

PANORAMA

Lúcio Álvaro Marques

PERSPECTIVES ON BRAZILIAN PHILOSOPHY IN THE LAST CENTURY

Evaluating the history of the evolution of philosophical ideas in a century is as difficult and risky a task as it is thought-provoking. Difficult, because of the risk of committing historical lapses, and risky if we think about how important the last hundred years have been in the history of Brazil. By way of example, here are some of the main milestones between 1900 and 2000 [IBGE n.d.b; n.d.a; n.d.c]: (i) the population grew from 17.8 million to 175.9 million; (ii) the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) grew from 5.1 million to 665.4 million dollars; (iii) the illiteracy rate fell from 65.3 to 13.5% of the population. To update the information to 2023, I bring you these figures: the population is 214 million people; the GDP is estimated at 2.081 trillion dollars; and illiteracy still stands at 5.6% of the population. In 1900, Brazil had 24 institutions of higher education, most of which were denominational or private. In 2000, there were 1,180 public and private institutions offering 11,019 degrees courses [Neves, Martins 2016; INEP 2021]. In 2021, Brazil had 2,574 higher education institutions, of which 2,261 were private and 313 were public [Instituto SEMESP 2023: 10].

This information gives an idea of the social, political and economic revolution that Brazil has experienced in the last century. That's why I'll return to two elements: one relating to rural and urban housing, and the other to political crises. In 1940, 31% of the Brazilian population lived in urban areas; in 2000, this percentage reached 81.3%; and in 2017, the percentage was 84.3% of the population concentrated in an area of 0.63% of the national territory [EMBRAPA 2017], which indicates an acceleration of the rural exodus not always accompanied by adequate resettlement within the urban space. In terms of political history, republican Brazil came into being on 15 November 1889, and the First Republic lasted until 1930. The advent of the Vargas Era was marked by the Provisional Government between 1930 and 1934 within the debate of national constitutionalism, which was broken up in 1937, giving way to the Vargas dictatorship or *Estado Novo* until 1945. In 1946, a new constitution was granted, including direct elections. However, there was no end to coup attempts until 1964, when another dictatorship began, lasting until 1985. In 1988, the current Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil was promulgated, giving birth to the New Republic. Since then, two former presidents have been impeached: Fernando Collor de Melo in 1992 and Dilma Vana Rousseff in 2016, as well as recurrent

© L. Á. Marques, 2024

speeches in favor of decreeing the Guarantee of Law and Order (GLO), in defense of the extinction of social freedom guarantees and the return of the military dictatorship. This virulent, anti-republican discourse elected former President Jair Messias Bolsonaro (2019–2022), characterized by Perry Anderson [Anderson 2020: 121] as another member of contemporary political teratology, “a new monster” who advocates the elimination of opponents and violence against minorities.

It is within this scenario that I highlight three fundamental aspects for understanding Brazilian philosophy in the last century: in the first, by bringing together the processes of urbanization, schooling and demographic growth, we can see how the country underwent a geopolitical metamorphosis in the period, not always with adequate housing conditions; in the second, the fall in illiteracy, added to the growth in GDP, produced a revolution, but did not reduce the deep social inequalities; the third makes explicit a conflict between, on the one hand, the conservative mentality that produced the two dictatorships of the last century and which still fuels hate speech in our time and, on the other, the progressive stance committed to the defense of civil and social rights and the promotion of a just, egalitarian and inclusive society. These two stances are represented in the philosophical agenda of that and this century both by those who advocate conservatism, economic liberalism and the privatization of public rights, including education and health, and by those who fight for inclusion, diversity, solidarity and the social equality of universal rights.

In the light of these basic elements of the last century, we don't intend to present one or other winning model in Brazilian philosophy. I'm not thinking in the dual form of us versus them, but in the inclusive perspective of diversity and social plurality. That's why I'm characterizing four perspectives through which Brazilian philosophy has been thought of with greater or lesser emphasis. I don't distinguish between the ideological affiliations of authors in this part of the research, as it's not a question of identifying valid or invalid models. Rather, I distinguish some of the ways in which this philosophy has been constituted with the general aim of publicizing the state of the art of philosophical research in Brazil. In each perspective, I present one or more names that stand out in the way of philosophizing and list the names and works that participate in this way of doing philosophy. Naturally, I will prioritize highlights of the research that is underway at the beginning of the 21st century, since some perspectives have lost steam over the last century. As a result, the reader will be able to consider the four forms that have stood out most in Brazilian philosophical research over the last century: essayism, historiography, decolonization and research into sources.

I reiterate that this is not a hierarchical or evaluative reading of the perspectives, nor is it a criticism of any of the authors in question. Due to the length of the article, many names and works will be neglected, without this meaning any form of disparagement of the analyses developed by the authors. Furthermore, the presentation of the perspectives we are following will condense some of the elements present in *Forms of Brazilian philosophy* (*Formas da filosofia brasileira*, 2023), by Lúcio Álvaro Marques, but we will not follow everything in the work because we are interested here in formulating the basis for a state of the art in Brazilian philosophy. Methodologically, I will present each of the perspectives, justifying what validates the form of research highlighted among us and indicating, at the beginning of each one, the most significant works and names for understanding Brazilian philosophy. Here I take Brazilian or national philosophy in a precise sense, distinguishing, on the one hand, what would be a philosophy only made in Brazilian lands, but whose ob-

ject is not directly related to the national reality (for example, exegetical commentary is a philosophy made among us, but it is not directly characterized as Brazilian philosophy due to its low adherence to the national public debate) and, on the other hand, I treat Brazilian philosophy as that reflection which is not necessarily born in the philosophical territory, but which contributes to the self-understanding of national identity and which has Brazil as its object, without closing itself off in any form of utopian nationalism [Gomes 2001: chap. 10]. Let's take a look at what has characterized Brazilian philosophy over the last century.

1. PHILOSOPHY IN ESSAY FORM

There are at least ten works that deserve to be analyzed in detail in this section. Not all of them have been characterized as essays by their authors, although they sound like it. I start from the understanding of an essay as something that produces a unitary reading of a theme with respect to a demarcated temporal unit and that dwells on an object considered in its multiple aspects. Thus, *Contribution to the history of ideas in Brazil (Contribuição à história das ideias no Brasil, 1956)*, by João Cruz Costa (1904–1978); *Dialectics of colonization (Dialética da colonização, 1992)*, by Alfredo Bosi (1936–2021); *Some essays (Alguns ensaios, 2000)*, by Bento Prado de Almeida Ferraz Júnior (1937–2007); *A French overseas department (Um departamento francês de ultramar, 1994)*, by Paulo Eduardo Arantes (born 1942); *Diary of a philosopher in Brazil (Diário de um filósofo no Brasil, 2010)*, by Julio Cabrera; *Brazilian philosophy: ontogenesis of self-consciousness (Filosofia brasileira: ontogênese da consciência de si, 2002)*, by Luiz Alberto Cerqueira Batista and *Discourse and history: philosophy in Brazil in the 19th century (O discurso e a história: a filosofia no Brasil no século XIX, 2020)*, by Júlio Miranda Canhada are essays either because they were thought up this way by the authors or because they propose a unitary interpretation of a specific time or institution in Brazilian philosophy¹. And the other three essays I've highlighted in this list deserve a more detailed mention, namely: *Overview of philosophy in Brazil (Panorama da filosofia no Brasil, 1961)*, by Luís Washington Vita (1921-1968), *Critique of Tupiniquim [or Folk] reason (Crítica da razão tupiniquim, 1977)*, by Roberto Gomes (born in 1944) and *Philosophy in Brazil (Filosofia no Brasil, 2020)*, by Ivan Domingues (born in 1950).

Washington Vita's essay makes up for the book's brevity through the author's wit. He starts with the intention of doing “philosophy of philosophy in Brazil”, therefore metaphilosophy, and with this, he distinguishes between the colonial (1500–1822), imperial (1822–1889) and republican (1900–1969) periods, which is due to the national chronology. He highlights four trends in our philosophy – the positivist, the culturalist, the idealist and the neo-Thomist – all of which had their roots in the influences of European thought, which is not surprising considering the long colonial period that was extended, in some way, into the imperial one. Furthermore, it is not difficult to recognize that the main contribution of Washington Vita's essay lies in the distinction between the knowledge of salvation that formed the basis of philosophical practice from the begin-

¹ So as not to make the final bibliography too long, I have listed only the works analyzed in each of the topics in this article. I present the names of many others in the body of the text just to give you an idea of the historical background that makes up each of the perspectives in this analysis. As our objective is restricted to characterizing each of the perspectives, what matters is to see how they came about and which work(s) are most recommended for initial reading.

ning of colonization until the second half of the 19th century, losing strength thanks to the dissolution of the patronage between Church and State², and the knowledge of illustration that expresses “confidence in the making of man, the recognition of his finitude and immanence, betting on the transformative power of liberating and humanizing history” and opening the doors of thought to the influence of modern European philosophies freed from the bonds of Lusitanian traditionalism and conservatism [Vita 1968: 14; 1969: 105-109]. Overcoming the knowledge of salvation would be equivalent to admitting a possibility of thinking that is free from the bonds and tutelage of traditional and conservative Catholic thought. Although this is not enough to characterize what Brazilian philosophy would be, according to Washington Vita, it serves as a critical demarcation for thinking about philosophical matrices.

Another noteworthy essay is the ironic *Critique of Tupiniquim Reason*, which has little or nothing of nativism or naive nationalism. In it, the author highlights at least three perspectives for philosophizing in Brazil: (i) it is not enough to eclectically bring together parts of philosophical systems or cling to foreign novelties in order to philosophize here, as this is nothing more than theoretical mimicry, (ii) doing philosophy is not reduced to form or to the titles of those who do it, but requires the ability to think about the national reality without subterfuge and (iii) a significant part of what has been done as philosophy in Brazil is nothing more than commentary and repetition. This is why we need an affirmative reason that takes a critical stance towards foreign philosophies and the national reality, that is creative in raising questions and dispelling prejudices, and that has the audacity to think for itself without anaesthetizing itself in the face of reality or sterilizing itself by reducing his role to mere exegetical commentary [Gomes 2001: 10].

The third essay is by Ivan Domingues and is structured in six steps. Despite the extensive time span the work covers – from 1500 to the present day – its analyses stand out for the author's critical rigor. He begins the essay by establishing metaphilosophy as an interpretative presupposition (first step), based on the *in praesentia* and *in absentia* methods, on the semiotic tripod of author, work and public, and on the ideal type, similar to both Sílvio Romero's national type and Max Weber's ideal type. The author then goes on to analyze the five centuries of Brazilian history since the Portuguese invasion. In the second step, he analyses Brazilian colonial society, characterized by the Jesuit pedagogy that would have predominated throughout the colony (it is now known that there was a differentiated role for other religious orders in philosophical teaching, such as the Carmelites, Franciscans and Benedictines) and, from Ignatian pedagogy came the profile of the ideal type that predominated throughout the period, the Church's organic intellectual who combined the mission of catechizing with the educational mission in schools and colleges, from the time he graduated from the first philosophy course in Bahia in 1575. In the third step, the period from Independence through the Empire to the Old Republic, this is the 19th century, is analyzed in the wake of the expansion of social institutions such as the law courses in Recife

² The Padroado was a socio-economic system established between the Portuguese Crown and the Catholic Church that lasted from 1500 to 1889 in Brazil. For example, the Church catechized, civilized and appeased the enslaved, whether indigenous or African, and passed on the tithes to the Crown, while the Crown financed the ecclesiastical works of catechization and the construction of temples, colleges and health home. With the proclamation of the Republic on 15 November 1889, the process of secularization of the Brazilian state and the separation of Church and State began, especially with the advent of secular education, state health policies and the reduction of Church control over sectors of Brazilian social life, such as birth, marriage and death registers.

and São Paulo, pharmacy in Minas Gerais and fine arts in Rio de Janeiro with the French Artistic Mission. The emerging type is the foreign intellectual, sometimes thinking about Brazil, but with his head in Europe, without much connection to Brazilian reality. In the fourth instalment, the author considers the period from 1930 to 1960. This coincides with the creation of the public university at national level with the transplantation of the French philosophical system and the figure of the specialized scholar, who will make a career within the walls of the university, as well as the humanist public intellectual, although they fail, with a few exceptions, to think about the change from the post-colonial agrarian-export society to the modern urban-industrial society that emerges in the first half of the century. In the fifth step, the type of Brazilian public intellectual philosophers is analyzed. With the foundation of the National Postgraduate System (Sistema Nacional de Pós-Graduação, SNPG) and the professionalization of philosophical teaching, philosophical production of an international standard takes shape. This gave rise to a renewed experience of philosophical production in Brazil. Finally, in the sixth step, Domingues analyses the type of globalized cosmopolitan intellectual, whose figure would be able to stand up in the public debate. However, this type has yet to appear in Brazilian philosophy: “until today, it has been absent from *Terra Brasilis*: precisely the figure of the globalized cosmopolitan intellectual”. Domingues explained: “cosmopolitan like the public intellectual, but without carrying his agenda with the mission and the political agenda, imprisoned to the national and local context, exchanging them for cultural themes and current challenges, in a broader and virtually universal perspective” [Domingues 2017: 546], meaning globalized.

As far as the essays are concerned, Domingues is certainly the most promising in the current panorama of debate on Brazilian philosophy. If his insights are correct (which I’m not questioning here), Brazilian philosophy does exist, but it has not yet been able to produce a globalized public intellectual of the level of a Diderot, Voltaire, Kant and Nietzsche, to think of the big names up until the turn of the 19th century, or Richard Dawkins, Amartya Sen, Michael Sandel, John Rawls, Jürgen Habermas and Michel Foucault, to consider the 20th century cast. These intellectuals would be able to intervene in the global agenda of thought efficiently and gain recognition from their peers. Brazilian philosophy is therefore sufficiently equipped to produce new philosophers capable of acting in the philosophical mainstream, but without being the globalized public intellectual acting on the national and international scene in philosophy and public debate.

2. THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF BRAZILIAN PHILOSOPHY

It is commonplace to say that the historiography of Brazilian philosophy began with *Philosophy in Brazil* (*A philosophia no Brasil*, 1878), by Sílvio Vasconcelos da Silveira Ramos Romero (1851–1914), as well as the polemical rhetoric full of *ad hominem* arguments, which made its author an unsympathetic figure for serious study. Since then, there have been other authors who have dedicated themselves to the same task, such as Jorge Jaime de Souza Mendes (1925–2013) with his four volumes *History of Philosophy in Brazil* (*História da filosofia no Brasil*, 1997–2002), in which he brings together more than 500 candidates for Brazilian philosophers who, according to him, are only those who have traces of originality and have made a definitive contribution to our philosophy. Still within the same culturalist historiographical school is Antonio Ferreira Paim (1927–2021) with the seven volumes of his *History of philosophical ideas in Brazil* (*História*

das ideias filosóficas no Brasil), the first of which was released in 1967 and the last in 1998. This is an author who was awarded the National Book Institute Prize for Brazilian Studies (1968) and the Jabuti Prize (1985), but who is not without some strange attitudes to the researcher, as has already been shown in relation to one of his volume *Early stages of Brazilian philosophy: complementary studies to the history of philosophical ideas in Brazil (Etapas iniciais da filosofia brasileira: estudos complementares à história das ideias filosóficas no Brasil* [Paim 1998]). Among other aspects, it fails by transcribing texts without a historical basis, without properly identifying the sources, or proposing internal criticism of documents, “without external criticism establishing the links between the transcribed texts and other research, devoid of a causal link that connects the texts to each other and debates them within an evaluative hypothesis of the content”, thus violating the basic principles of historiographical analyses and studies [Marques 2023: 109-110]. Still as a work by culturalists, with Antônio Paim as a star, there is the *Bio-bibliographical dictionary of Brazilian authors: philosophy, political thought, sociology, anthropology (Dicionário biobibliográfico de autores brasileiros: filosofia, pensamento político, sociologia, antropologia*, 1999) published by the Brazilian Thought Documentation Center (Centro de Documentação do Pensamento Brasileiro, CDPB). This is a useful authorial catalogue for anyone dedicated to looking up Brazilian names and works.

In addition to these four authors and works, four more names should be mentioned: the first is Antônio Joaquim Severino with *Contemporary philosophy in Brazil (A filosofia contemporânea no Brasil*, 1997). This is an analysis of the 20th century with a very good list of names and works on Brazilian philosophy distributed among the neo-thomist, positivist, neo-positivist, phenomenological, humanist, culturalist, dialectical, critical theory and archaeogenealogy heritages. From the systematic perspective of historiography, the second author is Ricardo Timm de Souza, with *Philosophical Brazil (O Brasil filosófico*, 2003), which, although brief, has noteworthy insights, both in terms of statistical surveys of post-graduate studies in Brazil and the analytical premises of the 19th and 20th centuries. In the third position of this group, I mention the seven volumes of *Brazilian bibliographical dictionary (Dicionário bibliográfico brasileiro)* [Sacramento Blake 1883–1902], by Augusto Vitorino Alves Sacramento Blake (1827–1903). His work dates back to the turn of the last century and is noteworthy not only for its completeness, but especially for being the most extensive catalogue of names. And, although it has a broader scope, covering history and other areas of the humanities, it brings together a list of authors who were and are decisive for understanding the theoretical foundations of Brazilian philosophy in the 20th century.

Finally, the last author I will mention in this section on historiography is Paulo Roberto Margutti Pinto, or simply Paulo Margutti, as he is known. This is a work in progress as it brings together, to date, two volumes of *History of philosophy in Brazil (História da filosofia do Brasil*, 2013 and 2020), an enviable number of articles and chapters on the history of Brazilian philosophy, as well as monographic studies on names from that history. I illustrate with *Development, culture, ethics: the philosophical ideas of Mário Vieira de Mello (Desenvolvimento, cultura, ética: as ideias filosóficas de Mário Vieira de Mello*, 2015); *Nisia Floresta, an unknown Brazilian: feminism, positivism and other trends (Nisia Floresta, uma brasileira desconhecida: feminismo, positivismo e outras tendências*, 2019); *The philosophical ideas of Eduardo Ferreira França (As ideias filosóficas de Eduardo Ferreira França)* and *The philosophical ideas of Domingos José Gonçalves de Magalhães (As ideias filosóficas de Domingos José Gonçalves de*

Magalhães 1809–1857), both published in 2023. As if that weren't enough, the author has already announced several more volumes that will be released soon. Although he studies the 19th century in these books, their theoretical incidence took place throughout that century and in the first half of the last century. Furthermore, this is the latest major development in Brazilian historiographical research.

There is no doubt that the historiography produced by Margutti is not only convincing because of its length, which is admirable, but also because of the quality of the analysis and the technical rigor of the production. I will now present the procedures adopted both in the monographic books (all freely available on the internet), firstly, and in the two volumes of his *History*, secondly, because of the differences in methodological procedures. These are differences that the author has developed over the course of the research itself, more as a feature of the maturing of the method than as a result of an a priori decision on the procedures to be adopted. Let's see.

In his monographic studies, Paulo Margutti follows a five-stage procedure: (i) he begins them by presenting the biographical data and the works of the personality in question, taking care to date and sequence the production, (ii) he analyses the main interpretations received by the work, (iii) he carefully takes up other thinkers directly or indirectly linked to the works cited, (iv) he analyses in detail all the works presented in the first stage and (v) he compares the author's results in relation to the philosophy in progress at the time from an international perspective, without neglecting to situate it within Brazilian philosophy. In this way, the monographic studies go far beyond the mere presentation of the biographer's ideas, both by interpreting them in the light of occidental philosophy and by placing them in direct dialogue with the national philosophy that was contemporary with them. Furthermore, the bibliographical survey in each work is exhaustive, demonstrating a research that marks an irreplaceable interpretative form. This doesn't mean that his analysis is the only one, but it is essential for anyone who wants to study who he analyzed, thus forming a new Brazilian historiographical paradigm.

The differences between the culturalist historiographical paradigms (represented by Miguel Reale, Jorge Jaime, Antonio Paim and others) and the new historiography (represented by Antônio Joaquim Severino, Roberto Hofmeister Pich, who will be quoted below, and Paulo Margutti) are in form and content: in culturalist historiography, the readings are general and try to encompass long periods in brief analyses and are not dedicated to establishing primary sources and, in the new historiography, the form is one of detailed analysis of periods and respective authors with a pretension to exhaustion (according to the methodology of monographic studies described in the previous paragraph) and, as for content, they excel in the critical edition of sources and documents from the colonial and imperial periods. As a result, they not only provide interpretations of the history of Brazilian philosophical thought, the fairness of which is beyond the scope of this article, but also recognizably publish historical documents and unpublished texts with broad access to the scientific community.

There is a noteworthy methodological difference between the two volumes of Paulo Margutti's *History of philosophy in Brazil* (*História da filosofia do Brasil*, 2013 and 2020): in the first, analyzing the period 1500–1822, there was still no documentary research on the period, so the author opts for an interpretation including data from literature and based on pluritopic hermeneutics. Fortunately, as he has stated on several occasions since the book was published, this is not a period devoid of primary sources; rather, there is a considerable list of philosophical texts, which has called into question the distinction between a more

practical and less scriptural Sanchist tendency and a more scriptural and theoretical Fonsequista tendency within the Portuguese philosophy matrix³. Therefore, it is not a question of a period and a volume reduced to a general worldview, but of a text with documentary bases, which, according to the author, will be expanded and explained more fully in the re-edition of the book. In the second volume, he analyses the period 1808–1843, starting with seven authors, with an enviable list of works to analyze, which constitutes a new interpretative key. Fully immersed in the form of writing typical of the 19th century, Margutti shows how Brazilian philosophy was pregnant with an Enlightenment rupture, although still marked by the Lusitanian religious heritage. There, a *philosophia ancilla theologia* reigned, that is, philosophy as a propaedeutic to theology. If this is the status of philosophy within the Enlightenment rupture, remaining halfway there, at some point it will be convenient to evaluate Paulo Margutti's historiographical basis against the distinction between the knowledge of salvation and the knowledge of illustration drawn up by Luís Washington Vita.

Having said that, there is no doubt that the historiography of Brazilian philosophy has shown noteworthy vigour, especially in recent decades. It would be a fool's errand to question the existence or otherwise of Brazilian philosophy. If there is one observation to be made about Paulo Margutti's historiographical work as a whole, I would compare it to Franz Rosenzweig's (1886–1929) *Hegel and the State* (*Hegel und der Staat*, 1920) and *The Star of Redemption* (*Der Stern der Erlösung*, 1921). When they were published, his friends asked Rosenzweig make a guide to the work and its interpretation. So, he published *The new Thinking* (*Das Neue Denken*, 1925). The book popularized the author's philosophy. *Mutatis mutandis* is perhaps a good option for the author to undertake, given the body of work and even pointing to possibilities for the future development of Brazilian philosophical historiography.

3. DECOLONIAL PHILOSOPHICAL THINKING

Charles-Robert Ageron attributes the use of the expression decolonizing Algeria (*décolonisât l'Algérie*) to a journalist who used it in 1836. From 1927 onwards, the term was popularized in the Indian anti-colonial struggle (as decolonization), became part of the agenda of progressive debates and, in 1952, it entered circulation for good [Rioux 2007: 256]. In Latin America, it was practically from the period of maturity of liberation philosophy (after 1913) that the term was established as an agenda for philosophical thought. It should be understood, however, that this is not a watertight, deterministic dating. It's interesting to see how late this debate appeared on the Latin American agenda, given that it has been used for centuries in Algeria, Europe and India, and it seems that we are only now recognizing the need to decolonizing epistemology, even if it means mimicking the agenda of thought with some delay.

On the other hand, if we look closely at the debates established over the last century, we can see that we haven't missed the tram of history. We just don't use the same terms.

³ The Sanchist tendency is the legacy of Francisco Sanches, who emphasizes the practical nature of Lusitanian culture, attached to skepticism and the philosophical intuitions present in literary works. While the Fonsequista tendency is the heir of Pedro da Fonseca and values the spirit of detailed scholastic study by recognizing the authority of the great names in the history of philosophy and defends the theoretical character of the philosophy of the Second Scholasticism of the 15th–18th centuries [Margutti 2020: 17].

Since the decolonial agenda confronts the colonization of being⁴, power, gender and knowledge, we can place some elements of the history of Brazilian philosophy within this spectrum of debates, although without pretending to be exhaustive. Other names could be mentioned, but we'll just stick to the following.

With regard to the colonization of being, we would highlight two works because of their proximity to the debates of the last decade. Firstly, *Latin America: the non-being* (*Latin America: the non-being*, 1987), by Roque Zimmermann (1939–2019). The author shows how the negative ontology imposed on Latin American peoples has, over time, produced a derogatory and reductionist understanding of their own history. The denial of being began with the violence of the colonization processes, when local identity was denied, otherness was the object of somewhat exotic discourse and the human being was bestialized in forms of enslavement. This resulted in a negative self-understanding that was consequently incapable of deconstructing the structures of social subalternization of Latin American peoples. There was not only a subalternization of the original peoples. There was also a process of undoing identities. As the original peoples were subordinated to European colonizing action, their identities were relegated to the historical background in favor of the colonial enterprise. In this sense, they were not only enslaved, but dispossessed of their property and land. *Pari passu*, the Africans trafficked to Abya Yala (renamed the New World by the Europeans) were enslaved and also stripped of their identities. As a result, the process produced, on the one hand, the de-Indianization of indigenous people and the de-Africanization of Africans and, on the other, the de-Europeanisation of Europeans, since they began to act in a much more violent way than those identified in Europe's ancient history (Ribeiro 1995). The colonization of being did not only operate as a negative index during the colonial period; on the contrary, it was capable of destroying the possibility of producing a positive identity even after Independence. For this reason, in 1995, Darcy Ribeiro (1922–1997) still identified in Brazil's social and anthropological heritage a fracture in the composition of national identity [Ribeiro 1995: 131]: “his son [of the colonial slavery process], Creole, born in the new land, racially pure or mestizo, this one, knowing himself to be non-African like the “boorish blacks” he saw arriving, neither white nor Indian and their mestizos, felt challenged to leave the nullity (ninguendade), building his identity. Thus, he too would be a proto-Brazilian out of lack”.

In the sphere of the colonization of power, secondly, the processes were so efficient that they colonized Brazilian political and social structures. Manoel José Bonfim (1868–1932) argues in *Latin America: ailments of origin* (*América Latina: males de origem*, 1905) that the proclamation of Independence in 1822 did not produce a rupture in the structures of social domination. What did occur was the transfer of structures from the big house and the mill⁵ controlled by the rural oligarchies to patrimonial structures (with con-

⁴ In the decolonial agenda, there is a direct critique of the legacy of European philosophy, yet they inherit and retain the classic nomenclature of the metaphysics of being. In line with the observation of Plínio Junqueira Smith (professor at the Federal University of São Paulo – UNIFESP), it would be more coherent to speak of the colonization of the human being and not, generically, the colonization of being. This distinction avoids the ambiguity between the ontological and anthropological debate on colonization: the distinction between the metaphysics of being and the condition of the human being.

⁵ The big house was the dwelling or residence of the masters during the colonial period and was usually next to a slave quarters, where the enslaved were kept; a sugar mill, where the sugar cane was processed, and a chapel, where Catholic priests administered the sacraments. This big house functioned

trol of the state machine by the old rural oligarchy now transformed into the ruling political class), physiologist structures (with politicians transforming public activity into a profession and using the state for their own benefit) and authoritarian structures (through the use of police and political forces to repress forms of resistance by social movements and criminalize debates on progressive agendas) [Marques 2023: 421-463]. Within the political and social organization of the Brazilian government, authoritarian and violent forms still prevail, which are legitimized by liberal and supremacist discourses managed by those who perpetuate themselves in power, as Lilia M. Schwarz's *On Brazilian authoritarianism (Sobre o autoritarismo brasileiro, 2019)*.

With regard to gender colonization, thirdly, relations are even more violent in a country with a strong patriarchal, authoritarian and conservative heritage. For a long time, figures such as Nísia Floresta (1810–1885), recently studied in a monographic work of the same name by Paulo Margutti (2019); Patrícia Rehder Galvão (known as Pagu: 1910–1962), author of *Industrial Park (Parque Industrial, 1933)*; Marielle Francisco da Silva, born in 1979, known as Marielle Franco, who was brutally murdered in 2018; and Lélia González (1935–1994), a reference in studies on intersectionality; among many other women, are voices and symbols of a struggle that is as necessary as it is difficult in order to deconstruct the machismo and conservatism ingrained in Brazilian social structures. In this respect, the best reference for an introduction to the history of women in Brazil is still the *Dictionary of Brazilian Women from 1500 to the present day (Dicionário Mulheres do Brasil de 1500 até a atualidade, 2000)*, organized by S. Schumacher and É. Vital Brazil, both for its length and for its ability to compile accurate and diverse information from biobibliographical data on historiographies that go back a long way. As for the debate on the colonization of gender, we recommend the book *Towards an Afro-Latin American feminism (Por un feminismo afro-latino-americano, 2020)* by Lélia González *et alii*.

As for the colonization of knowledge, fourthly, we still mimic a large part of the international agenda in philosophy and other fields. I'm not advocating forms of epistemic paricide against the European, African or Indigenous agenda. On the contrary, in a globalized world, the real form of colonization is to reduce one's own gaze to any form of xenophobic nationalism. The two most striking counterexamples to the attempts to deny dialogue between local and international agendas are the interdependence caused by the Covid-19 pandemic, when peoples and nations had to come together to think of a response to the health crisis and the climate crisis we are facing, with the emergence of extreme changes. Coming out of the colonization of knowledge will probably not be through the denial of other countries' knowledge, but through the ability to establish common agendas for a world that is minimally dignified and balanced for all people, without any exclusion. With this in mind, I've listed a quartet of works that provide an understanding of the basic debates for tackling social and epistemological inequalities: the *Dictionary of Black Slavery in Brazil (Dicionário da escravidão negra no Brasil, 2013)*, by Clóvis Moura; the *Dictionary of Slavery and Freedom (Dicionário da escravidão e liberdade, 2018)*, by Lilia Moritz Schwarz and Flávio Gomes; *Cannibal Metaphysics (Metafísica cannibal, 2015)*, by Eduardo Batalha Viveiros de Castro; *The Fall of Heaven (A queda do céu, 2015)*, by Davi Kopenawa and Bruce Albert; and *Life Is Not Useful (A vida não é útil, 2020)*, by Ailton

as a centre of social, political, economic and religious organisation and administration and is conservatively well exemplified in Gilberto Freyre's book, *Casa-grande & senzala* (1933).

Krenak, recently elected to the Brazilian Academy of Letters (2023). Both Kopenawa and Krenak are indigenous authors and present analyses of life and contemporary society from an indigenous understanding of the world, without closing themselves off to a nativist view of society. On the contrary, they directly debate problems of neoliberalism, geopolitics and the pandemic.

This is not an exhaustive presentation of the subject, but rather an indication of the state of the art with a few works that serve as a general introduction to the debates on being, power, gender and knowledge. The names mentioned are part of a history in process in which voices come together in a kind of metalanguage of the social agenda in the face of a globalization process that excludes most of the world's inhabitants. Not to mention the devastating effects on the world's fauna and flora resulting from the policy of socio-environmental exploitation, the forms of colonization mentioned in the topic reveal a frightening profile of our society, which has not yet been able to overcome the forms of external colonization from within and still faces so many internal divisions.

4. STUDYING THE SOURCES OF BRAZILIAN PHILOSOPHY

There are five dictionaries that offer broad access to the authorial catalogue of Brazilian philosophy: *Brazilian bibliographical dictionary (Diccionario bibliographico brasileiro, 1883–1902)*, by A. V. A. Sacramento Blake; *Bio-bibliographical dictionary of Brazilian authors (Diccionario biobibliografico de autores brasileiros, 1999)*, edited by the CDPB; the *Dictionary of colonial Brazil 1500–1808 (Diccionario do Brasil colonial 1500–1808, 2000)* and the *Dictionary of imperial Brazil 1822–1889 (Diccionario do Brasil imperial 1822–1889, 2002)*, organised by Ronaldo Vainfas; and the *Dictionary of authors in Colonial Brazil (Diccionario de autores no Brasil Colonial, 2010)*, by Palmira M. R. Almeida. Ronaldo Vainfas's dictionaries don't just focus on philosophical themes, but are interested in general knowledge of the periods, although they only have an entry on classes in the first volume, and are unaware of entries such as school, college, teaching and professorship. Palmira Almeida's dictionary is good, although incomplete in terms of the list of authors and writers from the period studied. The benefit lies in the easy accessibility of the work. The one published by the CDPB is the best of the previous ones, but it doesn't surpass Sacramento Blake's classic. The latter falls short when it comes to the twentieth century, for obvious reasons. However, it is exhaustive and accurate in relation to the Colony and the Empire and is available for free on the internet.

The dictionaries are a gateway to a continent that has been little explored in Brazilian philosophy, but which is very promising. This continent is little explored because, ever since Sílvio Romero, there has been a vulgate as imprecise as it is disparaging that insists on claiming that there was nothing noteworthy in terms of philosophical production in the colonial period. What's more, the author of *Philosophy in Brazil* (1878) went on to say that there was no serialization of ideas, no genetic inheritance, and even less the idea of a system in everything that was produced in philosophy during the Colony. What is most shocking is to find, in 1998, in Antonio Paim's *Early stages of Brazilian philosophy*, the literal endorsement of this same stance without it being supported by exhaustive research into the colonial period [Marques 2023: 97-98]. On the contrary, the dictionaries are an indication of everything that was produced in the Colony, by listing the repertoire of authors and works. What's more, there are a number of recent dossiers on Brazilian philosophy that deserve attention and which can be found in the following philosoph-

ical journals available in open digital format: *Kriterion* (Federal University of Minas Gerais), v. 44 (2014), *Argumentos* (Federal University of Ceará), n° 25 (2021), *Transformação* (Paulista State University), v. 26, tomos 1 and 2 (2023), *Aurora* (Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná), v. 35 (2023) and *Pensando* (Federal University of Piauí), v. 15 n° 34 (2024).

With regard to research groups that bring together various professors and researchers from the country and abroad, consider the WG of the National Association of Graduate Studies in Philosophy (Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação em Filosofia, ANPOF), especially *Philosophising and Teaching Philosophy* (Filosofar e Ensinar a Filosofar), whose research focuses on the debate about philosophy teaching practices in secondary schools; *Liberation, Latin American and African Philosophy* (Filosofia da Libertação, Latino-Americana e Africana), which focuses on the dialogue between the heritage of liberation and African philosophy; *Women in the history of philosophy* (Mulheres na história da filosofia), thinking about education and the history of women's education in Brazil; and *Brazilian Philosophical Thought* (Pensamento Filosófico Brasileiro), as it describes itself, attentive to the development of the “axes of dialogue, pluralism and critical thinking, in relation to the practice of philosophy in our country, with a view to developing its own agenda within the ANPOF – at the same time on the fringes of ufanistic⁶ and uncritical nationalisms, as well as the cultural and epistemic neo-colonialism that still characterizes a good part of the national *intelligentsia*” [ANPOF n.d.].

Finally, I would like to highlight three other projects focused on research into Brazilian philosophy, two of which are aimed at researching historical sources of Latin American and/or Brazilian thought: the first, *Scholastica Colonialis*, developed by Roberto Hofmeister Pich and Alfredo Santiago Culleton, studies the development of Latin American philosophy from the perspective of Baroque Scholasticism or Second Scholasticism between the 16th and 18th centuries [Pich, Culleton 2017]. The second, *Encyclopaedia of Brazilian Philosophy* (Enciclopédia da Filosofia Brasileira), linked to the aforementioned Pensamento Filosófico Brasileiro, strives to research and create a digital collection on Brazilian philosophy “taking it not simply as a universal philosophy made in Brazil, but with the marks of its local inscription in our culture and history, as it suffers the frictions of our environment and receives the contributions of our intelligentsia – we were not alone in this strives within Brazilian academia” [Domingues, Marques n.d.], whose collection is under construction and open access.

These projects complement each other both as historical perspectives, since the first focuses more on the colonial period and the second on the 19th and 20th centuries up to the present day, and as forms of work. While the first aims to collect historical sources in Latin America, the second is centered on producing entries that allow initial but rigorous access to authors, institutions, themes and periods of this philosophy.

The third ongoing project, which is also linked to the WG, focuses exclusively on the Brazilian colonial and imperial periods. As well as surveying sources, it also aims to pub-

⁶ “Ufanism, from the Portuguese “ufanismo”, is a form of jingoism, jactancy, an excessive pride, a sense of boasting or self-vangloriation of a country, an excessive exaltation of its qualities, most of times because of misinformed patriotism. Ufanists generally exceed their compliments to the point of creating a distant view of reality. ... The common use in Portuguese comes from the book “Porque Me Ufano do Meu País” (“Why I Am Proud Of My Country”), by Count Afonso Celso. The adjective “ufano” comes from Spanish and means a group boasting arrogantly to himself extraordinary merits.” [StoneDroid 2011].

lish previously unpublished philosophical, legal and theological writings in a digital and bilingual version. This is the *Scripta Brasiliana Series* registered with the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico, CNPq). This project brings together researchers from Latin American and European countries, with collaborators in all regions of Brazil. It is a project approved by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Itamaraty (Brasília, Federal District) and will be published by Fundação Alexandre de Gusmão.

The *Scripta Brasiliana Series* is initially planned to run for the next decade, publishing colonial and imperial writings with scientific apparatus and bilingual editions. Currently, the collection under construction includes almost 600 letters dating from the 19th century and philosophical writings of various kinds: (a) more than thirty *conclusiones philosophicas ex* from the states of Maranhão, Pará, Rio de Janeiro and Minas Gerais, including two on public law and three on theology; (b) a commentary on the subject of slavery, dating from the 19th century, from Minas Gerais; (c) four Benedictine *cursus philosophicus* from Rio de Janeiro, whose edition will prioritize the one signed by Friar Gaspar da Madre de Deus; (d) a Carmelite *cursus philosophicus* from Pará; (e) two Franciscan *cursus philosophicus* written in Mato Grosso [Marques 2021]. With the exception of the writings on slavery and the letters, all the other texts date from the mid-18th century and were scattered in libraries in Brazil, Portugal and the United States of America. However, it should be noted that this list of writings is not all we know of. There are other texts that could be part of the second stage of *Scripta Brasiliana*.

As a result, two basic aspects of this topic are evident: one, that it attests to the existence of various research groups on Brazilian philosophy and its interconnections with contemporary thought. It's not just about these groups, as there are several other research projects that are registered with higher education institutions and/or are not listed on the ANPOF website, but which are still active, such as the *Brazilian Academy of Philosophy* (Academia Brasileira de Filosofia, ABF), founded in 1989 in Rio de Janeiro and still active today, and the recently created *Brazilian Association of Philosophy Teaching* (Associação Brasileira de Ensino de Filosofia, ABEF 2023), whose interest is to “bring together professionals with a degree in Philosophy who teach in the area and/or research Philosophy Teaching in all its perspectives and at all levels: basic education, undergraduate and postgraduate” (ABEF, Statute, art. 1, item i). The other noteworthy aspect is the vigor of philosophical production, especially in the last two decades. The dossiers and articles in periodicals and in the ANPOF Column, together with the books, themed lives and biennial national meetings of the ANPOF, indicate the growing interest of the Brazilian philosophical community in thematizing and making known not only its production, but also its academic and social legitimacy.

Without being ufanistic or demeaning, to think about Brazilian philosophy is certainly to equalize the social and political status of more than three thousand postgraduates in the specific area, trained in 327 undergraduate courses recognized by the Ministry of Education. The postgraduate program in philosophy comprises 92 courses, including 2 networked professional master's degrees, 53 academic master's degrees and 37 academic doctorates, according to public data from the Sucupira Platform and a further 46,422 dissertations and theses on philosophy available to read and download free of charge from the *Brazilian Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations* (Biblioteca Digital Brasileira de Teses e Dissertações). After the SNPG was set up in the 1960s (Note / Parecer nº 977/1965, known as the Sucupira Parecer, of the then Federal Education Council), in the

sphere of the federal government, under the purview of CAPES/CNE, and when it itself founded ANPOF two decades later, the national philosophical community professionalized itself by working in secondary, higher and postgraduate education, later extending to primary education. On the one hand, they resisted the military dictatorship's attempt to exclude the humanities; on the other, they fought for the professionalization of philosophical teachers. The progress that has been made is indisputable, although there are still shortcomings: for example, when it comes to ANPOF's working groups (WG), most of them are centered on the history of European or North American philosophy, some focus on thematic research, others gather around one name. A considerable part of their output is reduced to the exegesis and commentary of classic philosophical authors, with no relation to the Brazilian reality, which characterizes a philosophy among us, but not a philosophy of our own, with its own relevance and identity. Other groups, far fewer in number, are trying out a Brazilian philosophy, concerned with the problems of the national reality and focused on works that analyze the social, cultural, economic and intellectual development of the country, the fruits of which are promising if they are not reduced to a trend of the moment.

In light of all this, we can distinguish three attitudes among philosophy researchers and teachers in Brazil: the first, the ufanist, who naively admits that we have always had Brazilian philosophy without any setbacks, whose debate on originality would already be outdated, this stance is nourished by naivety and is too nationalistic; the second, the academicist, identifies and reduces Brazilian philosophy to the practice of exegesis and commentary on classical authors, being unable to realize that most of the theses and dissertations produced in the SNPG are nothing more than theoretical mimicry, and have little or nothing to say about and to the Brazilian reality; the third, critical, recognizes the merits of the professionalization of philosophical teaching, researches within the SNPG and is fundamentally concerned both with the heritage of the history of national philosophy teaching and with philosophizing based on the reality and dramas of Brazilian society.

Finally, it must be recognized that, despite the setbacks in consolidating public, free and quality higher education in the country, more than 95% of Brazilian scientific research comes from public higher education institutions. This research has been consolidated on the national and international stage, and in 2015 Brazil was ranked 14th in the world for scientific production. Which can be recognized from the figure of three intellectuals of the last century. From a philosophical perspective, names such as Newton Carneiro Affonso da Costa (born 1929), with his formulation of paraconsistent logic, and Marilena de Souza Chauí (born 1941), with her analysis of national reality, are worthy representatives of our best philosophical heritage. And from a political and educational perspective, it would be strange to neglect the name of Paulo Reglus Neves Freire (1921–1997, known as Paulo Freire).

When it comes to scientific production and dissemination in the humanities and social sciences, led by Thomas Kuhn and Everett Rogers in numbers of citations and references on a global scale, both with 81,311 and 72,780 references respectively, we are honored to highlight the name of Paulo Freire as the third most cited intellectual in the world with no less than 72,359 references, ahead of names such as Michel Foucault, John Rawls, Clifford Geertz and Karl Marx [Green 2016]. This is a ranking alongside others such as those by Steven Pinker and Times Reuters, which use different criteria. Certainly, Paulo Freire's name can be recognized as the greatest and most outstanding Brazilian global public intellectual. I say this not from the position of a Brazilian who admires his fellow countryman, but based on the analysis made by Professor Henry A. Giroux, from McMaster University

in Hamilton, Canada. He does not hesitate to say that “since the 1980s, there has been no intellectual on the North American education scene to match their [Paulo Freire’s] theoretical rigor or moral courage” [Giroux 2021: 180]. More than that, Giroux not only recognizes the excellence of Freire’s contribution to North American thought, but also places him at the privileged intersection of those rare intellectuals who have never abandoned their own reality, the particular and the local, and who, at the same time, have achieved worldwide recognition. For this reason, he concludes: “Paulo Freire was a cosmopolitan intellectual who never neglected the details of everyday life and the connections, however belated, with a wider, global world.” [ibid.: 194].

REFERENCES / СПИСОК ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

- Anderson, P. (2020). *Brasil à parte: 1964-2019*. (A. B. Souza et al., Trad.). São Paulo: Boitempo. ANPOF. (n.d.). *GT Pensamento Filosófico Brasileiro. Apresentação*. Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação em Filosofia. <https://www.anpof.org/anpof>
- Domingues, I. (2017). *Filosofia no Brasil: legados e perspectivas – ensaios metafísicos*. São Paulo: Unesp.
- Domingues, I., & Marques, L. (n.d.). *Enciclopédia da Filosofia Brasileira*. Editora Fi <https://www.editorafi.org/enciclopedia-da-filosofia-brasileira>
- EMBRAPA. (2017, October 10). *More than 80% of the Brazilian population inhabits 0.63% of the national territory*. Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária. <https://www.embrapa.br/busca-de-noticias/-/noticia/28840923/mais-de-80-da-populacao-brasileira-habita-063-do-territorio-nacional>
- Giroux, H. A. (2021). Paulo Freire e a promessa de uma pedagogia crítica em tempos sombrios. In A. M. A. Freire (Org.), *Testamento da presença de Paulo Freire, o educador do Brasil: testemunhos e depoimentos*. São Paulo: Paz & Terra,.
- Gomes, R. (2001). *Crítica da razão tupiniquim*. Curitiba: Criar.
- Green, E. (2016, May 12). *What are the most cited publications in the social sciences according to Google scholar*. London School of Economics. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2016/05/12/what-are-the-most-cited-publications-in-the-social-sciences-according-to-google-scholar/>
- IBGE. (n.d.a). *20th Century Economy*. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. https://seculoxx.ibge.gov.br/images/seculoxx/economia/contas_nacionais/1_indice.xls
- IBGE. (n.d.b). *Censos Demográficos*. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. <https://memoria.ibge.gov.br/historia-do-ibge/historico-dos-censos/censos-demograficos.html#:~:text=Foi%20a%20seguinte%20a%20popula%C3%A7%C3%A3o,e%208%20487%20554%20mulheres>
- IBGE. (n.d.c). *Memory of Demographic Censuses from 1870 to 2000*. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. <https://memoria.ibge.gov.br/historia-do-ibge/historico-dos-censos/censos-demograficos.html#:~:text=It%20was%20the%20following%20population%C3%A7%C3%A3o,e%208%20487%20554%20women>
- INEP. (2021, June 16). *Sinopse Estatística da Educação Superior 2000*. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira. <https://www.gov.br/inep/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/acervo-linha-editorial/publicacoes-institucionais/estatisticas-e-indicadores-educacionais/sinopse-estatistica-da-educacao-superior-2000>
- INEP. (n.d.). *Map of Illiteracy in Brazil*. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira. https://download.inep.gov.br/publicacoes/institucionais/estatisticas_e_indicadores/mapa_do_analfabetismo_do_brasil.pdf

- Instituto SEMESP. (2023). *Mapa do ensino superior no Brasil*. São Paulo: SEMESP.
- Margutti Pinto, P. R.. (2013). *História da filosofia do Brasil (1500-hoje): 1ª parte: o período colonial (1500-1822)*. São Paulo: Loyola.
- Margutti Pinto, P. R. (2020). *História da filosofia do Brasil (1500-hoje): 2ª parte: a ruptura iluminista (1808-1843)*. São Paulo: Loyola.
- Marques, L. Á. (2021). Em busca de uma filosofia colonial brasileira. *Veritas (Porto Alegre)*, 66(1). <https://doi.org/10.15448/1984-6746.2021.1.39730>
- Marques, L. Á. (2023). *Formas da filosofia brasileira: 12 aportes metodológicos à historiografia, metalinguagem e autocrítica da filosofia brasileira*. Cachoeirinha: Fi. <https://www.editorafi.org/ebook/a013-formas-filosofia-brasileira>
- Neves, C. E. B., & Martins, C. B. (2016). Ensino superior no Brasil: uma visão abrangente. In T. Dwyer (Org.), *Jovens universitários em um mundo em transformação : uma pesquisa sino-brasileira* (pp. 95-124). Brasília: Ipea; Pequim: SSAP. <https://repositorio.ipea.gov.br/bitstream/11058/9061/1/Ensino%20superior%20no%20Brasil.pdf>
- Neves, C. E. B., & Martins, C. B. (2016). Ensino superior no Brasil: uma visão abrangente. In T. Dwyer (Org.), *Jovens universitários em um mundo em transformação: uma pesquisa sino-brasileira* (pp. 95-124). Brasília: Ipea; Pequim: SSAP. <https://repositorio.ipea.gov.br/bitstream/11058/9061/1/Ensino%20superior%20no%20Brasil.pdf>
- Paim, A. (1998). *Etapas iniciais da filosofia brasileira: estudos complementares à história das ideias filosóficas no Brasil* (Vol. III). Londrina: UEL.
- Pich, R. H., & Culleton, A. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Scholastica Colonialis: reception and development of Baroque scholasticism in Latin America, 16th-18th centuries*. Barcelona & Roma: Brepols. <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.TEMA-EB.5.107198>
- Ribeiro, D. (1995). *O povo brasileiro: a formação e o sentido do Brasil*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Rioux, J.-P. (2007). Point de vue - La décolonisation, cette histoire sans fin. *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'histoire*, 96(4), 225-234. <https://doi.org/10.3917/ving.096.0225>
- Sacramento Blake, A. V. A. (1883-1902). *Diccionario bibliographico brasileiro* (Vol. 1-7). Rio de Janeiro: Typographia Nacional. <https://www2.senado.leg.br/bdsf/handle/id/221681>
- Schumaher, S., & Vital Brazil, É. (Orgs.). (2000). *Dicionário Mulheres do Brasil de 1500 até a atualidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.
- StoneDroid. (2011, January 4). *Ufanism*. Urban Dictionary. <https://www.urbandictionary.com/author.php?author=StoneDroid>
- Vita, L. W. (1968). *Antologia do pensamento social e político no Brasil*. São Paulo: Grijalbo.
- Vita, L. W. (1969). *Panorama da filosofia no Brasil*. Porto Alegre: Globo.
- Zimmermann, R. (1987). *América Latina: o não-ser*. Petrópolis: Vozes.

Received / Одержано 26.11.2023

Lúcio Álvaro Marques

Perspectives on Brazilian Philosophy in the Last Century

I present a state-of-the-art Brazilian philosophy from four perspectives: essayism, historiography, decolonial thinking, and primary source research. I don't prioritize the perspectives presented or assess the viability of ideas that have been listed in my paper, as I believe that they are viable and productive. However, it's does not mean that I do not see the shortcomings of these ideas or do not distinguish them in any way. It is merely a provocation to the reader to get

closer to Brazilian authors and philosophical works from the last century. Even if I believe in the viability of Brazilian philosophy, I warn: in fact, not everything that belongs to its realm is viable. After pointing out the main social, economic, and political changes of the 20th century, I list authors and works from this century that show some of the theoretical strength of Brazilian philosophy. From the four perspectives I distinguish three approaches – ufanist, academicist, and critical. Among these approaches, I consider the last one to be the best.

Lucio Альваро Маркес

Перспективи погляду на бразильську філософію останнього століття

Я представляю найсучаснішу бразильську філософію з чотирьох точок зору: есеїстика, історіографія, деколоніальне мислення та дослідження першоджерел. Я не встановлюю пріоритетність представлених точок зору та не оцінюю життєздатність ідей, перелічених у моїй статті, оскільки вважаю, що ці ідеї життєздатні та продуктивні. Однак це не означає, що я не бачу недоліків цих ідей або ніяк їх не розрізняю. Це просто провокація, що має на меті наблизити читача до бразильських авторів і філософських творів минулого століття. Навіть якщо я вірю в життєздатність бразильської філософії, я попереджаю: насправді не все, що належить до її сфери, є життєздатним. Після вказівки на основні соціальні, економічні та політичні зміни ХХ століття, я перелічую авторів і праці цього століття, які демонструють певну теоретичну потугу бразильської філософії. У межах зазначених чотирьох точок зору я виділяю три підходи – уфаністський, академічний і критичний. Серед цих підходів найкращим я вважаю останній.

Lucio Álvaro Marques, Professor at the Federal University of the Triângulo Mineiro (Uberaba, Brazil).

Lucio Альваро Маркес, професор Федерального університету Триангулу Мінейру (Убераба, Бразилія).

e-mail: lucio.marques@uftm.edu.br
