Guevara America[1]

## The Violence of the System: Production of Disposable Subjects

The objective of this paper is to reflect on new and increasingly subtle forms of aggression against marginalized groups. In particular, it addresses the case of immigrants who are constantly subjected to state, police, and citizen surveillance and control. The article is organized into three sections corresponding to the main and sub-themes. The first section addresses the Foucaultian notion of State Racism defined as the condition for the sovereign exercise of power to be legitimately articulated in a society. The second section refers to the critical debate proposed by the French academic Didier Bigo on the securitization of migration, understood as the one that justifies coercive and discriminatory practices towards those who cross borders. Finally, based on the proposal of the philosopher and sociologist Jean Baudrillard, the last section of the article concludes with an analysis on the violence of the current system dominated by an exclusionary productive order in which personal interest reigns and where life and the link with the other are commodified producing "disposable" subjects.
Keywords: Power, State Racism, Disciplinary techniques, Securitization, Structural violence, Migration.

## *A rendszer erőszakvilága: Eldobható sorsok a gyártósoron*

*A tanulmány célja, hogy a marginalizált csoportok elleni agresszió új és egyre finomabb formáira reflektáljon. Különös figyelmet szentel a bevándorlók ügyére, akik folyamatosan állami, rendőri és állampolgári megfigyelésnek és ellenőrzésnek vannak kitéve. A cikk három részre tagozódik a fő- és az altémák mentén. Az első szakasz az állami fajgyűlölet foucault-i fogalmával foglalkozik, amelyet úgy határoz meg, mint annak feltételét, hogy a szuverén hatalomgyakorlás legitim módon megnyilvánulhasson egy társadalomban. A második rész a Didier Bigo francia akadémikus által javasolt kritikai vitára utal, amely a migráció biztonságossá tételéről szól, amely a határátlépőkkel szembeni kényszerítő és diszkriminatív gyakorlatokat igazolja. Végül pedig Jean Baudrillard filozófus és szociológus véleménye alapján a cikk utolsó része a jelenlegi rendszer erőszakvilágának elemzésével zárul, amelyet egy olyan kirekesztő termelőrendszer jellemez, ahol a személyes érdekek uralkodnak, és ahol az élet és a másikkal való kapcsolat árucikké válik - ,,eldobható" szubjektumokat szül.*
*Kulcsszavak: hatalom, állami rasszizmus, fegyelmezési technikák, szekuritizáció, strukturális erőszak, migráció*

[1] University of Public Service, Budapest, Hungary- Guevara.Parra.America.Celeste@uni-nke.hu
Universidad Autónoma de Bucaramanga, Bucaramanga, Colombia- aguevara2@unab.edu.co

*Introduction*

On October 20, 2021, the first Summit of Foreign Ministers on the migration situation in the Americas took place in Colombia with the participation of 17 countries of the continent. The purpose of the summit was to seek joint responses that would allow, in the words of the Colombian Vice President, "to put an immediate stop to the constant flow of migrants to the north"[2]. Although both the Vice President and the head of state of the host country called for a solidarity approach to the situation, migration is still considered as a "global risk that requires a global response"[3]. This tendency to use terms such as "massive flow" and "risk" in the political discourse on immigrants evokes the feeling of an external invasion that must be controlled. In this sense, immigrants are inscribed in a warlike logic that approaches them as if they were illicit goods.

Therefore, the securitization of migration is a process that starts from the discourse and creates continuous unease and uncertainty by focusing on general fears and on the "social distribution of evil" that falls on the specific category of the immigrant[4]. Based on this conception, some politicians propose programs aimed at "restoring order" by controlling migratory flows (with some success at the electoral level). At the same time, a fantasy figure of the State is constructed as a guarantor of protection against this "invasion" of foreigners. The above is illustrative of how the exercise of power that left physical marks on the body and that had terror as a guarantee, over time was hidden (or became less visible) by taking refuge in the discourse of law derived from the "social pact."[5]

This is the effect of incorporating disciplinary techniques that individualize bodies, thus allowing them to be introduced in a controlled manner into the productive system, an indispensable phenomenon for capitalism to take place.[6] In this sense, Jean Baudrillard emphasizes that, in place of direct coercion, the seduction of the productive forces of the market comes into play invading everything, including the journalistic order, once considered the repository of our relationship with the truth. News arrives, settles for a moment, but soon vanishes on the surface. This system is violent because, as with the circulation of ephemeral news, it produces everything (including life itself) as merchandise ready to be consumed, discarded and forgotten.

Next, through the three sections into which the text is divided, an attempt will be made to develop the following question: What are the consequences of being classified as a threat

---

[2] *DW*, "Colombia", 2021. "Colombia held first foreign ministers' summit on the migration crisis in the Americas" [Translated from the original Spanish: "Colombia sostuvo primera Cumbre de cancilleres sobre la crisis migratoria en las Américas"]
[3] *DW*, "Colombia", 2021.
[4] Bigo 2002, 63–92.
[5] Foucault 2003.
[6] Foucault 2007.

object? To this end, emphasis will be placed on the concept of sovereignty, vigilance and social control linked to the exercise of contemporary power. The first section is dedicated to two of Foucault's works ("Society must be defended" and "Psychiatric Power") from which the passage from sovereign power - embodied in the figure of the monarch - to the disciplinary power - distributed and anonymous - is pointed out. Subsequently, based on Didier Bigo, this article delves into the construction of an internal enemy (the immigrant) after the world wars on whom the current practices of surveillance and control fall, practices justified in the name of the defense of national sovereignty. Finally, the third section addresses Jean Baudrillard's remarks on the current era, which is inscribed in a system in which bonds and life itself are commodified and, consequently, some subjects and groups are considered worthless.

## *In defense of society*

As a prelude to the subject that will be addressed in the following section regarding the securitization of immigrants, this first part emphasizes a certain discourse of sovereignty based on "Society must be defended" and "Psychiatric Power", both works by Michel Foucault. This Foucauldian reflection includes terms such as Power, State, and Law not as analytical tools or descriptors of phenomena, but as narratives that construct certain individuals as a threat to the ("homogeneous") social body and that justify, in the name of the security of the majority, the use of coercive techniques.

First of all, the 1976 course "Society must be defended"[7] revolves around the articulation of the concepts of Power, State, and Racism and their relation to the question of Truth. In the first term, Foucault refers that in essence power is repression. Hence the doubts Clausewitz's maxim regarding war as the continuation of politics by other means[8]. Foucault proposes instead that "politics is the continuation of war by other means" because the war continues in peace by repressing society.[9] That is to say, war does not vanish with civility since it continues to be exercised, this time, within the social body itself.

Power is not only coercive but also circulates and is exercised in a chain, hence for Foucault it is not possible to speak of its "localization". In Western society this circulation and exercise are organized on the basis of a very particular relationship that transforms repression (which is power) into law and truth. It is in the credibility of what is called truth that power acquires its practical raison d'être. Foucault says that "the essential function of the technique and discourse of right is to dissolve the element of domination in power and to replace that domination, which has to be reduced or masked".[10] Thus, the exercise of

---

[7] Foucault 2003.
[8] Clausewitz 2008.
[9] Foucault 2003, 29.
[10] Foucault 2003, 35.

power includes a certain economy of the discourses of truth whose function is aimed at establishing the social and institutional bases through law so that power can be exercised. Hence, it is doubted that law is necessarily an instrument of legality and instead it is considered as something that allows (by means of masking) the exercise of coercive power by one group towards the rest.

When it is said that power is repression, it is not only referring to physical coercion, ideas are also repressed. Foucault introduces the term subjugated knowledge understood as that discriminated by formal institutions for being considered incapable of inscribing itself in the logic of dominant knowledge.[11] The above allows an understanding of why the history of political ideas told by authors such as Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu, among others, worked to legitimize sovereign power.

This history starts from the simple oppression: Machiavelli's prince had to do whatever was necessary to maintain power and this included resorting to mechanisms of direct coercion[12]. Subsequently, the historical narrative gives a privileged place to the legitimate consideration of sovereignty through the contractual theory (of Rousseau and Hobbes) that makes the sovereign the representative of all.[13] In fact, it is Hobbes who takes God out of the equation and in Leviathan presents the State, where all wills converge, as absolute[14]. Power then becomes perpetual, is actualized, exercised, and becomes truth, the truth that invokes the following, a sovereign is legitimate.

One thus has a legal-rational body of action founded on the supposed consensus around the state that will have as its main task to fix guarantees among the people and ensure peace. Nevertheless, for Foucault such a contract, in which it is accepted to surrender one's will to the sovereign, never existed[15]. As an example, he takes up the history of France presented as a "mixture" between Franks, Gauls, Romans...this version masks the oppressive and bloody arrival of different conquerors. Hence, it emphasizes that history is the discourse of those who "speak the truth", their truth, imposed by force of arms.

This allows him to introduce the concept of *state racism*[16], which does not refer to ethnic racism but to the conflict between two social groups where one group dominates and oppresses the other within the state. That is, there is not always another "race" but there is always a different group within the social body. Now, the Hobbesian State attempts to eliminate the differences between groups by converging the trust of all in the sovereign[17].

---

[11] Foucault 2003.
[12] Maquiavelo 1971.
[13] Foucault 2003.
[14] Hobbes 2004.
[15] Foucault 2003.
[16] Foucault 2003, 81.
[17] Hobbes 2004.

However, this state was built on many differences (classes, nations, races, languages...), differences that are disguised and hidden while paradoxically they are at the same time reproduced[18]. Although some of these differences have vanished in principle (such as slavery), others persist (the qualifier "immigrant").

Here a double operation in power comes into play, which consists, on the one hand, in generating legitimacy and respect for the law (rule of legitimate understanding) backed by the same "truth" that unites the members of the social body ("we are all Colombians") and, on the other hand, in creating differences in order to separate groups – as recalls the proposal of a Colombian senator to divide a region between indigenous people and those who want development [19] –. Foucault elucidates a discursive turn regarding the idea of defending oneself from the enemy, an idea that conceived that the State, the law and the structures of power "not only do not defend us against our enemies but they are the instruments our enemies are using to pursue and subjugate us"[20]. This discourse, which emphasized that we must defend ourselves against society and its oppressive apparatus of power, is replaced by "we must defend society against all the biological dangers of this other race, of this sub-race, of this counter-race that we are reluctantly building"[21]. In other words, we must defend ourselves against the very groups we have internally founded as different.

Now then, in Foucault in order to analyze the exercise of power it is necessary to refer to its extremities, to its ultimate ramifications, where it takes the form of techniques and acquires material goods, where it becomes less juridical.[22] In "Psychiatric Power" reference is made to the encounter between two different types of power, the macrophysics of sovereignty and the microphysics of disciplinary power.[23] This is based on the analysis of the fine morphology of specific scenes in which power enters the scene. One of these scenes involves King George III of England, who, seized by mania, against his will and losing his rights as sovereign, becomes subject to the medical device that surrounds him. The monarch falls under a power that even opposes sovereignty, it is a multiple anonymous power in which nothing is said (all agents remain mute) and which manifests itself in the impeccable character of a rulebook. This protopsychiatric scene makes it possible to elucidate how while *sovereign power* manifests itself through the shining force of the

---

[18] Foucault 2003.

[19] The senator in question proclaims that a referendum is necessary to "decide if we split Cauca department in two. One indigenous, so that they can carry out their strikes, demonstrations and invasions, and one with a vocation for development where we can have roads, where investment is promoted and where there are decent jobs for the Caucanos". *El Tiempo. «One Cauca for mestizos and another for indigenous people, proposes Paloma Valencia»* [Translated from the original Spanish: «Un Cauca para mestizos y otro para indígenas, propone Paloma Valencia»]. El Tiempo, March 17, 2015.

[20] Foucault 2003, 65.

[21] Foucault 2003, 65.

[22] Foucault 2003.

[23] Foucault 2007.

individual who possesses it, *disciplinary power* is a discreet, distributed power, which aims at the docility and submission of those on whom it falls (is exercised) in silence.

Another prototypical scene of psychiatry is that of Philippe Pinel, the physician, freeing the insane locked up in the Bicêtre hospital. Such "liberation" establishes a certain debt of recognition that must be paid "continuously and voluntarily, through obedience".[24] So, to remove the chains is to ensure, through grateful obedience, a subjection. This scene of liberation, as Foucault emphasizes, is therefore not a scene of humanism, but the transformation of a certain form of sovereignty power, which was violent, into a form of subjection that is a relation of discipline.[25] Finally, it is important to note that, although power is oppression, where there is oppression there is also resistance, evident in George III's act of throwing mud and filth as a secular gesture of insurrection against the powerful. In this case he will not be executed by such action but stripped and washed, thus making "the body clean and true at the same time".[26]

In sum, in Foucault the question of power is not localizable in an institution or in a specific instance. Power circulates in a network through a series of permanent relations that traverse the consciousness and the body of people. Power represses, but at the same time produces effects of knowledge and truth. Power makes one truth (e.g., health, safety) prevail over others that are undervalued because they do not fit into the logic of the dominant discourses of truth. For its part, truth is an arbitrary construction, associated with the force of those who wield power, that tries to disrupt values from the confusing, the hidden, the random, the uncertainty related to the future (as could be thought for the case of the "madman" but also of the immigrant) in order to allow a certain order to operate on the basis of specific techniques as a guarantee of security, peace, and homogeneity. In this sense, the State promotes racism, or the domination of one group over another, to the extent that by creating internal frictions it directs society against itself. To this end, groups of excluded people are constructed at the moment of applying certain disciplinary treatment to them. Nevertheless, the excluded do not cease to constantly challenge power.

### Securitization of the immigrant as a discourse of "truth"

In tune with what was presented in the previous section, Didier Bigo's proposal[27] consists in analyzing the conditions under which the authority of truth has been made to a discourse that creates the immigrant as a stranger within the State. According to this logic, the targeting of the border crosser by both the police and the military apparatus is explained by

---

[24] Foucault 2007, 46.
[25] Foucault 2007.
[26] Foucault 2007, 43.
[27] Bigo 2002.

the fact that an enemy other than the Soviet Union is sought, this justifies the use of military technologies for new purposes after the end of bipolarity.

The securitization is then made to operate on the basis of narratives uttered by different actors who exchange fears and beliefs about the immigrant conceived as a threat to security. At the base of these discourses, it is possible to trace the conception of the State as a body (a container) that, as Foucault points out, must be defended. In this context, citizens are the imagined nationals as opposed to foreigners, and immigrants are seen as outsiders who come in and do not quite fit the national standard. A whole mobilization against certain groups is thus created and it is justified the entry on the scene of professionals in the specific field of security (police, military, customs officers, intelligence service, risk assessment experts...) while the role of governments is claimed as providers of protection.[28]

Through the intertwining of discourses, we are then faced with the creation of new threats that converge in the figure of the immigrant. From the police apparatus, for example, the increase in crime is explained by the activities of immigrants and their children who are not well socialized in the host country. Journalists, for their part, evoke the feeling of insecurity among locals due to the presence of foreigners. Economists assess the danger to the welfare state of receiving a "new burden". Various security studies relate the latter to existential threats and present the army and other security experts as responsible for combating them.[29]

The plasticity of terminology is important here as it allows each country to sell its fears to other nations (hence Algerians are monitored in Britain and Germany, and Kurds in France and Britain). Also, it is common the use anticipatory technologies, statistical projections are made and risk profiles are created as a way of forecasting the movement in space of the target group, as well as the possible evolution of their behavior in the future. This use of anticipatory techniques, whereby specific groups are blamed before their members have actually acted, allows a group of people to be singled out for difficulties that are structural (unemployment, planning, demographics, the huge gap between north and south).[30]

Securitization is then shown as the explanation of a process, i.e. as the truth that justifies the use of coercive means (the solutions) and not as a discourse that can be questioned. It is curious that while car accidents are qualified as misfortunes, some people are considered as threats to be controlled. Under this logic, Bigo starts from the Foucauldian concept of panopticon (global surveillance that falls on everyone) and adds the neologism *banopticon* to emphasize that based on the profile and by means of current

---

[28] Bigo 2002.
[29] Bigo 2002.
[30] Bigo 2002.

computer technologies, it is decided who needs to be placed under surveillance ("bad citizens") and therefore should be subjected to specific treatment and who should not.[31]

However, contrary to what is emphasized by this "internal security" discourse, security practices are not given in a natural way, instead, they respond to the discursive construction of certain situations as problematic. This construction is useful for the ruling class to justify its authority and to allow it to mask or deny other problems. Thus, the technology of power attempts to capitalize on trust in the state by worrying citizens about the dangers facing the world, while techniques for fear management and evil distribution mobilize the term immigrant for every public policy weakness. This explains the strengthening of an "internal security State" to the detriment of a State interested in the management of social services.[32]

In this context, migration as a term is a way of designating someone as a threat to a country's core values and thus forcing institutional practices to be deployed on certain populations, so it has nothing to do with the legal terminology for referring to outsiders. What is at stake is not so much a legal status as a social image related to the distribution of "evil". Therefore, terms such as sovereignty, security, or internal threat, rather than instruments that interpret social reality, are categories that demand a critical analysis linked to a particular way of exercising sovereignty.

### *The violence of the global as a producer of disposable subjects*

In this section reference will be made to what the culture critic Jean Baudrillard proposes on ways of exercising power in the new world order characterized by a "social implosion". With this concept, he designates the inner destruction or process of entropy that occurs when the world is emptied of meaning, when the frontiers between reality and image collapse, and when distinctions are annulled.[33]

Baudrillard places the symbolic start date of this implosion at the events of May '68: where revolutionaries believed they were demanding "more sociability" - by means of ideologies proclaiming participation, self-management, free initiative, solidarity, equality, and freedom - the "silent majority" takes shape, absorbing all signs and meaning but no longer giving any one back.[34] That is to say, the liberation of the productive forces (linked to the figure of consumption and the mass media explosion) has been confused with the liberation of man. The silent mass accepts all the messages that come from power and immediately diverts them towards the entertainment: "everything becomes a spectacle: the

---

[31] Bigo 2002.
[32] Bigo 2002.
[33] Baudrillard 1994.
[34] Baudrillard 2019.

news and the political scene, the intellectuals who practice the talk show and the programs that offer reality shows".[35]

In this postmodern scene, objects are the actors of the global process of which we - human beings - are mere characters or spectators. In other words, modernity is brought to its point of maximum realization as a result of liberation in all fields such as political, social, sexual, and artistic ones, but everything that has been liberated has been so in order to be put into circulation as merchandise.[36]. This idea embraces the subjects themselves since each one has to transform himself into a business to which value must be added in order to assume an operational role within the current system.

The ideological trap of this system of objects rests on two principles, the *personalizing principle* and the *principle of credit.*[37] On the one hand, the *personalizing principle* singles out the user, harassing him with the idea of personal achievement while at the same time managing to forge a consensus, a game of status where the rules (of consumption) are the same for everyone. On the other hand, the *principle of credit* shows how the object imposes its rhythm on us, which means when we acquire that, we enslave ourselves as a labor force. Both principles (personalization and credit) are distributed in the form of publicity with which it is no longer necessary to resort to repression. This is to the extent that, given its quality of pure seduction, advertising internalizes the very act of consumption, but also guarantees adherence to social consensus and its norms. It thus avoids "what all language does: to open itself to the possibility of a true communicative exchange".[38]

Here we can elucidate where the miracle of the system is, a question asked by the Italian psychoanalyst Massimo Recalcati to which he answers that the ultimate goal of the system is self-reproduction, consequently, it does not harbor social dialectics and makes possible neither contradiction nor structural change.[39] Let us take for example the continuous tests and polls that claim to represent wills and are considered "forms of expression" of the masses. For Baudrillard, the polls "return to all questions that are addressed to them a tautological and circular answer".[40] There is no interlocutor because these polls are self-referential, "those asked present themselves as the question imagines them and demands them".[41] This is the procedure by which the mass is secluded in its silence, disappearing as a subject of history.

Terrorist violence is another phenomenon that is part of the social implosion and it would not be possible without the exhibitionist force of media transparency. The dread of

---

[35] Baudrillard 1994, 135.
[36] Baudrillard 1993.
[37] Baudrillard 2005.
[38] Téllez 2009, 11–39, 21.
[39] Recalcati 2015.
[40] Baudrillard 2016, 78.
[41] Baudrillard 2016, 78.

the real (towards the nuclear threat, for example) generates the hyper-real, which has its reign in television. The mass media have taken over the war - which needs to be believed - by means of the "simulation model" aimed at neutralizing any reaction. Nor would terrorism be possible without the "principle of evil" as a denial of Western values of progress, political morality, rationality, and democracy. It seems that our idea of good is nothing but the product of no longer knowing how to include evil in our symbolic universe.[42] This is exemplified by the faith placed in human rights as if they were a kind of "prophylaxis" against violence.

The American post-structuralist philosopher Judith Butler also speaks out on this "prophylaxis" based on Western ideals.[43] She explores the way in which the war leadership of the United States has imposed a distinction between those lives that deserve to be mourned and those that do not. To this end, the emotions of public opinion are manipulated regarding which lives should be sorrowed. The author points out in this task the participation of the media that publish images and information of those who are considered unjustly dead, as it has happened with respect to September 11, 2001. On the contrary, public affection is manipulated by using nationalist slogans to promote the military effort in the U.S. wars with Iraq and Afghanistan.

This distinction has become part of war itself and has led the first world to the destruction and abandonment of populations that do not conform to the prevailing Western standard of humanity. Therefore, the philosopher emphasizes that war is framed to enhance an unequal and politically induced distribution of precarity. This compromises the ontological status of certain populations conceived as destructible (as in the case of Muslim communities) and not worthy of being mourned, rather than as living populations in need of protection against illegitimate state violence, hunger or disease.[44]

This shows that we are facing a "hypertrophy of the same" similar to the viral diseases of this time: AIDS and cancer.[45] In those diseases, it is our own antibodies that destroy us. Once the pathogenic forms are eliminated, thanks to the predominance of absolute prophylaxis, we are left without threats, therefore, the being devours its own defenses. In other words, our "culture of asepsis" produces a "total positivization" that eliminates everything that is different. The "other" remains unbearable, but nowadays he cannot be eliminated without further ado, that is why it is sought to make him controllable and negotiable. This allows madness, death, "savage societies", immigrants... to be reintegrated, assumed, reabsorbed in the universal concert.

---

[42] Baudrillard 1993.
[43] Butler 2016.
[44] Butler 2016.
[45] Baudrillard. 1993.

Now, as the installation of a model of society produces all the rest as waste, the capitalist discourse makes recognition between subjects and cultures impossible because they are converted into equivalent, evaluable, interchangeable, consumable, and disposable objects. Those who do not participate in this "total mobilization" of life towards its positive affirmation are seen by others and experience themselves as insignificant, useless to society. The marginalized groups that the current world order fixes to the periphery because they have no clear place in capitalism (such as groups of displaced persons, poor immigrants, or street dwellers) are perceived as chaotic poverty and are identified as dangerous to the system itself. Such discrimination and exclusion are not unfortunate consequences of globalization, but the logical results of a world governed by competition.

For Lyotard, the modern project is realized today by technoscience but devoid of the ideals of freedom, fraternity and equality advertised by modernity.[46] In the first place, we are not so free if we live in cities that watch all our movements and restrict our liberties under the pretext of security; where fraternity is less and less generous because it is more important to take care of our own interests and, in this sense, the other is a means to achieve them or an obstacle to eliminate; where rights are transformed into business (of health or education for instance); where "there are more and more social barriers, segregation...stratifications"[47], therefore we are not equal in terms of access to opportunities between population groups.

What's more, "universal" values (human rights, freedom, culture and democracy) are dying as a result of market globalization. Information channels and platforms allow these values to circulate like any other merchandise. Therefore, it is not surprising to see the emergence of a new form of violence characterized by the devaluation of the human and of life itself that is assigned an exchange value. In Colombia this is exemplified by the case of extrajudicial executions or false positives, intensified since 2006, involving members of the army who, in exchange for promotions and incentives, participated in the murder of civilians, mostly young people from underprivileged sectors, making them look like members of illegal armed groups in order to show the supposed effectiveness of state security policies.[48]

For Baudrillard, however, the game is not over, we are faced with an omnipresent global technostructure that, after eliminating external enemies, has been left alone to exercise its dominion, but is now confronted by heterogeneous forces that emerge from everywhere. Those forces claim to be heard and refuse to be homogenized under the principle of cultural equivalence produced by industrial processes. Such reaction takes the form of singularities that create their own game and impose their own rules. Examples

---

[46] Lyotard 1997.
[47] Lyotard 1997, 37.
[48] Gómez 2020, 23–26.

include collective manifestations of an ethnic, religious, or linguistic nature, or individual emotional outbursts that react with violence. Heterogeneity can also manifest itself in the form of impotent surrender linked to self-hatred and remorse. In this respect, for Baudrillard, the obscure object of resentment and source of accumulated hatreds, is the excess of comfort, of universal availability, of defined achievement and imposed identities against which the heterogeneous reveals itself.[49]

## *Summary*

As analyzed by Foucault, power creates truth and has the capacity to impose it as truth for all (while suffocating other truths). To this end, in contemporary times it is no longer necessary to use the direct force that marked the physical body; power has been hiding behind the discourse of social consensus that justifies the use of individualizing techniques on subjects, making them useful and docile. Then, instead of resorting to terror, it dissuasively penetrates the conscience of the subjects as a form of subjection to the dominant structures.

Bigo proposes the neologism banoptic to refer to the creation of groups of excluded people as a product of the exercise of certain practices that fall upon them. In other words, administrative measures subject certain individuals to label them as sources of discomfort. The immigrant is shown in opposition to the image of the "good citizen" as a troublemaker who does not follow the expected behavior, therefore, as a "danger" to national homogeneity and stability. In this sense, the securitization of the immigrant articulates migration as a security problem and frames it in relation to terrorism, crime, or unemployment. It seems that, as Baudrillard points out, the role of the current system traversed by the productive order is to exercise a "therapeutic task" of eradicating evil and the other, elements that do not disappear but are made to play a controlled role within the system.

Today we are facing the *violence of the global* that, through deterrence as a weapon, sells an idea of happiness based on consumption and prohibits conflict because the absence of the counterpart is the basis of any form of domination. As a result, the planet is reduced to a logistical apparatus where everything circulates as merchandise, including human rights that only apply to certain sectors of the population that have the purchasing power to access them. In this sense, as Judith Butler points out, there are lives considered more valuable (and therefore worthy of mourning) and others that are the object of indifference or contempt for not occupying a privileged place in the scale of Western values or the productive system.

---

[49] Baudrillard 2006.

Now, from what has been elucidated in the text, it should be added that citizens can be formed within a matrix of power or within frameworks of interpretation that impose certain values as universal, absolute, and unquestionable. However, this does not mean that it is necessary to reconstitute that matrix, or that framework, in a loyal or automatic way. As Butler rightly emphasizes, the circulation of the frame of reference makes it fallible, that is, vulnerable to inversion, subversion, and even critical instrumentalization.

REFERENCES

Baudrillard, Jean. *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*. London: Verso Books, 2019.
*Simulacra and simulation.* Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1994.
*Symbolic exchange and death*. London: Sage, 2016
*The system of objects.* London: Verso, 2005.
*The transparency of evil: Essays on extreme phenomena*. London: Verso, 1993.
Violencia política y violencia transpolítica. In *Los límites de la estética de la representación*, de Adolfo Chaparro Amaya (Ed.). Bogotá: Universidad del Rosario, 2006.

Bigo, Didier. «Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the governmentality of unease.» *Alternatives*, *N°2*, 2002.

Butler, Judith. *Frames of war: When is life grievable?* London: Verso, 2016.

*DW, «Colombia held first foreign ministers' summit on the migration crisis in the Americas»* [Translated from the original Spanish: "*Colombia sostuvo primera Cumbre de cancilleres sobre la crisis migratoria en las Américas*"]. October 21, 2021. Available at https://www.dw.com/es/colombia-sostuvo-primera-cumbre-de-cancilleres-sobre-la-crisis-migratoria-en-las-am%C3%A9ricas/a-59573865 Accessed December 12, 2021.

*El Tiempo «One Cauca for mestizos and another for indigenous people, proposes Paloma Valencia»* [Translated from the original Spanish: «Un Cauca para mestizos y otro para indígenas, propone Paloma Valencia»] *El Tiempo*, March 17, 2015. Available at https://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/CMS-15410396 Accessed December 12, 2021.

Foucault, Michel. *El poder psiquiátrico* [*Psychiatric power*]. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2007.
*Society must be defended: lectures at the Collège de France 1975-1976, trans.* New York: Picador, 2003.
*Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.

Gómez, Juan Camilo. «Antecedentes históricos sobre los "falsos positivos" en Colombia.» [Historical background on "false positives" in Colombia]. In *Garantía de no repetición: una contribución a la justicia transicional*. Gerado Barbosa - Andrés (eds.) Ciro, 23-26. Bogotá: Universidad Externado, 2020.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan or the Matter, Forme and Power of a Common-Wealth Ecclesiastical and Civil*. London: St. Pauls Church-yard 1651, 2004.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *La condición postmoderna* [*The postmodern condition*]. Madrid: Cátedra, 1997.

Maquiavelo, Nicolás. *El príncipe* [*The prince*]. Madrid: Ediciones Ibéricas y LCL, 1971.

Recalcati, Massimo. *Ya no es como antes. Elogio del perdón en la vida amorosa.* [*It's not like it used to be. In praise of forgiveness in love life*]. Barcelona: Anagrama, 2015.

Téllez, Magaldy. «La Implosión de Lo Social y La Era Transpolítica. La Mirada Baudrillardiana de La Condición Postmoderna.» [The Implosion of the Social and the Transpolitical Era. The Baudrillardian View of the Postmodern Condition]. *Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana, N°47*, 2009.

Von Clausewitz, Carl. *On war*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.