

# JOSÉ DA SILVA LISBOA: TO WHAT EXTENT A BRAZILIAN LIBERAL?

Mauricio C. Coutinho\*

## 1. Introduction

José da Silva Lisboa (1756-1835) has long been acknowledged as an idiosyncratic character in Portuguese and Brazilian intellectual history. Born in the city of Salvador, Bahia, from a humble family, he went to Portugal to study Idioms (Greek and Hebrew) and Law at the University of Coimbra, the main Portuguese intellectual center. Graded in 1779 and back to Salvador, he taught Rational Philosophy and Moral, as well as Greek, but soon acceded to the colonial public service, as Deputy and Secretary of the Inspectorate of Agriculture and Commerce, a sort of Chief Tax Inspector, in charge of supervising taxes, revenues and business in agriculture and commerce in general, including slave traffic.

Increasingly interested in commercial subjects, Lisboa wrote a treatise on commercial law that was published in Lisbon, in 1798.<sup>1</sup> The favorable reception of this book led him to the writing of what was first intended to be the last (and eighth) volume of his lengthy commercial law treatise, but at last became an independent book on political economy, *Principles of Political Economy*, published in Lisbon in 1804.<sup>2</sup> If not the first Portuguese written book to discuss economic subjects and political economy, *Principles* is at least acknowledged as the first Portuguese book to display the denomination of the novel science – political economy – in its title, and to systematically attempt to deal with such a subject.<sup>3</sup> As we will see, *Principles* became the first of a long list of books on political economy published by Lisboa, who also published in various other subjects.

Alongside his pioneering activities as a political economy writer, Lisboa was to play an important role in a unique historical experience, the transfer of the Portuguese Prince Regent, D. João, and the whole court, to Brazil. The removal of the Portuguese Court from the continental capital to its main colony, in the end of 1807, was a consequence of the invasion of Portugal by Napoleon troops. Along the eighteenth century, Portugal had remained as a staunch ally of England, and as such accused by Napoleon of breaching the Continental Blockade. To the Braganças, the Portuguese royal family, the flee from Lisbon offered them by England's representatives, became the only way to keep the throne. Immediately after D. João and his immense retinue arrival at Salvador, Lisboa was incorporated to the inner circle of the Portuguese bureaucracy. In such a position, he participated, or was at least informed, of the discussions on the opening of the Brazilian ports to foreigner ships and goods, which resulted in the enactment of the Opening of Ports Royal Chart, signed in Salvador few days after the Court's arrival, at 28-01-1808.

An enthusiastic defender of the just signed Chart, Lisboa immediately moved to the colony capital, Rio de Janeiro, where D. João and the royal entourage established

---

\* UNICAMP email: [mcout@eco.unicamp.br](mailto:mcout@eco.unicamp.br)

The author is granted by FAPESP (Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo)

<sup>1</sup> *Princípios de Direito Mercantil e leis da marinha* (Lisboa, 1798).

<sup>2</sup> *Princípios de Economia Política* (Lisboa, 1804).

<sup>3</sup> Almodovar (2001) provides a very good account of the first political economy Portuguese writers and writings.

what was to be the center of the Portuguese empire until 1821 – the year D. João VI (now the king, not more the Regent Prince) returned to Lisbon. Still in Salvador, shortly before his removal to Rio de Janeiro, D. João established an official discipline (or *catedra*) of Political Economy, assigning it to Silva Lisboa. Although the *catedra* never became operative, that is, there were no lecturing activities, the initiative shows the importance the Regent, as well as his most important consultants and officials, conferred to the new discipline. It was supposed, specially by Lisboa and by a very prominent Portuguese minister, Souza Coutinho, that the acquaintance with political economy was decisive to the organization of the new government experience – in fact, as we will see further, to any successful governmental action. Additionally, it should be noted that irrespective of its non-functioning, the *catedra* is considered one of the first experiences in political economy teaching, under this proper heading, around the world.

In Rio de Janeiro, many official functions were assigned to Lisboa. We will come to his activities later, but it is important to underline one of them: chief of the Royal Censorship and Secretary to the Royal Press – the first press to be established in Brazil. Lisboa was appointed to this positions as soon as May 1808, and immediately began his prolific activities as editor, and specially, as author. The new official press published many of Lisboa's pamphlets and books, and, as a symbolic mark, the inaugural Royal Press text was his, the two volumes *Observations on the Free Commerce in Brazil*.<sup>4</sup>

The fact is that Silva Lisboa became an important consultant and a high graded public servant, extremely loyal to the Braganças – both to D. João and to D. Pedro, D. João's son who was to succeed him and to become the first Emperor of the incoming Brazilian empire, in 1822. After the independence, D. Pedro also conducted Lisboa to positions in the Constitutional Assembly and later in the Senate. In Congress, Lisboa always kept aligned with the Braganças policies. The defense of these policies led him to become a frequent polemicist on issues of the political scene, both in Parliament and in the press, an activism that aroused a lot of opposition, be it from the several intellectuals and businessmen who defended protectionist policies, or who were not so amicable to English interests, be it from the political adversaries of the Emperor, specially after D. Pedro forcefully closed the Constitutional Assembly and imposed a non-voted constitution to Brazil. Lisboa defended D. Pedro in both occasions, when he closed Congress and when he delivered the country its new Constitution. An economic liberal he was a political conservative, theoretically and in his political practice, what can be attested by his effective allegiances in the boiling Brazilian First Empire political scene. Lisboa's activism, intellectual and political, converted him in a controversial figure, who aroused either open eulogies or fierce opposition. The excited and partisan judgement of his contemporaries was to be transmitted to future interpreters of Lisboa's works.

In Brazil, much more than in Portugal, the analysis of Lisboa's books and actions became a partisan activity. In one extreme, he is considered a predecessor of a dreamed of and never achieved liberalism, and even an original political economy thinker – which he was not, as we will see.<sup>5</sup> In the other extreme, he is harshly combatted for his allegiances to the Braganças and for his pro-British stand. Even a very balanced and authoritative historian as Sérgio Buarque de Holanda<sup>6</sup> insists on the

---

<sup>4</sup>*Observações sobre o Comércio Franco no Brasil*, Lisboa (1808, 1809).

<sup>5</sup>Very representative of this view is Almeida (1975).

<sup>6</sup> See Hollanda (1956).

subservience to the Braganças and to the English imperial rule over Portugal and Brazil.<sup>7</sup> From an alternative angle, but also in a depreciatory mood, Lisboa has been compared with Hamilton: while Hamilton is admitted to have adapted his political economy knowledge to a realistic defense of American trade and industry, not submitted to a naïve liberal faith, Lisboa is accused of having contributed to the destruction of Brazilian manufactures, by his defense of open trade.<sup>8</sup> Only recently have Lisboa's texts received a more balanced and contextual approach.<sup>9</sup>

Another difficulty in dealing with Lisboa's text lies in an aspect also remarked by his critics: he is an extremely prolix (and not only prolific...) author. He wrote a lot, and his writings are repetitive. Although it is admissible that some repetition is inherent to the activities of diffusion and institutionalization of a new science, Lisboa went overboard. Maybe his high position in the Royal Press, which gave him special access to publishing, stimulated his prolixity. Even if we attain ourselves to the analysis of his more fundamental, or theoretical, works in political economy, leaving aside newspaper articles, parliamentary speeches, occasional papers, the repetition is excessive.

Apart from being repetitive, a significant characteristic of Lisboa's writings is the frequent appeal to the authority of Adam Smith. From his first to his last book, he was a Smithean. I know of no political economy author so faithful to Smith's ideas – one might say, to a very personal representation of Smith's ideas. Letting to comment on Lisboa's Smithianism in further passages, it is impossible not to emphasize this trace from the beginning.

The paper is divided in five sections, including this introduction. The following one presents a very brief description of the ambience of the Portuguese and Brazilian economic thought. The next one presents a brief biography of Lisboa and a short note on his main economic texts. The fourth section will sketch what I consider Lisboa's main economic questionings: a) connections between political economy and jurisprudence; b) free trade, free industry; c) free labor, slave labor, scarcity of labor; d) industry and intelligence. In the conclusion I will try to advance on Lisboa's economic theory, based on textual evidence, at the same time pointing new trends for further research.

## **2.Lisboa and the Portuguese economic debate**

The spread of eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries political economy in Portugal was marked by some very important constitutive traces of Portuguese economy and society.<sup>10</sup> First of all, in eighteenth century, Portugal's economy and society were marked by the permanence of non-modern, that is, feudal and ancient, institutions, both in agriculture and land tenuring and in manufacturing activities. Although Portugal had been a precocious European modern state, under the rule of a established monarchy, and

---

<sup>7</sup>On the reception to Lisboa along the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, see Rocha (2001).

<sup>8</sup> Celso Furtado, one of the most authoritative Brazilian economists, in his largely read book on Brazilian economic history, *Formação Econômica do Brasil*, first published in 1959 (Furtado, 2006), put forward the standard contrast between Hamilton and Lisboa. Alternative approaches to the same contrast in Fenelon (1973) and Vernengo (2008).

<sup>9</sup> Specially from Novais e Arruda (1999), Almodovar (2001), Cardoso (2001), Cardoso (2009).

<sup>10</sup>The brief characterization of the Portuguese economic thought follows Almodovar and Cardoso (1998), Almodovar (2001), Cardoso (2009).

a forerunner in overseas mercantile business, the Portuguese economy exhibited many non-capitalist traces.

In 1750, Portugal embarked in a fierce modernizing experience conducted by D. José's I prime minister, Sebastião de Carvalho e Melo, the Marquis of Pombal, who governed from 1750 to 1777. The main characteristics of Pombal's rule were economic protectionism, huge efforts in the reconstruction and modernization of Lisbon, after the 1755 earthquake, opposition to the political supremacy and to the economic privileges of the nobility, and the campaign against the Jesuits, which led to their expulsion from Portugal and from the colonies. The suppression of the Jesuits brought as a side consequence the necessity of rebuilding and reforming the whole educational system, including Coimbra university, since the Jesuits were the mainstream of the entire Portuguese educational structure.

The monopolistic structures of Brazilian trade is just an example of the many monopolist practices established by Pombal, in order to favor public finances and the Portuguese economy in general, both in dire conditions when he resumed office. In fact, an immediate consequence of Pombal's mercantilism was the reduction of the dependence from England.

One of the main issues of Pombal's mercantilist policies was the reorganization of the state bureaucracy, which required the learning of jurisprudence and of commercial rules. A sort of enlightened ruling class and bureaucracy was needed to conduct the Portuguese enterprises (the most important of them governmental) and government itself. As a consequence of this sort of statecraft, Portuguese Enlightenment became intertwined with the state.

Although the king's death, in 1777, represented a retreat from Pombalism, arising attempts to rebuild some of the economic privileges of the nobility, the Portuguese Enlightenment was kept. Coimbra graduates, who benefited from the educational reform, were to become the new intellectual voices in the governmental bureaucracy, in the press and in intellectual activities, and, most of all, in the debates of the Royal Academy of Sciences. Quite surprisingly, the Royal Academy debates brought physiocracy to Portugal, being the physiocratic defense of agriculture one of the main arguments utilized against Pombal's Colbertist policies.

Physiocracy, in Portugal, represented defense of agriculture, of market freedom and an attack to mercantilist policies – in Portugal, mercantilism was associated to Pombalism. The dogma of the sterility of non-agricultural activities was well received by the Portuguese physiocrats, who accepted the *produit net* conception but never delved into the intricacies of the income flow designed by Quesnay. Most of all, physiocracy was not taken as the complex economic thinking it effectively was, but as an instrumental doctrine to the defense of the rural interests. In contrast, the adherence to Smith's doctrine meant an attack to the agricultural interests. At the end of the eighteenth century, Portuguese economists staged a physiocracy versus liberalism debate, being physiocracy now interpreted not only as a defense of agriculture, but as a defense of privileges incompatible with free trade and labor mobility. Silva Lisboa's first political economy book, *Principles of Political Economy* (1804), which contained a defense of Smith and a criticism of physiocracy, was part of this peculiar Portuguese quarrel. Specifically, the *Principles* attacked the physiocratic perspective and the pro-agriculture policies proposed by Joaquim José Rodrigues de Brito, one of the pioneers of Portuguese political economy

Lisboa was not the first introducer of Smith's liberal messages in Portugal. According to Almodovar and Cardoso (1998), the first reference to the *Wealth of Nations* was made by Vilanova-Portugal in 1791. Sparse references came afloat, between 1792 and 1802, basically referred to liberty of production and commerce, as well as division of labor. However, Rodrigo de Souza Coutinho, the Count of Linhares, an important political personage who, after an international experience in Italy, became minister in charge of the Navy and of Overseas Colonies, and later (1801-1803) president of the Royal Treasure, was quite acquainted with the *Wealth of Nations*, particularly with Smith's positions on paper money, which he used to substantiate the monetary policies proposed in Portugal. Souza Coutinho was also one of the main leaders of the pro-British wing of Portuguese politics, and a very close consultant of the Prince Regent D. João, first in Portugal and, from 1807 until his death in 1812, in Brazil. In fact, Souza Coutinho was the mentor and main executive of the Brazilian solution to the Portuguese crisis, as he had been, before 1807, one of the leading supporters of a more liberal colonial policy.

Numerous reasons contributed to bring Lisboa under Coutinho's wing: both took Smith as an inspiration, advocated for a liberal colonial policy, and played a decisive role in the transference of the political command of the Portuguese empire to Brazil. The choice of Lisboa as a member of the highest staff of Royal consultants and public executives in Brazil was most likely a Coutinho's initiative.

The establishment of the head of Portuguese government in its main colony had impacting consequences on Portuguese and Brazilian history, and also on economic thinking and on the works of Silva Lisboa. As we have seen, Souza Coutinho had been one of the supporters of a looser political rule over the colonies. To Silva Lisboa, a Brazilian born Portuguese, this softening of the colonial pact was very enticing. The establishment of the Court in Rio de Janeiro meant that the former colonial capital became the effective capital of the whole Portuguese empire. A final political solution to this paradoxical situation was achieved in 1815, when Portugal and Brazil officially became a United Kingdom. But, even before the union, the political and institutional differences between the European and the American dependencies of the Portuguese empire almost disappeared. To many Portuguese intellectuals and politicians, not to mention the crown itself, the flee to Rio de Janeiro was explained as a simple move within the boundaries of the Portuguese territory. In reality, the economic enactments that followed D. João's transfer leveled the field, in the sense of not admitting any essential economic difference between Portugal and Brazil. Among these measures, the most important were the opening of the Ports (January 1808), the annulment of the 1785 chart that prohibited the establishment of factories in Brazil (May 1818), several privileges and exemptions favoring the buildings of manufactures in Brazil (1808 and 1809), and the 1810 Portuguese-British commercial treaty, that conceded almost unlimited privileges to British trade and industry. Tensions would arise only in 1820 and 1821, when D. João returned to Lisbon and the partisans of the reestablishment of the old colonial pact became more aggressive. This tensions, however, led to the Brazilian independence, in 1822.<sup>11</sup>

In the same thread, Napoleon's invasion of Portugal and the removal of the Court to its Brazilian territory, under the protection of the British navy, paved the way to the defense of some liberal theses. If Souza Coutinho and Silva Lisboa sustained the open trade advantages before 1808, the new economic events could be presented as old

---

<sup>11</sup>A synthetical account of the 1808-1821 economic policy in Cardoso (2000).

plans turned into reality. Since Souza Coutinho was the leader of the pro-British wing of Portuguese politics, the new agreements with England, apart from their strict political necessity, could be presented as the fulfilment of old and meritorious aspirations.

On the other hand, and adding up to liberalism, many market protections, in agricultural and non-agricultural activities, typical of old Portugal, were suddenly watered down. As a matter of fact, a great part of the Portuguese legislation regulating the exercise of professions and economic activities had always been ineffective in Brazil, due to the realities of a slave labor economy and to the difficulties in controlling agriculture and artisan practices around a vast territory.<sup>12</sup> Besides, the opening of the ports meant a flood of English-made products to Brazil. Both Brazil and Portugal were in an entirely non-competitive position vis-a-vis England, especially in what concerns manufactured goods. For one reason or another, protection, monopolies etc became ineffective.<sup>13</sup>

As we will see, Silva Lisboa adapted his conceptions on free trade and on the advantages of division of labor to the new situation. At any rate, to long date Portuguese liberals, the removal of the Court to a new territory meant an upgrade and the realization of a pre-existent liberalism, and opened new spaces to political economy.<sup>14</sup>

### 3. Lisboa's economic writings

I will make a few notes on the general content of Lisboa's main theoretical books, considering as theoretical those writings concerned with economic theory and/or with comments on political economy authors. Among his works, it's worth mentioning<sup>15</sup>:

*Principles of Political Economy* (Princípios de Economia Política) (Lisboa, 1804);

*Observations on Free Commerce in Brazil* (Observações sobre o Comércio Franco no Brasil) (Lisboa, 1808/1809);

*Observations on the Freedom of Industry and the Establishment of Factories in Brazil* (Observações sobre a Franqueza da Indústria e Estabelecimento de Fábricas no Brasil) (1810);

*Studies on Common Wealth and Political Economy* (Estudos do Bem Comum e Economia Política) (Lisboa, 1819/1820);

*Readings on Political Economy, or Economic Law* (Leituras de Economia Política, ou Direito Econômico) (Lisboa, 1827).

In my view, Lisboa's most important books are *Principles of Political Economy*, for its pioneering character and for expressing a truly (continental) Portuguese ambience; *Observations on the Freedom of Industry*...., because it expresses a Brazilian character, that is, it reflects the new conditions brought about by the transfer of the head of the Portuguese empire to Rio de Janeiro; *Studies on Common Wealth*..., which is a

---

<sup>12</sup>An overview of Brazilian colonial economy in the eve of D. João's arrival, in Holanda (1962) and Pantaleão (1962).

<sup>13</sup>Apart from a few monopolies kept by Portuguese government.

<sup>14</sup>Cardoso (2001) and Cardoso (2009) emphasize this point.

<sup>15</sup>The whole list of Lisboa's writings, economic or other, in Rocha (2001).

kind of Lisboa's *opus magnum* in political economy, in the sense of giving his perception of the main developments in political economy, from Smith to Ricardo. Yet, *Observations on Free Commerce* is quite similar and inferior to the other *Observations...*, whereas *Readings...* is shadowed by the much more ambitious *Common Wealth*.

*Principles of Political Economy* stand out as a truly original book, in the sense of well representing the Portuguese debates on political economy, and also for its attachment to Smith. As already mentioned, Lisboa's *Principles* was a Smithean response to Joaquim José Rodrigues de Brito's defense of physiocracy, or a criticism of pro-agriculture and of restrictive policies for labor mobility and manufacture. In fact, most chapters of the book sustain a comparison between physiocracy and Smithean economics, while the 12<sup>th</sup> chapter is overtly dedicated to the criticism of Rodrigues de Brito.

Before we come to the criticism of physiocracy, it is worth stressing that Lisboa considered political economy a science devoted to the “happiness of the nation”, a branch of the moral sciences, being Smith the “priest of civil justice”. As far as it focused on the “system of social order”, political economy was considered the science of the legislator (the “public man”) - a position not totally alien to Smith's stand, but much closer to a state oriented approach of social order. The sovereign should be a kind of chief applier of the “social order system”.

Going further, Lisboa did not put the Aristotlean *oikos nomos* totally apart from the social order. The monarch was but the chief of a vast family, and should protect the whole as a father protects all his dependents.<sup>16</sup> This paternal protection entailed a rejection of all special protection to any member of the state, that is, a rejection to monopolies and to impediments to the flourishing of all branches of industry. Lisboa considered the assurance of the “free employment of people and capitals” the second principle of political economy.

Free employment was entirely compatible with the search of private interests. Lisboa is quite incisive in the defense of the private interests of producers, which would imply civil liberty, extension of the market, moderation in taxes, and education. One should say that his admission – or harsh defense – of private interests is a very advanced position, a concession to individualism very surprising in view of the Portuguese and catholic background of Lisboa's texts. Going further, and in the wave of Hume and the many Enlightenment thinkers who associated commerce to polished costumes and considered the political advantages (in the sense of protecting liberties) of commercial societies, Lisboa admitted that exclusively agricultural societies stimulate oppression. That is, his attack to the defendants of a rural society had not only an economic, but also a political stand.

Following Smith, Lisboa was an enthusiast of the division of labor. In the *Principles*, however, his vision of the division of labor is not very specific and was grounded on non-Smithean arguments. For him, the division of labor was an extension of the natural diversity of talents and endowments of individuals and nature. The establishment of commerce between individuals and nations was an extension of the natural diversity of conditions and propensities God established on earth. In later works Lisboa would become more specific about division of labor, and more aware of the

---

<sup>16</sup>In a very interesting mention to a Portuguese myth – the Aljubarrota battle, that guaranteed Portugal's independence from Spain – Lisboa says that the Portuguese won the battle, in spite of inferiority of means, because of social cohesion assured by a paternal rule of the subjects.

benefits of intra-firm division of labor. In the *Principles*, however, the advantages of division of labor were essentially a motto against the protection of agriculture and against impediments to capital and labor flow into and across branches of activities. Also, it was the basis of Lisboa's defense of free trade with other nations as well as within the boundaries of the Portuguese state.

In what refers to the economic theory underneath and surfacing the *Principles*, it is arguable that Lisboa was as unspecific or not precise on the intricacies of Quesnay's theoretical scheme as the Portuguese physiocrats were. To begin with, Lisboa's approach to physiocracy was much more concerned with its economic policy implications.<sup>17</sup> Although he mentions Quesnay, his description of the physiocratic creed are mostly based on a Grivel's article on agriculture, published in the French Encyclopedia. The (transcribed) 30 maxims proposed by Grivel represent a sort of physiocratic common sense, and Lisboa does not go far beyond criticising the physiocratic principle that land is the only source of wealth.

The presentation (on *Principles* chapter V) of the “Fundamental principles of Smith's system” consists on a long transcription of the *Wealth of Nations* Introduction: “*The annual labour of every nation...*”. More precisely, Lisboa transcribes the seven first paragraphs of the Introduction, then concluding that: 1. labor, and not land, produces wealth; 2. the origin and foundation of any property and value lie in labor; 3. any land responds to the application of assiduous and well conducted labor – that is, it is men's hands that make land produce.

Lisboa concludes that many are the consequences, moral, economical and political, that derive from the basic principle that labor, and not land, is the source of social wealth. A long range of maxims follow these bare conclusions, being the apex a further defense of division of labor, mixed to a very eloquent defense of freedom of trade.

Other authors mentioned by Lisboa, either approvingly or disapprovingly, are Dugald Stewart, Montesquieu, James Steuart, Hume, Garnier. Lisboa seldom specifies the texts he is based on, but, in what concerns Smith, he mentions *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* and a non-specified draft. He is also very emphatic on the excellency of Garnier's comments, which may indicate his using of Garnier's French translation of the *Wealth of Nations*. Unfortunately, we have no clues about the edition of the *Wealth of Nations* Lisboa was acquainted to. Reeder and Cardoso (2001) say that Lisboa apparently read the English version of the *Wealth of Nations*. Rocha (1996) attributes to Antonio Moraes e Silva a Portuguese translation of the *Wealth of Nations*, to which Lisboa was aware, in the last decade of the eighteenth century. The first generally admitted Portuguese edition of the *Wealth of Nations* is Bento da Silva Lisboa's (son of José da Silva Lisboa), from 1810. In another context – discussing Lisboa's use of “intelligence” as a productive factor – Rocha (1996) raises the suspicion that Lisboa's acquaintance with economic principles and political economy writers came from the reading of general encyclopedias and of Garnier's French version of the *Wealth of Nations*.

In short, we cannot be very confident on how extensively Lisboa knew the political economy of his time, and should be much more careful in referring to Lisboa's political economy proficiency in 1804. Anyway, it cannot be denied that *Principles of*

---

<sup>17</sup>Almodovar and Cardos (1998) emphasize this point.

*Political Economy* is an eulogy to the new science, as well as a strong defense, based on Smith, of the very particular Portuguese liberalism Lisboa represented.

In spite of keeping the Smithean flair, *Observations on Free Commerce in Brazil* and *Observations on the Freedom of Industry and the Establishment of Factories in Brazil* differ from the *Principles* and are effectively works of a different make. To begin with, in these books the references to Smith are incidental, whereas in *Principles* they were almost obsessive. Besides, although both *Observations...* are not works on economic principles, they cover a wide range of economic issues, and do not remain restricted to the contrasts between agriculture and manufacture. But, most of all, both works are definitely “Brazilian”, in the sense of being referred to the problems of the colonial territory, now the effective head of the Portuguese empire. Both works reflect Lisboa's fierce opposition to the ancient colonial pact, which submitted Brazilian external trade to Portugal and blocked the development of many economic activities in the colonial territory, specially manufacturing activities.<sup>18</sup> The relief brought about by the new economic order, in the wave of D. João's arrival, is clearly expressed: “Thank God! We have relieved the colonies of what Smith called the dead weight and clog, that until now compressed and blocked the great spring of human industry...” (Lisboa, 1808/1809, p.202).

The main issue tackled by both *Observations...* is protection of different kinds of industry, privileges, protection to manufactures and commerce. As a general rule, as we know, Lisboa was against privileges and protection. According to his arguments, protecting and maintaining “artificial” industries would drive capital and industry out of their natural, and most efficient, destinations. Admitted exceptions are only those designed to protect new inventions – in this case, a temporary monopoly represents an incentive, a fair compensation to those who innovated to the benefit of mankind.

Lisboa extensively discusses the arguments in favor of privileges and concessions to the establishment of new industries in Brazil, apparently justifiable given the special conditions Brazil was submitted to: contacts with Portugal had almost ceased and even the usual trade channels were deranged by the political situation in Europe. He emphatically dismisses these demands, arguing that the spirit of the 1808 and 1809 legislations on ports and commerce was the complete freedom of trade, and the removal of all obstacles to labor and capital. And to those who asked a special protection to the introduction of machinery in Brazil, on the grounds this could be considered an innovation in our territory, Lisboa replied that such an argument was evasive, since almost all equipment is to be new in a country still devoid of manufactures and factories.

A necessary complement to Lisboa's defense of open trade, in a situation Brazil was entirely dependent on England to keep the provision of manufactured goods, not to mention the political dependency of the Braganças and of the Portuguese empire to England, was the favorable, almost naive, judgement of the British people and commercial class. Part II of the *Observations on Free Commerce in Brazil* can be considered a compliment to the English genius. Besides extolling the English people, Lisboa describes the advantages achieved by Brazil in its England trade: access to inexpensive commodities, good prices for our exported agricultural products, access to credit.

---

<sup>18</sup>Novais and Arruda (1999) very persuasively remark the anti-colonial stance of Lisboa's works.

Of course, the special relation kept with England destroyed the perspectives of establishing manufactures in Brazil. In this case, Lisboa had economic arguments to explain why Brazil should preferentially concentrate on agriculture and manufacturing activities complementary to agriculture. Lisboa was quite aware of the economies of scale in many branches of modern industry. Mass production required a considerable amount of capital and the existence of big markets, and Brazil was devoid of capital and of population. Thus, internal factors blocked Brazilian and Portuguese access to modern industry. Lisboa emphasizes that labor – free labor – was a scarce factor in Brazil. Under conditions of scarcity of free labor and plenty of land, agriculture was preferential to manufacturing industry. In this context, Malthus' authority was called in defense of agriculture.

Instead of protecting slave trade, said Lisboa, government should exert its efforts in bringing European free labor to Brazil. Free labor would naturally diversify industry (and here Lisboa meant artisan activities). Lisboa's point of comparison was North America, which, by the immigration of white workers, had developed manufacturing activities, reestablishing relations with England on a mutually beneficial basis after the pains of Independence.

In both *Observations...*, North America is taken as a point of reference, or as a sort of imagined future. According to Lisboa, the United States achieved a natural diversification of economic activities, combining a strong agriculture with a raising manufacturing experience. Brazil should tread America's lead. It is worth mentioning that Lisboa's depicted image of America was devoid of slave labor and plantation agriculture. Anyway, Brazilian agriculture could be naturally complemented by artisan activities and, provided no impediments to labor mobility were imposed, it might combine agricultural exports with a diversified artisan basis. The construction and successful operation of non public sponsored factories would be less likely, almost impossible, since it demanded requisites Brazil lacked, as capital, large population and superiority relatively to competing foreign countries.

Just to conclude, Malthus (many times mentioned) and Say, besides Smith, are the most frequently mentioned political economy authors in both *Observations...*. I venture saying Say was becoming a special influence on Lisboa. We will come to the possible Say's influence later, in dealing with labor and intelligence.

*Studies on Common Wealth and Political Economy* is Lisboa's *opus magnum* in political economy, in the sense of displaying an apparent mastering of the whole body of economic theory, up to 1819, and of discussing a large mass of economic topics. In the Preface, confirming long established conceptions, Lisboa situates political economy as the branch of Jurisprudence, which sets the fundamentals of the social system, ultimately aiming at employment and plenty. Political economy knowledge is essential to statecraft.

Lisboa's purpose is to stimulate the “commercial spirit”. In this sense, he proceeds, *Common Wealth...* represents a continuation of the *Principles*, having Smith, Ricardo and Malthus (“the triumvirate of political economy”) as referential authors. Lisboa says that he has tried to make clear and deeper one point barely posed by Smith, viz., that prosperity depends on the quality, and not only the quantity, of the performed labor (or industry). This is Lisboa's quest for “intelligence”, his alleged contribution to economic theory,<sup>19</sup> which, as I will argue later, sounds as Say's.

---

<sup>19</sup>On the real or supposed Lisboa's contribution to economic theory, Almeida (1975) and Paim (1968).

Anyway, besides the “triumvirate” and Say, the list of economists called forth in *Common Wealth* is impressive: João de Barros, Duarte Ribeiro de Macedo, Rodrigues de Brito, Accursio da Neves (Portuguese authors); among the British economists, Bacon, Hume, Locke and Newton, James Steuart (although, according to Lisboa, not favourable to free trade),<sup>20</sup> Edmund Burke (Lisboa wrote a book on Burke), Lauderdale, Playfair, Bentham, Benjamin Franklin, not to mention the Edinburgh Review; among the French economists, Bodin, Sully, Fenelon, Quesnay, Gournay, Mercier de la Rivière, Mably, Linguet, Canard, Ganilh, Sismondi; Italian economists, Maquiavel (although not properly an economist), Davanzati, Galeani, Gorani, Verni, Algaroti, Filangieri... In short, a long and updated list of economists, whose books were surely not easily available in Rio de Janeiro at Lisboa's time.

Rocha (1996) suggests Lisboa was an attentive reader of Dictionaries and Encyclopedias that contained summaries of political economy - ideas and authors. Lisboa would not have had primary access to so many books and, effectively, he may not have directly read even Ricardo and Malthus. I am not so confident Lisboa didn't read Ricardo's *Principles*, and I suspect he was a reader of Malthus, but these are conclusions inferred from Lisboa's approach to these authors, and not supported by supplementary evidence.

Among *Common Wealth's* large array of economic topics, general and applied to Brazil, it is worth stressing industry and division of labor, the “fundamental economic law”, and a new appraisal of agriculture. The “fundamental economic law”, according to Lisboa, is the following: men are born unable to providing for their basic subsistence, but are endowed by God with the faculty of understanding. Human progress depends on men's intelligence – here understood as intellect. The faculty of understanding is complemented by supplementary gifts and instincts, as free choice, curiosity, desire of bettering individual conditions (stressed by Smith, adds Lisboa), aversion to hard and mechanical labor, and impulse to socialize. In Lisboa's view, there is a set of human propensities that impels men to strive, to socialize and to avoid hard work. These propensities drive economic society to wealth, being wealth understood as plenty of commodities, conveniences, luxury etc.

More properly, the wealth of nations (plenty) is dependent upon industry, labor and intelligence – and Lisboa affirms that the *Wealth of Nation* had distinguished these three components of human action. Labor is understood as the mechanical activities of the body, while industry consists in the continuous application of human energy in painful or non-pleasant activities, and intelligence is the knowledge of the consequences, causes and effects of human action. In short, intelligence would be a distinctive capacity.

In further passages, Lisboa specifies his understanding of industry, which effectively was an important and many-sided word in eighteenth and even nineteenth century parlance. Industry means labor, effort applied to work - the opposite of laziness. An industrious worker is nothing more than a diligent worker. However, industry is also meant as non-agricultural activities. This is its modern sense, already alive in Lisboa's time. Lisboa avoids this distinction between agricultural and non-agricultural activities. For him, any continuous expenditure of human effort is industry.<sup>21</sup> And, most of all, he insists intelligence differs from industry. In Lisboa's view, Brazil should emphasize

---

<sup>20</sup> Stewart's political economy had been already discussed in Lisboa's *Principles*.

<sup>21</sup> Although he also reminded Say's definition of industry as “any useful employment of arms and capital”.

intelligence, instead of bare industry, which can be read as free labor versus slave labor. We will come later to industry and intelligence.

In not discriminating agricultural from non-agricultural industry, Lisboa was trying to add further thoughts on agriculture, very much in touch with existing Brazilian conditions. Contrarily to the United States, Brazil still was, in 1818 and 1819, an entirely non-industrial country, industry here understood as manufacturing or even mechanical activities. Of course, this was one of the consequences of free trade and of the special relations established with England.

In Lisboa's view, free trade was always dependable, and the supposed lack of mechanical activities in Brazil was not an entirely true, let alone attributable to free trade, picture. Lisboa supported his point of view with a double-edged reasoning. On the one hand, he argued that industry also applies to agriculture, in the sense agricultural labor may be continuous and energetic, and also in the sense there are artisan and even mechanical activities complementary to agriculture.<sup>22</sup> That is, agriculture did not exclude industry. On the other hand, he insisted on the importance of agriculture, frequently invoking Malthus' authority, while admitting, in other occasions, that agriculture comes first because it provides subsistence, that is, embracing a kind of agricultural common sense not attuned to more structured understanding of free trade.

*Common Wealth* dwells on a variety of other topics, but those yet mentioned suffice to: 1. show his commitment to free trade, to division of labor and to Smith's authority; 2. display the large array of economists he had read or, at least, was aware of; 3. show how important and instrumental to think the Brazilian reality, the comparison with the United States was; 4. present the subtleties and contexts of Lisboa's distinction of industry and intelligence.

Some of these topics will be dealt with in the next section.

#### **4.Lisboa's main economic questions**

The insertion of political economy in the larger branch of jurisprudence is a typically Portuguese tradition, shared by Lisboa. This insertion has two dimensions. One of them is properly scientific: political economy was conceived as an offspring of studies on law and jurisprudence. The other is institutional: political economy was taken by Portuguese intellectuals and officials, in late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, as essential to statecraft and to the exercise of economic policy in a modern – that is, an increasingly commercial – society. However, it is worth remembering that Smith opens Book IV of the *Wealth of Nations* with a clear statement: “Political economy, considered as a branch of the science of a statesman or legislator...”.(Smith, 1776, p. 428) We are not so far from Smith's earlier definition of jurisprudence: “... the theory of the rules by which civil governments ought to be directed”.(Smith, 1762-3, p. 5)

One might ask whether, being jurisprudence the common point of departure, there is a clear distinction between the English or Scottish tradition in political economy

---

<sup>22</sup>Lisboa contests Franklin, who, according to him, would have ignored the fact that we have machinery (and thus capital) annexed to agriculture. He could have called the sugar manufactures, a rather complex mechanical and chemical activity, in support of his stand. Surprisingly, he missed the sugar cane example. In fact, Lisboa writings make few mentions to sugar cane plantation and sugar production – the main economic activities in Brazil.

and the Portuguese (and Lisboa's) tradition. The answer is not so evident, but, in spite of the common point of departure, it is possible to mark some clear clashes between the Portuguese and the English or Scottish traditions in political economy. To begin with, Portuguese tradition is connected to cameralism, while the Smithean lineage is not. Lisboa's works, as Souza Coutinho's, descend from Pombal policies.

Going further, the Portuguese debate between free traders and defendants of physiocracy reminds us of the late prevalence of non-capitalist institutions in Portugal, such as obstacles to full labor mobility, protection to industries, markets and professions, absence of free mobility of capital and labor in agriculture. Although Smith's time Scotland and England preserved some old fashioned institutions, the main feudal and non-capitalist restrictions to mobility, free trade and freedom of access to all economic activities, had almost disappeared. To put the distinctions in a sentence: Portugal was a modern fifteenth century state, while England was a modern eighteenth century state. The national economic debates necessarily reflect this distinction.

Additionally, Portugal and England were entirely different colonial states. Smith's reflections on the colonies, in the *Wealth of Nations*, are very interesting but incidental to the main corpus of the book. Lisboa's reflections entirely reflect the peculiar colonial situation of Portugal in the beginning of the nineteenth century, and are central to the corpus of his works.

Free trade and freedom of industry are demands of a different kind, in the *Wealth of Nations* and in Lisboa's works. Smith attacked the mercantile system, especially the monopolistic companies which operated England's external trade. He also criticized other policy practices, listed and analyzed in the *Wealth of Nations'* Book IV, such as restraints upon the importation from foreign countries and bounties. Adam Smith's criticism, especially his criticism to monopolies, was well grounded in his price theory, and particularly on the distinction between natural and market prices of commodities (*Wealth of Nations*, Book I, chapters VI and VII). Monopolies could keep the market price of commodities above their natural price.

As we have seen in the *Principles*, Lisboa was especially concerned with restrictions to labor (and capital) mobility among artisan and manufacturing professions, as well as with restrictions and protections still prevailing in agriculture – remains of old Portuguese practices, or of protections and monopolies created in Pombal's era. In both *Observations* and in the *Common Wealth*, free trade mainly meant an unimpeded external trade, which would give access to the cheapest (and imported) commodities and would also raise the demand for Brazilian made (colonial) products. There are no traces of price theory in Lisboa's quest for free trade, apart from a very vague idea on the importance of demand to sustain prices and stimulate production.

Free trade and freedom of industry were connected to Lisboa's view of division of labor. Since division of labor implied specialization oriented by natural (territorial or personal) endowments, free trade meant low costs of production, or access to products otherwise inaccessible. As we have seen, freedom of industry wasn't a motto of special relevance in the Brazilian context, since Portuguese practices and restrictions to the exercise of professions were scarcely enforced in the colonial territory – having in mind the bold exception represented by the pre-1808 legislation blocking the establishment of manufactures and factories in Brazil, which, after D. João's move, became nonsensical and was finally eliminated.

We may say that the new political status and the renewed economic necessities changed Lisboa's approach to the compelling demand for free trade, that became quite literal: no impediments to international trade (other than generally imposed duties on imports). In the same tread, freedom of industry acquired the strict meaning of no protection from external competition. The only admitted protection was unlikely to be relevant to Portuguese and Brazilian realities: new techniques, new machinery, to which a temporary monopoly was allowed.

One of the main discussion and partisan comments aroused by Lisboa's actions and texts refers to his position on a very sensible historical issue: slave labor. There are no doubts that his economic writings criticize slave labor and argue for the superiority of free labor. In addition to several derogatory mentions to slave labor in both *Observations* and *Common Wealth*, in a specific text on “freedom of labor” (Lisboa, 1851) Lisboa argues, supported by several examples, the superiority of free labor over slave labor, in terms of productivity. However, he apparently concedes – the text is dubious – that, under certain conditions (the force of habits and traditions, harsh climate), slave labor is admissible, being only necessary to soften the inherent brutality.<sup>23</sup> That is, Lisboa did not sufficiently protest against slavery, although he was convinced of its inferiority and many negative aspects. This lack of effective action against slave labor can be attributed either to his subservience to the Braganças or to his realism, since Brazilian economy entirely depended on slave labor.

His belief on the superiority of free labor is confirmed by his insistence in bringing free white European workers to Brazil. Only free workers, seeking the defense of their best interests, would be capable of developing several branches of manufactures and of supplying specialized services. Complementary, an inflow of free laborers would soften the scarcity of labor that so much marked the Brazilian economy. That is, scarcity of free labor is the key to understanding Lisboa's portrait and diagnosis of the Brazilian economy. As we have already seen, in Lisboa's view, scarcity of free labor and abundance of land made agriculture the naturally preferential, or most attractive, activity in Brazil.

If Lisboa's basic economic scheme – abundant factor versus scarce factor determining the allocation of resources and the choice of economic activities – is clear and, to a certain extent, compatible with economic reasoning, much less clear is the Brazilian (and even North American) economy picture he portrays. In what refers to Brazil, scarce references are made to its basic economic activities, sugar cane agriculture and sugar production, and gold mining, both activities entirely based on slave labor. Other relevant agricultural products, as tobacco and cotton, were also dependent on slave labor. Mining activities opened space to an urban economic tissue much more open to free labor; but gold mining was a decadent activity in Lisboa's time, while the ups and downs of sugar production never blocked its supremacy in Brazilian colonial economy. In few words, slave labor was not only dominant, but it remained as the only economic alternative to Brazil – the next Brazilian economy upswing would be associated with coffee production, another slave labor activity. And it might be said that Lisboa was the right man in the right position to confirm the relevance and dominance of slave labor, since his official commitments in Salvador, Bahia, one of the main slave

---

<sup>23</sup>“In American colonies, where the habits of the impositions of a torrid climate allow to the continuity of slave traffic... it seems fair that the sovereign gave protection against the tyranny of their masters...” (Lisboa, 1851, p. 330).

traffic spots and one of the main sugar export ports, put him in a privileged position to assess all the economic and social dimensions of slave labor and slave traffic.

It is worth noting that Lisboa's view of the North American economy was also blind to its slave labor content. In praising American economic diversification and the growth of manufacturing activities, he only looks at a limited Northeastern extension of the territory. Of course, Lisboa was quite aware of the importance of southern production, and consequently of slave labor, in North America, as an incidental reference to the southern cotton economy in *Observations on the Freedom of Industry* shows.<sup>24</sup> That is, Lisboa's portrait of America was also partial - he had full knowledge of the hard reality of modern slave labor, which, however, wasn't fit to his envisaged model of economic progress.

Some biographers and critics think Lisboa's remarks on intelligence, a presumed distinctive component of human action, different from industry and labor, reflect the distinction between slave and free labor, and point to the superiority of free labor, the only one capable of embodying intelligence.<sup>25</sup> As we have seen, industry means continuous effort, while intelligence means knowledge applied to labor. In Lisboa's view, intelligence effectively combines with free labor. The many references to the necessity of intelligence, more than mere industry, in order to pursue wealth, are compelling. Lisboa goes further: only intelligence fosters and adequately drives industry.<sup>26</sup> With this distinction, and at the same time combination, between industry and intelligence, Lisboa keeps his Smithean side – industry produces wealth – at the same time insisting on a point – intelligence -, which, from his point of view, although already considered by Smith, lacked special emphasis.

It is worth noting Lisboa's insistence in staying inside Smith's boat. According to him, the well-known triad - skill, dexterity and judgement –, first mentioned in the very Introduction to the *Wealth of Nations*, explains everything: it may be equated to intelligence. However, despite Lisboa's insistence in remaining faithful to Smith, I think his quite loose conception of intelligence owes a lot to Say.

In fact, Lisboa's insistence in presenting production and creation of wealth as a process of transformation of nature and appropriation of natural forces, such as energy, raw materials etc, resounds Say. In a very suggestive passage in the *Common Wealth*, insisting in the role of nature in the production of wealth – its “cooperation” with men -, Lisboa says: “Then, the reunion of the intelligences in the well supported social cooperation, everything increases nature prodigality, thus diminishing the painful and dangerous labor of men, in order to give them the plentiness of all useful things, with the least possible value.”(Lisboa, 1818-19, p. 236). The purpose is to “increase nature prodigality”, that is, to make a superior appropriation of the gifts of nature, a process which depends on intelligence. In my view, Say's influence is indelible.

---

<sup>24</sup>Lisboa responds to the argument that it should be allowed protection of textile industry in Brazil, because our cotton would not have access to the European market, once the political and commercial conditions were reestablished, since American competitiveness would suffocate Brazilian cotton exports.

<sup>25</sup>Rocha (2001) comments on this point.

<sup>26</sup>“...it has not yet been fully admitted that it is Intelligence the element who gives, enhances, and well directs the General Industry;...” (Lisboa, 1818-19, p. 188).

## 5. Conclusion

Lisboa justified his economic policy proposals, especially free trade, upon the authority of great economists and their doctrine, the science of political economy. As we have seen, besides Smith he refers to a great number of prominent economists, from Quesnay to Ricardo, that is, from the origins of political economy to its most updated contributions. It is quite clear that many mentions are just discursive, a mere element of rhetoric, an appeal to the authority of acknowledged, although certainly not read, writers. However, his appeals to physiocracy and to Quesnay are emphatic and it is likely he had read, apart from many physiocratic texts directed to the popularization of the doctrine, Quesnay's contributions to *L'Encyclopédie*. I also infer, from the many references to precise Books and chapters of the *Wealth of Nations*, and from a special mention to *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, that he effectively read Smith. The same applies to Malthus, a very popular – we should say, an indispensable – author, and to Say. I think his references to Ricardo are merely rethorical (although he mentions a special chapter of the *Principles*, the 28<sup>th</sup>), for two reasons. First, there are no traces of any theory of distribution in Lisboa's texts, and one cannot read the *Principles* without tumbling over distribution. Second, Lisboa writes *Common Wealth* in 1818 – the (mentioned) first edition of the *Principles*, from 1817, was too new to be well read and known in Brazil. Besides, Ricardo's prestige until the *Principles* came from his activities and texts on monetary questions, and there are no evidences Lisboa was concerned with or aware of monetary theory. We will come to this point later.

This rather vague introduction – to what extent Lisboa was a learned reader of political economy – leads us to two more precise questions. One of them can be answered: to what extent he knew and effectively used economic theory? The second demands further research: which editions of the referred books he effectively used?

I will try at least to propose some considerations concerning the first question, checking Lisboa's awareness and use of some basic elements of economic theory: circular flow of income, value and prices, natural versus market prices, income distribution, monetary theory, taxation. I think this is a kind of minimal list, in the sense of including issues necessarily dealt with by the main post-Smith economists, and certainly dealt with by Lisboa's incensed “triumvirate of political economy”, Smith, Malthus, Ricardo.

Despite Lisboa's intense use of the opposition Smith-physiocracy, he seems to be entirely unfamiliar with the subtleties of Quesnay's economic theory, including the flow of income and commodities from one class to another. Putting boldly: he is only aware of the physiocratic doctrine of the agricultural character of wealth, which he combats with Smith's conception about the role of labor in the creation of wealth. I think that, although Lisboa knew and used the notion of capital – for him, capital is necessary to further the division of labor – he did not take it from the physiocrats.

In what refers to value and prices, in the *Common Wealth* Lisboa seems to be uncomfortable with Say's position on utility determining value. In his view, in saying that value consists in utility, Say forgets that abundant commodities have a high value in use and a low market price. We have no further digressions on this issue, but Lisboa was a firm adherent to the principle that value depended only on labor, or on the difficulty or facility of production. The basic conception of value or price as exchange relation, the whole content of chapters IV, V and VI, Book I, *Wealth of Nations*, any approach to Ricardo's or Malthus' digressions on value – all these discussions are ignored. Lisboa knows that mass production, or production that requires less work

(industrial production) costs less; that is, the growth of wealth reduces unitary prices. But this is all. No clues whatsoever of any preoccupation with relative prices.

On natural prices and market prices he also makes few approaches. Lisboa made many incidental mentions to market price, but no clear difference between natural prices and market prices emerges. The whole content of chapter VII Book I of the *Wealth of Nations* did not impress Lisboa. In discussing the prices of Brazilian agricultural goods, Lisboa points to the dependence of market prices on demand, but it is not clear the relation between market prices and natural prices. Some acquaintance with cost of production is apparent in his treatment of industrial products and competitiveness – industrial products are cheaper because it is easier to produce them. Again, his approach to industry and competition is entirely instrumental, connected to the advantages of free trade and to the role of division of labor. In terms of the *Wealth of Nations*, Book I, chapters 1, 2 and 3 are Lisboa's theoretical reference.

Income distribution, in any of its possible uses – relation between wages and profits, profit rate, rent – is entirely strange to Lisboa's thinking. A typical classical issue, wages of subsistence, is also missing. No reference to any topic that might point to income distribution.

Almost the same may be said of monetary theory. In fact, we have scarce mentions to money, metallic money or paper money. Besides a very inconclusive mention (in *Observations on the Freedom of Trade*) to scarcity of money in circulation, in a mining country, and to the connections between money in circulation and the balance of trade, Lisboa insists on the non-monetary character of national wealth (in *Common Wealth*), and notes elusively the possibility of substituting paper money for metallic money (*Common Wealth*). In short, no discussions on money or monetary policies.

Finally, on taxation, an almost mandatory theme in political economy, one scarce mention in the *Principles*, insisting on the importance of a moderate taxation. So, the answer to the first question – to what extent Lisboa knew and used the main corpus of economic theory of his time – is plain and simple: very few notions of division of labor sufficed to his economic policy advises and to his beliefs on the advantages of free trade.

The second question – which authors and editions Lisboa effectively read and referred to – will stay non responded, for lack of evidences. As we have seen, it isn't definitely established which edition of the *Wealth of Nations* he had access to, either when he wrote the *Principles* or after he moved to Rio de Janeiro. Brazilian culture, as well as Portuguese, was Francophile. However, Portugal had intense economic relations with England. After 1808, Rio de Janeiro became a kind of English commercial point. More than a hundred British shops and import and export business opened in Rio and Salvador immediately after the Opening of Ports. Hundreds of British adventurers, which seized the opportunity opened by free trade, settled in Rio.<sup>27</sup> Of course, British officials and sailors became familiar to Rio's human landscape. It is likely that the English language became usual in commercial and diplomatic communication, and very likely that Portuguese-Brazilian officials, as Lisboa, became acquainted to English. As a complement, the access to English texts must have become usual. That is, Rio de Janeiro's culture must have become anglicized, at least to a certain extent, and no difficulties in accessing English books should have been felt. But this is a general and

---

<sup>27</sup>On British business in Rio de Janeiro, soon after the opening of Brazilian ports, Pantaleão (1962).

non-documented stand, since we still lack a more precise description of the cultural assets of Rio de Janeiro, in Lisboa's time.

From the reading of Lisboa's texts and from some of his translation solutions, I became skeptical about his fluency, either in English or in French. For instance, he translates the French expression 'bon marché', which is simply 'cheap', as 'good market' (in Portuguese, 'bom mercado'), which does not correspond to cheap nowadays, and did not correspond in the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Lisboa's many transcriptions (marked by inverted commas) of the *Wealth of Nations* are hardly compatible with Smith's text. At least, the quotations aren't verbatim. Let us take an example of *Common Wealth*. Lisboa says that he quotes Smith according to Bento Lisboa's translation of the *Wealth of Nations*, the first Portuguese translation to be printed. I have not had access to Bento Lisboa's translation, and so, I cannot attribute to him (Bento) or to his father (José) the responsibilities for what truly is an adaptation of Smith's text, as the following comparison shows.

In chapter 11 Part III of the *Common Wealth* (Smith's Doctrine on the Effects of Division of Labor), Lisboa inserts a thirteen paragraph long transcription of the *Wealth of Nations*. The 13th paragraph corresponds to the first paragraph of the *Wealth of Nations* Chapter IV (Book I). The 12<sup>th</sup> corresponds to the last paragraph (8<sup>th</sup>) of Smith's chapter III. The 11<sup>th</sup> is a transcription (missing a few lines) of the original 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph. The 10<sup>th</sup> is an adaptation of Smith's 6<sup>th</sup>. The 9<sup>th</sup> is a defective and missing transcription of paragraph 5. The 8<sup>th</sup> is a defective translation of Smith's 4<sup>th</sup>. The previous Lisboa's paragraphs (1 to 7) don't correspond to the remaining parts of *Wealth of Nations* chapter III, and I couldn't check whether they are transcriptions of other parts of the *Wealth of Nations* – which they seem to be – or simple adaptations of Smith's ideas, far from literal.

But this is just a small test, to show that either Bento Lisboa's translation, which is assumedly non-integral,<sup>28</sup> scrambled Smith's text, or José da Silva Lisboa himself did it. I am not sure of Rocha's (Rocha, 1996) hypothesis that José da Silva Lisboa used Garnier's French translation of the *Wealth of Nations*, instead of the original English text.

These few remarks simply demonstrate that a lot of comparative reading and checking must be done, in order to assess Lisboa's uses of Smith's texts. Of course, the same necessity applies to other political economy texts, especially those from Say and Malthus, most likely read by Lisboa. A lot of comparative analysis, as well as a research on the books effectively available to Lisboa in Rio de Janeiro, must be done.

---

<sup>28</sup>According to Almodovar and Cardoso (1998).

## REFERENCES

- ALMEIDA, J. (1975) “Atualidade das ideias Econômica do Visconde de Cairu”. In: LISBOA, J.S. (1818-1819) *Estudos do Bem Comum e Economia Política*. Rio de Janeiro, IPEA-INPES.
- ALMODOVAR, A. (2001) “Processos de Difusão e Institucionalização da Economia Política no Brasil”. In: CARDOSO, J.L. (org) *A Economia Política e os Dilemas do Império Luso-Brasileiro (1790-1822)*. Lisboa, Comissão Nacional para a Comemoração dos Descobrimentos Portugueses.
- ALMODOVAR, A. and CARDOSO, J.L. (1998) *A History of Portuguese Economic Thought*. London: Routledge.
- CARDOSO, C.F. (2000) “A Crise do Colonialismo Luso na América Portuguesa – 1750-1822”. In: LINHARES, M.Y. (org) *História Geral do Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Campus.
- CARDOSO, J.L. (2001) “O liberalismo económico na obra de José da Silva Lisboa”. In: IV Congresso Brasileiro de História Económica - 5a Conferência Internacional de História das Empresas. São Paulo, USP.
- CARDOSO, J.L. (2009) “Free Trade, Political Economy and the Birth of a New Economic Nation: Brazil, 1808-1810”. *Revista de História Económica*.
- FENELON, D. R. (1973) *Cairu e Hamilton – um estudo comparativo*. Belo Horizonte, UFMG, Tese de Doutorado.
- FURTADO, C. (1959). *Formação Econômica do Brasil*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2006
- HOLANDA, S.B. (1956) *Raízes do Brasil*. 3a Ed. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio.
- HOLANDA, S.B. (1962) “A herança colonial – sua desagregação”. In: HOLANDA, S.B. (org) *História Geral da Civilização Brasileira*. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro.
- LISBOA, J.S. (1798) *Princípios de Direito Mercantil e Leis da Marinha*. Lisboa: Régia Oficina Tipográfica.
- LISBOA, J.S. (1804) *Princípios de Economia Política*. Lisboa: Imprensa Régia.
- LISBOA, J.S. (1808-1809) *Observações sobre o Comércio Franco no Brasil*. In: ROCHA, A.P. José da Silva Lisboa, Visconde de Cairu. São Paulo: Editorial 34.
- LISBOA, J.S. (1818-1819) *Estudos do Bem Comum e Economia Política*. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA-INPES, 1975.
- LISBOA, J.S. (1827) *Leituras de Economia Política ou direito economico*. Rio de Janeiro: Typographia Plancher-Luignot.
- LISBOA, J.S. (1851) “Da liberdade do trabalho”, *José da Silva Lisboa, Visconde de Cairu*. S. Paulo, Editora 34., revista artistica, scientifica e litteraria do Rio de Janeiro, n. II, t. II, 1851. In: ROCHA (2001). A. P. *José da Silva Lisboa, Visconde de Cairu*. São Paulo: Editora 34.

- NOVAIS, F.A. e ARRUDA, J.J.A. (1999) “Prometeus e Atlantes na Forja da Nação”. In: LISBOA, J.S. (1810) *Observações sobre a Franqueza da Indústria, e Estabelecimento de Fábricas no Brasil*. Brasília, Senado Federal, Coleção Biblioteca Básica Brasileira.
- PAIM, A. (1968) *Cairu e o Liberalismo Econômico*. Rio de Janeiro, Tempo Brasileiro.
- PANTALEÃO, O (1962) “A presença inglesa”. In: HOLANDA, S.B. (org) *História Geral da Civilização Brasileira*. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro.
- ROCHA, A.P. (1996) *A Economia Política na Sociedade Escravista*. São Paulo: USP-Hucitec.
- ROCHA, A.P. (2001) *José da Silva Lisboa, Visconde de Cairu*. São Paulo: Editora 34.
- SMITH, A. (1762-3) *Lectures on Jurisprudence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- SMITH, A. (1776) *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- VERNENGO, M. (2008) *Economics ideas and institutions in historical perspective: Cairu and Hamilton on Trade and Finance*. Salt Lake City, Department of Economics, University of Utah, Working Paper n. 2005-08.