

ΣΟΦΙΑ—SOPHIA

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18634/sophiaj.14v.2i.853>

The caravan of Modernity: notes to consolidate a concept of illustrated Modernity

Adriana María Galvis Cardona*

Article Information

Received: June 05 of 2017
Revised: November 19 of 2017
Accepted: June 30 of 2018

How cite:
Galvis, A.M. (2018) La caravana de la modernidad: apuntes para consolidar un concepto de modernidad ilustrado. Sophia, 14 (2), 94-105.

*Teacher of basic and secondary education. Student at the PhD in Language and Culture, Pedagogical and Technological University of Colombia. Adianagalvis83@gmail.com



ISSN (electrónico): 2346-0806 ISSN (impreso): 1794-8932

Abstract

This article reviews the horizon of thought offered by some intellectuals, whose approaches are related to Modernity as a social, political and ideological phenomenon that has its peak in the subcontinent during the nineteenth century, and that continues taking position and re-signifying during the twentieth century, through the Enlightenment as a project from which education is planned in Latin American countries. The main purpose then lies in tracing the concept of modernity, in order to understand its origin and historical projection in the historical, political and educational diversity of the Latin American subcontinent. It is concluded from this tracking that the processes of hybridization and appropriation of modernity are closely linked with educational processes, with the critical and reflexive impulse of the peoples, product of the illustrated project that was translated in each one of the Latin American countries at a different rhythm, but always from an educational-formative projection.

Keywords: Education, essay, illustration, modernity, Latin American thinking.

Introduction

In the Latin American subcontinent, Modernity has been studied from different areas, taking into account the sociopolitical realities that have developed in each of the countries. In order to understand the state of the discussion around questions such as: How much has been researched about Modernity? Who has investigated (it)? From what dimensions has it been studied? Next, there are related and synthesized the perceptions of various thinkers who have reflected on Modernity. At first, there are related some European thinkers and historians who conceptualized about Modernity; afterwards, it is made a tour of the Latin American countries and their experiences and perceptions of Modernity; and in the end, some thinkers who have special relevance within the Latin American and Colombian scope, in order to understand both the concept and the state of the discussion in Colombia.

Methodology

For the location of the bibliographic documents that are related in this article, several documentary sources were used, through the database system of the UPTC Library, using the descriptors: modernity, modernity concept revision, conceptual maps, and the combination of the different keywords. The databases consulted were; Redalyc, Scielo, Eric and Academia. A “Google academic” search was also carried out with the same terms. Regarding the selection criteria, these are determined by the objectives of the review, that is, by the intention to consolidate the concept of modernity. This through a title, the authors, the summary and the results.

Based on the title and the reading of the abstract, there are inferred its usefulness and relevance for the purpose of the article.

Some theoretical approaches to the concept of modernity, and its genesis from the concept of history

In order to investigate the meaning of Modernity, it is necessary to dwell on some events of the past. For the specific case that concerns us, the present as modernity, as postmodernity, as modernization; because these concepts that semantically seem to have a close relationship, actually differ significantly. A reference that can serve as support for the understanding of this idea is *The History of the Twentieth Century* by Eric Hobsbawm (1997), who in his particular narrative style, converges history and experience in a framework of useful and important thought for history and its understanding.

In the same vein, Reinhart Koselleck (1993), demonstrated before the Enlightenment how it was possible to articulate ideas and events, in order to generate new perspectives of history. Later, Koselleck (2001) points out, it was from this intellectual context that history could acquire a new field of experience and, therefore, to clear the specific domain of its objects, a fact that is attributed to the formation of philosophy in the history. Subsequently, a new set of circumstances produced the beginnings of Modernity, events and motives that are taken up by Marshall Berman

(1998) in his work *All Solid vanishes in the air*, which produces an X-ray of Modernity. This discovery of socio-historical dynamics became a reaffirmation that supported the idea of the historicity of modern societies. Tomlinson (2001). In this way, in different geographical points, there were emerging traditions that retained the purpose of understanding and explaining themselves from new currents, and from the analysis of durable structures within history.

Regarding the historical moment in which this new way of thinking was imposed, Aguirre (2005) places it at the end of the 1960s, in which is relevant the wave of social movements of 1968, whose purpose was the transformation of the present. In the same line of problematization of the concept of history that will lead to Modernity, Pierre Vilar (1999) has argued that perhaps the most serious danger in the use of the term history is that of its double content; since it designates both the knowledge of a subject, and the subject matter of this knowledge. However, ambivalence is a central issue in historical knowledge, as two sides of a coin where each one requires its reverse.

From the sociological line, Giddens (1999) argues that the understanding of history has become an academic practice that involves reflective knowledge, which turns history into an adaptive knowledge that conforms to the present and past new practices, and the results of their products also entail a record of versatility in line with scientific discourse. With these assumptions and intellectual concerns, a new historiographical proposal was born in the last third of the century; about it, Koselleck (1993) argues that the history of the present time is a beautiful expression, but a difficult concept; it is beautiful because it evokes through a metaphorical description, but difficult, because the history of the present time cannot be understood apart from the great transformations that the world has experienced in its natural evolution. Sauvage (1998) has argued instead that the history of the present is one whose chronological boundaries should be linked to the lapse of a human life. In the same way, the historian Garton (1999) has recognized that the history of the present is constituted by contradictory terms, because, by definition, history deals with the past, even though it is linked to the present and future.

In order to understand the quality of the transformations of the world and of current history,

one of the central theses developed by the German sociologist Beck (1998) can be tackled; he argued insistently that in the present, the world is not before the end of Modernity. In fact, the quality and depth of contemporary changes do not designate anything other than the evidence of entering a second modernity, an idea shared with the German sociologist Giddens (1999). Meanwhile, a voice that announces a second modernity, a radicalized or late one, is Tomlinson (2001). In that intention to define Modernity, the Swedish sociologist Therborn (1999) appears on the scene, who has defined it culturally, as the predominant mentality of an era, focused on the future, a definition that contrasts with pre-modernity, which is one that looks back over the shoulder; and with postmodernity, which has lost its sense of time.

With the same concern, the German historian Koselleck (2001) developed another conception of Modernity: the space of experience and the horizon of expectation. This concept, a bit encrypted, seeks to find a field of convergence in historical time, putting the past into play with the future. From these notions, Koselleck (1993) concludes that the modern era can only be conceived as a new time from which expectations have increasingly moved away from the experiences made. In this same sense, Modernity has begun to be another; it has entered a world modernity, or a second modernity.

In synthesis, the diverse conceptions about Modernity, and the derivations that have been extracted from it, allow a greater precision of the concept, concludes Robertson (2000). Similarly, Tomlinson (2001), considers that an explanation in these terms also runs the risk of being tautological, since the content and orientation of Modernity are produced from the interrelation between experience and expectation, and originate from elements of the past, present and future. Koselleck (1993), on the other hand, considers that Modernity is constructed in the present through the coexistence of temporalities, a position to which Larraín (2005) joins, from the inclusive recognition of the other as a subject.

Beck (2004), on the other hand, is committed to the hybridization of institutions as a solid foundation for the development of the thesis of the existence of multiple modernities, which leaves in place the idea that Western modernity is an experience among many others. However, the bet inspired by Koselleck (1993), -the recognition of

multiple modernities- omits to point out the basic components of Modernity, so there would not be any set of elements and contents that support the very notion of modernity; therefore, when the concept becomes so relative, it empties itself of all content.

With this panorama, Jorge Larraín (2005) has introduced a new operative category: “lattice modernities”; its relevance lies in the fact that globalizing tendencies can be analyzed, and therefore the impact of its purposes. As a complementary line to this postulate, Fazio (2006) argues that the trajectory of modernity in the West has been transformed into a temporary category. This set of perceptions and concepts about Modernity reveals substantial differences that in turn are the echo of silent but profound social and sociocultural revolutions with multiple manifestations, which can be understood as the triumph of the individual over the collectivity, as an individuality of thought.

In this second section, there are exposed the perceptions of Latin American essayists and thinkers from countries such as Argentina, Chile, Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, Brazil and Peru, with respect to the concept of Modernity and its experience, echo, and reality in the Latin American subcontinent. .

In Argentina, Beatriz Sarló developed an essay entitled *A Peripheral Modernity: Buenos Aires, 1920 and 1930*; in this text, there are linked the literary criticism and the Argentinian intellectual discourse in the process of modernization of Buenos Aires for two decades, in which there is an important social and cultural development. Her interpretive work takes as a reference the reflections and proposals of Raymond Williams, Walter Benjamín, Carl Schorske and Marshall Berman. In order to create the conceptual framework, reference is made to the work of Pierre Bourdieu, *A peripheral modernity*; in this approach it is sought to understand the cultural fabric and the social imaginary of Buenos Aires, lived by *porteño* (Buenos Aires inhabitant) intellectuals who react in contradictory ways before the urban transformation processes during the 1920s and 1930s.

Leonardo Senkman (2015) states that this analysis includes cultural practices, as well as novels and poems; a rich corpus of texts of the culture that is woven from fragments, prose texts,

poems, magazines, stories, essays, manifestos, interviews, biographies, images, epistolary confessions, prologues and brochures make up the analyzed corpus, without leaving aside the historical-demographic approach. He also concludes that his essay is a genuine innovation in Latin American socio-cultural studies, in which an ideological-political commitment is recreated, where there are combined various pieces and dimensions of society, both sociological and literary, inviting readers to read the country from different and varied perspectives, as the discursive pieces that intervene in the investigation.

In Bolivia, Soruco (2015) carries out an analysis of Carlos Medinaceli’s work on Bolivian society. Soruco explains that Medinaceli seeks to interrogate the social context and the densities of the relationship between literature and society in Bolivia, during the first half of the 20th century and, from there, to build a plan of cultural generalization and understanding of its history.

Carlos Medinaceli was one of the first Bolivian critics, but also a novelist, essayist and poet. Through his work -exposes Soruco- it is possible to reconstruct a sociological hypothesis about the 1850-1950 period. The author clarifies that the study is carried out 67 years after the death of Medinaceli, but considers that this event allows him to see in perspective his time, the social processes and the narratives that he generated, and that gives an account of the way in which Bolivia lives the cultural phenomenon of Modernity.

Soruco explains how Medinaceli defines the Bolivian contradiction, expressed from his role as an authentic though misunderstood intellectual, who reads his society without reductionist intentions, or singularities, if not, on the contrary, he does it from his theoretical potential, relating work, context and culture, from the time that he had to live. For this case, Soruco makes use of statistics, archival documents, interview-type testimonies, autobiography and epistles, in order to arrive at a relational understanding of the society in which he lives, and which is clearly revealed in the plot that weaves his analysis. To paraphrase Soruco (2015), with regard to Medinaceli’s speech, the purpose is to investigate the thinking of Carlos Medinaceli of the Bolivian society in which he lived, and to interrogate this social context, in order to assess in his light the uniqueness of the author and his work. Another purpose of this analysis is to study the link

between Medinaceli and the relationship between literature and society in Bolivia, during the first half of the 20th century; and from there, to find meaning in the construction of Bolivian modernity.

In Brazil, Oliven (2001), in his text *Cultura e modernidade no Brasil*, states that Modernity occupied Brazilian intellectuals during several eras, but always under the contradiction regarding the realization of the social changes that propitiate the access of the majority of the population to the benefits of a material nature. Similarly, one of the nuclei that is strongly positioned in this discussion is the racial issue, as an element of exclusion par excellence that through authoritarianism seeks to proceed against the indigenous population. Regarding the republican period, –Oliven claims– the tendency is to think Brazil under the premise of the non-viability of building civilization from the tropics. In this sense, the author qualifies the intellectuals as apathetic and indolent in this regard, and accuses of this situation to the intention of whitening the population by means of the arrival of European immigrants.

In the 30s' decade of the 19th century, the author narrates, with Gilberto Freyre, a new vision of Brazil was inaugurated, which tries to stop seeing the country as a tropical civilization, in order to begin the construction of a racial democracy. From Freyre's vision, the racial mixture was not a theme of Modernity, but a theme that had occupied some thinkers at different times. Meanwhile, the rest of the country, that is; those who did not live in Rio de Janeiro, used to see “modernization” (“*modernização*,” in Portuguese in the original) as a phenomenon limited to the, by then, capital of the country. In short, Brazilian modernity is characterized by miscegenation, syncretization of ideas, and whitening through European ideologies and colonies in the same country.

In Chile, Nelly Richard (2003) points to the philosophers Pablo Oyarzún and Sergio Rojas as emblematic thinkers of Modernity, from disciplines such as philosophy of history and philosophy of art. For them, this period has not only involved the consummation in the history of the *animal rationale*, but also the critical consummation of Western individuality. Richard (2003) argues that Modernity and its consequences have not only been a subject of reflection on the part of the European thought, but also the Latin American one; mainly in Chile, because at present, philosophy in that

country has rethought the subject from different orientations and disciplinary areas, with authors such as Pablo Oyarzún, Sergio Rojas, Martín Hopenhayn and Willy Thayer, but also from the contributions of Carla Cordua and Marcos García de la Huerta, among others.

In Venezuela, Harry Almela (2012) is categorical in stating that one of the poles that has exerted most influence on the political and social field in Latin America is the questioning of the triumphs of Modernity, expressed in the criticism to the established order in the world and its consequences in Latin America. Among the questions the author asks to account for the phenomenon of modernity in Venezuela, he highlights this question: How can modernity be defined in Latin America, with Catholic roots that does not practice at all the ethics of Protestantism, where rationality, austerity, asceticism and enrichment as a sign of predestination to eternal salvation are –according to Weber– their main assumptions? In short, the construction of the modern imaginary for Venezuela requires special attention in the tensions generated by political and economic realities, since Modernity, understood as political and economic progress, moves in an international dynamic, with a multicultural condition, and therefore, with a complex crossing of mentalities and dynamics of thought.

In Peru, Mejía (2005) states that the foundation of a modern social thought developed from the late nineteenth century, and lasted until the fifties of the twentieth century. In this period, it is generated the establishment of a social thought, which is the classic stage of social ideas in Peru, and which generates a significant contribution to the understanding of society, manifested in the so-called generation of the nineteenth century, for approaching knowledge of the national reality and formulating alternatives for its development. However, during the second half of the nineteenth century, Mejía (2005) states, two currents in Peruvian social thought predominated: positivism in philosophy and biology in social ideas. Positivism meant some scientific zeal to study reality, and to observe and approach the most urgent problems in the country, which implied the abandonment of the intellectualist tradition and the (its) substitution for a perspective that emphasized the modernization of the country. On the other hand, *biologism* represented the colonial inheritance that explained

social organization based on the genetic premises, and on the superiority and natural domination of Creole elites. Clemente Palma is the greatest exponent of racist ideas; in 1897 he published *El Porvenir de las Razas* (The future of races) in Peru.

The foundation of a social thought in Peru responds to the development of a project of Modernity, which in some way has meant the type of society that was built during the 20th century. In this context, it is proposed the development of an enlightened, cohesive and modernizing oligarchy capable of organizing and integrating society through the centralization of the state; but the State, declares Mejía (2005), assumes a Eurocentric perspective that magnifies the characteristics and European trajectory as superior, while the culture and native elements are seen as inferior and lacking in value. The process of miscegenation is shown as an ideology based on the premise of the white superiority of the Creole, and the contempt for everything indigenous, which must disappear.

The most critical perspective of the oligarchic order has Manuel González Prada, Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre and José Carlos Mariátegui among its greatest exponents, who developed real original and suggestive contributions to Peruvian social thought. José Carlos Mariátegui, particularly in seven essays on the interpretation of Peruvian reality (1928), offers a more analytical and scientific representation of society, which allowed to establish a perspective from the Andean side, and firm foundations for a sociological reflection. Mariátegui considers that theories do not “constitute principles of rigid consequences”, but that they rather acquire a concrete content in the study of the national reality.

In Ecuador, Valero (2014) states that, at the end of the wars of independence in continental Latin America in 1830, the new governments faced the problem of building states and nations on the ruins of the old regime, after having destroyed -in words of Halperin Donghi- the “spoils of the victors.” These processes occurred in different ways throughout the subcontinent; in this work, we focus in a particular way on the ecclesiastical reforms, in that process of independence of the local churches, of the invention of the Church as an institution and its subsequent secularization, events that go hand in hand and intersect with the construction of the States. It is addressed the case of Ecuador in the 1860s, when Gabriel García

Moreno became the head of a conservative and Catholic government that applied *Gallicanism* (ideas), and even anti-clerical reforms by forming an alliance with the Holy See.

Valero (2014) explains that in order to explain the history and tone of the relations between religious power and political power, there have been used the concepts of State and Church, inherited from the wars fought by the political elites at the end of the 19th century (Di Stefano, 2005). However, the meaning of these concepts is historical and, therefore, susceptible to be modified under certain circumstances; this way, by using them as monolithic notions and without problematizing them, we only obscure rather than clarify the complex process of secularization and construction and invention of the State and the church in Latin America. As Roberto Di Stefano already pointed out, in the 19th century, the “church” did not mean what it means now, but it operated as a corporation that for centuries served as the structuring axis of society, and (it was) always intertwined with civil power in a complex way

The independence processes brought about the creation of new political systems, whose legitimacy was established from individuals and no longer from God (Serrano, 2008); this transformation implied the rearrangement of the place that there would occupy God and the religion that accompanies it within the new order; in addition to the fact that the same church that sheltered religion in an institutionalized form was also emancipated from the king’s authority. However, the transition from a religious to a legal legitimacy did not imply, at the beginning, the expulsion of religion from the sphere of the State (Serrano, 2008); for this reason, the emergence of Catholic republics in Latin America is not strange, but they had their days numbered, faced with the advance of liberalism, which enshrined equality before the law and greater control of the State in areas that, traditionally, had been handled by the church.

In the case of Uruguay, Espeche (2010) develops an investigative work taking as a starting point the premise “Uruguay with its back to Latin America”; he maintains that understanding this proposition is a fundamental task if one wants to glimpse the criticisms and political positions of various Uruguayan intellectuals of the 60s. The author also emphasizes specific situations, such as the Cuban revolution, a topic that allows reviewing

certain oppositions that have articulated a large part of the stories about the history of Uruguay as a state-nation.

Espeche (2010) states that taking as a basis the fact that Uruguay, between the 50s and 60s of the 20th century, qualified itself (to be) in a position “with its back to Latin America”, that was a common way to refer the situation of the country with respect to the rest of the Latin American subcontinent. In such a way that the idea of the country as an island was based on social achievements such as political democracy, conquered in the first decades of the 20th century, the defense of the right to strike, the promotion of the 8-hour working day, among others; political achievements that make the difference with respect to other countries of the subcontinent.

In this panorama, Uruguay developed what was called a critical conscience, from the literature of Rama (cited by Espeche, 2010), which bases a thought scheme that was known as the “critical generation”, “generalized consciousness that serves all men who build a new time” (Rama 1972). Beyond that profound difference, there were notorious agreements that would later be repeated by others who identified themselves as its members, including those who emphasized the importance of education. It was Rama and Rodríguez Monegal who agreed that this critical generation had manifested around the 40s, and it was characterized by an infinite vocation for criticism in all its planes since it left nothing standing: neither culture nor politics, nor society.

The writer Juan Carlos Onetti, from his (journal) column “The stone in the puddle”, generated the bases against a format of national culture and literature that saw as obsolete, narrow and -in some sense- fallacious; he also recovered the need of the city as a theme, and also generating some relevance around authors such as Faulkner and Joyce. In the same section, “*Literarias*” (Literary things) of the weekly journal *Marcha*, a fact that led it to become a space dedicated to the review of national and foreign literature, denouncing the old *clientelist* (client-oriented) practices between the State and the already “old” culture representatives. But, above all, from “*Literarias*” in *Marcha*, and also from other publications that began to appear during the 40s. It was also *Marcha*, the platform from which the question was launched about what national literature was in Uruguay; and from there,

it can be tracked, -according to Espeche (2010)- to what extent and in what way Uruguayan literature was incorporated into the “Hispano-American” one, also interrogating this concept with the intention of understanding whether the definition took place by sharing a language; or if it was shared more than a language or a geographical space -the subcontinent-, what made that definition inclusive with respect to Brazil.

In any case, the question about the national literature should define a *before* and an *after*, what should or should not be recovered; what were the topics that had been fatally ignored. For Onetti it was clear: the city, its true theme; for those who grouped themselves around the magazine *Asir*; on the contrary, it would be precisely to go to the encounter of a true “field”.

It was, then, the “dwelling” literature, which could even find its material in the city, which was imbricated in an accurate assessment of the particular, the specific, of the “truly” Uruguayan as a literary theme and, then, it could become “universal.” Martínez (2015) deepens the apparent contradiction of a “fantasy realism” in the literary purpose of Juan María Brausen, alter ego of Onetti. Brausen is also creator of an invisible city in this other reality; and he personifies his dream universe through him. The legacy of this novel, which for Carlos Fuentes (1980) modernizes the genre in Latin America, lies in diluting the frontiers of fiction and truth, in making the real and the fantasy mutually determining.

With the fictitious or real base, the city already for Onetti and for Benedetti constituted a privileged subject from where to build a literature. The “rest of Latin America” seemed incompatible with the key words that previously would have served for “Hispano-America,” and this was an important slip on where to incorporate Uruguayan literature, on what framework of “other” literatures to cut it.

Among others, Benedetti tried to explain, for example, how the “lack” of “Indians” in that day’s enunciation did not make Uruguay a less Latin American country. In the same line, in 1952, the question for the national was for the essayist and literary critic Carlos Real de Azúa a question that, in reality, put in the foreground the tensions between that “modern” and exceptional Uruguay, that one that -as its capital- it turned its back; and “another” Uruguay, the rural one. The tense link

between “rural-city” is evident; here, we could think about the position of the Asir Group and the disagreements with those who wrote in *Número* or *Marcha*, for example; or in a different way, to what extent the city necessarily had to be the center of a new poetics, and not for that (being) less “rooted”, as proposed by Benedetti. The relationship between the “local” and the “international,” as Rodríguez Monegal put it.

In Paraguay, Mansilla (2017) carried out a study in order to characterize the development of Latin American political and cultural essays in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, through which he seeks to explain, through Latin American essays, a response to the lack of recognition of his country within the speeches. Mansilla (2017) exposes how from the first half of the nineteenth century, it is possible to see in the New, or in the Latin American subcontinent, an intellectual tendency that had been preoccupied with investigating political freedom and economic prosperity, but also for national identity, the relationship with the great powers and the establishment of an order based on science and technology, and the configuration of a fair future for their peoples.

To paraphrase Mansilla (2017), the tension between the sphere of pedestrian life of the everyday world and the rational scheme inherited from the colonizing culture has originated intimate reflections on Modernity, which Mansilla calls precocious, by orienting its actions according to the postulates of the Enlightenment and rationalism; that is, according to the aspirations of his time.

Other perspectives and thinkers that are articulated with the understanding of Modernity in Colombia

Boeder (2003), exposes how Heidegger, unlike the abstract self of modern philosophy, conceives humans as “beings in the world,” a concept that does not have a spatial connotation; on the contrary, “Being in the world” means that human beings are participants in a field of relations with things, which are loaded with meaning; so that, fundamentally, objects are not mere extended bodies that lie in a geometric space; to that extent, objectivity is a positioning, a way of seeing and understanding the world. Hilb (2016) also reflects, based on the works of Hannah Arendt, who states that one of the features that more fully defines Modernity is the encounter of the human being with the question

about the foundation of his freedom, and that is in the scope of political relations, the foundation of order and authority can no longer be based on God or nature, and is subject to its processing in the coexistence of men.

Flynn (2008), exposes the thought of Claude Lefort, who argues that modernity has provided us with social philosophies and philosophies of history, but has not engendered any political philosophy. In addition, he abandons the project of transcendence and identity, thereby nullifying his freedom, and man submits to a kind of ideological chain. This idea is exemplified with the German extermination that happened towards 1930, and Berman (1998) exposes in his text *Todo lo sólido se desvanece en el aire* (*Everything that is solid vanishes in the air*), his reflective experience of the Modernity. In the introduction, Berman points out the importance of the environments and modern experiences that cross the boundaries of geography, ethnicity, class, nationality, religion and ideology. It can be said in that sense, following Berman (1998), that Modernity unites all of humanity. Another outstanding idea that Berman points out is that to be modern is to be part of a world in which, as Marx expressed, the solid vanishes in the air. These ideas are the keys that will help us understand his project; the fact that Modernity is lived by everybody; and that given its Marxist approach, the proposed analysis will also become a position in front of the world that surrounds us, that is, in force.

Jarque (2002) states that Stephen Toulmin was one of the most influential thinkers of the last century. The essay “*Cosmopolis*”, on which his dissertation is based, came to light in the year 2001. Toulmin offers us his theory about the beginnings of modern times. The official version used to teach that in the first decades of the seventeenth century, Modernity started with the adoption of rational methods of thought. However, there is a revised point of view that traces the origin to the end of the previous century. For Toulmin, the germ of Modernity were created in the Renaissance. So, it would be Montaigne with his “*Apology*” and not Descartes with the “*Speech of the method*” who gave the ultimatum of exit towards modern philosophy.

Amengual (1998) takes as reference the text *The Wild Thought*, authored by Strauss, published in 1962, in order to develop a characterization of Modernity, a position from which he states that

anthropocentrism is the specific mode of thinking about Modernity, in such way that it defines itself, as the one in which man understands himself as the center of reality, as a subject, as a measure of all things. These qualifications of man represent at the same time an essential characterization of Modernity. In that same sense, the fundamental problems of Modernity are primarily anthropological problems, since this is defined as that period in which man discovers and affirms himself as a point of reference for all reality.

Koselleck (2011), from the Gadamerian intellectual orbit, identifies three concepts that develop in his work as axes that unfold during Modernity. He highlights iconic elements such as the cult of the dead, the century of lights and violent death as an event that legitimizes the unity of political action. Koselleck questions the hope of the beyond, and transposes it to the hope of an earthly future of the community, with which the promise of eternity is temporalized. Finally, he exposes the democratization of death from the image of soldiers fallen in combat, with which this figure becomes a symbol of the entire nation.

López (2004) develops a reflection on the position of Gadamer, where, in dialogue with the Greeks and with the moderns, explains López, Gadamer makes a great effort to overcome Modernity; one of the most relevant points in the discussion arises around the idea of friendship. The author argues that Gadamer forces, through his reflections, to see the man as a self-conscious subject, from the “modern paradigm” that would not allow friendship to be possible, since modernity has its own characteristics: alienation and loneliness. Meanwhile, from the Aristotelian notion, autarky forms the basis for the perfection of friendship. Another element highlighted by López, from the author’s reflections, is the possibility of keeping the dialogue open and alive, because only in this way is it possible to be happy and escape from modern destiny.

Habermas (2008) approaches the concept of modernity, by stating that this is understood as a historical epoch, insofar as it becomes aware as a historical problem with its rupture of the exemplary character of the past, and its need to extract all the normative from itself. Then, the question arises whether the principle of subjectivity and the structure of self-consciousness that underlie it are enough as a source of normative orientations,

if they are enough not only to found science, but also to stabilize a historical formation, which has broken with all the traditional ligatures.

Castro C. D., Castro A. (2013), in their article *Modernity and postmodernity: a current discussion*, develop a reflection on the notions of Modernity and Postmodernity in the West, which was present at the dawn of the 21st century, a time at which it was not yet known if there was a real epochal rupture; or if Postmodernity was nothing else than a fold of Modernity. In some disquisitions, it is glimpsed the idea that Postmodernity is a challenge to modern ideals and axioms, it is a repulsion of the paradigms of Modernity, so that it is shown as a rupture or discontinuity that highlights the crisis of Modernity. Postmodernity, in this line of meaning, is seen as a time of change, as a moment of cultural transformation that marks a distancing from Modernity, and which invites us to think ineluctably in the words of Oscar Wilde; that we live in an epoch of surfaces, in a liquid epoch, in a light epoch.

Sanchez, in his article *Modernity, Modernization and Modernism*, separates each of the terms, in order to strengthen its meaning and field of action; and to emphatically explain that it is not the same meaning, and that in reality there are substantial differences between the terms, concluding that: a typical case of access to modernization is to say the use of science and technology for industry, and consequently, to an advanced development of the productive forces, together with the exaggerated production and consumption of goods as a sign of modernism, which gives cohesion around the possession of objects, but with a precarious modernity in the full use of reason.

Pérez (2016), Zambrano (2017), and Sánchez (2015) converge in affirming that revolutions constitute a central phenomenon in the characterization of modern history, as a transcendent form of political resistance, an exercise in which academic writing has an important role, because it is through it that becomes evident the split between pre-modernity or early modernity, modernity and hypermodernity. In early modernity, writing was intended to account for the constant struggle that the writer was living on a problem of thought. Later, during Modernity, writing is on the side of science and accompanies the role of scientific societies; it also serves as a tool for the research subject, becoming a prominent element on account of the emergence of scientific

journals and the manifestation of thought, events and concepts that make up the history of Modernity, and its configuration and identity in history.

Conclusions

Modernity in the Latin American subcontinent is full of historical paradoxes that define educational systems, politics, architecture and other elements of cultural character, which are children of European modernity and the Enlightenment. Since the beginning of the 19th century, Modernity has been present in the Latin American educational, political and cultural panorama, consolidating a daughter identity option of enlightened modernity that has largely taken its real form under the slogan of “order and progress”.

In Colombia, an amalgam can be read in which elements of the enlightened modernity of the 20th century converge, based on an identity of religious substratum with indigenous and Hispanic elements, which have entered into the logic of modernizing processes, seeking sustenance in the rational (and) illustrated European model, and leading the country to modernizing experiments in a desperate search for Modernity. In fact, it can be said that it is a pseudo-modernity, or a tracing of modernity, taking as reference an eminently European phenomenon that can only be understood from a political and ideological context that is largely foreign to Latin America, a fact that conflicts both the concept of Modernity and the Latin American identity, in which the terms do not necessarily have to be exclusive, because in fact, it is possible to show an imbrication as a product of the same historical process of identity construction and construction of modernity, but differentiating its meaning according to the historical evolution of modernity, with its complexities and its trajectory.

The modernizing intention in Latin America had a prominent echo in the diffidence stimulated by the indigenous and Afro-descendants racial elements, because it was considered that they were not suitable for civilization processes, due to their racial inferiority.

The process of modernization in the Latin American subcontinent is conceived as a historical necessity to repeat the paths traveled by developed societies, with which the educational and thought model is confused with the application of economic policies.

References

- Aguirre, C. (2005). *Para comprender el siglo XXI*. Madrid: El Viejo Topo.
- Almela, H. (2012). *Historia, modernidad y posmodernidad en Venezuela*. Argos, 29(57), 13-29.
- Amengual, G. (1998). *Modernidad y crisis del sujeto*. Andalucía: Caparrós editores.
- Beck, U. (1998). *¿Qué es la globalización? Falacias del globalismo respuestas a la globalización*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Beck, U. (2002). *Libertad o capitalismo. Conversaciones con Johannes Williams*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Beck, U. (2004). *Poder y contrapoder en la era global. La nueva economía mundial*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Benedetti, M. (1951). *Arraigo y evasión en la literatura hispanoamericana. Marcel Proust y otros ensayos*. Montevideo: Número 67-106.
- Berman, M. (1988). *Todo lo sólido se desvanece en el aire*. Bogotá: Siglo XXI.
- Bloch, M. (2003). *La extraña derrota*. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Boeder, H. (2003). *El límite de la modernidad y el legado de Heidegger*. Buenos Aires: Quadrata.
- Espeche, X. (2010). *De una isla a otra: intelectuales uruguayos y América Latina como problema a mediados del siglo XX (1952-1962)*. *Anclajes*, 14(1), 51-72.
- Fazio, V. (2006). *Globalización y relaciones internacionales en el entramado de un naciente tiempo global*. *Análisis Político* 19 (56), 51-71.
- Flynn, B. (2008). *Lefort y lo político*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo Libros Editorial.
- Fuentes, C. (1980). *La nueva novela hispanoamericana*. México: Joaquín Mortiz.
- Garton, T. (1999). *Historia del presente*. Barcelona: Tusquets.

- Giddens, A. (1999). *Consecuencias de la modernidad*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Colombia Aprende. (2015). *Guía para construir estados de arte*. Recuperado de: http://www.colombiaaprende.edu.co/html/investigadores/1609/articles-322806_recurso_1.pdf.
- Habermas, J. (2008). *El discurso filosófico de la modernidad*. Madrid: Katz Editores.
- Hilb, C. (2016). *Abismos de la modernidad. Reflexiones en torno a Hannah Arendt, Claude Lefort y Leo Strauss*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1997). *Historia del siglo XX*. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Jarque, E. (2002). *Experiencia histórica y arte contemporáneo: ensayos de estética y modelos de crítica*. Castilla: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha.
- Koselleck, R. (1993). *Futuro pasado. Para una semántica de los tiempos históricos*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Koselleck, R. (2001). *Los estratos del tiempo. Estudios sobre la historia*. Barcelona, Paidós.
- Koselleck, R. (2011). *Modernidad, culto a la muerte y memoria nacional*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.
- Larraín, J. (2005). *¿América Latina moderna? Globalización e identidad*. Santiago: Lom Ediciones. Leal, A;
- Leal, C.D. (2013). *Modernidad y postmodernidad: una discusión vigente*. *Música Cultura y Pensamiento* 5 (5), 87-97.
- López, A. (2004). *Senderos dialógicos entre antiguos y modernos*. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Mansilla, H. (2017). *La ensayística latinoamericana como filosofía política*. *Revista Ciencia y Cultura*, 21(38), 59-82.
- Martínez, V. (2015). *El humanismo radical de Juan Carlos Onetti*. *Revista de El Colegio de San Luis*, 5(9), 160-179.
- Mejía, J. (2005). *El desarrollo en la sociología en el Perú. Notas introductorias*. *Sociologías, Porto Alegre*, 7 (14), 302-337.
- Oliven, R. (2001). *Cultura e modernidade no Brasil. São Paulo em Perspectiva*, 15(2), 3-12.
- Pérez, L. (2016). *Modernidad, progreso y violencia: algunas claves para un concepto jurídico de revolución*. *Encuentros*, 14(2), 121-139
- Perla, P. (2014). *Un proyecto de modernidad católico: el Ecuador de García Moreno*. *De Raíz Diversa* 1 (2), 155-182.
- Rama, A. (1972). *La generación crítica*. Montevideo: Arca.
- Richard, N. (2003). *Biblioteca Nacional de Chile. Portal de memoria chilena*. <http://www.memoriachilena.cl/602/w3-article-92364.html>.
- Robertson, R. (2000). *Globalización: tiempo-espacio y homogeneidad – heterogeneidad*. *Zona Abierta* 92 y 93, 213-242.
- Rodríguez, E. (1996). *Literatura de medio siglo*. Montevideo: Alfa.
- Sánchez, G. (2015). *Modernidad, modernización y modernismo*. Santiago de Chile: Universidad de Chile.
- Sánchez, P. (2015). *Los conceptos modernos de revolución y progreso. Apuntes para el análisis filosófico-histórico del contexto colombiano de siglo XX: La revolución en marcha (1934-1938)*. *Revista CES Derecho*, 6(2), 121-132.
- Sarlo, B. (1998). *Una modernidad periférica: Buenos Aires, 1920 y 1930*, Buenos Aires: Ediciones Nueva Visión.
- Sánchez, G. (2015). *Modernidad, modernización y modernismo*. Santiago de Chile: Facultad de Filosofía y humanidades. Universidad de Chile.
- Sánchez, P. (2015). *Los conceptos modernos de revolución y progreso. Apuntes para el análisis filosófico-histórico del contexto colombiano de siglo XX: La revolución*

- en marcha (1934-1938). Revista CES Derecho, 6(2), 121-132
- Sarló, B. (1998). Una modernidad periférica. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Nueva Visión.
- Sauvage, P.(1998). Una historia del tiempo presente. Historia Crítica (17) , 59-70.
- Senkman. L. (2015). Etnicidad e inmigración durante el primer peronismo. Estudios Interdisciplinarios de América Latina y el Caribe 3(2), 25-32.
- Soruco, X. (2015). Patria y modernidad en Carlos Medinaceli. Estudios Bolivianos 22, 123-138. Recuperado de: <http://www.revistasbolivianas.org.bo/scielo.php?script=sci_arttex-t&pid=S2078-03622015000100007&l-ng=es&nrm=iso>.
- Therborn. G. (1999). Europa hacia el siglo XXI. México: Siglo XXI.
- Tomlinson. J. (2001). Globalización y cultura. México: Oxford University Press.
- Vilar. P. (1999). Iniciación al vocabulario del análisis histórico. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Zambrano, A. (2017). Gobernanza de la escritura: la escisión entre modernidad e hipermodernidad “la cita y el paréntesis”. Praxis y Saber, 8 (16), 205-224.