
- Barros, L. M. (2019b). Mediações culturais na comunicação e experiência estética como estruturas de reconhecimento. In M. J. Baldessar, D. I. Monje (Orgs.), *Diálogos latino-americanos: Colóquios Brasil-Argentina* (pp. 35-50). Intercom.
- Barros, L. M. (2020). O “percurso do reconhecimento” para tempos de ódio: *Estesia e produção de sentidos em Paul Ricœur* [Apresentação de trabalho]. XV Congresso da Associação Latino-americana de Pesquisadores em Comunicação, Medellín, Colômbia.
- Braga, J. L. (2006). *A sociedade enfrenta a sua mídia: Dispositivos sociais de crítica midiática*. Paulus.
- Cruz, M. T. (1986). A estética da recepção e a crítica da razão impura. *Revista Comunicação e Linguagens*, 1(3), 67-75.
- Cruz, M. T. (1990). Experiência estética e esteticização da experiência. *Revista de Comunicação e Linguagens*, (12/13), 57-65.
- Escosteguy, A. C. D. (2018). Estudos culturais latino-americanos e Jesús Martín-Barbero: Mais afinidades do que disputas. *MATRIZES*, 12(1), 99-113. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1982-8160.v12i1p99-113>

- Girardi Júnior, L. (2018). De mediações em mediações: A questão da “tecnicidade” em Martín-Barbero. *MATRIZes*, 12(1), 155-172. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1982-8160.v12i1p155-172>
- Hjarvard, S. (2014). Mídia-tização: Conceituando a mudança social e cultural. *MATRIZes*, 8(1), 21-44. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1982-8160.v8i1p21-44>
- Ianni, O. (2000). *Enigmas da modernidade-mundo*. Civilização Brasileira.
- Lévinas, E. (1993). *Humanismo do outro homem*. Vozes.
- Lopes, M. I. V. (2014). Mediação e recepção: Algumas conexões teóricas e metodológicas nos estudos latino-americanos de comunicação. *MATRIZes*, 8(1), 65-80. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1982-8160.v8i1p65-80>
- Lopes, M. I. V. (2018). A teoria barberiana da comunicação. *MATRIZes*, 12(1), 39-63. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1982-8160.v12i1p39-63>
- Marques, A. (2011). Comunicação, estética e política: A partilha do sensível promovida pelo dissenso, pela resistência e pela comunidade. *Galáxia*, (22), 25-39.
- Martín-Barbero, J. (1987). *De los medios a las mediaciones: Comunicación, cultura y hegemonía*. G. Gili.
- Martín-Barbero, J. (2004). *Ofício de cartógrafo: Travessias latino-americanas da comunicação na cultura*. Loyola.
- Mbembe, A. (2017). *Critique of Black Reason*. Duke University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2002). *Phenomenology of Perception*. Routledge.
- Orozco Gómez, G. (2005). O telespectador frente à televisão: Uma exploração do processo de recepção televisiva. *Communicare*, 5(1), 27-42.
- Parret, H. (1993). *The Aesthetics of Communication: Pragmatics and beyond*. Springer-Science+Business Media, B.V..
- Rancière, J. (2005). *A partilha do sensível: Estética e política*. Editora 34.
- Rancière, J. (2012). *O espectador emancipado*. WMF Martins Fontes.
- Rancière, J. (2015). *O mestre ignorante: Cinco lições sobre a emancipação intelectual*. Autêntica.
- Ricœur, P. (1988). L'identité narrative. *Esprit*, (7/8), 295-304.
- Ricœur, P. (1991). *Do texto à ação: Ensaios de hermenêutica II*. Rés.
- Ricœur, P. (2006). *Percursos do reconhecimento*. Loyola.
- Ricœur, P. (2010). *Tempo e narrativa*. WMF Martins Fontes.
- Ricœur, P. (1995). *One as another*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Silva, G. (2012). Pode o conceito reformulado de bios midiático conciliar mediações e mídia-tização? In M. A. Mattos, J. Janotti Jr., & N. Jacks (Orgs.), *Mediação & mídia-tização* (pp. 107-122). Edufba.

- Sodré, M. (2002). *Antropológica do espelho: Uma teoria da comunicação linear e em rede*. Vozes.
- Sodré, M. (2006). *As estratégias sensíveis: Afeto, mídia e política*. Vozes.
- Verón, E., Prieto, L. J., Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V., Sluzki, C. E., & Masotta, O. (1971). *Lenguaje y comunicación social*. Nueva Visión.
- Verón, E. (2004). *Fragmentos de um tecido*. Unisinos.

Article received on november 9th 2022 and approved on november 16th 2022.

