



doi: 10.20396/rfe.v13i3.8665100

Amerindian heterotopia and the resistance against the Brazilian ethnocide

A heterotopia ameríndia e a resistência contra o
etnocídio brasileiro

*Gustavo Ruiz da Silva*¹

Abstract:

This article aims, starting from a contemporary problem (the destruction of indigenous lives and cultures in Brazil), to think about ethical questions – especially in what concerns other ways of constituting subjectivity and (dis)obedience. Thus, the indigenous obedience issue will be based on Pierre Clastres' *societies against the State*, giving an extent to Viveiros de Castros and possible relationships with our western reality. The subjectivity issue, then, will be approached based on what was pointed out to us by Michel Foucault. Facing these Amerindian realities as heterotopias, how could we produce resistances and dissonant possibilities in our present reality?

Keywords: Amerindian Subjectivities. Disobedience. Dissonant possibilities.

Resumo:

Este artigo visa, a partir de um problema contemporâneo (a destruição das vidas e culturas indígenas no Brasil), pensar problemas éticos, em especial no que consistem as formas outras de constituição da subjetividade e de (des)obediência. A questão da obediência indígena, então, será pensada a partir dos escritos de Pierre Clastres, dando margem para a relação com nossa realidade ocidental a partir de Viveiros de Castros. A questão da subjetividade será abordada a partir daquilo que nos foi indicado por Michel Foucault. Encarando essas realidades ameríndias como heterotopias, como poderíamos produzir resistências e possibilidades dissonantes em nossa realidade presente?

Palavras-chave: Subjetividades ameríndias. Desobediência. Possibilidades dissonantes.

Prolegomena of political anthropology

¹ Mestrando (Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo - PUC/SP, sob orientação da professora Yolanda Glória Gamboa Muñoz) e graduado em Filosofia (Universidade de São Paulo - USP). Graduado em Ciências Sociais/ Antropologia (PUC/SP, sob orientação do professor Guilherme Simões Gomes Jr.). Atualmente sou membro do i.) Grupo de Pesquisa Michel Foucault (sob orientação da professora Salma Tannus Muchail; PUC-SP/CNPq).

Our intention with this essay is to express our misalignment to what concerns the contemporary relation between the Brazilian government, represented by Jair Bolsonaro (current President of Brazil; Without Party), and our Amerindian communities within their subjectivities. Even though in 1946, the Nuremberg Trial created the juridical term “genocide” recognizing this new idea of criminal manifestation. It was only invented as an answer to the massive killing of European Jews during the German’s Nazi government in WW II. Precisely, genocide conceptualized as a logical product of racism – a judicial delict with roots in the free development and effectuation of racism. However, when it happens as an implication of the colonial powers, the political game relation is different, notably because the public opinion prevents an action like Nuremberg; there was never a judicial accusation against the death policy practiced in the colonies (CLASTRES, 2004b, p. 54-63).

[We] are used to deploring the misdeeds of colonization and confessions of guilt have become routine. But we lack a sense of dread when faced with the idea that not only do we take ourselves to be the thinking head of humanity but that, with the best intentions in the world, we do not cease to continue doing it. [...]The dread only begins when we realize that despite our tolerance, our remorse and our guilt, we have not changed that much (PIGNARRE & STENGERS, 2005, p. 88)².

Although the anti-Semitic genocide was the first one to be accused in a Court, the colonial expansion – first in the 16th century and then in the 19th century – is marked by the methodic massacre of autochthone peoples. A destruction machine is operating on Amerindians since 1492, but now in a more subtle way, not only physically as it used to happen. The Amerindian peoples are victims of both destructions: the physical violence (centered in the race) and also the cultural destruction (based on a systematic action

² Original: «*Nous avons par exemple l’habitude de déplorer les méfaits de la colonisation, et les aveux de culpabilité sont devenus routiniers. Mais il nous manque l’effroi devant cette idée pensante de l’humanité, mais que, avec les meilleures intentions du monde, nous ne cessons de continuer à le faire (...) L’effroi commence quand nous rendons compte que, malgré notre tolérance, nos remords, nos culpabilités, nous n’avons pas tellement changé*».

against their thoughts and way of living, a way of soul suppression). Genocide and *ethnocide*: both sides of the extermination of the Other in which the last is the vocation to assess differences by the stands of the culture of the self.

Moreover, there is a specification in the ethnocide notion: the negation of the Other to the ethnocide agent is submerged in positivity as it conducts a personal identification. The agent is moving this indigenous to the soul's salvation path while its civilization is pushed to a better situation where the "Westernness" is the ultimate goal. The spirituality of the ethnocide agent is nonetheless the Humanist ethics. Two axioms determine it: the cultural hierarchy and a positive negation. It could be said: "the native culture is inferior therefore I am going to hoist it to a superior level, once my soul is pure and noble – the native indigenous will become a complete Western", a Brazilian, for example. What is operating here is not ordinary cultural destruction, but a unique Humanism written in European thought (CLASTRES, 2004b, p. 54-63).

Though, apart from the physical and cultural destruction caused by geno and ethnocide, what is being exterminated? The answer is a unique way of thinking. Called savages, the logic of giving, receiving, and giving back with an agonistic character as a general rule founded these communities (MAUSS, 2007). Thus, they are not only exchange societies, but they are also societies made for the war. They are not societies for the State, based on the principle of peace ensured by the Leviathan³, it is war as a principle that guarantees its social existence (CLASTRES, 2004a, p. 158-187) – to think the "primitive" Amerindian society, it is mandatory to consider the violence because this is their principle (FERNANDES, 2006).

The result of it is that they are not societies *without* State, but societies *against* the State (CLASTRES, 2008a, p. 170-193). The cosmological political view which organizes these groups of the Amazonian Lowlands does not carry the unity notion but quite the opposite, the multiplicity. For the Amazonian peoples, the One, the State, is responsible for

³ According to Abensour (2003), the Archeology of Violence is an *anti-Hobbes* books, since Clastres is a thinker of rupture, discontinuity and accident.

the extinction of the multiple (CLASTRES, 2008b, p. 153-158). If the Leviathan is the One who sustains the social unicity through peace, they would be against it because they rather have their dissonant subjectivities safeguarded by the war (RUIZ DA SILVA, 2020a, p. 59-67). Hence, there is a specific political apparatus that maintains this cultural and sociological (dis)organization: the leader's speech opacity. We do not intend to explain this problem in detail; however, it is relevant that the main sustaining movement is the resistance against hamlet's chief: the Indigenous chief does have the prestige but he does not have the possibility to apply his power, especially because it does not have the will of speech (CLASTRES, 2008c, p. 39-55).

In this sense, corroborating with this Amerindian perspective, Paul Veyne defends that the State cannot appear in its sovereign wholeness if not entering communication; in other words, it is necessary a "chief", a sovereign who will have the first or last word – a chief is communicational; however, knowing who really commands and especially why everyone obeys is a question that is located elsewhere (VEYNE, 1988, p. 17). According to Muñoz (2015), it is an image problem, a question that refers to the relation that the self establishes with itself when obeys to the State or Society: it is the *autokrateia* idea, the use of pleasure instituted by the relationship between the self and itself in the pairs "domination-obedience", "command-submission" and "domain-docility" (FOUCAULT, 1998, p. 66)⁴. What "*interests us here is how the State shows itself as an announcer entity, hence, for this, it is necessary for someone to give it a voice, since an entity does not own itself*" (RUIZ DA SILVA, 2020, p. 60. Our translation)⁵.

Contemporary brazilian situation

⁴ Remembering that obedience produces obedience and it is and must be prior to every order and command (FOUCAULT, 2012, p. 264-265).

⁵ Original: "*que nos interessa aqui é como o Estado se mostra como entidade locutora, onde, para isso, é necessário que alguém lhe ceda voz, dado que uma entidade não a possui por si*" (RUIZ DA SILVA, 2020, p. 60).

Since 13% of the Brazilian national territory are landmarks for autochthone communities and these areas are far inside into the Amazonian, Pantanal and Cerrado ecoregions (mostly in the Center-West and North regions of country), and 56% of the population lives in the South and Southeast parts of the territory, people in general do not have any contact with these hamlets. Subsequently, these areas turned into “spaces others”, where 107 hamlets and ethnical tribes are completely untouched: there are more than half a million persons⁶ with multiple political wills and subjectivities fighting against the idea of State and struggling to keep their culture through an ethnocidal power that overcame everyone that stands against its sovereignty.

Even though what happens inside their societies might be interesting for us (philosophers or anthropologists), it is dangerous to the establishment. The 2018's Brazilian's elections were crucial to potentialize a new wave of nationalism and world's perspective inside the country, one based in a powerful moral view not only of what is good or bad, what savage is and what civilized is, but in what love is about. Bolsonaro was not only the representative of pro-landowners and pro-guns groups at the House of Representatives and Senate, but also a commissioner to Christian communities, in especial evangelicals and Presbyterians.

Church leaders all over the country supported him above all others, they saw him as a representative of “good values” and a bulwark against communism or “gender ideology” (the loss of parent's power over their child sexuality). He has been massively viewed as the only truly pro-life, pro-God, pro-family candidate, and since he has been elected to the presidency, he did not disappoint his electors. Since the Ministry of Women, Family and Human Rights' creation (former Ministry of Human Rights), the only female Minister of this Government (Damares Alves), is facilitating the access of missionaries into distant hamlets' evangelization – Bolsonaro must achieve them all.

Nowadays 13 of the isolated hamlets recognized by Funai (Indigenous' National Foundation) are already working with protestant churches

⁶ It is not rigorous to use the idea of “individuals” for Indigenous communities. For this reason, we decided to use “persons”, expressing the huge number of “individuals” but maintaining the recommended idea of “person”.

(TOLEDO, 2020). In this year's February, Bolsonaro designated to Funai's direction Ricardo Lopes Dias, an ex-missionary pastor who worked for more than 10 years for a missionary organization called "Novas Tribos Brasil", a branch of the American movement "New Tribes Mission" (now called Ethnos360), that was found guilty of genocide after the contact of the mission in one indigenous community resulting in the death of one quarter of the Zo'é's (Amerindian Tribe) population (about 37 people) (MERLINO, 2020). One of the four American missionaries of the movement in Brazil (that used to act in Acre) was accused of pedophilia, and sexual abuse of Amerindian girls in the state and was arrested in 2013 when he returned to the US.

Lopes Dias was exonerated from the job in November, after multiple Indigenous leaders accused him of incompetence and misconduct, he was substituted by Marcelo Xavier da Silva, a police delegate known for his connections with the rural groups, known for their position against the demarcation of indigenous land (BBC, 2019). Besides religious people being nominated to positions directly linked to jobs that should protect Amerindians, they are all over de government. The NGO Atini, founded by the Ministry Damares Alves, was accused by indigenists to incite hate against Indigenous and accused by Kajutiti people of kidnapping one of their children under the subterfuge of giving the child a dental treatment (EL PAIS, 2019), fifteen years later and Damares still is the girl's protector.

Nevertheless, the Amerindian's communities are still a constant reminder that there are other things than political obedience and economic productiveness⁷: spaces like these are surrounded by multiplicities and other possibilities. The Amerindians, in what concerns the Brazilian government, are living in constant heterotopias: physical locations of multiple concrete "utopias", spaces that lodge the imagination (FOUCAULT, 2009a, p. 19-30). Another thing that marks these hamlets as spaces others is its seclusion, they are isolated and accommodating a specific type of activity: a society that obeys rules which are different from ours (FOUCAULT, 2001, p. 1571-

⁷ Conforming to Clastres (*apud*. Viveiros de Castro, 2010, p. 15), the "primitive society" is the immanent exterior of the State because it is a force of anti-production.

1581). The Indigenous heterotopia is not something inexistent, unreal, but something physically located in a remote location that is always remembering the Western world that something can emerge, something different that might not follow the same political and economic rules.

That is why not only is economically profitable to destroy these communities (by liberating 13% of the Brazilian territory to the livestock and agricultural sector) and normalize these bodies (by separating the native from their culture and pushing them to become proletarians or workers) but also symbolically useful to extinguish this potency of resistance against the State and Capitalism. So, it is not a surprise that the current Brazilian President, Jair Bolsonaro, known for being extremely conservative and authoritarian, is putting massive effort into this ethnocide and genocide against the Amerindian communities localized in our country: he is intensively trying to destroy and kill these heterotopias. The problem only gets worse when we remind that the Vice-President is a General from the Army; according to him, there are no such things as Indigenous, gypsies, or maroons, only Brazilians (SIMON, 2020).

Nevertheless, what the Government did not expect, unfortunately because most of the white Brazilian population does not study Amerindian cultures, is that the Indigenous would always fight against the oppression, just like they have been doing since 1530 when the Portuguese colonization started in Brazil. As have been noticed by a whole tradition of ethnologists, a peculiar characteristic of resistance among the Amazonian Indigenous is that they laugh at the same thing that they fear: for them, to live is to live dangerously, that is the savage warrior's misfortune. What is implicated on that is a subjectivity construction: there is a catch game through the looking between the warrior *self* and the enemy, namely the One, the State that is suppressing the multiplicity. In the agonistic symbolic economy among the Amerindians, it is necessary to be aware of when to look and when not to because the State can kidnap your soul – the Capitalist State is the main ethnocide agent of all, and it is its principal action (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 2001, p. 885-917).

The point of view of the State is not just any point of view. It is the point of view, never a point of view. The State is, precisely, an absolute (...). The concept of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari proposed in *Thousand Plateaus: capture device*. This is what we are discussing (...). The State is a Self that is never Another (...). One of the typical traumas, in the indigenous world, involves a solitary exit of a person to the forest, to hunt for example, which ends in the sudden encounter with these germs, these State larvae (...) You run into a jaguar, she looks at you differently, you can't escape eye contact: then the animal suddenly (in your eyes) becomes a person, a relative for example, and asks you - "why do you want to kill me, my brother?" Do not answer! – or you have already lost (...). Before the State, we are nothing more than individuals (...). The bad encounter in the bush, the accident that separates the subject from his soul. He returns home without a soul. Then languish. And if a shaman does not bring the soul back, the subject dies (...). He becomes a jaguar, he becomes dead, he becomes whatever he found (...). You must look at the animal first before the animal looks at you. Because if it looks at you before you look at it (it is not seeing, it is looking), you are captured by its subjective power, you lose your sovereignty, you are in its hands (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 2007c, p. 256. Our translation)⁸.

Brazilian history, however, can be quite tricky. For us, the ontological and the juridical definition of “Indigenous” usually go into public merging, giving birth to picturesque things. In the 1970s, during the military dictatorship, there was a movement of emancipation, the Government did not want to be responsible for the autochthones anymore, especially those that “were no longer true Indigenous” – this was a legal “disindianization” based

⁸ Original: “O ponto de vista do Estado não é um ponto de vista qualquer. Ele é o ponto de vista, jamais um ponto de vista. O Estado é, justamente, um absoluto (...). O conceito de Gilles Deleuze e Félix Guattari proposto em *Mil platôs: aparelho de captura*. O que estamos discutindo é isso (...). O Estado é um Eu que nunca é Outro (...). Um dos traumas típicos, no mundo indígena, envolve uma saída solitária de uma pessoa ao mato, para caçar por exemplo, a qual desemboca no encontro repentino com esses germes, essas larvas de Estado (...) Você topa com uma onça, ela te olha diferente, você não consegue fugir do contato ocular: aí o bicho se transforma (a teus olhos) subitamente em uma pessoa, um parente por exemplo, e lhe pergunta – “por que você quer me matar, meu irmão?” Não responda! – ou você já perdeu (...). Diante do Estado não somos mais do que indivíduos (...). O mau encontro no mato, o acidente que separa o sujeito de sua alma. Ele volta para casa sem alma. Então definha. E se um xamã não trazer a alma de volta, o sujeito morre (...). Vira onça, vira morto, vira seja lá o que for que ele encontrou (...). Você tem que olhar primeiro para o bicho, antes de o bicho olhar para você. Porque se ele olhar para você antes de você olhar para ele (não é ver, é olhar), você é capturado pela potência subjetiva dele, você perde sua soberania, está nas mãos dele”.

on ontological characteristics, features that were based on something inherent to those persons. The result of it was the submergence of ethnicities: to be Amerindian in Brazil now it is no longer necessary to wear feathers, *urucum*, bow, and arrow – an amalgamation was in process (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 2007b, p. 130-161).

It's still in course. All over Bolsonaro's government the Christian word is being spread (besides all the other things, such as respiratory diseases responsible for the killing of Indigenous population), creating ways to facilitate the extradition of natural goods and minerals, and above all others the impossibility of another way of being and existing outside of Christianity, Capitalism and State. In the time between January of 2019 and May of 2020 (FONSECA & CORREIA, 2020), concerning the isolated Amerindians, R\$ 30 million were spend out of the public money on publicity actions linking churches and religious leaders to catechization actions.

However, aside from the isolated small tribes in the middle of the untouched Amazon forest, what is to be an Indigenous in Brazil, then? It can be defined as a certain way of becoming⁹, something essentially invisible but by no means less effective: an infinitesimal ceaseless movement of differentiation, not a massive state of “difference” interiorized and stabilized, viz., a changeable identity. From that aforementioned moment on, an impetus and a possibility of progressive re-ethnization of the Brazilian people were gained, now free from the Government chains: everybody can be Amerindian, except those who are not (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 2007b, p. 130-161). The resistance is amplified to all those who want to experience an Amerindian-becoming to turn into a warrior against the State.

The other face of this movement, unlikely what we could cheer for, is that the State tries to resist it. By fighting against this way of thinking and becoming, the Sovereignty is willing to destroy its own population

⁹ According to Deleuze (1977, p. 8): « A mesure que quelqu'un devient, ce qu'il devient change autant que lui-même. Les devenirs ne sont pas des phénomènes d'imitation, ni d'assimilation, mais de double capture, d'évolution non parallèle, de nocés entre deux règnes ». Translation: *As someone becomes, what he becomes changes as much as himself. Becomings are not phenomena of imitation or assimilation, but of double capture, non-parallel evolution, marriage between two kingdoms.*

undistinguishably; ethnocide and genocide, respectively the killing of the soul and body based on the general and systematic racism, in the case, through the discourse of preservation: preservation of a white, Christian, hierarchical capitalist society based on obedience. Anyone who flees from it is circumscribed as abnormal and targeted as dangerous – as a conclusion, the State as a suicidal, racist, and murderer institution (FOUCAULT, 2005, p. 285-316). Not only these pockets of possibilities, Amazonian heterotopias, are the focus of destruction but all those who try to express something against what is propagated by the State, headed by Jair Bolsonaro.

For this reason, what is necessary for moments like this is to make an intensive filiation and a demonical alliance between Anthropology and Philosophy (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 2007a, p. 91-126). Aiming to produce in ourselves potency enough to resist and fight against this domination¹⁰, using, especially in the Brazilian case, these symbolical fields of Amerindian *ethos* supplements, that can provide us a whole new grammar of existence based on different ways of how to be subjected to something or someone – new forms of obedience and new games of power. To overcome the ordinary ethics that guided the Western way of thinking for too long and contest Jair Bolsonaro and the Brazilian ethnocidal State, it is required to seek new kinds of politics, a good clashing that creates and multiplies possibilities for our reality (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 2007c, p. 226-259).

A good policy, the one that first arouses my sympathy, is one that multiplies the possible, that increases the number of possibilities open to the species, and that is it. A policy that has an objective to reduce the possibilities, the alternatives, to circumscribe possible forms of creation and expression, is a policy that I discard out (...). How to prevent this? How to escape this? Distressing Question (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 2007c, p. 266. Our translation)¹¹.

¹⁰ Domination defined as arbitrary interference of an external agent against the self action and arbitrium.

¹¹ Original: “*Como impedir isso? Como escapar dessa? Questão Angustiante (...). Uma boa política, aquela que me desperta simpatia de início, é aquela que multiplica os possíveis, que aumenta o número de possibilidades abertas à espécie, e só. Uma política cujo objetivo é reduzir as possibilidades, as alternativas, circunscrever formas possíveis de criação e expressão, é uma política que descarto de saída*”.

Final notes

Having said the aforementioned, this paper aimed to prioritize the ideas of circulation, appropriation and cultural reframing, valuing not only the situations, but also the interests and possible meanings that were attributed to the changes that the Amerindian experienced; thus, what was planned was a “*reconstitution of the indigenous conceptual imagination in terms of our own imagination*” (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 2017, p. 15. Our translation)¹².

We turned ourselves to the post-structuralism contributions to the indigenous peoples’ studies, making their leadership (protagonism) not merely narrative but epistemological, putting it as a “divergence operator, modulator of continuous variation (variation of variation). The structure as a closed grammatical combinatorial and as an open differential multiplicity” (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 2008, p. 56. Our translation)¹³. The point is to think about the Amerindian culture not only based on their destruction or actual reality, since it would construct our argument on negativity or simply on something already existent, but rather on untold possibilities – the “against” here used is an active action that folds or bends the domination into a reaction (ABENSOUR, 2012).

As pointed by Ruiz da Silva (2020), political ethics must be addressed by how the self presupposes a group of practices (reflected or voluntary), thought in which people conduct conducts, transforming and modifying your own self based on aesthetical parameters: it is in this, that liberty can be found. It's in the relation to yourself that you can establish a way to obey, disobey, or obey even more. Thus, that is why it's important to stand out the idea of “image of the self”, created by Veyne (1988): how the individual establishes a relationship between your own self and itself, always independent of what

¹² Original: “*Reconstituição da imaginação conceitual indígena nos termos de nossa própria imaginação*”.

¹³ Original: “*como operador de divergencia, modulador de variación continua (variación de variación). La estructura como combinatoria gramatical cerrada y como multiplicidad diferencial abierta*”.

is established among the Society and the State. Viz., the real nucleus of submission is in the nexus of power between State and Individual. As a result of it:

We now see the development of counter-conducts, of demands in the form of counter-conduct, which means: There must be a moment when, breaking all the bonds of obedience, the population will really have the right, not in juridical terms, but in terms of essential and fundamental rights, to break any bonds of obedience it has with the state and, rising up against it, to say: My law, the law of my own requirements, the law of my very nature as population, the law of my basic needs, must replace the rules of obedience. Consequently, there is an eschatology that will take the form of the absolute right to revolt, to insurrect, and to break all the bonds of obedience: the right to the revolution itself (FOUCAULT, 2009b, pp. 453-452)

What is aimed to achieve here is to show and reveal the darkest and most perverse functioning and exercise of power. Considering the heterogeneity that constitutes the subjects, the discipline of bodies and the production of knowledge, it is only within the framework of practices that is inserted in the “order of things” that it is possible to compete for the exercise of power (MENICONI & RUIZ DA SILVA, p. 103-116, 2020). Effective contestation, therefore, must put sovereignty in question. Hobbes helps us to understand what Foucault means by “*breaking all the bonds with obedience*”. In the canonical Leviathan, there’s a construction of a chain of voices that goes from the Sovereign's mouth to the subjects' ears, where disobedience would be inserted. We would deliver our natural freedom by placing in our ears the chains of voices that, like civil laws project from the Sovereign (HOBBS, 2003, p. 130). The command-obedience pair, where Hobbes comes in his project to give us new reasons to obey, since being a citizen is being obedient (LEBRUN, 1984, p. 24), makes us believe that a supra-societal power is necessary, capable of legislating about our lives, leaving us sovereignty to obey.

For this reason, the *technologie de gouverner* is in the ability to make yourself obey; the rationality of the governed cannot be the product of chance, a spontaneous result of processes that escape the exercise of power. On the

contrary, the rationality of the governed must be sufficiently raised, provoked, and motivated by and for obedience, since the ability to govern consists in the encounter between the techniques of domination exercised over others and the techniques of self (FOUCAULT, 2001b, p 1604). As noticed by Ruiz da Silva and Meniconi (2020), the command-obedience pair is clearly related to the very effect of power as such. The individual is a being linked to his own portrayal by self-practices, taking care of the value of his own image, which may lead him to disobey, or as Veyne (1988) said, to obey even more¹⁴. It is created with a new subjectivity, something typical of those who do not accept being normalized. Thus, the overcoming of the State domination and its geno and ethnocidal techniques consists in the composition of the anti-hegemonic discourse and practices: where heterotopic marginality can establish itself as something within the order of things, at the same time as outside the hegemonic discipline. This may be the way to constitute subjects that no longer respond to the Christian-State morality under which we live in Brazil – “*another world possibility, way more combative, way more ungovernable*” (RUIZ DA SILVA, 2020a, p. 65. Our translation)¹⁵.

References

ABENSOUR, Miguel. *L'Esprit des lois sauvages – Pierre Clastres ou une nouvelle anthropologie politique*. Paris: Seuil, 1987.

_____. *La démocratie contre l'État – Marx et le moment machiavélien*. Paris: Édition du Félin, 2012.

BBC. Falhou no psicotécnico, investigou desafeto e atacou procurador: A trajetória do novo presidente da Funai. *BBC News Brasil*, 25/07/2019. Disponível em: <https://www.bbc.com/portuguese/brasil-49107737>. Acesso em: 09/12/2020.

¹⁴ This notion was better described and worked in Ruiz da Silva (2020b).

¹⁵ Original: “*uma outra possibilidade de mundo, muito mais combativa, muito mais ingovernável*”.

CLASTRES, Pierre. “Arqueologia da Violência: a guerra nas sociedades primitivas”. In: _____. *Arqueologia da Violência: pesquisas de Antropologia Política*. Trad. Paulo Neves. São Paulo: Cosac & Naify, p. 158-187, 2004a.

_____. “Do etnocídio”. In: _____. *Arqueologia da Violência: pesquisas de Antropologia Política*. Trad. Paulo Neves. São Paulo: Cosac & Naify, p. 54-63, 2004b.

_____. “A sociedade contra o Estado”. In: _____. *A Sociedade Contra o Estado: pesquisas de Antropologia Política*. Trad. Theo Santiago. São Paulo: Cosac & Naify, p. 170-193, 2008a.

_____. “Do Um sem o Múltiplo”. In: _____. *A Sociedade Contra o Estado: pesquisas de Antropologia Política*. Trad. Theo Santiago. São Paulo: Cosac & Naify, p. 153-158, 2008b.

_____. “Troca e Poder: Filosofia da chefia índia”. In: _____. *A Sociedade Contra o Estado: pesquisas de Antropologia Política*. Trad. Theo Santiago. São Paulo: Cosac & Naify, p. 39-55, 2008c.

DELEUZE, Gilles. *Dialogues, avec Claire Parnet*. Paris: Ed. Flammarion, 1977.

EL PAÍS. Ministra Damares é acusada por indígenas de sequestrar criança, diz revista. *EL PAÍS*, 31/01/2019. Disponível em: https://brasil.elpais.com/brasil/2019/01/31/politica/1548946667_235014.html. Acesso em: 09/12/2020.

FERNANDES, Florestan. *A função social da guerra na sociedade tupinambá (1920-1995)*. 3ª ed. São Paulo: Globo, 2006.

FONSECA, B., & CORREIA, M. (2020, June 15). Governo gastou mais de R\$ 30 milhões em rádios e TVs de pastores que apoiam Bolsonaro. *Agência Pública*, 15/06/2020. Disponível em: <https://apublica.org/2020/06/governo-gastou-r-30-milhoes-em-radios-e-tvs-de-pastores-que-apoiam-bolsonaro/>. Acesso em: 09/12/2020.

HOBBS, T. *Leviatã, ou matéria, forma e poder de uma república eclesiástica e civil*. Trad. J. P. Monteiro e M. B. N. da Silva. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003.

LEBRUN, G. *O que é poder*. Trad. R. J. Ribeiro. São Paulo: Ed. Brasiliense, 1984.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *História da Sexualidade II: O Uso dos Prazeres*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Graal, 1998.

_____. “Des espaces autres”. In: _____. *Dits et écrits II, 1976-1988*. Paris : Gallimard, p. 1571-1581, 2001.

_____. *Dits et écrits. Vol. II: 1976-1988*. Paris: Gallimard, 2001b.

_____. “Aula de 17 de março de 1976”. In: _____. *Em Defesa da Sociedade*. Curso no Collège de France (1975-1976). EWALD, F.; FONTANA, A. (Org.). Trad. Maria E. Galvão. São Paulo: Ed. Martins Fontes, p. 285-316, 2005.

_____. “Les Heterotopies”. In: _____. *Le Corps Utopique, Les Heterotopies*. DEFERT, Daniel (Org.). Paris : Nouvelles Édition Lignes, p. 19-30, 2009a.

_____. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College De France, 1977-1978*. SENELLART, M.; EWALD, F. FONTANA, A. (Eds.). Trad. Graham Burchell. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009b.

_____. *Du Gouvernement des vivants. Cours au Collège de France (1979-1980)*. Paris: Gallimard, 2012.

MAUSS, Marcel. *Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques*. Paris : PUF, col. « Quadrige Grands textes », 2007.

MENICONI, Pedro; RUIZ DA SILVA, Gustavo. “Da lepra ao mundo pós-COVID19: um estudo a partir das formas disciplinares”. In: MENEZES, L. M. B. R. (Org.). *Filosofia Política. Perspectivas pós covid-19*. Curitiba: Ed. Bagai, 2020.

MERLINO, T. Fui obrigado a entrar em terra indígena com um missionário’, diz servidor da Funai. *Repórter Brasil*, 25/11/2020. Disponível em: <https://reporterbrasil.org.br/2020/11/fui-obrigado-a-entrar-em-terra-indigena-com-um-missionario-diz-servidor-da-funai/>. Acesso em: 09/12/2020.

MUÑOZ, Yolanda G. G. Obedecer! Escutando ecos nos escritos de Michel Foucault e Paul Veyne. *Sofia (Vitória)*, v. 4, n. 2, 2015.

RUIZ DA SILVA, Gustavo. A imagem de si: entre obediência e subjetividades dissonantes. *CIPPUS*, v. 8, n. 2, p. 29-67, 2020a.

_____. *Resenha: GROS, Frédéric. Desobedecer*. São Paulo: Ubu editora, 2018. 224p. Argumento, Salvador, n. 16, p. 117-126, 2020b.

PIGNARRE, Philippe; STENGERS, Isabelle. *La sorcellerie capitaliste: pratiques de desenvoutement*. Paris: La Decouverte, 2005.

SIMON, A. Weintraub: Odeio o termo "povos indígenas"; Quer, quer. Não quer, sai de ré. UOL Notícias, 22/05/2010. Disponível em: <https://noticias.uol.com.br/politica/ultimas-noticias/2020/05/22/weintraub-odeio-o-termo-povos-indigenas-quer-quer-nao-quer-sai-de-re.htm?cmpid=copiaecola>. Acesso em: 09/12/2020.

TOLEDO, D. Ex-missionário nomeado para Funai é acusado de manipular indígenas e dividir aldeias. *Repórter Brasil*, 18/02/2020. Disponível em: <https://reporterbrasil.org.br/2020/02/ex-missionario-nomeado-para-funai-e-acusado-de-manipular-indigenas-e-dividir-aldeias%EF%BB%BF/>. Acesso em: 09/12/2020.

VEYNE, Paul. “O indivíduo atingido no coração pelo poder público”. In: _____. et. al. *Indivíduo e Poder*. Trad. Isabel Dias Braga. Lisboa: Ed. 70, 1988.

VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo. *Filiação Intensiva e Aliança Demoníaca*. Novos Estudos CEBRAP, vol. 7, p. 91-126, 2007a.

_____. “No Brasil todo mundo é índio, exceto quem não é”. In: SZTUTMAN, Renato. *Encontros: Eduardo Viveiros de Castro*. Rio de Janeiro: Beco do Azougue, p. 130-161, 2007b.

_____. “Uma boa política é aquela que multiplica os possíveis”. In: SZTUTMAN, Renato. *Encontros: Eduardo Viveiros de Castro*. Rio de Janeiro: Beco do Azougue, p. 226-259, 2007c.

_____. Claude Lévi-Strauss, fundador del pos-estructuralismo. *Revista de Antropologia*, p. 47-61, 2010. Disponível em: https://sisbib.unmsm.edu.pe/BIBVIRTUAL/Publicaciones/revis-antrop/2008_n6/pdf/a04v6n6.pdf

_____. “Introduction: The Untimely, Again”. In: CLASTRES, Pierre. *Archeology of Violence*. Jeanine Herman. Los Angeles: Semiotext, p. 9-52, 2010.

_____. *O medo dos outros*. Revista de Antropologia, vol. 54, n. 2, p. 885-917, 2011.

_____. *A inconstância da alma selvagem e outros ensaios de antropologia*. São Paulo: Ubu Editora, 2017.

Submetido em: 26/03/2021

Aceito em: 20/11/2021

Publicado em: 12/01/2022