THE BANISHMENT DISCOURSE AND THE WESTERN MACHINE OF MAKING BARBARIANS

O DISCURSO DO DESTERRO E A MÁQUINA OCIDENTAL DE FAZER BÁRBAROS

EL DISCURSO DEL BANIMENTO Y LA MÁQUINA OCCIDENTAL PARA HACER LOS BÁRBAROS

Luis Gustavo Cardoso
PhD in Law
Institution: Universidade Federal do Paraná
Address: Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil
E-mail: prof.luisgustavocardoso@gmail.com
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9388-0689

Katya Kozicki
PhD in Law
Institution: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina
Address: Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil
E-mail: katyakozicki@gmail.com
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2388-0499

ABSTRACT
This article presents an interdisciplinary analysis of the banishment discourse in the Western world during the Classical Greek antiquity (8th century B.C. to the 4th century B.C.) from a narrative and historical, theoretical perspective. The text presented here is also marked by its authors' Brazilian nationality and legal tradition, considering that the local and actual legal institutes reveal an unequivocal bond to the ancient tradition. Focusing on the legal institutes of extradition, deportation, expulsion, and surrender, this study inquires the moral and political effects of banishment as a critical concept of international law and political life. The analytical method resorts on a case-by-case basis to historical narrative and interpretation of the consequences of displacement. It hypothesizes that the banishment discourse produces a division between a We and an Other and eventually irrupts social rupture and exile. This research proposes a broader and historical view of international law while employing the theoretical tool of auditorium, created by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca. Thence concludes that the discourse of banishment is responsible for making the so-called barbarians in the Western imaginary, which works as a device and a fundamental argument for a permanent distinction towards the foreign one.
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RESUMO
Este artigo apresenta uma análise interdisciplinar do discurso de banimento no mundo ocidental durante a antiguidade clássica grega (desde o século VIII a.C. ao século IV a.C.)
a partir de uma perspectiva teórica narrativa e histórica. O texto aqui apresentado também é marcado pela nacionalidade e tradição jurídica brasileira de seus autores, tendo em vista que os institutos jurídicos locais e atuais revelam um vínculo inequívoco com a tradição milenar. Centrando-se nos institutos legais de extradição, deportação, expulsão e entrega, este estudo investiga os efeitos morais e políticos do banimento como um conceito crítico do direito internacional e da vida política. O método analítico recorre caso a caso à narrativa histórica e à interpretação das consequências do deslocamento. Levanta-se a hipótese de que o discurso do banimento produz uma divisão entre um Nós e um Outro e eventualmente provoca ruptura social e exílio. Esta pesquisa propõe uma visão mais ampla e histórica do direito internacional ao utilizar a ferramenta teórica do auditório, criada por Perelman e Olbrechts-Tyteca (2000). Conclui-se daí que o discurso do banimento é responsável por tornar os chamados bárbaros no imaginário ocidental, o que funciona como dispositivo e argumento fundamental para uma distinção permanente em relação ao estrangeiro.

**Palavras-chave:** exílio, desterro, bárbaros, extradição, auditório.

**RESUMEN**
Este artículo presenta un análisis interdisciplinario del discurso del destierro en el mundo occidental durante la antigüedad clásica griega (desde el siglo VIII a.C. hasta el siglo IV a.C.) desde una perspectiva teórica histórica y narrativa. El texto aquí presentado también está marcado por la nacionalidad y la tradición jurídica brasileña de sus autores, considerando que las instituciones jurídicas locales y actuales revelan un vínculo inequívoco con la tradición antigua. Centrándose en las instituciones legales de extradición, deportación, expulsión y entrega, este estudio investiga los efectos morales y políticos del destierro como concepto crítico en el derecho internacional y la vida política. El método analítico implica la narrativa histórica y la interpretación de las consecuencias del desplazamiento caso por caso. La hipótesis es que el discurso del exilio produce una división entre nosotros y el Otro y eventualmente desemboca en ruptura social y exilio. Esta investigación propone una visión más amplia e histórica del derecho internacional utilizando las herramientas teóricas de la audiencia, desarrolladas por Perelman y Olbrechts-Tyteca (2000). Se concluye que el discurso del destierro es responsable de transformar a los bárbaros en el imaginario occidental, o que funciona como dispositivo y argumento fundamental para una distinción permanente en las relaciones exteriores.

**Palabras clave:** exilio, bárbaros, extradición, auditorio.

Why this sudden bewilderment, this confusion?
(How serious people's faces have become.)
Why are the streets and squares emptying so rapidly,
everyone going home lost in thought?

Because night has fallen and the barbarians haven’t come.
And some of our men just in from the border say
there are no barbarians any longer.
1 INTRODUCTION

It is not uncommon for the news to bring up cases in which the legal institutes of extradition, expulsion, surrender, and deportation appear as a political problem involving relations between states and, even more, differences of national identity that are difficult to unravel only under the legal prism. Therefore, analytical tools born in other fields of knowledge, such as political philosophy, sociology, and anthropology, enter the scene to favor a possible solution capable of producing at least conciliatory effects in political life. Behind the normative surface, in the background of jurisdic- tional competence and normative competition, there is life itself, the dynamics of acceptance of refugees, asylum seekers, and immigrants. In more hegemonical regions, such as North America and Western Europe – for South America, Brazil – political, social, and economic resistances are still affirmed despite well-settled conventions and firm jurisprudence. In some cases, resistance wears ethnic repudiation and promotes serious conflicts in civilian life.

In the broader picture of foreign affairs, one may find a profound change in the notions of space and economy reconfigured by communications and the new division of labor on a global scale. In this context, there is the individual whose characteristics become increasingly higher at the transnational level for two main reasons. First, in most cases, due to the spaces conflicted by scarcity, armed dispute, climatic and environmental upheavals, and ethnic, political, and religious persecution. Second, not so explicitly, as a means of social ascension or spatial replacement of the workforce to leverage individuals through social or financial capital through contexts beyond their country's administrative and legal borders.

This shift in relations is the immediate and mediate cause of legal conflicts in the private sphere since the circulation of people, companies, and goods only increases. However, there is no stanza of life where these effects emerge more sensitively than in migration. The passage and entry of individuals and groups searching for better living conditions provokes the most diverse reactions everywhere and raises age-old questions.
from the past, such as armed conflicts, disputes over energy sources, financial debts, and religious disagreements. But the most significant repercussion here is xenophobia.

The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines xenophobia as "fear and hatred of strangers or foreigners or anything strange or foreign." Its etymology indicates a feeling of aversion to foreigners. Foreigners are outsiders who do not share the same traditions as those who enunciate this concept.

This political disturbance associated with a linguistic distinction between East and West has deep, entrenched roots. Moreover, Orientalism’s discourse is an analytical tool of high sophistication that modernity has fabricated to justify interventions in the Near and Middle East. However, personal issues concerning individuals' mobility remain at the international level. For example, better economic conditions in the Eurozone make economically well-positioned countries, such as Germany and France, the scene of a secular dispute between outsiders and insiders, mobilizing old discourses of ethnic repudiation and hatred. In North America and Brazil, these speeches also arise dressed in a different tone and decide the fate of millions of immigrants’ everyday lives.

Therefore, the idea of a foreigner relates to ancient notions of social and political identification. This word somehow links to expulsion in its semantic field, which goes back to the old idea of banishment or exile. The discourse accompanying the concept is old too. The rivalry between Westerners and Persians, Westerners, Muslims, Westerners, and Arabs is not new. The modern Western record of repudiation of the Saracens dates from the Battle of Lepanto in 1571. Western literature seems to associate irrationality with Easterners and attribute the reason for the state to itself. The most curious references can be found in Montesquieu's Persian Letters. The sultan and shah are seen as irrational

---

1 The same entry at the Merriam-Webster continues: “If you look back to the ancient Greek terms that underlie the word xenophobia, you'll discover that xenophobic individuals are literally "stranger fearing." Xenophobia, that elegant-sounding name for an aversion to persons unfamiliar, ultimately derives from two Greek terms: xenos, which can be translated as either "stranger" or "guest," and phobos, which means either "fear" or "flight." Phobos is the ultimate source of all English -phobia terms, but many of those were actually coined in English or New Latin using the combining form -phobia (which traces back to phobos). Xenophobia itself came to us by way of New Latin and first appeared in print in English in the late 19th century". Last access on May 13th, 2024: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/xenophobia
and cruel leaders. The literature attributes the extension of their reign and vassals to the foreign government. The same literature used those to define foreigners from the point of view of Orientalism. In these cases, the idea of barbarism helps to identify the other as a born enemy.

The same speech signs as their origins are far backward. Exile, which is associated with military campaigns, invasions, conquests, and wars, is a concept that operates, above all, a dualistic and often polarized notion of one and the other. There is an ethnological sense proper for ancient societies. Its strength, however, extends to more recent cultural contexts and, resized by institutions as in the Greek case, gives another configuration between the sustained relationship between subjects.

Data on the economic and cultural dynamics of non-national groups, such as income per capita, political regime, and consumption habits in the country of origin, would allow us to infer a relationship between the new division of social work and possible destinations chosen by emigrants. This observation has severe consequences. From a legal perspective, it evokes the possible and potential civil, administrative, labor, and even criminal disputes, which the international order has already been able to arrange with some correctness and competent legal support. Examples include international organizations, including the United Nations, and their respective specialized bodies, such as the International Labor Organization. These normative bodies have the scope to rule the conduct of countries and international actors concerning the reception of foreigners in any country that has ratified treaties on these topics. However, the legal institutes of expulsion and extradition, subject to sovereign legislation and jurisdiction, produce ambiguities that sometimes alienate them and bring them closer to exile because of their internal dynamics.

In the Brazilian case, extradition has not served as an instrument of repudiation and non-recognition. In recent history, this has not prevented nor stopped a certain feeling of estrangement from the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries immigrants who migrated to Brazil from Europe and Asia in search of better living and working conditions. Not to mention slavery, which would raise an even more extensive debate. However, the institute has had an apparent political connotation, serving as a regulating instrument of Brazilian foreign policy interests in the most different contexts. Two examples need to be mentioned here:
the case of Olga Prestes, extradited by President Getúlio Vargas's government at the request of the Third Reich in Germany, and the recent case of Cesare Battisti, who was extradited.  

The expulsion, carried out through an administrative procedure under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Justice, has as a requirement to report the danger to public order and national security. International law rules the impossibility of applying expulsion to nationals. In the case of a foreign individual, expulsion finds its revocation only at the will of the issuing state. In Brazil, the expelled person's return to the national territory without the consent of the State finds a penalty provided for in Article 338 of the Criminal Code:

The foreigner who has been expelled from the country [Brazil] and re-enters into [the Brazilian] national territory:
Penalty: imprisonment, from one to four years, without prejudice to further expulsion after serving a sentence.

Countries' extradition and expulsion procedures observe domestic legislation and ratified treaties. Moreover, they send messages to the international community. There are also very relevant developments here since the intended message has a) an institutional and formal character, whose object is the relationship between the state and the international system, and b) a social and material character without the need for an immediate object but which is, unless mistaken, even more, essential for our analysis because it is he who is responsible for the dynamics of the country's individuals, culture, and social organization concerning the reception of foreigners regarding the construction of the binomial self-identity versus someone else's identity.

As Brazil serves this article both as geopolitical and legal tradition perspective, the readers educated under (or in) their nomos should recognize that Brazilian Bildung, like any other, is as heterodox and complex as possible. It provides a rich cultural mosaic based on indigenous, African, European, Arabic, and Asiatic legacies. The Brazilian

---

5 (2018) The final decision was delivered by the Brazilian Supreme Court in the Reclamation 29.066 and preventive prison for the Extradition 891, held by the Justice Luiz Fux, in December the 12th, 2018. See the whole decision here: http://www.stf.jus.br/arquivo/cms/noticiaNoticiaStf/anexo/Rcl29066ePPE891_decisaoLF.pdf

national individual's social institutions formalized law and based on the daily norm of interactive relations, are also European, indigenous, African, Arabic, and Asiatic. Their machine of thinking, understanding, listening, speaking, and writing, oiled by time, is similar to this. However, their political institutions, made up of buildings and laws, are strictly Western and evoke their Western origins at all times. This is the meaning of what only finds complete understanding if the observers stretch to appreciate their Mediterranean ancestors.

The normative perspective puts forth a specific and essential topic: the legitimization of the discourse that constitutes the concept of foreigners and exile, which builds itself to target the auditorium of the city that expels a person from and its surroundings. This is a place where other rules prevail over norms, different customs, and according to more radical readings, where barbarism prevails. There is a connection between political institutions and the auditorium, that they are, or should be, a place of representation; such a link is responsible, in the legal set, for the formal and material legitimization of the rules. Let us look carefully at our practices regarding the meaning we attribute to them. We can perceive the reproduction of ancient schemes of distinction from the other and have a unique way of recognizing our place in the world. This shape leaves traces and signs and acts in history as a continuous motif, constantly reminding us of our specific origins of ours.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

πας μη Ελλην βαρβαρος

Regarding the nature of the contracts between barbarians, ancient Greek citizens said they had no value in Hellenic land. Furthermore, they did not even touch the staircases of the Delphic oracle. "For the barbarians," the Hecatombs of the Aegean or the fighting of the aristói, which were the aristocratic chosen ones, would make no historical or legal sense. The legal contract's strength refers to a sense of belonging

7 Hellenic proverb: “who is not Greek is barbaric.”
8 Aristói is a term that designates Greek aristocrats, a prominent social class, of subjects educated in the political and sports arts.
beyond the mere order of Greek *poleis* laws.\(^9\) For average Greek citizens, that sentiment referred to a complex and sophisticated cognitive-linguistic apparatus responsible for attributing or being a framework where meaningful attributions are sought for each city citizen.

This network of meta-legal strength was expressed in the very life of the Hellenics: war, games, sacrifices, banquets. That unity sentiment guaranteed an environment favorable to the circulation of common values through homogenous signs and emblems. However, it did not fail to present singularities and even accounted for special effects in the legal sphere. In public life, which the Greeks handled with grace, the plays targeted the closest people, and in the *odeon*\(^{10}\), the *teorein* was made. The choir, through the refrains, and the actors, through the speeches, made a personal tragedy in the staged tragedy. On the route between Thebes and Corinth and the battle of Antigone and Creon, Oedipus’s unfortunate fate passed on messages on the affirmation of a determined ethos, which found resonance far beyond the arena and was capable of entering every Greek home. There could be no better *auditoriums*. People were raised speaking the same language, practicing the same religion at local festivals, and recognizing the same *agogê* traditions.\(^{11}\) If one of us faced an arduous journey in space and time, what would he have to say?

Homer's *Iliad* immortalized the story of Hector,\(^{12}\) whose corpse waited nights before being buried in his native soil when Achilles took his body to the beaches of Troy. It does not differ from Antigone's dilemma, whose brother suffered the rejection of Creon\(^{13}\) and sustained the fortune of not being buried in the city he was born. However, we are not immediately concerned with the debate on natural law. We are interested in the idea of banishment: the most significant punishment that was given in the penalty of ostracism, exile, isolation, non-recognition, and perhaps the very lack of characterization by a subject’s group, which was the effect of transgression that broke the bond between a

---

\(^9\) *Poleis* is the term used to describe the ancient Greek city-states. The term was received by the languages of the Latin trunk and is widely used in Portuguese.

\(^{10}\) Arena of the Greek theatre.

\(^{11}\) Name given to pedagogy for young Greeks.

\(^{12}\) We speak of Hector, in Homer's *Iliad*, but we could also deal with Aeneas, in Virgil's *Aeneid*, who, although not killed in battle, was condemned to permanent exile from a no longer existing Troy.

\(^{13}\) This is the *Antigone* tragedy, part of Sophocles’ Theban trilogy.
person and the city. As an antinomic and yet semantic correspondent, we have the idea of belonging, which constitutes the strength of the chain of transmission of local values and a point of most significant fragility. The Greek theatre skillfully plays with the concepts of belonging and banishment because the tragedy's function corresponds, in real life, to a specific form of social organization and positioning of these two concepts that contain political practices. It would not be inadequate to infer that this form of composition occurs precisely through observation: it detaches itself from reality to reorganize itself in the field of fiction and reach, in the education of the arenas, the Greek auditorium. The composition of this auditorium defines a figure that operates adhesion, or opposition, between positions in the Greek world. It is responsible for dividing or adding two parts to the debate. According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, the auditorium study could also “constitute a sociology chapter since, more than his character, a man's opinions depend on his social environment, circle, the people he surrounds himself with, and with whom he lives. [...] Each medium could be characterized by its dominant opinions, undisputed convictions, and the premises it accepts without hesitation; such conceptions are part of their culture.”

We are, therefore, facing a significant problem, which is the existence of a normative apparatus skillfully linked between the subjects. We also experience the repetition of specific social issues: desertion, defeat, and exile. There's the belonging behind the ban, which is an antinomic and potentially equivalent term. The process of mischaracterization of the one who belonged and no longer belongs. This characterization leads to the gradual and no less violent transformation of an individual into a barbarian—the composition of the auditorium as a foundation and a repeated consequence of isolation practices. These elements constitute a sequence of actions whose social origin is not

---

14 It is interesting to think, here, of ostracism as something positive for those who achieved it, from the point of view of parresía (frankness and rhetorical security): speaking the truth in democracy meant winning enemies and, consequently, running the risk of having the name voted on ostraka (ceramic pieces from the Hellenic period); see the example of Cimon and Themistocles; if you take Demosthenes' speeches in the Philippi, for example, we see him exalting the one who has the courage to challenge the democratic leaders by speaking the truth, even though he knows he can be killed or ostracized. Michel Foucault devoted himself to the theme in his last class at the Collège de France, published as La Courage de La Verité (The Courage of Truth). See Foucault, Michel. A coragem da verdade: o governo de si e dos outros II. Curso no Collège de France (1983-1984). Tradução de Eduardo Brandão. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2001.
15 See Perelman’s and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s Treaty on argumentation (2000).
fragmented but brought together under the continuum of social identity. In practice, they refer to a specific way of conveying values and norms. Furthermore, they are responsible for deciding what is inside and outside. If we were facing a less complex society of tribal organization, we would say that a primitive reaction of social organization is responsible for guaranteeing the prominence of the place where the discourse originates over the place where this discourse creates ethnic differentiation.

Although it deals with Greeks, this scheme does not suffer from decisive disruptions. There is a noisy relationship between whoever sends and receives the message, configured unevenly, with a progressive advantage for the sending center. This relationship, which occurs internally and bilaterally, becomes a regional problem in transcending the notion of space to which belonging and banning relate with the continuation of conflicts and the repetition of diplomatic disagreements. When relations are no longer just bilateral but become multilateral, the political and legal confrontation is not the same. For example, for the ancient Greeks at the discursive level, it is also a matter of designating “one of us” and the others, the barbarians. What are the effects on the validity of the standards of such a framework? How does the argumentation theory address legitimizing the discourse when the situation expands and becomes even more complex?

Administrative resources promoted the distinction between fellow citizens and foreigners and political and social ones. Perhaps for us, the most famous case is when Dario I and Xerxes took on the Hellenes, which mobilized the Attic peninsula and gave rise to a confederation between the Greek poleis. The account of barbarism would spread in the oral tradition first a) as a form of local affirmation of the transmitted values and identity of complete function that was responsible for deciding the place and the role of the Greeks and b) as a way of identifying the other and the consequent reaction in the form of repulsion of Greek territory and history. What effects would not have the tales created to stigmatize the enemy with the worst mistakes? Even after the conflict ended, such reports would remain popular mainstream references and constituted a codex of examples, jurisprudence, and solutions to future disputes. Failure to recognize the policy of the other, administration of the other, and right of the other has the most severe implications because it universalizes the place and leaves only the secret place and lack
of identity for the rest of the individuals and groups.

The disparity between the two sides, a relationship of cultural, social, and political subordination designated at the discursive level, presents a contrast of auditorium and immense, insurmountable difficulty in communication. Interestingly, the same was not true among the Greeks when they fought with each other and sought territorial and tax expansion. Unless mistaken, the most reasonable explanation for this is the very high degree of communication between individuals, which is undoubtedly favored by elements of a culture that saw war as a necessity. This was a vector of immanence among the Greek citizens, making it possible to be put in the social context. A Theban citizen is a foreigner in Athens. In other words, the problem of barbarism arises between Hellenists and non-Hellenists, but the status of citizenship, which puts opposing poles between Eupatrids and foreigners, differentiated Greeks from Greeks. It was not because of conflicts, victory, and consequent defeat on either side of history that ordinary Greeks' most sacred offal and practices were despised. The difference cannot be significant to the Persians because the worst defamation came from the Greeks. However, the question remains whether those defamation acts amounted to mere cultural repudiation or whether they extended to a lack of understanding given the diversity of the repertoire of emblems and signs provided on each side.

However, this repulsion vector did not manifest itself with the same strength among the Persians. Even among the more diverse ethnic groups surrounding Greek lands, the feeling of distinction was not so eloquent. Macedonians who placed themselves on top of the Attic peninsula until the strip of the Near East extended even to the Indies to conquer it knew how to deal with the difference between audiences in the political, social, and cultural planes, but all were in favor of the better administration of the Empire. In practice, it was a matter of preserving the most diversified audiences that could organize the permanence of the local use of the most skillful modes of production, social cohesion, and local reverence for the general administration internally and availability spaces that favor effective communication between different places and groups externally, providing cohesion in the broader framework of Macedonian domination.

Reports show that Alexander the Great undertook efforts to preserve dialogue between different practices possible in the extension of the Empire. He endeavored to
understand the unique dynamics of each of them. The emperor promoted legal and administrative planning never been seen before, which had consequences for both the inside and outside of his Empire. Such effects did not stop at the effectiveness of communications, transport, and merchandising. Far beyond what was visible, they infiltrated the subjects’ lives and shaped the nature of inter-ethnic social relations, making new combinations favorable at all levels. It was to encourage the permanence of values and promote, in the structural ground, unique arrangements that better modulate the new structure of the Empire. On the other hand, it is good to remember that Alexander was a pioneer in thinking of a monetary and linguistic unit. He was the first to put his image on the effigy of the coins to be recognized in his Empire, and, mainly, this is what led to the idea of a universal language: koine.  

Furthermore, it was also an opportunity to legitimize one's domination through the discourse of tolerance, which in parallel followed the transformation of values as something positive. These two lines of force set the stage for a parity relationship between the auditoriums subordinate to the emperor’s command. They meant a singular and, in some ways, an arbitrary kind of equity established from the top down but which successfully maintained the order and functioning of political institutions. Here, another force, the power to rule, reveals itself. How extensive is this power in the face of the most common aspects of Hellenic legality? What is the quality of the command in front of such a diverse and complex panel? How is it legitimized?

16 Regarding this scene on Alexander the Great, see the excellent article *O Diálogo e a Intercomunicabilidade entre Culturas: Raimundo Lulo e a Oportunidade Perdida*, (2004, p. 25-32) – The Dialogue and Incommunicability between Cultures: Raimundo Lulo and the Lost Opportunity -, by the Brazilian philosopher Plínio Fernandes Toledo, in which the author resumes a short story on Alexander told by Jorge Luis Borges. Both authors deal with the coexistence of individual trajectories between East and West, as avatars capable of merging these two universes' cultural, social, and political aspects.
3 THE POWER OF COMMAND, THE BANISHMENT, AND THE BANISHED

It is certain that, just by force, Alexandrian majestic makings would not be viable. It was necessary to guarantee domination by mobilizing the least possible reaction on the enemy’s side. Here is the Alexandrian thesis: in cultures that receive an external attack and begin to see themselves as subordinate, given the risk of losing their political and social autonomy, the tendency is strong resistance in the face of the conqueror. In this sense, the conquered tend to resist a culture different from their own. Not being threatened, the conqueror expands his territory and administration without more significant efforts at cultural domination because the dominance he has, combined with force, can impose fear and order immediately. At first, he is not concerned with expressing his traditions' role and setting it. After all, that is not the purpose of his political action, whose long-term effectiveness will depend much more on the use of strength than on cultural assimilation by the other dominated.

Returning to Alexander's case, his education is based on considering the discursive level between interlocutors. Perhaps the philosopher Aristotle passed him into a categorizing and systematizing tendency. After all, the sense of otherness that, before any other element, except for better judgment, is responsible for favoring an equal relationship between the observer and the observed object. This more tolerant construction of discourse also appeared in political practice in the administration of the Empire. On the other hand, let us remember that Alexander was not so forgiving. One of his favorite practices was crucifying those who did not accept to submit - see the siege of Tire.

For what purpose would banishment be promoted if all discursive possibilities were accepted in the Empire as subordinates to the emperor’s supreme command? Therefore, we have two moments worth observing: education and the circumstances that favored Alexander to push banishment from standard practice. However, this was not a common practice among the ancients around the Mediterranean, for whom the ban remained the most serious of immediate effects for the ban. What, then, was an exile?

Anyone walking through the cities bordering the Mediterranean in the 5th century B.C. would find scattered settlements and difficulty in communication. The rocky, abrupt
geography, diversity of languages and dialects, precarious monetary situation, administrative confusion in the division of properties, and often different religious cults and norms in each corner could only make life difficult for the traveler. If our anthropologist decided to climb the Greek or Italic cliffs, even though he noted the differences we have just mentioned, he would also notice some similarities. A man wrapped in a tunic, his face covered in totally miserable ways, denotes the burden of poverty and a rupture of his original context. From the Maghreb to the Balkan regions, our anthropologists would often find the figure of the banished person. They constitute a well-defined social type characterized in such a manner as to be rejected. Because of this, it is unnecessary to speak of his social function: physically expelled from the territory of legality, from the jurisdiction - if one can say so - of his own, they are definitely outside the system of social exchanges in which they have grown up. They no longer have a role to play among their own since they could reorganize themselves and even suppress the initial function of the banned one. Nor will appeals come forward: the auditorium is not the same, adherence to their speech no longer exists, and the network of norms, which supported him, no longer applies to them.

This singular form of condemnation was not only given to transgressors of the norm. Patients who offered the risk of contagion, like those contaminated with leprosy, were also removed from the cities towards exile. The deserters' transgressions were serious and indicated the non-recognition by the positive hemisphere of the beliefs (constituted by the city of which he had deserted). In the moral plane, the family dishonor added severe effects on the family in the administrative dimension. What was at stake was a change in the speech of those who would be banned, a change that transcended prose communication and manifested itself, even more strongly, in daily practices and recognition of the current rule.

The Greek case is of specific interest because of two factors. First, relevant sources travel through millennia, based on Sophocles' plays, frescoes, and utensils. In addition, the extensive critical bibliography was in the most diverse areas of knowledge, such as literary theory, anthropology, ancient history, and art history. Second, the degree or intensity of the permanence of Greek values in Western institutions, given by the symbolic system current between us and by the same administrative institutions that
crossed the Roman Empire, were translated into Latin and finally reached the present
time. The specifics of exile among Greek citizens are concepts we continue to convey:
theory, xenophobia, norms, and ethics.

As a legal institute based on traditions, exile was a radical and not unusual reason
that it had phases, well-marked stages, which we now analyze. Those who are banished
receive stigma from their own. Suppose one of the individual’s crowning elements is
successful in the saga imposed on them, either by their own will or under the
circumstances. In this case, it is necessary to observe the relationship between the
elements of the saga that constitute common cultural values.

In general, the hero's trajectory builds up the exaltation of their values; moreover,
the imposition of a transformation indicates, at the individual level, psychological
progression and, at the social level, the recognition of his new status. In the case of the
ban, we could think of an inversion of this scheme. The confrontation of norms assumed
by the collective spirit promotes upside-down recognition. The subject who previously
participated in the usual circle of social activities became a transgressor of a specific
element and the set of models that give meaning to the society they belong to.

When deserting, moving in defense of another polis, and adopting habits and
practices different from their confessions and rituals, the individual resembles the
auditorium as an adept of foreign and barbaric things. Therefore, there is a clear
relationship between the composition of the subject's identity, given by the repertoire of
their practices, and the design of the group's identity provided by the general rules in
force. The transformation that occurs in this individual pushes him to the opposing
hemisphere of the social relations that involve him in the city. This transformation drives
individuals away and results in their total exclusion of the environment in which they live.
The link between individual and collaborative practices of traditions and norms looks
pretty evident. The subject's permanence requires complete adherence to the values
conveyed. This homogeneous group does not want intercultural dialogue. On the
contrary, it is exclusive and self-affirmative; its acceptance of possibilities only foresee
movement within the circle of codes, values, norms, etc.

Likewise, exile relates to the exiled figure strictly, which reveals the binding and
unique character of this institute: a) It exists with only one motive, the exile, which can
be for many reasons, such as defection, transgression, contagion. b) It exists for one purpose only, which is the exclusion of the transgressor. The values' preservation needs, penalizing character of banishment, and, above all, the realization of a deep-seated feeling of identity and estrangement from the other remain. The individuals' clothes are stripped of them in the city-state, and their new clothes are barbaric. The auditorium denies the individuals their original credit, their latest debt is a title everywhere refused, and that cannot be paid. The permanence in the social circle and maintenance of social bonds, marriages, places of prominence in the family, and even political places are no longer possible and represent irreparable loss. It is better for an ancient Greek citizen to die in the city than to spend outside it. Therefore, the condition of permanence undergoes a radical change and becomes a condition of passage through other places. Thus, a banished person becomes a wanderer.17

The social rupture in exile has another discursive break at the bottom that is responsible for tacitly saying that the city and exiled interlocutors no longer communicate as before. This information needs more careful analysis and is not subject to universalization. The exiled remain in possession of the traditions in which they have grown, and they are aware of their calendars and rites and know, as before, which protocols and rules govern daily life. However, the practice of diverse conduct, easily identified within the community they live, signifies the detachment he promotes concerning the general auditorium. The content and form of their speech take another position, which, with very little, is highlighted and makes the subject disagree entirely with the environment in which they live. The explanation is not complicated. Inside homogeneous environments, heterodoxy stands out and is not well regarded. It does not matter that the exiled repent, either by opportunity or independently. What is essential is the symbolic act of the rupture, which produces for them and the city undeniable and definitive effects.

17 Regarding ostracism, consider that opponents of democracy – Demosthenes, and Plato, for example - defying the hypocrisy of the majority by exposing the vices of politics in the “people's polis” was a virtue. Being ostracized or killed for it was seen as a good thing. Let us regard a specific interpretation introduced by Michel Foucault in his text mentioned above: frank speech, parresía, does not fit in democracy because it leads to exile or death. Therefore, parresía should be directed not to others, not to “the care of others,” but instead to oneself, as an exercise of self-care. It is also good to remember that ostracism, at least practiced in Athens, lasted ten years, and was a limited condemnation.
There is still a considerable effect here. In the land of speakers, interactions are grounded on the word with great force. The oral transmission of traditions accompanies the practice of verbal contracts in private life. In public life, the norms helped the list of daily cases that, in the end, comprised proper jurisprudence in a sense close to what we attribute to it today. Thus, exile is also related to private life with a definitive cut in interactions and the annulment of duties and obligations hitherto current. Eventually, the auditorium turns its back on the banished person and seals the end of their citizenship.

The conversion characteristic, or the locking down, of the ancient Greek auditorium in the face of the person who expressed defiance of the city's nomos through practices or discourse. The non-recognition of the established norm applies to the individual, but it also applies to states outside the discursive axis and practices different norms. It does not matter whether they are Persians, Arabs, or Indo-Asians. Above all, according to the establishment, they are barbarians and cannot exercise the Greek spirit based on this premise. A keen sense of prominence in the field of knowledge is reflected in the projection, a little and sometimes very idealized, of corresponding importance in the political and legal areas. After all, not all campaigns were won by Hellenists. On the contrary, Jean-Pierre Vernant's classics and more recent studies prove a profuse symbiosis among cultures around the Mediterranean of Antiquity. Above all, what matters to us is the strength of the discourse because it has been transferred to our Western political and legal standards and is still the mainstay of legitimation on the outer plane of interventions and the inner dimension of identification West. Opposition remains our way of knowing who we are and where we are.

4 CONCLUSION

This work describes a path around the exile’s institute, whose political and legal dimensions reflect Classical Greek antiquity. Therefore, it addressed the historical circumstances that formed the category of ostracism. It projected the institute of the exile as a specific section along with its possible motivations and consequences for the group and the banned and concentrated his analysis on it.

This article considers primary sources to realize the task. These sources join the
registration and inscription on frescoes and ancient textual support. It also finds secondary sources, which combine specific reports about the exile. Eventually, this text recollects a minimal pair of works reflecting the old Greek way of life in what it has of intersection, border, and inherent heritage, which our legal institutions of banishment infiltrate.

Although the ban on nationals is prohibited mainly by the international order and even by national regulations, as in the Brazilian case, the exile’s motivations and political and moral effects still surround the modalities of excluding foreigners from sovereign territories. While it is true that international law and international politics have restricted the apathy and expulsion of nationals, on the other hand, they continue to re-signify the relationship between those who are inside and those who are outside. On the contrary, modern society has created collateral devices of social distinction that reaffirm and make the mechanisms of exclusion abroad more sophisticated. There remains a more profound level of political and normative life to change, which is discourse.

In the most political sense of the pronoun “us,” the barbarians are the other. However, barbarians are only in the discourse, which is the structuring element of a particular Western imagination. The discursive machine produced the division between national and foreign and western and eastern, whose terms of operation stand out in a specific language that dates to Classical Greek antiquity. Another endeavor hypothesizes that discourse is updated in successive approximations between the different worldviews that crossed the Mediterranean until the end of the pre-modern period.

This article focuses on the effects of the discourse of banishment from a specific theoretical tool, the auditorium, inscribed in the work of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca. The persons subjected to internal jurisdiction were expelled from the city and sentenced to return ten years after the sentence or never again and faced severe changes in the relationship with those who remained in the town. That emptied a person's moral quota. The gesture of expulsion from the city casts a negative impression on expelled persons. It makes them someone to whom no more legal or jurisdictional protection is attributed, neither personal nor territorial. There is no more possible auditorium for the banished, and the city can no longer hear them.
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