

NECROENUNCIATION: COMMANDING THE DEATH OF THE *OTHER*

NECROENUNCIÇÃO: COMANDO DE MORTE A *OUTREM*

Hildomar José de Lima¹

Universidade Federal de Goiás

Karla Alves de Araújo França Castanheira²

Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto

Tânia Ferreira Rezende³

Universidade Federal de Goiás

Abstract: Violence and hatred towards others are ancient characteristics, but they are not natural or intrinsic to human beings. They are constructed and historically fueled, just like the sociodiscursive practices that materialize them. Despite this, violence is at the base of human relations (disputes), sustaining the power tensions that act within the webs of social relations, and hatred has been a strategy of domination, oppression, and resistance to domination and oppression. Thus, the figure of the antagonist or enemy, the target of hatred and violent practices forged in power struggles, is still fundamental in the manichaeian structure of human consciousness and subjectivities. In this process, a language and a way of signifying the world emerge, formalized by violence: *necrolanguage*, in *necroenunciations*. Based on the video of the Brazil's Ministerial Meeting of April 22, 2020, in this article, we discuss the effects produced by the *necroenunciations* of the then Brazilian government, focused on national development, and their impacts on historically subaltern groups. Additionally, we reflect on the teacher training of these groups, based on a linguistic education that recognizes the colonial ambivalence of Portuguese, that is, its agency both as an instrument of domination and as a defense against its effects of domination. We can suggest that in the social tension, as a reaction, the *necroenunciations* and *necroenunciates* of the dominant discourses are also part of the victims' defense arguments, as they support the denunciations of social violence.

Keywords: Sociolinguistics; *necrolanguage*; *necroenunciacion*; Ministerial Meeting.

Resumo: A violência e o ódio a *outrem* são antigos, mas não são naturais nem intrínsecos ao ser humano. São construídos e alimentados historicamente, assim como as práticas sociodiscursivas

¹ Doutor em Letras e Linguística, área de Estudos Linguísticos, pela Universidade Federal de Goiás. Professor da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade Federal de Goiás, com atuação na área de Linguística no Departamento de Libras e Tradução e no Programa de Pós- Graduação em Letras e Linguística. E-mail: hildomar_lima@ufg.br

² Doutora em Letras e Linguística, área de Estudos Linguísticos, pela Universidade Federal de Goiás. Professora temporária da Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto e professora voluntária da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, com atuação nas áreas de Língua Portuguesa, Texto e Discurso e Formação de Professores. E-mail: karlacastanheira@gmail.com.

³ Doutora em Linguística pela Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Professora da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade Federal de Goiás, com atuação na área de Linguística e Língua Portuguesa no Departamento de Linguística e Língua Portuguesa e no Programa de Pós- Graduação em Letras e Linguística. E-mail: taferez@ufg.br

de sua materialização. Apesar disso, a violência está na base das relações (disputas) humanas, sustentando as tensões de poder que atuam nas malhas das relações sociais e o ódio tem sido uma estratégia de dominação, de opressão e de enfrentamento à dominação e à opressão. Assim, a figura do antagonico ou inimigo, o alvo do ódio e das práticas de violência, forjadas nos tensionamentos de poder, ainda é fundamental na estrutura maniqueísta das consciências e das subjetividades humanas. Nesse processo, insurge uma linguagem e um modo de significação de mundo, formalizados pela violência: a necrolinguagem, em necroenunciações. Com base no vídeo na Reunião Ministerial do Brasil de 22 de abril de 2020, neste artigo, discutimos sobre os efeitos produzidos pelas necroenunciações do então governo brasileiro, centradas no desenvolvimento nacional, e seus impactos sobre os grupos historicamente subalternizados. Adicionalmente, refletimos sobre a formação docente desses grupos, com base em uma educação linguística que reconheça a ambivalência colonial do português, isto é, sua agência tanto como instrumento de dominação quanto como defesa contra seus efeitos de dominação. Podemos aventar que, no tensionamento social, como reação, as necroenunciações e os necroenunciados dos discursos dominantes estão fazendo parte também dos argumentos de defesa das vítimas por embasarem as denúncias das violências sociais.

Palavras-chave: Sociolinguística; necrolinguagem; necroenunciação; Reunião Ministerial.

Recebido em 23 de fevereiro de 2024.

Aprovado em 22 de julho de 2024.

Introduction

Since the beginning of the invasion and domination of what is now America, that territory saw the installation of a technology of destruction of the life of entire groups to build a societal structure with a single way of living and existence. According to criteria established by a policy of extermination by colonization and Brazilian State, the “Amerindian” human groups were inferior and hindered the project of white civilization. These groups, generically denominated “Indian”, was determined as antagonistic to civilization, justifying the sacrifice of their bodies and their lives. Such sacrifice ranged from material deprivation to the symbolic denial of the conditions of survival and existence to material elimination.

Achille Mbembe (2018), following Foucault, labels this policy of death of the *other*, the *antagonist* to modern civilization, as “necropolitics”. In order to justify necropolitics, there is a whole process of constructing a “politics of enmity” (MBEMBE, 2011), in which the antagonist is history and summarily elected and its image as evil is built and spread. As the enemy of the common good, the antagonist, thus, must be destroyed. In the generation of this discursive position is developed a language of destruction: this is a necrolanguage.

In the spheres of power, through concrete practices of necrolanguage, a socio-discursive mesh of destruction of the image and dignity of the elect is constructed for the construction of the antagonist. These are the discursive effects of the language of destruction. This sociodiscursive mesh is woven into enunciations in order to compose necrodiscourses, involving *micro-* and *nano*structures of power, which start to tension social relations in all spheres of society. The result of this process is the publicization of statements, which can effectively be the death commands of the *other*, the antagonist. These are necroenunciated.

In this context, our aim, with this article, is to problematize how the necroenunciated sociodiscursive fabric is historically woven and to discuss its maintenance and its effects, even nowadays, considering who are the enunciators involved. These effects reverberate and authorize the permanence of necroenunciations towards the same groups, built as antagonists, since “the arrival” of the speakers of colonization. Based on this problematization, we reflected on the role of language education and teacher training of groups antagonized by civilization, conceiving of Portuguese in its colonial ambivalence, both as an agency and as a defense against the material effects of the state's necroenunciations.

The linguistic materiality taken to highlight this discussion is the video of the ministerial meeting of the Bolsonaro Brazilian Government, which took place on April 22, 2020, in dialogue with other linguistic materialities available in the Brazilian media⁴. The reading and interpretation of linguistic materiality is based on the Dialogical Indicator Paradigm, proposed by Carlo Ginzburg (2016). What we can suggest is that in the social tension, as a reaction, the necroenunciations and the necroenunciations of the dominant discourses are also part of the defense arguments of the victims since they are based on denunciations of social violence (Villapudua, 2020).

Violence and hatred toward the other are old, but they are not natural or intrinsic to human beings. These feelings as well as their targets and agents are historically constructed and nurtured. Likewise, the sociodiscursive practices of materializing violence and hatred are constantly reconfigured, as the profiles of their targets change and are reconfigured. We can say that violence is at the base of human relations (disputes) and sustain the tensions of power that operate in the mesh of social relations, and that

⁴ We chose to keep the transcriptions data in Portuguese adding the translations of the quotes in footnotes since some of the data analyzed don't have a corresponding expression in English.

hatred has been a strategy of domination and oppression as well as of confronting domination and oppression. In this line of reasoning, we can suggest that, in the Manichaean structure of human consciences and subjectivities, forged in the tension of power, the figure of the antagonist or enemy, the target of hatred and, therefore, of the practices of violence, is still fundamental.

1. Between onticide and genocide

In the context of slave colonialism – patriarchal, Euro-Judeo-Christian, modern and rational – the other colonial was determined to be antagonistic and its image was being built and sustained as the image of the enemy of civilization and progress, the enemy of good. This enemy had to be destroyed and, because he was an enemy of good, his destruction was justified. That is why it was necessary to build the image of the other colonial as the antagonist of civilization (annihilation of dignity), therefore, it is essential to eliminate its existence (the soul, the memory, and the body).

Since then, genocides and onticides have occurred (in which the death of the being does not always imply the elimination of his material life). The annihilation of the colonial other, the subordinate of coloniality, through the destruction of dignity, is one of the socio-discursive strategies of weakening/eliminating the being for the configuration of the antagonistic. It is a socio-discursive process that involves and involves the body, with everything that concerns it. This is an onticide process through language, that is, necrolanguage practices, through the appropriation and use of necroenunciations that make up socio-discursive meshes that are becoming naturalized.

Language, in general, and statements and speeches, specifically, play a fundamental role in onticide, as they form a socio-discursive network for building the antagonistic, the enemy of good, destroying their dignity. The antagonist can be an individual or a collectivity, therefore, the onticide can be the annihilation of an individual or a collectivity, or of an individual to reach a collectivity, or of a collectivity to reach an individual, its leadership.

The Manicheistic worldview and the necrolanguage that sustains it generate necroenunciations pregnant with hatred, leading to material practices of violence against historically selected targets. There are several origins and directions of necroenunciations, such as the direction of the construction of the antagonist, the reproduction of the constructed image of the antagonist, the defense reaction of the antagonist, etc.

Scarlet Stigert (2019, p. 82) appears to understand necrodiscourse as the State's discursive practices in confronting organized crime, more specifically, “criminal factions”, such as the Primeiro Comando da Capital (PCC), in São Paulo. For Karla Castillo Villapudua (2020, p. 1), “the necropolitics and the necrodiscourses that it produces work under the premise of raising awareness and making policies of violence and death visible”⁵.

In this sense, even though it is a call to denounce, because the necrodiscourse is a form of denouncing the necropolitics, without being its objective, it ends up strengthening the social network of necrolanguage, from which the necropower benefits the most. In other words, necropolitics, as a call to denounce, uses a language that generates denunciation. This language is co-opted by the denounced institutions and by the denouncing and denounced social and political segments, constituting a unique sociodiscursive network, the necrolanguage of the society of enmity (MBEMBE, 2011). From this socio-discursive fabric, from necrolanguage, necroenunciations emerge, which are summons and commands of death: the annihilation of the other through the destruction of his dignity and the elimination of his life.

In proposing the concept of 'necropolitics', based on Foucault's “biopolitics”, Achille Mbembe (2018) showed that in addition to the State's power over life, there is a State death policy, the social and political power for determine how some people can live and how others should die. Furthermore, how some people are left to die by the state and how others are killed by the state. In this way, the distinctions (stratification) between life (being alive) and living (the conditions of living and existing) are materially and symbolically established; death and dying.

Mbembe draws attention to how the Nazi state did not invent necropolitical technology, but used a technology invented by Europeans and tested with populations in peripheral countries, such as African countries. This is equivalent to saying that, from the perspective of necropolitics, the target of onticide, like that of genocide, has a race, a color, and a geographic location. Necropolitics, therefore, operates a geo-onto-epistemicide (LIMA; REZENDE, 2020).

As already mentioned in the introduction, our objective, in this article, is to discuss

⁵ [...] la necropolítica y los necrodiscursos que produce, funcionan bajo lapremisa de concientizar y visibilizar las políticas de violencia y muerte.

how the sociodiscursive fabric generated by and which generates necroenunciations is historically woven and how its effects, considering the actors involved, act in society. We move on to the interpretation and discussion of the proposed linguistic materiality to highlight the discussion, the video of the ministerial meeting of the Bolsonaro Brazilian Government, which took place on April 22, 2020, in dialogue with other materials available in the Brazilian media. The interpretation and discussion of this materiality are the foundations of the Dialogical Indigenous Paradigm, as proposed by Carlo Ginzburg (2016).

2. When language is a weapon: the pater-power of the white military

Who speaks what, where, to whom, under what circumstances/conditions and for what purpose have been the trigger questions for the interpretation of statements and statements. According to Mignolo (2009), in view of the colonization movement triggered by the great navigations and mercantilism, the colonized territories are specifically marked geo-historical spaces and the populations of these territories are political bodies marked with colonial wounds.

In civilizing enunciation, the colonizer is in the interchangeable space of the I-enunciator and the you-enunciatee. The colonized, the other, in turn, is in the space of the he/she, the non-person, outside the space of the enunciation, the space of that which is spoken of, of whom/what one speaks, of the one who does not speak. The colonizer declares himself an enunciator, establishes, authorizes, his enunciatees, and prevents the other to denounce, disallowing and disqualifying their utterances.

People, those who speak for the non-person, tell of the truth about themselves, about the excluded third person, which, in this binary, hierarchical and excluding statement, it has to be. The non-person, excluded from the space of enunciation, is unable to oppose, with its truth, the truth of the enunciating I/you, with authorization legitimized by the place of power it occupies. Thus the voice of truth and the truth about the other is naturalized, the one who does not have a space for speaking in the enunciation, and even though he speaks, he is not heard, because he is either not authorized to speak or his speech is already disqualified.

The meeting from April 22, 2020, which we discuss here, is an enunciative space full of power disputes, with different forms and degrees of participation by the participating enunciatees. The Chief of Staff of the Presidency, Braga Neto, in the

meeting, a co-enunciator of the President of the Republic, the self-declared enunciator in any situation: “[...] in front of Fort Apache: *I am the supreme commander of the Armed Forces*. Period.”

The purpose of the meeting was to present the Pró-Brasil Plan (*Pró-Brasil Ordem and Pró-Brasil Progresso*), the Government's plan to resume the country's socioeconomic growth after the pandemic, in response to the consequences of the economic and social crisis generated by the health crisis. Minister Braga Neto started the presentation of the Plan, stating that he requested the meeting with the ministers because, he says, the Plan would only have effect if it had the adherence of all ministers.

Minister Braga Neto's enunciative acts are marked by “subpoenas” – appeals and summonses – to ministers to engage in the execution of the Plan; they are calls, in his words, to “synergy”, “...because Brazilians are like this, when we launch the Program, they will start to demand results, so I have to have some response for the public⁶” (BRAGA NETO, 2020). We ask: <Who are the Brazilians and who is the public?>

Another marker of his enunciative acts is the “interrogation”, among those that occur, we highlight: “Who is to blame?”⁷, which, given the crisis that the Government was going through, aimed to reposition the responsibility for the consequences of the health crisis. The government, in April, was experiencing wear and tear due to the coronavirus pandemic, which spread in Brazil since late February and then Brazil went on alert and then into emergency in March. This crisis is compounded by Mandetta's departure from the Ministry of Health.

Braga Neto ended the presentation with slides and the microphone was opened. Several ministers spoke until President Bolsonaro took the floor. All speeches, except that of the President, focused on discussing the Plan presented, with different concerns.

For the purpose of this discussion, we are interested, in principle, in the speeches of the Minister of the Environment, Ricardo Salles, and that of the President of the Republic, Jair Messias Bolsonaro, which we consider to be the foundations of what we understand by *necrolanguage* and *necroenunciation*, in addition to his enunciative acts demanding answers. The enunciated answers, in turn, are discussed next, in order to

⁶ “...porque o brasileiro é o seguinte, na hora que nós lançarmos o Programa, eles vão começar a cobrar resultado, então, eu tenho que ter alguma resposta pro público”

⁷ “Quem é culpado?”

compose the socio-discursive network of propagation and naturalization of *necrolanguage*.

The enunciative acts of the Minister of the Environment are responsive acts, representing the intention of giving back to general demands “from all over the world”, not only to him, but to many of the ministers present at the meeting. The Minister positions himself as an enunciatee in relation to the President, but, by appointing some of the ministers present and offering to make his enunciative acts serve as answers to the demands made also to these appointed ministers, he positions himself as enunciator of his colleagues.

Salles seeks to build, in advance, adherence to his speech, declaring that he is starting from the slides presented, relating environmental problems to other problems. He seeks a common ground, via legal restrictions on the exploitation of land, legal reserves and natural resources. It situates, updating and reconfiguring, the historical land struggles, which always opposed the political decision-making power to the original peoples and workers of the land, having, now, the pandemic as a context and as an opportunity.

Minister Salles’ speech reflects a consensual *necrolanguage*, naturalized by historical voices that occupy political spaces of power, joining with several political leaders interested in the “matter”, which has been drawing the world's attention to Brazil, with a negative repercussion. It is in this sense that we consider that Minister Salles' enunciative acts, during the Ministerial Meeting, are exemplary of how the political stance of a government leader establishes *necroenunciations*.

The Minister explicitly proposes to take political advantage of the coronavirus pandemic to “pass on the infralegal reforms, deregulation, simplification”⁸ of environmental laws, changing the “rules” to simplify the rules and facilitate the exploitation of the protected lands by the Union. The referentiality of polyphony and the place of belonging of the group that forms the collective consensus that the Minister represents is made explicit when Salles uses the expression “passar a boiada”⁹:

- 1) [...] Então, pra isso, precisa ter um esforço nosso aqui enquanto estamos nesse momento de tranquilidade no aspecto de cobertura de imprensa, porque só fala de

⁸ “passar as reformas infralegais, de desregulamentação, simplificação”

⁹ This expression is similar to the expression “to push through”, in English, meaning “forcing laws approvals”.

COVID, e *ir passando a boiada* e mudando todo o regramento e simplificando normas. [...] (SALLES, 2020, *emphasis added*)¹⁰

The expression “passar a boiada”, in this enunciative context, reveals semantically and pragmatically the intention to open or expand spaces to “facilitate” the passage of a large amount of “unrest”. The sense of “facilitating” in “large quantities” is reinforced by the use of another expression with an equivalent meaning, right afterwards, by the Minister: “agora é hora de unir esforços pra *dar de baciada*”. A “baciada”, in the same semantic and enunciative field as the previous expression, is a unit of measurement of great quantity.

The sense of “facilitating”, opening and letting go, is confirmed by the following statement by Salles: “agora *tem um monte de coisa que é só parecer, caneta, parecer, caneta*. Sem parecer também não tem caneta, porque dar uma canetada sem parecer é cana.”. It is also revealed here the care to “ir passando a boiada” and “dar de baciada” without violating the law. The intention is to change the law.

The Minister's intention reflects a State project and is also in the speech of the President of the Republic, in official pronouncements, as in his speech at the UN General Assembly in September, 2020:

- 2) Nossa floresta é úmida e não permite a propagação do fogo em seu interior. Os incêndios acontecem praticamente, nos mesmos lugares, no entorno leste da Floresta, onde *o caboclo e o índio queimam seus roçados* em busca de sua sobrevivência, em áreas já desmatadas”. (JAIR BOLSONARO, 75ª Assembleia Geral da ONU, 2020, *emphasis added*)¹¹

In his pronouncement, the enunciator establishes the discursive nonsense that naturalizes *necroenunciations* by pointing out to the world who are to blame for the burning of Brazilian forests. By making the caboclo and the indigenous responsible for the burning, the Brazilian Government validates the statements (“ir passando a boiada”,

¹⁰ “[...] So, for that, we need to make an effort here while we are in this moment of tranquility in terms of press coverage, because it only talks about COVID, and *push through* (a literal translation would be *let the cattle go through*) and change all the rules and simplify standards. [...]” (SALLES, Ministerial Meeting, 2020, *emphasis added*).

¹¹ “Our forest is humid and does not allow the spread of fire inside. The fires happen practically, in the same places, in the eastern surroundings of the Forest, where the *caboclo and the indigenous burn their plantations* in search of their survival, in areas already deforested”. (BOLSONARO, 75th General Assembly of the United Nations (UN), 2020, *emphasis added*)

“dar de baciada”, “parecer, caneta, parecer, caneta” etc.), which naturalize the destruction of the environment. At the same time, it confirms the indigenous as the nation's antagonist.

Minister Salles opens and closes his speech referring to the slides presented by Minister Braga Neto, a strategy to stay within in the objective of the Meeting. President Bolsonaro's turn then came and he spoke for more than 16 minutes.

The President began by presenting his concerns on two fronts: one, from entrepreneurs, for the reopening of trade, which he presents as a solution to stop unemployment, and the other, for impeachment, because he did not present the Covid-19 exam that was required. From then on, he summons the ministers to be politically concerned, to take a stand and declare their positions in defense of the Government, of the President.

The President is emphatic and incisive in declaring his position as *I*-enunciator:

- 3) E eu tenho o poder e vou interferir em todos os ministérios, sem exceção. Nos bancos, falo com o Paulo Guedes, se tiver que interferir. Nunca tive problema com ele, zero problema com o Paulo Guedes. Agora, os demais, vou! (BOLSONARO, 2020)¹²

The President's enunciative acts are marked, predominantly, by “subpoenas” (summons, order, appeal) and, secondarily, by factual “interrogations”, “assertions” (demands) and assertive “negations” (“zero problema!”). In this way, all the indexes that mark his enunciative acts provoke answers.

- 4) Se nós começarmos a falar com propriedade, e tem gente, muita gente, que fala muito melhor do que eu e tem um conhecimento muito melhor do que eu, tem que falar, pô, discretamente, mas tem que falar, tem que falar, pra num deixar subir a temperatura, porque é só porrada o tempo todo em cima de mim. (BOLSONARO, 2020)¹³
- 5) Acordem para a política e se exponham, afinal de contas, somos o Governo ou não somos? E se eu cair, cai todo mundo. Agora, vamo cair, se tiver de cair, um

¹² “And I have the power and I will interfere in all ministries, without exception. In the banks, I talk to Paulo Guedes, if I must interfere. I never had a problem with him, zero problem with Paulo Guedes. Now, the rest, I will! (BOLSONARO, Ministerial Meeting, 2020)

¹³ “If we start talking with property, there are people, many people, who speak much better than me and have a much better knowledge than me, they have to speak, damn, discreetly, but they have to speak, they have to speak, to not let the temperature rise, because it is just beaten all the time on me.” (BOLSONARO, Ministerial Meeting, 2020)

dia, vamo cair lutando. Vamo cair por uma bandeira justa, não por uma babaquice de dede exame a aa antivírus, porra, pelamor de Deus, porra, tá. (BOLSONARO, 2020)¹⁴

He knows how to mobilize the group (“lead the pack”) to “synergy”, by inciting inner anger, touching the violence of each individual. This is a common strategy for social mobilization. The common enemy is established, it highlights the threats and the imminent dangers, incites fear and, through fear, hatred. Hence, defense strategies are presented, by attacking:

- 6) Daí, inventam o racismo, como inventaram agora pro Weintraub. Desculpa, desculpa o desabafo, puta que o pariu! O Weintraub pode até falar a maior merda do mundo, mas racista?! Pô, tem que reagir, pessoal! É outra briga, tem que ser um Governo com altivez, se expor, mostrar que nós temos o povo do nosso lado, que nós somos submissos ao povo. (BOLSONARO, 2020)¹⁵

The speeches that follow the President's speech try, in some way, to give answers to his summons and, in a way, to please. Some lines deserve to be highlighted. The Minister of Health, Nelson Teich, highlights the importance of controlling not the disease, but fear, because the latter prevents control of the economy. His concern is to minimize fear and reduce the sensation of a crisis. The President cuts in to talk about fear as a consequence of the way information about Covid deaths is presented. According both to the President and to Minister Teich, it is necessary to control people's perception of how the Government cares for the sick. The concern is how not to let the health crisis impact the economy.

Pedro Duarte Guimarães, President of Caixa, responds to the Government's political call, mentioning the disarray and theft in the previous government, following:

- 7) [...] vocês tão em casa? Eu tenho 30 mil funcionários na rua. Num tem esse negócio, essa frescurada de hom'office. Eu já visitei 15 agências, e você em casa? Aí o pessoal ficou um pouco mais calmo. Quer dizer, eu posso ter 30 mil

¹⁴ “Wake up to politics and expose yourself, after all, are we the Government or not? And if I fall, everyone falls. Now, we’re going to fall, if we have to fall, one day, we’re going to fall fighting, for a fair flag, not for a bullshit of ... examining the ... the antivírus, damn, for God's sake, damn it, ok.” (BOLSONARO, Ministerial Meeting, 2020)

¹⁵ “Hence, they invent racism, as they have now invented for Weintraub. Sorry, I'm sorry for the outburst, fuck! Weintraub may even say the biggest shit in the world, but racist?! Gee, you have to react, guys! It is another fight, it must be a Government with pride, to expose itself, to show that we have the people on our side, that we are submissive to the people.” (BOLSONARO, Ministerial Meeting, 2020)

brasileiros nas agências lá. Sabe quantas pessoas a Caixa está pagando hoje? 7 milhões de pessoas, e todo mundo em hom'office. Que porcaria é essa? (GUIMARÃES, 2020)¹⁶

- 8) O cara vai pro camburão com a filh/ se fosse eu ia pegar minhas 15 armas e ia dar uma/ eu ia/ia morrer, porque se a minha filha fosse pro camburão, eu ia matar ou morrer. Que isso? Tava nadando na pi/ é uma atleta olímpica. Cê tira a pessoa, a pessoa tá nadando com 14 anos, eu tenho uma filha, a Maria, de 14 anos. Se a minha filha fosse pro camburão, ou eu matava ou eu morria. Que isso? (GUIMARÃES, 2020)¹⁷

The President of Caixa, in his speech, presents his adhesion to armament, to the negationism of Covid-19, and to “submission to the people”. All of Guimarães' statements are acts that are responsive to the commands of the President of the Republic and are, in turn, death commands, they are *necroenunciations*.

Minister of Women, Family, and Human Rights, Damares Regina Alves, adheres to the President's and to Braga Neto's subliminal proposal to reposition the responsibility for the consequences of the pandemic in Brazil.

- 9) Primeiro óbito dia 12 de abril e eu fui pra Amazônia, Roraima, junto com o Presidente da Funai e o Secretário Nacional de Saúde Indígena, pra acompanhar o primeiro óbito, a forma como a gente como a gente conduziu deu muito certo. Vamos ter que melhorar? Vamos ter que melhorar. E por que que nós fomos lá, Presidente? Porque nós recebemos a notícia que haveria contaminação criminosa em Roraima e Amazônia, de propósito, em índios pra dizimar aldeias e povos inteiros pra colocar nas costas do Presidente Bolsonaro. Eu tive que ir pra lá com o Presidente da Funai e me reunir com os generais da região e o Superintendente da Polícia Federal pra gente fazer uma ação ali meio que sigilosa, porque eles precisavam matar mais índios pra dizer que a nossa política não tava dando certo. (ALVES, 2020)¹⁸

¹⁶ “[...] are you at home? I have 30 thousand employees on the street. There's no such thing, this hom'office bullshit. I have already visited 15 agencies, and you at home? Then the people got a little calmer. I mean, I can have 30 thousand Brazilians in the branches there. Do you know how many people Caixa is paying today? 7 million people, and everyone in hom'office. What the hell is this?” (GUIMARÃES, Ministerial Meeting, 2020)

¹⁷ “The guy goes to the van with his daugh/ if it were me I would take my 15 guns and give him one [shoot]/ I would / would die, because if my daughter went to the van, I would kill or die. What is that? [...] You take the person, the person is swimming at 14 years old, I have a daughter, Maria, 14 years old. If my daughter went to the van, I would either kill or I would die. What is that?” (GUIMARÃES, Ministerial Meeting, 2020)

¹⁸ First death on April 12 and I went to the Amazon, Roraima, with the President of Funai and the National Secretary for Indigenous Health, to accompany the first death, the way we conducted it worked very well. Will we have to improve? We will have to improve. And why did we go there, President? Because we received the news that there would be criminal contamination in Roraima and the Amazon, on purpose, in indigenous people to decimate villages and entire peoples to put on President Bolsonaro's back. I had to go there with the President of Funai and meet with the generals of the region and the Superintendent of the

According to the Minister, those responsible for the impacts of Covid-19 among indigenous peoples in the Amazon are indigenous peoples and *indigenistas*. The contamination and death of indigenous peoples by Covid-19 is a project to harm the President. The historical antagonist is confirmed as an obstacle to progress and an enemy of good. The government's *necroenunciation* follows.

The Minister of Education, Abraham Bragança de Vasconcellos Weintraub, behaved like a “loyal squire”. He responded with absolute adherence to the President's enunciative commands.

- 10) Brasília é muito pior do que eu imaginava. As pessoas aqui perdem a percepção, a empatia, a relação com o povo, se sentem inexpugnáveis. [...] A gente tá perdendo a luta pela liberdade. É isso que o povo tá gritando. Num tá gritando pra ter mais estado, pra ter mais projeto, pra ter mais.../ o povo tá gritando por liberdade. Ponto. Eu acho que é isso que a gente tá perdendo, tá perdendo mesmo. Acho/o povo tá querendo ver o que me trouxe até aqui. Eu, por mim, botava esses vagabundos todos na cadeia, começando no STF. É isso que me choca. Era só isso, Presidente. (WEINTRAUB, 2020)¹⁹

The Minister is more emphatic in adhering to “submission to the people” and in attacking the Supreme Court (STF) – the President complained about the STF's position in the face of the threat of impeachment and in the face of restrictions on his freedom and the right to come and go. For this reason, the President, speaking after him, in a moderate way, mentions his uneducated manner. The Minister follows:

- 11) Odeio o termo povos indígenas, odeio esse termo, odeio. O povos ciganos, só tem um povo nesse país. Quer, quer; num quer, sai de ré. É povo brasileiro. Só tem um povo, pode ser preto, pode ser branco, pode ser japonês, pode ser descendente de índio, mas tem que ser brasileiro, porra. Cabar com esse negócio de povos e privilégios, só pode ter um povo, num pode ter ministro que acha que é melhor que o povo, do que os cidadãos. Isso é um absurdo, a gente chegou até aqui...

Federal Police so that we could do a somewhat secretive action there, because they needed to kill more indigenous to say that our policy was not working right. (ALVES, Ministerial Meeting, 2020)

¹⁹ “Brasília is much worse than I imagined. People here lose their perception, their empathy, their relationship with the people, they feel impregnable. I was privileged to see / more than half of this team arrive. I was Executive Secretary to Onyx Minister. We are losing a little of that spirit. We are losing the fight for freedom. That's what the people screaming. They're not screaming to have more state, to have more project, to have more ... / the people is screaming for freedom. Period. I think this is what we are losing, we are really losing it. I think / the people want to see what brought me here. If it was me, put these bums all in jail, starting at the STF. And this is what shocks me. That was all, President.” (WEINTRAUB, Ministerial Meeting, 2020)

Senhor levou uma facada na barriga, Fez mais do que eu, levou uma facada, mas eu também tou levando bordoadas e tô correndo risco e fico escutando esse monte de gente defendendo privilégio e teta. Entendeu? É isso. (WEINTRAUB, 2020)²⁰

Here, we have the socio-discursive fabric very well woven by *necroenunciations* composed of different ideological threads (Volochnóv, 2017) and different directions of responsive acts. The Minister reports at the same time to the President and Minister Damares Alves. The first enunciative acts are acts responsive to the statements of Minister Alves, who defended public policies for a plural Brazil, as he is, citing, for this, the Ukrainian, Gypsy, indigenous peoples, the rubber tappers.

In responding to the Minister's statements, Weintraub reinforces the Government's nationalist project and strengthens the attack on the President's enemy, which Minister Alves also made, in a more cordial and subliminal way. Minister Weintraub's responses are, at the same time, a misogynistic attack on Alves, a racist attack on the country's ethnic minorities and a stroking of the President. These explicit *necroenunciations* make the socio-discursive network a complex tangle of *necrodiscourses* that are responsive to the *necroenunciative* commands of the President, the speaker of the Event.

Hate is not due to the terms "indigenous peoples" and "gipsy people". The hatred is for the existence of these peoples, for the existence of all peoples excluded from "Brazilian" citizenship. Racial purification, through language, is explicitly expressed in the Directory of Indians²¹, of 1857, and is, therefore, a discourse that sustains the coloniality of power. It is important to understand that, in this power game, the indigenous

²⁰ "I hate the term indigenous people, I hate that term, I hate it. Gypsy people, there is only one people in that country. Want, want, don't want, get out on reverse. They are Brazilian people. There are only one people, they can be black, can be white, can be Japanese, can be descended from indigenous, but it has to be Brazilian, fuck. [We have to] end with this people and privileges thing, there can only be one people, one cannot have a minister who thinks he is better than the people, than the citizens. This is absurd, we got here ... sir got stabbed in the stomach, did more than me, got stabbed, but I'm also getting hit and I'm at risk and I hear this bunch of people defending privilege and teat [something very easy]. Understood? That's it." (WEINTRAUB, Ministerial Meeting, 2020)

²¹ It has always been a maxim unalterably practiced in all nations, which have conquered new domains, to *immediately introduce their own language to the conquered peoples, as it is indisputable, that this is one of the most effective means to banish from the rustic peoples the barbarity of their old customs; and to have shown the experience, that at the same time, that the use of the Prince's Language is introduced in them, which conquered them, affection, veneration, and obedience to the same Prince are also rooted in them.* Observing therefore all the polished Nations of the World, this prudent, and solid system, in this Conquest was practiced so much on the contrary, that only the first Conquistadores took care to establish in it the use of the Language, that they called general; truly abominable, and diabolical invention, so that the Indians would be deprived of all those means, which could civilize them, to remain in the rustic, barbaric subjection, in which until now they were kept. (...) (DIRETÓRIO DOS ÍNDIOS [1757], § 6º, *emphasis added*)

person is the victim of an extermination policy and is responsible for that policy: the victim's blame. This is a socio-discursive fabric woven by *necroenunciations* by the State.

Another evidence of the composition of the sociodiscursive fabric by state *necroenunciations* is the expressed ideological intolerances anchored in the principles of Euro-Jewish-Christian patriarchalism: “family”, “God” (church), “Brazil” (homeland, nation), “armament” (weapon, firepower), “liberty” (liberalism).

- 12) Quem não aceitar a minha, as minhas bandeiras, Damares: *família, Deus, Brasil, armamento*, liberdade de expressão, livre mercado. Quem não aceitar isso, está no governo errado. [...]. *Eu quero todo mundo armado!* Que povo armado jamais será escravizado. E que cada um faça, exerça o teu papel. (BOLSONARO, 2020, *emphasis added*)²²

These principles are stated in the Directory of Indians and are the principles of the French Revolution, but which were not accepted by those enslaved in the Haitian Revolution. The inseparability between “God” and “armament” has been built discursively since the electoral campaign of a significant number of people who hold political positions today. The notion of “armament” and, consequently, of “armed people”, is discursively reconfigured and becomes institutionalized based on evangelical Christian beliefs.

Based on this institutionalization, a crime is created to typify people who disagree with religious precepts that are politically imposed. According to the President: “I ask the entire international community for religious freedom, and to fight against *Christophobia*²³”. (BOLSONARO, 75th UN General Assembly, 2020, *emphasis added*). Once the crime has been typified by the State, all the victims of the State are guilty and, according to this appeal, the State is the victim of a “Christophobic” society. For Lima and Rezende (2021), there is a Christian Euro-Jewish *modus operandi* at the basis of the *necroenunciation*, which is “that of killing innocent souls to enrich the Crown with the justification of saving the Gentiles, that is, the victim's blame for their own misfortune.”

²² Whoever doesn't accept mine, my flags, Damares: *family, God, Brazil, armament*, freedom of expression, free market. Whoever does not accept this, is in the wrong government. [...]. *I want everyone armed!* That armed people will never be enslaved. And let each one does, play your part. (BOLSONARO, Ministerial Meeting, 2020, *emphasis added*)

²³ “Faço um apelo a toda a comunidade internacional pela liberdade religiosa e pelo combate à cristofobia”

In this sense, we understand by *necroenunciation* the discursive commands that make language an instrument of control of the vision on the socio-political and historical constitution of society and, therefore, a weapon of death. As the *necroenunciations* are adjusted into the language, due to the strength of the political place of speech, they gain strength and social dimension, constructing a web-shaped structure, which are the socio-discursive meshes, which can also be understood as *necrodiscourses*.

3. When “words become weapons”²⁴: Linguistic Education to combat *necroenunciations*

In Brazil, from the perspective of interculturality in sociolinguistic pluralism (REZENDE; RODRIGUES, 2020), we think and promote teacher training as a space for political struggle for social transformation. For this, the diverse practices of multiple literacies are considered, in situations of translanguaging (ANZALDÚA, 2012). With regards to Portuguese, school, academic, social and political literacies are considered.

Similar to Caliban, in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, under the reconfiguration of Augusto Boal (1979), the appropriation of the dominator's language can become a weapon for the dominated, in the terms of Yvonne Vera (1999). It is about having appropriate instruments to fight with advantages, at least close by, in the enemy's arena.

Thus, in educating teachers in diversity, for the linguistic education of groups subalternized by society and by State policies, the instrumental and political appropriation of the language, which is the only official language of this plural nation, Brazil. In other words, we seek to promote intercultural teacher education for plural linguistic education, which sees more than the instrumental appropriation of the language, providing subaltern groups to speak through the cracks in the silencing mask until it is shattered (EVARISTO, 2017).

It is also a challenge of fundamental importance that the impacts of this teacher training reach socially privileged groups. As we seek to carry out a linguistic education

²⁴“A writer must have an imagination that is pure stubbornness, which can invent new gods and banish the inefficient ones. [...] Their writing must reveal how desperately Africa was wrong in its memory. Women, with no power to rule, frequently have no platform to express their disapproval. [...] some of these women simply explode. Words become weapons.” Yvonne Vera. *Opening spaces: contemporary African women's writing*. Harare: Baobab, 1999, p. 1-2.

concerned with building respect for the other and caring for the dignity of every human being, we envision the formation of more humanized, democratic and ethical subjectivities and collective consciences, with a more equitable distribution of spaces for representation and rights. social and collective.

Thus, due to the ambivalent appropriation of the national language, groups that are underrepresented and unheard of in decision-making spaces, can break through the siege, shatter the silencing masks and participate in the enunciative space as enunciatees and co-enunciatees. In this way, these historical subjects of law rise in these spaces, with their counter-enunciations, destabilizing the official *necroenunciations*. This is how, we hope, your "words become weapons".

Many actions to destabilize the state's *necroenunciations* are already happening through social media by countless grassroots influencers, with emphasis on the indigenous radio Yandê (REZENDE; GOMES, 2020). This movement enabled the election of the first indigenous woman to the Federal Chamber in 2018. To paraphrase Adrienne Rich, in dialogue with Conceição Evaristo (2017), the knowledge and language of the oppressor are the flanders' masks that are silent. The appropriation of knowledge and the language of domination, in this way, is a way of rebelling against this oppressive silencing.

For this, we propose another way of promoting knowledge and linguistic education. In addition to the pedagogies inherited from colonization, we propose wheels for sharing knowledge, inspired by Paulo Freire (1967). Between the missionary pedagogy of guardianship and the authoritarian pedagogy of silencing, we seek to exchange knowledge constructions for common liberation. All pedagogy is a way of domination and control and exchanges are socializations of what we have to strengthen and face common causes.

Finally, the confrontation of the State's *necroenunciations* lacks and depends on the construction and ethical socialization of collective and solidary bioenunciations (ESPOSITO, 200) that support the teacher training for a plural linguistic education. For this, instrumental and political appropriation of the nation's unique official language is fundamental. This appropriation is only possible with adequate teacher training, that is, intercultural, plural and in translanguaging.

References

ANZALDÚA, Gloria. *Borderlands/lafrontera – the new mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 2012.

BOAL, Augusto. *A Tempestade*. [S.I.: s.n.], 1979.

DIRETÓRIO DOS ÍNDIOS. Texto integral. *Nação Mestiça*. Disponível em: <https://www.nacaomestica.org/diretorio_dos_indios.htm>. Acesso em: 29 out 2020.

ESPOSITO, Roberto. El dispositivo de la persona. *Manantial*. Buenos Aires, 2000.

EVARISTO, Conceição. *Nossa fala estilhaça a máscara do silêncio*. Entrevista à Carta Capital. 2017. Disponível em: <https://www.cartacapital.com.br/sociedade/conceicao-evaristo-201cnossa-fala-estilhaca-a-mascara-do-silencio201d/>. Acesso 13nov. 2020.

FREIRE, Paulo. *Educação como Prática de Liberdade*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1967.

GINZBURG, Carlo. *Mitos emblemas sinais: Morfologia e História*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2016.

LIMA, Hildomar José de; Rezende, Tânia Ferreira. O(A) surdo(a) em terras euro-ouvintistas: corpos e línguas na trama colonial. In: FARIA, Juliana Guimarães; Rezende, Tânia Ferreira (Org.). *Expressões Sinalizadas*. vol. 2, Goiânia: Cegraf, 2020 (no prelo).

MBEMBE, Achille. *Políticas da inimizade*. Tradução Marta Lança. Lisboa-PT: Antígona, 2017.

MBEMBE, Achille. *Necropolítica*. Tradução de Renata Santini. São Paulo: N1 Edições, 2018.

MIGNOLO, Walter. EpistemicDisobedience, IndependentThoughtandDe-ColonialFreedom. *Theory, Culture&Society*. Vol. 26 (7-8) (DOI: 10.1177/0263276409349275). Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, and Singapore: SAGE, 2009.

REZENDE, Tânia Ferreira; RODRIGUES, Eunice Moraes da Rocha. Perspectiva intercultural em práticas de formação de docentes indígenas. Dossiê Línguas Minoritárias. *Linguagem e Ensino*, v. 23, n. 4, 2020, p. 1204-1223.

REZENDE, Tânia Ferreira. GOMES, Letícia Santos. Uma canção pela vida: a decolonialidade está no seio da mãe terra. In: Mendonça e Silva, Cleidimar Aparecida. *América latina e língua espanhola: perspectivas decoloniais*. São Paulo: Pontes.

RICH, Adrienne. *The BurningofPaperInsteadofChildren*. Disponível em: <https://www.sccs.swarthmore.edu/users/99/jrieffel/poetry/rich/children.html> Acesso em: 13 nov. 2020.

STIGERT, Scarllet. *Contribuições da criminologia crítica à “Hipótese PCC”*. Trabalho de Conclusão do Curso de Graduação em Direito do Centro de Ciências jurídicas da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, 100fl, 2020.

VILLAPUDUA, Karla Castillo. Más biodiscursos menos necrodiscursos: a la conquista del tercereje. Dossiê Reflexiones Marginales. *Revista Latindex*, n. 58, jul. 2020.

VOLOCHINÓV, Valentin (Círculo de Bakhtin). *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem – problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem*. Tradução: Sheila Grillo e Ekaterina Vólkova Américo. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2017.