

IMAGINE NEW WORLDS NOW: COSMOPOLITICS AND RACIALITY

*IMAGINAR NOVOS MUNDOS AGORA: COSMOPOLÍTICAS E RACIALIDADE**IMAGINANDO NUEVOS MUNDOS AHORA: COSMOPOLÍTICA Y RACIALIDAD*

Juliano GADELHA¹
e-mail: jjulianogadelha@outlook.com

How to reference this article:

GADELHA, J. Imagine new worlds now: Cosmopolitics and raciality. **Rev. Cadernos de Campo**, Araraquara, v. 23, n. 00, e023021, 2023. e-ISSN: 2359-2419. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47284/cdc.v23i00.18372>



| **Submitted:** 17/08/2023
| **Required revisions:** 08/10/2023
| **Approved:** 03/11/2023
| **Published:** 22/12/2023

Editors: Profa. Dra. Maria Teresa Miceli Kerbauy
Prof. Me. Mateus Tobias Vieira
Profa. Me. Thaís Caetano de Souza

¹ Writer and multidisciplinary researcher. Master's degree from the Postgraduate Program in Arts at the Federal University of Ceará, Master's degree in Sociology from the Postgraduate Program in Sociology and Bachelor's degree in Social Sciences from the same university.

ABSTRACT: This critical essay interrogates colonial modernity's meanings of cosmos, life, and politics in order to understand the knowable and sensible processes of the struggle for existence in the world as we know it. The theoretical discussion follows the proposition of concepts through the black radical imagination, and a critique of the conceptions of subject and subjection. The methodology involves studies on racism and coloniality for a cosmopolitics that is attentive to the racialized ways in which governance manages the present, the past and the future in societies.

KEYWORDS: Cosmos. Escape. Governance. World. Life.

RESUMO: *Este ensaio crítico interpela os sentidos de cosmos, vida e política da modernidade colonial para uma compreensão de processos cognoscíveis e sensíveis de luta por existência no mundo tal como o conhecemos. A discussão teórica segue a proposição de conceitos por meio da imaginação radical negra e uma crítica às concepções de sujeito e sujeição. A metodologia implica os estudos sobre racismo e colonialidade para uma cosmopolítica atenta aos modos racializados como a governança gere o presente, o passado e o futuro nas sociedades.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Cosmos. Fuga. Governança. Mundo. Vida.

RESUMEN: *Este ensayo crítico interroga los significados de cosmos, vida y política de la modernidad colonial para comprender los procesos cognoscibles y sensibles de la lucha por la existencia en el mundo tal como lo conocemos. La discusión teórica sigue la proposición de conceptos a través de la imaginación radical negra y una crítica de las concepciones de sujeto y sujeción. La metodología implica estudios sobre el racismo y la colonialidad para una cosmopolítica atenta a las formas racializadas en que la gobernanza gestiona el presente, el pasado y el futuro en las sociedades.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: Cosmos. Escape. Gobernanza. Mundo. Vida.

Introduction

This critical essay starts from the principle of *black*² radical imagination, which does not consist of a school of thought, nor does it consist of a teaching methodology that calls on the well-known Kantian parameters³ of proof and the Hegelian parameters⁴ of justification for theoretical foundations. The idea of radicality comes from how it is possible to imagine the formulation of our categories of understanding in another way without necessarily detaching ourselves from our experiences. The attribute of *black* comes from the fact that it was intellectuals, artists and groups from social movements against anti-*black* racism who produced the first works of this plural kind of imagining worlds in favor of lives turned *black* in multiple attempts to escape from the same paradigms that ensure anti-*blackness* continues to operate in academia, the arts and politics. An extremely striking work in this endeavor is *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*⁵ by Robin Kelley, in which the author recounts his experience as a *black* intellectual and activist who finds in the desire for freedom not a direct way of making racism visible and understandable, but a way of imagining the anti-racist struggle in another way. But how does this quality of sensitive and cognitive capacity become possible for us, people marked as *black*? This essay attempts to show this. To do so, it invokes other manifestations of the world that allow us to rethink some paradigms on race.

Spillers (2003) talks about the extent to which our approaches against racism still move within a framework of ontological and epistemological understanding that ensures that this same racism reinvents itself as criticism and even dialogue with the same ends in disallowing

² In this essay, the identity-political designations of *black(s)* and the demarcation of *blackness* that bifurcates the usual meanings of what would or would not be human are always used to emphasize the plurality of these lives nuanced by race and their impossibility of ontological rescue within any context still marked by racial fiction.

³ Kant (1974) argued that knowledge about morals, ethics and politics comes from experience, but that there is a transcendental knowledge that marks experience itself, so that scientific work would always be how this first knowledge manifests itself in our lives, while philosophy would reflect on the depths of the transcendental itself, which would allow the philosopher to arrive at pure reason. The scientist's goal will always be to prove a force that allows the thing to exist as a thing or, otherwise, the thing does not exist. This Kantian ghost of proof crosses times and places and is even manifested in the social sciences and cultural studies, which believe they have rid themselves of pure reason. Mbembe (2018) demonstrates this very well in his critique of black reason.

⁴ Hegel (2016) takes up the Kantian question of reason as the identity of being and object, formulating a principle of humanity that crowns reason as the marker of the human. Here, the question does not stop at proving a transcendent capacity of things, but above all justifying (i.e. making the thing amenable to rationalization) so that it can assume existence, that of being conscious or that of object (that which is passive to other consciousnesses). In this philosophy, ideas are objects that do not need to be proven in the direct materiality of social life in order to be justified. These ideas just need to be coherent. This coherence would come from self-consciousness (*Selbstbewusstsein*), which does not just abridge to a person's awareness of themselves. Reason would not be in the field of a thought that is not found in the world that thought itself tries to understand, but in an immanent capacity of thought that becomes object and phenomenon, and as such inseparable from the justification of its movements.

⁵ KELLEY, Robin. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2002.

the production of knowledge by *black* people. The author warns us to always put our paradigms under suspicion, otherwise we tend to fall back into the traps of a knowledge that has always produced us as the others of science, those whose thoughts and actions can only be understood as research objects that always need a white framework for validation. It is at this point that the radical imagination distances itself from traditional *black* studies, which are usually trapped in the same conceptual tools that oppress them, because it does not attempt to perform structural critique by re-enacting the grammars that sustain the world as we know it, which is anti-*black*.

It is part of the *black* radical imagination to bring everyday life marked by racism and make a break with the world as we know it, composing a new political imagination now. By "now" I mean the duration against the arrow of time in which all times are possible. This is not about proposing localized studies of how a certain racialized group lives in a cultural context under the weight of certain structural oppressions. It's about how people marked by race as *black* turn this into an infinite field of possibilities to guarantee our existence in a world that does not recognize us as beings entitled to a dignified existence. The *black* imagination has experimented in infinite and radical ways with the formulation of concepts, the creation of poetics and the proposition of other ways of life for *black* people that allow them to critically cross power structures towards new worlds. Hence the futuristic character of this imagination, which turns its formulations into a refusal of conventional ways of doing science and philosophy, without denying the importance of imagining the scientific and philosophical in another way. Here, this imaginative task begins with a critique of the conception of the *subject*⁶ that has guided various social movements in search of recognition of the autonomy of their members in societies. It so happens that little has been done to question the extent to which this category allows us to overcome old and new modes of subjection. This attention is followed by a series of critical formulations as routes for imagining a new cosmopolitics, in other words, a new composition of our lives with everyone else on the planet without re-enacting the foundation of property and its most perverse action, the total expropriation of the other, which is the foundation of slavery.

The *subjects* who attribute civilization to other worlds, the uncivilized or barely civilized, who would need to be convinced to unite in the same world project, which would be exactly the project of civilizing societies: this is the facet of the colonial project that reinvents and updates itself through discursive practices, which present themselves as plural, dialogical,

⁶ I use the word *subject* in italics to emphasize its inability to include the different positions of race, class, gender, sex, sexuality, among others, that non-normative ways of existing experience.

democratic, salvationist, among other definitions that are far from an effective process of historical reparation with other peoples, whose right to human ontology⁷ was denied at first. If, on the one hand, the worlds despoiled by colonization have already been almost completely plundered by the last half millennium, on the other, the world of the *subjects* who created this modernity shows increasingly obvious signs of the ruin of their cosmopolitics, which not only guided them in their respective self-projects of civilization, but which was also responsible for the very colonial enterprise that continues in its becoming-world⁸, breaking down the divisions between North and South in these times of those who, according to their own twists and turns in the trunk of the onto-epistemic inheritances⁹ of modernity and humanity, no longer think they are modern¹⁰ or even human.

In fact, the European civilizing process and coloniality have become one and the same project. And the most dangerous thing is that it is a project with multiple dimensions, spatialities and localities. Coloniality, in its plurality, is now becoming the world since its modes of governance (read: the apparatuses, techniques, aesthetics, sharing, languages and desires that unite finance, politics and racial fiction)¹¹ are everywhere. And to make matters worse, there are the so-called geophysical problems of the planet, which no longer only concern the existence of (more than) human collectives on Earth, which creates the feeling that the sky will soon fall for all terran worlds¹². If the sky has already fallen for other people, why is it only

⁷ A philosophical principle that makes it possible to understand multiple existences, based on a conception of the human that is unimplicated from the world itself. This is the Heideggerian legacy of ontology that has forgotten that the very contingency of the human is marked socially, culturally, morally and politically, so that the human is not a universal ontological category, as studies by Spivak (1999) and Warren (2018) have already revealed.

⁸ In addition to affirming certain ways of ordering the world, coloniality also produces meanings of worlds that are yet to come, since it is mobile and strategic, moving through socio-cultural and historical processes without being tied to the time and space of a specific locality. It is in the future that coloniality is actualized as new, as avant-garde, as (re)invention in terrifyingly creative ways. Its new worlds always return as a World of the Same.

⁹ According to Spivak (1999), ontology has always guided the parameters of knowledge production and the reflection on this production - epistemology - so there is no such thing as a transparent epistemology, i.e. one that is not marked. It is in this sense that I speak of ontoepistemic inheritances to allude to what we have inherited from certain ways of understanding the world and formulating categories of understanding.

¹⁰ Here, notions of the modern are based on the understanding that a space-time dimension has been determined as modern or modernity through economic, social, cultural, political, moral and, above all, racial conceptions and values. It's about the concept of modernity as a colonial inheritance that reinvents itself as plural in order to deal with the difference in the world, the endless others that this modernity constructs from time to time in different localities.

¹¹ Although the concept of governance is plural in political philosophy, I use it to point out that governance is not just about modes of government. It consists of a mobile and strategic alliance between capital, politics and race that crosses and is crossed by different modes of government around the world.

¹² I allude to the "fall of the sky", based on David Kopenawa's prophecy about the end of worlds in which the Earth is not just planet Earth (KOPENAWA; BRUCE, 2015). Terran worlds are multiple dimensions that acquire cosmology through the principles of space, time and form. These worlds are compositions that order the ways in which we understand locality, duration and the definition of things and beings with the Earth.

now that the supremacist *subjects* are worried about the fall? Well, the fall they fear is that of what they identify as their world, because other worlds they have already tried to overthrow, nothing more obvious and petty. Hence the voices of certain worlds come to haunt other worlds again on various fronts. The old colonial tactic! What has changed is the shape of the caravels, now in the mold of neoliberal democracy, of international economic and political packages, of the deeper ways of feeling and expressing/performing things. It is in these latter ways that, for example, we have what I call "artistic reproductive futurism".

"Artistic reproductive futurism" consists of the modes of governance in the arts, that is, the structures of power-domination that manifest themselves in the cognitive, sensitive and/or aesthetic ways of the arts field and which are updates of colonial, classist, *cisheterofuturist*¹³ and racist structures, among other markings of power-difference in (more than) social life¹⁴. These manifestations occur because there is no such thing as art as an autonomous field on the one hand and modes of governance on the other, but rather because the arts are part of the ways in which we organize ourselves, think, feel, desire and interact with other living people who are marked by the cognizant and sensitive architectures that also sustain governance itself. It is in this composition with worlds that the arts need to elaborate meanings and actions that make it possible to avoid the manifestation of the structures of domination that precede and follow the very construction of works or poetics. I say avoidance not in the sense of denying that the arts are crossed by these structures, but that, in the very impossibility of denying them, we can trace paths of decolonization of matter and the sensible. So "artistic reproductive futurism" is not limited to questions of capitalized modes of production or other modes of production tied to political-economic imaginations; it takes on often subtle spheres of how a normative future (sexual, religious, generational, etc.) is being maintained even through what we believe to be the purest subversion of things or believe to be an honest sharing with other forms of life. Hence the importance of the anti-colonial stance in the arts, because it does not deny the importance of making art, nor does it exclude the possibilities for people who make art (curators, artists, art critics, etc.) to negotiate with the curatorial, exhibition, aesthetic laboratory and other markets

¹³ From the principle that orders futures according to compulsory heterosexuality and cisgenderism. Cisheterofuturism is a concept I created to inform that the normativities of gender, sex and sexuality produce futurity.

¹⁴ All forms of power produce differentiation between people, things and institutions. The idea of power-difference serves to point out that difference is not always what escapes modes of domination, as Deleuze and Parnet's (1998) post-structuralism would have it when they conceive of difference as a line of flight. This French philosophy takes escape in reference to the plane of representations, forgetting that the diagrams of power are both molar and molecular, in other words, that these diagrams are both representative and intensive, so that in this philosophy, escape is against representation and not against the general logic that allows both instance and becoming.

of this field in capitalist societies. Anti-colonial criticism, in its various forms, proposes the abolition of modes of art-making that are still hostage to governance.

There are all kinds of extractivist subjects proposing peace and unity between the worlds that modernity itself once divided between moderns and non-moderns. The former, as always, thinking of the good of all people and for all people, with themselves as the totality. In the end, this shows that by people they mean only themselves. The colonial project of salvation is that the subjects, the supposed moderns par excellence, would be aware that they would have to deal with a certain condition:

[...] the condition that they recognize the existence of a real war where they saw only a question of politics and the "re-socialization" of ontological delinquents (the non-modern ones) (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO; DANOWSKI, 2014, p. 121).

But coloniality in these parts was never a question of resocialization, but of extermination of indigenous peoples and enslavement, especially of black people of African origin. The thorn in the side of modern people in Europe and their white descendants here is that now we, racialized people from the Americas and other lands they invaded and plundered, for whom we were never modern beings, want our part in this modernity. We want to point out that we are not responsible for the devastation of the Earth, whose effects modern people and all their modernity have caused and imposed on all humanities, but that we demand rights to education, health, the economy, and other things more than the political and economic games played by them commanded say they offer us and they don't offer. Contrary to what some theories about the Anthropocene might think, such as Tsing's (2021) anthropogenic fable that seeks more than human alliances, there will be no peace between our worlds and them because we learned that this separation between us and them is only ours beneficial to the extent that we manage to escape them, that we remove and return the separatist logic that separates humans from the universe and that does not recognize how we all are part of everything that exists in infinity and without the principle of property.

When I question modernity, I am not looking for (impossible) inclusion in their world, since this world is marked by hierarchical distinctions that produce expropriation, plundering and massacres of all kinds, all of which are sustained by ways of thinking, acting and feeling

that are hollowed out by wisdoms of "in common"¹⁵. In my worldview¹⁶, there is no separation between everything we recognize as human and other living things. This separation is one of the compositions of colonial ways of thinking. This does not mean that I am proposing a cosmopolitics of homogeneity, but rather a cosmopolitics of recognizing singularities through the entanglements between all the ways of being in life. However, since they produced what currently comes to us as governance, the latter hits me with daily blows with which I am separated from them all the time via exploitation, violence and, above all, in the acquisition of rights to a livable life.

I come from Afro (descendants of Sudanese peoples) and indigenous (Janduins, Jenipapos, Canindés and Paiacus peoples) lineages in northeastern Brazil that have given me conceptions of the future and of being alive that cannot be mapped by any reproductive futurism of governance. This latest futurism, in its idea of a world to come as salvation for all worlds, is trying to hold us hostage to a new debt, the debt for the salvation of the planet that finds in turbulent climatic phenomena supposed justifications for exempting people from their extermination of other people, maintaining the asymmetrical logic of powers through a false symmetry, the symmetry that we are all responsible for the devastation of the planet. Well, we have always been committed to our mother Earth, because it is the colonial *subject* who has made its governance an agency with the non-human, causing more and more ends of the world. This debt card seeks to soften the asymmetries between worlds, so that its proponent *subjects* are not concerned with thinking about a symmetrical future for all Earth's worlds, but rather with putting the responsibility for a series of power asymmetries on a symmetry of guilt, which says that all beings on Earth will answer for the planet's ills. Yes, we will be responsible for what happens to the planet. But each person will respond from their own position¹⁷.

To justify the grand plan of governance, they invoke nothing less than certain theories of networks and not only them, but especially them, to say how all people, to some extent, are connected to each other, connected to other collectives and to the other forces on the planet. Of course, this connection exists, but beyond the cosmic connections we experience, there are entanglements of power and inequality. The problem is that a certain invocation of networks is intended to have the effect that there is no room for "purifications" (LATOURE, 1994, p. 16, our

¹⁵ Being in common means that we are implicated with each other in an infinite cosmic web.

¹⁶ I conceptualize worldview as the perceptions and sensations with the invisible forces that make up cosmologies and cosmogonies.

¹⁷ Perhaps it goes without saying that each group is structurally positioned by society. The idea of positionality corresponds to the mark that the group or the people belonging to it occupy in the social structure.

translation) that reveal the real agents responsible for certain evils. Some people conveniently forget that these spaces for purification have been and continue to be mapped out when it comes to the consumption of certain goods and the enjoyment of certain qualities of life. The supposed owners of modernity know very well where to allocate minorities when they seek to consume legitimate goods by separating themselves from the rest of the world. When it comes to denying rights to other people, asymmetry is the law. Epistemological cynicism and political shamelessness go hand in hand in theories that fail to pay attention to the fact of network flows. Far from balancing the worlds, they increasingly point out their asymmetries. I quote Haraway and Kunzru (2000, p. 36, our translation):

Technology is not neutral. We are inside what we do and what we do is inside us. We live in a world of connections - and it's important to know who is made and unmade.

But if everything is together and mixed up, what allows me to trace an us against a them if not the old asymmetries of power that are updated by the new couplings that range from everyday computer technologies, through *agribusiness* to wars fired via the slightest commands from the commons¹⁸? We, the lives that have in fact always lived in symmetry with the cosmos¹⁹ and, although we continue to be persecuted and killed, we denounce the trickery of the *subjects* who remain hegemonic, supposedly universal and stable, but overly concerned with their endless others. We do not want the dirty empire of coloniality, but we do want the right and the pleasure of being alive on the planet. What many of us demand from this modernity that haunts us is the right to live, which it claims to promote and does not fulfill, or fulfills for only a few lives.

In my particular case, for years I have learned to be negligent of the productivity logic of governance that marks our steps through a kind of eternal return to the cartographies of conquest and expropriation. I only produce what enables me to achieve implicit prosperity (my own ascension and that of others living on the planet), after all, we are all constituents of the cosmos in its most diverse worlds. This does not mean resorting to the racist view that we are savages. What I want to make clear to other worldviews is that we are the manifestation of the

¹⁸ I call minimal commands of the commons the strategies for appropriating ideas, feelings, bodies and things via the reinvention of their causes and effects in the field of everyday life as microphysical ways of power continuing to order the ways in which we relate to and share with each other.

¹⁹ I conceive of the notion of cosmos in a plural way, since there are different cosmologies as symbolic, affective and material systems about what the world is. However, each system carries an ordering of things and beings, sustaining conceptions about the creation of the world - cosmogonies - which return as ordering principles of cosmological systems, and which are the principles that sustain many of the visions of the genesis of the universe.

universe. It was colonial whiteness that divided up and delimited the ways in which we manifest and/or manifest the cosmos, separating it from the human. I am not a being in sympathetic mixture with the world, but I am in common with it, so that the two of us are able to manifest ourselves in each other, maintaining our singularities and recomposing the infinitude of matter. We are alive because of what we have in common, and this is not homogeneity. With all this ancestral learning, I've struggled to kill the desire for knowledge that does not recognize the other, to get rid of those who live off the imagination besieged by the World of the Same²⁰, to get away from those who turn the ways of teaching/learning into yet another way of capturing, emptying and objectifying our lives. All of this consists of my knowledge projects. The apocalyptic project of destroying the world as we know it, that is, destroying the metaphysics that underpins governance, as Warren (2018) proposes, and the project of postponing the end of our lifeworlds, as Krenak (2019) rehearses, will not come at the hands of the *subjects* of racial supremacy, which is the figure embodied by humanity elected to exist by governance itself, even though these *subjects* advocate these causes²¹. In a similar way, these two projects, which are not mutually exclusive, are difficult for those of us who are racial *minorities* and who are still trapped in the colonial desire that captures all the power to be alive that has always been forged in the absence of the urge to consume and kill.

If we can cut off governance in order to live, it's because the logistics that no longer separate capital from politics and race do not float over us unharmed. Cutting means interrupting a flow or distorting it. We are lives that cross these logistics and are crossed by them. But we have the capacity to adapt and the power to radically transform and improvise. Governance insists on being in us, but we can cut it out. That's what I call guerrilla warfare. All this kind of guerrilla warfare is about making one or more injunctions of power structures fail. Guerrilla warfare is not synonymous with the wars structured around the world, although it does learn from them. If we flee, we do so because we have been and are being lives forged in a constant violence from which we are always finding some way out. However, escape does not merely mean dodging the structures of domination. Escape becomes operative because we also

²⁰ I do not conceptualize the World of the Same as just a world of representations and stratifications of all kinds, as in French post-structuralism. The Same is not opposed to what we conventionally call difference, as it constitutes the conventional ways of dealing with it through sensitive, perceptive and reflective orderings of what is similar and what is singular, representations and non-representable forces, rationalities and irrationalities, among other things. The Same is part of the world as we know it. Thus, the World of the Same corresponds to how the world as we know it reinvents itself while maintaining its old colonial architectures.

²¹ Theories of the end of the world carry different cosmological and cosmogonic presuppositions, so we must pay attention to which world we are talking about and, above all, which reasons certain groups defend for the end of a certain world and others set out to postpone the ends of other worlds.

create it in what we are, forged socially, culturally and psychologically in ways of existing with the world that have not been totally colonized. It is in escape that, consumed, we present ways of not having our lives consumed, that by dying we plot how to escape death, that by fighting we also concern ourselves with self-care and other ways of taking pleasure in living. The crack in the colonial wound is deep and it is naive to think that we are going to close it. Our flight is right into the abyss that is the world that has been imposed on us. We, racialized people committed to anti-racism, for example, do not operate by negating the racial scheme as if it would then disappear, but by making its perverse politics fail. Killing the white schema of racial supremacy is an exercise in flight that tells us how we inhabit the world, how we are no longer falling through the cracks, even though the fall is constant. In short, it tells us how we have learned to fly high from below, dismantling the bottom-surface logic.

If we insist on confronting the futuristic plans of governance through counter-responses (the old binary logic of confrontation), they can annul the unrecognizable ways of being alive that have not yet been achieved by it. I have learned from the massacre of our people that we must cross the semiologies of war to another place, a place of prosperity that is only made possible by the maintenance of life. If we stay in the dialectical struggle, what is possible will institutionalize the common game of the races. In *black* colorism, for example, black versus white often ends up institutionalizing a common game in which white *subjects* will always come out ahead, while the black people participating in the game remain stuck in the white mirror image. However, it is important to note that the black and white markings of this colorism do not correspond to the black and white designations of indigenous populations. However, when a person's ancestry, as in the case of mine, is made up of the compositions of *black* African²² and indigenous South American²³, which is something common throughout Brazil, but which manifests itself in a preponderant way in racialized people from the northeast of the country, especially those born in Ceará and Paraíba, being a blackness generally involves a complexity in which our self-affirmation in the world does not fit into certain chains of the duality of racial fiction, although we are constantly marked by such chains.

²² My paternal lineage is marked by Sudanese African peoples, especially those from Nigeria, Dahomey and the Ivory Coast, where one of my grandmothers came from. In the timeline of my father's conception, José Aldeni Gadelha, my grandmother, Maria Alice da Silva, a *black* woman of darker skin, conceived her son with José da Costa Gadelha, a white man of Sephardic Jewish origin from Algeria.

²³ My maternal lineage comes from the Janduins and Paiacus peoples who fled with other indigenous peoples through Ceará and the surrounding area.

We need not forget that we are people marked by race and point out the whiteness of those who have marked us and oppress us, but we need to be aware that we, people marked like others by colonial whiteness, know, in our lives made other and by them, something about possibilities and we are constantly taken by that whiteness as the condition of possibility for the production of knowledge of it. What I'm getting at is the fact that it is in the secret contingency that people on the run reserve life. The white colonial *subject*, on the other hand, suffers from the terrible affliction of thinking he is singular when he speaks of the singularity of non-white people. The condition of this white singularity seems to be non-white worlds. This is a power game in which, at the same time, the *subject* of racial supremacy poses as universal, since he is the representative of the fully human status of the world, and also recognizes himself as authentic or specific when he diagnoses his peculiarity in relation to the rest of the peoples. The problem is that this diagnosis is made by the power games, exclusion, expropriation and denial of autonomy of those peoples who come to be constructed as others. It is, then, a singularity of the order of power fantasies that is effective in the structural, institutional and behavioral layers of society.

Making whiteness think about its singularity in relation to non-white lives without making the latter captured by the former is a step towards racial supremacy being perceived as also situated in specific places of existence, which say who has power and who does not, according to the ways of governing the world. It is necessary to recognize that we are structurally marked and positioned beings, because no fullness and breaking of the chains of duality will be achieved if we are not attentive to how the World of the Same crosses us and constitutes us on some level. However, we are not held hostage by localities, nor do I wait for answers from colonial *subjects* in order to move on with my life. Waiting for that counter-response that is so common in clashes about racism prevents us from continuing our escapes, and it is through what we trace in our escape that we remain living people. Our possibilities do not depend on the responses of the *subjects* privileged by colonial whiteness. It's more like returning the unease of racism to them and escaping in a kind of spell than hoping to be part of a great pedagogy of racism. What we give back is the logistics of oppression, not its products. Otherwise, we would be back to direct reactive confrontation. Our escape is about knowing how to be and not be in the games of governance, bewitching its own fetishism.

I rescue my future through the possibilities of escaping from within, even from the commands, without becoming material for the colonial fantasies of those who position themselves via privilege like the *majority*. An escape that can only be imagined by the body

and the spirit, because the fugitive imagination is not floating in the mind, it is within the technologies that we engender with other worlds and against the World of the Same. In the case of visions of how to create new worlds on this plane, I'm not proposing simple reflexive capacities for the abstractions of *subjects*. I'm talking about making housing, education, health, forms of healing and culture effective in their *co-creations*²⁴ with organisms, machines, algorithms, images, sounds, etc. Above all, I'm talking about crime (in the sense of breaking the order of governance) in relation to these technologies and their organizations. Crime always informs about the failure of their regularity, their deceptive accessibility, the democratic guarantees they do not provide, their ability to supposedly generate life when many kill other lives, etc. In this sense, crime is an escape route. And because the overwhelming majority of people die, it's not a fatality.

The fugitive imagination is totally embodied in the sense of couplings of people with other people and with various worlds without the principle of ownership, but with various senses of vital alignments. A body that (re)imagines a whole life below and beyond the lives that exist as normal and even those that are said to be abnormal, not for lack of new designations, but because the escape route is coupled to a whole other plot, that of forces that cannot be located by the normativities that are the expert and perverse designators of behavior. What's more, the question is never exclusively about visible bodies, because thinking that everything should start from the (visible) forms of the body in the world and centralizing life in bodily matter is one of the fantasies of racialization. Therefore, dealing with the gender, sex and sexuality markings of people who are insolent to *cisheterofuturism*, which reduces these people to the visible of their bodies, is a major problem, before all the other problems that this involves and which results in failures to understand these people in their struggles for habitable worlds. An example of a very common mistake is to summarize these lives as dissidents, when in fact they are possibly insolent to dissidence itself.

What I mean is that there seems to be a politics going on in parallel to the technologies of control and stimulation, a politics that neither directly opposes the Norm (read the practical and discursive semiology of governance) nor clearly accepts it, since either of these two attitudes - resisting or accepting - would be to recognize the normative power and again

²⁴ I do not see creation as the fruit of the "ego", but as a complex and involved process that involves various beings and forces that manage to detach themselves from the trappings of the world as we know it. Because of this, when I say that we create something, I'm actually saying that we create in common, in other words, we co-create something with something else which, in turn, continues or allows the process to continue in multiple directions and non-colonial sharing.

legitimize it via dissent or simply via confrontation. The manufacture of habitable worlds, in a deeper sense than the Butlerian vision of *habitable life*²⁵, is something that inevitably passes through some clandestine route, clandestine to the clandestine people themselves. Clandestinities trace the routes by which it becomes possible to live their lives that are insolent of being lived under the logic of the Same. This logic does not consist of an opposite of difference, but where difference itself is posited as such by the sameness of things. If there is a politics of non-recognition towards the Norm that does not involve direct confrontation with the latter, it is in and through this politics that all people, in their clandestine vibrations, deposit and radiate their inventive capacities to generate new worlds, surpassing this whole World of the Same that persecutes them. Politics no longer as a common field of tension between forces, but as life strategies that cannot be located through the eyes of supremacist powers. Not allowing oneself to be located by these powers without having them as referents or references for non-location. And perhaps politics is no longer the right word for all of this.

Overcoming the fantasies of subjection

Getting out of the fantasy of desiring the modern heritage of the *polis* and its *subjects of existence*²⁶ consists of an operation of demystification. Mystification is not a mere truth effect of some collective lie, it is a constraining effectiveness, it exists and has normative agency. With this understanding, I allow myself to understand the limit that only understands insolence as resistance to the power of societies. The idea of resistance not infrequently restricts *minority issues* to visions of humanisms legitimized by the power of structures, as if our struggles were for the restitution of a humanity legitimized by *cisheterofuturist* whiteness that never belonged to us, forgetting that many minorities never wanted such a humanity or simply gave up fighting

²⁵ Butler (2006) understands that our vision of the human designates livable lives and unlivable lives, the latter being all those marked by dissidence, because the very requirements of humanity have been denied to dissident groups. Fighting for a livable life in a world that normalizes, segregates, sickens and kills a series of lives is the author's political vision of a livable life. Butler believes in a new path for the human: "There is a certain new path of the human that takes place in order to begin the process of remaking the human. I can feel that without certain recognizable traits I cannot live, but I can also feel that the terms by which I am recognized make my life uninhabitable. This is the conjuncture from which critique emerges as a questioning of the terms that restrict life in order to open up the possibility of different ways of living" (BUTLER, 2006, p. 16-17, our translation).

²⁶ Alluding to Foucault's (2013) limits on the autonomy of the subject that the author tried to confer in rescue of a new aesthetic of existence. The subjects of existence are all those with fully human status in the world. Even though they are hierarchized among themselves, they can resist power, embrace it or confront it with the possibilities of a structural game of struggle that ensures their belonging to the field of humanity. It turns out that racialized, transgendered and other people whose humanity has been denied to them are not subjects of existence, because they are the social non-existents who have often even given up the struggle for a livable life in the same world that persecutes, constrains and kills them.

to have the humanity of hegemonisms, since the latter simply does not meet the demands of those in other positions in the world. We have our own ways of autonomy, cooperation, duty, work, pleasure, creativity, etc. even if we are negotiating with the World of the Same.

I believe in the strength of what is not resisted by political activism, and yet escapes. I reimagine worlds not through the diagrams of power, but constantly through the impossibilities of not being common to the diagrams, even though the diagrams persist in the world. From the failure to abolish the diagram, I experience the conditions of possibility for accessing other dimensions not locatable by the World of the Same. This all happens when I always try to find another layer of life, when I show other people and forces that our energy fields, from which we radiate other possible imaginations, are not in common with the projects of reproductive futurism, because these imaginations belong neither inside this world nor outside it.

In the black Afro-indigenous traditions of northeastern Brazil, where I was born, there are simultaneous cosmovisions, present, past and future, which activate layers that are invisible without any counterpart to the visible of the supremacist powers. This does not allow us to come together as communities that are visible to the onslaughts of power-knowledge from other groups. Studies on indigenous peoples at crossroads with *blacks* escape the studies on indigenous communities so favored by ethnology, because the meanings of Afro-indigenous are not confined to an ethnic or simply hybrid racial demarcation, as these meanings trigger subjective, spiritual, cosmological, material and affective dimensions in constant flux with races, genders, classes, spaces and times in order to compose cognitions and sensitivities that allow other conceptions of experiencing the world and recreating it in different territories. This does not mean that recognizable studies with racialized communities can give clues about some plural way of composing worlds. For example, studies on the cosmic medicine of the Pitaguary²⁷ and the ritual poetics of the Tremembés²⁸ give us clues through ethnography and

²⁷ “Indigenous healing practices, as assumed by the Pitaguary, work with another form of rationality, quite distinct from that of biomedicine. This condition marks a differentiation not only in diagnostic-therapeutic procedures, but also in the way people, nature and spirituality are considered” (ANDRADE; SARAIVA DE SOUZA, 2016, p. 180, our translation).

²⁸ “Among the indigenous groups of the Northeast there are basically four types of ritual, known as: Ouricuri, Praia, Toré and Torém. Toré is the most widespread and is variably associated with the first two modalities. We are not going to offer a detailed description of all of them here, as our aim is to establish a general picture of indigenous rituals in the Northeast that can shed light on the reworkings and correspondences that we can find in the Tremembé Torém. More importantly, certain elements such as the chants, the choreography and the presence of alcoholic beverages will illustrate the hypothesis of a broad process of communication between this indigenous ritual and the popular imagination in which the figure of the native and the alcoholic beverage are inescapably associated, as well as a knowledge of plants and their healing powers” (MESSENDER, 2012, p. 32-33, our translation).

historiography about the difficulty of the realism schemes and theoretical foundations of the medical sciences academy in understanding that the manifestations of the invisible are not virtualities, they are not simple anecdotes that we tell, since such manifestations deviate from historically recognizable principles in the eyes of the onto-epistemology inherited from colonial modernity. These ways of imagining and creating worlds are invisible to the dual states - visible and invisible, said and unsaid, audible and inaudible - of the power diagrams themselves.

As long as academia insists on capturing radical imaginations within the old parameters of knowledge production and circulation, it will become increasingly difficult to understand other onto-epistemologies such as those of *black* radical imagination studies, which have been creating methodologies and other experiments on how to approach what is not allowed to be apprehended as a recognizable archive by academia as we know it. This is the task of Hartman's critical fable (2019; 2008) and, above all, of the elusive methodology undertaken by the *undercommons* plan mentioned by Moten and Harney (2013) below:

In the *undercommons* of the reproductive social domain, the means, i.e. the planners, are still part of the plan. And the plan is to invent the means in a common experiment launched from any kitchen, any back porch, any basement, any living room, any park bench, any impromptu party, every night. This ongoing experiment with the informal, carried out by and on the means of social reproduction, as the advent of life forms, is what we mean by planning; planning in the *undercommon* is not an activity, nor is fishing, dancing, teaching or loving, but the ceaseless experiment with the futuristic presence of the life forms that make such activities possible (MOTEN; HARNEY, 2013, p. 74-75, author's emphasis, our translation).

Moten and Harney start from the undercommons to support the theory of what they call the "black study" as a prophetic study, since it never allows itself to be located in the real time of events but is also a kind of fugitive plan that improvises the future now. The "black study" neither stops at conceptual prisons nor simply rebels against them. This study produces a secret dimension between the prison and the revelation that the former tries to prevent. It is "a secret that calls the prophetic into being, a secret held in common, organized as secret, calling the prophetic organization into being" (MOTEN; HARNEY, 2013, p. 42, our translation).

If, based on the futuristic plans of the *black* radical imagination in line with other histories of raciality, I talk about imagining the future in *another* way as something that builds non-locatable networks, this never corresponds to any strictly individual demand. It was the colonizing world that created individualism. This is not part of my way of conceiving the "me" that I inherited from my grandfathers and grandmothers of the maternal line, who were peoples attributed as Tapuias by the colonizers and who were various lineages of indigenous people

from the borders between Maranhão, Ceará and Paraíba known for their merciless war tactics towards the colonizing peoples²⁹. What I live as "me" only exists in deep implication, since I do not imagine alone or indicate that we should have all this imaginative load on the back of a single person, or at the very least we will get sick. It's when we realign ourselves with the Earth that we manage to weave new lines with the world.

In order to really happen, the living thing comes from an imagination of a whole split and open world, particular and multiple, which escapes and can only be realized by it. This brings us to the dimensions of cosmoguerrillas. What I call cosmoguerrillas are not rebellions or counter-rebellions everywhere, which would turn them into state agencies of insurgents. They are compositions of worlds that do not allow themselves to be organized by what the world as we know it recognizes/would recognize. They are present in multiple forms of knowledge production and poetic creation that announce other worlds, such as Butler's science fictions (2019; 2017) and Bonn's cosmopoetics of refuge (2020). I reiterate: I do not think of cosmoses as existing from one against the World of the Same, although the former end up being against this World³⁰. So cosmoguerrillas do not aim to rescue the memory of conquest through war, they do not want to maintain the colonial prison through such memory. The materialities of cosmoguerrillas are made by a kind of secret that reimagines colonial prisons. Cosmoguerrillas only allow themselves to be located as futuristic zones ready to violate all the violence of the Same. In every cosmoguerrilla, one negotiates with the rational and the sensible, the representable and the non-representable, the locatable and the non-locatable, the instance and the becoming in ways that are never previously given or fully envisioned, but always in some kind of plot in which the forces that maintain this world that constrains us are only summoned to their own end.

The cosmoguerrillas take on a new sense of prophecy and seek to establish an inventive imagination through the people who have had their desire to dream kidnapped, but who manage

²⁹ "Before the Dutch invasion, the general knowledge of the Tapuias and particularly the Cariris was through the suspicious information of the Tupís natives, their enemies. However, there had already been some contact between missionaries and, above all, adventurers and these aborigines. As far as Ceará is concerned, what we have on the subject can be found in Father Luis Figueira's report, the <<Relação do Maranhão>>, written in 1608, describing his unsuccessful expedition to Ceará, in the company of Father Francisco Pinto, who was then sacrificed in the Ibiapaba mountains by the Tapuias Tacarijús. The selfless missionary refers to the Tapuias who inhabited the mountain range and its surroundings, in Maranhão and on the Ceará side" (POMPEU SOBRINHO, 1934, p. 8, our translation).

³⁰ The conceptualization of the cosmos includes worlds that do not start from the principle of separability between (more than) human lives and the world, unlike the World of the Same in which the world is a property of humans. In this conceptualization in which human lives are implicated with the universe, cosmologies and cosmogonies are based on the principle of existence in common with all things and all beings.

to live through the escape route and beyond, people who, although imprisoned, are apart from the prisons without being directly located from a counterpoint to what is rational and irrational in these prisons. Only initiated groups reach them, not because they are initiated by the technologies of individual learning in this world or by some phenomenology of the beings of the organization itself, which would interfere with any pedagogical work with other escaped people. Cosmoguerrillas allow escape, since they enable their worlds to learn that they are the universe itself experiencing itself. It's about learning that each and every one of us has the power to change, adapt, destroy and create the radical immanence of the cosmos itself, as quantum physics has warned us about fractals³¹. Cosmoguerrillas teach us that we are more than human and that our lives are more than social. The organization of any cosmoguerrilla is organized by neglecting the Norm as self-care and by refusing it as defence. The teachings of the organizations are always to flee from all normative teachings, but there is always a recognition between one life and another life whose route is to flee. Everywhere in this World of the Same, a fugitive world escapes and will always recognize another fugitive.

Ontological dispossession

I will now focus on the fact that some people have always been treated as having no ontology³², which short-circuits the network of thought that operates through the notion of *subject* as if it were universally welcoming. I am trying to deepen the vision of the limits of this subject category for anti-colonial action. It turns out that when this category focuses on those people who are not only outside its ontology, but who *a priori* have been understood as having no ontology, as in a way black Africans and the indigenous people of the Americas have been understood, we fail to understand what is not allowed to be mapped by modern conceptions of the *subject*. But it's obvious that those who have the status of subjects very helpfully tried to plot a narrative of conceding their ontology to those people without it, when such a concession (impossible, by the way) was of interest to the modern-colonial ontological project, especially when that project began to collapse. And so the project of people without ontologies continues. This project, in the case of black lives, usually takes the following path:

³¹ In our physical and biochemical composition we carry fractals from different bodies in the universe, including fractals from stars in distant dimensions. Fractals act as infinitesimal dimensions that connect us to the entire universe, informing us that we carry characteristics and capacities of everything that exists and could exist in the world. On our material and quantum connection, see Clegg (2018).

³² I rescue the sense of ontology as a demarcator of the human in epistemologies of European origin to affirm how it becomes impossible for those who have been deprived of their humanity through various colonial processes.

When you admit once and for all that ontology leaves existence aside, it won't allow us to understand the being of black people. Because black people no longer have to be black, they have to be black in front of white people. Some will say that we should remember that the situation has a double meaning. We reply that this is not true. In the eyes of the white man, the black man has no ontological resistance. From one day to the next, black people had to situate themselves in front of two reference systems. Their metaphysics or, less pretentiously, their customs and frames of reference were abolished because they contradicted a civilization they did not know and which was imposed on them (FANON, 2008, p. 104, our translation).

If the imposition of civilization as a predetermining racial differentiation of who the *subjects* would actually be is a mark of colonization, the idea of putting all people who are *subject* to the civilizing process in the same position as the agent who is structurally recognized as the civilized corresponds to a fiction of power, whose ways of being materialized in society are disastrous. It is the dispossession of any possibility that certain racialized people have of enjoying the goods of modernity that the ontology of whiteness fabricates as legitimate and desirable. Claiming to grant a certain ontology to others has been a common tactic for various purposes of governance across the planet which, in practice, have never recognized the Other as a being entitled to a dignified life by their own concepts of dignity.

For example, regarding the narrative of India's transition to the modern state, Chakrabarty (1992) believes that, in addition to this transition being a work of fiction that the colonizing world told the colonized Indian people, it was made through the promise of their adherence to the condition of *subject*. An impossible access because, both theoretically and practically, the *subject* was always the European, the one who, in his diversity of existences, really enjoyed autonomy according to the rules of the Same World. In this limit of Indian people being the *subject* of Europe lies more than the generic indication of the impossibility of all people colonized by Europe becoming European. There is also the limit of the very notion of *subject* in thinking about the positions taken in social life by the people of the colonized worlds.

However, Spivak (2010) warned us that not every Other from the colonies is an Other from Europe. In the case of the American colonies, for example, the question of Otherness is more than a dispute over nationalism, it is, from the outset, racial-colonial, a delimitation of borders between what is humanity and what is not. The differentiating principle is to actually be considered a white *subject*, according to the local configurations of whiteness of European origin. And, in the specific case of Brazilian fiction, nationalism has never existed without racial differentiation and racism. My country's own colonial white *subjects* return the act of such impossibility whenever they can, even if unconsciously or veiled. Returning to the dialogue

with Chakrabarty (1992), this author notes that there are two daily symptoms of the subalternity of non-Western Third World histories: historians from the so-called Third World feel the need to refer to works of European history; for their part, historians from Europe do not feel the obligation to correspond. And they do not feel it precisely because, for them, we, the "colonized" people, have never been and will never be *subjects*, no matter how much those who have fabricated themselves as the true *subjects* tell us otherwise, no matter how much they conceive of the modern idea of the *subject* through a lens of magnification and refraction of the kind that, in one cultural zoom, there would be *subjects close* to them and in another frame there would be *subjects far* removed from the vision of how the *subject* finds itself.

The question of the *subject* is far from being solved through the lens of cultural relativism. Moreover, the cultural difference so endorsed by this relativism has been yet another of the countless facets of actualizing racial difference³³. Here in Brazil, a typical example of the academy's coloniality is the requirement of foreign language proficiency exams in postgraduate programs for Brazilian candidates, when in universities in Europe and the USA, for example, it is rare for candidates to be required to have some proficiency in languages other than those of their own country. Brazilian academia forgets, or pretends to forget, that the quality of the exam it requires, in addition to promoting what Bourdieu (2007, p. 9) called "distinction", is pure coloniality.

Thus, the differences I emphasize cannot be reduced to questions of naming, such as whether or not we are called a *subject*, because what has become more commonplace with the advent of so-called anti-colonial critiques, together with other non-hegemonic thoughts, is the spectre of overcoding, which haunts the entire enterprise of modes of knowledge today. This overcoding is not just about one code overlapping another, but about the very principle of elaborating the world through categories of understanding, space, time and form that make all coding possible. The question remains: how can we elaborate cognitions that do not attempt to reduce the irreducible becomings of life into the notions architected by the onto-epistemologies inherited from colonial modernity?

In the case of Brazil, the logic of race codification, however veiled, never fails to tell us how black people have never been *subjects*, and it tells us this in many ways. One of them was when, after the process of abolishing legalized slavery, black people were never included in the social field that includes the rights of *subjects* and, obviously, *subjects* of law. This does not

³³ On how cultural difference mirrors racial difference, see FERREIRA DA SILVA (2019).

mean that I believe in the possibility of such a project of inclusion, as long as it is based on the compositions of the ontology of colonial whiteness, but it does highlight the absence of an effective attempt to point out Brazil's lack of interest in the quality of life of the blacknesses. For example, after abolition, black people were not immediately *subjected* to projects of incorporation into society or as workers to sell their labor power. Despite the fact that those lives apprehended by the category of the proletariat are those that have been so expropriated that they only have their labor power as a means of survival, seeing some people as workers consists of approaching a certain notion of *subject*, since the category of *subject* presupposes autonomy. And autonomy is one of the fictions of the *subject* of liberal capital, as well as being something that, to this day, Brazilian elites do not wish to confer on the poor, nor do they recognize for black people, who remain most of the population in Brazilian poverty indices.

According to Borges (2018, p. 59, our translation), in Brazil, those lives that were once enslaved continued to be seen as mere labor power in the post-abolition period: "The black man has always been the labor power, not as a seller of it, but as the labor power itself". This is still reflected today when Brazilian people are found under slave labor, mostly black people. What we find there is their difficult access to subjects of law, because the idea of such access would be a step towards short-circuiting the network of "post-abolitionist" colonialism and all the racism that feeds it. After all, I return to Borges (2018, p. 59, our translation):

[...] positioning oneself as a working class in the post-abolition era is a problematic experience, because positioning oneself in a category that seeks rights means, first, understanding oneself as a subject in the world, something that was perversely denied under the slave system.

This does not mean that the question of the subject is exclusively the question of work, but that the latter, in full exercise of the designation worker, can only be granted to those people who have acquired the former. Today, some people call black people workers, but the working conditions of most of these people are still very close to slavery.

Regarding the effects of racism in Brazil, Borges continues:

The consequences, especially on the psychic level, are remarkable, such as the denial of the being that is not and pretends to be, of this individual without a place and, therefore, who denies himself and his equals all the time (BORGES, 2018, p. 59, our translation).

The assertion that there is no place for these blacknesses comes precisely from the fact that Brazilian society has worked at all times not to include them. This has taken on extreme

characteristics, from the incentives to bring white European peoples (especially Italians) to Brazil in a policy with clear objectives of whitening the local population under total neglect for the lives of the country's black populations to the present day, in which affirmative policies, such as racial quotas, still encounter strong barriers to being put into effect. There are many other examples. However, the process of trying to fit into a notion of *subject* that does not and never will encompass them makes the black *subject* just a matter of naming, because in practice the racism in force insists on dismissing what is usually said out of hand. It is necessary to rework what makes a *subject* of law a *subject* of law, and this can only be done by completely abolishing the modes of *subjection* of the architectures of power-knowledge that allow the racial fiction to be constantly updated.

Racism has a prominent place in the very rationality of what was coined by Foucault as biopower - a power over life for those who the world actually thinks deserve to live - and is justified by a fact already noted by Mbembe (2016, p. 128, our translation), namely:

[...] more than class thinking (the ideology that defines history as an economic class struggle), race has been the ever-present shadow over the thinking and practice of Western politics, especially when it comes to imagining the inhumanity of foreign peoples - or dominating them.

So, rather than always returning to racism as a way of explaining the mentality that manages the games of domination, it is up to us to question how race itself acts as an element of thought-action-sensation, which architects and is constantly being architected in multiple networks that, in turn, make racism *alteriorly* possible and not only that.

Traces, networks and other possible cognitions

I now see how colonialism is marked by traces that seem to disappear, but always remain. I am increasingly distancing myself from the idea that the World of the Same is just an irrational imposition of violence or that it is a rational structure of violent action. Because both things take place in colonialism: irrationality and meticulous rational techniques to achieve the irrational desire for extermination. The concept of the trace finds its meaning here in the fact that it does not seek to centralize the forces of coloniality in automated spheres that prevent the detection of the porosities between oppressions, their connections and disconnections with other oppressions, both internal and external to colonialism itself. Rather than being restricted to approaches that even recognize the interfaces of the phenomena of oppression, I am

interested in crossing other crossroads. I understand coloniality as an uninterrupted chain of violence that takes place within, above, below, in front of and through the imposition of the logistics of the Same, which can be traced back to two forces through which these same logistics are made philosophically effective: abstraction and sensation.

There is a sense of suspicion that maintaining the brutality of certain connections and disconnections between worlds would not be possible without the coupling of various resources, means and many ends that are agreed upon for the extermination of the usual people (Afro-descendants, quilombolas and indigenous people, especially in the Brazilian case). Paying attention to how these networks act allows me to fight them where they are most cynical, veiled and almost imperceptibly visible. However, the traces of colonialism, which are also plural and open, as much as they act by constricting lives, make up trails that intersect and challenge the ideas of origin and sequentiality. This means that colonialism, in its multiple ways of acting, cannot be reduced to a narrative, or even several narratives, which have the principle of linearity as the basis of the facts. There are cuts, escapes and resistances in all the stories of colonization and this already prevents any desire for sequentiality, except when we take into account the fact that a world that thinks of itself as the World has been fabricated as such through ideas of sequence and *determinability*³⁴.

When I say that coloniality continues, I say that it continues because the traces always come back, or simply that they are there in becoming with the world. The traces are the marks that constantly appear and disappear only to reappear again, informing us of the erratic or even fantasmatic character that coloniality has and without which it would not be possible to materialize in the form of a difference between humanities, namely racial fiction. This is also why racism cannot be contained in a totality, since it acts in various sub-layers through a series of *necropowers*³⁵. The vision I aim to achieve does not provide answers or certainties to all

³⁴ I borrow the notion of *determinability* from Ferreira da Silva (2019) to indicate the onto-epistemic bases of causality and effect of the modern-colonial project. The author calls separability and determinability "two intertwined elements of the Kantian program that continue to influence contemporary epistemological and ethical projects: (a) separability, that is, the idea that everything that can be known about the things of the world must be understood by the forms (space and time) of intuition and the categories of the Understanding (quantity, quality, relation, modality) - all other categories about the things of the world remain inaccessible and therefore irrelevant to knowledge; and, consequently, (b) determinateness, the idea that knowledge results from the capacity of the Understanding to produce formal concepts that can be used to determine (i.e. decide) the true nature of the sensible impressions gathered by the forms of intuition" (FERREIRA DA SILVA, 2019, p. 39, our translation).

³⁵ In reference to the theory of necropolitics conceptualized by Mbembe (2016) in which necropowers correspond to the injunctions of laws, techniques, aesthetics and all the forces that make manifest macro and microphysically the policies of killing and letting die certain populations of the planet.

these questions, but this does not exempt me from looking at colonialism from another perspective, that of the traces.

It is worth remembering that the scientific theories of the network concept appear as a symptom of the economic and political macrologies that gained greater expansion in the 19th and 20th centuries, so that these theories become the representative parameters of the behavior of today's *subject* of knowledge, confusing the desire of this *subject* with the operation of the networks in which he acts, but this still modern *subject* has always been much more than this effect of his industrial and post-industrial societies. Although theories such as Latour's studies (1994; 2004), point out that hybrids and their collectives have always existed as such and that purification - the process that separates life into distinct ontological zones and prevents us from thinking about the symmetries between nature and culture - was the hallmark of those who thought of themselves as modern *subjects*, the European West only began to think more deeply about networks at the moment when the economic, social and cultural effects of contacts with the Atlantic and the immersions of prey in the Africas and the Americas began to be more and more intense.

Mercantile capitalism and its later face, industrial capitalism, can only be understood on the basis of the multiple histories of modern colonization in which the lives designated as *black* were simultaneously transformed into merchandise and labour power and, with this, such lives became the modern symmetry of nature and culture that says that the *Black person is a hybrid* imagined by European whiteness in the service of intensifying the purification of certain whites as the legitimate *subjects* of the world in relation to other peoples, but which above all says the materialization of a set of practices of abstraction and sensation about the world.

How do *subjects* of European modernity discover overnight that they are not and never were modern? It was not only the experiments of the metaphysical epoch or the emergence of science laboratories that caused this discovery, as Latour would have it. The first laboratories were the other peoples who were first given the idea of being inhuman (inferior humanities) and non-human (that which no longer even presents humanity) and then understood as objects endowed with agency. It is no coincidence that the great modern theory of the agency of objects is due to this colonial fantasy, in which the perception of agency for objects of all worlds is due to the vision of equating lives turned *black* with the world of things. This tells the whole story of how Europe constructed the Other not only from a self-world, but also through processes of purification and symmetry between natures and cultures, even though the term culture only came into use long after the modern colonization of the Atlantic began.

I come back to the fact that we have to be careful with essentialisms in coloniality studies. In the case of Indian coloniality, the configurations of what the Other would be are intertwined with a specific mode of subalternity, as Spivak (2010, p. 76, our translation) warns us:

In subaltern studies, due to the violence of imperialist, social and disciplinary epistemic inscription, a project understood in essentialist terms must travel in a radical textual practice of differences. The group's object of investigation - in this case, not even the people as such, but the floating intermediate or buffer zone - is a deviation from an ideal - the people or the subalterns - who are defined as a difference from the elite. It is towards this structure that the research is oriented, a situation somewhat different from the self-diagnosed transparency of the radical intellectual of the First World.

The Indian philosopher draws our attention to a series of possible deviations that structure differences through domination/subjugation, so that all knowledge as knowledge-power also operates its multiple routes. In the case of the Atlantic colonial project, one of its particularities was the fact that a specific type of human was seen as both agent and object, so that their subjugation came about through a total expropriation of the condition of humanity. In European scientific knowledge, objects came to be seen as hybrid agents of nature and culture, since the world perceived as both object and agency by the modern-colonial white world were black African lives and, nevertheless, those of the indigenous peoples who lived/live in the Americas. From there, a certain conception of network thinking is amplified as a thought that no longer centralizes the human as the center of interactions and that there would no longer be a separation between natures and cultures, in other words, the idea of symmetry would find resonance in the traffic of those hybrid agents of nature-culture forcibly embarked on slave ships by the promotion of the Atlantic as a great network of connection between diverse worlds. The leap of multiple dimensions that we have, based on this fact, is what allows us to understand that the techno-industrial and the computerized were never the first matrices for thinking about the deconstruction of dualities, ontologies and all the series of purifications that a certain project of modernity once thought possible.

The influence of how industry, and everything that has generated it and what has been generated from it, has layers that go beyond the matrices of Western Europe. However, it was in this Europe that a series of displacements of humans from functions long thought to be performed directly and exclusively by humanity there began. We are faced with the emergence of industrialized work operations and the scientific laboratory, which usually appear to us as the maximum examples of the undoing of this centrality of the human, which found its greatest

expression in the computer operations developed by the USA. But the technological mentality born in Europe and spread throughout the world is not the only factor responsible for the emergence of post-human thinking. This very idea of irradiation traces the arrow of technology's time. However, technologies and the thought of the *subject* as an effect of them are fantasies of those people who have always insisted on destining other people as if they were objects or natures. Then the posthuman is more human than you can imagine!

It's no wonder that the first thing that certain network theories tried to do, by seeking symmetries between the human and the inhuman and non-human, was to continue the project of erasing the representations of those people not considered human or considered inferior human, crowning racism. This racism prevents us from seeing that various African ancestral technologies and indigenous technologies in the Americas, each in their own way, do not operate through distinct and purified ontological zones, which posthuman theories claim to call into question, but which have always been disregarded by my African and indigenous ancestors. The critique of post-human, post-organic and other hybrid fictionalizers only makes sense to those who first believed in a human world that was separate from other things and from the cosmos, only to later see them as non-separate.

Final considerations: above and beyond structures

The notion of cosmopolitics has been gaining momentum in environmental movements and in the social sciences, especially in anthropology, in order to understand the associations and dissociations between everyone living on the planet. The first appearance of the term comes from the work of Isabelle Stengers to understand how the history of science constructs a certain notion of the world. One of these works, in its most recent version, appears in a succinct/precise way in the form of an article published in Portuguese as *A Proposição Cosmopolítica (The Cosmopolitical Proposition)*³⁶. It is in resonance with this perspective that the term began to appear in different approaches by a range of authors, such as Latour (2004) and Glowczewski (2015), to understand the ways in which worlds are composed and how associations and orderings by these worlds act. Far from compiling a genealogy of the term cosmopolitics, this essay has provided an opportunity to think about how we can structure other worlds, if we understand the limits of many of our categories of understanding and ways of feeling the other.

³⁶ STENGERS, Isabelle. A proposição cosmopolítica. *Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros*, Brasil, (69), 442-464, 2018.

The route was the *black* radical imagination, since we are marked and marked in an anti-*black* world in which race in intersection with other structural markers are forces that sustain the *separability*³⁷ of our social relations.

However, recognizing how social structures position us according to markers of race, class, gender, sex and sexuality, among others, can open the door to the dangerous idea that structural critique should close itself off to identity politics, or to an equally extreme but opposite version, that we should abolish senses of belonging in order to pulverize our particular histories in favor of framing them within a general framework of understanding in which we would all be human, erasing the fact that humanity is not an ontological guarantee for all the people on the planet. Aware of these two dangers, I conclude this essay on the political importance of crossing both visions that affirm group belonging and those that understand the possibility of existing in another way in the world that is becoming a new world, without falling into the becoming of the post-structuralist proposal of a world to come that retraces the roadmaps of conquest and expropriation in the field of the possible.

Ever since what was naively called post-structuralism, which originated in French academia, it was already becoming increasingly apparent in the Euro-American centered academic field that the ideas of representation and its more praxeological field - knowledge about/with ideologies - seemed to imply a kind of evil to the new thinking of the modern post-structural intelligentsia and also to various factions of post-modern thinking that were more and more vehemently proclaiming the plural fractures of time and space. These two diverse and plural ways of conceiving the world - post-structural and post-modern - saw structural representation and even ideology as problematic (not to say outmoded).

In the case of the European influence, this moment owes much of its strength to the legacies of the post-May 1968 demands in France, where micro-logical visions were opted for, with desire, subjectivity and even power as dimensions to be understood through operations that could no longer be mapped by macro-logical concepts. This triggered multiple ways of thinking with strong foundations in the nascent philosophies of the time, especially those of Derrida, Deleuze and Foucault, just to name a few of the best known in Brazil. In the US, the attacks on time and space came mainly from the techno-scientific advances of the post-World War II era and the country's imperialist policy of ascension in the world.

³⁷ On the concept of *separability*, see footnote 30.

Furthermore, in both cases, European and American, the theory of relativity and quantum particle physics influenced ways of understanding social and cultural life through molecular conceptions. And this was important for us to better understand some of the microphysical issues of life, but it was damaging because we thought that the so-called old macrological issues, especially those of politics and economics, could be understood almost exclusively by the micro-politics they involve, without paying attention to the fact that, according to quantum physics itself, the micro is also in the macro and vice versa. Even a profound intellectual like Spivak (2010, p. 54, our translation) falls into this trap when she says: "the relationship between global capitalism (economic exploitation) and the alliances of nation states (domination and geopolitics) is so macrological that it cannot account for the micrological texture of power". She also forgets to cross the distinction between micro and macro.

The problem in the transition from macro to micro in social/cultural studies was that the new conceptions of *diferrence* were pitted against those of representation, in a way that smacks of hatred towards the possible autonomy of those lives that have been diminished by the World of the Same when it comes to questions of the right to power, especially against identity-based representations of lives such as homosexuals, indigenous people, transvestites, etc. This became a process of erasure, where people spoke of *diferrence* without giving much importance to how identity is a fundamental part of the struggle for social existence of those people who are, in terms of acquiring rights, socially non-existent *subjects*. What was being called a *diferrence* in several of these French studies were always non-identity ways of existing, which served to bad faith transparent *subjects* into disallowing the affirmation policies of groups who had their identity hijacked and dissolved in the game of becoming and/or *diferrences* supposedly thought of without referents.

As much as we can flee like the devil flees from the cross from everything that closes off worlds in some identity that does not allow us to accompany and overcome the variations and derivations of power, I do not recommend simply denying identity and all the other marks that constitute us and that often inform us of who has been marked for death and who has been marked for life according to the modes of governance. The misconception that denying identities in favor of *diferrences* in the post-structuralist sense would make it possible to empower certain *subjects* ended up offering recourse to projects to erase certain people in favor of the usual dominant *subject*, who remained comfortable once again in his zone of transparency towards a world that, in turn, remained renewed as the Same. In these kinds of studies, the sites of supremacisms were ratified as the Norm through certain discourses of *diferrence*, which, in

the special case of Deleuze's philosophy, was often a way for the *subject* to differ, sought by the intensities of the Other, through the cartographies of the conquest and expropriation of intensities.

The idea of always being open to multiplicity and, therefore, to deterritorialization does not say, nor does it justify why, in many of the questions posed by Deleuze and his followers, it is the *subject* of racial supremacy who needs others in order to undertake deterritorialization, as in the processes of territoriality described by Deleuze and Guattari (2010) in their greatest work, *The Anti-Oedipus*. Although in this work the authors do not restrict their thinking to becoming and/or *difference* only through the colonial fantasy of *lessening* other existences, this way of thinking became an avatar of the "aberrant movements" - to use an expression by Lapoujade (2015) - of this philosophy. It thus erased not only the ideologies of the struggles of dispossessed people of all kinds, but mainly the fact that it was from a very particular and ideologically constructed place, even if thought of as transparent, that all the invocation and defense of the so-called *differences* for oneself came from, which only existed via the others on the endless colonial menu of the diverse. Those who are truly open to multiplicities first seek them out in their own lives in connection with others, and not in the act of consuming other people's intensities by reducing other people's lives to colonial fantasies. However, locality, as Ferreira da Silva (2019) allows us to understand, is more of an ordering fiction, since the macro is in the micro and the micro in the macro, if we really follow the quantum view that everything is in everything and everything everywhere, however fractal it may be.'

I no longer dare to operate along a line of escape strictly in the sense of the philosophy of difference that dematerializes worlds and becomes susceptible to some new territorialization/materialization. For a long time, I have always operated critically with this philosophy (GADELHA, 2017) and, in my latest studies, I have tried to understand how matter itself disappears not through necropolitical erasure, but through an effect of *fugitivity*³⁸ – the effect that the thing remains alive and radiates powers without being able to be seen/apprehended by the world as we know it – and also by an effect of *spectrality* – the effect of things coming and going, appearing and disappearing, haunting the spatio-temporal dimensions, as Gordon's (2008) studies on social phantasmagorias have shown us, understood

³⁸ I transpose the notion of *fugitivity* as proposed by Moten and Harney (2013). For the authors, *fugitivity* is a force woven into the undercommons that escapes even the desire of the beings involved to flee. I am concerned that this capacity aligns the (more than) human and the non-human with the fugitive forces of the universe, such as those that break space-time and go against our arrow of time that organizes perceptions and sensations of what a given world is.

by the author as a state of animation that opens up through the spatio-temporal cracks of social structures and moves a repressed or unresolved social violence that is known, sometimes very directly, sometimes more obliquely.

Therefore, I have tried to understand how the matter (more than social) of our lives negotiates or can always negotiate with coloniality so that, in the unexpectedness of the transaction, it triggers a collapse of the space-time markings of power, this matter being right there where things start to happen, where there is no longer any space-time to be mapped. How can we make time disappear and events start to happen where no space-time can be demarcated? There seems to be a guerrilla war with the very dimensions of events. The ordered narratives of the heroic *subject*, the savior, the victor, do not reach the guerrilla because the guerrilla places itself under the insignia of error and death, returning as a living thing, a secret thing, an erratic thing, a spectral thing, everything that the colonial archives of the ends and their own critiques do not account for.

REFERENCES

- ANDRADE, J. T.; SARAIVA DE SOUSA, C. K. Práticas indígenas de cura no Nordeste brasileiro: discutindo políticas públicas e intermedialidade. **Revista Anuário Antropológico**, v. 41, n. 2, p. 179-202, 2016.
- BONA, D. T. **Cosmopoéticas do refúgio**. Florianópolis: Cultura e Bárbarie, 2020.
- BORGES, J. **O que é encarceramento em massa?** Belo Horizonte: Letramento; Justificando, 2018.
- BOURDIEU, P. **A distinção: crítica social do julgamento**. São Paulo/Porto Alegre: Edusp/Zouk, 2007.
- BUTLER, J. **Deshacer el género**. Barcelona: Paidós, 2006.
- BUTLER, O. **Kindred: Laços de Sangue**. São Paulo: Editora Morro Branco, 2017.
- BUTLER, O. **A parábola dos talentos**. São Paulo, Editora Morro Branco, 2019.
- CHAKRABARTY, D. “Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for ‘Indian’ Pasts?”, **Representations**, v. 1, n. 37, p. 1-26, 1992.
- CLEGG, B. **Teoria quântica: 50 conceitos e ideias fundamentais explicados de forma clara e rápida**. São Paulo: Publifolha, 2018.
- DELEUZE, G.; GUATTARI, F. **O Anti-Édipo: capitalismo e esquizofrenia**. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2010.
- DELEUZE, G.; PARNET, C. **Diálogos**. São Paulo: Editora Escuta, 1998.
- FANON, F. **Pele negra, máscaras brancas**. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2008.
- FERREIRA DA SILVA, D. **A dívida impagável**. São Paulo: Oficina de Imaginação Política e Living Commons, 2019.
- FOUCAULT, M. **História da sexualidade: o cuidado de si**. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal, 2013. v. 3.
- GADELHA, J. **O Sensível E O Cruel: uma aprendizagem pelas performances sadomasoquistas**. Rio de Janeiro: Metanoia Editora, 2017.
- GLOWCZEWSKI, B. **Devires Totêmicos: Cosmopolítica Dos Sonhos**. São Paulo: N-1, 2015.
- GORDON, A. **Gothly Matters: Haunting and The Sociological Imagination**. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

- HARAWAY, D.; KUNZRU, H. “Você é um ciborgue”: um encontro com Donna Haraway. *In: SILVA, T. T. da. (org.). Antropologia do ciborgue – as vertigens do pós-humano*. 1. ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2000. p. 17-32.
- HARTMAN, S. **Lose Your Mother: A Journey Along the Atlantic Slave Route**. Princeton: Farrar Straus Giroux, 2008.
- HARTMAN, S. **Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments: Intimate Histories of Social Upheaval**. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2019. *E-Book*.
- HEGEL, G. W. F. **Ciência da Lógica 1**. A doutrina do ser. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2016.
- KANT, I. **Crítica da Razão Pura**. São Paulo: Abril S. A. Cultural e Industrial, 1974.
- KELLEY, R. **Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination**. Boston, Beacon Press, 2002.
- KOPENAWA, D.; ALBERT, B. **A queda do céu: palavras de um xamã yanomami**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2015.
- KRENAK, A. **Ideias para adiar o fim do mundo**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2019.
- LAPOUJADE, D. **Deleuze, os movimentos aberrantes**. São Paulo: n-1 edições, 2015.
- LATOUR, B. **Jamais fomos modernos: ensaio de antropologia simétrica**. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1994.
- LATOUR, B. **Políticas da natureza: como fazer ciência na democracia**. São Paulo: EDUSC, 2004.
- MBEMBE, A. “Necropolítica”. **Arte & Ensaios - Revista do PPGAV/EBA/UFRJ**, v. 1, n. 32, p. 123-151, 2016.
- MBEMBE, A. **Crítica da razão negra**. São Paulo, Editora N-1, 2018.
- MESSENDER, M. L. L. Etnicidade e ritual Tremembé: construção da memória e lógica cultural. **Revista de Ciências Sociais da UFC**, v. 43, n. 2, p. 32-42, 2012.
- MOTEN, F.; HARNEY, S. **The undercommons: Fugitive planning and black study**. Wivenhoe; New York: Minor Compositions, 2013.
- POMPEU SOBRINHO, T. Os Tapuais do Nordeste e a Monografia de Elias Herkman. **Revista do Instituto do Ceará**, Revista por ano/1934, p. 7-28, 1934. Available: <https://www.institutodoceara.org.br/revista/Rev-apresentacao/RevPorAno/1934/1934-Tapuias.pdf>. Access: 01 Oct. 2023.
- SPILLERS, H. **Black, White, & in Color**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

SPIVAK, G. **A critique of postcolonial reason**: toward a history of the vanishing present. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Havard University Press, 1999.

SPIVAK, G. **Pode o subalterno falar?** Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2001.

STENGERS, I. A proposição cosmopolítica. **Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros**, Brasil, n. 69, p. 442-464, 2018.

TSING, A. L. O Antropoceno mais que Humano. **Revista Ilha**, v. 23, n. 1, p. 176-191, 2021.

VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, E.; DANOWSKI, D. **Há um mundo por vir?** Ensaio sobre os medos e os fins. Florianópolis: Cultura e Barbárie; Instituto Socioambiental, 2014.

WARREN, C. L. **Ontological Terror**: blackness, nihilism, and emancipation. Durhan; London, Duke University Press, 2018.

CRediT Author Statement

Acknowledgements: Not applicable.

Funding: The research was carried out with funding from CAPS.

Conflict of interest: There are no conflicts of interest.

Ethical approval: Not applicable.

Availability of data and material: Not applicable.

Authors' contributions: Not applicable.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.
Proofreading, formatting, normalization and translation.

