

CRITIQUE OF IDENTITARIANISM AND REGIMES OF TRUTH: AN ARCHAEOGENEALOGICAL READING OF A MEDIA ARCHIVE IN CONTEMPORARY BRAZIL

CRÍTICA AL IDENTITARISMO Y REGÍMENES DE VERDAD: ARQUEOGENEALOGÍA DE UN
ARCHIVO MEDIÁTICO EN EL BRASIL CONTEMPORÁNEO

CRÍTICA AO IDENTITARISMO E REGIMES DE VERDADE: ARQUEOGENEALOGIA DE UM
ARQUIVO MIDIÁTICO NO BRASIL CONTEMPORÂNEO

Tici Jardim Pimenta*

Luciana Carmona Garcia**

Universidade de Franca

ABSTRACT: This article examines the recent emergence of the so-called “critique of identitarianism” as a discursive practice that, in Brazil, has presented itself as a key to explaining crises of the left, the fragmentation of the progressive field, and disputes over so-called “identity agendas.” In the context of Michel Foucault’s centenary and through an ironic shift from “We, the Victorians” to “You, the identitarians,” it asks how this critique contributes to the current updating of regimes of truth that articulate knowledge, power, and the body. Drawing on Foucauldian Discourse Studies, the article mobilizes Navarro’s systematization (2015, 2020), under the label Archaeogenealogical Discourse Analysis (AAGD), using operators such as archive, eventalization, and causal demultiplication. The corpus comprises 23 discursive events selected from Google’s “News” tab using the queries “pauta identitária + esquerda” and “identitarismo + esquerda” (2000–2025). The study treats the platform’s algorithmic agency as part of the conditions shaping what becomes retrievable and approaches the material as a strategic archive rather than a statistical sample of public debate. The analysis describes the constitution of “identitarianism” as a problem-term and an accusatory operator, the retroactive lexicons, the subjects authorized to critique, the circulation supports, the political-ideological positions, and the

* Doutora em Linguística pela Universidade de Franca (Unifran), psicóloga e sexóloga. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Linguística, Universidade de Franca, Av. Dr. Armando de Salles Oliveira, 201, Parque Universitário, Franca, Brasil. E-mail: ticijardimpsi@gmail.com.

** Doutora em Linguística pela Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar), professora permanente e coordenadora do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Linguística da Universidade de Franca (Unifran). Programa de Pós-Graduação em Linguística, Universidade de Franca, Av. Dr. Armando de Salles Oliveira, 201, Parque Universitário, Franca, Brasil. E-mail: luciana.garcia@unifran.edu.br.

recurring dichotomies. It argues that the “critique of identitarianism” operates as a dispositif of intelligibility and government of minority struggles, producing “identitarians” and “critics of identitarianism” in asymmetrical positions of voice and legitimacy.

KEYWORDS: Michel Foucault. Foucauldian Discourse Studies. Archaeogenealogical Discourse Analysis. Identitarianism. Regimes of truth.

RESUMEN: El artículo analiza la emergencia reciente de la llamada “crítica al identitarismo” como práctica discursiva que, en Brasil, se ha presentado como clave para explicar las crisis de la izquierda, la fragmentación del campo progresista y las disputas en torno a las llamadas “pautas identitarias”. En el contexto del centenario de Michel Foucault y del desplazamiento irónico de “Nosotros, los victorianos” a “Ustedes, los identitarios”, se pregunta cómo esta crítica contribuye a la actualización de los regímenes de verdad que articulan saber, poder y cuerpo. A partir de los Estudios Discursivos Foucaultianos, se moviliza, bajo el rótulo exógeno de Análisis Arqueogenealógico del Discurso (AAGD), la sistematización de Navarro (2015, 2020), con operadores como el archivo, la acontecimentalización y la desmultiplicación causal. El *corpus* reúne 23 acontecimientos discursivos seleccionados en la pestaña “Noticias” de *Google* mediante las combinaciones “pauta identitária + esquerda” e “identitarismo + esquerda” (2000–2025). El recorte asume la agencia algorítmica de la plataforma como parte de las condiciones de aparición de lo recuperable y trata el material como archivo estratégico, no como muestra estadística del debate público. El análisis describe la constitución de “identitarismo” como palabra-problema y operador acusatorio, los léxicos retroactivos, los sujetos autorizados a la crítica, los soportes de circulación, las posiciones político-ideológicas y las dicotomías recurrentes. Se argumenta que la “crítica al identitarismo” opera como dispositivo de inteligibilidad y de gobierno de las luchas minoritarias, produciendo “identitarios” y “críticos del identitarismo” en posiciones asimétricas de enunciación y legitimidad.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Michel Foucault. Estudios Discursivos Foucaultianos. Análisis Arqueogenealógico del Discurso. Identitarismo. Regímenes de verdad.

RESUMO: O artigo analisa a emergência recente da chamada “crítica ao identitarismo” como prática discursiva que, no Brasil, tem se apresentado como chave para explicar as crises da esquerda, a fragmentação do campo progressista e as disputas em torno das chamadas “pautas identitárias”. No contexto do centenário de Michel Foucault e do deslocamento irônico de “Nós, os vitorianos” para “Vocês, os identitários”, pergunta-se como essa crítica contribui para a atualização dos regimes de verdade que articulam saber, poder e corpo. Partindo dos Estudos Discursivos Foucaultianos, mobiliza-se, sob o rótulo exógeno de Análise Arqueogenealógica do Discurso (AAGD), a sistematização de Navarro (2015, 2020), com operadores como arquivo, acontecimentalização e desmultiplicação causal. O *corpus* reúne 23 acontecimentos discursivos selecionados na aba “Notícias” do *Google* a partir das combinações “pauta identitária + esquerda” e “identitarismo + esquerda” (2000–2025). O recorte assume a agência algorítmica da plataforma como parte das condições de aparecimento do recuperável e trata o material como arquivo estratégico, não como amostra estatística do debate público. A análise descreve a constituição de “identitarismo” como palavra-problema e operador acusatório, os léxicos retroativos, os sujeitos autorizados à crítica, os suportes de circulação, as posições político-ideológicas e as dicotomias recorrentes. Argumenta-se que a “crítica ao identitarismo” opera como dispositivo de inteligibilidade e de governo das lutas minoritárias, produzindo “identitários” e “críticos do identitarismo” em posições assimétricas de fala e de legitimidade.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Michel Foucault. Estudos Discursivos Foucaultianos. Análise Arqueogenealógica do Discurso. Identitarismo. Regimes de verdade.

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, discussions about so-called “identity politics” have grown in Brazil, accompanied by the consolidation of a “critique of identitarianism” that presents itself as key to understanding contemporary social conflicts and struggles. On the centennial of Michel Foucault, this movement marks an ironic shift: from the “We, the Victorians” discussed in *The Will to Knowledge* (in 1976) to the “You, the identitarians,” who now become the primary targets of accusations of micro- and macro-social crises.

Just as the repressive hypothesis in the nineteenth century helped organize a discursive economy around sex (Foucault, 2022b), the “critique of identitarianism” today seems to serve as a framework for explaining what is truly at stake in discussions of identity, struggle, justice, and social revolution.

Across various media outlets, this critique claims the authority to diagnose left-wing crises and the fragmentation of the progressive field, assigning to feminist, anti-racist, LGBTQIAPN+, and other minority struggles the responsibility for shifting the focus of the “social question” toward demands deemed “particularistic” or “symbolic”. This is not merely a terminological dispute but the emergence of a discursive practice concerning bodies, identities, and political conflicts that, in the manner of the apparatuses analyzed by Foucault, does not simply involve prohibition but, above all, incites, organizes, and distributes discourses, producing knowledge, power, and silences (Foucault, 2023).

This article takes this practice (referred to here as the “critique of identitarianism”) as its object of analysis and asks how it participates in the contemporary updating of regimes of truth that connect knowledge, power, and the body. The dialogue with the Foucauldian shift from an economy of scarcity to discursive production is relevant because it can help describe the apparatus associated with the vocative “You, the identitarians” and how it fabricates objects, organizes silences, circulates economies of systematic non-knowledge, and produces sites of subjectivation.

Rather than debating the “validity” of accusations directed at so-called “identity politics, agendas, or bodies,” we aim to describe the enunciative regularities that run through this archive: the object “identitarianism” and the “retroactive” lexicons it fabricates, the subject positions it authorizes, and the recurrent dichotomies it stabilizes and operationalizes.

The hypothesis is that the “critique of identitarianism” has been functioning as an operator of intelligibility and as a form of governing minority struggles (always minoritized within it), by redistributing what can be said about gender, race, sexuality, and other somatopolitical differences, and by producing “identitarian” subjects and “critics of identitarianism” whose positions of voice and legitimacy are asymmetrical.

Beyond noting the topic’s contemporary salience, it is important to emphasize that “identitarianism” has circulated in recent public and academic debates less as a stabilized concept than as a contested problem-term and accusatory operator—one capable of bundling heterogeneous objects and reordering regimes of legitimacy across political fields. In this sense, accounts of the rise of “new discourses critical of identities” directly frame the phenomenon and its wider circulation, including within university and media arenas (Colling, 2024; Eachuspleste, 2025), helping delineate the problem addressed here.

Theoretically, the article is grounded in Foucauldian Discourse Studies (EDF) and, under the label Archaeogenealogical Discourse Analysis (AAGD), uses Navarro’s (2015, 2020) framework¹. Empirically, it analyzes 23 discursive events selected from the “News” tab of Google, spanning 2000 to 2025, and treated as archive fragments. Because the platform’s algorithmic agency shapes what becomes retrievable, the empirical archive is approached as a strategic cut rather than a statistical sample.

Accordingly, section 2 outlines the Foucauldian foundations and the analytical operators of AAGD. Section 3 details the procedures for corpus construction and selection, reconstructs the phenomenon’s recent emergence within the archive, and delineates enunciative series through brief excerpts, culminating in Table 1, which synthesizes these series.

¹ This article presents partial results of doctoral research conducted in the Graduate Program in Linguistics at Universidade de Franca (Unifran), funded by CAPES/PDGP (Process No. 88887.839586/2023-00), under the advisement of Luciana Carmona Garcia, and by CAPES/PDSE (Process No. 88881.125778/2025-01), under the supervision of Maria Alejandra Vitale.

2 FOUCAULDIAN FOUNDATIONS AND OPERATORS OF AAGD

Archaeogenealogical analyses of discourse, as practiced within Foucauldian Discourse Studies (EDF), do not result from a simple terminological update but from a move that treats Foucault's work as an independent methodological framework. The acronym Archaeogenealogical Discourse Analysis (AAGD) functions, in this article as in the thesis from which it emerged, as an exogenous label. It is not a fixed term in, for example, Navarro (2015, 2020), but rather a way of designating the surface of an analytical practice discernible in Brazilian discursive studies. This Foucauldian gesture shifts the analytical regime from an inventory of "opinions" to the description of the conditions of emergence, circulation, and rarity of utterances, thus understanding discourse as a productive historical practice (Foucault, 2022a).

Resuming debates begun in 2006, Navarro (2015) develops a program of archaeogenealogical discourse analysis that connects theory, practice, and empirical work through a method of historical reading of utterances. To analyze discourse "with Foucault" means shifting the focus from linguistic structures or pre-existing explanatory models toward the historical conditions that give rise to utterances, tracing the path from the utterance to discourse, to the discursive formation, and finally to the archive. In Foucauldian terms, the utterance matters for its function and for its insertion within a field of rules that makes it possible, citable, and effective (Foucault, 2022a), that is, as an event with materiality and effects.

In Navarro (2020), this gesture is systematized under *A verdade e as formas jurídicas* (Truth and Juridical Forms), in which Foucault explicitly outlines three research axes: historical research, discourse analysis, and theory of the subject. Taken together, these axes establish archaeogenealogy as a framework for understanding within which concepts such as archive, event, and apparatus function as reading operators. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Foucault, 2022a), the archive is defined as a historical system that governs the appearance of utterances—a set of practices and rules that, within a specific formation, determines what can be said. The question "How did this utterance appear and not another in its place?" becomes a methodological guide. For the purposes of this article, this tripartition prevents the analysis from being reduced to a merely textual inventory by requiring the linking of utterances, practices, and conditions of possibility, thereby placing subjectivation back at the center of the analytical problem.

Research linked to EDF develops procedures that apply the Foucauldian theoretical and methodological tripartition in practice. Eventalisation refers to the process of isolating discursive events (not as origins, but as key turning points) to reframe them within enunciative series and networks of power; causal demultiplication dismisses single explanations, viewing each event as the result of multiple processes and strategies working together (Navarro, 2020). Methodologically, this implies that a corpus is not selected to "represent" the totality of a debate, but to render visible series and regularities, describing convergences among heterogeneous forces in the stabilization of an object (here, "identitarianism") as a problematic term and in the production of asymmetrical positions of legitimacy. We call this connection among archive, eventalisation, and causal demultiplication AAGD in this article.

Within this horizon, the reference to ECTI[B]D (Contemporary, Transdisciplinary, In-disciplinary, and Brazilian Discourse Studies) draws, for purposes of minimal positioning, on Mendizábal's proposal (2019), indicating an ecology in which Theories of Discourse, Discourse Analyses, and Discourse Studies coexist in Latin America. Situated within Brazilian Discourse Analyses (ADB), AAGD operates here as a specific Foucauldian affiliation within a historically heterogeneous field (Gregolin, 2006; Mazière, 2007; Maingueneau, 2015; Ruiz, 2021) and is mobilized only as a basis for reading the empirical archive of this article: the discourses of the "critique of identitarianism."

The exogenous form AAGD, therefore, is not meant to rename a field or replace the diversity of EDF, but to designate a set of Foucauldian operators as systematized within a situated Brazilian lineage. Throughout this article, these operators do not function as doctrinal exposition, but as a reading hypothesis tested against the materiality of the analyzed archive, through selection procedures, the cutting of enunciative series, and the description of effects of truth and subjectivation that emerge from them.

In direct dialogue with Foucault, the article mobilizes Navarro's systematic pathway (2015, 2020) to make explicit a set of Foucauldian operators for reading the archive (Foucault, 2022a, 2022b, 2023). This is one possible selection within EDF, chosen for

its ability to make the analytical steps explicit and, in that sense, sufficient to sustain the adopted path without requiring an additional theoretical-methodological framework.

3 “YOU, THE IDENTITARIANS”: AN ARCHAEOGENEALOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE “CRITIQUE OF IDENTITARIANISM”

3.1 CORPUS AND SELECTION

In section 2, AAGD was situated within Brazilian Discourse Analyses. The next step is to turn to the empirical object of this article: the emergence of the “critique of identitarianism.”

The corpus was built from searches in Google’s “News” tab using the descriptors “pauta identitária + esquerda” and “identitarismo + esquerda” within the time window 2000–2025. The searches were conducted in an anonymous window, with no active login, and the results were recorded on the date of collection as a mitigation measure, without claiming to fully neutralize personalization. The aim was not to obtain statistical representativeness of “public debate,” but to cut a minimal archive of retrievable and citable media utterances, that is, a regime of visibility in which certain sayings become more readily circulable. In this sense, the “News” tab operates as a *dispositif* for ordering what is retrievable, ranking results based on algorithmic and commercial criteria, and thereby intervening in the conditions under which the empirical archive appears. The procedure does not eliminate algorithmic agency; it treats it as part of the archive’s conditions of appearance. Methodologically, this implies treating the “News” tab as part of the archive’s own *dispositif* of visibility, so that the corpus is not presented as “the debate,” but as a cut of what is retrievable and sayable under historically situated algorithmic conditions.

Items were included when they met the following criteria: (i) occurrence of “identitarianism” or “identity agenda” in the title, functioning as an accusatory label directed at minoritized struggles, theories, or practices, even if heterogeneous; (ii) explicit linkage to “the left,” to a crisis of the progressive field, or to electoral losses of the left; (iii) media circulation with identifiable authorship or publication in an outlet with a defined editorial section. Duplications and textually identical republications were discarded, as were variants of the same text. When the same text appeared at more than one URL, we kept the first publication or the most editorially stable version, recording republications as circulation rather than as new events. The final set of 23 items was treated as discursive events in the Foucauldian sense, that is, situated utterances whose singularity makes it possible to reconstruct enunciative series and effects of subjectivation (Foucault, 2022a, 2022b; Navarro, 2015, 2020). The final cut does not aim to exhaust the archive, but to gather sufficient materiality to describe regularities, dispersions, and convergences among heterogeneous actors and supports in the stabilization of “identitarianism” as a problematic term, as well as two specific subject positions: “the identitarians” (problem-target) and “the critics” (rationality-solution).

3.2 HISTORICAL A PRIORI AND EMERGENCE IN THE ARCHIVE

Understanding these materials archaeogenealogically requires reconstructing the a priori conditions that enable, on one hand, a critique of identities within feminist and sex- and gender-dissident fields, and, on the other, the consolidation of the “critique of identitarianism” as an accusatory category that recodes and empties these and other struggles of their particular sites of power-knowledge (Foucault, 2022a, 2022b, 2023). A first level, in this sense, refers back to the modern creation of categories such as gender, heterosexuality, homosexuality, and transsexuality.

Readings inspired by Foucault and queer/cuir theories (Leopoldo, 2020; Sousa; Colling; Casteleira, 2024) suggest that much of the vocabulary through which we name bodies today derives from a psybiomedical framework that pathologized bodily differences and desires, invented oppositions such as heterosexuality/homosexuality, and instituted a regime of coherence between sex, body, and social role, disseminated through a pop psychology of sexual differences (Katz, 2007; Connell & Pearse, 2015; Butler, 2022; Favero, 2022; Preciado, 2023). On this terrain, from the 1960s onward, the feminist and dissident turn emerged: feminist and gender studies, articulated with LGBTQIAPN+ and transfeminist practices, reappropriate signifiers forged in clinical settings to denaturalize

hierarchies of sex, race, sexuality, and class (Moschkovich, 2018; Green et al., 2018; Oliveira et al., 2022). Transfeminisms and queer/cuir theories reject gender as an essential identity and treat it as a political practice of twisting norms. From this emerges an internal gesture: a critique of identities that questions the captures and erasures produced by the categories themselves, without abandoning their strategic use (Butler, 2022, 2024; Preciado, 2023).

A second level concerns the recent constitution of the “critique of identitarianism” as a discursive practice in Brazil. It consists of a set of utterances that, since the mid-2010s, have blamed “identity agendas” for fragmenting the left, distancing “the people,” degrading the public sphere into “*lacração*,” censoring debate, and eroding “political universalism.” As Colling (2024; Eachuspleste, 2025) suggests, this critique has increasingly been formulated within universities and media outlets by subjects who identify as progressive, left-wing, and/or liberal, and not only by conservative actors.

In this recent scene, “identitarianism” does not stabilize as a disputed concept, but as an accusatory utterance. Its efficacy depends precisely on functioning as a problematic term that dispenses with substantive definition and, at the same time, reorganizes the field of the sayable, operating as an explanatory shortcut to frame heterogeneous struggles under a single diagnosis. In terms of irruption in the archive, what is observed is not the gradual entry of a theoretical category, but the emergence of an operational label that makes the critique sayable, authorizes subject positions, and converts political divergences into effects of “excess,” “deviation,” or “threat” to universality.

Delineating this a priori required building an empirical archive (Navarro, 2020), based on the search procedure described in 3.1, which indicates no occurrences until 2015 and a strong concentration between 2021 and 2024. Among more than 1,900 search results, the lexical operator “*identitarismo + esquerda*” accounts for 98.43% of the results between 2021 and 2024, compared to “*pauta identitária + esquerda*.” From this universe, 23 discursive events were selected. In these texts, “identitarianism” operates as a problematic term, articulated through dichotomies such as class versus identity, material versus symbolic, and people versus minorities, and it serves as a key to explaining contemporary conflicts and disputes. From the standpoint of AAGD, as described earlier, what matters is to describe the regularities that traverse this materiality (Navarro, 2020). It is this discursive materiality—these power-knowledge strategies—that subsection 3.3 analyzes in detail.

3.3 ENUNCIATIVE SERIES OF THE CORPUS

This subsection describes the enunciative regularities that traverse the discursive practice identified as the “critique of identitarianism” and how it produces a common enemy: “the identitarians.” The analysis was conducted by cutting enunciative series, each constituted by linguistic-discursive approximations among recurring utterances with variations across different supports and positions, thereby producing discursive convergence around the same accusatory object.

At the level of linguistic-discursive materiality, the regularities observed in the corpus can be described through three recurring operators: first, a family of nominalizations and operational labels—“identity agenda,” “identity activism,” “*lacração*,” “woke culture,” “identity politics,” and “place of speech”—functions as an accusatory operator, condensing heterogeneous objects under a single name and dispensing with substantive definition to produce an effect of self-evidence. Second, reiterated dichotomous pairs (universal versus particular, material versus symbolic, reason versus affect, people versus minorities) operate as a syntactic dispositif of hierarchization, in which one pole is naturalized as the measure of the political and the other is marked as deviation, excess, or noise. Third, recurring predications such as “fragments,” “hinders,” “censors,” “numbs,” and “degrades” sustain the fabrication of asymmetrical subject positions, recoding “identitarians” as a moral, affective, or particularist problem while authorizing “critics” as a lucid instance of “correction,” “rationality,” and “universality.”

Three utterances that synthesize the first series include: Barros (2016, n.p.), who states that “for the identitarian left everything was reduced, then, to origin”; Aldo Rebelo, in an interview published by Oliveira (2021, n.p.), who argues that the contemporary “identity agenda” overrides the “common interest,” leaving the latter “marginalized”; and Ruy (2021, n.p.), who claims that identity activism “fragments the progressive field” and offers “aesthetic solutions.” The series operates through hierarchical redistribution: class,

people, common interest, and materiality appear as the legitimate core, while gender, race, and sexuality are recoded as dispersion, pulverization, “secondary themes,” or the moralization of conflict.

From a linguistic-discursive standpoint, this first series is organized around a grammar of downgrading. “Identity agenda” and “identity activism” appear as syntagms already marked by particularization and suspicion, whereas “common interest,” “the people,” and “materiality” function as self-evident nouns—as if they required no demonstration, only recognition. The opposition is not only thematic but also predicative: the “identitarian” pole is attributed traits such as fragmentation, aesthetics, dispersion, and moralization, while the “common” pole is presented as what has been improperly marginalized. Thus, the series produces a specific truth effect: legitimate politics identifies with the universal, while minoritized struggles are reinscribed as errors of focus, noise, or symptoms—thereby positioning the “critic” as an instance of correction and measure.

In a second series, identitarianism is described as a regime of authorization, policing, and a “place of speech.” Paradigmatic examples include Gomes (2018, n.p.), who describes “limits of identitarian authorization to speak on behalf of others” and mentions “that so-called ‘place of speech’”; and Barros (2016, n.p.), who links “place of speech” and “protagonism” to disputes “within the [neoliberal] market.” “Place of speech” is reconfigured as a mechanism of interdiction rather than as a situated operator of theoretical problematization; the critique thus shifts focus from the content of struggles to the legitimacy of who speaks and to an alleged inflation of authorization.

A third series frames “identitarianism” as censorship, cancellation, and the moralization of public debate: Gomes (2020, n.p.) speaks of “cancellation or digital lynching,” attributing these to “defenders of identity agendas,” and later (Gomes, 2022, n.p.) condenses the trope into a “Manual for Silencing Critics and Prohibiting Dissent.” In an interview reported by Trigo (2019, n.p.), Antonio Risério invokes a “spiral of silence [of rational critics]” and names “identitarian fascism.” In this series, the critique stabilizes a scenario of persecution and censorship, recasts dissent and public criticism as proof of authoritarianism, and shifts the question of inequality toward freedom of expression as a sovereign value.

A fourth series consists of a single text—Marçal (2019, n.p.)—in which “identitarianism” is framed as the product of “foreign funding,” a “market niche,” and a “new world aristocracy.” Identitarianism is portrayed as an importation, manipulation, or engineering, thereby stripping political agency from struggles and recoding them as symptoms of capture, fashion, or elite instrumentality. The rarity of this occurrence does not invalidate it; rather, it marks a useful point of inflection at which the accusation is reconfigured as a hypothesis of fabrication and management.

In a fifth series, “identitarianism” appears as political blackmail and an instrument of institutional dispute: Thomaz (2023, n.p.) reports that the then-leader of the Partido da Causa Operária (PCO) claims there is an articulation of “identitarianism to attack” and “blackmail” the government; Sabino (2023, n.p.) asserts that the left’s identity agenda is a “political weapon” and that Lula “exercises a strange numbing power over the press, always concerned with equalities of gender and skin color (I refuse to call it race, because race does not exist [sic]).” Struggles are treated as illegitimate pressure tactics; “identitarianism” functions as a label that anticipates disqualification, framing demands as opportunistic tactics rather than as claims for justice and equality.

In a final, identifiable series, “identitarianism” appears as irrationality, delirium, and political degradation. Betim (2019) reports Tatiane Roque distinguishing an “identity agenda” from a “lacrative mode of doing politics,” stating that “the culture of *lacrção* is hindering everyone.” Ciro Gomes, in Gimenes (2022, n.p.), dismisses the “nonsense [identitarian] of the left” and its “hyper-fragmentation.” The critique installs a depreciative affective vocabulary in which identitarianism becomes synonymous with excess, hysteria, victimhood, nonsense, or *lacrção*—decisive for producing the pair identitarians versus the lucid.

The convergence of these series produces a particular effect: “identitarianism” becomes a problematic term that dispenses with substantive definition and functions as a flexible accusatory dispositif, aggregating heterogeneous objects, authorizing enunciators, downgrading demands, and stabilizing dichotomies: universal versus particular, material versus symbolic, rational versus irrational, freedom of expression versus censorship. The excerpts above serve as material indices of series drawn from the full set of 23 discursive events; thus, the reading does not rely on isolated examples but on recurrence and variation across the corpus.

3.4 A SYNTHESIS OF THE CORPUS

Based on the series and recurring functions observed in the excerpts, a descriptive synthesis was produced, redistributing the material across analytical dimensions. Table 1 presents this movement in an archaeogenealogical scheme. It reorganizes the material according to dimensions central to archaeogenealogical discourse analysis: core objects, “retroactive” lexicons, subjects authorized to critique, sites of enunciation, political-ideological positions, dichotomous axes, and discursive functions.

Analytical dimension	Synthesis	Predominant discursive function
Core object	“Identitarianism” is stabilized as a monolithic entity and a privileged explanation for crises, defeats, and the fragmentation of the left	Produces an object-problem that reorganizes what can be said and works as an explanatory shortcut
Retroactive lexicons	Variants (“identity agenda,” “identity politics,” “lacrção,” “cancel culture,” “woke culture,” “place of speech/positionality”) modulate tone and broaden adherence without substantive definition	Expands the accusation through operative synonymies; facilitates circulation and immediate recognition
Subjects produced	Produces a diffuse “common enemy” (“the identitarians”) and, in contrast, “critics” as an instance of lucidity and measure	Distributes legitimacy and positions of voice asymmetrically
Circulation supports	Newspapers, magazines, portals, and digital ecosystems function as echo chambers and mechanisms of social validation	Naturalizes the object and stabilizes recurrence as public “evidence”
Recurring dichotomies	Freedom/censorship; material/symbolic; rational/irrational; universal/particular; people/minorities	Hierarchizes “the political” and downgrades somatopolitical differences as deviation/excess
Narratives and framings	Crisis of the left; “identitarian authoritarianism”; “irrationality”; “petty-bourgeois deviation”; “globalist elite”; “trend/marketization”	Converts demands for recognition into a threat to unity/reason/freedom; moralizes and governs dissent
Apparatus effects	The critique operates as a technology of management: it silences, (re)centers authorities, and produces systematic non-knowledge	Updates regimes of truth and governs minority struggles by reordering the sayable

Table 1: Archaeogenealogical synthesis of the “critique of identitarianism” based on 23 discursive events in the corpus (2016–2025)

Source: organized by the authors based on journalistic-media publications retrieved from the “News” tab of the *Google* conglomerate.

Table 1 does not replace the corpus but reorganizes it in descriptive-expository form. It was built from the enunciative series described in 3.3, using a procedure for marking utterances by function. Each discursive event was coded for the presence and recurrence of: (i) naming of the object “identitarianism” and its correlates; (ii) mobilized dichotomies; (iii) dispositifs of authorization and de-authorization; (iv) framings of crisis and fragmentation; (v) censorship/cancellation vocabulary; (vi) attributions of irrationality, fashion, victimhood, or political degradation. The scheme is therefore a synthesis derived from the

series, not an “inventory” of opinions. Analytically, it is a moment of synthesis following the cutting of the series, in which the previously described regularities are redistributed into dimensions for purposes of exposition and verifiability.

At the level of objects, the core is not “identities,” but the construction of an entity called “identitarianism,” taken as a monolithic block and as a privileged explanatory problem for the left’s defeats, the fragmentation of the progressive field, and contemporary social conflicts. Other objects — such as “woke culture,” “lacrção,” “cancellation,” “identity politics,” “place of speech,” and “fragmentation of the left” — operate as symptom-signifiers, repeatedly pointing back to the same accusatory core, allowing modulation of the critique’s tone while dispensing with a substantive definition of what “identitarianism” is.

At the level of subjects, the analysis shows the production of a diffuse common enemy — “the identitarians” — condensing feminisms, antiracisms, sexual and gender dissidences, decolonial epistemologies, struggles of disabled people, etc. In parallel, authorized enunciators converge by positioning themselves as “lucid,” speaking “above” identity disputes in the name of reason, unity, nation, class, the people, or freedom of expression. The supports listed in the corpus function as echo chambers and instances of social validation; repeated diagnoses, labels, and narratives across distinct outlets help stabilize “identitarianism” as a “real” problem worthy of public attention.

The scheme also makes visible that this discursive practice is not monopolized by a single political spectrum. The convergence among orthodox Marxism, media liberalism, moderate progressivism, nationalism, moral-religious conservatism, and the cultural far right points to a transversal alignment: what elsewhere appears as antagonism becomes partial convergence around the same object.

From a Foucauldian perspective, the shift from discursive formations to apparatus/dispositif allows us to see that what is at stake is not only a set of utterances but an assemblage in which media institutions, parties, digital networks, moral norms, and argumentative techniques articulate around the same problem (Foucault, 2022a, 2022b, 2023). The “critique of identitarianism” can thus be read as a discursive practice inscribed in a dispositif that simultaneously organizes a regime of truth and modes of subject formation: on one side, “the identitarians,” produced as affective, partial, particularist subjects; on the other, “the critics,” produced as subjects of reason, universality, and measure.

By anchoring Table 1 in series cut from linguistic-discursive materialities, the analysis makes it possible to trace — through excerpts and recurrences — the regularities that sustain the construction of the scheme.

4 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Instead of proposing a new “school” or affixing a definitive label, this article uses the exogenous designation “Archaeogenealogical Discourse Analysis” (AAGD) as a resource for methodological legibility, making visible, with Foucault, a mode of reading discourse currently practiced within Foucauldian Discourse Studies in Brazil. By mobilizing the operators systematized by Navarro (2015, 2020) — archive, eventalisation, and causal demultiplication — the text stakes out a verifiable analytical path that shifts the focus away from a debate of “opinions” and toward the conditions of emergence and efficacy of utterances, bringing to the foreground effects of truth and subjectivation.

The reading of the selected media archive shows that “identitarianism” stabilizes less as a concept than as a problem-word and an accusatory operator. Its force lies in dispensing with substantive definition while condensing heterogeneous objects under a single diagnosis, reorganizing legitimacy, and redistributing the sayable across gender, race, sexuality, and other somatopolitical differences. What emerges, then, is a machinery of enunciability that produces asymmetrical positions: on the one hand, “the identitarians,” recoded as partial, affective, or particularist subjects; on the other, “the critics,” authorized as an instance of measure, reason, and universality.

In tribute — and reflection — on Foucault’s centenary, perhaps it is not asking too much that the Foucauldian presupposition that it is “we, the identitarians,” who (re)produce the conditions in which we find ourselves today become a premise, and not merely an instrument for managing modes of life. If “identitarianism” appears in the analyzed archive as a problem-word capable of reordering legitimacy and redistributing the sayable, the critical task must also include analyzing the conditions that make this word citable, effective, and politically operational, as well as the subjects it produces, stabilizes, and hierarchizes.

REFERENCES

- BARROS, D. R. Quando “opostos” se atraem e se tocam? O MBL e a esquerda identitária. *Pragmatismo Político*, 13 out. 2016. Disponível em: <https://www.pragmatismopolitico.com.br/2016/10/quando-opostos-atraem-tocam-mbl-esquerda-identitaria.html>. Acesso em: 9 set. 2026.
- BETIM, F. Tatiana Roque: “O problema da esquerda não é a pauta dita identitária, mas sim a lacração”. *El País Brasil*, São Paulo, 24 mar. 2019. Disponível em: https://brasil.elpais.com/brasil/2019/03/20/politica/1553037448_213932.html. Acesso em: 10 set. 2026.
- BUTLER, J. *Desfazendo gênero*. Tradução de Alécia Bretas, Ana Luiza Gussen, Beatriz Zampieri, Gabriel Lisboa Ponciano, Luís Felipe Teixeira, Nathan Teixeira, Petra Bastone e Victor Galdino. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2022.
- BUTLER, J. *Quem tem medo do gênero?* Tradução de Heci Regina Candiani. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2024.
- COLLING, L. Os novos discursos críticos às identidades e a crise nas universidades. *Le Monde Diplomatique Brasil*, 25 out. 2024. Disponível em: <https://diplomatique.org.br/os-novos-discursos-criticos-as-identidades-e-a-crise-nas-universidades/>. Acesso em: 10 set. 2026.
- CONNELL, R.; PEARSE, R. *Gênero: uma perspectiva global*. Tradução de Marília Moschkovich. 3. ed. São Paulo: nVersos, 2015.
- EACHUSPLESTE - Escola de Artes, Ciências e Humanidades da USP. Aula Magna: a emergência de novos discursos críticos às identidades: obras, pistas e hipóteses. Aula Magna do prof. Leandro Colling. São Paulo: YouTube, 30 set. 2025. 1 vídeo (2h10min35seg). Disponível em: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ObqQ9ds69Lg>. Acesso em: 9 set. 2026.
- FAVERO, S. *Psicologia suja*. Simões Filho, BA: Devires, 2022.
- FOUCAULT, M. *A arqueologia do saber*. Tradução de Luiz Felipe Baeta Neves. 8. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2022a.
- FOUCAULT, M. *História da sexualidade I: a vontade de saber*. Tradução de Maria Thereza da Costa Albuquerque e J. A. Guilhon Albuquerque. 13. ed. Rio de Janeiro; São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2022b.
- FOUCAULT, M. *Microfísica do poder*. Tradução de Roberto Machado. 16. ed. Rio de Janeiro; São Paulo: Paz & Terra, 2023.
- GIMENES, H. Para Ciro, pautas identitárias são “baboseiras da esquerda”. *Pleno.News*, 5 set. 2022. Disponível em: <https://pleno.news/brasil/eleicoes-2022/para-ciro-pautas-identitarias-sao-baboseiras-da-esquerda.html>. Acesso em: 9 set. 2026.
- GOMES, W. Dois problemas democráticos da política identitária. *Revista CULT*, São Paulo, 21 jan. 2022. Disponível em: <https://revistacult.uol.com.br/home/dois-problemas-democraticos-da-politica-identitaria/>. Acesso em: 9 set. 2026.
- GOMES, W. Esquerda identitária e satanização da maioria. *Revista CULT*, São Paulo, 9 nov. 2018. Disponível em: <https://revistacult.uol.com.br/home/esquerda-identitaria-e-satanizacao-da-maioria/>. Acesso em: 9 set. 2026.

- GOMES, W. O cancelamento da antropóloga branca e a pauta identitária. *Folha de S.Paulo*, São Paulo, 11 ago. 2020. Disponível em: <https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/ilustrissima/2020/08/o-cancelamento-da-antropologa-branca-e-a-pauta-identitaria.shtml>. Acesso em: 9 set. 2026.
- GREEN, J. N.; QUINALHA, R.; CAETANO, M.; FERNANDES, M. (org.). *História do movimento LGBT no Brasil*. São Paulo: Alameda, 2018.
- GREGOLIN, M. R. *Foucault e Pêcheux na análise do discurso: diálogos e duelos*. 2. ed. São Carlos: ClaraLuz, 2006.
- KATZ, J. N. *The invention of heterosexuality*. With a new foreword by the author. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- LEOPOLDO, R. *Cartografia do pensamento queer*. Simões Filho, BA: Devires, 2020.
- MAINGUENEAU, D. *Discurso e análise do discurso*. Tradução de Sírio Possenti. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2015.
- MARÇAL, W. Identitarismo bilionário. *Disparada*, 30 jan. 2019. Disponível em: <https://disparada.com.br/identitarismo-bilionario/>. Acesso em: 9 set. 2026.
- MAZIÈRE, F. *A análise do discurso: história e práticas*. Tradução de Marcos Marcionilo. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2007.
- MENDIZÁBAL, I. R. Análisis del discurso en Latinoamérica: un estado de arte. *Chasqui: Revista Latinoamericana de Comunicación*, Quito, n. 139, p. 15-66, 2019. Disponível em: <https://repositorio.flacsoandes.edu.ec/items/6b9db149-9c93-4d25-a943-0f8d84c085df>. Acesso em: 10 set. 2026.
- MOSCHKOVICH, M. B. F. G. *Feminist gender wars: the reception of the concept of gender in Brazil (1980s-1990s) and the global dynamics of production and circulation of knowledge*. 2018. 202 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, SP, 2018. Disponível em: <https://repositorio.unicamp.br/acervo/detalhe/1082998>. Acesso em: 5 set. 2026.
- NAVARRO, P. Estudos discursivos foucaultianos: questões de método para análise de discursos. *MOARA – Revista Eletrônica do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras*, Belém, v. 1, n. 57, p. 8-33, 2020. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufpa.br/index.php/moara/article/view/9682/6672>. Acesso em: 10 set. 2026.
- NAVARRO, P. Por uma análise arqueogenealógica do discurso. In: BARONAS, R. L. (org.). *Estudos discursivos à brasileira: uma introdução*. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2015. p. 149-173.
- OLIVEIRA, M. R. G.; NASCIMENTO, L. C.; JESUS, J. G. (org.). *Gritarias epistêmicas: (r)existências de travestis e mulheres transexuais negras no Brasil*. Salvador, BA: Devires, 2022.
- OLIVEIRA, W. Pré-candidato Aldo Rebelo diz que pauta identitária marginaliza o debate que importa. *Gazeta do Povo*, Brasília, 5 dez. 2021. Disponível em: <https://www.gazetadopovo.com.br/república/pre-candidato-aldo-rebelo-diz-que-pauta-identitaria-marginaliza-o-debate-que-importa/>. Acesso em: 9 set. 2026.
- PRECIADO, P. B. *Dysphoria mundi: o som do mundo desmoronando*. Tradução de Eliana Aguiar. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2023.
- RUIZ, M. A. A. Por uma análise do discurso brasileira: Gestos de leitura na construção de um campo de pesquisa. *Fórum Linguístico*, Florianópolis, v. 18, n. 3, p. 6455-6465, jul./set. 2021. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/forum/article/view/77815>. Acesso em: 10 set. 2026.

RUY, C. B. Como surgiu a política identitária e qual sua relação com a ideologia liberal. *Brasil de Fato*, São Paulo, 17 set. 2021. Disponível em: <https://www.brasildefato.com.br/2021/09/17/artigo-como-surgiu-a-politica-identitaria-e-qual-sua-relacao-com-a-ideologia-liberal/>. Acesso em: 9 set. 2026.

SABINO, M. Por que Lula não é um racista sexista como Bolsonaro. *Metrópoles*, 29 nov. 2023. Disponível em: <https://www.metropoles.com/colunas/mario-sabino/por-que-lula-nao-e-um-racista-sexista-como-bolsonaro>. Acesso em: 8 set. 2026.

SOUSA, C. G.; COLLING, L.; CASTELEIRA, R. P. Provocações iniciais para pensar o pós-queer/cuir no Brasil da atualidade. *Conceição|Conception*, Campinas, SP, v. 13, p. 1-24, 2024. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/conce/article/view/8677692>. Acesso em: 10 set. 2026.

THOMAZ, D. Por que PCO incomoda esquerda e agrada bolsonaristas. *Folha de S.Paulo*, São Paulo, 9 set. 2023. Disponível em: <https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/ilustrissima/2023/09/por-que-pco-incomoda-esquerda-e-agrada-bolsonaristas.shtml>. Acesso em: 9 set. 2026.

TRIGO, L. Em livro polêmico, Antonio Risério ataca o “fascismo identitário”. *G1– Pop & Arte*, 11 nov. 2019. Disponível em: <https://g1.globo.com/pop-arte/blog/luciano-trigo/post/2019/11/11/em-livro-polemico-antonio-riserio-ataca-o-fascismo-identitario.ghtml>. Acesso em: 9 set. 2026.



Received on April 29, 2026. Accepted on September 27, 2026.

Published on October 15, 2026.