

# **Anthropology and science in earlier modern philosophy: on the normative formation of the concept of modernity as self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, endogeny and independence of reason – an essay**

## **Antropologia e ciência no começo da filosofia moderna: sobre a formação normativa do conceito de modernidade como autorreferencialidade, auto-subsistência, autonomia, endogenia e independência da razão – um ensaio**

*Leno Francisco Danner<sup>1</sup>*

*Agemir Bavaresco<sup>2</sup>*

*Fernando Danner<sup>3</sup>*

---

**Abstract:** In this paper, we argue that the normative concept of modernity as self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, endogeny and independence of reason is based on the correlation of anthropology and science in a double, however correlated, point: on the one hand, it is rooted on the idea of the natural world as a purely technical, physical, chemical and biological triad of structure, dynamics and object, which obeys to quantitative and definite-invariable material laws; on the other, it is grounded on the idea of human mind or human nature as a normative subject that is able to interpret in an objective way this purely technical nature and, more importantly, to construct the epistemological-moral-ontological objectivity from the modern self's capability of creating its own axiology and rationalizing the epistemological-moral foundation and the anthropological-ontological place-belonging in the world and in society. As a consequence, the normative concept of modernity, associated to a technical view of nature and to a political-profane-historical notion of society-culture-consciousness, of socialization-subjectivation, enables the idea that modernity is a very singular anthropological-societal-cultural-cognitive process of evolution in human history, as its paradigmatic basis (reason between natural science and secular culture) represents directly universalism in itself, so as to construct a barrier and an opposition between modernity and the other of modernity, as well

---

<sup>1</sup> Doutor em Filosofia (PUCRS). Professor de Filosofia e de Sociologia no Departamento de Filosofia da Universidade Federal de Rondônia (UNIR). Contato: [leno\\_danner@yahoo.com.br](mailto:leno_danner@yahoo.com.br)

<sup>2</sup> Doutor em Filosofia (Université Paris I – Phanteón Sorbonne). Professor de Ética e de Filosofia Política no Departamento de Filosofia e no Programa de Pós-Graduação em Filosofia da Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS). Contato: [abavaresco@pucrs.br](mailto:abavaresco@pucrs.br)

<sup>3</sup> Doutor em Filosofia (PUCRS). Professor de Filosofia no Departamento de Filosofia da Universidade Federal de Rondônia (UNIR). Contato: [fernando.danner@gmail.com](mailto:fernando.danner@gmail.com)

as to institute the process of modernity-modernization and its comprehension as a self-referential, self-subsisting, autonomous, closed and endogenous process, and as a principle of movement, dynamics and explanation. Here, modernity can be explained only by its internal processes, subjects, principles, values and multiple dynamics, as it signifies a self-constructive movement in itself and by itself, as an overcoming of traditionalism as a minority and a consolidation of modernity-modernization as a majority due to the intersection of reason, science and culture.

**Key-Words:** *Res Cogitans*; *Res Extensa*; Self-Referentiality; Reason; Normativity.

**Resumo:** Argumentamos no artigo que o conceito normativo de modernidade enquanto autorreferencialidade, auto-subsistência, autonomia, endogenia e independência da razão é baseado na correlação de antropologia e ciência em um duplo, porém imbricado, ponto: por um lado, ele está enraizado na ideia do mundo natural enquanto uma estrutura, uma dinâmica e um objeto puramente técnicos, físicos, químicos e biológicos que obedecem a leis materiais quantitativas e definidas-invariáveis; por outro, ele é fundado na ideia da mente humana ou da natureza humana enquanto um sujeito normativo que pode interpretar de modo objetivo esta natureza puramente material e, mais importante, que tem condições de construir a objetividade epistemológica-moral-ontológica a partir da capacidade de criação da própria axiologia por parte do self moderno, em termos de sua capacidade de racionalizar a fundamentação epistemológico-moral e o lugar-pertença antropológico-ontológico no mundo e na sociedade por parte desse mesmo self racional. Em consequência, o conceito normativo de modernidade, associado a uma compreensão técnica da natureza e a uma noção política de sociedade-cultura, de socialização-subjetivação, possibilita a ideia de que a modernidade é um processo de evolução singular em termos antropológicos-sociais-culturais na história humana, de modo a construir-se uma barreira e uma oposição entre modernidade e o outro da modernidade, bem como instituindo o processo de modernidade-modernização e sua compreensão enquanto um processo, um movimento, uma dinâmica e um princípio explicativo autorreferenciais, auto-subsistentes, autônomos, fechados e endógenos. Aqui, a modernidade pode ser explicada apenas por seus processos, sujeitos, princípios, dinâmicas e valores internos, da mesma forma como ela significa um movimento autoconstrutivo em si mesma e por si mesma, enquanto superação do tradicionalismo como minoridade e consolidação da modernidade-modernização como maioridade a partir da intersecção de razão, ciência e cultura.

**Palavras-Chave:** *Res Cogitans*; *Res Extensa*; Autorreferencialidade; Razão; Normatividade.

## Introduction

In this paper, we develop, as an essay, three arguments regarding the constitution and development of earlier modern philosophy, from Bacon to Descartes, Locke, Hume and Kant, in term of its impacts on the constitution of contemporary theories of modernity. The first is that earlier modern philosophy gradually constructs and legitimizes the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeny of reason in relation to faith-theology-Church through the separation between nature and normativity and, in consequence, through reason-science-philosophy's restriction on the natural sphere, transforming it into

a technical-logical-instrumental, non-political, non-normative and amoral sphere, dynamics, practice and object, while faith-theology-Church centralizes and monopolizes, as its very specificity and task, the normative sphere constituted by the correlation of religion-theology and anthropology-ontology-morality. As a consequence, in earlier modern philosophy, the reason-science assumes and affirms itself as a pure technical-logical-instrumental sphere, subject, practice and value, which formulates a non-political and non-normative method, a technical-logical-instrumental one, directed exclusively toward the study, framing and conceptualization of the natural-material-physical-chemical-biological world. Through Descartes' separation between *res cogitans* and *res extensa*, which was the paradigmatic model of philosophical-scientific constitution and functioning in/through modernity (and even nowadays, in many situations), reason-science-philosophy can only focus on the *res extensa* as its field and object of study, as it constitutes itself in technical-logical-instrumental terms, so that it avoids public-political-normative justifications, consequences and actions that could directly face the centrality of faith-theology-Church in this earlier European society-culture.

The second argument is that the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeneity of reason gradually assume and affirm not only a technical-logical-instrumental meaning, constitution and range, but also a normative-political dimension, so that reason-science-philosophy criticizes, delegitimizes and overcomes the centrality of the faith-theology-Church, refusing the religious centralization, monopoly and foundation of social normativity, which become a matter of/for the same reason centralized, monopolized and streamlined by institutionalized natural science and marked by a very political, historical, profane and normative meaning, range and dynamics. Therefore, starting from Locke, Hume and principally Kant – and Hegel afterward –, we can see that reason is the only basis for epistemological-moral objectivity-intersubjectivity, with full

capability of grounding, constructing and justifying valid knowledge and the biding moral-political-normative practices and values. That means the supremacy of a self-referential, self-subsisting, autonomous, independent and endogenous pure political-historical-profane reason which centralizes, monopolizes and assumes exclusively the internal, aseptic and depurated capability-task-exercise of constructing, legitimizing and fomenting socially the objective-intersubjective epistemological-moral-ontological framework for the axiology-*praxis* as a whole. Now, if in earlier modern philosophy reason had only a technical-logical constitution, meaning and action, restricted to the natural-material-physical-chemical-biological world and to the terms of a technical-logical-instrumental method, subject, value, practice and object, in the end of the 17th century modern natural science, very institutionalized and politically empowered, assumes, affirms and promotes also and fundamentally its political-normative capacity to frame, study and construct the meaning of both the natural world and the societal-cultural-moral sphere. From now on, scientific reason subsumes all fields of human life under its rules, practices and values, sustaining, in consequence, its self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeny based both on reason's exclusive capability-potentiality for constructing objectivity and justification in general, and on reason's purity and normative-historical-profane-political constitution, that is, the reason's creative power as the only one capable of constructing any possible thing.

And here comes the third argument of our paper. Contemporary theories of modernity, in particular Hegel, Weber and Habermas, and many contemporary political philosophies, for example Rawls, assume, affirm and use this idea of the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeny of reason as a pure political-historical-profane-normative principle and in terms of self-effort as basis of its construction of the concept of modernity and, as a consequence, with an aim toward the foundation of an intersubjective-universal notion of social

normativity based on the idea that modernity is exactly a singular process of anthropological-societal-cultural constitution, development and evolution marked by the consolidation of reason as the only potency-agency for the construction, legitimation, streamlining and foment of meaning at all, of anthropological-ontological, social-cultural and epistemological-political objectivity as a whole and for all. This understanding-stylization of modernity-modernization characterized by the centrality of a pure reason – pure in the sense of separation regarding tradition, essentialist and naturalized bases, pure also in the sense of a full internal creative power which guarantees starting from itself (and by itself) objectivity as a whole, for all – leads to the idea, very central to these theories mentioned above, that rationalization is not only a very complete creative power, with reason as a normative-political-historical-profane and secularized power, potency, agency, but also that it is an exclusive civilizational-societal-cultural process of Europe by itself, starting from itself. In this case, both the explanation of the process of modernity-modernization and the foundation of an objective-intersubjective-universal notion of social normativity can be found exactly in the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeneity of reason-modernity, in its own capability-power in terms of creation of all possible meaning, all that is required to become normatively-politically legitimized and socially bidding. Here, only reason itself – by reason, starting from reason – can and has the power for creation, recreation, legitimation and changing of any possible valid meaning. So, if earlier modern philosophy starts from assuming and affirming itself as a technical-logical-instrumental field, subject, practice, value and subject, with no normative-political consequences, impacts and presuppositions, if in the end of the 17th century scientific reason is consolidated as the only basis for meaning as a whole and for all, which led to the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeneity of reason as a fundamental characteristic-principle-movement of/for

modernity-modernization, then with contemporary theories of modernity we have the direct and pungent association between modernity and pure reason, with reason as a political-normative-creative power that is exclusive to modernity, with modernity as pure, political, normative, profane, historical and creative reason. In other words, the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeneity of this model of pure political, historical, profane, normative and creative reason led to the construction of the *myth of modernity* as a singular process-principle-dynamics based exclusively on a model of pure reason with no metaphysical-theological foundations, a model fully universal, fully political-normative-creative, condition for all meaning, objectivity-intersubjectivity, agreement and criticism-reflexivity.

### **1. Reason, nature and culture-morality: on the self-subsistence, self-referentiality, autonomy and independence of reason in earlier modern philosophy**

When we analyze the founding philosophical texts of modernity, when we study earlier modern philosophy, it is impressive how powerful and desperate are the attitude of philosophers of separating reason and faith without denying and delegitimizing the very basis of earlier modern European society, which was exactly faith as a public, political and institutional grounding of everyday life in all aspects. It is much interesting, sometimes funny, sometimes annoying, how very carefully regarded is the philosophical foundation of natural science and anthropocentrism by philosophers as Bacon, Descartes, Locke, Hume and Kant, especially in the case of Descartes, who lived exactly in the end of the 16th century to the middle of the 17th century, a moment in which the Inquisition had yet a powerful social, political and institutional foundation-influence. Anyway, what can be seen in the constitution, development and evolution of earlier modern

philosophy is exactly the gradual separation between faith and reason, theology and science-philosophy from the idea that, on the one hand, reason-science-philosophy is based on the Revelation made possible by faith, by Church, explained and streamlined by theology (cf.: Descartes, 2001, pp. 27-36, pp. 43-46; Descartes, 2000, p. 277; Descartes, 1989, pp. 93-97, pp. 107-121), but on the other, reason-science-philosophy is related only and fundamentally to the natural, biological, physical, chemical, material world, without compromises with spirituality at all, without putting down the biblical Revelation and, here, the centrality of Church-Bible – said spirituality being a matter of/for faith basically, to which reason can at most contribute, but not influence or delegitimize at all (cf.: Descartes, 2001, pp. 37-42; Descartes, 1989, pp. 98-106). In this sense, we repeat, reason-science-philosophy refers itself only and fundamentally to the material, physical, chemical and biological world, in which the researcher, from a consistent method of investigation, can achieve epistemological objectivity by constructing a set of useful (scientific) knowledge for everyday life, as insisted Bacon, Descartes, Locke and Hume in their foundation, defense and promotion of modern natural science and, here, of the scientific method – knowledge is power, that is, technical knowledge allows for technical control, reproduction and orientation of nature, which means the production of technical-instrumental objects and practices, only without political-normative consequences (cf.: Bacon, 2002, §§ 01-04, pp. 05-11; Descartes, 1993, pp. 11-44; Locke, 1999, pp. 25-33; Hume, 2004, pp. 71-91). *This is the first epistemological-normative step of modern earlier philosophy* in its constitution, development and evolution as an autonomous, independent, self-referential and self-subsistent institutional field-subject of research with a very independent and autonomous institutional, logical-technical perspective: the careful and respectful (and even scared) separation between faith-theology and reason-science-philosophy, performed on the argument that reason-science-philosophy is based on faith-theology, but at the same time

independent from it by assuming that only the material, biological, physical and chemical world is its object of study and foundation, so that reason-science-philosophy assumes, here, a technical-logical-instrumental constitution, meaning and action (cf.: Bacon, 2002, §§ 5-26, pp. 11-17; Descartes, 2001, pp. 67-86; Locke, 1999, pp. 37-43; Hume, 2004, pp. 33-41; Kant, 2001, AVII-AXXIII). Reason-science-philosophy focuses exclusively on the quantitative facts proper to physics, chemistry and biology, and it has only legitimacy, meaning and future in centralizing and focusing its action on the matter, destitute and purified completely of normativity. In earlier modern philosophy, therefore, the argument for the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy and independence of reason-science-philosophy regarding faith-theology is exactly that reason-science-philosophy refers itself *only to material facts*, not to normativity: here, facts are a matter of/for reason-science-philosophy, while normativity is a matter of/for faith-theology.

Now, the *second epistemological-normative step assumed and performed by earlier modern philosophy*, as we can see again in Bacon, Descartes, Locke, Hume and Kant, is the consolidation of this idea of the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy and independence of reason-science-philosophy regarding faith-theology, which is based on the separation between reason-science-philosophy and faith-theology, and which conduces to the correlation of reason-science-philosophy with materiality, with the technicality of nature, of the facts from physics, chemistry and biology (as with the correlation of faith-theology and normativity). Here, assuming that matter in physics, chemistry and biology is just quantitative, the *res extensa*, in Descartes' words, streamlined by causes and permanent-invariable physical laws, the researcher *with an analytical, quantitative and descriptive method*, can interpret and even reproduce material facts, *and only material facts* (cf.: Bacon, 2002, §§ 29-62, pp. 17-34; Descartes, 2001, pp. 03-66; Descartes, 1989, pp. 53-82; Locke, 1999, pp. 57-66; Hume, 2004, pp. 33-41; Kant, 2001, BVII-BXLIV). He is not a normative-political subject and,

in consequence, his work has not normative-political-moral justifications, presuppositions, influences and results. That is the motive why reason-science-philosophy does not deny or delegitimize faith-theology, because it is not a political-normative-moral sphere, practice and value; and that is the motive why reason-science-philosophy has a very specific field of constitution and research that is unpolitical-depoliticized, amoral and non-normative, just factual, just material, just technical (cf.: Descartes, 2001; Descartes, 1989; Descartes, 1993; Locke, 1999; Hume, 2004; Kant, 2001; Kant, 1998). Now, in consequence, reason-philosophy-science has the complete capability, guided by a correct quantitative-descriptive-analytical method, of framing, studying and constructing knowledge of and from nature, of and from material-physical-chemical-biological facts, relations and objects. Here, it does not need religious-normative explanations, principles, practices and subjects, but only the use of its own skills, instruments and initiative. Therefore, starting from the separation between reason-science-philosophy and faith-theology we arrive at the idea of reason-science-philosophy as a self-referential, self-subsisting, autonomous and independent field, subject and capability that centralizes and monopolizes the material-physical-chemical-biological world, which focuses only and basically on this material-physical-chemical-biological world, having all capacity and legitimacy to frame, analyze and describe material facts, *without any normative, political and moral presupposition, consequence, destination and even vocation* (cf.: Descartes, 2001, pp. 71-86; Descartes, 1993, pp. 83-103; Locke, 1999, pp. 67-89; Hume, 2004, pp. 91-143). Here, if reason-science-philosophy has a social-political-cultural foundation, it is just a technical one; it is based and dependent on factual processes, objects and analyses.

With regard to the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, endogeny and independence of reason-science-philosophy, there remains instituted the idea that reason is totally capable of describing the natural world, the factual-material sphere,

unveiling its mysterious relationships-process and solving its problems-challenges. With respect to matter, we just need a well-guided reason in accordance to these quantitative-descriptive-analytical methods and practices of which we spoke above. Reason by itself, only reason by itself, investigates, makes explicit and measures all that is material, physical, chemical and biological, consequently constructing the barriers between reason and faith, and between science and theology, and making reason-science gradually autonomous, independent and overlapped to faith-theology. Therefore, in earlier modern philosophy there happens the progressive strengthening of this epistemological-political-normative comprehension that reason-science has all power and capacity to construct the epistemological objectivity of the natural world, that is, to study, frame and describe in an objective and justified way natural objects, relations and process, without any other basis, principle and practice other than those of reason-science. As we said, by assuming that the natural world is constituted and streamlined by material-physical-chemical-biological principles, objects, processes and relations, and by arguing that they are constant-invariable laws with regularity and materiality, earlier modern philosophy is able to at the same time (a) separate reason-science-philosophy regarding faith-theology; (b) correlate reason-science-philosophy only and exclusively to and with the natural world, to and with material facts, objects, processes and relations; (c) affirm reason-science-philosophy's self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy and independence regarding faith-theology and, as consequence, the complete capacity of reason-science-philosophy to centralize, monopolize and streamline the study of nature from reason itself *and in a technical manner*; and (d) depoliticize the rational-scientific-philosophical foundation, investigation, sphere-object and social-cultural-institutional grounding, by comprehending nature as a non-political, non-normative and amoral sphere, process, relationships and objects, so that conceiving nature as a purely technical-logical-

instrumental sphere, dynamics and objects that could be accessed, framed and investigated by quantitative, descriptive and measurable investigations (cf.: Bacon, 2002, §§ 66-95, pp. 37-75; Descartes, 1999, pp. 83-121; Locke, 1999, pp. 131-132; Hume, 2004, pp. 95-118). Here, reason-science-philosophy becomes a pure technical-logical, apolitical-depoliticized-amoral field, subject, practice and method, performing and generating, in consequence, a technical-logical, non-political and non-normative practice, knowledge and object: reason-science-philosophy contributes to solving technical problems, not to grounding the anthropological-ontological-normative objectivity-meaning, which remains a matter of/for theology-Church.

Here, in truth, we have the *third epistemological-normative step of/for earlier modern philosophy*, which is the idea of reason-science-philosophy as an unpolitical, non-normative instrument, field, practice and subject that restricts itself to the natural world and as a technical-logical, apolitical-depoliticized-amoral practice-action-principle-subject. If we look at Descartes' *Discourse on Method*, we perceive only the pungent attempt to ground the autonomy, independence, self-referentiality and self-subsistence of reason-science-philosophy in relation to faith-theology-Church, by the association of the former with a technical-logical, non-political and non-normative understanding of nature, of physics, chemistry and biology. Indeed, both the separation between *res extensa* and *res cogitans* and the restriction of reason-science-philosophy to the natural-material sphere and as a technical-logical practice-value-subject, by Descartes, lead him to argue that reason-science-philosophy has no political-normative-religious constitution, consequences and impacts, because it is a research technique based on quantitative-descriptive-analytical methods and practices, which presupposes also the technical constitution of nature, of matter. In this sense, the separation between *res cogitans* and *res extensa*, if on the one hand points to this self-referentiality and self-subsistence of reason in terms of capability of constructing objective-justified

knowledge of/from nature, on the other allows exactly the technical, apolitical-depoliticized, non-normative and amoral meaning, constitution and streamlining of nature, avoiding, in consequence, any theological criticism regarding a possible political-normative impact-consequence of reason-science-philosophy on social-cultural-institucional terms. Therefore, for earlier modern philosophy, reason-science-philosophy, since it focuses only on the *res extensa*, that is, on a pure technical-material sphere, adopting for that end technical-logical methods, practices and values, does not have political-normative impacts, consequences and contributions, but, as we insistently said in this text, just technical-instrumental impacts, contributions, made possible by technical-logical-instrumental actions, values and researches. All that is political-normative remains a monopoly of theology-Church, a field for which reason-science-philosophy is not responsible. That was the epistemological-political-methodological strategy in order to allow the constitution, consolidation and gradual strengthening of reason-science-philosophy, as its empowerment in relation to theology. In other words, with the aim of making possible the rational-scientifical-philosophical foundation-investigation of epistemological-moral objectivity without facing the power of theology-Church, earlier modern philosophy insisted very emphatically on the technical-logical-instrumental meaning of its constitution, action and object, by separating natural world and normativity (a separation that was already partially used by Greek and Medieval philosophy-theology), and by assuming and focusing only on this technical-logical-instrumental, non-political and non-normative nature as its field and object of investigation, and grounded on a technical-logical-instrumental method, symbols, instruments and practices of research.

This separation between nature and normativity, *res extensa* and *res cogitans* enabled a peaceful, respectful and friendly relationship between science-philosophy and theology-Church, between reason and faith – reason-science-philosophy always

affirming and accepting directly and explicitly its submission to faith-theology-Church, as assuming-affirming its restriction to the natural-material world and under a technical-logical-instrumental meaning, constitution and dynamic. More important, this separation made possible a relatively strong autonomy, independence, self-referentiality and self-subsistence of/for reason-science-philosophy regarding religion-theology-Church, since it presupposed the depoliticization-apoliticity, amoral and non-normative constitution, foundation and functioning of reason-science-philosophy, as a technical-logical-instrumental subject, field, practice, value and object in terms of natural science and rational method. Now, reason-science-philosophy's autonomy, independence, self-referentiality and self-subsistence as a very proper, specific and particular sphere, subject, practice, value and object lead to the constitution, development and consolidation of an endogenous institutional field, subject, practice, value and object, Science as a rational field with a technical-logical-instrumental functioning, highly institutionalist programming, capable of defining, constructing and orienting from a technical-logical-instrumental standpoint the meaning, validity and application of socially binding knowledge. As an autonomous, independent and internal-exclusive practice-dynamics, reason-science becomes a self-referential and self-subsisting subject-movement that would have conditions, capability and power to formulate all valid knowledge in its field of research, beyond normative intrusions and alien control-influence of religion-theology-Church. Here, a reason that is scientifically structured, guided and applied-streamlined has the normative, political and creative power to objectively interpret nature with technical-logical-instrumental methods, practices, values and instruments, so as to construct from its internal, endogenous and very particular skills an intersubjective-universal notion of social normativity, of morality.

With Descartes, Locke and Hume, reason becomes the criterion on which the objective interpretation of the natural world

would be grounded, constructed and performed (cf.: Descartes, 2001; Descartes, 1989; Locke, 1999; Hume, 2004); with Kant and, afterward, Hegel, this capability of objectively interpreting the natural world is expanded, so that reason becomes also a normative-political power capable of grounding an intersubjective-universal model of social normativity or morality, valid for all. In these two moments, reason's self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeny, reason's normative-political-creative power to construct-ground objective-intersubjective-universal meaning is affirmed, assumed and consolidated as the very basis of modern epistemology (cf.: Kant, 2001, AVII-AXXIII; BVII-XLIV; Kant, 1998, pp. 11-22; Hegel, 1992, pp. 260-269). Reason is, from now on, the only arbiter, judge, sphere, value and practice on which justification is based; reason is the only subject, arena, practice and value from which knowledge and morality are constructed, supported and performed intersubjectively (cf.: Habermas, 1989, pp. 17-36). Here, a model of pure reason, that is, a model of normative-political-creative power with no essentialist and naturalized basis, a model marked by reason's endogeny, autonomy and internality, performs a self-referential, self-subsistent and independent dynamics of rational constitution, legitimation and evolution in which, from which modernity gains form, sense and streamlining. With Kant and Hegel, therefore, as a consolidation of the epistemological-political developments of earlier modern philosophy, the self-comprehension of/by modernity as self-referential, self-subsisting, internal, endogenous, autonomous and independent process-movement of normative-creative reason becomes definitely hegemonic as the paradigmatic epistemological-political basis of modernity, as modernity itself (cf.: Habermas, 2002, pp. 54-72). Therefore, this model of normative-creative reason as a self-referential, self-subsisting, endogenous, autonomous, internal and independent process-dynamic-movement overcomes that separation between *res cogitans* and *res extensa* that was used in earlier modern philosophical tradition in

order to separate faith-theology-Church and reason-science-theology and to depoliticize reason-science-philosophy's constitution, by restricting it to the natural sphere and as a technical-logical-instrumental practice, methodology, subject and value. With Kant and Hegel, reason not only assumes, centralizes and monopolizes the objective interpretation of the natural world, but also the normative-creative power to ground and institute morality intersubjectively and in an universally binding manner for all and in every place, by denying this capability to religion. Reason as a normative-creative power becomes the universal paradigmatic basis of meaning and justification as a whole, from the natural sphere to the moral-political-cultural horizon: only from and by reason as a self-referential and self-subsistent capability, it is possible to ground epistemological-moral objectivity, to construct meaning and justification.

Now, here comes the *fourth step in terms of constitution, development and consolidation of modern normative self-comprehension as reason*, as a self-referential, self-subsisting, autonomous, endogenous and independent process of rational creativity as a political-normative subject-agency, which is the politicization of reason-science-philosophy, in which reason consolidates itself as the only subject, principle and basis of all sense. As we said above, if reason initially was affirmed as a non-political and non-normative instance, practice and value directed and restricted to the natural sphere, assuming a technical-logical-instrumental legitimation, action and consequence, from Kant and Hegel onward reason is the very epistemological-political-normative basis for meaning as a whole, a pure, full and powerful normative-creative principle which depends just on itself, just on its own capability to interpret objectively the nature and to construct an intersubjective-universal notion of morality that is valid for all. And therefore the concept of modernity becomes intrinsically associated to and dependent on this self-referential, self-subsisting, endogenous, autonomous and independent model of pure

normative-political reason that is the arbiter of nature and culture, that constructs all possible objective-intersubjective meaning. Reason, a pure normative-political reason, is the subject-condition for the construction of valid meaning in terms of a self-effort to overcome the essentialism-naturalism and of institutionalization of science and politics as paradigmatic instances that express reason itself. Reason between science, history and politics is what allows the creation, recreation and validation of socially bidding values, practices and subjects. Reason is objectivity, it is the beginning, the way and the final point of the circular process of political-normative creation and recreation of meaning as a whole. All starts from reason and ends in it, by it.

## **2. The concept of modernity as self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeny of reason: on the construction of the normative paradigm of modernity and its contemporary assumption**

With Kant and, afterward, Hegel, as recognizes Habermas in his magnificent *The philosophical discourse of modernity*, as a theory of European modernity as post-metaphysical universal reason, modernity is consolidated, affirmed and assumed in its meaning as self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeny of reason, in a double sense: (a) reason is a circular *praxis* that depends exactly on its own movement, on its own creative-normative power, becoming totally capable of grounding the epistemological-moral objectivity, meaning as a whole, without any other resource or basis than itself – it does not need a previous essentialist and naturalized structure-subject-principle, but just its self-assumption of its creative-normative power, which means that reason itself, by itself, determines what is objectivity and what is not, both in terms of natural science (from technical-logical-instrumental methods, practices and values) and in terms of morality-politics-law, from the presupposition of the

creative-normative constitution of human reason or of human nature as normative-creative reason; and, in consequence, (b) modernity as self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, endogeny and independence of reason, *by reason*, is comprehended, legitimized and used as a very exclusive, internal and singular process-movement without any contact with the other of modernity, so that modernity as reason-rationalization is a civilizational-societal-cultural-paradigmatic context-subject-practice-value that does not exist in any other place than Europe, which means the direct and pungent correlation between European modernity and reason, European modernity as pure and powerful political-profane reason, as well as the correlation between the other of modernity and traditionalism in general, the other of modernity as traditionalism in general (cf.: Habermas, 2012a, pp. 94-95; Kant, 2001, AVII-AXXIII, BVII-BLXIV; Hegel, 2001, pp. 61-65). Here, in the first case, modernity-modernization is a pure, direct and linear process-movement of overcoming traditionalism and of consolidation of this pure, political, normative and profane reason as a civilizational-anthropologic-societal-cultural-paradigmatic basis-dynamic-practice-principle-value on which all meaning, sense and relation is grounded, streamlined and performed (cf.: Habermas, 2012a, pp. 325-326; Habermas, 2012b, pp. 141-202). In this stylized self-comprehension of the process of European modernity-modernization, reason comes out of its childhood-minority and reaches its adulthood-majority, from a very internal and hard self-effort of purification-politicization that leads it correlatively to achieve its self-consciousness about its creative-normative power and to deparate itself of all that is not normative-political and technical-logical-instrumental, becoming totally separated from metaphysics-theology and from magical-animist and essentialist and naturalized foundations-presuppositions, which means also the complete politicization of reason, by assuming itself as the only, pure and full power in creative-normative terms, a power that is basically political and profane (cf.: Rawls, 2003;

Habermas, 2012a; Habermas, 2012b; Habermas, 2002; Habermas, 1997; Rorty, 2010). Reason by itself, from itself, overcame traditionalism, that is, overcame the childhood of humankind and achieved-reached the adulthood of humankind as reason itself, by itself, from itself (cf.: Kant, 1999, pp. 05-11). In the second case, this process of modernity-modernization as self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeneity of reason becomes a very singular characteristic-movement of European cultural modernity by itself, from itself, from its internality and as exclusiveness and absolute singularity (see Hegel, 2001, pp. 105-115; Weber, 1984, pp. 11-24; Habermas, 2012a, pp. 90-142; Habermas, 2002, pp. 01-25). Indeed, in contemporary theories of modernity, such as those of Weber and Habermas, the self-comprehension of modernity-modernization as constructed and streamlined by earlier modern philosophy and consolidated by the European philosophy of the 18th and 19th centuries (in the case of Kant and Hegel), in terms of self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeneity of reason, that is, in terms of a self-effort of purification-politicization of reason by itself and in itself, through the overcoming of its minority as traditionalism and the consolidation of its majority as a pure and full political-profane-creative-normative power, this self-comprehension of modernity-modernization as pure reason leads to the idea that the process of modernity-modernization is a very internal, closed, exclusive and, then, totally singular civilizational-anthropologic, societal-cultural and epistemological-normative-paradigmatic process, movement, dynamic and value *in relation to all the rest of the societies-cultures-paradigms* (cf.: Hegel, 2001, pp. 53-115; Weber, 1984, pp. 11-24; Habermas, 2012a, pp. 90-142, p. 355-385, pp. 588-591, p. 683). In consequence, the philosophical-sociological discourse of modernity can reconstruct the process of modernity-modernization as a very internal, exclusive, endogenous, self-referential, self-subsisting, autonomous and independent process-movement of constitution of reason by itself and from itself, that is, modernity-modernization as

the overcoming of traditionalism and its dogmatic, fundamentalist and noncritical anthropological-ontological-epistemological-political basis – traditionalism as humankind’s minority-childhood – and the consolidation of the correlation of modernity-modernization, reason and universalism as humankind’s majority-adulthood (cf.: Habermas, 2002, p. 122). Here, modernity-modernization as pure and full creative-normative reason means a self-effort of reason itself and by itself, a constructive-constitutive process-movement-work *from internality to universalism-globalism*. In the same way, this self-effort of reason in itself and by itself also allows the process of modernity-modernization to be explained only by its internal processes-movements-subjects-principles-practices-values, so that modern Europe becomes, in contemporary theories of modernity, a very internal, closed, autonomous, independent, endogenous and singular anthropological-ontological world, a very specific and particular epistemological-moral-political paradigm in normative-symbolical terms (cf.: Habermas, 2012a; Habermas, 2012b; Habermas, 2002; Habermas, 1997). As Weber and Habermas say, only Europe achieved and has the correlation of modernity-modernization, pure and full reason as creative-normative-political-profane power and universalism, which means the absolute-complete singularity of European modernity-modernization as reason-rationalism-rationalization and universalism (cf.: Weber, 1984, p. 11; Habermas, 2012a, pp. 94-95).

Now, starting from this double meaning of the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeneity of reason as a pure-full creative-normative-political-profane power assumed and developed as the normative-symbolical self-comprehension of European modernity, we have, in the theories of modernity, the constitution, framing and grounding of the concept of epistemological-moral universalism in a very curious way and dynamics developed from the correlation of European modernity-modernization, reason-rationalism-rationalization

and/as universalism-globalism. Indeed, in the theories of modernity above mentioned, the epistemological-moral universalism is grounded-legitimized from a totally (and scandalously) stylized comprehension of the process of modernity-modernization (a) as a very internal, closed and exclusive constitutive-evolutionary movement of Europe from itself and by itself, with no correlations to the other of modernity (to colonialism in particular and, here, to Indian and Black peoples); (b) from the idea of reason-rationalism-rationalization, as a direct and linear movement of purification, politicization and completeness of itself, by itself, in itself, from itself; (c) as a universal-global anthropological-societal-cultural tendency and as epistemological-political basis for a normative paradigm that could serve as *medium* for the intercultural dialogue-*praxis* (cf.: Dussel, 1993, pp. 13-115; Mignolo, 2007, pp. 75-168; Danner, Bavaresco & Danner, 2017a, pp. 149-201). In the *myth of modernity*, constructed, sustained and fomented by modern philosophies (especially by Hegel, but also Kant) and by contemporary theories of modernity (Weber and Habermas, as cited above), European modernity-modernization comes out as a totally internal, endogenous, closed, autonomous, independent, self-referential and self-subsisting process-movement of self-construction, of hard self-effort of reason in itself, from itself, for itself, and becomes a direct, linear and full universalism-globalism, that is, a tendency of/for human nature in general. Therefore, the process of modernity-modernization is *at the same time* an internal-closed-singular movement, dynamic, practice and principle *and* a direct, pure and full universalism-globalism, a general tendency in anthropological-societal-cultural terms. And that means that the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, internality and endogeneity of European rationalism is not a problem for the theories of modernity to ground a universal epistemological-moral paradigm that is both the tendency of human evolution and the normative basis for social criticism, reflexivity, framing and cooperation inside Europe and

outside of it, with the other of modernity (cf.: Habermas, 2012a, pp. 325-325, p. 683; Danner, Bavaresco & Danner, 2017b, pp. 17-47).

The myth of modernity, the myth of reason, of which we spoke above, means a correlated set of characteristics of European philosophy: first, the idea that reason-rationalism-rationalization is exactly a self-referential, self-subsisting, autonomous, independent and endogenous process-movement regarding religion, metaphysics and myth, a process-movement of purification, politicization and completeness of reason in itself, by itself, from itself; second, the idea that modernity-modernization is a direct, linear and pure political, normative and profane process-movement of emergence, constitution and development-consolidation of reason-rationalism-rationalization as an anthropological, societal, cultural and cognitive basis of modernity and beyond, as a general tendency of human evolution as a whole; third, as a consequence, the idea that the process of modernity-modernization is a movement of overcoming traditionalism as minority-childhood (because of the centrality of religion, metaphysics and myth in anthropological, societal, cultural and cognitive terms) and of consolidation of a pure-political-profane-normative-historical reason-rationalism-rationalization as the fundamental, the only normative-creative potentiality-capability in terms of constructing, grounding and fomenting objective-intersubjective meaning as a whole; fourth, the idea of self-circularity of reason, in the sense that it works in itself, starts of itself, returns to itself, acts from and for itself, that is, reason as a self-capability, a self-effort and a self-movement-dynamic of construction of itself, as purification, politicization and completeness, a process-movement-effort that separates radically what is reason-rationality-rationalization in relation to all that is essentialism-naturalism; fifth, the construction of a notion of modernity-modernization, of reason-rationalism-rationalization as exclusiveness, internality and singularity, as a closed, circular, self-subsistent and self-referential principle-practice-subject, and, afterward, despite that, the association among

modernity-modernization, reason-rationalism-rationalization and/as universalism-globalism, from the idea that this process-movement of pure reason, this overcoming of traditionalism as minority and the consolidation of reason as majority-adulthood is the ontogenetic basis and dynamics of human nature as a whole, which means, here, the fact that reason is universal, because it is the very basis and movement of human nature (cf.: Habermas, 2012a, pp. 325-325).

What is interesting and important, for example, in Weber's and Habermas' theories of modernity is exactly this association between modernity-modernization, reason-rationalism-rationalization and universalism-globalism as the paradigmatic-normative core of the European symbolical, epistemological, normative and cultural self-comprehension, which means, in other words, that European self-comprehension stands and is based on the idea of its absolute singularity regarding all the rest of societies-cultures. Here, this singularity is the same than the circularity, self-subsistence, self-referentiality, autonomy, endogeneity and independence of reason as a very internal, closed and exclusive process, dynamics, practice and principle of and for European modernity-modernization. In this sense, the process of modernity-modernization can be comprehended, explained and framed by internal principles, practices, subjects and relations very proper and restricted to Europe, in terms of overcoming traditionalism and of consolidation of this pure, political, profane and normative reason as the very creative power of and for modern society-culture-consciousness. As a consequence, Weber and Habermas can divide, as starting point and pre-concept of their theories of modernity, the entire set of societies-cultures in, on the one hand, modern Europe as reason-rationalism-rationalization and universalism-globalism, and, on the other, *the rest of the societies-cultures* as traditionalism in general, correlating modernity-modernization, reason-rationalism-rationalization, universalism, criticism, reflexivity and emancipation, as traditionalism in general, essentialist and

naturalized foundations, strict contextualism, dogmatism, fundamentalism-fanaticism and totalitarianism. In the same sense, Weber and Habermas can comprehend the process-movement of emergence, constitution, development and evolution of the Western modernization as a very internal, closed and exclusive process-movement, in which a self-referential, self-subsisting and circular reason purifies and politicizes itself, becoming hegemonic anthropologically, socially, culturally and epistemologically, which consolidates – we repeat again – the idea, the self-comprehension that the process of modernity-modernization is a self-effort of reason in itself, by itself, from itself, as an overcoming of traditionalism (essentialism-naturalism-contextualism, fundamentalism-dogmatism-fanaticism) and a constitution of pure political-normative-profane-historical reason as the only anthropological-ontological-epistemological basis and as the fundamental creative-normative power of and for Europe as modernity-modernization, as the land of this pure-profane-political-normative-historical reason. And, finally, Habermas can give a more provocative step than Weber, by arguing that reason is not a property exclusive to modern Europe, but rather a fact that is very basic, ontogenetic to the human species as a whole, so that the correlation of modernity-modernization, reason-rationalism-rationalization and/as universalism-globalism is a core which gradually will be consolidated as the nuclear structure, dynamics and principle of human nature in its development throughout history. As we said above, from the circularity, self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, endogeny and independence of the reason, presupposed, developed and defended initially by modern philosophy, we arrive, with contemporary theories of modernity, at the idea that, if on the one hand modernity-modernization is a process-movement very singular, exclusive and closed to Europe from itself, by itself, in itself, in terms of consolidation of reason-rationalism-rationalization (that is, by the way, the meaning of Enlightenment), on the other, modernity-modernization represents

the very ontogenetic basis of-for human evolution, the very way assumed and crossed by human evolution throughout history, as an overcoming of traditionalism-essentialism-naturalism-contextualism and dogmatism-fundamentalism-fanaticism and a consolidation of modernity-modernization, reason-rationalism-rationalization and/as post-metaphysical universalism-globalism based on politicization, historicization and profanization of everything and everyone. In this sense, if earlier modern philosophy, in/by Bacon, Descartes, Locke and Hume, consolidated the separation between reason-science-theology in relation to faith-theology, assuming reason as a technical-logical-instrumental practice-value restricted to the natural-material-physical-chemical sphere, with no political-normative basis, consequences and vindications; and if Kant and, afterward, Hegel extended this proposition in terms of consolidation of reason as the only normative-creative power, subject, practice and value, associating directly and pungently modernity, reason and universalism, pointing to this association as the very way of human evolution throughout history, the final point of human evolution as self-consciousness and self-effort by reason in itself and from itself; Weber and Habermas, as main examples of contemporary theories of European modernity as universalism-globalism by and from rationalization, assume and consolidate the idea of the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, endogeny and independence of reason as the very basis, process, dynamics, practice and value that would define European modernity-modernization as the very fundamental explicative principle-movement of and for the process of European modernity-modernization, its past, present and future as universalism-globalism, as the ending point, the mature point of-for human evolution throughout history. In this sense, modernity-modernization remains an exclusive, internal and singular anthropological, societal, cultural and epistemological process-movement-principle, but at the same time an ontogenetic

movement, principle and tendency to human evolution as a whole, which leads to the idea that a self-referential, self-subsisting, autonomous, endogenous and independent pure reason allows the meaning, the criticism, the reflexivity and the emancipation not only for European modernity as a closed, exclusive, internal and very singular society-culture-consciousness, but also for the entire world as traditionalism in general. Here we can see that the correlation of modernity-modernization, reason-rationalism-rationalization and/as universalism, from the purification, historicization, profanization and politicization of reason, from the self-effort of the reason *against all the rest as traditionalism*, absolutizes reason's purity, chastity and salvific power-vocation-movement, which means also, in contemporary theories of modernity, the absolutization-sanctification of the pure, direct and linear association between modernity-modernization, reason-rationalism-rationalization and/as universalism-globalism as the only possible route in terms of the reconstruction, present and future of European modernity-modernization as universalism-globalism, the only possible route that silences and deletes its problems, contradictions and violence by means of a very stylized philosophical-sociological-normative elaboration, ignoring and delegitimizing the other of modernity and, in truth, putting the very sense, constitution, framing and criticism regarding the other of modernity as a *modern task* allowed by the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, endogeny and independence of a circular, exclusive and internal process of reason-rationalization. Here, Europe explains and saves itself through and from itself, and explains, saves and conduces also the other of modernity: salvation emerges from Europe, by its self-effort, and comes to the other of modernity.

## **Conclusion**

Earlier modern philosophy, passing through 18th and 19th European philosophy and coming to contemporary theories of

modernity, gradually forged, sustained and promoted the myth of the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, independence and endogeneity of reason as the condition of/for the objectivity-intersubjectivity of the values, practices and meanings socially and institutionally binding, creating a model of pure, political, profane, historical and normative reason that would be the very power of/for creation and recreation, justification and validation of any possible knowledge and practice – here, if objectivity-intersubjectivity is possible, then it is possible in rational terms, by reason, and for no other instance of symbolical, epistemological and political production. Now, as we argued in the second chapter of this paper, contemporary theories of modernity led this myth of the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, endogeneity and independence of reason to an absolute, blind and noncritical position, as the basic process, movement, practice and principle for the explanation, understanding and evaluation of the past, present and future of modernity-modernization in its correlation of reason-rationalism-rationalization and/as universalism-globalism, deleting and silencing modern irrationalities, colonialism and contacts in relation to the other of modernity. Now, according to these contemporary theories of modernity, this process of Western modernization acquires singularity, specificity and a special character in human evolution as a whole exactly because it is marked by the correlation of reason-rationalism-rationalization and universalism-globalism in a movement that Europe – internally and by reason – gradually, directly and strongly purifies itself of any signal of essentialism-naturalism-contextualism, becoming, by reason, a very universalist-globalist society-culture-consciousness with a profane, political and historical sense, dynamics, constitution and range. That was possible by the fact that the process of European modernity-modernization is a straight, direct and linear evolutionary movement of purification, consolidation, profanization and politicization of reason regarding traditionalism, so that becoming characterized by a self-effort of/by reason in terms of

overcoming essentialism-naturalism-contextualism as the basis of the meaning, of the *praxis* as a whole, instituting political-historical-profane rationalization as the fundamental context, *praxis* and value for any possible epistemological-moral foundation. There is, here, an absolutization of the myth of the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, endogeny and independence of reason as the very core of the European modernity-modernization as universalism-globalism by means of a circular reason-rationalism-rationalization, because, as we said above, the theories of modernity reconstruct and stylize the process of modernity-modernization based on the idea that it is a very singular, closed, exclusive and endogenous constitutive and evolutionary process of a self-referential, self-subsisting, autonomous, independent and circular reason-rationalism-rationalization that, by a hard self-effort of purification, politicization, historicization, profanization and criticism, reaches the pure epistemological-political-normative universal point of view, achieving and becoming the very ontogenetic core of human nature in its constitution, development and evolution throughout history.

As a consequence, the model of modernity-modernization as reason's self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, endogeny and independence, regardless of its closure, internality, exclusiveness and singularity, is put as the apogee of human evolution, that is, as the paradigmatic basis in terms of human improvement-constitution-evolution throughout history and of *medium* for intercultural dialogue-*praxis*. This strong stylization of modernity-modernization, therefore, invented a salvific model of European modernity-modernization as a self-referential, self-subsistent and circular reason that purified, profanized and politicized its constitution and its capabilities, becoming the hegemonic creative-normative power for the definition of modernity-modernization and, in truth, revealing the fact that human evolution as a whole is a big, straight, direct and linear process of rationalization, a movement toward rationalism in which

humankind as a whole will be totally rational and, therefore, fundamentally universalist-globalist, as European modernity. Here, there is a historical-sociological blindness and a philosophical romanticization of European rationalism that imply the following problematic epistemological-political and methodological-programmatic steps-choices-consequences: (a) European modernity is singular – and universal – when compared to the rest of societies-cultures because it is marked by a process-movement-principle of pure political, normative, historical and profane reason as the only ontogenetic basis, principle, practice, subject and value of meaning at all, something that was not reached yet by the other of modernity; (b) reason is a self-referential, self-subsisting, autonomous, endogenous, independent and circular process-movement-value, that is, it is a self-effort of purification-politicization of a profane, normative, historical and creative power, cleansed of any remnant of essentialism-naturalism-myth-contextualism, becoming totally universal; (c) modernity-modernization as an overcoming of minority-childhood in terms of traditionalism and as a consolidation of the Enlightenment as majority-adulthood in terms of political, profane, historical and normative reason, is a closed, endogenous and internal process of constitution-development that can be explained, understood and reconstructed from the affirmation of multiple internal dynamics, principles, subjects and practices, without necessity of appealing to movements, subjects, practices and values outside of modernity-modernization, so that colonialism and the other of modernity are not important or fundamental in order to reconstruct the process of European modernity-modernization; (d) notwithstanding its internalism, closure, circularity, self-referentiality and exclusivism, modernity-modernization as Enlightenment by a pure political-profane-historical-normative reason is an ontogenetic process, value and principle that characterizes the very core and way of and for human evolution throughout history, which proves European modernity-modernization's universal-global range, sense,

constitution and movement; and, finally, as consequence of these points, (e) European rationalism, as a pure, straight, direct and linear process of empowerment of a political-normative-profane-historical universal reason becomes the only, the fundamental, the exclusive condition for criticism, reflexivity, emancipation, the very basis of any possible justified intercultural dialogue-*praxis*, so that modernity-modernization as circular, self-referential and self-subsisting pure-political-normative-profane-historical reason is the paradigmatic-anthropological model of human evolution and of objective-intersubjective epistemological-moral grounding.

Now, in conclusion, we think that it is necessary to rewrite the history of modernity-modernization, of reason-rationalism-rationalization, beginning with the overcoming of the fantasy of the self-referentiality, self-subsistence, autonomy, endogeny and independence of reason regarding traditionalism, both internal to European modernity-modernization and in its relation to the other of modernity. In this sense, it is necessary also to rethink the category of pure-political-normative-profane-historical reason as the core and role of and for European modernity-modernization, avoiding such a purity, chastity and singularity of both European modernity-modernization in anthropological, societal and cultural terms, and reason-rationalism-rationalization in epistemological-political-cognitive terms. As a consequence, the process of European modernity-modernization as a straight, direct and linear process of purification and politicization of a pure, normative, profane, historical and creative reason which gradually becomes independent, autonomous and overlapped to traditionalism, gradually becoming also the salvific basis of and for Europe and humankind as a whole, must be demystified, so that the Enlightenment must be confronted with its irrationalities, contradictions and false stylizations. The idea that Europe is the land of reason, science, Enlightenment, universalism, development, while traditionalism in general, the other of modernity in general resides in the land of barbarism, fanaticism and poverty-

underdevelopment; the idea that European modernity-modernization by a pure, political, profane, historical and normative reason gradually hegemonic as the only basis-practice-value and creative power resides in the land of criticism, reflexivity and emancipation, of freedom, equality and justice, while the other of modernity, the traditionalism in general resides in the land of fanaticism, dogmatism and fundamentalism; the idea that European modernity-modernization resides in the land of post-traditional, profane, political, historical universalism-globalism as a non-ethnocentric and non-egocentric society-culture-consciousness, while traditionalism in general resides in the land of uncritical, blind and closed contextualism; all of these ideas are part and consequence of an illusionary, Manichean and dualist separation between Europe as reason and universalism *versus* all the rest as traditionalism in general, essentialist-naturalized-mythical, a Manichean construction of the modern philosophy that was assumed and extended by contemporary theories of European modernity-modernization as straight, direct and linear pure-political-profane-normative reason-rationalism-rationalization. Because the stylized history of the process of European modernity-modernization as emergence, development and consolidation of a self-referential, self-subsistent, autonomous, endogenous and independent pure, political, normative, historical and profane reason as the only creative power, subject, practice and value of the objectivity-intersubjectivity is the history of freedom, equality and justice as the ending point, as the direct, straight and linear core of the evolution of modernity in itself, by itself, from itself. This self-effort of reason and by reason is what singularizes and makes special European modernity-modernization regarding the other of modernity, that is, traditionalism in general, as recognize Weber and Habermas in their philosophical-sociological discourses of Europe's modernity as a self-referential, self-subsisting, exclusive, internal and singular civilizational-societal-cultural-paradigmatic process made possible by a pure, political, normative, historical and

profane reason that gradually consolidated itself by self-effort as the only creative power, subject, practice and relation, showing also that this is the evolutionary route of and for human nature as a whole, that is, to become European modernity-modernization, to be guided, oriented and judged by the normative paradigm of modernity as universalism-globalism via this pure, political, normative, historical and profane reason. Now, this salvific – because stylized, blind and, therefore, false – understanding of the process of modernity-modernization as consolidation and universalization-globalization of a pure, political, profane and normative reason as the only power, route and choice we have in our present and for our future must be deconstructed and criticized, by unveiling the historical-sociological blindness and the philosophical romanticization-stylization of European rationalism, which means (a) the overcoming of singularity, circularity, self-referentiality, self-subsisting, autonomy, endogeny and independence of the process of modernity-modernization regarding the other of modernity; (b) the overcoming of the notion of a pure, political, normative, historical and profane reason as a self-effort of surpassing traditionalism-essentialism-naturalism-contextualism as the minority-childhood of humankind, and the direct, linear and straight consolidation of the Enlightenment as and by pure, political, normative, historical and profane reason in its universal-global sense, range and dimension; (c) the refusal of the direct, linear and pure correlation between modernity-modernization, reason-rationalism-rationalization and/as universalism-globalism, as the refusal of the purist and simplest association of traditionalism in general, essentialism, naturalism and contextualism; and (d) the refusal of the correlation of modernity-modernization, reason-rationalism-rationalization, universalism, criticism, reflexivity and emancipation, as coming from traditionalism, contextualism, fundamentalism, dogmatism and fanaticism.

## References

BACON, Francis. *Novum organum*. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 2002.

DANNER, Leno Francisco; BAVARESCO, Agemir; DANNER, Fernando. “O colonialismo como teoria da modernidade: esboço de uma pesquisa interdisciplinar em teoria social crítica”, *Ágora Filosófica*, v. 1, n. 1, pp. 149-201, 2017a.

DANNER, Leno Francisco; BAVARESCO, Agemir; DANNER, Fernando. “Modernity and colonialism: on the historical-sociological blindness of the theories of modernity”, *Sofia (UFES)*, v. 6, n. 1, pp. 17-47, 2017b.

DESCARTES, René. *O discurso do método*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2001.

DESCARTES, René. *Regras para a direção do espírito*. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1993.

DESCARTES, René. *Meditações metafísicas*. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 2000.

DESCARTES, René. *Princípios da filosofia*. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1989.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. *Teoria do agir comunicativo* (vol. I): racionalidade da ação e racionalização social. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2012a.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. *Teoria do agir comunicativo* (vol. II): sobre a crítica da razão funcionalista. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2012b.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. *O discurso filosófico da modernidade: doze lições*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2002.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. *Ensayos políticos*. Barcelona: Ediciones Península, 1997.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. *Consciência moral e agir comunicativo*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1989.

HEGEL, G. W. F. *Fenomenologia do espírito* (Parte I). Petrópolis: Vozes, 1992.

HEGEL, G. W. F. *A razão na história*. São Paulo: Centauro Editora, 2001.

HUME, David. *Investigações sobre o entendimento humano e sobre os princípios da moral*. São Paulo: Editora da UNESP, 2004.

KANT, Immanuel. *Crítica da razão pura*. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2001.

KANT, Immanuel. *Prolegómenos a toda metafísica futura*. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1998.

KANT, Immanuel. *Resposta à pergunta 'O que é o Iluminismo?'*. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1999.

LOCKE, John. *Ensaio acerca do entendimento humano*. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1999.

MIGNOLO, Walter. *La idea de América Latina: la herida colonial y la opción decolonial*. Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa, 2007.

RAWLS, John. *Justiça como equidade: uma reformulação*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003.

RORTY, Richard. *Uma ética laica*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2010.

WEBER, Max. *Ensayos sobre sociología de la religión (T. I)*. Madrid: Taurus, 1984.