

EPILOGUE

THE MULTIPLE VISAGES OF THE ONE PEOPLE AND THE SIXTH SUN

The invasion and colonization excluded several visages (*ros-tros*), historical subjects, and oppressed peoples from the hegemonic community of communication. These make up the other face (*te-ixtli* in Náhuatl) of modernity as do the Others covered over (*encubierto*) by the discovery, the oppressed within peripheral nations (and so doubly dominated), and the innocent victims of sacrificial paradigms. This social block, as Gramsci dubbed it,¹ form a people, a historical subject, evident in such moments as the national emancipation movements in the early nineteenth century. In those movements, the *criollos* rebelled against the Spanish and Portuguese bureaucracies and commercial powers to win their own independence.

In this emancipation, all the dominated classes, the *social block of the oppressed*, took on the physiognomy of a historical subject

and realized an authentic political revolution. Later, as the century progressed, the *criollos* transformed themselves from being dominated to dominating the neocolonial, peripheral order. Their class mediated the domination externally imposed by the centers of industrial capitalism, England and France in the nineteenth century and the United States beginning with the end of the second so-called world war.

In this epilogue I wish to indicate aspects not treated in the previous chapters and deserving future consideration. I wish to focus on the multiple visages which pertain to the single Latin American people and which modernity has overlooked.

The first protagonists of Latin American history subsequent to the cultural shock of 1492 were *the Indians*,² who still remained invisible to modernity. Although the invasion changed their lives by introducing iron instruments such as the ax, which transfigured agriculture and domestic labor, they have prolonged their resistance for five centuries. The Spaniards brutally and gratuitously exploited them on the *encomiendas* (estates), in the *repartimientos* (apportionments of Indians) for agriculture or mining, including the Andean *mita* (slave labor), and on the *haciendas*, where they received hunger wages. The Indians had to recompose entirely their existence to endure the inhuman oppression that was their lot as the first victims of modernity, the first modern holocaust, as Russell Thornton called it.

Although the European invaders numbered a hundred thousand at the end of the sixteenth century, one percent of the total population, they controlled strategic cities, roads, ports, and mountains. The daily life of the rest of the population, however, eluded the colonizers in spite of their ingressions³ into the indigenous collective unconscious via the reductions and the doctrines of the missionaries. With their numbers reduced and their elites extirpated, the poor indigenous population survived, unable to revive its previous splendor. The colonial government systematically dominated this population while ceding them a traditional, communitarian proprietorship over some lands. Nineteenth-century liberalism, however, struck a second fatal blow against the Indians by enshrining an abstract, bourgeois, individualist, civic life, instituting private property in the countryside, and suppressing communal modes of living.

It was not surprising when the Indigenous Salvadoran Association (ANIS), in the First Spiritual and Cultural Meeting (*encuentro*), repudiated on February 11, 1988, the "*foreign invasion* of America." They called for "a stop to the genocide and ethnocide of sub-peoples and subcultures, and totally rejected the celebration of the five-hundred-year-old *foreign invasion*."⁴

Earlier, on March 6, 1985, the Indian Council of South America, in its Declaration of the International Commission CISA for the Human Rights of the Indian Peoples, wrote:

We are certain that the genocide perpetrated on the Jews by the Nazis under Hitler will eventually appear as miniscule. We are certain that all political and ecclesiastical leaders of the Spanish Empire will be condemned to death on the gallows or to perpetual chains. We are certain that perpetual justice will be done.⁵

In an *indigenous consultation* in Mexico sponsored by CENAMI in October 1987 and focusing on *five hundred years of evangelization in Mexico*, the indigenous peoples concluded:

We have been deceived into thinking that the discovery was good. The *day of the race* (*Día de la raza*)—[the denomination of the October 12 festivals]—we are now clear about its consequences. We need to distribute to local communities some literature⁶ concerning what really happened so that we can all become more aware of why we are enslaved.⁷ There is no need for festivities on October 12, since we are in mourning. Pope John Paul II has supposedly requested a novena to prepare for the celebration, but our response is that *he can listen to what we have to say. The pope's role is to serve the church, and we are the church*.⁸ Today the conquest continues with all its terror and sorrow.⁹ We do not want to celebrate a festival, since the missionaries did not come as brothers, as the gospels say, but as part of the Spanish conquest that enslaved us. We are sad.¹⁰

In 1992, five hundred years later, the Indians would still concur with Bartolomé de las Casas who wrote in the sixteenth century:

In their treatment of the Indians, the Spaniards acted as if they were starved wolves, tigers, and cruel lions rushing upon defenseless animals. The Spaniards have done nothing these forty years

[today we ought to say, these five hundred years] except break them in pieces, kill them, cause them anxiety, afflict them, torment them, and destroy them. They have employed strange, new, and diverse cruelties neither seen, nor read about, nor heard of before.¹¹

Some Peruvian Indians invited by some Spanish groups to Seville to reflect on 1492 protested near Columbus's tomb in the cathedral until the police were called in and imprisoned them. A little afterward, one commented to me, "We are used to this, but we did not expect to be treated this way, today, here!" Although there may not be many indigenous witnesses at the Seville international exposition, this imprisonment symbolizes how Spanish, Portuguese, Christian, modern Europeans perpetrated the first holocaust of the violent myth of modernity.

This example of modernity's cruelty, invisible to one concentrating only on its emancipative, rational, enlightened (*aufgeklärt*) nucleus, pales when one turns to the sufferings of the peaceful African peasants. Slave traders caged these peasants like beasts and transported them as cargo in boats across the Atlantic. In this cruelest of histories,¹² modernity subjected thirteen million Africans to the *treatment*¹³ by immolating them as a second holocaust¹⁴ for capital, the new god of the sixth sun. The first slaves arrived from Spain in Santo Domingo in 1504, but their service altered when the cycle of sugar replaced the cycle of gold in Hispaniola in 1520. The Spaniards imported African slaves to labor on sugar, cocoa, and tobacco plantations, to live and die in sugar mills, and thus to provide capitalism with its originary value through their objectivated labor.

South of the Sahara, flourishing kingdoms¹⁵ once produced gold and transported it across the desert by caravans that traded in the Islamic and Christian Mediterranean. With the discovery of the Americas and the unearthing of new and more productive gold and silver mines, these kingdoms faced a crisis. Complicit with the merchants of nascent European capitalism, these kingdoms collaborated in hunting (*caza*) free African peasants and selling them for arms and other products. In the famed *triangle of death*, ships left London, Lisbon, The Hague, or Amsterdam with European products, such as arms and iron tools, and exchanged these goods on

the western coasts of Africa for slaves. They then bartered these slaves in Bahia, Hispanic Cartagena, Havana, Port-au-Prince, and in the ports of the colonies south of New England for gold, silver, and tropical products. The entrepreneurs eventually deposited all that value, or coagulated human blood in Marx's metaphor, in the banks of London and the pantries of the Low Countries. Thus modernity pursued its civilizing, modernizing, humanizing, Christianizing course.

In Cartagena—as in English, Portuguese, or French colonies—slave traders stripped Africans naked, herded men and women together, and displayed them in the market place. Purchasers punched their bodies to assess their constitution, fingered their masculine or feminine sexual organs to determine their health, and examined their teeth. These buyers, having calculated their size, age, and strength, paid with gold coins the value of their persons for life. Then they were branded by fire. No other people in human history and in such numbers were ever so reified as merchandise; no other race was treated this way. Another glory of modernity!

The slaves, however, resisted continually, and many finally attained liberty. The thousands of Afro-Brazilians populating the *quilombos* (liberated territories) and defying colonial armies and the many Jamaican slaves who took refuge along the Pacific coasts of Central America provide evidence of the resistance. The enslaving-colonial order, nevertheless, met every intention of flight or emancipation with systematic brutality. The French—revolutionaries only in their own nation in 1789—promulgated *Le Code Noir ou Recueil des Reglements rendus jusqu' à présent*,¹⁶ which protracted for decades the suffering of Afro-Caribbeans in Haiti, Guadalupe, and Martinique. In this prototypical document, mercantilist capitalism, sprung from the modern bourgeois revolution, upheld its *rights*. Modernity has shown its double face even to this day by upholding liberty (the essential liberty of the person in Hobbes or Locke) *within* Western nations, while at the same time encouraging enslavement *outside them*. European Common Market politics, closed in upon itself, expresses this double face in new guise. Modernity's other face shows up on the map tinted with negritude in the southern United States, the Caribbean, the Atlantic coast of Central

America, the north and east of Colombia, the Pacific coast as far south as Ecuador, the three Guyanas, and Brazil, home of sixty million Afro-Brazilians.

Transplanted Africans, who are accustomed in the Caribbean area to keep the *umbilical cord* of a newly born child in a little box or bury it in the earth,¹⁷ created a new, syncretistic culture. The world music of rhythm, from the blues to jazz to rock, expresses Afro-American culture. In Latin America, African-Latin American religious expressions from Haitian voodoo to Brazilian *candomble* and *macumba* reflect the transplantation of slaves.

The third visage of those from below is that of the sons of Malinche, the mestizos,¹⁸ as Carlos Fuentes calls them, the sons and daughters of Indian women (the mother) and Spaniards (the dominating male). Latin America must live out its subsequent cultural history and politics with the ambiguity of this new denizen who is neither Indian nor European. In *El laberinto de la soledad*, which speaks of the loneliness of the mestizo, Octavio Paz in the 1950s vents his own uncertainty:

The Hispanist thesis that we have descended from Cortés and not the Malinche belongs to the patrimony of several extravagant people who are not pure white themselves. On the other hand, *criollos* and maniac mestizos spread about equally untrustworthy indigenist propaganda to which the Indians themselves have never paid much attention. Mestizos¹⁹ prefer to be neither Indian nor Spaniard, nor to descend from either group. They do not affirm themselves as mestizos but as abstractions, as if they were only human beings. They begin in themselves and wish to be children of no one.... Our popular cry²⁰ betrays us and reveals the wound that we alternately show or hide without indicating why we separate from or negate our mother or when that rupture occurred.²¹

In contrast to Africans, Asians, American indigenous peoples, and even white North Americans, all of whose culture, race, and identity are evident, most Latin Americans are, as Paz indicates, neither Amerindian nor European. There are more than two hundred million people of this mixed-race heritage who have developed this continent and marked it with their history. These mestizo sons and daughters celebrate their five hundredth birthday in a way that neither

Indians, nor Europeans, nor Africans, nor Asians can. The Indians, who call them *ladinos* in some places, hate them because they are given priority as *lord*, even though they are not white. The Europeans and their *criollo* sons and daughters despise them likewise for not being white. In the midst of such contradictions, the mestizo, nevertheless, represents what is unique, positively or negatively, to Latin American culture. The mestizo is responsible for building Latin America, Luso-Hispanic America, Hispano America, Ibero-America as a cultural block beyond mere geography (South America, Central America, North America, and the Caribbean).

Mestizos live in their own flesh the contradictory tension of modernity as both emancipation and sacrificial myth. Following in the footsteps of their father Cortés, they have pursued the project of modernity through the eighteenth-century Bourbon colonial Enlightenment, the nineteenth century's positivist liberalism,²² and through the developmentalism of modernized dependence after the populist and socialist crises of the twentieth century. But they will always fail unless they recover the heritage of their mother, the Malinche. Mestizos must affirm their double origin, as the peripheral, colonized, victimized other face of modernity and as the modern ego which lords it (*enseñorea*) over the land invaded by Cortés. As the majoritarian race, mestizos make up that part of the social block of the oppressed who are entrusted with *the realization* of Latin America. However, the mestizo culture cannot claim to exhaust in itself all Latin American culture.²³ Nevertheless, the project of liberation needs to be mindful of the cultural-historical figure of the mestizo, the third visage and other face of modernity. While not suffering to the extent of the Indian or African slave, the mestizo cannot escape the structural oppression resulting from cultural, political, and economic dependence at national and international levels.

The *Nican Mopohua*,²⁴ although originally Náhuatl according to the Indian Antonio Valeriano, mediates between the indigenous and mestizo/*criollo* cultures. It announces the beginning of the sixth sun, even as it tries to offer hope for the poor and the oppressed.²⁵ In this text, the Guadalupe-Tonantzin says to Juan Diego:

To you, to all of You together who dwell in this land... I have come here to hear your laments and to remedy all your miseries, pains, and sufferings.

The Virgin, the Tonantzin (our little mother) of the oppressed Aztecs, directs herself to Juan Diego, the Indian par excellence, and not to the Spaniards who *have recently come here*. Juan Diego, calling himself a "*string, a step ladder without boards, excrement, a loose leaf*,"²⁶ becomes the subject and protagonist of this apparition:

The Virgin is an Indian. In addition, she appears to the Indian Juan Diego on a hill that before had been a sanctuary dedicated to Tonantzin.... The conquest coincides with the apogee of the worship of the masculine deities: Quetzalcóatl... and Huitzilopochtli.... The defeat of these gods... produced among the faithful a longing to return to ancient feminine deities.... This Catholic virgin is also Aztec mother, and so the indigenous pilgrims call her Guadalupe-Tonantzin. Her principal task does not involve guarding the earth's fertility, but serving as the refuge of the forsaken.²⁷

Quickly after this, thanks to Miguel Sánchez's *Imagen de la Virgen María Madre de Dios de Guadalupe milagrosamente aparecida en México* (Mexico: 1648), the mestizos and *criollos* appropriate this indigenous image to affirm their identity against the Spaniards and the Europeans. She symbolizes the unity of the Latin American people, a social block of the oppressed, a unity at once dispersed and contradictory:

Across the bridge extending between Tepeyac²⁸ and St. John's Apocalypse,²⁹ the eighteenth-century³⁰ preachers and nineteenth-century revolutionaries present themselves.³¹... Miguel Sánchez does not hesitate to assert that the image of Guadalupe is originary to this country and that she is the preeminent *criollo* woman.... Sánchez was... certainly a fully self-conscious *criollo*³² patriot.³³

Although the symbol of María Guadalupe united diverse classes, social groups, and ethnic groups at a critical juncture in the constitution of the nation state, the mestizos and *criollos* have appropriated it. Nevertheless, she has functioned as the mother of a free nation filled with contradictions, threatening its future development.

One can speak of the native elites as a fourth, dominated visage. These *criollos*, white sons and daughters born to Spaniards or

Portuguese in the new world, suffered under the Hapsburgs and later the Bourbons or under the Portuguese kings in Brazil. By the end of the eighteenth century, as they became acutely aware that their own historical project was being frustrated, they took charge of the *emancipative project*. José de San Martín in El Plata, Simón Bolívar, a wild (*montuano*) conservative in Venezuela and Nueva Granada, and the priest Miguel Hidalgo in New Spain were all *criollos*. *Criollos* in the new world had known and lived its rivers, mountains, and woods as their own since their birth. But they knew them differently than indigenous peoples, who held them as ancestral gods; than African slaves, who recognized them as strange, possessed by slaveholders, and far distant from their native Africa; and than depreciated mestizos. *Criollo* consciousness was happy, basically undivided, even though partially dominated by peninsulars, royalists, *gapuchines*, and Hispano-Lusitanos. This hegemonic class at the start of the nineteenth century galvanized into a historical people in arms a contradictory social block of oppressed peoples including Indians, African slaves, *zambos* (sons of Indians and Africans), mulattos (sons of whites and Africans), and mestizos (sons of whites and Indians).

The Latin American people undertook the adventure of emancipation against France,³⁴ Spain,³⁵ or Portugal,³⁶ and in Jamaica, Curaçao, and other Latin American colonies, they stood up to England and Holland. To a great extent, Latin Americans experienced their historical unity via the negation of their colonial past and in common cause against a common enemy. This nineteenth-century emancipative process, hegemonized by the *criollos* in Luso-Hispanic America, rapidly fell apart, however. The *criollos* simply were not adept at taking up, subsuming, or affirming the historical projects of indigenous peoples, emancipated African slaves, mestizos, and other groups in the oppressed social block. Therefore, Simón Bolívar's dream of an easy unification under the hegemony of the white race was only a fantasy:

Of the fifteen or twenty million inhabitants who find themselves spread out on this great continent of indigenous, African, Spanish, and mixed-race nations, the white race is the smallest

minority. But this race possesses the intellectual qualities that makes its influence seem equal to the other races in the eyes of those unacquainted with this race's moral and physical qualities. The composition of these qualities produces an opinion most favorable to union and harmony among all inhabitants, in spite of the numerical disproportion between the races.³⁷

In spite of Bolívar's conviction that the whites could reconcile these diverse races and cultures, the *criollos* ended up monopolizing the power in the new national states after the independence movements. A new oppressed social block replaced the former, as the *criollos* took up the roles of dominators, conservatives, federalists, liberals, or unitarians. As a result, everyone, with the greater or lesser participation by mestizos, indigenous peoples, and mulattos, formed classes and groups dependent not upon Spain or Portugal, but upon England, France, and finally the United States.³⁸ While awareness of dependence could have sparked an *assumptive*³⁹ project, such a project would have fallen short of a project of liberation encompassing indigenous peoples, Afro-Latin Americans, peasants, workers, and marginal peoples—in brief, modernity's *other face*. The projects of national emancipation, heirs of the emancipation movements led by *criollos* in the nineteenth century, have produced the modern nation-state. But the purposes of indigenous and Afro-Latin American groups still await integration into a future Latin American project of liberation.

After the emancipation consummated between 1821 and 1822 from Mexico to Brazil, new visages took the stage as the ancient poor people of the colonial era reappeared as if with new clothing. The fifth visage, the peasants,⁴⁰ were simple indigenous people who had departed from their communities, or they were impoverished mestizos, *zambos*, or mulattos who had dedicated themselves to the land. These small proprietors often owned more or less unproductive land plots or shared *ejidos* [government plots of land] without real competitive possibilities. Propertyless, poorly paid laborers from the countryside also belonged among the "laborers directly engaged with the land." In the earlier twentieth century, more than 70 percent of the Latin American population dwelt in the countryside and suffered exploitation at the hands of large landlords of the *criollo*

oligarchy. In Mexico, the peasants rose up in revolt between 1910 and 1917, and even when their leaders Francisco Villa and Emiliano Zapata were assassinated, the *cristeros* revived the revolution. To this day peasants in other regions lack land as can be seen in the thirty million *northeasterners* in Brazil, who occupy land illegally and destroy the tropical Amazon forest in order to eat.⁴¹ Finally, the modernizing advance of the unplannable free market supposedly governed by Adam Smith's mythic, provident hand of God, prevents isolated peasants from reproducing their life in the countryside and impels them toward the cities. Here the destiny of the sixth sun-capital—enables them to be transformed into other visages of the other face of modernity.

Workers make up the sixth visage.⁴² The industrial revolution took place primarily in England in the mid-eighteenth century after Spain and Portugal had inaugurated mercantile capitalism at the end of the fifteenth century. The industrial revolution, however, reached Latin America only at the end of the nineteenth century⁴³ and unfolded there as an originally dependent industrial revolution.⁴⁴ Therefore, the national bourgeoisie of Latin American countries, who construct unitarian projects for conservative or liberal constituencies or populist ones that are not really popular, find themselves enmeshed in a *weak* capitalist system. Within the international capitalist system, they end up structurally transferring value to the central capital and its metropolitan centers, to England first, to the United States since 1945, and last to the giants of transnational capitalism such as Japan, Germany, and the European Common Market. According to the clear and yet insufficiently elaborated position of Mauro Marini, weak capital superexploits (*sobre-explota*) its laborers.⁴⁵ That is, weak capital increases excessively labor hours and augments absolute surplus value by heightening the intensity and rhythm of labor (a derived type of relative surplus value) and by disproportionately diminishing absolute and relative salaries (the minimal salary is \$45 monthly in Haiti, \$60 in Brazil, and somewhat more than \$100 in Mexico).⁴⁶ All this occurs because peripheral capital must compensate for the value it transfers to central capital.⁴⁷

The entire discussion about modernity and postmodernity, whether in Habermas, Lyotard, Vattimo, or Rorty, omits any reference

to this entire problematic and displays a lack of world consciousness typical of Eurocentric and North American philosophies. World capital exploits most of all these millions of Latin American, Asian, or African laborers. Hegel foresaw these miserable masses in his *Philosophy of Right* when he predicted that bourgeois society would resolve its contradictions by seeking solutions beyond its borders:

The amplification of that articulation is reached by means of colonization, to which, spontaneously or systematically, the developed bourgeois society is pushed.⁴⁸

Marx amplifies Hegel by this further reflection:

Accumulation of capital is, therefore, increase of the proletariat.⁴⁹ The law [of the accumulation of capital] establishes accumulation of misery (*Akkumulation von Elend*) corresponding with accumulation of capital. Accumulation of wealth of one pole is, therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, ethical degradation, at the opposite pole—that is, on the side of the class that produces its own product as capital.⁵⁰

Obviously in 1992 the mythology of a free market of perfect competition holds Marx in disrepute.⁵¹ Marx's stock is particularly low since he explains how the misery of the people (indigenous peoples, Africans, mestizos, peasants, laborers) of peripheral nations is proportional to the wealth of the rich within both peripheral and central capital. The myth of modernity ignores all this.

One ought not forget the seventh visage of the other face of modernity, the marginal ones.⁵² Due to weak, peripheral capital's transference of value, it not only superexploits salaried labor but also fails to employ an enormous relative and absolute overpopulation,⁵³ a *reserve labor army*. These structural weaknesses in Latin American countries produce an urban marginality growing by the millions in large cities such as São Paulo, Mexico City, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Lima, Bogotá, Rio, or Guadalajara, as well as in cities like New Delhi, Cairo, or Nairobi.

This contemporary phenomenon of marginality, a modern but more serious version of the *lumpen*, reveals disfigured visages, the unjust outcome of what Habermas and others have called late

capitalism (*Spätkapitalismus*). Even careful historians and philosophers neglect the systematic linkages between postindustrial, service-oriented, financier, and transnational late capitalism and peripheral capitalism. Industrialized peripheral capitalism subsumes living labor by offering minimum subsistence salaries to competing marginalized ones who must sell themselves at subhuman prices, like the illegal *braceros* in the United States. The quality of these marginal lives with respect to food, clothing, habitat, culture, and sense of personal dignity falls well below that of the festive and populated city of Zempoala, which Cortés entered in 1519. Five hundred years finds millions of marginal persons in Mexico City yearning to have the food, the clothing, and dignity characterizing those who inhabited Mexico-Tenochtitlan. I am here recommending neither a return to the past nor a folkloric or preindustrial project such as Gandhi's. I simply desire to show modernity's other face, the structural product of its myth, and to recognize that myth for the sacrificial, violent, and irrational myth it is.

During the long history from 1492 to 1992, the era of the sixth sun, the Latin American people, the social block of the oppressed, have struggled to create their own culture.⁵⁴ Any attempt at modernization which ignores this history is doomed to fail, since it will be overlooking its own other face.⁵⁵ Furthermore, people seeking to modernize will encounter difficulties in that sector which modernity has always exploited and oppressed, and which has paid with its life for the accumulation of originary capital and central capitalism's development. In the name of modernity's rational and emancipatory nucleus, which can free one from an immaturity that is not culpable, I wish to deny modernity's Eurocentric, developmentalist, sacrificial myth.

Therefore, any merely assumptive liberating project will favor the *criollos*, behave conservatively on behalf of large landholders, and uphold a liberalism that denies the indigenous, Afro-Latin American, and colonial past. Authentically liberating projects must strive to lead modernity beyond itself to transmodernity. Such projects require an amplified rationality which makes room for the reason of the Other within a community of communication among equal participants, as envisaged by Bartolomé de las Casas in the 1550 Valladolid debate.

Within such projects, all ought to be welcomed in their alterity, in that otherness which needs to be painstakingly guaranteed at every level, whether in Habermas's *ideal speech situation* or Apel's *community of ideal or transcendental communication*.

This book serves only as a historico-philosophical introduction to an intercultural dialogue that will encompass diverse political, economic, theological, and epistemological standpoints. Such a dialogue endeavors to construct not an abstract universality, but an analogic and concrete world in which all cultures, philosophies, and theologies will make their contribution toward a future, pluralist humanity.

Modernity began in 1492 with Europe thinking itself the center of the world and Latin America, Africa, and Asia as the periphery. The year 1492 carries a different, non-European significance in the peripheral world.

In analyzing these topics, I have sketched the historical conditions for a theory of dialogue. Such a theory should not (1) fall into the facile optimism of rationalist, abstract universalism that would conflate universality with Eurocentrism and modernizing developmentalism, as the Frankfurt School is inclined to do; nor should it (2) lapse into the irrationality, incommunicability, or incommensurability of discourses that are typical of many postmoderns. The philosophy of liberation affirms that rationality can establish a dialogue with the reason of the Other, as an alterative reason. Today, such rationality must deny the irrational sacrificial myth of modernity as well as affirm (subsume in a liberating project)⁵⁶ the emancipative tendencies of the Enlightenment and modernity within a new transmodernity.