



The reception of Deleuze and Deleuze-Guattari's thought in Brazilian educational research: early decades

Christian Fernando Ribeiro Guimarães Vinci

Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Cidade Universitária 'Zeferino Vaz', s/n., 13083-970, Campinas, São Paulo, Brasil. E-mail: vinci@unicamp.br

ABSTRACT. The article in question aims to present a brief overview of the movements of diffusion and appropriation of the thought of Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) in the field of educational research in Brazil. This considers both his individual work and that written in collaboration with Félix Guattari (1930-1992), contextualizing the different moments of the reception process of these authors' ideas and considering solely their early decades (1980-2000). To achieve this, we proceed with the analysis of an extensive bibliographic archive compiled throughout our master's and doctoral research. We consider the beginning of the reception of these authors in the 1980s, integrating them into the group of 'post' theorists - post-critical, post-structuralist, or post-modern - until the automatization of deleuzian and/or Deleuze-Guattarian research in the 2000s. During this time, a concern for methodological issues emerged within these studies. We argue that understanding the way the Deleuzian, Guattarian, and Deleuze-Guattarian thought was received in the educational field requires taking into account certain broader contexts, such as the one established by the crisis of the critical paradigm in the 1980s. We also understand that educational research aligned with the theoretical diapason of the 'Philosophy of Difference' gains prominence and autonomy only when it stops fighting the critical paradigm and starts constructing its own methodological tools.

Keywords: Gilles Deleuze; Félix Guattari; educational philosophy; scientific method; science popularization.

A recepção do pensamento de Deleuze e Deleuze-Guattari na pesquisa educacional brasileira: décadas iniciais.

RESUMO. O artigo em questão almeja apresentar um breve panorama dos movimentos de difusão e apropriação do pensamento de Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) no campo das pesquisas em Educação, levando em consideração tanto sua obra individual quanto aquela escrita em parceria com Félix Guattari (1930-1992), contextualizando os distintos momentos do processo de recepção do pensamento desses autores e considerando unicamente as suas décadas iniciais (1980-2000). Para tanto, procedemos com a análise de um extenso arquivo bibliográfico compilado ao longo de nossa pesquisa de mestrado e doutorado, levando em consideração o início da recepção desses autores na década de 1980, integrando o grupo de teóricos 'pós' - pós-crítico, pós-estruturalista ou pós-modernos -, até a autonomização das pesquisas deleuzianas e/ou deleuze-guattarianas na década de 2000, quando do surgimento de uma preocupação com questões de cunho metodológico no interior desses estudos. Defendemos não ser possível compreender o modo como se deu a recepção do pensamento deleuziano, guattariano e deleuze-guattariano no campo educacional sem levarmos em consideração certos contextos maiores, como aquele instaurado com a crise do paradigma crítico na década de 1980, e entendemos que as pesquisas em educação que se filiam ao diapasão teórico da 'Filosofia da diferença' adquirem proeminência e autonomia apenas quando se recusam a combater o paradigma crítico e passam a construir ferramentas metodológicas próprias.

Palavras-chave: Gilles Deleuze; Félix Guattari; filosofia da educação; método científico; difusão científica.

La recepción del pensamiento de Deleuze y Deleuze-Guattari en la investigación educativa brasileña

RESUMEN. El artículo en cuestión pretende presentar un breve recorrido por los movimientos de difusión y apropiación del pensamiento de Gilles Deleuze en el campo de la investigación en Educación, teniendo en cuenta tanto su obra individual como la escrita en colaboración con Félix Guattari, contextualizando los diferentes momentos de este proceso de recepción en Brasil. Procederemos al análisis de un extenso archivo recopilado durante nuestras investigaciones de maestría y doctorado, teniendo en cuenta el inicio de la

recepción de estos autores en la década de 1980, cuando pasaron a formar parte del grupo de 'post' -teóricos de posgrado-críticos, postestructuralistas o posmodernos-, hasta el empoderamiento de la investigación deleuziana, guattariana y/o deleuzo-guattariana en la década de 2000, cuando surgió una preocupación por cuestiones metodológicas dentro de estos estudios. Argumentamos que no es posible entender cómo fue recibido el pensamiento deleuziano, guattariano y deleuzo-guattariano en el campo educativo sin tener en cuenta ciertos contextos más amplios, como el que se instaura con la crisis del paradigma crítico en la década de 1980, y entendemos que Las investigaciones en educación que se adhieren al marco teórico de la Filosofía de la Diferencia adquieren protagonismo y autonomía sólo cuando se niegan a combatir el paradigma crítico y comienzan a construir sus propias herramientas metodológicas.

Palabras-clave: Gilles Deleuze; Félix Guattari; filosofía de la educación; método científico; divulgación científica.

Received on October 15, 2022.

Accepted on April 19, 2023.

Introduction

In the month of September in the year 1982, the work 'Mille Plateaux', published two years earlier in France, was honored with a full-page review, 'As mil planícies de Guattari' (Escobar, 1982), in the culture section of a prominent Brazilian newspaper, the *Folha de São Paulo*. Unlike the other reviews that occupied half a page or less, the analysis of this book stood out not only for its length but also for the praises articulated by a reviewer who frequently suggested to his readers that they were facing one of the most important books of the 20th century. This wasn't surprising, given that one of the authors, the psychoanalyst Félix Guattari, was a well-known figure in Brazilian intellectual and political circles. In that distant September, he was concluding an extensive trip throughout Brazil, engaging with diverse groups to discuss the directions of our country's democratization¹. The influence of the French psychoanalyst on our political-intellectual landscape was substantial; in the same year, Guattari conducted an extensive interview with one of the prominent leaders of the period, the labor unionist Luiz Inácio 'Lula' da Silva. The interview was published in booklet format (Guattari, 1982) shortly after the aforementioned review and quickly sold out in the Brazilian publishing market. His presence in our intellectual and media circles made Brazil one of the countries most engaged in discussions about micropolitics² and the schizoanalytic movement he advocated (Dosse, 2010)³.

If the attention given by the newspaper to 'Mille Plateaux' was not a great surprise, considering Guattari's circulation in our country, the complete absence of his partner's name, Gilles Deleuze, in the headline could surprise contemporary readers accustomed to the opposite situation: the prominence of the author of 'Difference and Repetition' (Deleuze, 1988) and the lack of recognition for his partner, Guattari. Was this truly a significant work for contemporary philosophical discussions, as the reviewer defended, or were these praises merely aimed at magnifying the media presence of the French psychoanalyst? How could the omission of Deleuze's name from both the main title and the body of the text be justified? Could this analysis be more interested in praising the eminent French thinker Guattari, who had a strong media and intellectual presence in Brazil, in contrast to Deleuze, who never visited our country and perhaps, therefore, did not enjoy the same appreciation at that time? These questions, posed without the intention of resolving them here, shed light on certain ways in which the ideas of these authors diffused and were appropriated in Brazilian intellectual circles. Moreover, they allow us to revisit a concern raised years earlier by Jacques Derrida (1930-2004), the Franco-Algerian philosopher responsible for the theory of deconstruction in philosophy.

According to Derrida (2004), a contemporary of Deleuze and Guattari, the human sciences, previously dominated by a certain German hermeneutic culture, underwent a French reconfiguration in the 1960s that changed their operational mode. Decades later, much remains to be measured about "[...] what happened then and what remains to be analyzed, beyond the phenomena of rejection and fashion that [this reconfiguration] continues to provoke" (Derrida, 2004, p. 306). Derrida did not define how this reconfiguration occurred; he

¹ Félix Guattari had previously visited our country years earlier, making him a recognizable figure in our intellectual circles. Between 1979 and 1992, Guattari visited our country on seven occasions, and at one point, he even contemplated the possibility of settling here (Dosse, 2010). However, in 1982, we were amidst the euphoria of the redemocratization process, and his presence was aimed at engaging in a dialogue with this period. In her introduction to the book 'Micropolitics: Cartographies of Desire', psychoanalyst Suely Rolnik, the organizer of the trip, elaborated on this visit: "[...] I organized a packed schedule of activities between August and September 1982 in five states. I planned not only a series of conferences, roundtable discussions, and public debates (which consistently filled the spaces where they were held), but above all, meetings, encounters, interviews, and both formal and informal conversations with individuals, groups, movements, and associations" (Guattari & Rolnik, 2010, p. 16).

² According to Suely Rolnik (Guattari & Rolnik, 2010, p. 11), "[...] Brazil is one of the few countries where a clinic, including psychoanalytic, has so explicitly incorporated the contributions of Guattari, Deleuze, Foucault, and an entire philosophical tradition in which these thinkers are situated (especially the work of Nietzsche), to problematize the politics of subjectivation in the contemporary context and to confront the symptoms that arise from them."

³ Francois Dosse (2010), in *Deleuze & Guattari: Crossed Biography*, even went so far as to suggest that Brazil could be "[...] the only country where the graft of schizoanalysis truly thrived" (Dosse, 2010, p. 396). According to the author, this success could be attributed to the fact that "[...] the mixed society, fundamentally hybrid and mestizo as Brazilian society is, might be more conducive than others to this labile nature of subjective construction, its multiple becomings, and a fundamentally heterogeneous subjectivity" (Dosse, 2010, p. 396).

positioned himself as an agent or heir to it, asserting that much of this process would result from the new thought systems emerging and the media vacuum created by the crisis of the structuralist paradigm that dominated French cultural scene in the 1950s. This established media void also allowed philosophers of that generation—such as Michel Foucault (1926-1984), Gilles Deleuze, Jean-François Lyotard (1924-1998), Derrida himself, and others—to assume the role of spokespersons for this alternative mode of philosophizing. In the following decade, American universities would endorse this role, transforming them into the so-called post-structuralist thinkers (Cusset, 2008). In this regard, when considering how the thought of these authors was received, whether in Brazil or elsewhere, we cannot ignore the phenomena of trends associated with their names. In the Brazilian context, we must also not overlook the influence exerted by these phenomena on the way they were received by our intellectual circles.

The diffusion of Deleuze and Guattari's thought in our country, we believe, occurred in a diffuse manner, without a single axis of propagation and not restricted to academic circles. Unlike many other theorists, for whom the university and research within it represent the main avenue for disseminating their thought, the authors of 'Anti-Oedipus' (Deleuze & Guattari, 2010) have a strong affinity with artistic practices, clinical contexts, and certain forms of social mobilization.⁴ This implies a rather unique process of disseminating their thought. Even before there was a compilation of their main writings translated into Portuguese, Guattari's texts circulated among activists involved with pirate radio stations or Brazilian intellectuals engaged with psychiatric reform. Deleuze, on the other hand, although some of his works had been translated since the 1970s, only began to move beyond the role of commentator on other philosophers—Hume, Nietzsche, etc.—in the late 1980s. This was also the period when theater groups, dance companies, and artistic collectives emerged, engaging with his conceptual apparatus. The reception of Deleuze's thought in Brazil also witnessed curious and somewhat caricatured scenes, such as the curious case of the "[...] group of Deleuzians [...]" who, imitating certain Lacanians who dressed like Lacan in Rio de Janeiro, started doing something similar and physically imitated Deleuze (Escobar, 1991, p. 7). These appropriations, often experimental and sometimes distorted, ignored epistemological specificities or departed from the idea of rigor demanded by traditional philosophical exegesis. To the point that one of the introducers of Deleuzian thought in Brazil suggested that such appropriations resulted in unprecedented intellectual impoverishment, given the "[...] sterility of these Deleuzians in publications, original reflections, and innovative ideas" (Escobar, 1991, p. 7).

Given this preamble, how can we understand the complete absence of Deleuze's name from the review? Does this review illustrate a fashion phenomenon, simply consolidating the media attention around Guattari in the Brazilian press, or does it point to a significant reconfiguration in our epistemic field—a sign of a theoretical shift that was gradually taking shape in Brazilian human sciences? Regardless of any potential answer that might be outlined here, it seems impossible to separate the sphere of diffusion—understood in its broadest sense, encompassing media and academic aspects—from the sphere of appropriation itself. Elsewhere (Vinci & Ribeiro, 2015), we discuss the correlation between these spheres in order to understand the ways in which Deleuze's and Guattari's thought was received in Brazil. At that time, we regarded them as inseparable spheres⁵. We noted that the diffusion of Deleuzian, Guattarian, and Deleuzo-Guattarian thought in Brazilian intellectual circles followed a convoluted path that was difficult to grasp. Like others of their generation, the ideas of Deleuze and Guattari circulated – and continue to circulate – among artistic groups, political collectives, advocates of free media, as well as academic researchers from various fields. This specificity eventually impacted and imprinted a distinct mark on the appropriations of their thought across diverse domains. At times, we observe how certain academic appropriations, in dialogue with the more experimentally inclined appropriations typical of artistic collectives, forego the customary exegetical rigor in academic research in order to cast a more artistic or poetic gaze upon their research objects. We believe that this interplay between more experimental and more exegetical appropriations, what Eric Alliez (2015, p. 198) termed "[...] interconnected readings [...]", would characterize the appropriations of these authors' thought within the field of education as well, particularly from the 2000s onwards, when we would witness the emergence of discussions aimed not at merely introducing their thought, but at operationalizing it within the field through the creation of singular methodological tools that flirt with certain artistic languages.

⁴ Eric Alliez (2015) was among the first authors to observe that the reception of Gilles Deleuze's concepts in Brazil, whether developed in collaboration with Guattari or not, extends beyond university walls to an extent that we cannot disregard forms of appropriation of their ideas that do not adhere to academic protocols.

⁵ At that juncture, we primarily took into account the media appropriations of these authors' ideas, while also remaining attentive to how this appropriation reverberated within the realm of university research, particularly in the field of education (Vinci & Ribeiro, 2015).

With this work, our aim is to provide a brief overview of the reception of Deleuzian, Guattarian, and Deleuze-Guattarian thought within the realm of educational research, spanning from the 1980s to the turn of the 2000s, encompassing the initial decades of the introduction of their thought in Brazil. We seek not only to comprehend the distinct moments of diffusion and appropriation of this thought within educational studies, highlighting the specific contexts of each phase, but also the evolution of certain lines of force which, although latent in the production of the 1980s, would only gain autonomy and articulate themselves more organically in the subsequent decades, coinciding with the emergence of methodological discussions that would bring forth the full potential of Deleuzian and Deleuze-Guattarian thought. Only with the advent of these discussions, emerging in the mid-1990s, would the thought of these authors begin to act as intercessors capable of instigating an epistemic renewal within the field. Prior to this, entrapped within the debates dominating the educational landscape, Deleuze and Guattari appeared in educational research in a generic manner, cited incipiently and often used as arguments of authority. To reconstruct these scenarios, drawing from previous extensive research conducted within a diverse archival corpus (Vinci, 2014, 2019), comprising various bibliographical sources – primarily articles published in reputable journals, but also newspaper reports, books, lecture transcripts, and more – we aim to present the reader with a small excerpt of our documentary mass, in order to capture the general lines of force present within the production of each era.

Following Alliez (2015), we understand that, within the field of education, the study of Deleuzian, Guattarian, and Deleuze-Guattarian thought went beyond textual commentaries on the ideas of these authors, but rather aimed to make these texts function according to the plural regime of their inherent intensities, thereby equipping themselves, through interconnected readings, and in a more spiraling rather than linear process, with the essential conceptual tools for traversal (Alliez, 2015, p. 198-199). This engaged reading, diverging from the traditional rituals of academic analysis, would shape the ways in which the Brazilian educational field appropriated Deleuzian, Guattarian, and/or Deleuze-Guattarian thought. However, the apprehension of this process can only be understood by considering the distinct debates that unfolded within the realm of educational research, as well as the shift towards methodological discussions. As a kind of prelude, we present an interpretation of the partnership between Deleuze and Guattari that can indicate some important aspects of these authors' thought for educational research, as well as underscore their significance for the field.

Deleuze, Guattari: intercessors

Throughout our master's and doctoral research (Vinci, 2014, 2019), we mapped the educational productions that employed the theoretical framework of Deleuze, Guattari, and/or Deleuze-Guattari in Brazil, especially articles published in the most qualified journals of the field and defended dissertations/theses, taking into account the period 1980-2010. If we did not delve into the Guattarian references, as demonstrated well by the reference to the review 'As mil planícies de Guattari' (Escobar, 1982) that opens this article, it is because the movements of diffusion and appropriation of the thinking elaborated by the French psychoanalyst, in partnership or not with Deleuze, followed diverse paths and required specific analysis (Vinci, 2014). As an example, we can note two distinct moments in the appropriation of this thinker's thought: in the first moment, Guattari was read as a theorist aligned with the critical tradition, given his intense dialogue with certain theorists of the Marxist tradition - Trotsky, above all; in a second moment, we deal with the discrediting of his partnership with Deleuze. We find echoes of the first moment in appropriations made mainly in the 1980s; of the latter, in those of the 1990s and 2000s. Even today, it is not uncommon to come across studies whose exclusive reference to the name of Deleuze is the rule, even though many of the concepts used by researchers come from his joint endeavor with Guattari, especially the volumes of the collection 'Capitalism & Schizophrenia.' Deleuze himself (2007), at one point, pointed out the mistake of these appropriations that disregard his partnership with Guattari - as was the case with the reading presented by Arnaud Vilani, about which Deleuze made sharp criticisms in his *Letter to a Severe Critic*.⁶

Deleuze and Guattari, as argued on another occasion (Vinci & Ribeiro, 2022), worked together in a way that shifted each other's thinking. For our purposes, it is worth emphasizing that this mode of joint work

⁶ "It would be necessary to correct the way, right from the opening pages, you abstract Félix. Your viewpoint is correct, and one can speak of me without Félix. The fact is that *Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus* are entirely his as they are entirely mine, from two different perspectives. Hence the necessity, if you wish, to emphasize that if you choose to align with me, it is solely due to your own work and not due to any secondary or 'occasional' nature of Félix" (Deleuze, 2015, p. 82, author's emphasis).

prioritized a certain experimentation of ideas that both, each in their individual journey, dared to experience. In their work written in partnership with Claire Parnet, Deleuze refers to this movement of experimentation:

I was trying in my previous books to describe a certain exercise of thought. But describing it was not yet exercising thought in that way. (Similarly, shouting 'long live the multiple' is not yet doing it, it must be done. And it is not enough to say 'down with genres', it must be written in such a way that there are no longer any 'genres', etc.) Behold, with Félix, all this became possible, even if we failed (Deleuze & Parnet, 2004, p. 27-28, emphasis added)

Deleuze and Guattari were not mere work partners, but intercessors for each other.⁷ Intercessors, in Deleuze's terms (2007), operate as sensitive signs capable of engendering what the French philosopher calls 'thinking in thought' (Deleuze, 1988). As propagated in 'Difference and Repetition' (Deleuze, 1988), we are not naturally inclined to think; instead, we think only through a violent encounter with a sensitive sign that leads us to think⁸. We are victims of this encounter, more than agents. Moreover, thinking would not mean reflecting on this encounter or on other things, but in the company of this sensitive sign, creating something of the order of the unthinkable. Every thought, in a Deleuzian and/or Deleuze-Guattarian context, would be characterized as the creation of the unthinkable. Intercessors, in this vein, could be interpreted as sensitive and intensive interferences in the creative process of thought, fabulous interferences or caught in a "[...] flagrante delicto de fabular [...]" [flagrant crime of fabulation] (Deleuze, 2007, p. 157) capable of engendering the so-called 'thinking in thought'.

Thought only thinks coerced and forced, in the presence of that which 'gives thought', that which exists to be thought - and what exists to be thought is likewise the unthinkable or the unthought, that is, the perpetual fact that 'we have not yet thought.' It is true that, on the path that leads to what exists to be thought, everything starts from sensitivity. From the intensive to thought, it is always through an intensity that thought comes to us. The privilege of sensitivity as origin appears in this: what forces feeling and what can only be felt are the same thing in the encounter, whereas the two instances are distinct in other cases. In fact, the intensive, the difference in intensity, is both the object of the encounter and the object that the encounter raises sensitivity to (Deleuze, 1988, p. 210, emphasis added).

Following the path opened by Deleuze, if we do not think spontaneously, what do we do when we believe we are thinking? Generally, we remain tied to a certain infantile prejudice that conditions us to always conceive of thinking as a response, previously defined - either yes or no - to problems constructed the day before. We tend, in other words, to understand thinking as an action aimed at solving certain problems, but both the problems and the possible answers are defined in advance by the prevailing culture. To free ourselves from this limiting conception of what thinking means, Deleuze suggests that we start inventing our own problems. Since 'Bergsonism' (Deleuze, 2012), one of his early works, Deleuze insists on this issue, arguing that "[...] true freedom lies in a power of decision to constitute one's own problems: this power, 'semidivine', implies both the fading of false problems and the creative emergence of true one" (Deleuze, 2012, p. 11, emphasis added). Aiming to promote this liberation, it is advisable to proceed with a critique of what is conceived as thinking, refusing to understand it as a mere exercise of reflection on a given object, and to seek allies capable of dragging us into other realms of the thinkable, in which the unthought has not yet been thought, and therefore needs to be created. It is up to the intercessors, therefore, to promote this displacement, an intensive displacement.

In addition to the alliance forged between the two thinkers, each serving as an intercessor for the other, Deleuze's work, written in partnership with Guattari or not, would also seek thought allies, aiming to act as intercessors for researchers in the most diverse disciplinary fields. This desire, expressed countless times by Deleuze, would manifest itself in the refusal to offer his texts for mere reflection by others, demanding instead a treatment of his writings that did not go through a certain reverential behavior:

But a good way to read nowadays would be to treat a book as you listen to a record, as you watch a film or a television program, as you receive a song: any treatment of the book that requires special respect, a different kind of attention, comes from the past and definitively condemns the book. There is no question of difficulty or comprehension:

⁷ "I need my intercessors to express myself, and they would never express themselves without me; we always work in multiples, even when it's not apparent. And even more so when it is visible: Félix Guattari and I are intercessors for each other" (Deleuze, 2007, p. 156).

⁸ In *Proust and Signs*, Deleuze insists: "What compels us to think is the sign. The sign is the object of an encounter; but it is precisely the contingency of the encounter that guarantees the necessity of what it prompts us to think. The act of thinking does not arise from a mere natural possibility; on the contrary, it is the only true creation. Creation is the genesis of the act of thinking within thought itself. Now, this genesis involves something that violates thought, that removes it from its natural stupor, from its merely abstract possibilities. To think is always to interpret; that is, to explain; to develop is the form of pure creation. There are no explicit significations or clear ideas; only senses implicated in the sign exist; and if thought has the power to explain the sign, to develop it into an Idea, it is because the Idea was already present in the sign, in a state of implication and entanglement, in the obscure state of what compels thought" (Deleuze, 2010, p. 91).

concepts are exactly like sounds, colors, or images. They are intensities that are or are not suitable for you, that pass or do not pass. Pop philosophy. There is nothing to understand, nothing to interpret... The good way to read: all misunderstandings are good, provided, however, that they do not consist of interpretations but concern the use of the book, that multiply its use, that build a new language within its own language (Deleuze & Parnet, 2004, p. 14-15).

Therefore, Deleuzian and/or Deleuze-Guattarian writings would lend themselves to experimental appropriations and uses that would not be exhausted in the mere exegesis of their ideas. Instead, they would seek readers interested not in solving old problems, but in creating their own problems through a displacement or expansion of what is given - creating a language within their own. A reading capable, then, of connecting the written text to an outside, experimenting with it: “[...] this way of reading in intensity, in relation to the outside, flow against flow, machine with machines, experimentations, events in each one that have nothing to do with a book, fragmentation of the book, machination of it with other things, anything... etc., is a loving way” (Deleuze, 2007, p. 18).

It is not surprising, given this Deleuzian appeal to the educational field, that Deleuze and Guattari were summoned as companions to create other problems, to elaborate a different language in educational research. This creation, in turn, does not appeal to an uncontested appropriation of the methodological tools elaborated by the authors of ‘A Thousand Plateaus’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1998) - cartography, for example - but rather to a singular elaboration that takes up the fabulatory delirium of these tools and connects them with unprecedented problems in the field. However, this should not be done disregarding Guattari's role in the philosophical creation of ‘Anti-Oedipus’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2010) and ‘A Thousand Plateaus’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1998), as has often been done. Although today we come across research that recovers Guattari's legacy for the educational field (Carvalho & Camargo, 2015), this recovery is still done in a timid manner. In any case, understanding the way Deleuze and Guattari worked together helps us situate the appeal for an intensive reading present in the writings of these authors, whether jointly elaborated or not, that recent educational research seeks to recover. However, as the panorama of the diffusion of their thought to be presented shows, this interested or experimental appropriation of their writings only occurred at the turn of the 2000s. Before that, Deleuze and Guattari's thought was held captive by more complex demands, especially that derived from the paradigm crisis established within educational research, and for this reason, the appropriation of these authors occurred in an incidental manner, with little attention to specific elements of their thought.

The 1980s: beginning of the reception of deleuzian thought in Brazil

Sandra Benedetti (2007), in one of the first works concerned with measuring the impact of Deleuzian and Deleuze-Guattarian thought on Brazilian educational research – *Between Education and the Plane of Deleuze & Guattari's Thought: A Life...* – was astonished by the dizzying explosion of studies interested in approaching the educational realm through the conceptual framework erected by Deleuze, Guattari, and Deleuze-Guattari. In 2001, upon completing her master's research, there were only a few education articles that used the Deleuzian, Guattarian, and/or Deleuze-Guattarian theoretical framework as their main theoretical drivers; yet, less than five years later, upon starting her doctoral research, this number had nearly quintupled.

During her master's research (1996-2001), Alice was able to locate only four educational studies that brought Deleuze and Guattari into their main arguments. Three of them were doctoral theses in education and one in art education. In contrast, in the survey conducted in 2005, Guattari and, especially, Deleuze were mentioned in more than a thousand electronic sources, including theses, dissertations, articles on Brazilian academic production websites, as well as blogs by writers, journalists, artists, anarchists, and so on⁹. Currently, they are mentioned or theoretically underpin numerous Brazilian research projects produced across fields such as cinema, theater, arts, dance, communications, nursing, medicine, psychology, philosophy, among others. They are also present in dozens of educational research and studies across a wide range of thematic lines: curriculum, philosophy of education, teacher training, public policies, environmental education, education and multimedia, distance education, education in the arts (Benedetti, 2007, p. 23-24).

Contributing to this significant increase, as the researcher also notes, by 2005, two important journals in the field – *Educação & Realidade*, associated with UNICAMP, and *Educação & Pesquisa*, associated with UFRGS – had already published special issues dedicated to Deleuzian thought, attesting to its importance for research

9 We cannot fail to mention that, during this interval, certain modifications may have influenced this boom, contributing to the circulation of bibliographic material associated with the names of the authors in question. These include: the establishment of institutional repositories linked to Brazilian academic institutions, responsible for disseminating material produced within their postgraduate programs and others; as well as online portals for academic journals.

in the field and affirming the prognosis that these authors were no longer mere accessories for educational researchers but had gained relative importance. The exponential rise of research projects articulated with the theoretical framework of the authors of *A Thousand Plateaus* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1998) demonstrated, in the author's view (Benedetti, 2007), the centrality assumed by the *Philosophy of Difference*¹⁰ in the field of study, regardless of the thematic focus. This centrality is attributed to the pursuit of novelty by many researchers, interested in unpacking "[...] the conceptions of representation and recognition coupled with the idea of the educational subject, exposing the mechanisms of production and corruption of subjectivities by capitalism and its strategies of capture" (Benedetti, 2007, p. 160).

Endorsing the aforementioned prognosis, Cristiane Marinho (2014), in *Philosophy and Education in Brazil: From Identity to Difference*, comprehends that the emergence of this thought within educational studies led to a shift in the prevailing philosophical paradigms, particularly in discussions promoted in the subfield of Philosophy of Education, which was dominated by Marxist readings up until then. For Marinho (2014), the field of Philosophy of Education was relatively new in Brazil¹¹, with its emergence dating back to the mid-20th century, albeit somewhat timidly, intertwined with the field of History of Education. This early emergence explained the debates within the field and the crystallization of certain groups that, less interested in discussions like the one spearheaded by Deleuze, saw no reason to connect it to the debates he promoted¹². This situation, however, would change dramatically in the mid-1990s, with Deleuzian thought assuming a certain centrality in these debates and enabling a renewal of discussions in the field, as well as a complete autonomization of the Philosophy of Education field. Drawing from the Deleuze-Guattarian reading of philosophy as an eminently creative activity (Deleuze & Guattari, 1992), this would allow researchers in the field to move away from historical discussions about the meanings of education.

For the purposes of our article, it's worth noting that prior to this reconfiguration of the field, as observed by both Benedetti and Marinho, the thought of Deleuze, Guattari, and Deleuze-Guattari followed a tortuous path. Understanding their eruption into educational research requires considering the conflict that emerged in the mid-1970s and 1980s within the realm of critical studies. As noted by Maria Rocha (2022) in *Bourdieu à la brésilienne*, the field of critical studies, dominant in educational research until the 1990s, crystallized in the 1970s through dialogue with the work of sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and, secondarily, with that of philosopher Louis Althusser. The choice of Bourdieu's thought was not accidental; in the face of a dictatorial regime that restricted the unrestricted circulation of certain thinkers, especially those involved in Marxist discussions, the work of the French sociologist, still relatively unknown in Brazil, offered a way to conduct social criticism without necessarily relying on the theoretical-methodological arsenal of Marxism present, by contrast, in Althusser. The reproductive paradigm, influenced by Bourdieu and Althusser's readings, would become a significant and almost uncontested feature of those decades, responsible for the main criticisms directed towards the educational system – seen as a reproducer of social inequalities or as a mechanism reproducing state ideology. However, in the mid-1980s, we would witness the emergence of a new paradigm, the so-called Historical-Critical paradigm, which would point out the limitations of the preceding critical-reproductive reading and question its real capacity to change the social landscape.¹³ As Lucia Aranha (1992) notes, this was a moment of conflict within the critical paradigm that would intensify with the crises in the socialist world emerging in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, in summary, the field of educational studies was marked by a struggle between two distinct poles, both linked to the so-called critical realm. Even important authors like Paulo Freire converged towards one of these poles. According to Marinho (2014), although Freire only alludes to Marxism – his major influence derived from a kind of Christian existentialism – his placement within the field of critical studies was natural and unquestionable. Given the dominance of this debate within the field, authors who, in some way, did not

¹⁰The concept of *Philosophy of Difference* is used to refer to a certain French line of thought that emerged in the 1960s, articulated by various authors such as Gilles Deleuze and Jacques Derrida. It aims to break away from the Hegelian dialectic by drawing on Friedrich Nietzsche and his theory of forces. In "Nietzsche and Philosophy," Deleuze (2017) understands dialectic as a mode of thought that tends to erase difference in favor of identity, reducing the former to mere opposition. In this process, the exercise of thought primarily seeks identities and approximations through a representational game, disregarding any difference. Drawing from Nietzsche, Deleuze questions the forces that strive for the production of identity and the erasure of any trace of difference. In this context, difference is not secondary or a mere accident; rather, it is the matrix of possibility for all thought. The encounter with sensible signs, the so-called intercessors capable of engendering thought within thought, relies on encountering differential forces. However, for such an encounter to take place, one must escape the dialectical movement.

¹¹ Only in 1993, within the scope of ANPED - National Association for Postgraduate Education and Research in Education, did we witness the emergence of a Working Group (WG) focused on the topic of Philosophy of Education.

¹² Marinho (2014) identifies three general frameworks, namely: the one associated with the thought of Anísio Teixeira, closely aligned with a pragmatist approach inspired by the thinking of John Dewey; the one linked to Paulo Freire's thought, connected to Christian existentialism with a certain nod to Marxism; and finally, the perspective represented by Demerval Saviani, which is distinctly Marxist in nature. According to the author's analysis, these three perspectives would shape the field of Philosophy of Education until the mid-2000s, when a new epistemological perspective, linked to the Deleuzian and/or Deleuze-Guattarian Philosophy of Difference, would emerge.

¹³ We find this critique in Demerval Saviani (2021), an author who views the critical-reproductive paradigm as arising in response to the failure of May 68, denouncing the attempt by a certain group to promote social revolution through cultural revolution. While significant, this paradigm had a limitation in not considering teaching practice as an inherently critical gesture, as "[...] pedagogical practice always exists within the realm of symbolic violence, ideological inculcation, and the reproduction of production relations" (Saviani, 2021, p. 59).

directly engage with this critical discourse ended up being incidentally appropriated, often disregarding the specificity of their thinking. This was the case with Deleuze, Guattari, and Deleuze-Guattari, who emerged in this context as complete strangers.

Throughout the 1980s, there were occasional mentions of Deleuze or Guattari, with both authors rarely appearing together. Guattari, as demonstrated by studies carried out by José Carlos de Paula Carvalho (1985, 1987), was frequently associated with various other authors – for instance, Edgar Morin – and references to his thought were always incidental, with little in-depth exploration of his concepts and minimal engagement with Guattari's methodological approach. Deleuze, on the other hand, appeared only as a commentator on other philosophers, such as Kant (Borges, 1987) or Hume (Goto, 1989). Sometimes, as deduced from Carvalho's works (1987), Deleuze and Guattari appear as a kind of argument from authority, used to validate a reading and/or interpretation.

A notable exception during this period can be found in Aida Novelino's work (1988), the only author who engaged in a more in-depth discussion of Guattarian themes and concepts without reference to works written by or in partnership with Deleuze. She discussed topics like micropolitical movements and the production of subjectivities within capitalism, repositioning them to address her research problem: the production of an idealized concept of motherhood. According to the author:

[...] I consider it important, at this moment, to discuss Félix Guattari's notion of subjectivity production, to explain the process by which people are shaped to act, think, feel, etc. For him, subjectivation is a social dimension – not an aspect of the individual – and, as such, socially produced. It's the result of a collective process, not the sum of isolated subjectivities (Novelino, 1988, p. 23).

Although Novelino's reading delves more deeply into Guattarian discussions, her perception that the construction of an ideal – and therefore normative – profile of motherhood privileges how economic, political, and social interests shape this model over the centuries. Subjectivity can be read as a byproduct of ideological apparatuses present in society. This Marxist emphasis in the appropriations of Guattarian thought during the 1980s would be a constant.

In summary, we observe a more frequent presence of Guattari in the field's studies, even though the association of his thought often aligns him with a certain Marxist tradition – as is the case with Novelino (1988), who does so while recovering specific Guattarian concepts – or places him alongside various authors. In contrast, Deleuze appears as a commentator on various philosophers. In both cases, their works were read and appropriated incidentally, disregarding the specificity of their thought and placing them in discussion contexts that, to a contemporary reader, may seem contradictory. They were foreigners, therefore, without the right to citizenship, or at best enjoying a second-hand citizenship in the vast world of Brazilian research. However, as Marinho (2014) points out, the field of educational research was immersed in critical discussions, and within this theoretical strand, an embryonic struggle unfolded between advocates of reproduction and those associated with the historical-critical movement. This struggle would lead to a new paradigm, the so-called post-critical, within which Deleuze and Guattari would begin to gain prominence and enjoy a new phase of diffusion, marked by more attentive readings of their work rather than the incidental appropriations that characterized the 1980s.

Deleuze and Guattari in the 1990s

Within the field of educational research, it became customary to associate Deleuzian, Guattarian, and/or Deleuze-Guattarian thought with the emergence of the group referred to as 'post-critical' (Veiga-Neto, 1995; Corazza, 1996). Emerging primarily in the transition from the 1980s to the 1990s, the studies allocated under this label – sometimes also referred to as post-structuralist or post-modernist, at that time these designations were used interchangeably, or simply considered as 'post' theories (Corazza, 1996)¹⁴ – aimed to redirect canonical analyses in order to confront a certain crisis that had arisen within the previous critical perspective. This crisis was synthesized in the reading of Alfredo Veiga-Neto (1995), an author who stated:

[...] it is impossible to ignore that we are living in a time when Enlightenment ideals and promises are fading on the horizon of our hopes. The exhaustion of humanism and rationalism – at least as they were articulated in Modernity – can be felt both in social, political, and economic terms, as well as in ethical, epistemological, and aesthetic terms. It is mainly from there that the sensation of a profound and wide-ranging crisis is derived. It is in this scenario that many speak of a supposed end of the modern educational project (Veiga-Neto, 1995, p. 8).

¹⁴However, this does not imply that the authors disregarded the specificities of each of these designations. We can observe this attention to detail in the article by Tomaz Tadeu da Silva (1995), *The Modern Educational Project: Terminal Identity?* We believe that, as we will elaborate further, the attempt to counter the preceding critical paradigm characterized the research of the 1990s to the extent that, at that moment, the specification of these terms mattered relatively little.

Veiga-Neto's prognosis resonates with other publications from the 1990s, including those affiliated with the so-called critical paradigm. For instance, Lucia Aranha (1992) presented a very similar reading to the one mentioned above in her book *Pedagogia histórico-crítica: o otimismo dialético em educação* (Historical-Critical Pedagogy: Dialectical Optimism in Education). According to Aranha (1992), the field of educational research suffered from a profound sense of crisis, brought about by the inherent limitations of the critical tradition itself. This tradition, unable to keep pace with the political and social changes following the failure of the socialist historical project, ceased to question its aims and objectives. The author categorically stated: “[...] the use, by the theorists of the mentioned tendency, of dialectical historical materialism without a connection to contemporary theoretical and social dynamics may be contributing to possible inadequacies/gaps and/or misunderstandings” (Aranha, 1992, p. 8). As the only possible way out, the author insisted on the urgency of establishing a dialogue with other theoretical perspectives, in order to broaden the epistemic scope of the field and thereby renew the paradigm in question, and possibly enable “[...] greater complexity in educational theoretical/analytical frameworks, taking into account the complexity of present-day societies” (Aranha, 1992, p. 8). Among the list of authors mentioned by the author to promote this broadening or complexification of theoretical/analytical frameworks, there were numerous Brazilian authors associated with the historical-critical paradigm – such as Demerval Saviani, José Carlos Libâneo, and others – as well as authors distant from the critical tradition – Jean-François Lyotard, Edgar Morin, Michel Serres, etc. Like Veiga-Neto in his prognosis, Aranha (1992) also attacked the universalisms that permeated the slogans of critical theory in education, insisting on the need to historicize the concepts and intentions that shaped the field of education.

Despite the theoretical positions, the diagnosis of a crisis prevailing in educational research during the 1990s marked the emergence of a search for new paradigms in the field; in short, it marked a concern with producing an epistemic shift (Silva, 1995)¹⁵. The emergence of the so-called post-critical group, although it could be categorized simply as a superficial response to the critical paradigm that had dominated research since the 1980s or a futile attempt to “[...] overcome the contradictions generated within the very [critical] paradigm that entraps us [...]” (Veiga-Neto, 1995, p. 8), went beyond the performance of a merely negative task, aimed at combating the previous paradigm. Instead, it contributed to a considerable epistemic renewal, to the extent that it now inspires a considerable range of educational research (Marinho, 2014).

It is important to note that in the mid-1990s, authors who had been circulating in the field of educational research in a diffuse manner – such as Michel Foucault, present in the area's research since 1970 (Aquino, 2018) – began to gain prominence. Among them, Deleuze and Guattari emerged as important partners for educational researchers, albeit in a timid manner at first. Their importance to the research developed in the field would be attested in the 2000s and 2010s, thanks to the consolidation of the post-critical studies, especially in the field of curriculum studies (Paráiso, 2004, 2005), and due to the emergence of a certain rupture within this same group that allowed researchers aligned exclusively with the Deleuzian and/or Deleuze-Guattarian theoretical perspective to proceed with their investigative work autonomously. Educational studies aligned with the thought of Deleuze and Deleuze-Guattari, as argued elsewhere (Vinci, 2016), would eventually dissociate themselves from post-critical studies, as they abandoned their concern to renew, displace, or problematize the previous paradigm, and began seeking to create their own perspective on the objects of the field, a perspective that was more poetic in nature and clearly expressed in the methodological discussions that gained prominence in the mid-2000s.

This change in the relationship with the thought of Deleuze, Guattari, and Deleuze-Guattari also reflects a larger change that occurred in the Brazilian academic milieu. As Eric Alliez (2015) noted, the 1990s marked a new moment in the reception of Deleuze's thought in philosophy departments. This change allowed for the emergence of the first major commentators on the Deleuzian corpus, whose works offered an interpretative framework for Deleuze's thought that served as a basis for theoretical discussions not only in philosophy but also in education. The author states:

It is in these same years [1990s] that the situation begins to change in a large number of philosophy departments, which until then had largely ignored the inventiveness of Deleuzian concepts due to their resistance to the disciplinary history of philosophy and to the semiofficial division of the philosophical world into its two analytical and phenomenological blocs. The emergence of a new generation of young professors will trigger this transformation. For some who broke with the older and established generation, whose dogmatic and/or provincial

¹⁵ Cristiane Marinho (2014), in *From Identity to Difference: Philosophy of Education in Brazil*, argues that it was during this time that we began to witness the emergence of a philosophical perspective that broke away from the primacy of identity, a hallmark of all philosophical trends present in our country since colonial times. This perspective pointed towards a thought of difference expressed in French authors such as Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Gilles Deleuze.

formation – not always without reason – will be denounced, the image of '68 thought' (that is, Deleuze and Foucault – whose seminar on 'truths and legal forms' offered in 1973 at PUC in Rio de Janeiro and soon published had definitively marked minds) will represent something of the order of a cultural alternative in which a decidedly post-Nietzschean and transdisciplinary practice of contemporary philosophy is negotiated. For others, who were more numerous and possessed a more 'classical' background, the opening of the post-Heideggerian question concerning a philosophical history of philosophy, since it could no longer be satisfied with a destined identification with the obligatory theme of the end of philosophy and the forgetting of being, was becoming increasingly intertwined with an inquiry into the conditions of the aporetic exhaustion of phenomenology and analytic philosophy. Merleau-Ponty and Wittgenstein, in this context, stood out as notable interpreters; but also Deleuze, the outsider, whose creative thought was gaining a new relevance within a faculty threatened by instability (Alliez, 2015, p. 1999, emphasis added).

Similar to the educational field, where we observed a crisis of the critical paradigm, philosophy departments were experiencing a crisis of the dominant paradigms at that time. This crisis led them to seek solace in the realm of Deleuzian thought. Deleuze, through his engaged readings of the history of philosophy and his critique of its repressive character (Deleuze, 1988), offered an intriguing avenue for those situated within these departments, as it allowed them to contemplate the construction of a philosophizing history of philosophy and, furthermore, to conceive an alternative conception of what philosophy could be. It is worth noting that while Deleuze received significant attention, Guattari did not. This shift within philosophy departments regarding the reception of Deleuze and Guattari's ideas would have a noticeable impact on numerous educational works that emerged in the early 1990s, aimed at contemplating the theme of teaching philosophy.

In the dawn of the 1990s, we witnessed the emergence of initial discussions within the educational field, seeking to organically connect Deleuze's and Deleuze-Guattari's thought with the thematic concerns of the discipline. This appropriation was primarily driven by specific sectoral discussions, such as those undertaken by authors debating the guiding assumptions of philosophy education in our country, as well as a change taking place within philosophy departments. For our purposes, following the perspective proposed by Marinho (2014), discussions about the creative primacy of philosophy, as understood by Deleuze and Guattari (1992) as an activity primarily characterized by the creation of concepts, marked an unprecedented turning point for researchers in the field. Celso Favaretto (1992) and Ricardo Fabbrini (1993), for example, insist that in *What Is Philosophy?*, a book published in France in 1991 and translated into Portuguese in 1992¹⁶, a new conception of the guiding intentions of philosophy education in our country is found. According to Fabbrini, for instance, it falls to the Philosophy teacher in the classroom to "[...] deconstruct and reconstruct the text – work on it: trace its plane of immanence, invent or reinvent the concepts and their coexistence" (Fabbrini, 1993, p. 127). This defense, aligned with the Deleuzo-Guattarian ideas expressed in 'What Is Philosophy?' (Deleuze & Guattari, 1992), seeks to renew the stagnant conception of philosophy education as merely a conduit for discussing or explicating universal formative ideals. Though they recognize the uniqueness of Deleuze and Guattari's interpretation, as well as their importance in redefining the purpose of teaching Philosophy in our country, these authors do not extensively engage with the authors of *A Thousand Plateaus* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1998). However, other works do, albeit with reservations.

Nyvia Cristina Bandeira Castro, in an article titled *Discursive Issues: Revisiting Some Considerations* (1993), presents a more exegetic and dense reading of Deleuze's work to address matters concerning discursive analysis and, especially, the politics of signification at play in our society – revisiting the discussions from *The Logic of Sense* (Deleuze, 2009), a work by Deleuze translated into Portuguese in the mid-1970s. Deleuze-Guattarian concepts like 'watchword, difference', and many others circulate in a more organic manner, being analyzed and operationalized within the text itself. Unlike texts that would emerge in the 2000s with a more experimental nature, Castro's (1993) work still adheres to the rules of a certain exegetic reading, focused more on understanding the specificity of Deleuze's conceptual apparatus than on experimenting with it. Deleuze, in turn, while his thought's specificities are safeguarded, appears alongside various authors, particularly within the realm of linguistic discussions – Benveniste, Ducrot, etc. In truth, this interest in comprehending the theoretical framework forged by Deleuze, rather than merely experimenting with it, becomes a hallmark of the appropriation movements of his thought throughout the entire decade of the 1990s.

In this vein, for instance, we would witness the emergence towards the end of that decade of research endeavors interested in experimenting with concepts such as transversality or rhizome, similar to the movement undertaken

¹⁶ The early translation of the book *What is Philosophy?* into Portuguese can be attributed to the efforts of Eric Alliez. He spearheaded the newly established "Trans" collection, which systematically introduced the works of Deleuze and Guattari in our country through the publishing house Editora 34. This publishing house is one of the primary venues for disseminating the works of these authors in Brazil.

by Silvio Gallo (1999). Gallo, in *Transversality and Education: Contemplating a Non-Disciplinary Education* (1999), aiming to escape the limitations imposed by a certain paradigm prevalent in the field of scientific discussions, which tends to hierarchize and discipline knowledge primarily through the metaphor of the tree of knowledge¹⁷, revisits the notion of the rhizome forged by Deleuze and Guattari (1998), seeking to subvert the “[...] order of the arboreal metaphor, taking as a paradigm that type of rootlike stem of some plants, formed by a myriad of small intertwined roots amid small storage bulbs, questioning the intrinsic relationship between the various areas of knowledge” (Gallo, 1999, p. 30). Gallo's discussion, his reappropriation of the rhizome concept as a way to displace certain canonical discussions in the field, still aims to expand theoretical horizons, much like other productions of the decade. However, it does so in a more organically engaged dialogue with Deleuzian, Guattarian, and Deleuze-Guattarian thought. In Gallo (1999), the authors are not summoned to join a generic group of authors, nor are they merely utilized as arguments of authority. Furthermore, the guiding principles of the rhizomatic paradigm are presented as tools for working within a distinct methodological perspective from the canonical one for the field. While Gallo does not deeply delve into methodological discourse, aiming to construct a tool for researchers in the field, his work begins to indicate this intention that would take precedence in the productions of the subsequent decade. Moreover, Gallo emerged as one of the principal advocates of this thought within the realm of educational research.

On one hand, Deleuze and Guattari start to gain recognition from researchers in the field, whether due to specific discussions – such as those related to philosophy education – or due to their distinctive conceptual framework that enables researchers in Education to tentatively steer toward discussions about difference. On the other hand, we observe the persistence of occasional interpretations of their thought, still situating them within larger analytical categories – post-critical or Marxist – to make them comprehensible to a broader readership. Even today, one could argue, these appropriations coexist in relative harmony, spanning from more radical appropriations of their thought to fleeting or rushed mentions – hastily linking them to epistemic fields that might be foreign to them, such as certain Marxist interpretations. Undoubtedly, far from denying this evaluation, it transpires that in the 1990s, the appropriations of Deleuzian, Guattarian, and/or Deleuze-Guattarian thought still resonate largely with the crisis of paradigms that prevailed in the field in the preceding decade; the research developed under the aegis of this thought, in other words, still emerges within a responsive, occasionally negative framework, aimed at addressing an assumed crisis and indicating alternative paths.

Comparing the production developed in the 1990s with what would take shape later, such as those developed by Sandra Corazza (2002), it becomes evident that while those of the 1990s still seek to reconsider or even challenge the preceding paradigm, the research developed at the turn of the 21st century seeks to achieve autonomy. They comprehend that the endeavor is no longer about surpassing or reconsidering prior paradigms, but about crafting or producing a distinct kind of Education. As highlighted elsewhere (Vinci, 2016), such research aims to assume a stance of pure positivity and creativity, rather than being confined to the negative role ascribed to them previously. While the research of the 1990s did not pursue autonomy – except for a few exceptional cases, as we will explore in the subsequent section – a significant portion of this was due to how Deleuze, Guattari, and Deleuze-Guattarian thought was disseminated in the educational field. It was through works that indiscriminately positioned these authors within a broader theoretical context, which conventionally came to be known as the post-critical framework.

Lastly, it was during the 1990s that we witnessed the formation of a significant group of researchers, mostly associated with UFRGS, who were eager to foster an epistemic renewal in the field. We find echoes of this effort in the journal *Teoria e Educação*, a publication with a brief lifespan – published between 1990 and 1992 –, yet it provided researchers with access to previously unpublished theoretical discussions within our country. The dossiers featured in this journal included authors linked to the field of ‘cultural studies’, such as Stuart Hall, and discussions that brought elements of French post-structuralist thought into the foreground, particularly Michel Foucault. With editorial figures like Tomaz Tadeu da Silva and Alfredo Veiga-Neto, both important disseminators of this French thought in our country, the journal played a pivotal role in propelling the research that came to be known as post-critique. Even after its discontinuation in 1992, its editors remained committed to the dissemination of this thought, as evident in the trilogy organized by Silva and Veiga-Neto: *Critical Educational Theory in Postmodern Times*, organized by Tomaz Tadeu da Silva in 1993 (Silva, 1993); *The Subject of Education: Foucauldian Studies*, also organized by Silva in 1994 (Silva, 1994); and finally, *Post-Structuralist Critique and Education*, organized by Alfredo Veiga-Neto in 1995.

¹⁷ According to Silvio Gallo: “The arboreal paradigm implies a hierarchy of knowledge, as a way to mediate and regulate the flow of information through the inner paths of the tree of knowledge. The leafy tree that represents knowledge presents it in a disciplinary manner, fragmented (the branches) and hierarchized (the branches branch out and do not communicate with each other unless they pass through the trunks)” (Gallo, 1999, p. 30).

This herculean effort, in essence, instrumental in introducing thinkers beyond the realm of critique, granted Brazilian readers access to a multitude of other theoretical perspectives, yet not necessarily those represented by the Deleuzian, Guattarian, and/or Deleuze-Guattarian perspectives. Deleuze and Guattari, collectively or individually, appeared more as commentators, while the appropriation of their thought, consequently, continued to occur incidentally. It can be inferred that, within the post-critical studies, the thought of these authors was not distinguished from that of other authors labeled as post-structuralist. Much of this can be attributed to the researchers of that period engaging in a struggle against the preceding theoretical field, often referred to as critical, thereby being limited to a task predominantly of a negative nature. It's only as we progress into the 1990s that we observe a more enriched discussion with these authors. Towards the end of this decade, the first discussions about transversality (Gallo, 1999), becoming (Fonseca, 1999), and even tentative movements toward an alternative methodology, cartography (Gauthier, 1999), emerge. These discussions, although cautious, herald the change that would transpire in the transition to the 2000s – a change that would reintegrate the main lines of Deleuze's, Guattari's, and Deleuze-Guattari's thought in promoting new methodological approaches, experimental methodologies keen on fostering not just a paradigm shift or a confrontation with the preceding paradigm, but rather enabling the emergence of the unthought within education.

Toward an alternative educational thought: methodological appropriations of deleuzian and deleuze-guattarian thinking

Among the publications that emerged in the 1990s, one stood out due to its singularity: the book *Investigative Paths I: New Perspectives in Educational Research*, organized by Marisa Vorraber Costa (1996a). This particular book, interested in presenting new methodological perspectives, sought to provide an outlet for all those engaged in overcoming the “[...] limitations imposed by the methodological formalism established by modern science [...]” (Costa, 1996b, p. 14). Without a doubt, this book could be considered one whose intentions extended and corroborated those expressed by other publications of the period, almost all of which were interested in promoting a surpassing or a displacement in relation to the prevailing epistemological perspective. Focusing on methodological discussions proved to be a more conducive field for this task, as it allowed an appropriation of the so-called post-structuralist authors that could escape the mere incidental citation of their ideas, thereby avoiding their approximation to dissonant theoretical paradigms. For example, working with Deleuze's theoretical perspective based on difference from a Marxist-dialectical reading, as occurred in the 1990s, where differences would transmute into mere opposition. In this work, we can discern an effort not only to discuss the authors' ideas and present them to a broader audience but also to construct cohesive methodological tools in their company. In other words, in ‘Investigative Paths’ (Costa, 1996a), we observe, beyond the interest in expanding or challenging the dominant theoretical paradigm, a concern in constructing a new epistemic field, abandoning the old thought structures that animated educational research until then. Undoubtedly, this task, capable of generating anxiety in those who dare challenge the established scientific parameters that have endured for centuries, as expressed by Marisa Costa:

[...] it is necessary to criticize the game of reproducing models so well established by the epistemological architecture of enlightenment, which institutes vigilance in all fields, making us subjects to its dictates, both thematic and methodological. The intellectual and emotional fragility that afflicts us when we have to confront methodologies in our investigations is the result of the deification of this kind of thought we call science, which is impregnated with ‘parameters’ that frame everything, homogenizing all, defining right and wrong, good and bad, false and true, etc. (Costa, 1996b, p. 18, emphasis added).

The publication, as noted above, followed the trend of its time; most of its articles sought to position themselves against the modern scientific tradition and its claim to truth, operationalizing a negative task. However, they innovated by indicating the need to create our own methodological guidelines for dealing with singular objects, for constructing our own problems. Like other publications of the period, the compilation also included articles that engaged with a variety of authors, particularly Michel Foucault, but also Martin Heidegger, Hans-Georg Gadamer, and, importantly for our focus, Gilles Deleuze. For the first time in our research, we encountered a text aimed at discussing educational themes, specifically research methodology, from an organic reading of the Deleuzian and Deleuze-Guattarian corpus. The author, Sandra Mara Corazza (1996) – one of the most eminent researchers in Education working with Deleuze and Deleuze-Guattari's thought in Brazil – provided insightful reflections from what she terms the ‘stopping point’, the point at which the researcher needs to problematize their

own research movements, the labyrinth they entered to produce an “[...] other mode of experimentation (not in the positivist mode) of take-off (not in the phenomenological mode) of the knowledges, powers, and forms of subjectification that permeate and produce [our] research practices” (Corazza, 1996, p. 105). Assuming from the outset that this endeavor would require the construction of a new vocabulary and a new methodology, in order to escape the canonical views of the field about what it means to conduct research in Education, Corazza found a powerful ally in Deleuze for this task.

In this context, Deleuze appeared as a member of the ‘post’ theorizations, and Corazza, at this moment, was still seeking to understand how this “[...] pororoca [meeting of waters] between critical educational research practice and post-theorizations came about [...]” (Corazza, 1996, p. 106), as well as the best way to position herself within this so-called pororoca. Although the negative task is still present – questioning the previous paradigm – a force prevails in her text that, years later, would be better explored in other works like *Towards a Philosophy of Hell in Education: Nietzsche, Deleuze, and Other Outcasts* (Corazza, 2002), in which the negative work gives way to purely positive experimentation: to lead thought to fabricate other possibilities, to enhance the potency of pedagogical practice, or to subject educational research to confront a fictional malady like never before. The pursuit of creating other problems in educational research would replace the concern of problematizing the previous, so-called critical paradigm; it is no longer about denouncing its limitations and expanding its scope of action, but about producing another thought about education. These endeavors are manifest in the general rallying cries that structure the intentions of the work:

It might be criticized for having little to do with the rational, the systematic, the academic, with scientific theorizing, serious and grave in education. And that is even proposed. Without being a concession to exoticism, esotericism, or eschatology, the book claims its fictional illness, its curative anomaly, its valetudinary state. It believes that only through the exalted madness of thought can educational imagination trace its own plane of immanence and create its characters, as conceptual invention establishes its festival (Corazza, 2002, p. 13).

Corazza's work aims to think/experiment with the hell that runs through the world of Education, turning it into her point of hallucination, a “[...] weapon of war capable of shooting projectiles at absolute speed against the fortresses of Educational Bliss” (Corazza, 2002, p. 12). This experimentation, in turn, would be conducted by creating what the author called an infernal abstract machine, forged with concepts from the philosophy of Nietzsche, Deleuze, Guattari, and other outcasts. This methodological tool would enable accessing the unthinkable – the thought-other of Education (Corazza, 2002).

The intent expressed by Corazza would mark many other works that emerged in the period, to the point that we can affirm that the educational production of the 2000s, aligned with Deleuzian and Deleuze-Guattarian thought, would assume the task of methodological renewal through the creation of theoretical tools capable of serving as intercessors. We observe this concern in the bibliographic explosion that we would witness at the end of the decade, with the book *Cartography Method Clues* (Passos, Kastrup, & Escóssia, 2012b), originally published in 2009 and organized by Virginia Kastrup, Eduardo Passos, and Liliana de Escóssia, serving as a landmark in the field. Henceforth, the search for methodological tools involving the conceptual apparatus of Deleuze and Deleuze-Guattari would become frequent in the field, and gradually, these discussions would be articulated with an incitement to produce movements of experimentation. The authors of the aforementioned book insist on this articulation that seeks to conceptualize methodology as a kind of experimentation:

Hence the traditional sense of methodology imprinted in the etymology of the word: *metá-hódos*. With this direction, research is defined as a path (*hódos*) predetermined by the given starting goals. In turn, cartography proposes a methodological reversal: to transform *metá-hódos* into *hódos-metá*. This reversal consists of a wager on the experimentation of thought – a method not to be applied but to be experienced and assumed as an attitude. (Passos, Kastrup, & Escóssia, 2012a, p. 10).

Experimentation as an attitude, not just a method. An attitude that dares to confront the old methodologies and markers of scientific work, especially by proposing that the important aspect is not apprehending/reflecting on the object, but intervening in processes, thinking other possibilities. An attitude that seeks to push the researcher beyond the limits imposed by the scientific field, enabling them to observe their object from unheard-of angles constructed in the very movement of research. There are no safe markers or predefined paths in this perspective, only experimentation and potentials to be experienced/invented.

Many other researchers also sought to forge their own methodologies, employing this same kind of experimentation. Sandra Corazza (2012), for example, sought to think it based on her vital foundation, and in her work *Valéry-Deleuze Method: A Drama in Intellectual Comedy*, we read: “[...] as artists or operators of

forces, by actualizing experimentations of vital postures, researchers turn research clinical; and, by diagnosing the vital type of each Vidarbo of AICE (its de-Outside), they turn discourse into criticism” (Corazza, 2012, p. 1022). It is interesting to note how the methodological experimentation propagated by the researcher aligns her with a certain artistic endeavor; in fact, this will be the second major trend of the discussions that emerged in the 2000s, namely: to conceive educational research as an art of thought, and the researcher as an artist.

The experimentation advocated by these works, therefore, would be a kind of artistic methodology aimed at problematizing everyday objects, a problematization that seeks to remove these objects from the sensory grid in which they are immersed, so that we can establish a different relationship with them. For this reason, as Corazza (2017) insists, such research is akin to a certain poetic practice, an endeavor interested in casting a different gaze upon the world, thus allowing a detachment from empirical objects that does not resemble the detachment propagated by modern sciences, but rather that advocated by art, comprehending detachment as the invention or experimentation of other possible meanings for everyday objects.

Thinking of educational research in terms of experimentation, we believe, would allow us to understand it in terms of potency, considering what it is capable of achieving or producing when connected with so many other things. These things would not be found in a dazzling elsewhere or a future to come, but in the mundane here and now, resignifying practices and objects from a different perspective, more poetic or artistic. We would then conceive research as immanent experimentation, eschewing the judgment of it through transcendent scientific parameters or universal values. There would be a reconfiguration of the field, made possible by these movements of experimentation, resulting from the emergence of a new understanding of what research means. Research would no longer mean answering questions in order to achieve an external goal but creating questions in dialogue with educational trivialities, with its much-maligned present.

These movements of experimentation in Education would also allow for an ethical-aesthetic reformulation of the field, enabling the establishment of a thought policy not categorized by transcendent markers. The researcher's attitude towards their object, under the aegis of experimentation, would demand a new way of relating to thought. Thought would not seek to represent or reflect reality but to fabricate other possibilities through the experimentation of this very reality. In this context, the researcher would not seek to confirm a pre-defined truth or hypothesis, nor be content to describe certain practices; instead, they would seek to experiment with the unthinkable through their work. Here, reality would emerge as a great intercessor, a companion to be experienced. Thus, experimentation in educational research would come to mean a search for creating original and yet unstated or configured problems. The experimentation undertaken by a researcher would sound, therefore, like a unique and individual artistic creation, to be evaluated by what it fosters, the universe it erects, and the affective impacts it generates – the amount of potency it presents for those interested in problematizing the educational field. Ultimately, due to its poetics.

Final considerations

With this article, our aim was not only to present some of the movements of diffusion and appropriation of Deleuze and Deleuze-Guattari's thought in our country, particularly within educational research, but also to contextualize them. If today the authors of *A Thousand Plateaus* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1998) hold a prominent place in the field of educational research, it is the result of struggles and battles fought within the discipline. Initially appropriated due to the crisis that emerged within the critical paradigm that animated research during the 1980s, and integrated alongside a heterogeneous range of authors, Deleuze and Guattari gradually secured their place and established themselves as important theorists for the field. Acknowledged for their more experimental character, educational research developed under the aegis of Deleuzian and Deleuze-Guattarian thought received recognition due to its concern in constructing theoretical tools that, more than merely seeking to question or reformulate the preceding theoretical paradigm, aim to consider the problems of education through a lens more poetic than scientific. The construction of a unique problematics entails fostering new affects within the educational realm, demanding a reading in intensity in which texts do not aim to present a truth or solve a pre-constructed problem, but instead present themselves as intercessors, sensitive signs through which we can begin to contemplate the unthinkable in education. In some manner, this pretense reached its maximum potency within methodological discussions, to the extent that today, when dealing with a vast array of research interested in conducting cartography or geared towards the production of becoming in education, we must acknowledge the debt of all these studies to such discussions.

Clearly, this did not occur without some losses: Guattari, for instance, once a prominent thinker, had his name erased from research produced during the 1990s and 2000s, only to be recently recovered. Furthermore, as highlighted by Benedetti (2007), these more experimental research endeavors are often understood as unserious or insignificant, since their immediate engagement is not aligned with human emancipation or civic promotion – thinking within the grand universals that surround the field. For those incapable of recognizing the importance of such research, it is worth recalling the Deleuzian discussion (Deleuze & Parnet, 2004) about the tendency of questions regarding the future of a revolution to fail. Before a question about the future, it is necessary to work with and against the present time, in order to promote a revolutionary becoming of individuals. Instead of a question that aspires towards an elsewhere, perhaps unattainable, Deleuze invites us to engage with the here and now, with the immanence of relationships. This engagement requires a sensitive change, more than an intellectual one, an appeal to construct different relationships with the space of the real, relationships more inclined towards creating other possibilities not configured by grand universal ideals that tend to homogenize relationships and silence difference. For a field so laden with slogans, as is the educational one, learning to regard the everyday school environment from a different perspective seems to be an urgent task, and therefore, it is advisable not to disregard the experimentation promoted by these studies that continue in the company of the Deleuzian, Guattarian, and Deleuze-Guattarian theoretical framework.

References

- Alliez, E. (2015). Deleuze no Brasil. *Cadernos de Subjetividade*, 1(esp.), 197-200.
- Aquino, J. G. (2018). Foucault e a pesquisa educacional brasileira, depois de duas décadas e meia. *Educação & Realidade*, 43(1), 45-71. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-623661605>
- Aranha, L. (1992). *Pedagogia histórico-crítica: o otimismo dialético em educação*. São Paulo, SP: Educ.
- Benedetti, S. C. G. (2007). *Entre a educação e o plano de imanência de Gilles Deleuze e Félix Guattari: uma vida...* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.
- Borges, B. I. (1987). Os sentidos da crítica. *Educação e Filosofia*, 2(3), 61-79.
- Carvalho, A. F., & Camargo, A. C. (2015). Guattari e a topografia da máquina escolar. *ETD – Educação Temática Digital*, 17(1), 107-124. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20396/etd.v17i1.8634821>
- Carvalho, J. C. P. (1985). A dimensão do imaginário na problemática organizacional da educacional. *Revista da Faculdade de Educação da USP*, 11(1), 19-42.
- Carvalho, J. C. P. (1987). O imaginário e o pensamento organizacional na obra de Edgar Morin: seus fundamentos antropológicos. *Revista da Faculdade de Educação da USP*, 13(1), 43-89.
- Castro, N. C. B. (1993). Questões discursivas: retomando algumas considerações. *Educação e Filosofia*, 7(13), 33-44.
- Corazza, S. M. (1996) Labirintos da pesquisa, diante dos ferrolhos. In M. V. Costa(Org.), *Caminhos investigativos I: novos olhares na pesquisa em educação* (p. 103-128). São Paulo, SP: DP&A Editora.
- Corazza, S. (2012). Método Valéry-Deleuze: um drama na comédia intelectual da educação. *Educação & Realidade*, 37(3), 1009-1030.
- Corazza, S. M. (2002). *Por um inferno em educação: Nietzsche, Deleuze e outros afins*. Belo Horizonte, MG: Autêntica.
- Corazza, S. M. (2017). *Docência-pesquisa da diferença: poéticas do arquivo-mar*. Porto Alegre, RS: Doisa, UFRGS.
- Costa, M. V. (1996a). *Caminhos investigativos I: novos olhares na pesquisa em educação*. São Paulo, SP: DP&A Editora.
- Costa, M. V. (1996b). Introdução: novos olhares na pesquisa em educação. In M. V. Costa (Org.), *Caminhos investigativos I: novos olhares na pesquisa em educação* (p. 13-22). São Paulo, SP: DP&A Editora.
- Cusset, F. (2008). *Filosofia Francesa: a influência de Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze & Cia*. Porto Alegre, RS: Artes Médicas.
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Diferença e repetição*. São Paulo, SP: Graal.
- Deleuze, G. (2007). *Conversações: 1972-1990*. São Paulo, SP: Editora 34.
- Deleuze, G. (2009). *Lógica do sentido*. São Paulo, SP: Perspectiva.
- Deleuze, G. (2010). *Proust e os signos*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Forense Universitária.

- Deleuze, G. (2012). *Bergsonismo*. São Paulo, SP: Editora 34.
- Deleuze, G. (2015). *Lettres et autres textes*. Paris, FR: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Deleuze, G. (2017). *Nietzsche e a filosofia*. São Paulo, SP: N-1 Edições.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1992). *O que é a Filosofia?*. São Paulo, SP: Editora 34.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1998). *Mille Plateaux*. Paris, FR : Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2010). *O Anti-Édipo*. São Paulo, SP: Editora 34.
- Deleuze, G., & Parnet, C. (2004). *Diálogos*. Lisboa, PT: Relógio D'Água.
- Derrida, J. (2004). O que quer dizer ser um filósofo francês hoje?. In J. Derrida, *Papel-máquina* (p. 305-314). São Paulo, SP: Estação Liberdade.
- Dosse, F. (2010). *Gilles Deleuze & Félix Guattari: biografias cruzadas*. Porto Alegre, RS: Artmed.
- Escobar, C. H. (1991). Apresentação. In C. H. Escobar (Org.), *Dossier Deleuze* (p. 7-8). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Hólon Editorial.
- Escobar, P. (1982, 5 de setembro). As mil planícies de Guattari. *Folha de São Paulo*, p. 5.
- Fabbrini, R. N. (1993). O ensino de filosofia: uma arte da multiplicação dos signos?. *Educação e Filosofia*, 12(6), 125-127.
- Fonseca, T. M. G. (1999). A subjetivação na perspectiva da diferença: heterogênesse e devir. *Educação e Realidade*, 24(1), 61-72.
- Favaretto, C. F. (1992). Sobre o ensino de filosofia. *Revista da Faculdade de Educação*, 19(1), 97-102.
- Gallo, S. (1999). Transversalidade e educação: pensando uma educação não-disciplinar. In N. Alves, & R. L. Garcia (Orgs.), *O sentido da Escola* (p. 15-36). Petrópolis, RJ: DP&A Editora.
- Gauthier, J. (1999). O que é pesquisar – entre Deleuze-Guattari e o candomblé, pensando mito, ciência, arte e cultura de resistências. *Educação & Sociedade*, 20(69), 13-33.
- Goto, R. (1989). O ceticismo de Hume. *Educação e Filosofia*, 4(7), 1-5.
- Guattari, F. (1982). *Guattari entrevista Lula*. São Paulo, SP: Brasiliense.
- Guattari, F., & Rolnik, S. (2010). *Micropolíticas: cartografias do desejo*. Petrópolis, RJ: Editora Vozes.
- Marinho, C. M. (2014). *Filosofia e educação no Brasil: identidade e diferença*. São Paulo, SP: Edições Loyola.
- Novelino, A. M. (1988). Maternidade: um perfil idealizado. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 65(1), 21-28.
- Paraíso, M. A. (2004). Pesquisas pós-críticas em educação no Brasil: esboço de um mapa. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 34(1), 283-303.
- Paraíso, M. A. (2005). Currículo-mapa: linhas e traçados das pesquisas pós-críticas sobre currículo no Brasil. *Educação & Realidade*, 30(1), 67-82.
- Passos, E., Kastrup, V., & Escóssia, L. (2012a). Apresentação. In E. Passos, V. Kastrup, & L. Escóssia (Orgs.), *Pistas do método da cartografia: pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade* (p. 8-18). Porto Alegre, RS: Sulina.
- Passos, E., Kastrup, V., & Escóssia, L. (2012b). *Pistas do método da cartografia: pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre, RS: Sulina.
- Rocha, M. E. M. (2022). *Bourdieu à Brasileira*. Recife, PE: Confraria dos Ventos.
- Saviani, D. (2021). *Pedagogia histórico-crítica: primeiras aproximações*. São Paulo, SP: Editores Associados.
- Silva, T. T. (1995). O projeto educacional moderno: identidade terminal. In A. Veiga-Neto (Org.), *Crítica pós-estruturalista e educação* (p. 245-260). Porto Alegre, RS: Sulina.
- Silva, T. T. (1994). O sujeito da educação: estudos foucaultianos. São Paulo, SP: Editora Vozes.
- Silva, T. T. (1993). Teoria educacional crítica em tempos pós-modernos. Porto Alegre, RS: Artes Médicas.
- Veiga-Neto, A. (1995). Prefácio. In Veiga-Neto, A. (Org.). *Crítica pós-estruturalista e educação* (p. 7-9). Porto Alegre, RS: Sulina.
- Vinci, C. F. R. G. (2014). *Deleuzo-guattarianas: experimentações educacionais com o pensamento de Gilles Deleuze e Félix Guattari* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.
- Vinci, C. F. R. G. (2016). O pensamento pós-estruturalista na pesquisa educacional brasileira: um possível itinerário. *Revista Sul-Americana de Filosofia e Educação*, 14(27), 42-58.

- Vinci, C. F. R. G. (2019). *Lenta-voragem: experimentação e prudência nas pesquisas educacionais deleuzo-guattarianas* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.
- Vinci, C. F. R. G., & Ribeiro, C. R. (2015). Implicações midiáticas e acadêmicas nos modos de apropriação do pensamento de Gilles Deleuze e Félix Guattari para o debate em educação no país. *ETD-Educação Temática Digital*, 17(1), 125-141.
- Vinci, C. F. R. G., & Ribeiro, C. R. (2022). Das missivas aos modos. *Revista Portuguesa de Educação*, 35(1), 189-207.

INFORMAÇÕES SOBRE O AUTOR

Christian Fernando Ribeiro Guimarães Vinci: Professor at the College of Education, State University of Campinas (UNICAMP). Member of the PHALA group - Research Group on Education, Language, and Sociocultural Practices (UNICAMP), and the OLHO - Audiovisual Studies Laboratory (UNICAMP).
ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2914-3032>
E-mail: vinci@unicamp.br