Philosophy in the Age of Emission without Listening

_____

By David Cota

Abstract

This essay examines the contemporary condition of philosophy under the regime of emission without listening, characterized by textual proliferation detached from any interlocutive function. It argues that current discursive production no longer reorganizes the field of the possible, but rather becomes a mechanism of visibility and institutional legitimation. The critique focuses on three nuclei: textual inflation as a symptom of symbolic disarticulation; citation transformed into an emblem of belonging rather than a conceptual operator; and algorithmic silencing, which reduces difference to mere statistics of compatibilities. Against this scenario, the text proposes rethinking philosophy as a mediation of symbolic legibility, where listening and hesitation emerge as ontological conditions of thought. The argument is articulated in critical dialogue with Adorno and Deleuze, recovering diagnoses of the sterilization of communication and displacing them into an ontology of emerging complexity. The central contribution lies in affirming philosophy not as commentary or performance, but as an operative gesture of symbolic inscription capable of sustaining difference and reorganization within the contemporary saturation of discourse.

Introduction

Contemporary philosophy is confronted with a structural mutation in its conditions of symbolic possibility. This is not a crisis of content nor a matter of institutional decline, but a profound alteration in its operative function. Philosophical writing has multiplied exponentially—articles, conference papers, academic publications, and digital interventions constitute a continuous flow of emission. Yet this quantitative excess has not expanded the symbolic space: it has instead produced a rarefaction of listening. The paradox is only apparent: never has so much been written, and never has so little been read. And this disjunction does not result from laziness or distraction, but from the very algorithmic reorganization of the regimes of visibility, recognition, and validation.

The *Ontology of Emerging Complexity*[1] (OEC) allows us to read this phenomenon not as a passing symptom, but as the effect of a technical reorganization of *symbolic inscription*[2]. Writing philosophy is no longer an operation of openness to *alterity* but has become a gesture

_____

[1] - The **Ontology of Emerging Complexity (OEC)** is the philosophical framework that grounds this essay. It conceives reality as processes of material reorganization in which new forms emerge through operative excess rather than predetermined essences or transcendental structures. Within this framework, classical terms such as *symbol*, *mark*, *listening*, or *reason* are redefined as material-operative categories rather than phenomenological or metaphysical ones. *Emergence* is understood as the operative moment when accumulated complexity compels the creation of a new symbolic grammar, and *inscription* as the material act of opening new regimes of legibility. All subsequent notes clarify concepts in this technical sense.

[2] - *Symbolic inscription* - refers to the material operation by which a difference becomes legible and reorganizes a field of possibilities. It is not a metaphorical "writing" but a concrete act of structuring the real.

_____

of self-presence within a saturated circuit. *Listening[3]*, understood not as receptive passivity but as availability for symbolic reconfiguration, has been replaced by a logic of performative emission. In this new regime, thought no longer emerges from interruption, hesitation, or exposure to the other, but from the necessity of maintaining visible presence within a space that rewards incessant production rather than the quality of inscription. The philosophy, once thus reconverted, no longer operates upon the real—it merely circulates within a system of self-referential redundancies

I. Textual Inflation and the Collapse of Listening

The first sign of this mutation is textual inflation. Philosophical writing—understood as a practice of *symbolic inscription[4]* of the real—has ceased to be articulated with its interlocutive function. Writing is no longer undertaken to respond to a question, to address a problem, or to prolong a listening. One writes in order to occupy space. One writes in order to be present. The consequence is an ontological inversion of the function of philosophical language: from being a medium of *listening[5]* and symbolic reorganization, it has become a mechanism of visibility and legitimation. This transformation is not merely sociological; it is operative. Philosophy loses its function of *symbolic hesitation[6]* before the real and becomes a strategy of emission.

In this new regime, every act of writing tends to be absorbed by a performative circuit of self-affirmation. The text no longer addresses an other, not even the real: it addresses the system that validates it. The problem lies not only in the volume of production, but in its orientation. Writing, when stripped of listening, becomes mere proliferation without reorganization—and therefore, without thought. The OEC rejects the idea that the multiplication of discourses is, in itself, a sign of symbolic vitality. Production is symbolic only when it reorganizes the structure of the possible—when it displaces, when it inscribes what previously had no place.

Philosophical listening is, in this horizon, more than a disposition: it is a structural function of inscription. Without listening, there is no philosophical gesture. To listen is to allow the other—whether another thought, another body, or another world—to appear without being immediately subsumed. It is to sustain the *hesitation[7]* necessary for a difference to inscribe itself. When emission becomes autonomous, this possibility disappears. What is produced is no longer symbolic reorganization, but only *operative repetition[8]*.

---

[3] - *Listening* - not subjective receptivity but a structural function of symbolic inscription: the suspension that allows alterity to appear without immediate subsumption.

[4] - *Symbolic inscription* - refers to the material operation by which a difference becomes legible and reorganizes a field of possibilities. It is not metaphorical writing, but the concrete structuring of the real.

[5] - *Listening* - not understood as receptive passivity, but as the structural function of making alterity legible without immediate subsumption.

[6] - *Symbolic hesitation* - denotes the suspension that allows time for difference to inscribe itself. It is not psychological indecision, but an ontological condition of emergence.

[7] - *Hesitation* - here is to be read in continuity with symbolic hesitation: the interval that sustains the possibility of a new inscription.

[8] - *Operative repetition* – designates operations that reproduce patterns without opening symbolic difference. *Hesitation* - here is to be read in continuity with symbolic hesitation: the interval that sustains the possibility of a new inscription.

The phrase "the more one writes, the less one reads" is neither an anti-technological slogan nor a conservative lament. It is an ontological diagnosis. It names the current condition of a philosophy without listening, in which the inflation of production does not generate difference, but saturation. And where there is saturation, there is no symbolic emergence—there is only operative noise. The excess of emission does not expand symbolic space: it collapses it.

Thus, to think philosophy in the age of emission without listening requires more than lamenting the speed or superficiality of the times. It requires a reconceptualization of the very function of philosophical writing. The problem is not the number of texts, but the absence of listening as a condition of symbolic inscription. The real question is this: how can listening be reinscribed at the heart of the philosophical gesture? How can we sustain the interval necessary for writing to once again become world—and not merely presence?

II. Citation as a Symptom of Institutionalization

Citation, once a gesture of affiliation and critical response, has today become a rhetorical mechanism of validation. One cites not in order to resume a line of thought, nor to inscribe oneself within a dialogue, but to signal belonging. The cited name functions as a sign of discursive alignment: it operates as an emblem, not as a conceptual operator. This transformation converts the philosophical gesture into a ritual of recognition. The text ceases to be an argumentative traversal and becomes a showcase of institutional compatibilities. The author no longer risks their thought in tension with the other cited—he merely invokes them as a seal of acceptability.

The effect of this mutation manifests itself in the conversion of the philosophical text into a curricular artifact. Instead of being a field of symbolic elaboration, it becomes a unit of counting: indexable, quantifiable, profitable. The text ceases to be a symbolic body and becomes a technical record. This displacement enacts a silent mutilation of thought: philosophy is no longer evaluated by what it inaugurates, but by what it reproduces. The criterion ceases to be the intensity of the question and becomes the density of the referential apparatus. The more names, the greater the supposed symbolic reliability. But this reliability is not epistemic—it is statistical.

To maximize this reliability, philosophical discourse begins to mold itself strategically. Style adapts to the demands of recognition: more quotable sentences, concepts with the appearance of novelty, structures that accommodate the extraction of excerpts. Philosophical writing becomes an interface. It is no longer a traversal of language, but a surface adjusted to the evaluating gaze. This phenomenon creates an aesthetics of citability: an art of writing so as to be highlighted, detached, appropriated. The philosophical text is no longer organized from its symbolic interiority, but from its operative extractability.

In this process, citation loses its original function of acknowledging *alterity*[1]. The other cited no longer appears as a disruptive presence. Their voice no longer obliges us to reorganize anything. It becomes a name that circulates. The operation of citing deactivates the thought of the cited and activates only its symbolic aura. Alterity is annulled by the ornamental function of the name. The gesture of citation is converted into an empty echo— there is no confrontation, no inscription, no response.

This mechanism reveals the existence of an economy of prestige. The cited name is valued for what it represents in the academic field, not for its transformative function within

the text. Citation operates as currency of symbolic capital: it is accumulated, counted, distributed. It is not thought that circulates, but the authority of the name. The philosophical text is thus covered by a layer of signs that displace nothing, merely attesting to belonging.

This logic leads to the annulment of the constitutive tension between originality and heritage. The philosophical text begins to avoid any real dissensus with the cited authors. It does not risk reinterpreting, contradicting, or displacing. The authority of citation paralyzes creative drift. Writing becomes exhibition, not clash. It ceases to be a response to what exceeds us, and becomes a celebration of what legitimates us.

To write in order to be cited is, in this sense, to empty the philosophical gesture of its alterity[9]. For philosophy is not born from the repetition of what is already authorized, but from the inscription of a dissonance that unsettles the symbolic field. Citation, when it is not risk, is ornament. And thought that surrounds itself with ornaments no longer wishes to disturb—it only wishes to confirm.

III. Algorithmic Silencing and the Ontology of Indexation

In contemporaneity, silencing is not produced by repression, but by *non-inscription[10]*. The absence of voice is not due to explicit prohibition, but to the incapacity of crossing the technical filters that define what may or may not appear as real. What is not indexed does not appear; what cannot be retrieved as a signal is treated as non-existent. But this logic is not epistemic—it is ontological. It is no longer a matter of ignorance or negligence, but of the infrastructural construction of the world by filters that organize the field of the legible.

It is at this point that algorithms cease to be mere instruments of information ordering and begin to operate as *ontological grammars[11]*. Their action is neither neutral nor external: it strikes at the symbolic matter of the world, determining what emerges and what remains opaque. Code, as a material operator, distributes visibility, defines relevance, and decides precedence. In this sense, we do not only manage information under algorithmic form—we are managed by it in the very constitution of what is thinkable, sayable, and circulable.

Discursive plurality, so celebrated by the rhetoric of the network, is an illusion maintained by automated curation that compresses difference under protocols of similarity. What appears as diversity is often a machinic repetition of predictable variations. The algorithm filters not only by keywords, but by vectors of *inferential compatibility[12]*—everything that deviates, everything that exceeds, everything that resists statistical prediction is devalued. Alterity is not silenced by interdiction, but by programmed irrelevance.

This mechanism installs a new type of acceptability: no longer based on argumentation, conceptual force, or symbolic novelty, but on adherence to operative

---

[9] - *Alterity* - does not designate a metaphysical "other" but a difference that obliges symbolic reorganization. It is an operator of transformation, not a substance or entity exterior to the system.

[10] - *Non-inscription* - denotes the status of what has not been symbolized or made legible within a regime of visibility. It is not metaphysical absence, but operative exclusion from appearing as effective difference.

[11] - *Ontological grammars* - are the algorithmic rules and structures that configure what may appear as real. In the OEC, grammar is not metaphorical: it names the material distribution of possibility.

[12] - *Inferential compatibility* - refers to algorithmic filtering based on statistical proximities and predictive associations, it signals the replacement of symbolic conflict with machinic adequacy.

patterns. Thought ceases to be evaluated by its capacity to produce *symbolic reorganization*[13] and is instead judged by its conformity to technical regimes of *legibility*[14]. Whatever cannot be converted into inferential compatibility is treated as error, noise, or redundancy. Legibility becomes the filter of existence.

The deepest consequence of this reorganization is the substitution of symbolic conflict—where ideas, forms, and vocabularies confront one another as divergent modes of world inscription—by a grammar of statistical compatibility. Divergence ceases to be productive and becomes dysfunctional. Ideas that do not anticipate their own algorithmic acceptability become invisible. The demand for predictability, for frictionless adequacy, displaces philosophy from the space of thought to the space of optimization.

We are not merely facing a system of technical triage. We are facing an *economy of the thinkable*[15]. Whatever is not profitable in terms of attention, calculated relevance, or inferential affinity is excluded from the symbolic field. Philosophy, in this new regime, risks becoming only what passes through—and not what thinks. For to think, in this sense, requires the unthinkable: that which cannot yet be translated into signal, index, or ranking.

Algorithmic operation does not deny thought: it silently models it. It decides what will be heard, where it will be displayed, how long it will remain visible, with which other ideas it will be associated. This modeling preconfigures the field of possible symbolic emergences. What becomes unsustainable, then, is not the existence of divergent voices—but their capacity for inscription. Exclusion is not enacted by denial, but by the absence of a structure that allows something to emerge as a problem.

Contemporary ontopolitics is no longer disputed in the sphere of ideas, but in the architecture of the technical preconditions of symbolic visibility. It is there that it is decided who will have a place, which themes will be legible, which discursive forms will be treated as thought and which will be discarded as deviation. Philosophy, if it wishes to remain a power of inscription and not a mere artifact of circulation, will have to confront this structure. It is not enough to demand listening: it is necessary to reconfigure the devices that decide what may be listened to.

In this context, philosophical critique cannot remain on the plane of representation. It must operate as symbolic counter-engineering: unveiling regimes of filtering, dismantling structures of anticipation, and proposing spaces of *hesitation*[16] that suspend the logic of preemption. Thought cannot be compatible with the economy of the predictable—for to think is precisely to tear open that predictability. Philosophy will continue to exist only if it is capable of reinscribing the real outside the grammars that precede it.

---

[13] - *Symbolic reorganization* - is the criterion for thought: an inscription is valid only insofar as it reorganizes the field of the possible.

[14] - *Legibility* - means the capacity of a material difference to be recognized as bearing meaning within a symbolic regime. Without legibility, there is no effective existence.

[15] - *Economy of the thinkable* - designates the technical distribution of what can count as thought. It shifts the question of philosophy from expression to infrastructural possibility.

[16] - *Hesitation* (OEC) - is not cognitive delay, but the ethical-ontological suspension that holds open space for alterity before subsumption.

IV. The Failure of Philosophical Mediation

For centuries, philosophy fulfilled a mediating function: between world and thought, between language and action, between event and its intelligibility. This mediation did not consist in simplification or translation, but in the creation of conceptual devices capable of *naming what erupts without form*[17]. Its place was that of tension: between the visible and the sayable, between knowledge and the sensible, between norm and possible. To think was to suspend the automatism of the immediate, to sustain the unfinished, to name what had not yet stabilized as discourse.

In the present discursive regime, however, this function is progressively deactivated. Philosophy no longer mediates—it circulates. It no longer operates as a space of symbolic interrogation, but as a piece within an ecosystem of anticipated responses. Philosophical language, captured by dynamics of pleasantness, formatted by styles of automated legibility, no longer names the real: it merely replicates it under forms compatible with systems of recognition.

The failure of philosophical mediation manifests itself in the impossibility of suspension. Discourse no longer interrupts the course of the world; rather, it accelerates it. The philosopher, instead of naming what still lacks form, participates in the continuous feedback of what has already been decided as relevant, visible, or discussable. Technical anticipation substitutes *symbolic hesitation*[18]. Thought is no longer undertaken to render the world legible, but to confirm what has already been rendered legible according to prevailing operational criteria.

This symbolic deactivation is not reducible to the obsolescence of philosophy in the public sphere. It is a mutation of its operative function. Thought is no longer summoned as mediation between heterogeneous instances, but as reinforcement of compatibilities. Its value lies no longer in the creation of problems, but in the optimization of responses. The philosopher, converted into commentator of current affairs or curator of kindred ideas, abdicates their fundamental symbolic task: sustaining the *difference that has not yet been named*[19].

The appropriation of philosophical language by regimes of anticipated response is not a technical accident: it is an ontopolitical consequence. It means that systems of discursive production no longer tolerate the interval necessary for something to emerge as a question. Philosophy thus becomes harmless: not through weakness, but through functionalization. In abdicating mediation, it abdicates its disruptive potency. In refusing hesitation, it dissolves into the operational flow that neutralizes it.

This scenario requires that we rethink not the content of philosophy, but its position in the contemporary symbolic system. Its failure is not a collapse of ideas—it is the loss of its function of delay. Philosophy does not serve to respond faster, but to delay long enough for meaning still to be disputed. To recover mediation is, therefore, to recover the time of

---

[17] - *Naming what erupts without form* - in the OEC does not mean attributing a label to what already exists, but instituting it symbolically: transforming the non-stabilized into legible difference.

[18] - *Symbolic hesitation* - is the suspension that sustains the interval necessary for difference to inscribe itself. It is not cognitive indecision, but ontological condition of emergence.

[19] - *Difference not yet named* - is a key notion of the OEC: it denotes potential configurations awaiting symbolic inscription. Philosophy's role is to sustain such potential without premature closure.

thought—the *time of the between*[20], of the unthought, of the still informe. Without this time, everything is response, and no response is true.

V. The Paradox of Intercommunication among Elites

We live in an age in which discursive production among philosophers appears intense and multifocal, but effective communication between them proves structurally absent. There is a multiplication of interventions, publications, and expositions, but these voices coexist without forming a *common field of symbolic inscription*[21]. Dialogue, as a structure of *co-emergence*[22] among heterogeneous thoughts, has been replaced by a regime of parallel, self-referential, and strategically positioned statements. As Adorno already pointed out, this is a field where the exchange of ideas is converted into productive parallelism—into "tacit agreements between unthematized incompatibilities."[23]

This logic institutes what we may call a discursive archipelago: each philosopher speaks from his own island, surrounded by systems of reference that guarantee internal consistency but avoid any risk of *symbolic reorganization*[24] from the other. Interlocution is replaced by cross-visibility: everyone refers, everyone positions themselves, everyone encounters one another, but few actually read—and no one listens to the other as *operative difference*[25]. The effect is that of simultaneity without relation. As in Deleuze, where differential systems coexist without reference to a center, but here without the functional intersection that would allow real emergence.

In this scenario, the academic network functions less as a shared system of thought and more as a performative device. Each textual entry fulfills the function of updating the presence of a name, a brand, a theoretical identity. Philosophy, converted into a circuit of symbolic self-validation, no longer organizes a community of risk, but a space of performance where legitimation occurs through the recurrence of the gesture. It is not a matter of thinking *with* the other, but of thinking *before* the other—under the logic of a discursive choreography that avoids frictions.

The consequence is the erosion of the idea of a philosophical community as a field of mutual inscription. The recognition of the other as a source of symbolic disruption is replaced by mechanisms of discursive equivalence. Each intervention is welcomed as long as it remains within zones of stylistic and referential compatibility. Alterity here is not combated—it is neutralized by aesthetic absorption. True dissensus—that which demands reorganization—gives way to a pluralism of surfaces.

---

[20] - *Time of the between* - refers to the operative interval where symbolic inscription becomes possible: neither already codified nor pure chaos, but the horizon of emergent legibility.

[21] - *Common field of symbolic inscription* - the shared operative space where differences become legible and effective. It is not a mere "context" of discussion but a material regime of possibility.

[22] - *Co-emergence* - reciprocal emergence of differences within the same field of inscription, produced by mutual modulation rather than consensus or aggregation.

[23] - Adorno, *Negative Dialectics* (1966), where he denounces the transformation of intellectual exchange into a parallelism of discourses that coexist without genuine encounter.

[24] - *Symbolic reorganization* - the process by which inscription displaces existing structures and opens new fields of possibility, beyond reiteration or compatibility.

[25] - *Operative difference* - a difference that reorganizes a field of possibility, producing symbolic effect. Distinct from mere disagreement, it has functional consequences within the symbolic system.

This fragmentation must not be confused with diversity. It represents rather a failure of symbolic cohesion. Instead of confrontation between paradigms, there is a mosaic of positions circulating without operative interference. Traversing this network, philosophy risks becoming an ecosystem of regulated self-expression—where everyone has the right to a voice, but no one responds to the other. Not by censorship, but by the absence of a shared symbolic space.

Against this scenario, it is not enough to call for more dialogue. It is necessary to reconstruct the ontological conditions of philosophical interlocution. This requires shifting the focus from publication to inscription, from circulation to co-presence, from the exhibition of ideas to the production of common fields of symbolic emergence. Community is not a given—it is an intensive construction. And where there is no sharing of symbolic risk, there is no common thought: there is only traffic of statements without place.

VI. The Urgency of an Ethics of Writing

In a world saturated with emission, writing philosophy has too often become a strategy of presence. The text is conceived as an extension of the author, the author as brand, the brand as symbolic capital. In this cycle, writing loses its alterity. It ceases to be an opening to the other and becomes a monument to itself. The urgency, therefore, is not moral but ontological: to rethink philosophical writing as a gesture of *inscription*[26]—and not of reproduction.

Suspending the immediate is the first movement of this ethics. Against the demand for quick response, against the compulsion of constant visibility, writing must become a gesture of delay. This delay is not technical lateness, but the operative condition of symbolic inscription. Only where the flow is suspended can meaning emerge. Writing should not accelerate the world, but open fissures in its automatism.

To write as an act of world means, in this context, to commit oneself to the reconfiguration of the real—and not to the maintenance of its noise. The philosophical text is not commentary, nor accessory, nor identity. It is cut, inscription, possibility. By inscribing a difference into the body of language, it reopens the field of the symbolic. But this is only possible if writing does not seek recognition, but discontinuity.

Exposure to the indeterminate is the criterion of this new writing. One does not write to confirm what is already known, nor to consolidate a position. One writes to render thinkable what still has no name, what still has no form. Philosophy, as the practice of inscription, demands this risk: that the text may not serve, may not circulate, may not confirm. That it may disturb.

The ethics of philosophical writing is thus an ethics of the *interval*[27]: between the visible and the sayable, between the possible and the permitted, between what is expected and what erupts. A writing that does not submit to performance, nor to pleasantness, nor to prestige. A writing that once again asks not "how to be read?" but "what must be written so that something might, finally, be read?"

---

[26] - *Inscription* - the material operation that stabilizes a difference as legible within a symbolic regime. Writing philosophy is here equated with such an operation, not with representation or reproduction.

[27] - *Interval* - the operative gap that sustains symbolic emergence. Neither already codified nor pure indeterminacy, it is the horizon where legibility can take form.

To write, within this horizon, is to sustain the world in openness. Not as promise, but as practice. Not as utopia, but as material inscription of a sense that has not yet allowed itself to be captured. Philosophical writing, if it still wishes to be such, will have to refuse the function of response. It will have to become, once again, a gesture that thinks.

Closing

After a dense path of diagnosis—saturation of language, algorithmic compression, the failure of symbolic mediations—the risk of interpreting the present as collapse seems inevitable. And yet, perhaps this is not the most rigorous gesture. For thought that aspires to be truly philosophical does not close its horizon in critique. At some point, it must be capable of seeing excess not only as obstacle, but as index of emergence.

It is here that a turning becomes necessary. If everything appears exhausted, saturated, locked in a closed circuit, perhaps this signals not the end of a symbolic regime, but its functional exhaustion—the moment in which the previous structure can no longer integrate what emerges. What we call noise may not be failure, but *exceedance*[28]. And what appears as dispersion may be, under another gaze, latent reorganization. Matter does not fail: it overflows.

According to the OEC, this overflowing is precisely what inaugurates a new regime of inscription. Every symbolic reorganization begins when the previous system becomes incapable of responding to the complexity that accumulates. It is in that moment—and only in that moment—that a new grammar becomes possible. Philosophy, as the practice of inscription, does not have as its task the restoration of lost forms, but the listening to the signs of what has not yet been formulated.

In this light, the chaotic emission of discourses, the proliferation of texts without reception, the fragmentation of the philosophical community—all of this ceases to be pathological symptom and becomes instead field of possibility. We are not facing an absence of meaning, but an excess not yet symbolized. And it is this excess—not silence—that demands thought.

Philosophy, at this new threshold, does not disappear: it changes scale. It becomes less stable form and more emergent practice. Less doctrine and more gesture. And listening, far from nostalgic retreat, becomes a technique of attention to what has not yet been named. To listen here is to accompany the reorganization of symbolic matter—not through waiting, but through readiness.

Perhaps excess seems threatening to us because we still use categories conceived for scarcity. But if we accept that the disproportionate is the proper terrain of emergence, then what we are living is not the end of philosophy—it is its passage. And to think, now, will be less to define than to sustain the still-informe. Less to control than to respond.

"What is not listened to does not disappear—it only insists on another frequency."

---

[28] - *Exceedance* - not failure or breakdown, but the overflowing of complexity beyond the capacity of a structure to integrate it. It is the motor of reorganization.

Bibliografia

- Adorno, Theodor W. 1966. *Negative Dialektik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

- Deleuze, Gilles. 1968. *Différence et répétition*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.