



Branches of Brazilian Philosophy in the Twentieth and Twenty-first Centuries: Five Attitudes Towards European Matrix – Typologies and Analytical Tools

Cinco Vertentes da Filosofia Brasileira Contemporânea: Atitudes Frente à Matriz Europeia – Tipologias e Ferramentas Analíticas

Ivan Domingues ^[a]

Belo Horizonte, MG, Brasil

^[a] Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Departamento de Filosofia

Como citar: DOMINGUES, Ivan. Branches of Brazilian Philosophy in the Twentieth and Twenty-first Centuries: Five Attitudes Towards European Matrix – Typologies and Analytical Tools.

Revista de Filosofia Aurora, Curitiba: Editora PUCPRESS, v. 35, e202330160, 2023. DOI:

<http://doi.org/10.1590/2965-1557.035.e202330160>.

Abstract

The article focuses on the Brazilian Contemporary Philosophy, in the light of legacies from centuries past and of future perspectives outlined in historical present, and it is divided into two parts. The first one is devoted to establishing the theoretical paradigms and the analytical tools requested for comprehension and formulation of historical-philosophical issues on a theoretical plan, as well as for searching ways or answers to issues on a methodological plan, with focus on the formation process of philosophy in our means, when being transplanted from Europe to the Americas, and taking the composition and distinction of Brazilian *intelligentsia* into account, from

^[a] Doutor em Filosofia, e-mail: domingues.ivan3@gmail.com

our colonial period to nowadays: on the one hand, the Formation (from beginning of XVIth century to the midst of XXIth) and Post-Formation (from the three last decades of XXIth century to XXIst) Paradigms; on the other hand, on the track of the Max Weber's idealtypes method, the modeling of Brazilian *intelligentsia* in this long period, distinguished into five main types: [i] the organic church intellectual or the Jesuits of the Colony; [ii] the strangership dilettante or the self-taught scholar remaining of Law Schools from the end of XVIIth century to the midst of XXIth (Coimbra, Recife, São Paulo); [iii] the scholar or the expert modeled by hard sciences in the first decades of the XXIth century and extended to human sciences and philosophy between the midst and the last decades of the XXIth; [iv] the political intellectual or the public intellectual engaged in practical issues and in the political scene, when promoting the fusion of the thought and the action; [v] the thinker or the cosmopolitan globalized intellectual, not yet existing among us and targeted as future speculation. The second part, envisaged as deployment and complement of the first one in the framework of a research in progress, intends to distinguish the different attitudes of Brazilian philosophical *intelligentsia* towards European matrix, across the Brazilian Contemporary Philosophy (XX-XXIst centuries: alignment and reverence; autonomy and critical assimilation; ideological and political instrumentalization; suspicion and defenestration – so which should be added the European himself attitude here acting, as the French Mission in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, modeled as catechesis and civilizing mission, prevailing in our means since the Jesuits from colonial times.

Keywords: Brazilian contemporary philosophy. Paradigms, tools and methods. Brazilian philosophical *intelligentsia*. Attitudes towards European matrix.

Resumo

*O artigo focaliza a filosofia brasileira contemporânea, à luz dos legados dos séculos passados e das perspectivas futuras que se abrem no presente histórico, e se divide em duas partes. A primeira está devotada ao estabelecimento dos paradigmas teóricos e das ferramentas analíticas requeridos tanto para a compreensão e a formulação do problema histórico-filosófico, quanto para a busca de caminhos ou de respostas para as questões no plano do método, com foco na formação da filosofia em nossos meios ao ser transplantada da Europa para cá, bem como na composição e distinção da *intelligentsia* filosófica brasileira, do período colonial aos nossos dias: por um lado, os paradigmas da formação (do início do séc. XVI até meados do séc. XX) e da pós-formação (das três últimas décadas do século XX ao XXI...); por outro, na esteira do método dos tipos ideais de Max Weber, a tipificação da *intelligentsia* filosófica brasileira neste longo período, distinguida em cinco extrações principais: [i] o intelectual orgânico da Igreja ou o jesuíta da Colônia; [ii] o dilettante estrangeirado ou o letrado autodidata remanescente das Escolas de Direito de fins do séc. XVIII até meados do séc. XX (Coimbra, Recife, São Paulo); [iii] o scholar ou o especialista disciplinar modelado pelas ciências duras nas primeiras décadas do séc. XX e se estendendo às ciências humanas e à filosofia entre meados e as últimas décadas do séc. XX; [iv] o intelectual político ou intelectual público engajado em questões práticas e na cena política, ao promover a fusão do pensamento e da ação; [v] o pensador ou o intelectual cosmopolita globalizado, ainda não existente entre nós e visado como sondagem do futuro. A segunda parte, visada como desdobramento e complementação da primeira nos quadros de uma pesquisa em curso, procura distinguir as diferentes atitudes da *intelligentsia**

filosófica brasileira frente à matriz europeia, ao longo da filosofia brasileira contemporânea (sécs. XX-XXI): alinhamento e reverência; autonomia e assimilação crítica; instrumentalização ideológica e política; suspeição e defenestração – às quais deveria ser acrescentada a própria atitude dos europeus aqui atuantes, como a Missão Francesa em São Paulo e no Rio de Janeiro, tipificada como catequese e missão civilizatória, prevalecente em nossos meios desde o jesuíta da Colônia.

Palavras-chave: *Filosofia contemporânea brasileira. Paradigmas, ferramentas e métodos. Intelligentsia filosófica brasileira. Atitudes frente à matriz europeia.*

As announced, throughout this article I shall speak about the “Five Attitudes Towards European Matrix” within the scope of Brazilian Philosophy, tracing our historical roots and the challenges of the present.

The departure point for this discussion is my book, *Filosofia no Brasil: Legados e Perspectivas – Ensaaios Metafilosóficos* [Philosophy in Brazil: Legacies and Perspectives – Metaphilosophical Essays], published in 2017, which is almost sold out. A second edition is forthcoming.

Taking into consideration the space limit, I shall thus briefly introduce the book, assured that at this point what is most important is not that which lies within it, but its developments, as we shall see in sequence. I shall therefore say a few words and establish the starting point, with the intent of providing my foreign colleagues with the fundamental notions regarding Brazil, Brazilian philosophy, and the directions of my research. Let us proceed.

To begin with the title of the book, I point that its nucleus is constituted by two branches. On the one hand, in the steps of “legacies and perspectives,” the historical branch is at stake, following the perspective of an *intellectual history*, in a sense closely related to the French historian Sirinelli, one of the authors of *Les intellectuels en France de l’affaire Dreyfus à nos jours*, published in 1986. Here I make additions and adjustments in order to transpose this approach to Brazil and its philosophy. On the other hand, considering the book’s final subtitle, “metaphilosophical essays,” I intend to offer the reader a set of exploratory essays about the *metaphilosophical aspects* of philosophy and Brazilian intellectual philosophers. With this proposal, I tried to open a path close to Timothy Williamson’s book, *The Philosophy of Philosophy*, published in 2007, according to his view regarding “the philosophical study of philosophy itself, its nature, methods, and aims.” However, there was an important difference in the two perspectives. In Williamson’s case, in accordance with the method and technical possibilities of analysis of arguments, having the question of conceptual clarification at its forefront and focused on the recent path of analytical philosophy in England and the United States, the challenge is to enable a transition to a “post-conceptual turn,” in the direction of post-analytical philosophies, such as the philosophy of the mind. In my case, and with different purposes and scopes, the challenge is the application of the philosophy of philosophy in its historical approach, concerned, above all, with Brazilian philosophy. In other words, more specifically, what is at stake here is not a mere analysis of arguments, much less internalist analyses or *interna corporis*, with an exclusive focus on philosophy, but rather contextualized analyses, carried out with the tool of the history of philosophy and with the support of economic, social cultural and political history.

The title of this article reflects this ordering of theoretical-methodological considerations and makes the promise to consider the analytical tools used in my analyses of Brazilian philosophy. These tools were employed in the past and will likewise serve us now.

The first one introduces the analytical *tour de force* and sets the bounds of the territory, along with the field of the problem to be investigated. I refer here to the analytical tool of *paradigms*, in an understanding close to that of Thomas Kuhn, where the meaning of theoretical tool differs from models, and acquires the sense of methodological tools, which are correlated and working together. Specifically, the *formation paradigm* with the aid of Brazilian thinkers such Gilberto Freyre, Caio Prado Jr., Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, Raymundo Faoro and Antonio Candido. Another important name is Darcy Ribeiro. The focus here lies in the formation of Brazilian society, economy, politics, literature, and culture. As known, these are different yet interconnected aspects, among which I add the formation of Brazilian philosophy itself, and similarly to the thinkers above, the path I follow departs from the colonial period to the present. As concerns Brazilian philosophy, my focus is the formation of an *academic philosophy*, undertaken with the contribution of Paulo Arantes and his *Departamento*

francês de ultramar [French Overseas Department], as well as that of Cruz Costa and his seminal work *Contribuição à história das ideias no Brasil* [Contribution to the history of ideas in Brazil], with their different and complimentary scopes. My approach, as it dilates the perspectives of both authors to include the five centuries of our history, introduces a distinction between two main periods. The first of them is simply designated as [i] “formation,” as exemplified in the Colonial period, and marks the beginning of the process when everything from Iberia was transplanted to Brazil, including libraries, schoolmasters, and institutional models, on the track of the *Ratio Studiorum* of the Cia de Jesus [Company of Jesus]. This continues in the post-Independence period, the Empire, the Old Republic and part of the twentieth century. This long period contrasts that which followed it, which I named [ii] “post-formation,” and its outcome. What we have here is a somewhat belated completion of the long process of formation of Brazilian philosophy in the last decades of the twentieth century, a moment when, finally, academic philosophy is consolidated and overcomes the institutional deficits and historical-cultural gaps. This is the theoretical paradigm of formation pursued as far as process and result, aiming to introduce slices upon the empirical real, and from there to distinguish stages or phases: a historical and institutional process in a nutshell, as I demonstrated throughout *Filosofia no Brasil* [Philosophy in Brazil].

The second tool is the method of ideal types, in Max Weber's sense, distanced from mathematical tools, which were not the case, but drawn from logics and associated to the methods of history and their investigation techniques, applied to spatial frames and temporal processes. In my case, the ideal types were adjusted to work with historical aspects, with the aid of philosophy, the history of philosophy, in sum – this is where Paulo Arantes and Cruz Costa come in. The ideal types were, furthermore, adjusted in order to operate the metaphilosophical aspects, thus recovering the *logos*, the *kanon*, the *techne*, the *ethos*, and the *praxis*, in their various meanings and variations throughout time, for there is more than one manner of doing and understanding philosophy in this part of the world.

The focus, therefore, is what we might call “academic philosophy,” as disseminated in the teaching and research institutions, but it is not restricted or exclusive to them, for an extra-academic or extramural philosophy also exists, learned and exercised in the living experiences, in the political arena, or in the perusal of books, as a source of pleasure or hobby. Philosophy is also present in further education courses in universities, or in private courses offered by institutions or by families, as occurs with the affluent families of the Renaissance or early modernity. It may be taught by private tutors, as in the case of Hobbes and many others. The challenge here was the mapping out of the different modalities of the experience of philosophy, embracing the various *logoi*, *kanonis* and *technai*, from the so-called pure philosophies, also known as *philosophia perennis*, to the practical (moral) or applied (science and art) philosophies and also the philosophies instrumentalized by religion and politics. In short, a broad framework of experiences and possibilities, differentiated in their literary genre and the philosophical *techne* in the treatise or systematic, the essayistic or exegetic and the practical or critical modes – some of them moving towards atopy and the universality of philosophy, others to its spatial-temporal inscription and localism, or the combination of these two modes. Another challenge was the mapping out of the different *ethei* of the intellectual corporation of the schoolmasters, devoted to the teaching of philosophy, as well as the thinkers and philosophers, scarcer and acknowledged as belonging to a higher level, but all part of the same intellectual elite. That is, the *intelligentsia*, in Mannheim's sense, understood as an intellectual corporation varying in space and time, and whose *ethos*, as corporation or collective *intelligentsia*, in taking the *ethos* in the platonic sense of attitude of behavior and mark impressed on the soul, will be more than one. In this case, it will be *ethei*, in the plural, having more than one attitude and feature, since the disposition or attitude that entails

philosophy and leads someone to do philosophy may be the illustration of the mind, the salvation of the soul, the caring for the self, or political revolution. In sum, as I said, distinct attitudes and marks captured by Max Weber's methodological tool of the ideal types, and with its help I was able to typify five models of Brazilian philosophical intellectuality:

[1] the organic church intellectual, such as the colonial Jesuit, in line with the medieval *magister*, who places philosophy in the path of knowledge for salvation (at the service of theology, or rather, of religion and faith), such as the great Vieira and about a hundred other schoolmasters in seminaries and Jesuit schools, including those of other religious orders;

[2] the culturally unattached and dilettantish foreign intellectual found in the end of the Colonial and the post-Independence periods, up to the present, who have blazed the trail for the secularization of philosophy in Brazil, once the way from knowledge as a means of salvation was changed to knowledge as illustration or education of the mind, as occurs during the Enlightenment in its many branches. This emerged when there were no colleges or secular philosophy courses in *Terra Brasilis* and this strain was made up of autodidact philosophers trained by personal endeavor and/or the support of Law Schools, as in Coimbra and Recife. Examples of this group are Sílvio Romero and Tobias Barreto, who had, as their platform, respectively the Colégio Pedro II and Recife's Law School, in dissidence and against the grain of the current official education. Sílvio Romero studied at the Law School and Tobias Barreto was the greatest of them all;

[3] the *métier* intellectual or scholar, an English word that translates the term *erudite* from the Latin languages, in its two variants. The first [i] is the erudite of broad horizons, with an encyclopedic mind, who leads us to the polymaths of all times, such as Aristotle, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, the Italian Renaissance philosophers, and the French free thinkers, including the encyclopedists. All of them named in my book as scholars of the type 1, best represented in Brazil by Father Lima Vaz in Minas Gerais and Dom Estêvão (Francisco Benjamin de Souza Neto) in São Paulo. The second variant [ii] is made up by the specialists or experts, trained according to the process of knowledge specialization, on the track of the modern scientific revolutions, having arrived at philosophy belatedly. In turn they were named in my book as scholars of the type 2, when designating the field specialist, today a legion in Brazil, including myself, you, everyone – and examples that may be cited here are Leônidas Hegenberg, who worked at ITA [Aeronautics Technology Institute], and Raul Landim, of UFRJ [Federal University of Rio de Janeiro], now retired, acknowledged by everyone as an eminent specialist in Descartes and Cartesianism;

[4] the public intellectual philosopher, in the sense of the political intellectual, either left-wing or right-wing, who carries a political agenda outside of the academy, by means of fusing philosophy and praxis, with the variations and possibilities enabled by the strain in giving free rein to the experience of engaged philosophy and political engagement, whether acting as the party intellectual or not. Examples: Father Henrique Vaz, in the Catholic Left circles, pointed as a mentor of JUC [Catholic University Students] and of AP (People's Action Group); Marilena Chauí and Paulo Arantes, she an influent intellectual of PT (the Worker's Party) and he linked to PSOL (the Socialism and Freedom Party), both belonging to the Left of the political spectrum, further left than Father Vaz. Yet the political Right includes Miguel Reale and Antônio Paim, who are the most well-known figures of this group, although this kind of intellectuals is not numerous, either to the Right or the Left.

[5] the cosmopolitan global philosopher, in the sense of the thinker of all times and places, cast as a counterexample, and against the grain to the specialized and international scholar, such as Newton da Costa, in Logics (a type 2 scholar). Many of these are of the type 1 strain, where they will emerge from different areas in the humanities, v.g. Paulo Freire, in Education, and Gilberto Freyre, in the Social

Sciences. There are also those who come from the field of arts and literature, such as Guimarães Rosa and Machado de Assis, all internationally acclaimed, with a global audience. In philosophy, specifically, in the absence of emblematic examples of the past and present, I am led to wonder at the possibility, taking the path of a counterfactual history directed towards the future, in an inquiry regarding the possibilities of historical development, at the emergence, amongst the Brazilian philosophy milieu, of our Rosa, our Machado. I mean, a Brazilian philosopher with a global or international recognition similar to that of Kant and reached by our writers above, despite the limited reach of the Portuguese language.

All these reflections were undertaken in the volume *Filosofia no Brasil* [Philosophy in Brazil], where an abundance of names and references are found, and cannot be detailed here due to the constraint of time. These considerations comprise the array of research activities which I have continued to develop in the last years, in my different inquiries in the field of Brazilian philosophy, positioning myself as a Brazilian and a philosopher.

Today, returning to the point where I left the reader at the end of my book, I want to share a second line of research that I am currently developing, and which will continue for the next few years. What happened is that during the process of revision of the book, I noticed some gaps and inconsistencies, some related to the ideal types of our intellectuals, and others to the metaphilosophical aspects of Brazilian philosophy. Starting with the ideal types, I realized they embraced, or had in common a set of subjacent attitudes regarding the European matrix. These were somehow focused, but not entirely developed, such as the public intellectual philosopher, considering that this type of intellectual could be not only of the Left, but also of the Right. There were, similarly, other aspects left in semi-darkness or at rest, like the attitude of reverence towards the European matrix, common to the nineteenth century dilettante, or to the twentieth century scholar. Still, there are aspects that are highly significant nowadays, yet were forgotten or abandoned throughout the centuries, such as the rejection of the European matrix by a group of decolonial thinkers, something which comprises today's discussion agendas. In this context, since people asked me about these agendas, I understand it is the case to consider them. In other words, there is an array of historical features and metaphilosophical aspects found throughout the twentieth century and up to the twentieth-first, and also in earlier centuries, that undo the idea of succession or linearity, which I have never endorsed. What is at play in the method of the ideal types is to capture the novelties and prevailing intellectual attitudes in specific contexts, allowing for mixed forms, variations, and discrepancies. Moving to the metaphilosophical aspects and the nature of philosophy – considering the discussions about the pertinence of philosophy *in/of* Brazil, relativized throughout the book –, I realized the need to develop the *topos* of national and world philosophy, if not local *and* universal philosophy, having to admit the possibility of more than one path, coordinated with more than one solution. These possibilities were dealt with in *Filosofia do Brasil*, but not in an emphatic or conclusive manner. The problem was thus reexamined in three directions: [i] the claim of philosophy's universal *topos* or its *atopy*, leading towards universalism; [ii] the affirmation of philosophy's spatiotemporal inscription, leading to heterotopias and localism; [iii] and the combination of these two, leading to a synthesis of the universal and the particular, or of the global and the local.

With this in mind, I delineated an analysis scheme having two foci. On one side, the *ethos* of the Brazilian philosophical *intelligentsia*, channeled as five attitudes in face of the European matrix of world philosophy, as emphasized here. On the other side, the modeling of the different philosophical discourses and *logoi* to which these attitudes are associated, in one way or another, and which, in their turn, must be tested in their greater or smaller extension. Taking these into consideration, in one extreme appears the European settled in Brazil, from the colonial period onwards, disseminating the

universal lights of the intellect (knowledge) in an attitude of conversion or catechesis, with enormous arrogance. But some Europeans differed in their attitude and had more empathy in their interactions with the natives and tried to learn from them, as we shall see. Both possibilities were considered in my approach. In the other extreme the Brazilians themselves appear, in their ethnic diversity, where a layer of the intellectual group does not identify with the country – a country with elites, iniquities and structural racism. This group rises against the European intruder's logocentrism and neocolonialism, in an attitude of suspicion against abstract universalism (the veil or the mask of particularism and xenophobia of the Old Continent's people), and attempts to give voice to the extractions and subaltern peoples, such as the natives and the African descendants, as well as the women, v.g. decolonial and postcolonial thinking. In the middle, between these two extremes, there are protagonists in [i] an attitude of reverence and alignment to the European matrix, acknowledging the universal lights of the philosophy irradiated from the North that arrives in Brazil and moves throughout the country, similar to sunlight, which is indifferent to the medium and able to spread out, being the same in the tropics and in the Northern hemisphere, or rather [ii] an attitude of independence and critical assimilation, considering that the medium affects the reception of ideas and retroacts upon them (an effect of context and of feedback), or still [iii] an attitude of appropriation and instrumentalization, with practical or political objectives, aiming, in the long run, not at Eurocentric goals, but those of Brazil and the Americas.

Specifically, along with the hypotheses and the tests, these attitudes can be distinguished in five types, including variants:

[1] Catechesis and civilizing missions in its two strands: [i] Catholic or religious, along the Brazilian colonial period, by means of an instrumentalized philosophy (*ancilla theologiae*), taught by clergy schoolmasters in schools and seminaries, with the Jesuits at the forefront, including Father Vieira, whom I have already dealt with in my book *Filosofia no Brasil*; [ii] lay or secular values and attitudes linked to the propagation of the different branches of the Enlightenment (French, English or German), from the Independence up to the Empire periods, with their main characteristics, according to the historians: on the one side, having as its irradiating centers the Colégio Pedro II in Rio de Janeiro, and the Law Schools in Recife and São Paulo; on the other side, achieving its highest point, in the twentieth century, with the French Mission in the foundation of the University of São Paulo (USP) and the School of Philosophy, Letters and Human Sciences (FFLCH), in 1934: the Philosophy Section, specifically. As I showed in my book, the Section where Jean Maugüé taught for 8 years, and the Mission about which Lévi-Strauss spoke in the initial pages of *Tristes Tropiques* – an autobiographical work providing the first ethnology of the Brazilian and French *homo academicus* of its time, which enables me to typify this important intellectual modality acting in our country, and test the hypotheses of philosophy's double inscription, universal and local. There are two examples: firstly, Maugüé, at FFLCH, was from the French Mission, as I said, whom I have already treated in my book about Brazilian philosophy, and about whom I will speak briefly in the next stage of my research, because he hardly said anything about his experience in São Paulo; secondly, Flusser, who was Czech, worked at the Polytechnical, and wrote a great deal about Brazil, and to whom I may devote a more detailed examination in the course of my research, seeing him as an outsider.

[2] Alignment and reverence, embracing autodidact philosophers and scholars, the first group prevailing in the nineteenth century up to the mid-twentieth, a time when the formation of philosophy took place in the shadow of Law Schools. The examples here are Tobias Barreto and Arthur V. Vellôso, Germanophiles who migrated to philosophy. The second group, constituted by the field specialists, such

as Leônidas Hegenberg at ITA, and Newton da Costa, initially at UFPR (Federal University of Paraná) and then at USP, prevailed in the latter half of the twentieth century: at first these were very rare, today there is a legion of them, trained in Brazil or abroad, the majority of them unattached to the country or the nationalist agenda, due to the belief that philosophy has no homeland and has always been inscribed in the transnational *agora*, as Deleuze used to say, with the scholar, the dilettante or the philosopher doing Philosophy *in* Brazil, and not *of* Brazil.

This is the place to focus on the hypothesis of philosophy's *atopy*. As an illustration of the second attitude, we may choose Leônidas Hegenberg or any other exponent of analytical philosophy, specifically as an example of the field specialist, a scholar in sum. From a different perspective, Farias Brito, who had more intellectual ambition, philosophized in the first person and was recognized as the first genuinely Brazilian philosopher. In fact, however, his philosophy was universal and he discussed transnational problems, as if his philosophy were inscribed in the international *agora*, and his exchanges occurred with Spinoza and Bergson, rather than with Brazilian thinkers.

[3] Assimilation and critical independence, initially scarce, as in the colonial and the imperial post-independence periods, but more current in the contemporary times, when this strain becomes more robust, with the idea of intellectual autonomy at the frontline, having at its center the geography and people of these lands: the *Homo Americanus*. However, this occurs without the denial of European roots, as if we were an extension of the Old Continent, prolonging not only Greco-Roman but Christian and Western civilization into the New World, where they will undergo the friction of the new environment: still today this type of intellectual is in a smaller number than the colonized scholar, but no less expressive and influential, having among them Father Lima Vaz, Giannotti, Marilena Chauí, Benedito Nunes, who declared to be an autodidact, but was much more, and many others.

This will be the occasion to return to the hypothesis of philosophy's double inscription, universal and local, taken as a synthesis and tested in the Brazilian rather than the French-Brazilian environment, as occurs in the first attitude, described above. A good example is Father Lima Vaz, to whom I dedicated a special essay on the occasion of the centenary of his birth last year. Throughout that work, I demonstrated that he understood that universal philosophy needed to be assimilated and acquire local color in its application to different cultures and contexts, having occupied himself with Brazilian philosophy as well as with the pressing events of his time and with the iniquities of the country, in his interviews and articles. The other example is Miguel Reale, whose work I am now researching, and who saw, in Brazilian philosophy, a prolongation of European philosophy, wherein his roots are set. This led him to declare, in *O homem e seus horizontes* [Man and his Horizons], that "if we want to be original, we must not let go of our European heritage nor of North-American imperialism, in search of a Tupi, Aztec, or Maya philosophy," which does not make sense. However, like Henrique Vaz, he points out the roots and local colors of the philosophy brought from Europe to the Americas. Linked to this, Reale sees in the culturalism fostered in Brazil, a line of thinking that begins with Tobias Barreto, leading up to his own, as the expression of a genuinely Brazilian philosophy, and according to him much more than Farias Brito's spiritualism, which is neither genuine nor Brazilian. Finally, Reale considers that his philosophical anthropology of culturalism offers a greater contribution than that of Tobias Barreto, and that what he accomplished is more original in general philosophy, besides the tridimensional theory of law considered by him as his greatest legacy, and also the most original, in legal philosophy and juridical sciences. That is his opinion, but maybe his real contribution in philosophy might have been neither Brazilian nor original as he imagines. This is a suspicion that requires further research, following Salazar Bondy's footsteps, who in a chapter published in the volume *Uma filosofia*

latino-americana [A Latin-American Philosophy], organized by Argote Marquinez, Bondy argues that Reale is, in reality, “one of the main followers of Leopoldo Zea’s culturalism.” Concluding, I was informed by Lúcio Marques that Salazar Bondy cites as the source of his assertion Zea’s work *La filosofía latinoamericana como una filosofía sin más*: a work with less than 100 pages and a wide audience, published in 1969, ten years before Reale’s *O Homem e seus horizontes* [Man and his Horizons].

[4] Ideological appropriation and political instrumentalization, to the Left or to the Right, as Cruz Costa indicates, when he distinguishes amongst us, on the one hand, the *glossators*, with their comments about the text, and on the other, those who handle ideas as instruments and “campaign equipment”, in the sense of using them as arms and means for action. Following their tracks, we find the two large fields of the political spectrum and their respective political intellectuals. To the Right, there are the positivists of the nineteenth century. Among them are Teixeira Mendes and Miguel Lemos, as Cruz Costa points out; both known as orthodox positivists, or followers of the apostolate. Miguel Reale and Antônio Paim, in the twentieth century, are also eminent representants of Brazil’s politically conservative philosophy. On one side, there is Miguel Reale, who alleged to do “pure philosophy,” ideologically uncontaminated, yet his work was politically oriented. As I see it, it had an ideology or view of world as its background, rather than philosophy or ethics. Originally an *Integralista* as a youngster, he was a militant and one of the founders of the Aliança Integralista Brasileira (AIB) [Brazilian Integralist Alliance], where he was the second most important member of this organization, known for its proximity to Italian Fascism. A liberal-progressist later, or social-reformist, as he defined himself politically sometimes, when he moved from the AIB to the PSP [Social Progressive Party], and finally became aligned to the military regime. On the other side, on a lower level, we have Antônio Paim, who abandoned Marxism and Bolshevism, defining himself as an English style liberal-conservative, like the Tories, and who, although ambitious, never achieved Miguel Reale’s influence and political *pathos*. In turn, on the left side of the political spectrum, we find the twentieth century Marxists intellectuals, such as Marilena Chauí, Leandro Konder and Paulo Arantes. Finally, we also find other branches of the political-ideological field. One on side, intellectuals from the Instituto Superior de Estudos Brasileiros (ISEB) [Advanced Institute of Brazilian Studies], including Marxists such as Álvaro Vieira Pinto and Roland Corbisier, or non-Marxists, such as Hélio Jaguaribe, who lean towards the Left, bearing in mind that ISEB’s project was written by Miguel Reale and had Roberto Campos amongst its founders. This explains the non-coherent and non-organic nature of the group, according to Paulo Arantes, who described the intellectuals from ISEB as a hodgepodge. On the other side, there are the left-wing Christians, such as Father Henrique Vaz, who was very active during the 1960s and is considered the intellectual mentor of JUC and of AP, as I commented before.

Here the hypothesis of philosophy’s local inscription will be tested, in the application of universal philosophy to specific contexts and different situations: in other words, its political and ideological inscription. The examples that may be chosen include, to the Left, Father Henrique Vaz or Marilena Chauí, to whom I have already devoted research in my book. To the Right, there is Miguel Reale, whom, as previously mentioned, I am now studying.

[5] Suspicion, rejection, and defenestration, as occurs in our days in the field of decolonial or postcolonial studies, following North American cultural studies, with its agenda against European logocentrism and Western neocolonialism, which result in cultural and epistemic colonialism, as in the second attitude described above. Thus, Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, Abdias Nascimento and Lélia Gonzalez, that are at the forefront of the decolonial agenda in Brazilian anthropology and social sciences. And what is important for the analysis: most of them arrived in these areas over ten years ago,

the exception is Abdias, who arrived earlier, and considering that their works have only recently received the attention of Brazilian philosophy, in the wake of identity and minority concerns.

I do not know yet which author or work I will include in the present study, in the absence of emblematic examples in philosophy. In Brazil this area is fragmented into the studies of the native peoples, the African descendants, and feminist groups, without a philosophical systemization. This is not my area of study and this point will be dealt with later, in the course of my research.

My intention is in placing epistemic aspects in the foreground, and to scrutinize, on the one hand, the levelling, if not the inversion, of the sociological place from which one speaks, as a social, cultural, and political site. On the other hand, the epistemic place from which one speaks, as a site of geopolitical and group struggle, steering towards the division of North and South epistemologies, as in some approaches. This leads to the politization of epistemological issues, amidst the frictions and cancel culture of the internet's social networks. It also takes us to the unsolved confusion between *de facto* and *de jure* questions, distinguished by traditional epistemology, surrounded by the question of the justification of knowledge, and, nevertheless, obscured by the relativist and binary postmodern epistemologies of decolonial thought.

In my case, when focusing the fifth attitude, in contrast to the other four, I intend to examine the hypothesis of *inscription* in its local and contextualized angle, without the counterparts of the universal *topos* and the unifying *us* of the philosophical tradition. I mean, if not as a reality (*quaestio facti*), at least as a project or idea (*quaestio juri*), having as its horizon the notion that humanity=idea, which leads to the postulation of philosophy's *atopy*. This equation, however, is ruled out by postcolonial studies, in its stand against the abstract universalism of the white European colonizer, arguing instead for specific perspectives concerning gender, class and ethnicity: on the one side, setting apart these groups and blocking their members from participating in the public space of discussions and learning with other people and groups, seen as suspects and in adversary fields; on the other side, shielding and morally immunizing these specific groups against their adversaries and critics.

This theme, as everybody knows, is enormously thorny. It discourages opposition and the critical examination of positions, to the extent that people turn away from the debate. The conflicts take place without a clear exposure of their epistemic credentials, of the consistency of these ways of knowing, or what all of these are in the long run. All in all, if such an attitude comes to prevail, it will distance us from philosophy, that throughout the centuries, instead of the particular and the local, focuses on the universal or the global, searching for a unified perspective. Therefore, if we really want to extend philosophy to decolonial studies, in order to bring to light the silenced or forgotten side of people and cultures, this attitude must be modified, in the sense of a comprehensive approach. The challenge is to extend to these ways of knowing the *ethos* and critical attitude, with the proposal, when looking ahead, of examining their consistency and the foundation of their credentials, in an open and frank manner. Only then will we be able to properly decide whether the *localist* hypothesis is able to withstand criticism and hold its ground. This is my intention, and my suspicion is that it would not. This remains to be seen in the future.

This is what I meant to say, keeping in mind that my intention is to publish the results of the research in a new volume of essays, which will still take some years to be completed.

Trans. Maria Clara V. Galery.

References

ARANTES, P. *Um departamento francês de ultramar: Estudos sobre a formação da cultura filosófica uspiana (Uma experiência dos anos 1960)*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz & Terra, 1994.

COSTA, J. C. *Contribuição à História das Ideias no Brasil*. 2ª Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1967.

DOMINGUES, I. *Filosofia no Brasil: Legados e Perspectivas – Ensaio Metafilosófico*. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2017.

REALE, M. *O homem e seus horizontes*. 2ª Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks, 1997.

SIRINELLI, J.-F. *Les intellectuels en France, de l’Affaire Dreyfus à nos jours*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1986.

WILLIAMSON, T. *The Philosophy of Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2007.

RECEBIDO: 09/03/2023
APROVADO: 21/07/2023

RECEIVED: 03/09/2023
APPROVED: 21/07/2023