

THE “PLACE” OF LIBERALISM IN BRAZIL OF THE 19TH CENTURY

O “LUGAR” DO LIBERALISMO NO BRASIL DO SÉCULO XIX

EL “LUGAR” DEL LIBERALISMO EN EL BRASIL DEL SIGLO XIX

Lucas Flôres VASQUES¹

ABSTRACT: The “place” of liberalism in Brazil of the 19th century had been the subject of major debates in the Social Sciences. Thus, we aim to map this debate and provide a summary of these positions. To do this, we will first make a return to the context of the emergence of liberalism in England, then we will advance to its philosophical principles in John Locke. Then, we will demonstrate how these philosophical principles were interpreted in Brazil in three positions: First as an “idea out of place” (SCHWARZ, 2000; NOGUEIRA, 1976), second as “an idea tends to find its place” (COUTINHO, 2000) and third as an “idea that is in its right place” (FRANCO, 1976; BOSI, 2010).

KEYWORDS: Liberalism. Political philosophy. Freedom. 19th century.

RESUMO: O “lugar” do liberalismo no Brasil do século XIX é alvo de grandes debates na filosofia política (RICUPERO, 2007). Assim, temos como objetivo mapear esse debate e fornecer uma síntese dessas posições. Para isso, faremos, primeiro, um retorno ao contexto de surgimento do liberalismo na Inglaterra e, posteriormente, avançaremos para seus princípios filosóficos em John Locke. Em seguida, demonstraremos como esses princípios filosóficos foram interpretados no Brasil em três posições: primeiro como “ideia fora do lugar” (SCHWARZ, 2000; NOGUEIRA, 1976), segundo como “uma ideia tende a encontrar seu lugar” (COUTINHO, 2000) e terceiro como uma “ideia que está em seu devido lugar” (FRANCO, 1976; BOSI, 2010).

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Liberalismo. Filosofia política. Liberdades. Século XIX.

RESUMEN: El “lugar” del liberalismo en el Brasil del siglo XIX es objeto de grandes debates en filosofía política (RICUPERO, 2007). Por lo tanto, nuestro objetivo es trazar un mapa de este debate y ofrecer una síntesis de estas posiciones. Para ello, primero haremos un retorno al contexto de la irrupción del liberalismo en Inglaterra y, posteriormente, avanzaremos a sus principios filosóficos en John Locke. Luego, demostraremos cómo estos principios filosóficos fueron interpretados en Brasil en tres posiciones: primero como “idea fuera de lugar” (SCHWARZ, 2000; NOGUEIRA, 1976), segundo como “una idea tiende a encontrar su lugar” (COUTINHO, 2000) y tercero como una “idea que está en su debido lugar” (FRANCO, 1976; BOSI, 2010).

PALABRAS CLAVE: Liberalismo. Filosofia política. Libertades. Siglo XIX.

¹ São Paulo State University (UNESP), Araraquara – SP – Brazil. Master's Student in Social Sciences. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1124-8506>. E-mail: lucas.vasques@unesp.br

Introduction

According to Raymundo Faoro (1987), political thought cannot be summarized to political philosophy, political science or ideology. Political thought, thus, is endowed with its own autonomous existence. In this way, reducing political thought to a mere political philosophy leads to a disfiguration of history itself, as well as to a detachment from reality. Political philosophies, such as liberalism, represent a teleological tool, an abstract goal to be pursued. Political thought, on the other hand, is its materialization. Faoro (1987, p. 15, our translation) states that "Political thought is inside political experience, incorporated to action, fixing itself in many abbreviations, in theoretical bodies, institutions and laws".

The objective of the present article is to understand how the debate around the political philosophy of English liberalism is structured as political thought in Brazil in the 19th century². To this end, the present article is composed of two parts. In the first part we will return to understand the context of formation of English liberalism. Once this question is overcome, we will advance to the understanding of the principles of liberal political philosophy through the writings of John Locke (1994). Having introduced its context and principles, we will verify how liberal political philosophy in Brazil is interpreted and debated.

To this end, the best known and widely referenced text is that of Bernardo Ricupero (2007), entitled **From formation to form: still the "misplaced ideas"**. However, this text is not able to provide an overview of the debates on the subject by excluding Marco Aurélio Nogueira's (1976) position on the subject. Moreover, Ricupero's text (2007) divides the positions on the subject into two opposing axes: "The ideas out of place" (SCHWARZ, 2000) and "The ideas are in their proper place" (BOSI, 2010; COUTINHO, 2000; FRANCO, 1976), simplifying the position adopted by Carlos Nelson Coutinho (2000). As we will demonstrate below, Coutinho's (2000) position in this debate should not be simplified into the slogan "Ideas are in their place" at the risk of essentializing the discussion and giving the false impression that it is a linear discussion, composed only of two binary positions.

² We deal with English liberalism only as a form of theoretical and empirical cut-off. After all, if we consider liberalism in its French version, the doctrinal liberalism, the terms of the debate become more complex. After all, if we consider the work of thinkers such as José Bonifácio de Andrada e Silva, we will verify that his philosophical and political trajectory was marked by the contestation of slavery. Slavery was an argument to contest the "place" of liberalism in the 19th century, as we will see below. José Bonifácio de Andrada e Silva's liberal ideas were always in friction with the slaveholding Brazilian society. Deeply influenced by the theses of John Locke, he was committed to the gradual abolition of slavery, to the expansion of primary and secondary education, and also defended the expansion of the country to the interior of the continent. He proposed the integration of the Indian into civil society, also with miscegenation as a fact of integration and national identity. This intellectual became a major inspiration in the search for a national identity, inspiring debates up to three centuries after writing his theses. A defender of the centralized state, he influenced Brazil's independence.

To constitute a systematic reading of this discussion, we point out that there are not only two binary positions in the debate, but actually three strands that mark different positions about liberalism in Brazil: 1) "Ideas out of place" (NOGUEIRA, 1976; SCHWARZ, 2000); 2) "Ideas tend to find their place" (COUTINHO, 2000) and 3) "Ideas are in their place" (BOSI, 2010; FRANCO, 1976). In order to understand how this problematic is constituted, we will first advance to the context of the construction of liberalism.

The Context of Liberalism's Emergence

The context of the emergence of liberal thought goes back to the 17th century in the disputes between the absolutists and the ascendant bourgeoisie. In addition to this dispute, Catholics, Anglicans, Presbyterians and Puritans were also fighting for religious hegemony in England. This political and social framework would culminate in 1640 in an armed conflict between King Charles I's military forces and the English Parliament. Called the Puritan Revolution, the battle ended with the victory of the Parliamentarians and the execution of Charles I.

Thus, after a regicide, the republican government of Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) was established, whose excesses and oppression prompted Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) to write *The Leviathan* in 1651. The dictatorship of Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) prospered militarily and commercially until his death in 1658. As his successor, his son Richard Cromwell was not as successful, being deposed with only 18 months of rule. His deposition plunged England again into a political and social crisis that would end in a civil war, the result of which was the return of the Stuart monarchy to power. During this period, tensions between the Crown and Parliament returned, as the latter was opposed to the pro-Catholic positions taken by the Stuart absolutists.

The return of the monarchy to power only occurred with the coronation of Charles II (1630-1685), who accepted the parliamentarians' prerogative to have his powers reduced. However, by adopting positions favorable to religious freedom, the king clashed with parliament, leading to the dissolution of the latter in 1681. The reign of Charles II lasted until his death in 1685, when, in the absence of an heir, he was succeeded by his brother, James II (1633-1701).

Like his brother, James II showed inclinations for the full exercise of absolutism. These inclinations of James, would lead to a union of English politicians, from various political spectrums, as a way to remove him from power. With the intention of accomplishing

this plan, English politicians conspire with William III (1650-1702), Prince of Orange. In 1688, the parliament crowns William as king of England, without bloodshed, after James II flees to France. Under the nickname of the Glorious Revolution, this historical period marked the triumph of a set of political ideas and practices that would receive the name of liberalism, through its greatest exponent, John Locke (1632-1704).

John Locke, the founder of liberalism

John Locke (1632-1704), opponent of the Stuart monarchy, was exiled and returned to England only after the Glorious Revolution. In the meantime, **The Second Treatise** (LOCKE, 1994) was published as a justification and legitimization of the Glorious Revolution. The basis of this defense was the right to resistance, in which the people could resist the sovereign if they deemed it necessary. His return to England occurs over the clamor and recognition of King William of Orange (WEFFORT, 2001).

To understand liberalism beyond its historical context, we will make an incursion through its main philosophical conceptions: natural law, state of nature, private property, money, state of war, contract, political society and government (VARNAGY, 2006). John Locke's conception of natural law consists of the belief that certain laws of nature also govern and can be unraveled through the use of reason. Thus, for the author, there would be a rationality inscribed in the hearts of men. Such rationality would be inculcated in men through the actions of a God, insofar as they would fulfill the purpose of discernment between good and evil, as an instinct to preserve life itself, freedom and property, inalienable rights (LOCKE, 1994).

Although natural law is constituted by a political imperative that does not cease with the formation of society. On the contrary, in Locke's (1994) perspective, it will become more rigorous through the action of law and laws. Thus, natural laws would be endowed with a coercive power toward those who infringe it.

The state of nature in John Locke's liberalism is a philosophical imperative to think about the natural state of human beings. Thus, for Locke (1994), human beings, as a divine creation, would live in a state of perfect equality and natural freedom. In this state, all subordination and vassalage would not exist, and human beings would be subject only to the force of natural laws, without the existence of law.

Another important principle of liberalism is the notion of private property. According to Varnagy (2006, p. 60), the notion of private property in Locke is polysemic: "[...] in a

broad and general sense, it implies 'life, liberty, and land' (II, 87, 123, 173) and, in a stricter sense, property, the right to inherit, and the ability to accumulate wealth." To this end, property in Locke (1994) is not unlimited, because for him possession depends closely on the amount of labor put into the object or place. Thus, the author (LOCKE, 1994) links labor to the value of a given object. The more work is performed - this limited by individual capabilities - the greater is the value of the product.

On the issue of money, Locke (1994) argues that thanks to its creation, men were able to create beyond their own subsistence. Thus, men were able to accumulate their possessions and their own surplus. To this end, money becomes a durable instrument that men could store without the temporal risk of its rotting, just like the food produced on their land. This is also due to the tacitly accepted pact that guaranteed money this status.

As a consequence of this process, there was an accumulation and concentration of goods and land. As commercial society became more complex, conflicts began to exist over the ownership of goods, which would result in the end of the state of nature. As a result of this process, it became necessary to build the law, the laws, and the State itself, as a means of regulating conflicts. Thus, the State in Locke (1994), in addition to guaranteeing the possession of property, should be responsible for penalizing individuals who transgress the laws. Thus, Tomas Varnagy (2006) proposes a division of John Locke's state of nature into two stages: the first, referring to limited property, based on labor, and the second, to unlimited property, mediated by the existence of money:

It is then possible to establish periods referring to the state of nature, in which there is society and natural law reigns, in two stages: in the first, property is limited by labor and life is pleasant and enjoyable; in the second, which arises with the appearance of money, there is both the possibility of unlimited accumulation and inequality in relation to possessions (VARNAGY, 2006, p. 63, our translation).

Despite this peaceful and harmonious state of nature, the need arises for men to organize themselves into a society. Thus, with the problems arising from the emergence of money, men organize themselves into a civil government as a form of mutual protection, with the security of their lives, goods and property.

In summary, the main purpose of political society is to protect property rights in the broad sense, i.e., life, liberty and property. Since these rights exist prior to the constitution of society and even in political society itself, there can be no right to impose, for example, taxes without the consent of its members (VARNAGY, 2006, p. 68, our translation).

As a consequence, according to Locke (1994), men enter into a civil government to protect themselves and their property. However, whenever a legislator or ruler turns against the interests of men and violates their property, the people would have a so-called "right of resistance." To the extent that confidence in the legislator is eroded, the citizens could by mutual agreement dissolve his authority.

Put all these principles together, how can liberalism be synthesized? Thomas Varnagy (2006) states that this would be an extremely difficult task. However, in a broad sense, liberalism means emphasizing individual freedoms in the face of external sanctions. Thus, to be liberal, in a broad sense in political philosophy, means to confront all forms that seek to take away from individuals their freedoms.

How to define liberalism? (...). In a broad sense, it emphasizes the freedom of the individual from external constraints (church, state, traditions, society). In the 18th and 19th centuries, it was based on the idea of the free market and sought to limit the powers of government through mechanisms such as federalism and separation of powers, although it did not necessarily imply democracy (VARNAGY, 2006, p. 77, our translation).

Despite this difficulty in defining the term "liberalism", this political philosophy ended up being read in Brazil on three axes of interpretation, the first as an "idea out of place" (NOGUEIRA, 1976; SCHWARZ, 2000), the second as an "idea that tends to find its place" (COUTINHO, 2000), and finally as an "idea that is in its rightful place" (BOSI, 2010; FRANCO, 1976).

Ideas out of place

Roberto Schwarz, in his thesis on "ideas out of place", in the work **Ao Vencedor as Batatas** (2000), seeks to demonstrate what are the relations between liberalism, philosophy, and political thought in Brazil. In it Schwarz demonstrates that there is a gap between theory and practice in Brazil. This gap is mediated by the practice of favor.

Through the practice of favor the whole social, political and economic structure is essentialized in the figure of the local elites. Thus, political practice becomes an instrument for the defense and perpetuation of personal interests.

The substratum of this political practice, according to Schwarz, was liberal philosophy. Alongside liberalism, the novel, the parliamentary system and the legal norms were "borrowed from central countries as a way to "civilize" (RICUPERO, 2008). That is, they were ideas taken from their place of origin, central countries, and used in peripheral

countries, far from their social conditions of production. This resulted in a process of detachment from their first practices:

Schwarz indicates, in other words, that peripheral countries, such as Brazil, would have to borrow from central countries forms, such as the novel, the parliamentary system, the legal norms and everything else that would make them "civilized" (Arantes, 1992; Palti, 2007). However, their social conditions would have little in common with those that originally produced these forms, which would cause them to suffer "twisting", becoming practically unrecognizable (RICUPERO, 2008, p. 64-65).

Thus, according to Schwarz (2012), liberal ideology takes its place as an "out-of-place idea" in its political practice in Brazil. Despite pushing for the liberation of colonies across America, liberalism in Brazil paradoxically served to preserve the legacy of slavery and the monopoly of land in the hands of landowners. After all, in Brazil in the midnineteenth century, slave labor and especially the slave trade thrived as a form of social organization. The Brazilian independence process from the Portuguese metropolis, under liberal inspiration, stands out. For Vivaldo Daglione (1961), liberalism in Brazil's Empire took on aristocratic garb, where a political battle was waged with the mercantile bourgeoisie. This process culminated in 1823 with the constituent assembly, under the promise of a "new doubly liberal constitution".

Schwarz (2000) states that liberal ideology served in Europe as a way to cover up the exploitation of labor under the ideas of labor freedom and legal equality. However, in Brazil, this exploitation was more explicit, based on slavery and slave trade. One of the greatest examples of this was the constitution of 1824, which, despite presenting itself as a liberal constitution, maintained slavery. Thus, the author argues that the predominance of liberal thought in international trade echoed in Brazil, making its bourgeoisie to settle under an economic rationale that aims at profit. Added to this, according to the author (SCHWARZ, 2000) Brazilian independence was also based on liberal ideals. All this conjuncture ended up clashing with the slave production mode and, in special, with the slave owners, the landowners and the agrarian elite (SCHWARZ, 2000).

This ambiguous or harlequin relationship between liberalism and political practice served to produce three classes: the landowner, the enslaved, and the free man. The latter being entirely dependent on the gestures of the former. After all, if the relationship between the landowner and the enslaved was mediated by the notion of property, of the landowner and the free man it was the "favor". Therefore, the "favor" prevails as a mediation that assures its parties the non-slavery.

[...] the favor assured both parties, especially the weaker one, that neither was a slave. Even the most miserable of the favored saw his free person recognized in the favor, which transformed benefit and consideration, however modest, into a ceremony of social superiority, valuable in itself (SCHWARZ, 2000, p. 8).

The "favor" is placed as a mechanism of reproduction of the classes of free men and landlords. It is a relational mediation that is made explicit in the dependence on the person and in the remuneration for personal services. To this end, the incompatible, or rather productively antagonistic, classes of landlords and freemen tacitly agree to cooperate for their mutual benefit. This cooperation comes to ensure for both parties that neither is a slave and therefore deprived of its freedoms. For Schwarz (2000), even the "most miserable of the favored" sees in the favor the recognition of his freedoms, of his person.

Another scientist to consider liberalism as an "out of place idea" was Marco Aurélio Nogueira (1976), studying the historical figure of Joaquim Nabuco. In this study he argues that liberalism in Brazil has always been very empty of egalitarian inspirations. Thus, still according to Nogueira, liberalism in Brazil is more a freedom of the nation than a freedom of the individual. Liberalism, therefore, assumes itself as a contradictory political practice, which was not able to find in the colony, social, political and economic bases for its full realization.

Ideas tend to find their place

Carlos Nelson Coutinho takes an intermediate position in the debate. For him, liberalism at one time was an idea out of place in Brazil, but with the process of capitalist modernization, it would tend to "find its place". To understand this position, we should make a theoretical return to his work **Cultura e Sociedade no Brasil** (2000), which highlights the existence of an intimism in the shadow of power in Brazil. This idea, postulated by Georg Lukács (1972), demonstrates the existence of a strong attraction between intellectuals and the State, with the State as the promoter of social transformations. In this way, Lukács (1972) identifies a conservative revolution, made from top to bottom, without popular participation and with a strong attraction to authoritarianism, characterizing a modernization by "Prussian way³" or of an "intimate" character.

³ The concept of "Prussian way" was formulated by Lenin and used by both Lukács and Coutinho, expressing, for Vladimir Lenin, the modernization process "from above" occurred in Germany, Italy and Japan. To know more about the subject read **Cultura e Sociedade no Brasil**, chapter II, by Carlos Nelson Coutinho, published in 2000 by DP&A.

[...] the transformations that occurred in our history did not result from authentic revolutions, from movements coming from the bottom up, involving the entire population, but were always processed through a conciliation between representatives of the economically dominant opposing groups, a conciliation that is expressed under the political figure of reforms "from above" (COUTINHO, 2000, p. 50, our translation).

By operationalizing this concept, also using Gramsci's notion of "passive revolution", Coutinho analyzes the "place of ideas" in Brazil and, in particular, the role of intellectuals in this process. He points out that the modernizing revolutions in Brazil assumed a passive character in which intellectuals were co-opted to carry them out. In this way, through the conciliation between fractions of the dominant classes, with the preservation of the latifundium and the maintenance of dependence on international capital, the popular layers were excluded from the political decisions taken in Brazil, through a process called "passive revolution" (COUTINHO, 1980).

In sum, Coutinho (1980) demonstrates that there is in Brazil a cooptation of intellectuals by the elite for the construction of a passive revolution. To this end, intellectuals have placed themselves in a manner "intimate with the power" of the elites and the state. As this "intimate" process progresses, capitalist modernization, driving and being driven by Prussian development, eventually put ideas in their "proper place." That is, as the process of co-opting intellectuals and capitalist development progresses, society becomes more adherent to the realities and class interests they are trying to express.

For Coutinho, as the modernization process advances, the more similar Brazilian society becomes to the general capitalist society, having greater sensitivity to the ideas formulated there and imported here. Therefore, following the author's perspective, liberalism tends to become an "idea in place" in Brazil as the intimate process of capitalist modernization advances.

Unlike the following position adopted by Franco (1976) and Bosi (2010), Coutinho (1980) places a temporal and procedural dimension on the question of liberalism as an idea "in its place." However, while Franco (1976) and Bosi (2010) place liberalism as a "fixed" idea that is independent of time and "place," Coutinho (1980) demonstrates the "intimate" relations between the idea of liberalism and the modernization process of the Brazilian elites, as well as the central role of intellectuals in this process. As this process advances, liberalism "tends to find its proper place" in the development of capitalism.

The ideas are in their place

Maria Sylvia de Carvalho Franco, from a Marxist perspective, in her article **As idéias estão em seu lugar** (1976), defends that both peripheral and central countries are part of the same order, that is, the same production system, whose primary objective is to generate profit, that is, to extract surplus value from labor. However, Carvalho Franco states that liberalism is the same, both in Brazil and in Europe, adapting to a global logic of capital accumulation. The integration of Brazil in a global logic, according to the author, has nothing to do with liberalism as an "out-of-place idea".

Following Carvalho Franco's example, Alfredo Bosi in **Ideologia e Contraideologia** (2010), points out that liberalism was never "an idea out of place" in Brazil, as in any other country, whether peripheral or not. His analysis is based on the assumption that in the first half of the 19th century, liberal ideology was hegemonic throughout the West, exploiting both the workers in the colonies (enslaved) and in the metropolis. That is, for the author, capitalism exploited the surplus value of labor in its most diverse expressions in these places. Whether at a different pace or place, "Old Continent" or "New World" experienced capitalist exploitation driven by liberalism.

Final considerations

Finally, our methodological path consisted in visiting the historical context of the emergence of liberal philosophy in England. In it, we understand how in a specific moment in England, in a specific context, the exaltation and defense of individual liberties resulted in a process of constitution of a political philosophy that remains as a teleological construction sought by the most diverse republican democracies spread throughout the world.

With William of Orange's seizure of power, political thinker John Locke was able to return to England after exile in Holland. With this, he was able to conclude the writing of his works that would serve as support for the interpretation of liberalism. In a movement exalting the defense of individual liberties, respect for the person and property, liberalism as a political philosophy spread through a wide range of countries in the 19th century, reaching even peripheral countries such as Brazil.

This arrival in Brazil is interpreted in the most diverse ways, either as an "idea out of place" (NOGUEIRA, 1976; SCHWARZ, 2000) or "an idea that tends to find its place" (COUTINHO, 2000), and even as "an idea that is in its rightful place" (BOSI, 2010;

FRANCO, 1976). This polemic, discussed earlier in this article, has moved the Brazilian intellectual scene in recent decades. The fact is that such views are distinguished in three theoretical axes, those such as Roberto Schwarz (2000) and Marco Aurélio Nogueira (1976), who consider liberalism as an English political philosophy (*logos*) that did not find in Brazil the same social conditions to realize itself as it found in England. Thus, its *praxis* was harlequinal and incomplete, making use only of aspects convenient to the elites.

The second theoretical axis of interpretation is based on Maria Sylvania de Carvalho Franco and Alfredo Bosi, who consider liberalism only in political practice. That is, regardless of its original place and specific conditions of production, it would be the same in its practice (*praxis*). After all, we all integrate the same production model, capitalism.

The third way, represented by Carlos Nelson Coutinho, works in a middle ground, oscillating in the understanding of liberalism between the two previous perspectives. He considers that liberalism, despite being detached from its first English context, would tend to place itself in Brazil, as it develops, as an "idea in place".

Understanding these three axes of interpretation, as we propose, through Raymundo Faoro's (1987) analysis of political thought, we understand liberalism as a *logos* able to provide teleological guidance for the practice (*praxis*) of political thought. Thus, liberalism would be a *nomoempirical* system of political philosophy, which emerged in England through the political practice (*praxis*) of English society, immersed in a specific political, cultural and economic context. After all, if in England the political *praxis* preceded the philosophical exercise of written systematization, in Brazil the *logos* had been sent in a way that served, through the practice of favor and enslavement, as an instrument of concentration of political and economic power in the hands of the elites.

The second theoretical path, expressed by Maria Sylvania de Carvalho Franco and Alfredo Bosi, despite providing a macro-structural interpretation of the capitalist system, places liberalism as the same product in terms of political philosophy (*logos*) and political practice (*praxis*). Thus, political philosophy is essentialized as a by-product of the political thought (*praxis*) of another historical context (nineteenth century Brazil), political and economic, to the detriment of the one expressed in eighteenth century England.

Roberto Schwarz (2012) also responded to the considerations made by Franco and Bosi about their theory of "ideas out of place". For the author, their critics ended up basing themselves on dichotomies that do not exist in their works, as if by objectifying that liberalism was formed as a political philosophy, they were neglecting its *praxis* in Brazil. Still, Schwarz (*idem*) affirms that ideas can indeed still be "out of place", even if they serve

the purpose of capitalist exploitation, framed in a global logic of the capitalist system of production.

In short, this article contributes to the discussion about the debate of the "place" of liberal ideas in Brazil insofar as it distances itself from the systematization proposed by Bernardo Ricupero (2007) about a first position entitled *As ideias fora do lugar* (SCHWARZ, 2000) and his criticism *As ideias estão no seu devido lugar* (BOSI, 2010; COUTINHO, 2000; FRANCO, 1976). In an attempt to overcome this dichotomous view of the debate, we systematized the "place" of liberalism in Brazil into three distinct positions, of which the first position would be "The ideas out of place" (NOGUEIRA, 1976; SCHWARZ, 2000), the second in which "Ideas tend to find their place" (COUTINHO, 2000) and, finally, "Ideas are in their rightful place" (BOSI, 2010; FRANCO, 1976).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: I thank FAPESP (Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo) for the support.

REFERÊNCIAS

BOSI, A. O Pano de Fundo Ideológico: O liberalismo excludente. *In: Ideologia e contraideologia: temas e variações*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2010.

CARVALHO, M. As ideias estão no lugar. *Cadernos de Debate*, v. 1, p. 61-64, 1976.

COUTINHO, C. *Cultura e Sociedade no Brasil: ensaio sobre idéias e formas*. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2000.

COUTINHO, C. N. *A democracia como valor universal: notas sobre a questão democrática no Brasil*. São Paulo: Livraria Editora Ciências Humanas, 1980.

DAGLIONE, V. A evolução política-econômica das Américas: do liberalismo como movimento de libertação política nacional ao mercantilismo como movimento de afirmação econômico-nacional. *Revista de História*, v. 23, n. 46, 1961.

FAORO, R. Existe um pensamento político brasileiro? *Estudos Avançados*, São Paulo, v. 1, n. 1, p. 9-58, 1987.

LOCKE, J. *Segundo tratado sobre o governo civil: ensaio sobre a origem, os limites e os fins verdadeiros do governo civil*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1994.

LUKÁCS, G. *El Asalto a la razón: la trayectoria del irracionalismo desde Schelling hasta Hitler*. Barcelona-México: Ediciones Grijalbo, 1972.

NOGUEIRA, M. **As desventuras do liberalismo**: Joaquim Nabuco, a Monarquia e a República. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e terra, 1984.

NOGUEIRA, M. Socialismo e democracia no marxismo de Carlos Nelson Coutinho. **Lua Nova**, São Paulo, n. 88, 2013

RICUPERO, B. Da formação à forma: ainda as “ideias fora do lugar”. **Lua Nova**, São Paulo, n. 73, p. 59-69, 2008.

SCHWARZ, R. **Ao vencedor as batatas**. São Paulo: Livraria Duas Cidades, 2000.

SCHWARZ, R. **Martinha versus Lucrecia**: ensaios e entrevistas. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2012.

VARNAGHY, T. **O pensamento político de John Locke e o surgimento do liberalismo**. Buenos Aires; São Paulo: CLACSO/USP, 2006.

WEFFORT, F. **Os clássicos da política**. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 2001.

How to reference this article

VASQUES, L. F. The “place” of liberalism in Brazil of the 19th century. **Rev. Sem Aspas**, Araraquara, v. 10, e021010, jan./dez. 2021. e-ISSN 2358-4238. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29373/sas.v10i00.15186>

Submitted: 09/05/2021

Approved: 07/06/2021

Published: 30/06/2021

Responsible for the translation: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.

Translated by: Alexander Vinicius Leite da Silva - ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4672-8799>.