


Coloniality of biopolitics, eurocentric knowledges and decolonial genealogy

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2024.018-001>

Guilherme Ribeiro dos Santos Sena¹

ABSTRACT

The proposition of this article is the continuation of a series of researches carried out by the author in the last two years, both in the form of a research project and an article in the publication phase. To this end, the method of critical analysis is used the decolonial genealogy or genealogical decoloniality, a way of approximating the analysis erected by the French philosopher Michel Foucault of the forms of exercise of power and the decolonial critical theory to modernity/coloniality in the figure of the Peruvian sociologist Aníbal Quijano. In this way, it was possible to identify how Eurocentric knowledge is formed and acts together with the coloniality of knowledge (Eurocentrism) as mechanisms for maintaining epistemic and racist prejudice. In addition, a new way of understanding the complexity of the forms of subjection/subjection within the colonial context was proposed in the figure of the coloniality of biopolitics, a form of exercise of the coloniality of power and biopolitics at the micro, meso and macrophysical levels.

Keywords: Coloniality of biopolitics, Subjection/subjection, Coloniality of power/knowledge, Decolonial genealogy.

¹ Undergraduate student in Psychology
Institution: Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN)
E-mail: guilherme.sena.143@ufrn.edu.br
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4162-2773>



INTRODUCTION

This work is based on the assumption of the theorization of a decolonial genealogy of knowledge/powers. This project has been developed in the last 2 years, supervised by Prof. Dr. Lucas Trindade da Silva (UFRN), having yielded a research report, published in the annals of the XXXIV Congress of Scientific and Technological Initiation of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN), and an article in the publication phase. To this end, the proposition of a decolonial genealogy takes place through the theoretical-methodological approach of the genealogy of power erected by Michel Foucault, strongly influenced by the thought of Friedrich Nietzsche, and by the critique of the coloniality of power developed by Aníbal Quijano.

The proposition of a decolonial genealogical analysis of Eurocentric knowledge is partly due to the influence suffered by the thought of Santiago Castro-Gómez, especially in *the social sciences, epistemic violence and the problem of the "invention of the other"* (2005), *Decolonizar la universidad. La hybris del punto cero y el diálogo de saberes* (2007a) and *Michel Foucault y la colonialidad del poder* (2007b). Together with the expansion of the concept of Foucaultian device by the hands of the Brazilian philosopher Sueli Carneiro, proposed in *Device of raciality: The invention of the other as not being as the foundation of being* (2023).

Therefore, unlike the works carried out previously, in which the greatest centrality fell on Foucault and Quijano, with these other two thinkers as secondary, who helped to think about decolonial genealogy, in this theoretical production, I will seek to give greater centrality to the thought of Castro-Gómez and Carneiro. It can be said that it will be possible to see both the Foucaultian and decolonial sides of the Colombian thinker and how the concept of raciality device thought by the Brazilian author becomes a key mechanism for thinking about the epistemic dynamics within Latin American materialities.

That said, the broader plane of this theoretical production is engendered by the approximation between Foucaultian genealogy and its origins, in Nietzsche, and Quijano's decolonial thought, thus producing a decolonial genealogy or genealogical decoloniality. This perspective of analysis of the Latin American social conjuncture is based on the assumption of the denial of the hegemonic Eurocentric ideal present in the canon of the humanities in the production of knowledge about Latin America. In addition, understanding the coloniality of power and Eurocentrism as devices of power and truth, respectively, is vital for the advancement of research.

To this end, Foucault (2021b) shows us that disciplinary techniques are mechanisms of differentiation, subjection/subjection, and individualization. Thus, with the expansion of these forms of exercising power, there is the emergence of the human sciences. These sciences remain with great influence from the natural sciences and positivism.



In addition, I intend to develop throughout this research, what I consider to be a new terminology of analysis of the mechanisms of hierarchization, subjection/subjection and individualization: the coloniality of biopolitics. A mechanism for controlling life and death through a logic of superiority on the part of the countries of the Global North, arising from the colonization period.

To this end, this research can be divided into two central axes: on the one hand, how the human and social sciences act within the context of colonialism and coloniality, being mechanisms of paramount importance in the colonization of these third world countries; on the other hand, I will seek to erect what I have been calling the coloniality of biopolitics, getting closer and closer to the decolonial debate of authors such as Santiago Castro-Gómez, Walter D. Mignolo, Ramón Grosfoguel and Aníbal Quijano himself to think about how this form of control of the subject population occurs. In this way, I will continue the debate that I have been doing in recent years on the proposition of a decolonial genealogical analysis of knowledge/powers, updating it.

The comparative analysis of the genealogy of power and the coloniality of power will start from Foucault and Quijano's refusal to work with the notion of ideology, adopting, respectively: the notions of truth device, that is, the political function of truth discourses, the discursiveness created and employed by them to exercise a certain social function and the mechanisms of power that allow their functioning; and Eurocentrism, or, in other words, the understanding of the production of European rationality as a constituent of the discursive formations present in countries affected by their geopolitical and military domination.

EUROCENTRIC KNOWLEDGE IN THE CONTEXT OF COLONIALITY

The proposition of a differential analysis of the epistemic mechanisms of coloniality necessarily implies the understanding of the role that intellectuals occupy within the context of colonialism and coloniality. Both European authors, Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze, and authors from the Global South, Gayatri Spivak and Florestan Fernandes, agree on one thing about the function of intellectuals: they are not necessary in representing the ideas of the people. In an interview in Foucault (2021), he and Deleuze discuss how the masses do not depend on intellectuals to know reality, however, there is a limit to what can and how this concreteness can be known, due to power relations.

For them, intellectuals are representatives of certain forms of exercise of knowledge/power. Because they are considered holders of this knowledge, and, as shown in previous research, see Sena (2023), it is not possible to exercise power without the action of knowledge, they are seen as the representatives of the uneducated masses. To this end, the agency of intellectuals for the cause of the



masses is, yes, a challenge to be carried out, but with the due consideration that they are not and should not be the leaders of the rebel movements.

For Spivak (2010), the use of intellectuals acts in a logic of permanence of exclusion of those who can or cannot speak about themselves. For her, within the colonization context, the more one belongs to marginalized groups, such as women, blacks and non-heteronormative people, the less one has the right to report their struggles and life experiences. Unlike her, Fernandes (2009) understands that the role of intellectuals may or may not be associated with the emancipatory context. To this end, the author presents the concepts of revolution within order and revolution outside order. Revolution within the order would be a type of revolution that does not shake the existing structures in a significant way, and does not seek to make profound changes in the status quo. On the other hand, the revolution outside the order presents itself as a way to break with the current forms of domination that dependent and late capitalism imposes. For him, the role of intellectuals may or may not be in favor of these significant changes in the current structures, and it is of paramount importance that they work, together with the people, so that there is a "deconstruction" of them.

For Castro-Gómez (2005), the social sciences occupied a privileged place in terms of hierarchization between the various societies. For him, many of them emerged as a way of analyzing "less developed" societies. To this end, "the social sciences have never effected an 'epistemological rupture' – in the Althusserian sense – in the face of ideology" (Castro-Gómez, 2005, p. 91). In other words, the social sciences, to use Fernandes' (2009) terms, have always been linked to micro revolutions within the order. Castro-Gómez takes up Althusser (1980) when he compares the social sciences to Ideological Apparatuses, even though apparently, in this case, there is a decentralization of the figure of the State. In Althusserian theory, Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) are forms of control and subjection of human subjectivity. They subject (trans)forming individuals into subjects, producing subjectivities.

That said, within the colonial context, there is the formation of subjects subaltern to those created in the context of the European ideological apparatus. Not only that, but the ISAs used in colonized countries are often imported from the colonizers. The Colombian thinker, however, does not limit himself to making a synthesis of the theory of subjection/subjection present in Althusserian thought, but also appropriates the one developed by Foucault. For him, the social sciences, in addition to being "Ideological Apparatuses", act in a double theoretical-methodological-comparative movement, where, within colonized countries, they operate as a form of adjustment and control of dissident subjectivities to the exercises of disciplinary knowledge/power. On the outside of these countries, they act as a form of legitimization of the International Division of Labor in favor of the colonizers (Castro-Gómez, 2005).



For the author, "the production of alterity inward and the production of alterity outwards were part of the same power device. The coloniality of power and the coloniality of knowledge are located in the same genetic matrix." (Castro-Gómez, 2005, p.91). In addition to what has been said, this same device of power, to which the author refers, is about the mechanisms of subjection/subjection developed by the coloniality of power and knowledge as forms of creation of subaltern identities.

For the author, Quijano borrows the Foucaultian concept of disciplinary power and expands it with his concept of coloniality of power. For me, however, what Quijano did was an even bolder project: he develops a problematic of the biopolitical-cellular mechanisms of differentiation, hierarchization and subjection/subjection based on Foucault's theorization about the forms of exercise of knowledge and power, a project that will be better developed in the next topic.

According to Castro-Gómez (2007a), due to the influence suffered by Jean Lyotard's thought, both inside and outside the colonial system, universities are in crisis, and their social role, within the context of coloniality, assumes the function of a device that reproduces the coloniality of being, knowledge and power. For him, universities act as forms of legitimization of social knowledge, in separating the doxa from the episteme, from the knowledge that can be known from the knowledge that should not.

Following this logic, Hur (2021) points out that, in universities, there is often the micropolitical agency of the axiomatics of capital in the figure of professors, due to the fact that there is a kind of implicit competition of who makes the most publications. In this way, professors and the university in general are at the service of the capitalistic logic, because it is using a performance diagram, where there is a mechanism of production of more and more capital.

Because of its role as a legitimizing agent of forms of knowledge, it is understood that all forms of knowledge that escape the logic and axiomatics of capital must be set aside. There is currently, it seems, a very strong debate, within the peripheral university context, an increasing discussion of the mechanisms of oppression developed by the countries of the Global North, whether from a Marxist bias, with a critique of central and late capitalism, or from a decolonial, postcolonial or anti-colonial bias. However, as much as these debates have increased in recent years, there does not seem to have been a significant change in university power structures with regard to the validation of forms of knowledge.

In Brazil, due to the implementation of the ethnic-racial quota system, we see a significant increase in black, quilombola and non-quilombola people, and indigenous people within public universities, compared to before this public policy was implemented, but this has not been guaranteeing that these people have the right to share their traditional forms of worldviews.

For a real realization of the decolonization of the current structures of knowledge/power, Castro-Gómez (2007a) shows us a possible path: the decolonization of knowledge and universities



that produce intellectual inequalities through dialogue between knowledges, or transculturality. For the author, it was possible to have a first epistemic rupture, with the advance of postcolonial, decolonial, decolonial and anti-colonial debates. However, this first rupture took place at the doxa level. Thus, a second epistemic rupture is necessary. This time, at the level of episteme.

To this end, it is necessary to rescue the ancestral ways of knowing. Those linked to the corporeality of these subalternized and racialized individuals. Not only its historical resumption, but also its incorporation into the central debates of the current modern/colonial world, with the character of knowledge as important and scientific as that brought with the advance of the westernization of knowledge.

With this in mind, the Colombian author exposes two central ways of decolonizing the university environment: "favoring transdisciplinarity", through the refusal of the capitalistic logic of exclusion (either one is a or one is b), and replacing it with an inclusive logic that encompasses the multiplicity of human subjectivity, with the use of a logic of (if it is a and b). Secondly, "the favoring of transculturality", with the favoring of knowledge from outside Europe and its Eurocentric-white-modern-colonial pattern.

In addition to Castro-Gómez's thought, two other authors of the decolonial turn are of paramount importance for understanding the processes of epistemic inferiorization centered on the racist procedures of erasure, hierarchization, and subjection/subjection. They are: Peruvian sociologist Aníbal Quijano and Puerto Rican sociologist Ramón Grosfoguel. For Quijano (2005a), European colonization in the Americas was based on two central axes of knowledge: Cartesian dualism and social Darwinism. According to the author, with the division made by Descartes between body and mind, in the mid-1630s, Europeans took on the characteristic of rational beings, relegating the rest of humanity to the corporeal side of the mind-body binomial. Social Darwinism, on the other hand, was important to classify the cultures of different countries, making European cultures closer to the ideal of humanity, and non-Western cultures closer to savagery and barbarism.

With this in mind, Grosfoguel (2016), inspired by Quijano's thought, shows that Descartes had an influence on the colonization process not only with his dualism, but mainly with his famous "I think, therefore I am". For the Puerto Rican author, Descartes made a substitution in his philosophy that transformed the philosophical paradigm into a pre- and post-Descartes. This theoretical turn took place in the exchange of the Christian God for the Cartesian "I". The "I", that figure from which all the investigation must start, from which knowledge derives and from which these forms of knowledge are born.

For Grosfoguel (2016), the Cartesian ego established a way of knowing the world that, erroneously, was not established with the relationships between people and the environment. In other words, Descartes was responsible for creating a new form of philosophical impartiality, which was



and continues to be central in today's universities and in the relationships we establish with the various disciplines of knowledge. For him, any form of knowledge that passes through the sieve of corporeality is necessarily wrong. An example of the traditional knowledge of the non-Westernized world.

To this end, Grosfoguel also appropriates the thought of Enrique Dussel to establish his theory on the Cartesian method and its importance in the current modern/colonial world-system. As this show, Dussel presents his idea that Descartes' "I think, therefore I am" is preceded 150 years by a "conquest, therefore I am". And the claim to universality that Descartes' thought brought really comes close to this universal ideal because of the conquest that Europeans subjected to the rest of the world. Thus, "What connects the 'conquest, therefore I am' (Ego conquiro) with the idolatrous 'I think, therefore I am' (Ego cogito) is the epistemic racism/sexism produced by the 'extermination, therefore I am' (Ego extermination)" (Grosfoguel, 2016, p. 31).

The author gives us three ways to solve the problem of universities with a westernized bias that we currently present due to the process of coloniality of knowledge: first, to recognize that the basis of universities is based on epistemic racism/sexism and provincialism, generated by the disqualification and cultural elimination that occurred in the twentieth century. XVI; secondly, the break with "Western epistemology", where there is a search for decision-making universalisms; finally, the redefinition of the canon of Westernized sciences, which have their formation in five countries (Germany, France, Italy, the United States, and England), in addition to the search for "pluralisms of meanings and concepts" (Grosfoguel, 2016).

These three ways of decolonizing the university, which has its westernized bases not only in Descartes, but mainly in Kant and Humboldt, can be summarized within a concept that the author borrows from Dussel: transmodernity. Unlike the postmodern project, which is based in European countries, the transmodern project focuses on countries in the Global South, which suffer from the sieve of coloniality and colonialism. It is based on the search for ways of life that escape the racist, patriarchal, bourgeois, colonial and modern ideals that Europe and the United States have been applying since the twentieth century. In short, "Transmodernity calls for a plurality of solutions, where 'many decide for many'" (Grosfoguel, 2016, p. 45).

With these decolonial authors already mentioned, another thinker of this turn who is of crucial importance for the analysis developed here is Nelson Maldonado-Torres. Maldonado Torres (2006) explains that the human and social sciences played a fundamental role during the colonization process. For him, while areas of the humanities such as sociology and psychology were concerned with studying the societies of the Global North, it was necessary to create two new sciences to study non-European societies: anthropology and orientalism. In addition, the Puerto Rican author states that, on the one hand, the natural sciences, such as physics, chemistry and biology, were concerned



with studying and intervening directly under nature, on the other hand, it was the duty of the human and social sciences to act under European and colonial materiality.

The author makes a genealogy, à la Foucault, of the invention and transformation of the humanities into areas of knowledge that aimed at the study of so-called modern societies for the study and intervention of coloniality and colonialism. For him, Ethnic Studies is a fundamental factor for a real decolonization of university spaces in the Third World, as they break with the racist view predominant in higher education centers. And it is, for him, precisely this role that the human sciences must play in Latin America. A path of aid in the struggle for decolonization and deconiality.

In addition to the central role that Castro-Gómez gives to the social sciences, Carneiro (2023) uses the concept of epistemicide, developed by the Portuguese author Boaventura de Sousa Santos, as a way of explaining how the mechanisms that the device of raciality operates within the scope of colonial knowledge. For her, Sousa Santos presents epistemicide as the other side of the genocide undertaken in the colonization of the Americas.

In addition to the annulment and disqualification of the knowledge of subjugated peoples, epistemicide implies a persistent process of production of cultural indigence: by denying access to education, especially quality education; by the production of intellectual inferiority; by the different mechanisms of legitimation of blacks as bearers and producers of knowledge and by the lowering of their cognitive capacity; by material deprivation and/or by the impairment of their self-esteem by the processes of discrimination resulting in the educational process (Carneiro, 2023, pp. 88-89).

In this way, the knowing Non-Being affirms the knowing Being in its ontological and gnosiological dimension. Racialized peoples, constituted as the Other of knowledge, culture, civilization and race, operate as mechanisms for the social elevation of non-racialized peoples. With this exposed, the device of raciality operates following a negative and positive logic, concomitantly, as it denies the existence of some in order to (re)affirm the existence of others.

In addition to the use of Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Carneiro (2023) makes strong use of the theory of the racial contract erected by Charles W. Mills to explain, among other things, how knowledge is affected by ethnic-racial relations. For Mills, there is a reality in fact and a reality created by "white epistemic authority", which arises as a way of maintaining power relations between the white race and racialized peoples. The author calls this way of seeing the disputes around knowledge "inverted epistemology", precisely because it does not match the actual reality.

The racial contract informed by this inverted epistemology leads to epistemicide, after all, the contract requires the epistemic authority to sanction a series of myths and false representations about non-whites and their political, moral, and cognitive capacities (Carneiro, 2023, pp. 93-94).

Epistemicide is actualized in hegemonic scientific practice when it operates in a search for a reality in fact that breaks the "appearance". Because, in this way, all forms of knowledge that escape



the hegemonic-positivist-white ideal are characterized as underdeveloped and subject not only to oblivion, but also to the effective erasure of these traditional relations of knowledge (Carneiro, 2023).

To this end, Antônio Bispo dos Santos (2023), better known as Nego Bispo, presents us with a solution to these forms of disqualification of traditional knowledge, a process he calls cosmophobia: countercolonization. We must appropriate the terms used by whites, as a way to combat them. To move away from white monotheism and its worship of the capital god, from its forms of subjugation of original identities.

COLONIALITY OF BIOPOLITICS

By the coloniality of biopolitics I refer, initially, to the mechanisms of formation and subjection/subjection of human subjectivity and individuality. A specific form of exercise of knowledge and powers that acts in a logic of differentiation-hierarchization of these subjectivities and subalternized corporeities. Following this logic, I think it is a good idea, initially, to explain what configures, on the one hand, the coloniality of power, and on the other hand, biopolitics.

For Foucault (2012; 2021a), biopolitics is characterized by a politics on population. As a form of exercising power in the mesophysical sphere, that is, a middle ground between the microphysics of power and the macrophysics of power (Castro-Gómez, 2007b). Biopolitics emerged in the middle of the eighteenth century, when there was the passage from sovereign power, or Sovereignty, where kings held the power to make die and let live, by a new form of control of power, where there was no longer the figure of the sovereign, and power over life was transformed into a power to make live and let die. Allied to the processes of racism and colonization, biopolitics was used as a State mechanism to control the human species, through the control of hygiene, fertility and death rates, and social assistance policies.

On the other hand, according to Quijano (2005a), the coloniality of power is defined as a mechanism for the exercise of colonial power by the hands of countries of the Global North over countries of the Global South, through both colonialism and coloniality. In view of this, I have proposed, in previous works, that the concept of coloniality of Quijanoian power was influenced by the genealogical analysis of Foucaultian power.

With this exposed, as stated in the previous topic, Castro-Gómez (2005) states that Quijano, with his concept of coloniality of power, appropriates the theory of disciplinary power erected by Foucault as a way of analyzing European material relations, and expands it, thus becoming a mechanism for analyzing Latin American materialities. In this way, the analysis of the coloniality of power in Quijano also borrows the Foucaultian concept of biopolitics. With that said, it can be said



that the concept of coloniality in biopolitics is strongly close to the theory of subjection/subjection that I developed in Quijano's thought earlier.

This comparison proves to be plausible and fruitful to analyze because it allows a new way of understanding how the subjectivities and bodies of the Global South are oppressed daily by the mechanisms of coloniality. Thus, "there is not only one coloniality of power, but there are many and its analysis will depend on the level of generality considered (micro, meso or macro), as well as its specific scope of action" (Castro-Gómez, 2007b, p. 168).

Because biopolitics is inserted at the level of the mesophysics of power, the analysis proposed here of a coloniality of biopolitics must necessarily pass through this form of analysis of concreteness. That said, the heterarchical analysis of the forms of power is important in understanding the mechanisms of the coloniality of power. According to Castro-Gómez (2007b), Foucault undertakes a heterarchical theory of power because he understands the processes linked to the exercises of power as a network of tangled threads, and that the different levels of analysis (micro, meso and macro) have certain independences from each other. Unlike the classical theories of power analysis, where the hierarchy of power relations was taken into account, in Foucault, these connections are understood as dispersed and non-linear.

Therefore, Castro-Gómez (2007b) also shows us that the path to the decolonization of power relations should not be based only on the macrostructural level, as certain Marxist analyses want, but also taking into account the coloniality of power in the micro and mesostructural spheres.

We must understand that decolonization does not depend on molar revolutions (although it does not exclude them), but that it implies the affection and creative transformation of what Pierre Bourdieu called habitus. I would like to call this type of molecular agency, which implies the creation of a post-colonial and post-capitalist habitus, the decoloniality of Being [...] (Castro-Gómez, 2007b, pp. 171-172).

Evidently, one cannot deal with coloniality or biopolitics without dealing with the guiding point of the colonial/modern-biopolitical project: racism. Unlike the version theorized by Foucault, who understands the mechanisms of racism used only by the state apparatus and, mostly, in the Jewish and Nazi questions, the racial theory developed by decolonial authors, using mainly Quijano, is extremely denser and more usable for this work. "Race will be both the organizer of the coloniality of power and the category that will organize the possibility of existence, production, and legitimacy of thought" (Oliveira and Osman, 2023, p. 167).

According to Quijano (2005a), the concept of race dates back to the mid-sixteenth century, with the European invasion of the Americas. The colonizers needed a form of affirmation of themselves and denial of the other that could provide the colonial project. To this end, there was the creation of the concept of race, along with all the evils subsequent to racialized populations. Carneiro (2023) states that, within the context of racial conflicts, the affirmation of the white ideal depends on



the denial of the racialized Other. Therefore, it was necessary to implement what the author calls the raciality device as a way of controlling subjectivities subordinated by the racial criterion.

Having exposed this, I make my own the words of Oliveira and Osman (2023):

Although it is evident that biopower is not the same as coloniality, it seems reasonable to us to intend to approximate both historical processes as ways of knowing modernity/coloniality, taking into account the premise that power relations as inscribed arise in approximate epochs and have important inflection points in relation to the effects they cause in the world as we know it (Oliveira and Osman, 2023, p. 178).

For Mignolo (2017), coloniality is to the American context what biopolitics is to the European context. According to the author, "'Biopolitics' is a concept of the analytical account of postmodernity. Like its European counterpart, 'coloniality' has been at the center of international debates; in his case, in the non-European world and in the 'former Western Europe'" (Mignolo, 2017, p. 14).

In his article *The structure of knowledge in Westernized universities: epistemic racism/sexism and the four genocides/epistemicides of the long sixteenth century*, Grosfoguel (2016) states that there was a fundamental paradigmatic change in the form of discrimination against Jews and Muslims different from that erected by Foucault in his course *In Defense of Society*. According to the sociologist, before the century. There were several persecutions against these religious populations, however, with the invasion of America in 1492 and the subsequent "invention" of racism against the indigenous people, who came to be considered soulless beings, there was a change in the way Jews and Muslims were seen, converted or not.

According to Grosfoguel (2016), Foucault starts from a place of Eurocentrism when he states that state racism against the Jewish population began in the twentieth century. Thus, for him, "contrary to what Foucault claims, sixteenth-century racism was already institutionalized as biopolitical racism of the State" (Grosfoguel, 2016, p. 41). This way of thinking by the Puerto Rican author is extremely important for the continuation of this research topic, as it inaugurates a new way of understanding the biopolitical mechanisms of the State and updates Foucault's theory on racism.

According to Foucault (2021a), biopower was indispensable for the development of capitalism. However, for the author, this "era of biopower" only really came to be consolidated in the middle of the twentieth century. Based on the assumption made by authors of the decolonial turn, especially here Quijano (1991; 2005b; 2014b) and Mignolo (2017), capitalism emerged together with coloniality and modernity. Also starting from Grosfoguel's (2016) previously mentioned notion of biopolitics, it can be said that it ceased to be analyzed as a triad and began to be seen as a quadriad: capitalism, modernity, coloniality, and biopolitics.

In other words, biopolitical mechanisms were as fundamental as the coloniality of power and knowledge for the emergence of capitalism as a hegemonic monetary system and for the subsequent



invention of modernity as a category of modernization of the social ideal. Therefore, I imagine, the coloniality of biopolitics can be understood as the fourth form of coloniality, together with the coloniality of power, knowledge and being (Castro-Gómez, 2007b).

In the wake of Grosfoguel (2008), we currently live under the sieve of a mechanism called by the author as "global coloniality". Global coloniality is directly intertwined with the modern/colonial capitalist world-system as an extension of the coloniality of power at the global level. This claim to universality may be due to colonization processes and the influence that the countries of the Global North still exert in the Global South. This influence is not only at the cultural level, but mainly at the economic level, due to institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and military, through organizations such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) (Grosfoguel, 2008).

The concept developed by Grosfoguel (2008) helps to understand how a coloniality of biopolitics can occur by allowing us to understand how the coloniality of power outside the individual territory of each nation-state is founded and how it works within the context of the modern/colonial capitalist world-system. In addition, it becomes important because it allows the expansion of the thought developed by Quijano, especially in *Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism and Latin America*, his most influential text for the construction of this text.

Concomitantly with what was previously discussed, the coloniality of biopolitics was established even before what Foucault (2021a) calls the era of biopower. This is due to the fact that the racist mechanisms of the State have been gestated earlier than the author imagined. State racism did not begin with the discrimination suffered by the Jewish population in the twentieth century. XIX, he began with the mechanisms of differentiation, hierarchization and subjection/subjection of Latin American indigenous peoples based on the argument that they were peoples without souls, as Grosfoguel (2016) shows.

Grosfoguel's (2016) argument is based on the idea that, during the Spanish (re)conquest of Al-Andalus, the Jewish and Muslim peoples who chose to remain in that territory were forced by the inquisitorial authorities to convert to Catholic Christianity. In this (re)conquest, Jews and Muslims who had recently converted to Christianity received a different status in relation to Catholics of origin, but without the racial criterion being applied. There was, in fact, the argument of blood purity during the process of the Spanish invasion, but this criterion took into account only the religious criterion.

With the Spanish invasion of the Americas and the subsequent encounter with indigenous peoples, a new criterion for classifying those people was adopted. If, before, Jewish and Muslim converts still enjoyed the privilege of being seen as soul-holders, indigenous peoples were not so lucky initially. The soul, as Grosfoguel (2016) shows, at that time was related to having or not having a religion, and Jews and Muslims had their gods, even if they were considered wrong gods. Unlike



what was considered of the native peoples, who were taxed as having no soul because they did not have gods. The truth is that they did have their gods, but they were totally outside the Western-centric-monotheistic-anthropocentric pattern. The indigenous deities were based on the forces and expressions of nature.

That said, the original peoples of the Americas were, according to the Puerto Rican author and in my view, the first to suffer from state and non-state mechanisms of racism. Following this operational logic, the coloniality of biopolitics emerged together with the coloniality of power. In other words, it was necessary to have a form of power that disciplined the subalternized bodies so that they could be at the service of central capitalism, which is the coloniality of power. It was also necessary to create a mechanism for the control and subjugation of non-white and European peoples as seen as sub-species of the human species.

The coloniality of biopolitics, therefore, also depended heavily on the coloniality of knowledge (Eurocentrism) to install itself as a form of subjection/subjection of dissident subjectivities. This correlation occurred because Eurocentrism, which is based on the argument that only knowledge produced along the lines of white-Eurocentric science based on Descartes and Kant, was valid. Thus, it was necessary for Eurocentrism to act as a form of subjection of colonized knowledge and as a method of analysis of the various Latin American materialities.

Also contrary to what was theorized by Foucault, the coloniality of biopolitics is not only exercised at the mesophysical level, but also at the macrophysical and microphysical levels. This phenomenon occurs mainly because it is taking into account that the coloniality of biopolitics goes beyond the state sovereignty of European nation-states and is established as a mechanism of control beyond the Atlantic. With this exposed, the microphysical-cellular criterion of the coloniality of biopolitics is due to its kinship with the coloniality of power as a molecular mechanism of differentiation and analysis of populations subjected to these forms of control of subjectivity and subalternized bodies.

CONCLUSION

The current work plan was based on an archaeogenealogical analysis of the mechanisms of subjection and production of truth under and in the body of individuals who have their cultures, ethnicities, languages and customs subjugated by a brutal process of physical repression, with several deaths and people in a situation of slavery, and mental, due to the devaluation of the significant nexuses present in their lives.

Thus, in order to make the present work possible, a wide range of primary and secondary bibliography related to Michel Foucault, Aníbal Quijano, Santiago Castro-Gómez and Sueli Carneiro was consulted, as well as authors belonging or not to the canon of Social Theory and philosophy, to



understand the possible points of influence that these thinkers exerted on the French philosopher and the Peruvian sociologist.

Having exposed this, it was essential for a better understanding of the subjects studied here, that both the topic of Eurocentric/racist knowledge in the context of coloniality and the concept of coloniality of biopolitics served as a way of updating the broader project that I have been doing in the last two years, entitled decolonial genealogy or genealogical decoloniality. This update takes place, here, because it is unraveling some of the various spheres that coloniality and colonialism infiltrate, requiring a differentiated approach to the analysis of the forms of exercise of knowledge/power at the level of mental and physical colonization.

It was possible to understand how the mechanisms related to Eurocentric knowledge acted in maintaining the status quo of coloniality and colonialism. In this way, the production of Eurocentric knowledge necessarily passes through the sieve of racism, as Grosfoguel (2016) shows. In addition, it was possible to understand the role of intellectuals and universities within the colonization context in the perpetuation of the colonial situation.

It is worth noting that the efforts undertaken here are the continuation of research carried out previously and that will continue to be carried out after the publication of this work. The considerations presented here are still the beginning of a broader project that involves both decolonial genealogy or genealogical decoloniality and the coloniality of biopolitics. This, by the way, still deserves to be explored better in a future text.



REFERENCES

1. Althusser, L. (1980). **Ideologia e aparelhos ideológicos de Estado** (1 ed.). São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.
2. Benevides, P. S. (2013). Verdade e Ideologia no pensamento de Michel Foucault. **ECOS**, Rio de Janeiro, 3*(1), 88-101.
3. Butler, J. (2022). **A vida psíquica do poder: Teorias da sujeição** (1 ed.). Belo Horizonte, MG: Autêntica.
4. Carneiro, S. (2023). **Dispositivo de racialidade: A construção do outro como não ser como fundamento do ser** (1 ed.). São Paulo, SP: Zahar.
5. Carneiro, S. (2011). **Racismo, sexismo e desigualdade no Brasil** (1 ed.). São Paulo, SP: Selo Negro Edições.
6. Castro, E. (2014). **Introdução a Foucault** (1 ed.). Belo Horizonte, MG: Autêntica.
7. Castro, E. (2016). **Vocabulário de Foucault** (2 ed.). Belo Horizonte, MG: Autêntica.
8. Castro-Gómez, S. (2005). Ciências sociais, violência epistêmica e o problema da “invenção do outro”. In Lander, E. (Org.), **A colonialidade do saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais, perspectivas latino-americanas** (pp. 87-95). Buenos Aires: Clacso.
9. Castro-Gómez, S. (2007a). Decolonizar la universidad. La hybris del punto cero y el diálogo de saberes. In Castro-Gómez, S., & Grosfoguel, R. (Orgs.), **El giro decolonial: reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global** (pp. 79-93). Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores; Universidad Central, Instituto de Estudios Sociales Contemporáneos y Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Instituto Pensar.
10. Castro-Gómez, S. (2007b). Michel Foucault y la colonialidad del poder. **Tábula Rasa**, Bogotá, 6*, 153-172.
11. Dussel, E. (2005). Europa, modernidade e eurocentrismo. In Lander, E. (Org.), **A colonialidade do saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais, perspectivas latino-americanas** (pp. 24-32). Buenos Aires: Clacso.
12. Fanon, F. (2020). **Pele negra, máscaras brancas**. São Paulo, SP: Ubu editora.
13. Fernandes, F. (2009). **Capitalismo dependente e classes sociais na América Latina** (4 ed. rev.). São Paulo, SP: Global editora.
14. Foucault, M. (2020). **A arqueologia do saber** (8 ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Editora Forense.
15. Foucault, M. (2014a). **A ordem do discurso** (24 ed.). São Paulo, SP: Loyola.
16. Foucault, M. (2016). **A sociedade punitiva: curso no Collège de France (1972-1973)** (1 ed.). São Paulo, SP: WMF Martins Fontes.
17. Foucault, M. (2013). **A verdade e as formas jurídicas** (4 ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Nau.



18. Foucault, M. (2012). **Em defesa da sociedade: curso no Collège de France (1975-1976)** (2 ed.). São Paulo, SP: WMF Martins Fontes.
19. Foucault, M. (2019). **História da loucura na Idade Clássica** (12 ed.). São Paulo, SP: Perspectiva.
20. Foucault, M. (2021a). **História da sexualidade 1: A vontade de saber** (12 ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Paz e terra.
21. Foucault, M. (2021b). **Microfísica do poder** (13 ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Paz e terra.
22. Foucault, M. (2001). **Os anormais: curso no Collège de France (1974-1975)** (1 ed.). São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.
23. Foucault, M. (2006). **O poder psiquiátrico: curso no Collège de France (1973-1974)** (1 ed.). São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.
24. Foucault, M. (2014b). **Vigiar e Punir** (42 ed.). Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
25. Grosfoguel, R. (2016). A estrutura do conhecimento nas universidades ocidentalizadas: racismo/sexismo epistêmico e os quatro genocídios/epistemicídios do longo século XVI. **Sociedade E Estado, 31*(1), 25-49.*
26. Grosfoguel, R. (2008). Para descolonizar os estudos de economia política e os estudos pós-coloniais: transmodernidade, pensamento de fronteira e colonialidade global. **Revista crítica de ciências sociais, 80**, 115-147.
27. Huguet, M. G. (2012). A análise do poder: Foucault e a teoria decolonial. **Tabula rasa, Bogotá, 16**, 59-77.
28. Hur, D. U. (2021). **Psicologia, política e esquizoanálise** (3 ed.). Campinas, SP: Alínea.
29. Lambert, H. (2017). Feminismo autônomo latino-americano: Na Bolívia, as Mujeres Creando reivindicam a descolonização dos corpos. **Cadernos De Gênero E Diversidade, 3*(4), 59-83.*
30. Lander, E. (2005). Ciências sociais: saberes coloniais e eurocêntricos. In Lander, E. (Org.), **A colonialidade do saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais, perspectivas latino-americanas** (pp. 8-23). Buenos Aires: Clacso.
31. Lisbôa, F. M. (2021). O dispositivo colonial: entre a arqueogenealogia de Michel Foucault e os estudos decoloniais. **MOARA—Revista Eletrônica do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras**, 2(57), 33-51.
32. Maldonado-Torres, N. (2006). Pensamento crítico desde a subalternidade: os Estudos Étnicos como ciências descoloniais ou para a transformação das humanidades e das ciências sociais no século XXI. **Afro-Ásia, 34**.
33. Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). Sobre la colonialidad del ser: contribuciones al desarrollo de un concepto. In Castro-Gómez, S., & Grosfoguel, R. (Orgs.), **El giro decolonial** (pp. 127-168). Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores.
34. Mbembe, A. (2018). **Necropolítica: Biopoder, soberania, estado de exceção, política da morte** (1 ed.). São Paulo, SP: N-1 Edições.



35. Memmi, A. (2007). **Retrato do colonizado precedido do retrato do colonizador** (1 ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Civilização Brasileira.
36. Mignolo, W. (2005). A colonialidade de cabo a rabo: o hemisfério ocidental no horizonte conceitual da modernidade. In Lander, E. (Org.), **A colonialidade do saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais, perspectivas latino-americanas** (pp. 33-49). Buenos Aires: Clacso.
37. Mignolo, W. (2017). Desafios decoloniais hoje: Epistemologias do Sul. **Foz do Iguaçu, 1*(1), 12-32.*
38. Nietzsche, F. (2020). **Genealogia da moral** (12 ed.). São Paulo, SP: Companhia de Bolso.
39. Nietzsche, F. (2017). **Sobre a utilidade e a desvantagem da história para a vida** (1 ed.). São Paulo, SP: Hedra.
40. Oliveira, M. J., & Osman, E. M. R. O. (2023). Biopoder e Colonialidade. **Revista Dissertatio de Filosofia, 57**, 162-187.
41. Quijano, A. (2014a). Colonialidad del poder y Clasificación Social. In D. Clímaco (Org.), **Cuestiones y Horizontes: de la dependencia historico-estructural a la colonialidad/descolonialidad del poder** (pp. 60-70). Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
42. Quijano, A. (2005a). Colonialidade do poder, eurocentrismo e América Latina. In Lander, E. (Org.), **A colonialidade do saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais, perspectivas latino-americanas**. Colección Sur Sur. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
43. Quijano, A. (2002). Colonialidade, poder, globalização e democracia. **Novos Rumos, 17*(37).*
44. Quijano, A. (2014b). Colonialidad y modernidad-racionalidad. In A. Quijano, **Textos de fundación** (pp. 60-70). Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Signo.
45. Quijano, A. (2005b). Dom Quixote e os moinhos de vento na América Latina. **Estudios Avanzados, 19*(55), 9-31.*
46. Quijano, A. (2014b). La americanidad como concepto o América en el mundo moderno-colonial. In A. Quijano, **Textos de fundación** (pp. 71-82). Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Signo.
47. Quijano, A. (1991). La modernidad, el capital y América Latina nacen el mismo día. **Revista del Centro de Educación y Cultura, 10**, 42-57.
48. Quijano, A. (1990). La nueva heterogeneidad estructural de América Latina. **Hueso Humero, 26**, 8-33.
49. Quijano, A. (2020). La tensión del pensamiento latinoamericano. In A. Quijano, **Cuestiones y horizontes: de la dependencia histórico-estructural a la colonialidad-descolonialidad del poder**.
50. Quijano, A. (1988). Lo público y lo privado: un enfoque latinoamericano. In A. Quijano, **Modernidad, identidad y utopía en America Latina**. Lima: Sociedad y Política Ediciones.
51. Quijano, A. (1998). ¡Qué tal raza! In A. Quijano, **Textos de fundación** (pp. 100-108). Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Signo.



52. Quijano, A. (1992a). “Raza”, “etnia” y “nación” en Mariategui: cuestiones abiertas. In A. Quijano, *Textos de fundación* (pp. 83-99). Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Signo.
53. Quijano, A. (1991). ¿Sobrevivirá América Latina? In A. Quijano, *Textos de fundación* (pp. 47-59). Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Signo.
54. Santos, A. B. dos. (2023). *A terra dá, a terra quer* (1 ed.). São Paulo, SP: Ubu Editora/PISEAGRAMA.
55. Sena, G. R. S. (2023). Genealogia e decolonialidade: uma agenda de pesquisa. In *Congresso de Iniciação Científica e Tecnológica, 34.*, Natal.
56. Silva, L. T. (2023). A duplicidade do assujeitamento. *Revista de Ciências Sociais-Brasil, 54*(1).
57. Silva, L. T. (2015). Uma análise comparativa dos conceitos de subalternidade e racialidade. *Temáticas, 23*(45), 127-154.
58. Spivak, G. C. (2018). *Pode o subalterno falar?* (1 ed.). Belo Horizonte, MG: Editora UFMG.
59. Yazbek, A. C. (2015). *10 lições sobre Foucault* (6 ed.). Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.