



## THE FORMATION OF AN AESTHETICS OF THE MODERN BEING - A South American Latin Analysis of Modernity and Lineages of the Nation State

*A FORMAÇÃO DE UMA ESTÉTICA DO SER MODERNO – Uma Análise Sul Latino Americana da Modernidade e das Linhagens do Estado Nação*

**Heleno Florindo da Silva**

Instituto Federal Sudeste de Minas Gerais, Muriaé, MG, Brasil

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/7260325357013152> ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5179-2699>

E-mail: [hfsilva16@hotmail.com](mailto:hfsilva16@hotmail.com)

Trabalho enviado em 03 de setembro de 2020 e aceito em 17 de julho de 2021



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



Rev. Quaestio Iuris., Rio de Janeiro, Vol. 15, N.02., 2022, p. 522-554.

Valéria Silva Galdino Cardin, Caio Eduardo Costa Cazelatto e Lucas dos Santos Mantovani

DOI: 10.12957/rqi.2022.54238

## ABSTRACT

The present study, based on a historical-Marxist methodological analysis, seeks to understand the process of forming an aesthetic to the modern *modus vivendi*, the result of the formation, in the last five centuries, of a national identity that has asserted itself as a thread conductor of the formation of the Nation State itself. Therefore, in the first part of the work, the first aspects of modernity and coloniality of the aesthetics of the modern being are discussed, and then the lines of the Nation State are debated from a perspective of the global South - especially Latin American. - about the formation of a national identity, which is seen from a place of origin (Western Europe - the colonizer); a sexuality (the masculine overlapping the feminine); a Race (the white overlapping the other races, especially the indigenous - inhabitants of *Nuestra América* - and the blacks - forcibly brought by the slave trade in Africa); an official Religion (Christianity as a mechanism of homogenization and standardization of the modern being) and, finally, a Social Class (the liberal and revolutionary bourgeoisie as a pillar of support for the modern constitutional normative pattern, especially from the revolutionary processes of the 17th century and XVIII).

**Keywords:** Modernity. Coloniality. Aesthetics of the Modern Being. Nation State. National Identity.

## RESUMO

O presente estudo, a partir de uma análise metodológica de cunho histórico-marxista, busca compreender o processo de formação de uma estética ao *modus vivendi* moderno, fruto da formação, nos últimos cinco séculos, de uma identidade nacional que se afirmou como fio condutor da formação do próprio Estado Nação. Para tanto, na primeira parte do trabalho se introduz à discussão os primeiros aspectos da modernidade e da colonialidade da estética do ser moderno, para em seguida debater-se as linhagens do Estado Nação a partir de uma perspectiva do Sul global – especialmente latino-americana – acerca da formação de uma identidade nacional, que passa a ser vista a partir de um local de origem (Europa Ocidental – o colonizador); uma sexualidade (o masculino se sobrepondo ao feminino); uma Raça (o branco se sobrepondo às demais raças, especialmente aos indígenas – habitantes originários de *Nuestra América* – e os pretos – trazidos à força pelo tráfico de escravos da África); uma Religião oficial (o cristianismo como mecanismo de homogeneização e uniformização do ser moderno) e, por fim, uma Classe Social (a burguesia liberal e revolucionária como pilar de sustentação do padrão normativo constitucional moderno, especialmente, a partir dos processos revolucionários dos séculos XVII e XVIII).

**Palavras-Chave:** Modernidade. Colonialidade. Estética do Ser Moderno. Estado Nação. Identidade Nacional.

## 1 – INTRODUCTION – Modernity and Coloniality of the Aesthetics of the Modern Being

Building a modern aesthetic<sup>1</sup>, As will be discussed here, it was necessary to form a rational subjectivity to modernity, so that we will work in this study, the aspects that characterize it more strongly, emphasizing for that, the fact that we can, about the formation of the referred aesthetic-modern pattern of the Self and from a reading of Nietzsche's work, on the understanding of potency and impotence - the search of modern man for the true aesthetics of the beautiful, of what is seen as correct, which must be followed - insists that Man, especially, the modern-European, started from its own image to build its world.

To do so, he gave this world, from within himself, its beauty, its *modus vivendi*, so that everything that does not fit into the aforementioned idealization of the beautiful – formed, as seen above, in the image of the modern Self – must be built with hammer blows, that is, it will be adapted or rebuilt, whatever the cost, or else it will be separated, thrown away.

To begin the debates that will lead this work, it is important, from now on, to emphasize that the central idea worked here concerns the understanding of the formation of a national identity, as a mechanism of separation, in modern rationality, between those identified as belonging to the correct way. of existence, homogenized and uniformed from this reality – European and colonial – and those perceived as inferior, as less, as people who should, necessarily, be removed or corrected,

---

<sup>1</sup> Regarding the origin of modernity as a new rationality to guide humanity, from new perspectives to replace the *modus vivendi* developed during the European Middle Ages, Dussel points out the fact that this modernity was effectively developed as an unfolding of the confrontation between the European and all those who - by the standards established by the European himself - were not perceived as similar, that is, all those identified as different, like the others, so that for him it was from this relationship that the founding rationality of modernity was born, because “[...] modernity originated in medieval European cities, free, centers of enormous creativity. However, it was born at the moment when Europe was able to confront the “other” and control him, beat him, violate him; when he defined himself as a discoverer, conqueror, colonizer of the constitutive Alterity of the same modernity” (1994, p. 8 – our translation). It is from these terms, therefore, that we will seek to understand here, the fact that “[...] modernity and rationality were imagined as exclusively European experiences and products”, so that “[...] between Europe, or rather Western Europe, and the rest of the world, were codified in a whole set of new categories: East-West, primitive-civilized, magical/mythical-scientific, irrational-rational, traditional-modern. In short, Europe and non-Europe” (QUIJANO, 2005a, p. 122). Therefore, we can extract from these premises, two concepts of modernity, a first Eurocentric, through which “[...] modernity is an emancipation, a way out of innocence through an effort of reason as a critical process, which opens humanity to a new human development. [...]. The key historical phenomena for the implementation of the principle of (modern) subjectivity are the Reformation, the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. [...]. We call this vision Eurocentric, because it indicates intra-European phenomena as the starting point of Modernity, and that subsequent development does not need more than Europe to explain the process”, as well as, on the other hand, a concept of modernity in a different sense. world, from the conquest in 1492, because “prior to that date the empires or cultural systems coexisted with each other. Only with the Portuguese expansion since the 15th century, which reached the Far East in the 16th century, and with the discovery of Hispanic America, the entire planet became the place of a single world history” (DUSSEL, 2000, p. 27 – translation).

so as not to affect the beauty of the established pattern – or, be adapted to it, to be inserted, to its surroundings, in its periphery.

The formation of the aforementioned national identity must be seen, therefore, when starting from the premise that the epistemology behind the sense of identity reflects the source of meaning and experience of a people, that is, by identity we must understand “[.. .] the process of constructing meaning based on a cultural attribute, or even a set of interrelated cultural attributes, which(s) prevail(s) over other sources of meaning” (CASTELLS, 2018, p. . 54), as well as, about other peoples, epistemologies and rationalities.

Thus, when discussing the fundamental relationship between aesthetics and utopia, Quijano will highlight the need to understand that if, on the one hand, the affirmation of a pattern of domination, a coloniality of power, has an aesthetic, all those utopian conjunctures that aim at subversion to this power, will also imply, therefore, the construction of an aesthetic (2014l, p. 734), because, concludes the aforementioned author, “[...] the realm of the aesthetic is a field of dispute between a dominant pattern and an alternative of subversion and liberation” (2014l, p. 735 – our translation).

The construction of a national identity for the modern State, responsible for the creation of the modern device of Us Vs. They, the result of a binary rationality, did not develop immediately in the year 1492 – a symbolic date to demarcate the origin of modern thought, as highlighted above – while it developed through a civilizing process, through the centuries of affirmation of the modern European standard to be universalized – with hammer blows – by the rest of the world from then on.

The formation of the aforementioned device is inherent to modern thinking, to the modern way of being, above all, as will be discussed here, with modernity being highlighted by the construction of instruments of homogenization and uniformization of a standard, of an aesthetics of the being that, according to Santos, can be understood from the meaning of negation arising therefrom, since

[...] these forms of radical negation produce a radical absence, the absence of humanity, modern sub-humanity. Thus, exclusion becomes both radical and non-existent, since sub-human beings are not even considered candidates for social inclusion. Modern humanity cannot be conceived without a modern sub-humanity. The denial of one part of humanity is sacrificial, insofar as it constitutes the condition for the other part of humanity to assert itself as universal (2010a, p. 38-39).

Thus, the modernity constructed from the European aesthetics stems from this understanding inherent to the setting of a *modus vivendi* in which all those cultures, recognized as

peripheral to the European, come to be understood as Other. As the Other, the different, the non-European, has two options: either he is denied, subjecting himself to what follows, such as slavery or death, or he must go through, accepting or not, a process of self-transformation, a procedure to modernize it, so that it is recognized as a subject, approaching the European aesthetic standard (DUSSEL, 1994, p. 32).

Before proceeding, it is necessary, however, to clarify that the expression civilizing process highlighted above appears here in the same sense given by Norbert Elias (1993), and that, even without a rational matrix, for the construction of its answers to the problems it sought respond with his work, as used here, because his perspective arises from a Weberian matrix, while ours develops from a dialectical-Marxist methodical perspective, from the epistemological lines of the multiple-dialectic, his writings will be for us useful at this point in the work.

Thus, the importance of the meaning given by Elias (1993) to what he called the civilizing process lies in the fact that his view of this process of civilizational construction is contained in a factual-temporal perspective, designating a long – and natural – process. – path, intrinsic to human relationships, which will help us understand how national identity, highlighted above, has developed over the last five centuries from – and as an instrument of – the affirmation and structuring of the European *modus vivendi* and, later, North American, as a civilizational standard to be reached by all those who wanted to be recognized as civilized.

It is from the debate on national identity, as demarcated, that archetypes of a social, political, economic and cultural nature, such as, for example, Christianity, are being universalized, as such values come to be understood as being members of a single community, all of it governed by God (CUEVA, 1996, p. 46), so that in this respect, Magalhães's contributions are also important for those who, conclusively,

national identity is fundamental for the centralization of power and for the construction of modern institutions, which accompany us until today, without which capitalism would have been impossible: central power, national armies, national currency, national banks, the standardizing national law, especially family, succession and property law, the national police, secret police and state bureaucracy, standardizing and uniformed schools (2012a, p. 2).

In addition, still on the importance of affirming and establishing a national identity, an element of identification of those who, as a people - nation - underlie the modern State, it is also important to highlight that not only the national State seeks, standardizing and homogenizing an identity, became useful or necessary, while modern rationality, as a whole, is also guided by the same premise, to the point of concluding at this point that an identity to modernity was substantial for its main creation, the national state, to was identified as an integral part of the imposition of the

European *modus vivendi* on other societies, markedly, from then on, as peripheral to the European center.

It is from these premises that Elias (1993) will understand the Absolutist State, whose sociogenesis is in the formation of court societies, as a moment of civilizational transition of humanity - for him, reduced to the context that mattered to his analysis, Europe - therefore, the emergence of absolutism will have, above all, a decisive place in the global civilizational process from, in these terms, the European pattern on the rise, given the fact that the

[...] civilization of conduct, as well as the transformation of human consciousness and the composition of the libido that correspond to it, cannot be understood without a study of the process of transformation of the State and, within it, of the process of centralization of society, which found its first expression in the absolutist form of government (ELIAS, 1993, p. 19).

This rising pattern occurred with regard to the absolutist model, developed from, among others, a basic premise, that is, the formation of an aristocratic and court society - whose identifying element was triggered by the search for an identity to the nation. on which the state in creation would be structured – which, by expanding throughout Europe, the center of the civilized world, could also and from there spread to the peripheral world of that center, so that “[...] the gradual formation of this absolutist court society was accompanied by a civilizing of the economy of impulses and the behavior of the upper class” (ELIAS, 1993, p. 19).

Elements of this search are found throughout the modern period on which the State was developed, which, as an instrument of civilizational stabilization, based on European cultural, political, social and economic standards, was structured by the national form, that is, of creation, in the last centuries, of a national identity, without which modern Eurocentrism and the Europeanization of the world would not be possible, as effected by modern rationality.

It is in light of these premises that, for example, in 1795 France, with the Marseillaise, became the first national state of modernity to have a National Anthem, built on its universalizing premises of officialdom and unity over the entire French territory – metropolis and colonies – and should be used, mainly, in public order celebrations, given that its main objective is the national homogenization and uniformization, necessary for the State, which at that time was in transition between absolutism and constitutionalism (CREVELD, 2004, p. 283).

Another characteristic arising from this is, for example, the fact that from the second half of the 20th century onwards. XIX, we can observe the creation of a series of commemorative dates, whose intention is always to demarcate the national unity, such as: the independence day, the day of the armed forces, day of the flag, day of the heroes of the fatherland, day of the dead in the wars,

victory day, among several other festivities that help us to corroborate the idea launched about the search for the formation of a feeling of national unity to society, through a national identity (CREVELD, 2004, p. 288).

Thus, from this aristocratic scenario, centered on a uniform and homogeneous model inherent to the aforementioned courts - noble-ecclesiastical -, a pattern of being in society begins to be forged, so that the national State in gestation will emerge in this context, as a instrument of superimposition of a cultural *modus vivendi* – the Western European – over the others, a context that will be better developed in the following topic.

## **2 – THE LINEAGES OF THE NATION STATE FROM THE SOUTH AND THE AESTHETIC COLONIALITY OF THE MODERN BEING – An Analysis of the Formation of a National Identity**

As a way of beginning the understanding of this superposition of a *modus vivendi*, of a civilizational identity, from Western Europe, Christian, masculine, white and, later, bourgeois, on the other existing epistemologies, important are the discussions brought by Anderson (1995). , p. 60-83) when highlighting, for example, how the process of formation of the Spanish State, during the initial process of affirmation of modernity, can be perceived and understood as a clear model of this mechanism of political-socio-cultural overlap of the Me/We versus Them/Others.

The foundations of support for this view can be perceived, as the aforementioned author points out, by analyzing the birth of the aforementioned Spanish State – the first national modern example – given that it occurred from a movement of ascension – and overlap – of two kingdoms (Castile and Aragon) – which were joined by the marriage wedding – held secretly as highlighted by CrevelD (2004, p. 137) – of Isabel I (Castile) and Ferdinand II (Aragonese) in 1469 – vis-à-vis the other kingdoms in the region.

It was, therefore, from the overlap of these two kingdoms - the largest local economy (Castile), with the largest military force in the region (Aragon), to other cities, kingdoms or nearby regions, such as: Milan, Navarre, Catalonia, Valencia , Galicia, Andalusia, as well as, and above all, by the conquest and subjugation of the Americas, that the Spanish State on the rise, becomes “[...] the first power in Europe throughout the sixteenth century, enjoying a position internationality that no other absolutism on the continent has ever been able to match” (ANDERSON, 1995, p. 60).

The ascending Absolutist State, based on the highlighted Spanish example, can be conceived, in this sense, as a place – the most appropriate – for the realization of modern designs,





which ranged from the recognition of civil and political rights to all those who, even different, accepted the superiority of the European standard, fitting into it as citizens – or quasi-citizens – to those practices, normal at the time – and, for many, even today – of ethnocide (ALMEIDA, 2012, p. 72 and LOSURDO, 2006, p. 23) and epistemicide (SANTOS, 2011a, p.87), that is, “the identity of the people was built on an imaginary plane that hid and/or eliminated differences, and this corresponded, in practice, to racial and cultural subordination. to social purification” (HARDT e NEGRI, 2010, p. 121).

This standardization sought during the development of European national states, even if at first, on the absolutist premises, is important for us to understand how such a system crossed the Atlantic, during the colonization process of the Americas by the European center, reproducing, especially here in Abya Yala, the same process of cover-up triggered in the European context of the rise of the national state during the affirmation of modern-western-European epistemology.

This discussion is highlighted by Santos when he emphasizes that the States that will be formed in the context, especially in Latin America, by the European colonizer, will also be the result of a process of political, social, economic and cultural domination, of a pattern established by a upper class - the European colonizer - in the face of the others - native peoples and forced immigration, so that for him this is reflected in the fact that even today

the fundamental concepts of modern constitutionalism are, therefore, those of popular sovereignty and the homogeneity of the people (that is, the people are homogeneous). When the United Nations was founded, the vast majority of Latin American countries declared that they had no ethnic minorities. [...]. All this to create a State that represents a nation and also a culture (2009, p. 206 – *Our translation*).

For the realization of this standardization, the State should, whenever possible, seek mechanisms to assert itself as a unit, as a nation, even if this means becoming an instrument – perhaps the most important of them – to cover up the diversity that exists in the Other.

This context is highlighted by Creveld when analyzing the use that the modern national state has made – and still does – of the bureaucratic and standardizing domination of scientific knowledge, because, according to him,

[...] The State's desire to dominate the curriculum had as part of its motivation the need to 'educate our masters' [...]. However, democratization did not explain why, in virtually all countries, more and more children were forced to study the 'national' language at the expense of their own native language [...]. Nor does it explain the constant parades, flag salutes, hymn-singing and hero worship that took place in many places, not to mention the need to 'encourage loyalty to a Kaiser, an army and a navy' (Germany); assist the 'race' in its 'struggle for life'



(England); and prevent ‘the power of national defense from being indebted to other countries’ (United States of America) (2004, p. 309).

The search, therefore, for the centralization of power through the structuring of the monarchical-absolutist model as the first type of State in modernity, will depend, among other aspects, on the creation of some instruments of political affirmation and stabilization, which for Elias will take place through both of the establishment of a more refined machinery for collecting taxes to the central government, as well as of military supremacy, even if such contexts, when expanding, promote the rise of the bourgeoisie, responsible, later, for the collapse of this absolutist model in the face of a constitutional- liberal, as we will discuss below.

The financial and military supremacy of the King, in relation to other existing authorities in the context of transition from the Middle Ages to Modernity, responsible, in these terms, for the centralization of the power to govern life in society, promoted to the absolutist monarchies of the beginning of modernity an element until then non-existent in the preceding medieval period, that is, the governmental unit of authority to which people owed allegiance.

This factor is essential for the political stability of the region, as “[...] the monarch had become the monopolist controller of enormous military and financial resources, generated throughout the entire area of the kingdom” (ELIAS, 1993, p. 89), so that we can conclude, when we visualize the construction of the modern State, from this scenario until our days, that

The mechanism that generated hegemony was always the same. In a similar way – through the accumulation of property – in more recent times a small number of economic enterprises outperform their rivals and compete with each other until, finally, one or two of them control or dominate a given branch of the economy, in the form of a monopoly. Analogously – accumulating land and, in this way, expanding military and financial potential – states in recent times struggle for preponderance in a given part of the world (ELIAS, 1993, p. 90).

Having demarcated the stability and medieval influences of the modern State, with an absolutist foundation, it is now necessary to move towards the verification of the process of construction, over the last five centuries, of the national identity necessary for the affirmation and development of the European-Western state rationality in Modernity, demonstrating, as defined above, how this element of uniformity and homogenization has, as main characteristics, being a Western European, masculine, white, Christian and bourgeois pattern.

Thus, throughout the remainder of this topic, we will discuss the historical formation of this national identity, without which it would not be possible to identify, decolonially, the modern model of life in society, based on the European National State, which develops, through the Eurocentric premises, to the four corners of the Earth.

In other words, it will be discussed how the absolutist State helped in the development of part of this identity, uniformizing and homogenizing, as well as, already in the transition, after the Bourgeois Revolutions, as the national-constitutional State, with a liberal cut, brought, from the definitive rise of the bourgeoisie, the capitalist pattern as the mainstay of social dynamics, in terms of its economic-political-cultural relations.

These premises – uniformity and homogenization – of modern rationality, derive from the ideal of unity, universality and centrality, discussed elsewhere, as marks present, from the Middle Ages, to the European social and political scenario, so that, from them, Elias will highlight that “the society of what we now call the modern era is characterized, above all in the West, by a certain level of monopolization” (1993, p. 97), concluding, in the end, that

[...] the monopoly formation process has a very clear structure. In it, free competition has an exactly definable place and a positive function: it is a struggle among many for resources not yet monopolized by any individual or small group. Every social monopoly is preceded by this sort of eliminatory test, and each of them tends towards monopoly (1993, p. 103).

The meaning sought by the formation of a national identity, therefore, from this process of centralization of power, of standardization, homogenization and standardization of the modern being, is characteristic, as stated above, of the modern device of concealment of diversity, a mechanism that sustains through the subjugation of the internal Other – the Moors of the Kingdom of Granada – or external – the original inhabitants of Abya Yala, reduced to unity, through the “Indian” symbol, since

In principle, the indigenous are seen as a homogeneous group, without significant differences in terms of race, culture, origin or any other distinctive feature. Therefore, there are no Indians in the sense of a cultural or racial or historical plurality and specificity. When talking about an Indian, the plural refers to a collection of individuals who can name themselves differently, but which, for Portuguese, is essentially one and the same reality (NEVES, 1978, p. 45).

Regarding the subjugation of the external Other – an inhabitant originally from Abya Yala, reduced in a uniform way by the designating symbol of “Indian” – conquered and dominated by the European during the process of conquest of the Americas, it is important to remember the clash between Bartolomeu de Las Casas and Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda<sup>2</sup> about the nature of the Indians, that is, whether or not they could be considered people.

---

<sup>2</sup> Revisiting this important debate that deeply marks aspects that will be identified over the last five centuries as characteristic of modern-western subjectivity, Wallerstein highlights that this was the first major debate on the morality of European expansion over other peoples of the world, so that, for him, it is visible that “[...] the history of the modern world-system also involved a constant intellectual debate about the morality of the system itself”

While Friar Las Casas, on the one hand, recorded his vision to the King of Spain, emphasizing that the aforementioned Indians were people and, therefore, human like Europeans, possessing, like these, the soul that underlies the Christian life, and that, in this way, should be, at least, respected in their social system, since, according to Las Casas, there is no hierarchical system of life in society, capable of justifying the sociocultural domination perpetrated by the Spanish colonizer in the Latin American colonies (WALLERSTEIN, 2007, p. 35-36).

On the other hand, Professor Ginés de Sepúlveda, identified the existence of the power of intervention and, consequently, of cultural subjugation of the Spanish European, vis-à-vis the Indians, native inhabitants of Abya Yala, including accepting the use, if necessary, of force, because it was necessary, according to its foundations, to Christianize and indoctrinate the barbarians, pagans, from the bases and foundations of the Christian doctrines of modernity (MAGALHÃES, 2017, p. 4-5), given that, for him, the native inhabitants of the Americas, did not represent, reliably, a Christian example of what the modern Being is, that is, one who was created in the image and likeness of God, having, therefore, been born to serve his superiors.

Thus, in the course of modern history, the different, the diverse, the Other, in this sense, everyone who did not share the aesthetics of the European colonizer and conqueror, was established and, consequently, identified - socially marked - not only as different, but also, above all, as inferior, someone who needed the subjugation perpetrated by this entity that was superior to him, the European and Christian colonizer, so that, from then on - and only from then on - it would be possible to achieve the quality of human, of equal, civilized, modern.

## 2.1 – Europe as the Center of the Coloniality of the Modern Being

From then on, the first great characteristic from which modernity will be founded - through and during the process of affirmation of European superiority over all other peoples - as a

---

(2007, p. 30), since we can see that “the imaginary of the modern/colonial world emerged from the complex articulation of forces, from voices heard or erased, from compact or fractured memories, from stories told on one side, which suppressed other memories, and from stories that were told and are told taking into account the duplicity of consciousness that colonial consciousness generates” (MIGNOLO, 2005, p. 40). Furthermore, regarding the importance of Las Casas in this scenario of formation of the modern State, through the rise of a national, uniformed and homogeneous aesthetic, especially regarding its valorous discourse on indigenous rights to be seen and recognized as human beings, we cannot not to emphasize that the same Las Casas, did not identify in the Moors or Turks, their character of infidelity, for professing the Islamic faith and, therefore, being seen by them as barbarians. This is what Losurdo will highlight when he returns to Las Casas and realizes that, for him, the Turks and the Moors “[...] are infidels and barbarians, but not in a merely negative sense, as in the case of the Indians, who do not they were lucky enough to get in touch with the Christian message before; no, the Islamists have not only rejected the message for centuries (obstinacy like all rationality in ugly sins and bestial customs), but they also fight it with fury.” (2010, p. 145)

paradigmatic rationality for the construction of a new model of social coexistence, structured in the form of the national state, lies in the fact that this whole construction, as we have discussed since the introduction elsewhere, has its epistemological locus rooted in the European-Western reality, which will sustain, in the context of the conquest of the Americas, the control, the dominance of the Center – Europe – over the Periphery (Americas), based, above all, on a developmentalist premise.

The process unleashed, from then on, of the need for affirmation, uniformizing and homogenizing, of a national identity to the foundations of construction of the modern State, stems from this inherent foundation of modern rationality, insisting on the concealment of the Other, the diverse, the different, characterized by the construction of the modern-western *modus vivendi*, a reflection of European aesthetics, it made Abya Yala the first colony in Europe.

In other words, as a result of a developmentalist premise, where Europe comes to be understood as the most developed thing, to which everyone should turn if they want to develop, the American continent – but especially Latin America – is embodied in the world's first great periphery, as it allowed the European to identify himself as the Center – Eurocentrism – from where everything else will only be the Periphery. Regarding this scenario, Dussel concludes that

The colonization of the daily life of the Indian, of the African slave shortly afterwards, was the first European process of modernization, of civilization, of subsuming (or alienating), the other as being the Same; but not as an object of a warlike praxis, of pure violence, but of an erotic, pedagogical, cultural, political, economic praxis, that is to say, the domination of the other begins with the domination of female Indian bodies by men, by domination culture, types of work, institutions created by European political bureaucracy [...] (1994, p. 49 – *tradução nossa*).

The discovery, but, above all, the conquest of America, therefore, has a fundamental role in the construction of the modern-European being, not only as any *modus vivendi*, inherent to a certain people, but as the standard that, uniformed and homogenized, should be taken to all peoples, making Europe the center and end of all history, that is, just as rivers flow into the sea, everything should be conducted in the European way.

The conquest of America by the Iberian Peninsula was of great importance for the superposition of the peoples of Europe – in its western part – over the other peoples, to the point that Todorov concluded, at this point, that “[...] the discovery of America, or rather, that of the Americans, is without a doubt the most surprising encounter in our history” (2010, p. 5).

A characteristic of this overlap is the fact that, for example, the American New World “discovered” – conquered – by the European served as an instrument of enrichment for those

Europeans who, poor in Europe, came to Abya Yala, to be owners and colonizers of these lands. “ownerless” (DUSSEL, 1994, p. 20-21).

Modernity and its rationality, from which the formation of the aforementioned modern device emerges – Us X Them –, especially from the construction of a national identity, therefore, they have an address – the western part of Europe, especially the overseas powers of Spain, at first, and Portugal later – so that we can see, from then on, that “the Modern State is born from intolerance towards the different”, depending, therefore, “[...] on policies of intolerance for its affirmation” (MAGALHÃES, 2012a, p. 24), which were structured, as we will discuss here, from the European *modus vivendi*.

Regarding these premises, it is important to emphasize that we do not want to deny here the importance of modern-European thought as a mechanism for establishing a sense of development, which is important and often necessary for humanity.

However, we want to affirm the need to uncover the different, the diversity, the Other, reflected in America, especially in Latin, conquered from the European invasions of the end of the 20th century. XV, which was – and still is – on the fringes of classical theories of State study.

Thus, it was from the European influxes that mark the events - especially the conquest of Abya Yala (Latin America) by the European colonizer -, identified above from the symbolic date of 1492, and which are understood here as responsible for the emergence, even if in its beginning, the exercise of construction of modern subjectivity from the affirmation, among other important aspects, of Europe as the aesthetic locus of “everything” - scientific knowledge, politics, law, the form of organization and life in society – what the subject must possess in order to be identified as modern and, consequently, developed.

The standardization and homogenization aimed at as instruments for the foundation of absolutism as a new model of state organization introduced, from characteristics removed in the Middle Ages, by European modernity, provided, in this desideratum, that Europe began to assert itself, as highlighted above, as a the pillar from which modern subjectivity would be created to, later, be taken to the four corners of the earth in the modern expansion of the European *modus vivendi*, to the point of the “[...] (TODOROV, 2010, p. 7), the genocide of the native inhabitants of Abya Yala.

For the imposition of this new paradigm of epistemological subjectivity of Being from the aforementioned scenario, it is important to highlight that such imposition will depend on the affirmation, for example, of Europe as owner of the New World, treating the discovered lands, as an extension of the territories of the European States - especially, at this first moment, Spain and

Portugal - to the point that such a need was reflected in the first conduct of European explorers and colonizers when they arrived in Abya Yala, because

Columbus' first gesture in contact with the newly discovered lands (hence the first contact between Europe and what will be America) is a kind of far-reaching act of naming: it is a declaration according to which the lands begin to make part of the kingdom of Spain. Columbus descends to land in a boat decorated with the royal standard, accompanied by two of his captains, and by the royal sieve, armed with his inkwell. Under the eyes of the Indians, who were probably perplexed, and without worrying about them, Columbus drew up an act of swearing-in" (TODOROV, 2010, p. 39-40).

Europe can be understood, for all these reasons, as the address from which modernity will be gestated, from its origins - with many characteristics whose roots are in the Middle Ages, as discussed above - until the establishment and development of the national state, as the main instrument of construction and affirmation of the unity and universality inherent to national identity, necessary, not only for the rising national state, but also for modernity itself, in its exercise of creating a subjectivity from the unfoldings caused by Eurocentrism.

## **2.2 – The Masculine Overcomes the Feminine – modernity as a locus of domination**

The second major characteristic that marks the modern epistemological subjectivity, inherent to the formation of an identity to the modern being, a structure on which a national identity capable of unifying, standardizing, homogenizing and universalizing the national form of the modern State from absolutism arises. What is intrinsic to the first state models of Modernity lies in the fact that this whole apparatus is built from the perspective of the superposition of men over women, that is, modern subjectivity is masculine.

One of the effects of this overlap was studied by Grosfoguel when discussing the structures of knowledge of universities westernized by Eurocentric modern-western rationality and subjectivity, from which he was able to observe the existence, in this context of scientific knowledge production, that even modernity will affirm as the The only true one, the only one that should be taken into account, of racism, sexism and epistemicides, because, for the aforementioned author, the aforementioned monopoly of valid knowledge by Western men has produced structures and institutions that give rise to racism/sexism "[..] epistemic, disqualifying other knowledge and other critical voices in the face of imperial/colonial/patriarchal projects that govern the world-system" (2016, p. 25).



Faced with such premises, we can see that an important characteristic of this submission inherent to modern-western-European subjectivity is in the way, for example, European colonizers and conquerors related to the American Indians during the conquest and colonization. Thus, it is possible to perceive that

the European finds Indian women beautiful; evidently the idea of asking her consent to “put his wish into execution” does not occur to him. He directs this request to the Admiral, who is a man and a European like himself, and who seems to give women to his countrymen as easily as he distributes bells among indigenous chiefs (TODOROV, 2010, p. 67-68).

This situation, inherent to the Indian women during the conquest, is also discussed by Las Casas when he emphasizes that – in the region where Cuba is today – “some mothers drowned their young children out of desperation; others, upon discovering that they were pregnant, aborted with the help of certain herbs that give birth to dead children” (LOSURDO, 2010, p. 38).

This premise of masculinization of modern subjectivity is possible to be perceived, very easily, for example, in the way in which the native women of Abya Yala, more than their companions, suffered a “double” process of objectification and domination by the European colonizer and conqueror. , because in addition to serving as manpower for the development of the extractive model, in line with the post-conquest colonial reality, they were also seen as “instruments for the procreation of manpower”

In this way, the colonial domination of the European conqueror over the original inhabitants of these lands, meant for the natives, a decrease in their human status quo, even more seriously than that through which the men originating from these lands passed, because, according to an example taken from Ribeiro, when he discusses the arrival of the Portuguese colonizer – after months of crossing the Atlantic – to Brazilian lands and the beginning, from then on, of the process of construction of the Brazilian people, it is possible to identify that “single women did not come, except, as far as is known, a probably Moorish slave, who was the subject of lively dispute. Consequently, the newcomers mated with the Indians, taking, as was customary on the land, as many as they could, starting to produce more mamelucos” (1995, p. 89), also known as *brasilindians*.

From then on, on the miscegenation that marks the origins of the Brazilian people, according to Ribeiro (1995, p. 109) “[...] the mameluco fell into a no man's land, from which he builds his identity as a Brazilian”, because they did not identify with their paternal matrix (in most cases, Portuguese) nor with their maternal matrix (indigenous), given the fact that



[...] were victims of their drastic rejections. That of their parents, with whom they wanted to identify, but who saw them as impure children of the land, took advantage of their work as children and, later, integrated them into their flags, where many of them made a career. The second rejection was that of the maternal gentile. In the conception of the Indians, the woman is a simple bag in which the male deposits his seed. The one who is born is the son of the father, not the mother, as seen by the Indians (RIBEIRO, 1995, p. 108).

It is from this context of concealment and exclusion that, in contemporary times, Santos will highlight that “indigenous peoples demand to be recognized not only as diverse cultures but as original nations or nationalities, that is, collective political subjects with the right to participate in the new State pacts”. , which are thus configured as Plurinational States” (2010c, p. 13 – our translation), given the fact that, as the same author points out, “within the same culture or nation, some versions may be preferred over others , since the different nations or cultural identities present are far from being homogeneous” (2010c, p. 82 – our translation).

Furthermore, regarding the masculine character of modern identity, universalized from the establishment of the national state, it is also important to emphasize that this reality is not perceived - as highlighted above - only from the draconian reality of the American Indians during the process of conquest and colonization. Abya Yala's European

The very context of classical explanation of the formation of modern-western-European thought, which runs from Greek and Roman antiquity, through the European Middle Ages, to the rise of the national state – at first absolutist and, later, constitutional – demonstrates how women are relegated to secondary roles – when they have some role historically recognized by those who narrate the historical construction of the State.

the word feminine<sup>3</sup>, for example, which serves to designate the sex of women, as opposed to masculine, designating the sex of men, etymologically, allows us to understand the historical

---

<sup>3</sup> As we seek to radically decompose the word feminine, seeking its etymological origins, we will identify that its Latin radical comes from *fei minus*, that is, in a literal translation, less faith. To be feminine, therefore, is to be the one who has the least faith, a fact that, as we will discuss below, led the Holy Inquisition to persecute and, in many cases, to torture, hang and burn alive, thousands of women throughout history, accused, The vast majority of acts of witchcraft (GROSFOGUEL, 2016, p. 26) or contrary to Christian determinations - heresies - whose capitulation was found in the "manual" of the Inquisition, and which became known as *Malleus Maleficarum* ("The Hammer of Witches "). In this way, “millions of women were burned alive, accused of witchcraft, even in the beginnings of Modernity”. Given their qualities of authority and leadership, the attacks constituted a strategy to consolidate the patriarchy centered on Christianity, which also destroyed autonomous and communal forms of relationship with the land. The Inquisition was the vanguard of the attacks. The accusation was an attack on thousands of women, whose autonomy, leadership and knowledge threatened the power of the aristocracy, which became the transnational capitalist class both in the colonies and in European agriculture” (GROSFOGUEL, 2016, p. 42). Such premises can be understood more easily, given its playful context, from the film *Sombras de Goya*, which tells the story of a young woman accused of Judaism for not having accepted, when offered, pork and who, from then on, she was tortured in the basements of the Holy Spanish Inquisition to confess the Jewish practices she was accused of.

process, from the binary modern rationality, which promotes the establishment of a pattern - in this case, the masculine – and the automatic lowering of everyone or everything, to those or that which are not identical to them.

Such a scenario, therefore, helps to understand the existence of a whole epistemological, social, economic, political and cultural framework, which explains the inferiorization of women compared to men, and makes modernity, as constructed, a rational-epistemological locus, eminently , dominated by masculine rationality, the only one understood as good or correct.

It is possible to perceive this domination, for example, by revisiting, as shown by Elias, the sociogenesis of feudalism and, from then on, understanding that “the domination of women by men remained intact”, given the fact that “in every page of the chronicles of the time mentions knights, barons and great lords who had eight, ten, twelve or even more sons” (1993, p. 59).

In other words, the female figure is not even remembered in the aforementioned context, a fact that demonstrates the historical, political, social and, above all, cultural-religious cover-up, perpetrated since always, in the face of women, because

Knights of the 9th and 10th centuries, and even most knights afterwards, did not behave with special delicacy to their own wives, and generally to women of lower classes. In castles, women were exposed to the rough "song" of the stronger man. They could defend themselves with stratagems, but in these places it was the man who was in charge (ELIAS, 1993, p. 75).

This scenario has repercussions that can be felt until the present day, because if we are willing to do a simple exercise, of questions and answers, whether with high school or higher education students and, in many cases, even law students - course, for example, in which theories to explain, justify and legitimize the State are studied, especially those that do so, as discussed above, from a perspective that explains the emergence of the State as a product of a rationality that is only modern – we will perceive the masculine character of rational subjectivity built from Modernity.

Perhaps all this history of domination and violence perpetrated against women since antiquity, in the Middle Ages and also in modernity, especially against the native women of Abya Yala, makes us finally understand why, in the 21st century, there is a feeling – and conduct, which is worse – of male superiority over females, which, in peripheral contexts such as Brazil, helps to leverage terrifying rates of physical, psychological and, in many cases, lethal violence against women.

Finally, Elias points out that in most of this medieval context and its social-political-economic formation, “[...] the man ruled and the dependence on women was visible and almost

unrestricted, nothing forced him to contain his impulses and to impose controls on them”, so that love, affection, was almost never talked about, to the point that, reflecting on it, we can understand that “[...] a man in love would have looked ridiculous in this midst of warriors” (1993, p. 78).

### **2.3 – Race as a Primordial and Distinctive Element of the Coloniality of the Modern Being**

So far, therefore, we have been able to identify that the process of formation of modern-western subjectivity, through ethnic-Eurocentric influxes, makes modernity, as well as its main instrument of affirmation and structuring of this scenario, the national state, have an address – Europe – and one sex – male – so that from now on, we will seek to understand how the racial issue was also – and still is – important for the establishment of the binary device – Us X Them – discussed here.

The idea of race is perceived, in a South Latin American decolonial perspective, as “[...] the most effective instrument of social domination invented in the last 500 years”, as it was produced at the beginning of the formation of modern rational subjectivity. -Western, during the paradigmatic ruptures of the period between the 15th and 16th centuries, in the following centuries, the racial question was imposed, from Europe, in the face of all other peoples on the planet, as a part - perhaps the main one - part of the modern instrument – national identity – of European colonial domination (QUIJANO, 2000b, p. 1).

To do so, we will use a decolonial perspective<sup>4</sup>, given that we have already introduced above, when revisiting the theoretical formation of the State, from antiquity to its first modern absolutist form, the understanding of the slavery and servile bases on which almost the entirety of human history was built, even if these lines have been analyzed outside of a decolonial understanding, as we will now.

Furthermore, before proceeding, it is important to emphasize that the decolonial perspective that we will work here – as well as in other parts of the present study – is the one developed by

---

<sup>4</sup> Regarding the decolonial premises developed here, as well as in other parts of this work, it is important to emphasize that such discussions will be headed from, especially, the writings and debates promoted by Aníbal Quijano, as highlighted in the passages above, since his critical perspective about the coloniality of power, serves as an instrument for the foundation of possible paradigmatic ruptures from the global South, as it opens our eyes, in a critical-reflective way, in various fields of knowledge (history, philosophy, social sciences, especially, to those developed in the South Latin American reality and from there (SEGATO, 2015, p. 36). However, other authors will also be important for this moment, as well as for the rest of the work, such as, for example, Enrique Dussel, Nelson Maldonado Torres, Walter Dignolo, Catherine Walsh, Josef Estermann, Arturo Escobar, Edgardo Lander, Rita Laura Segato, Santiago Castro Gómez, Julio Mejía Navarrete, Enrique Leff, Ramón Grosfoguel, Eduardo Gudynas, Antonio Carlos Wolkmer, among others.

South Latin American authors, among them, especially, the Peruvian sociologist Aníbal Quijano, one of the main debaters of decolonial perspectives in the South Latin American context, which is even one of the reasons for spelling, throughout the text, the word – and its derivations – decoloniality with the letter “s”, as the cited author in his numerous works.

Quijano's choice was made because we understand that his theoretical constructions, when debating the coloniality of power from a reality of racial domination of the European colonizer in relation to the original inhabitants of Abya Yala, not only allows us to discuss the racial aspect, inherent to rational subjectivity modern-western, but also to apprehend the role that the affirmation of a racial superiority, unleashed with the conquest of the Americas by the European colonizer from 1492, had in the establishment of the modern colonial-liberal-capitalist world system, because according to him “the The idea of race, in its modern sense, has no known history before America” (2005a, p. 117), because

With the formation of America, a new mental category was established, the idea of “race”. From the beginning of the conquest, the victors started a historically fundamental discussion for the later relations between the peoples of this world, and especially between “Europeans” and non-Europeans, about whether the aborigines of America have a “soul” or not; definitively, whether or not it has human nature (QUIJANO, 2014a, p. 759 – *our translation*).

From the premises that identify and justify this domination, through a feeling of European superiority, we can highlight that a natural vision of racial superiority of Europeans vis-à-vis all members of power was admitted, because “[...] was also elaborated as a colonization of the imaginary, the dominated were not always able to successfully defend themselves from being led to identify themselves from – and with – the eyes of their dominator” (QUIJANO, 2014a, p. 760 – *our translation*).

From this debate about humanity, or not, of the original inhabitants of Abya Yala, it is possible to identify how the idea of race, and the racist practices resulting from it, did not refer - at first and for the context under analysis - only to the issues of phenotypic difference, such as: skin color, eyes, hair, as these issues, at first, are banal to the human relationship that is intended to be built from this process of domination.

Even though modern history has built the understanding that the idea behind race is nothing more than a biological phenomenon, it is important to understand, through a decolonial perspective and, mainly, through the eyes of peoples inferior by this mechanism, that the epistemological construction behind the idea of race has consequences – very serious and important – in the history of power relations between people.

Thus, we emphasize that what we understand by race, stems from our understanding, from the chosen theoretical frameworks, of the need we have to understand race as an ideological construct “[...] biological nature of the human species and everything to do, on the contrary, with the history of power relations within world, colonial/modern, Eurocentric capitalism” (QUIJANO, 2000b, p. 3 – our translation).

Therefore, when discussing, as highlighted above, indigenous humanity, it was discussed whether or not the Indians belonged to the human species, reaching the conclusion that they should be understood as the most incipient level of human development, representing the wild. , the beast, from which human beings develop until reaching the evolutionary, political-social-economic and cultural pattern of Europeans (QUIJANO, 2014a, p. 759).

It is from this racial domination that we seek, therefore, from the discussions highlighted by the decolonial debates of Aníbal Quijano among others, to understand how this racialization of the modern being, based on the social division by skin color, is a deep mark of Eurocentric subjectivity, responsible for establish the foundations on which not only modernity but, above all, the national state were – and still are – built over the last five centuries, whether in its absolutist or constitutional form.

Thus, it is in this sense that, when debating the colonality of power, the result of the rise of modern-western European subjectivity, which is reflected in the main instruments used in modernity for the production of Eurocentric domination - of which the national state stands out - we can conclude , from the outset, that the racial issue is also associated with the colonality of power, since “[...] national stereotypes will become even more serious until they are configured as true processes of racist discrimination [...]” ( LOSURDO, 2006, p. 41).

Coloniality as an instrument of Eurocentric affirmation of a subjective-epistemological identity to modernity, “[...] constituted the cornerstone of the pattern of capitalist, colonial/modern and Eurocentric world power” (QUIJANO, 2000b, p. 1 – translation). ours), so that if we look at the present day, more than five centuries after the racial origins of Eurocentric modern-western subjectivity, we will realize that “[...] for the overwhelming majority of the world population, including the opponents and victims of the racism, the very idea of “race”, as an element of nature that has implications for social relations” (QUIJANO, 2000b, p. 2 – our translation) has not undergone significant changes, remaining virtually untouched since its origins.

In this way, the search to separate, from the Eurocentric discourse, cultural issues from racial issues, will only serve as an instrument for marking the historical differences between

Europeans and non-Europeans, that is, “[...] to mark the cultural inequality, inferiority, of these with the Europeans” (QUIJANO, 2014a, p. 763 – our translation).

As we begin the analysis of the racial issue as one of the main characteristics of modern identity, which will sustain subjectivity in formation from, as discussed above, the national State, unitarily and universally, related to the project of Eurocentric uniformization and homogenization, we can already withdraw a first understanding, namely, the fact that the association between people's color and their race took place after the beginning of the conquest at the end of the 15th century.

This is possible from the foundations with which we observe that the idea of race is prior to the understanding of people's color, because, in this first moment - the affirmation of the racial connotation as a mechanism of cultural subjugation of all peoples to the *ego conquiro* European – it is possible to identify the American Indians as the first modern race, without, as highlighted above, any documentation that associates, from this scenario, the Indians to the category of skin color.

Thus, it was only after the consolidation and naturalization of the racial premises that allowed the distinction between Europeans and non-Europeans that the racial pattern was established, also based on the skin color of individuals, that is, it was among British-Americans during the expansion of African slavery in the 17th century, that the issue of skin color began to be used as a racial factor.

The white being becomes, from then on, a designation of the identity of the dominators, while all the rest – especially blacks and browns (*mestizos*) – starts to be identified as those individuals who will be dominated and colonized at the will of their masters (QUIJANO, 2000b, p. 5), so that

This new pattern of power was constituted by plotting, on the one hand, a new system of domination configured around the ideological invention of race as an inequality of nature between the Iberian colonizers and the aboriginal colonized of what will become America. And on the other hand, a new exploitation system consisting of the articulation of all the hitherto existing forms of exploitation (QUIJANO, 2003, p. 54 – *tradução nossa*).

The racialization of the world from the conquest of *Abya Yala* (QUIJANO, 2014m, p. 317), therefore, produced the propitious scenario for the colonial structuring of power (domination), which occurred, since the rise of modern-western subjectivity, through the national state - first from the standardizing, homogenizing, universalist and totalizing prism of European absolutism, and then through the liberal-capitalist bourgeois constitutionalism - whose historical role to this day is still

central in terms of the classification and people's life in society, especially in social contexts of late modernity or underdevelopment.

The white race, from this historical context of colonial affirmation of hegemonic, Eurocentric, modern and western power, which will sustain the affirmation of the modern national State, is now perceived as inherent to the European colonizer and dominator, so that all other races will, in contrast to that, be treated in an inferior way.

The subject's skin color, in this sense, comes to be understood as a racial mark of differentiation between those who will dominate, because they are identified as superior (white Europeans) and those who are inferior to them (blacks, indigenous and non-Brazilian mestizos). Europeans).

The state system that will be structured from the national state during the fundamental rise, where the epistemological bases that will lead to the construction of a colonial, Eurocentric, western pattern, to the power of control and regulation of people's lives in society, from the formation of a uniformizing and homogenizing subjectivity, it has as its foundation element the idea of race – understood here, as in Quijano (2005b, p. 17) – as the first social, political, cultural and economic category of modernity.

The colonality of power resulting, therefore, from the establishment in the origins of modernity, of race as an inherent characteristic of being modern, separating people in society, mainly in relation to their access to the power of the national State, implied, for example, the Latin American context – and it still implies – something fundamental to the structuring and imposition of this scenario,

[...] the sociological invisibility of non-Europeans, Indians, blacks and their mestizos, that is, of the overwhelming majority of the population of America and, above all, of Latin America, in relation to the production of subjectivity, historical memory, imagination, rational knowledge. then, of identity (QUIJANO, 2005b, p. 24).

We can already see that the modern-western, Eurocentric subjectivity, in addition to the address (Europe), the sex (male), also has, from then on, a skin color, a race (white), with which it will produce a classification. distinguishing, in the quest to naturalize – uniformly, homogeneously and universally – the recognition of a national identity, as the aesthetic standard of the modern being, those who will participate in the conduct of state power and, therefore, will recognize themselves as superior, from those who will be subalternized by the resulting colonality.



## 2.4 – Christianity as a Tool for Homogeneity and Uniformization of the Modern Being from the Coloniality of Knowledge

Before, we analyze some developments of this process of racialization and whitening of the modern being, with regard to the socioeconomic classification from which the bourgeois state - the result of a transition between the absolutist national state and the constitutional national state - of a liberal-capitalist cut will take the lead. of the national state, it is therefore necessary to understand how the religious factor is also extremely important for the identification, legitimation and development of the aforementioned modern subjectivity.

Regarding the religious factor that will be placed, as highlighted elsewhere, as an important factor of demarcation of the European *modus vivendi*, from which, modernity and - for the study proposed here - especially, the national State that is structured from there, it is necessary to understand that the establishment of a nationality will result, among other aspects, from the establishment of common values and feelings.

It is therefore necessary to have – and to understand – this context, that “religion, whatever its content, is a discourse transmitted by tradition, and that matters as a guarantee of a cultural identity” (TODOROV, 2010, p. 116).

Thus, even if the scenario of decolonial reconstruction of an aesthetics of coloniality of power, imposed on the rest of the world, especially on South Latin America, from the process of Eurocentric conquest and colonization, shows us how important religion was In order, at the very least, to standardize modern discourse, culturalizing the indigenous or expelling the different – with the fall of Granada and the expulsion of Moors and Jews from the Iberian Peninsula – it is necessary to understand that here we are not demonizing or sanctifying any religion. .

Only, we seek to demonstrate how religiosity was present in the aesthetic formation of the modern identity of the national state, because we understand that there is no religion in itself more rational or true than another, as they all derive from faith, something eminently cultural, collective, but also individual.

The religious factor appears, this time, as one of the main values for the unification and homogenization of a people, that is, for the affirmation of a national identity, through the affirmation of the mentioned common values and feelings, which, as we can see, for example, it occurred during the formation of the Spanish State, because “[...] Spain was born with the expulsion of Muslims and later Jews. To be Spanish was to be Catholic, and anyone who did not behave like a good Catholic was excluded” (MAGALHÃES, 2012a, p. 24).

The ill-fated formation of the Spanish State from the marriage of Ferdinand (Aragonese) to Isabel (Castillian), as discussed above, failed to give rise, in the time when King and Queen lived, to a fully unified kingdom, or, even even create a single currency, so that the only example of unity of the Spanish monarchical state in that context was in charge of the Holy Inquisition.

About it, Anderson will highlight that “the Inquisition – a unique invention in Europe at that time – must be understood in this context: it was the only unitary Spanish institution on the peninsula, an elaborate ideological apparatus that compensated for the administrative division and dispersion of the State” (2016, p. 65).

The Catholic Church, as a religious institution of the ascending absolutist monarchies, was identified, from then on, as an important coordinator of people's lives in society, in view of holding the monopoly of faith and, therefore, of salvation, having in its arm repressive and police, the Holy Inquisition (Santo Oficio), a mechanism to hear “[...] denunciations and slander in the search for heresies and bestialities”, because among all its tasks, it was up to it to judge, condemn, incarcerate and even burn the most daring ones alive (RIBEIRO, 1995, p. 38).

Christianity, therefore, as a religion that has developed since antiquity – initially, in the East, but later taken to the West and, especially, to Europe, still during the Roman Empire – has a fundamental and very important role in the formation of the national aesthetics inherent to national identity produced by the Eurocentric subjectivity and rationality of western modernity. As highlighted by Creveld, when analyzing the works of Niccolò Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes – important theorists of politics and the modern State – about the religious factor to be used – or identified – by the rulers as an instrument of uniformity and social stabilization of a people, it is important keep in mind that

Commenting on his much-admired Roman republic, Machiavelli claimed that one of the secrets of political stability was that the upper classes used religion to keep the people in their place. [...]. Influenced by Galileo, Hobbes sought to ground his political system in the physics of his time, eliminating any factor that could not be seen, felt and measured. He was the first to proclaim that belief in God (if He existed) was irrelevant to politics; As for the external forms, Machiavelli followed in recommending that subjects be obliged to practice the religion indicated by the sovereign as being the most adequate for the maintenance of public order (2004, p. 101; 103).

Thus, the establishment of religious premises in the conduct of the State - or even the recognition of an official religion to the modern State - can be understood, throughout the civilizing process from which modernity was built in recent centuries, as a characteristic inherent and, markedly, present in the subjectivity of the modern being.

It was also from these religious premises, therefore, that the modern, Western and European capacity was extracted to produce a model of colonial and rational development that would allow European colonizers within the scope of the absolutist national state, the ethnocidal or epistemicidal cover-up of millions of people. , of multiple and plural cultural matrices, during – mainly – the first centuries of the conquest.

According to Machado and Lages, the process unleashed after the conquest, especially from the Papal rules on the European colonization of Abya Yala and the expansion of Christianity, produced a deep concealment of indigenous knowledge, knowledge and daily practices, because, according to the aforementioned authors, “lifestyles, practical knowledge and worldviews are elements of indigenous culture that were for a long time considered inferior to European culture” (2012, p. 106).

Regarding the influences of the rules coming from the Vatican for the Latin American colonization from the conquest, as well as for the expansion of Christianity, Ribeiro emphasizes that through the encyclicals and papal bulls it was granted “[...] to the kings of Portugal and, later, to the Spaniards, the right to invade, conquer and subjugate any [...] enemies of Christ, their lands and goods and reduce everyone to servitude and practice everything for their own benefit and that of their descendants” (1995, p. 67).

The use of religion as a colonization factor capable of producing the assimilation of the Indian and the black - the original representative of Abya Yala, or that fruit of a forced immigration - with the objective that they recognize themselves as subalterns, as inferior to the colonizer, thus facilitating its use as slave and slave labor, can be better understood, based on the aforementioned premises, through Jesuit epistemology and rationality.

When referring to the model of cultural assimilation through the Jesuit premises, as highlighted above, we conclude that through such a perspective it was possible for colonial, western and European modernity to produce a scenario of serious and drastic practices of standardization, homogenization and concealment of diversity. , these practices, responsible for concealing from the Indians (and, later, also from the enslaved African peoples) the cultural values that they once had in their self-recognition as an integral part of a non-European people.

The Christian religion (Catholic, Apostolic-Roman in its origins) can be perceived, therefore, as an indicative element of an important part of the modern aesthetics under which the identity subjectivity, which produced the modern national State, mainly in its first absolutist formulation, was realized and universalized as a standard for other non-European peoples.

This is what we can, for example, perceive in the process of conquering the territory of what we now know as Brazil, when

the first act indicative of the conquest was the implantation of a stone landmark in Porto Seguro, with the cross of Christ on one side and the coat of arms of Portugal on the other. Psychologically, the cross was already present in the name given to the island and in the altitude constellated in the collective unconscious. The cross, that is, Christianity, would be the perspective through which contact with the unknown could be understandable for a European conscience, in the same way as it would be the pattern chosen to shape the new reality (GAMBINI, 1988, p. 75).

## **2.5 – The Liberal and Revolutionary Bourgeoisie as a Pillar of Universalization of the Modern Constitutional Normative Standard**

As we move towards the final part of this work, it is necessary to discuss, even if briefly, the bourgeois influxes in the face of the formation of the aforementioned national identity to the modern nation-state, as it is the process of transformation from the absolutist national state to the constitutional national state, which will enable us to understand that the rational structure behind the national model of the modern, western and Eurocentric State, with a uniform and homogenizing base, makes it reasonable to identify, based on all the premises discussed so far, that

the nation-state has therefore become, above all, not only an imitation of the attributes of the ruler, but the universal aspiration of people throughout the world of capital. The Eurocentric pattern of power has become a model for all peoples (QUIJANO, 2014c, p. 620).

After all, as discussed above, it is against the backdrop of the absolutism of the modern national state that those medieval influences can most easily be identified in the daily context of people, from the late 15th century to the English social upheavals of the 17th century, but, mainly, the great North American and French ruptures of the 18th century, when the national Eurocentrism of the modern State was constitutionalized through revolutionary processes of bourgeois foundation and interest, as we will discuss from now on.

Thus, regarding the historical moment of the bourgeoisie's affirmation in the face, mainly, of the structure established from the needs of the nobility of the time, Wallerstein will discuss how it is possible to understand in this transition, also the origins of what he calls historical capitalism, because, according to the cited author, “the correct background image is that historical capitalism emerged through the transformation of the landed aristocracy into the bourgeoisie, because the old system was disintegrating” (2001, p. 91).



Thus, regarding the brief revisitation on the transition from the modern-national-absolutist State to the national-bourgeois State, which we propose here, as the last identifying trait of a modern aesthetic, inherent to the Eurocentric State itself, it is important to clearly establish, that we will also use a decolonial, South Latin American perspective to carry out this journey, since at this point of the work we seek to affirm a position on modernity from the subalternized, colonial and peripheral reality under which we were inserted, as Latin Americans – an integral part of the global South – for the last five hundred years.

The transition between absolutism and the constitutional-bourgeois State was marked from the moment in which the emergence of market interests - bourgeois - took place in an increasingly rooted way in the social bosom, that is, as societies increased their economic relationship, which took place, mainly, within their own territories – now unified under the tutelage of a national State – but also, in increasing volumes, commercial transactions between European States became naturalized – crammed with goods from the American colonies.

Bourgeois interests, merged to ensure the strength, increasingly evident, of mercantile relations that will structure - as we will discuss more precisely in the following topic - a model of national state, with capitalist and market foundation, and which will assert itself as an instrument of foundation and expansion of this new context of a rising constitutional-liberal-bourgeois national state, promote distrust about the presence of the state in the regulation of these relations.

It is from this fear that the aforementioned liberal formulations of the classic European and North American constitutionalism of that time will be based, because “the totalizing demand of the State, or rather, of the public, cannot be denied. However, it should only be admitted up to the limit of what is indispensable to guarantee the existence and performance of the private [...]” (QUIJANO, 2014f, p. 751 – our translation).

The relationship between public and private, therefore, will mark the bases on which the aforementioned bourgeois interests are being affirmed as members of a new social, political, economic and cultural rationality, the Rule of Law, that is, a state form built from norms, of laws, among which, the most important, will be called the Constitution, so that it is possible to extract from this context, the perspective under which this Rule of Law is the reflection of the bourgeois search for security.

The Constitution, as the security with which the rising bourgeoisie will seek to solidify and its epistemological bases, allowed, as stated above, the formation of a State whose main attribution is to guarantee that what was protected as a right or as a duty, in the laws that started to sustain social relations, can be effectively fulfilled.

In this way, it is possible to conclude that the bourgeoisie, as one of the three important social classes of the time, alongside the Clergy and the Nobility, will develop from the protection of the King, and more, which will be from, precisely when the bourgeoisie achieves more economic power than the nobility, which will then start to seek political power, which was made possible by the Eurocentric and North American Bourgeois Revolutions, so that

modern constitutionalism arises from the bourgeois need for security in economic relations, in contracts. Constitutionalism therefore means security. [...]. The essence of liberal constitutionalism will be security in legal relationships through predictability, respect for contracts and protection of private property. Now, for the first time, there was a law greater than the state: the Constitution. [...]. The constitutional norm is capable of offering security, since it is superior to all other norms and powers of the state (MAGALHÃES, 2012a, p. 36).

From then on, if the State will no longer act in an absolute way, mainly as a result of its departure from the mercantile relations produced in society - relations that are market-based and strictly based on liberal economic premises in foundation - whose domain becomes the bourgeoisie, a social class until then, like all the rest of the people, subordinated to those who governed and effectively exercised political-social and economic power, in the absolutist model (the nobility and the clergy), it will be up to him, on the other hand, to legitimately exercise the force necessary to enforce the rules of the market.

The role of the bourgeois rule of law as a “watchdog” of social relations of a private nature, established from the influxes of the market, occurs in this sense, because “private relations practiced in society are not established by immediate violence, they therefore need to, of an institutionalized norm” (QUIJANO, 2014f, p. 752 – our translation), so that “in bourgeois society, force can only be exercised legitimately by authority that does not necessarily come from the previous social status of those who exercise it” (QUIJANO, 2014f, p. 752 – our translation).

As seen above, the performance of the national State, based on these premises, becomes a mere guarantor of private contracts, established by free and equal subjects, as proclaimed by all the constitutions that were built throughout this 18th century period, but, especially in the 19th century, as a result of the great political, economic, social and cultural movements that came to be called, in State Theory or Constitution classes, Bourgeois Revolutions.

The rise of the bourgeoisie to political power from this revolutionary context demonstrates that, as drawn by Reinhard, “the ability of power elites to exploit war, religion and patriotism in order to extend their power has become decisive” (1997, p. 25 – our translation), because

[...] the Revolution gave further impetus to the growing power of the state by unleashing the forces of nationalism. Revolutionary wars were to prove the extent to which men were willing to die for their nation. For the holders of state power, this amounted to an additional opportunity to raise funds (REINHARD, 1997, p. 29 – *tradução nossa*).

As the bourgeoisie conquered what Elias calls state monopolies (1993, p. 100-104), it produced an institutional rupture between the ruling classes – or as Reinhard (1997) prefers “the Power Elites” or Faoro (2001) “the Owners of Power” – so that it assumed the central role in the conduction of the State, now based on a well-defined set of norms, which will be elaborated by those who, among the constituent citizens of the people, were “chosen” to this end, through indirect-representative democracy.

Therefore, the bourgeoisie assumed the last of the main characteristics worked here as identifying elements of the modern Eurocentric subjective rationality that, structured through the development of a national identity to modernity, as well as the State that was built from it, gave rise to the coloniality of power, exposed at this point, from an address (Western Europe), a sex (Male), a Race – skin color – (White), a religion (Christian) and a social class (Bourgeoisie).

Important information to corroborate this understanding of the European centrality in the coloniality of power through the modern rise of the national state and its structuring from an aesthetics to epistemological subjectivity on which the modern being was built over the last five centuries - especially, in the last two –, Martins, when discussing Paul Kennedy's work – *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* – highlights that “[...] in the year 1800, Europeans occupied or controlled 35% of the world's land surface; by 1878, that number had increased to 67%, and by 1914, to 84%” (2011, p. 66).

It was from these five characteristics, built on the basis of the modern enterprise of the last five centuries, whose beginnings were marked by the events of 1492, highlighted above, especially by the conquest of the Americas, that the coloniality of power - which subordinated, inferiorized, covered up diversity, especially, the diversity naturally existing in *Abya Yala* – not only produced an aesthetic for being modern, but also established itself as an instrument for the expansion of this aesthetic to the four corners of the world.



## REFERENCES

ALMEIDA, Marina Corrêa de. *Direito Insurgente Latino-Americano: Pluralismo, Sujeitos Coletivos e Nova Juridicidade no Século XXI*. In.: WOLKMER, Antonio Carlos e MELO, Milena Petters (orgs.). **Constitucionalismo Latino-Americano – tendências contemporâneas**. Curitiba: Juruá, 2013, p. 169-190.

ANDERSON, Perry. **Linhagens do Estado Absolutista**. 3ªed. trad. por BASTOS, Suely e BRITTO, Paulo Henrique. Tatuapé: Editora Brasiliense, 1995.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Passagens da Antiguidade ao Feudalismo**. Trad. por PRELORENTZOU, Renato. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2016.

CASTELLS, Manuel. **O Poder da Identidade**. 9ªed. Rev. e Ampl. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2018.

CREVELD, Martin Van. **Ascensão e Declínio do Estado**. Trad. por SIMÕES, Jussara. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2004.

CUEVA, Mario de La. **La Idea del Estado**. Cidade do México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1996.

DUSSEL, Enrique. **1492 El Encubrimiento Del Otro: hacia El origen del “mito de La Modernidad**. La Paz: Plural Editores, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Europa, Modernidade y Eurocentrismo*. In. LANDER, Edgardo (org.). **La Colonialidad del Saber: eurocentrismo y ciências sociais – perspectivas latino-americanas**. Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2000, p. 24-33.

ELIAS, Norbert. **O Processo Civilizador – Volume 2 – Formação do Estado e Civilização**. Trad. por JUNGSMANN, Ruy. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1993.

FAORO, Raymundo. **Os Donos do Poder: formação do patronato público brasileiro**. 3ªed. rev. São Paulo: Globo, 2001.

GAMBINI, Roberto. **O Espelho Índio – os jesuítas e a destruição da alma indígena**. Rio de Janeiro: Espaço e Tempo, 1988.

GROSGOGUEL, Ramón. *A Estrutura do Conhecimento nas Universidades Ocidentalizadas: racismo/sexismo epistêmico e os quatro genocídios/epistemicídios do longo século XVI*. In.: **Revista Sociedade e Estado**, Vol. 31, N. 1, Jan./Abr., 2016, p. 25-49, disponível em: <<http://www.scielo.br/pdf/se/v31n1/0102-6992-se-31-01-00025.pdf>>. Acessado em 26 de Agosto de 2018.

HARDT, Michael e NEGRI, Antonio. **Império**. 9ªed.. trad. por VARGAS, Berilo. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2010.

LOSURDO, Domenico. **Liberalismo – entre civilização e barbárie**. Trad. por JOFFILY, Bernardo e OUTRA. São Paulo: Anita Garibaldi, 2006.



\_\_\_\_\_. **A Linguagem do Império: léxico da ideologia estadunidense.** Trad. por CLASEN, Jaime A. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2010.

MACHADO, Isabel Penido de Campos e LAGES, Livia. *A Proteção das Identidades Indígenas no Marco da Proposta Plurinacional: uma assimilação da diversidade enquanto direito coletivo dos povos.* In.: MAGALHÃES, José Luiz Quadros de. (coord.). **Direito à Diversidade e o Estado Plurinacional.** Belo Horizonte: Arraes Editores, 2012, p. 105-117.

MAGALHÃES, José Luiz Quadros de. **Estado Plurinacional e Direito Internacional.** Curitiba: Juruá, 2012a.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Violência e Modernidade: o dispositivo de Narciso: a superação da modernidade na construção de um novo sistema mundo.** Disponível em: <<http://joseluizquadrosdemagalhaes.blogspot.com.br/2011/02/197-teoria-do-estado-primeiras-aulas.html>>. Acessado em 24 de Setembro de 2019.

MARTINS, Carlos Eduardo. **Globalização, Dependência e Neoliberalismo na América Latina.** São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.

MIGNOLO, Walter D.. *A Colonialidade de Cabo a Rabo: o hemisfério ocidental no horizonte conceitual da modernidade.* In.: LANDER, Edgardo (org.). **A Colonialidade do Saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais – perspectivas latinoamericanas.** Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2005, p. 35-54.

NEVES, Luiz Felipe Baêta. **O Combate dos Soldados de Cristo na Terra dos Papagaios – colonialismo e repressão cultural.** Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 1978.

QUIJANO, Aníbal. *Colonialidade do Poder: eurocentrismo e América Latina.* In.: LANDER, Edgardo (org.). **Colonialidade do Saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais.** Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2005a. p. 117-142.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Dom Quixote e os Moinhos de Vento na América Latina.* Trad. por ANDRADE, Gênese. In.: **Estudos Avançados.** Vol. 19, N. 55, set./dez., São Paulo, 2005b. p. 09-31.

\_\_\_\_\_. *“Raza”, “Etnia” y “Nación” en Mariátegui – cuestiones abiertas.* In.: QUIJANO, Aníbal. **Cuestiones y Horizontes: de la dependencia histórico-estructural a la colonialidad/descolonialidad del poder.** Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2014a. p. 757-775.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Estado-Nación, Ciudadanía y Democracia – cuestiones abiertas.* In.: QUIJANO, Aníbal. **Cuestiones y Horizontes: de la dependencia histórico-estructural a la colonialidad/descolonialidad del poder.** Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2014c. p. 605-624.

\_\_\_\_\_. *La Razón del Estado.* In.: QUIJANO, Aníbal. **Cuestiones y Horizontes: de la dependencia histórico-estructural a la colonialidad/descolonialidad del poder.** Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2014f. p. 743-755.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Estética de La Utopía. In.: QUIJANO, Abíbal. Cuestiones y Horizontes: de la dependencia histórico-estructural a la colonialidad/descolonialidad del poder.* Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2014l. p. 733-741.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Colonialidad del Poder y Clasificación Social. In.: QUIJANO, Abíbal. Cuestiones y Horizontes: de la dependencia histórico-estructural a la colonialidad/descolonialidad del poder.* Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2014m. p. 285-327.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Qué Tal Raza!. In.: America Latina en Movimiento.* N. 320, Ano 2000b, p.1-8. Disponível em: <<https://www.alainet.org/es/active/929>>. Acessado em 02 de março de 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Notas sobre “Raza” y Democracia en Los Países Andinos. In.: Revista Venez. de Econ. y Ciencias Sociales.* Vol. 9, N. 1, ener.-abr., 2003, p. 53-59.

REINHARD, Wolfgang. *Las Élités del Poder y la Construcción del Estado.* Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1997.

RIBEIRO, Darcy. *O Povo Brasileiro – a formação e o sentido do Brasil.* 3ªed. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1995.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Souza. *Para Além do Pensamento Abissal: das linhas globais a uma ecologia dos saberes. In.: SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa e MENESES, Maria Paulo (org.). Epistemologias do Sul.* São Paulo: Cortez, 2010a, p. 31-83.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Gramática do Tempo: para uma nova cultura política.* 3ªed. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, 2011a.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Pensar El Estado Y La Sociedad: desafios actuales.* Buenos Aires: Waldhuter Editores. 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Refundación del Estado en América Latina: perspectivas desde una epistemología del sur.* Buenos Aires: Antropofagia, 2010c.

SEGATO, Rita Laura. *La crítica de la colonialidad en ocho ensayos y una antropología por demanda.* Buenos Aires: Prometeo Libros, 2015, Cap. 1, p. 35-71.

TODOROV, Tzvetan. *A Conquista da América: a questão do outro.* Trad. Por MOISÉS, Beatriz Perrone. 4ªed. São Paulo: Editora WMF Martins Fontes, 2010.

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel Maurice. *O Universalismo Europeu – a retórica do poder.* Trad. por MEDINA, Beatriz. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Capitalismo Histórico e Civilização Capitalista.* Trad. por AGUIAR, Renato. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto, 2001.

**Sobre o autor:****Heleno Florindo da Silva**

Doutor e Mestre em Direitos e Garantias Fundamentais pela Faculdade de Direito de Vitória (FDV). Especialista em Direito Público pelo Centro Universitário Newton Paiva. Pesquisador Externo do Grupo de Pesquisa Estado, Democracia e Direitos Fundamentais, do Programa de Pós-Graduação Stritu Sensu da Faculdade de Direito de Vitória (FDV). Pesquisador Externo do Grupo de Pesquisa Estado & Direito: Estudos Contemporâneos da Universidade do Estado de Minas Gerais (UEMG). Professor D1/N1 de Direito do Instituto Federal Sudeste de Minas Gerais

Instituto Federal Sudeste de Minas Gerais, Muriaé, MG, Brasil

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/7260325357013152> ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5179-2699>

E-mail: [hfsilva16@hotmail.com](mailto:hfsilva16@hotmail.com)