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One day I learned
a secret art,
Invisible-ness, it was called.
I think it worked
as even now you look
but never see me.
Only my eyes will remain to watch and to haunt,
and to turn your dreams to chaos.

—Hami K. Bhabha, quoting Meiling Jin
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When one is asked who is the best-known and most admired man in Brazil, the response seems obvious: Edson Arantes do Nascimento, or Pelé, “the most famous soccer player on the planet” and “the greatest athlete of the twentieth century.” When one is asked what black woman is as famous and unanimously admired in Brazil, the answer is not so clear. I know of no black Brazilian woman, past or present, whose name, like Pelé’s, can be associated with such cultural ubiquity or memorable talent and whose existence is so universally celebrated in academia or any other social sphere. The only approximation of such a figure in our society is not a single woman but an iconic representation of an entire category of black women subjected to historical arbitration or image “betterment” while serving as the public emblem of many complex, uniquely Brazilian race and gender issues. I am, of course, referring to the woman we categorize as the mulata—symbol of the country of samba in the same way Pelé is the symbol of the country of soccer. These victorious subalterns are mute figures whose bodies speak visceral truths with self-absorbed eloquence. The masculine ideal is subjectified and individualized in a single black man, and womanhood is molded into a politically sterile collective representation severed from its obligations to both gender and race.1

From one point of view, the subaltern condition exemplified by the social positioning of the planet’s most famous soccer player and the ubiquitous image of the mulata reveals two active but unconscious subjects alienated from their race and gender and objectified through description and representation by the socially dominant other. Both figures speak clearly, although their discourse is abbreviated and highly scripted. From another perspective (Spivak, 1994), we might see the condition of subalternity as an unnamable, incoherent, and reticent codification attached to a senseless identity accidentally born of a certain discourse in a given historical, political, and geographical space. In short, as Caravalho (1999:10) has put it,
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Subalternity is a condition of silence. . . . For this very reason, the silenced subaltern needs a representative. However, from the moment in which he submits himself to being represented by a mediator, he becomes an object in the hands of this spokesperson to be traded in economic and power circuits. Self-definition is no longer under his control. . . . Paradoxically, the subaltern’s legitimacy is conferred upon him only by his spokesperson, who then usurps his place in the public imagination and reduces him to a generic other. As a result, we are engaged in a perpetual quest to capture the moment in which the subaltern went from being represented to being merely presented, because that is the most appropriate time for processes of insurrection, social movements, and revolutions to begin as subaltern classes try to regain control of the way in which they are represented.

In this article I intend to point to the difficulties that blacks face in attempting to gain notoriety in spheres of public interest other than soccer or samba. I choose to reflect upon the social space of Brazilian academia, of which I, a black writer and intellectual who studies the condition of being black in Brazil, am a member. Throughout its history the Brazilian academic establishment has proven especially resistant to the presence and mention of blacks. Evidence of this is clearly seen in the Ministry of Education statistics showing that only 2 percent of public university students are black—a report that is especially disheartening given that according to the latest census blacks and pardos (light-skinned, mixed-race blacks) make up almost 45 percent of the population. The number of blacks teaching at the university level is also negligible. Although the School of Philosophy, Letters, and Social Sciences at the University of São Paulo, Brazil’s most prestigious public university, has produced the contributors of the country’s foremost works on race relations and black culture, it currently employs only a single black professor in a teaching staff of 504. Interestingly enough, he is an African, educated entirely outside Brazil. Along these same lines of academic segregation, José Jorge de Carvalho (2001) observes that in the recent landmark publication Scientists of Brazil (1998), commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the Brazilian Society for Scientific Progress, of all 60 featured scientists only 1, the geographer Milton Santos, is black, and the biographical statement on him makes no mention of race.

In other words, as objects of study mostly represented and spoken for by white Brazilian and foreign researchers, blacks constitute nothing more than “ethnographic leftovers,” “an African residue,” and awkward social subjects when juxtaposed with the overwhelming whiteness of these investigators, their history, and the membership of their respective fields of study. Thus, the subalternity of the black intellectual reflects not only the consequences of economic and racial oppression but also a history of denied access to knowledge and power. This oppression has yielded an effective containment
of the proliferation of black-African symbols and values, the restriction of black use of the power of the written word, and tremendous difficulty in realizing and promoting a black intellectual experience within the Brazilian academic establishment. Essentially, the most powerful agents of self-narration and self-determination in the inner ranks of Brazilian academia are silence and denial.

In support of this premise, Karl Mannheim (1986) argues that we learn about the world through our own minds’ diverse and contradictory thoughts. All these different orientations are involved in a simultaneous struggle to mediate our experiences and determine what we consider “normal,” and these unconscious aspects of the innate reasoning process constantly influence our epistemic concepts and perspectives. “The thinker’s first reaction when confronted with the ambiguous and limited nature of his own ideas and experience is to block out and resist for as long as possible a complete and systemic formulation” of social problems as a whole (Mannheim, 1986: 129). Ramos (1995) asserts that blacks in Brazil have been studied almost exclusively through a European and American filter. Even among Brazilian writers, research on blacks is conducted with colonialist tactics aimed at transforming blackness itself rather than describing or interpreting the black experience. Ramos suggests that, given the high value that Brazilian culture places on whiteness as the ideal norm, these studies view a subject’s blackness as an obstacle to be overcome. Consequently, “the black man’s problem” in the Brazilian sociological tradition is not a legitimate attempt at self-analysis and definition but mere insolence, confusion, psychological illness, or some other clinical phenomenon.

How, then, can black intellectuals articulate the affront they face in Brazilian academia without having their discourse mistaken for activism? How can they incorporate into their writings the courage, creativity, and sharpness articulated in organized black movements when belonging and cooperative advancement in the field of research demand adherence to predetermined categories of racial, gender, and ethnic subalternity? As anthropologists, for instance, black academics observe their “natives” and themselves from the Establishment’s ethno-racial perspective (Sansone, 1999) and defend their field’s cultural and political agenda in terms of the very sociopolitical context in which they are either completely negated or assimilated as evolved beings (Fanon, 1983). Their ethnic consciousness, which has been entirely fashioned by outside forces, is forced to imagine or ignore only that which the reality of the field permits.

Once they become aware of their subaltern role, black intellectuals also realize the limits of what they can say and write, because their assigned place is not to act as agents of social reflection but instead to serve as mere
objects of study. They learn that awareness of their subaltermity may warrant addressing blackness and inequality, but such mention will undoubtedly call into question their perceived devotion to “scientific objectivity.” The lord and master that protects black intellectuals from losing control and being overcome by emotion also shields them from feeling that they are different or giving rise to the insurgency that their uniqueness might represent, because once they realize that they are not being treated equally they will have to struggle to repress a profound need to oppose this racial inequality and social injustice.

As a result of an ingrained tradition of external imposition perpetuated by white social scientists, who interpret and construct subjective truths gleaned from ethnographic encounters between themselves and their “natives,” the subaltern black intellectual inevitably becomes invisible, his black body lost and blended into the research and his consciousness of self rendered passive and mute. Immersed in a society in which whiteness is valued as universal, positive, neutral, and immortal, blackness seems expressible only through silence, discontinuity, or the affirmation of latent conflict. Black intellectuals must resist any sense of victimization to avoid weakening their scientific argument. This constant struggle to avoid being discredited or accused of racial bias often leads black intellectuals to forget that they belong to a segment of Brazilian society with a long history of suffering and discrimination that public policy has never sought to repair or even address. They also forget that blacks were integral to the founding and very constitution of our nation and persist in believing that they stand to lose everything if they raise the issue of racial inequality. Doing so would of course cause a bitter confrontation with white colleagues, who would invoke the myth of racial harmony in Brazil, asserting their belief in the lack of racial tension while disparaging any mention of the fact that they are the principal benefactors of the unjust status quo that serves the immediate and personal interests of both racist and nonracist whites and the social/political/economic order that naturalizes their power and privilege. Such is the ire that black intellectuals stand to face if they include racial considerations in their work, and therefore they choose to avoid it altogether, convinced that it is better to remain silent and seek individual satisfaction or the happiness of a small collective to which they belong.

Four prominent social anthropologists have written on the subject of blacks in Brazil: Raimundo Nina Rodrigues (1862–1906), Ruth Landes (1908–1991), Édison Carneiro (1912–1972), and Thales de Azevedo (1904–1995). Rodrigues, a racist white aristocrat, defended the necessity of transforming “the black man” into an object of science; Landes sought to perfect an outsider’s view of the race issue in Brazil; Carneiro, a socially unengaged
middle-class black man, produced some critical socio-anthropological self-
analysis; and Azevedo contradicted his own defense of the myth of Brazilian
racial democracy through his account of everyday social relationships in hier-
archical, feudal-like, and nepotistic 1950s Bahia.

The first of these writers saw blacks as scientific objects observed at a
strict distance from the researcher. Rodrigues made this attitude obvious
through his naming, categorization, and denigration of the other in the guise
of impartial medical and socio-anthropological knowledge, colored by
his own subjectivity and a thinly veiled belief in “natural” white superiority.
Landes, a foreigner, was weakened by her struggle to assert herself in a male-
dominated field and her constant reassertion of the value of her specificity as
a white woman. Whatever subliminal belief in the need to eradicate class and
color inequality and reject the thesis of innate black inferiority the other two
writers may have had was thoroughly obfuscated by the ambiguity and neb-
ulousness of their racial identities, wiped clean by aseptic analytical cate-
gories. Furthermore, their portrayal of Bahia as a racially mixed region, and
their insistence upon Brazil’s radical difference from the United States—its
lack of racial tension and easy black assimilation—betrayed tacit agreement
with the promotion of white expressions of black experience.

The intellectual effort exerted in this type of social anthropology is simi-
lar to what Claude Lévi-Strauss described as the way “savage thought” is
related to nature. While exposed to different levels of interaction and reci-
procity, blacks are subjugated through scientific procedures of methodical
observation, taxonomization, and differentiation, all means to the gathering
of scientific knowledge (Lévi-Strauss, 1997). These procedures propose to
organize our view of the “savage” mind, but they also create the mind itself,
especially in comparison with that of the social scientist, who classifies, reg-
isters, and places all aspects of this mind’s consciousness in secure and
easily located categories. In this sense, blacks are assigned their role in the
market of objects and identities through mostly arbitrary scientific proce-
dures that are not based on any universal reasoning but heavily influenced
by socio-historical values (Said, 1990: 64). Such views are easily identified
in the pioneering work of Rodrigues, who said that the value one might
attribute to certain exceptionally civilized, respectable, and domesticated
blacks could not compensate for the reality that their race was never able to
form civilized societies. He saw no way in which blacks could overcome
their bestial inferiority without moral tutelage, intellectual guidance, and
strict control of their cultural tendencies and behavior. These are the sorts of
racist and evolutionist ideas on which black anthropology in Brazil is based.

Notwithstanding his arrogance, Rodrigues remained an intellectual fight-
ing against subaltern status. Although he defended the supposed universality
of the European scientific tradition, he also argued that medical and social theories originating outside Brazil did not adequately address the country’s problems because of “their inability to affirm our national specificity and their insistence upon European science as the only theoretic parameter within which this uniqueness can (or cannot) be validated” (Corrêa, 1998: 101). Ironically, he suggested that these very European theories might provide effective criteria for judging blacks inferior because, after all, “it is not science that determines this inferiority but a perfectly natural phenomenon and product of unequal human progress and development among certain groups” (Rodrigues, 1988: 5). At the same time, he considered the reasons used to justify the exploitation and enslavement of blacks revolting and antiscientific.

For the most part, Rodrigues concerned himself principally with issues related to defining a future for the Brazilian nation and its people, protecting national ideals and images, and ensuring a place for Brazil among modern, promising, and powerful nations. For this reason the overwhelming presence of freed blacks in urban centers like Bahia, “where all classes would eventually be miscegenated into blackness,” was a subject of great concern for him. Along with his intellectual contemporary Silvio Romero, Rodrigues believed that blacks were more valuable to society as “objects of science” than as “economic chattel.” Both felt that it was a general good to get to know blacks scientifically, morally, and mentally in order to recognize “our own lowest and most inferior selves” and learn to compensate for their backwardness when competing with white nations (Corrêa, 1998: 168–169):

The introduction of freed blacks into civil society brought about the tremendous horror which Nina Rodrigues incessantly condemned: the transformation of whites into a dreaded other. His research eventually became consumed with attempts to illustrate the negative effects of this change as exemplified by the infiltration of Catholicism by black religions and the degenerative presence of black blood visible in the large population of mixed breeds. All negative consequences of this invasion are personified in the image of the *mestiço*, who not only exhibits the biological defects resulted from unequal genetic pairings but also demonstrates the danger inherent in contaminating higher social classes with ordinary black seed.

Rodrigues’s creation of the notion of three incompatible worlds—those inhabited by the barbaric African, the civilized white, and the degenerate but malleable *mestiço*—indirectly opened the way for the ideological legitimization of the cultural syncretism, miscegenation, and racial segregation so prevalent in Brazil. For example, in his text *Africans in Brazil* (1988) blacks do not exist as independent subjects. Instead, they function as a race of study objects whose values, morals, and worldview Rodrigues has extrapolated
from statements made in his office by a few passive and anonymous interviewees.

Another notable case of blacks’ being presented as mere objects of study is found in *The City of Women* by Ruth Landes (1947), an American anthropologist who was sent to Bahia in 1938 by her department at Columbia University to study “the people of Candomblé” and the Brazilian race model. Most writers analyzing her work call attention to her criticism of “the idealization of Africa,” “Yoruba purity,” and the “notable presence of homosexuals in Candomblé” (Fry, 1982; Dantas, 1982; Birman, 1995; Santos, 1995). These criticisms are the focus of the British-born anthropologist Peter Fry’s analysis of Landes, who in his view demonstrated considerable courage in even mentioning the taboo subject, albeit only to show her disgust with the acceptance of male homosexuality in Candomblé and lament that such errant morality compromised the “traditions” and seriousness of a religion created by revered and powerful priestesses. Patricia Birman suggests that those who criticize Landes’s position on homosexuals in Candomblé misleadingly represent their criticism as a “defense” of the religion, as if it were suffering an attack on its legitimacy and an attempt to further stigmatize already beleaguered blacks. Critics such as Arthur Ramos, Roger Bastide, and Melville Herskovits, for example, considered it a veritable sin that Landes dared to question the link between gender and biological sex, by showing that female roles in Candomblé could be occupied by biological males who were socially identified as women (Birman, 1995: 65–66). Regardless of the repugnance she felt in witnessing all this, Landes’s observations awoke others to the presence of an alternative masculine identity and demonstrated that matriarchal power in Candomblé was not limited by biological sex and was therefore only a religious principle historically constructed and legitimized through certain mystical archetypes associated with priesthood.

In accordance with Landes’s pioneering work, the anthropologist Rita Segato has produced a similar study on another Brazilian religion of African extraction called Xangô, most popularly practiced in the Pernambuco state capital Recife. Segato argues that the syncretism found in Xangô could help deepen our understanding of Afro-Brazilian religions by filling some gaps in the puzzle of fragmented mythologies and traditions. She also suggests that syncretism in both Xangô and Candomblé lends itself easily to experiences and relationships outside the realm of the sacred. This leads us once again to the subject of homosexuality in African religions in Brazil, and Segato broadens its scope by reflecting upon the much more limited mention of lesbian adherents to the faith. According to Segato, female homosexuality is a tradition among Xangô women, who are generally identified as bisexual or, more rarely, exclusively lesbian. Through homosexual practice and alternative
identities, these women reject and deconstruct established systems of sex and
gender. These identities are formed through natural tendencies and reinforced
by living as personifications of the masculine or feminine archetypes of spe-
cific Orixá gods to whose service devotees are born (Segato, 1985: 447–448):

There came a moment in my research when I realized that the sexuality and
the sexual preferences of Xangô devotees were not based on biological sex,
personality, or social status. Furthermore, I found that sexual activity was
ultimately a form of interaction between two individuals regardless of socio-
biological attributes. In the specific case of Xangô women, this fluid sexual-
ity was clearly expressed in the opinions of the devotees, but among the men
it seemed almost imposed through categorizations originating from dominant
ideologies that boxed their sexual preferences into a pseudo-social identity
and social category.

In addition to these findings, however, I would like to emphasize another
aspect of Landes’s research: the albatross of race in Bahia and Brazil as a
whole. Landes said that she arrived in Bahia already knowing that, in con-
trast to the situation in her home country, blacks and whites in Brazil were
reputed to live together in a civil, mutually beneficial way. In her introduction
to *The City of Women* she wrote: “This book does not discuss race problems
in Bahia because there were none. It simply describes the life of Brazilians of
the Negro race, a gracious and poised people whose charm is proverbial in
their own land, and undying in my memory” (vi). She later concluded the
book as follows (248):

In retrospect, the life there seems remote and timeless. I was sent to Bahia to
learn how people behave when the Negroes among them are not oppressed. I
found that they were oppressed by political and economic tyrannies, although
not by racial ones. In that sense, the Negroes were free, and at liberty to cul-
tivate their African heritage. But they were sick, undernourished, illiterate,
and uninformed, just like other poor people among them of different racial
origins. It was their complete poverty that cut them off from modern thought
and obliged them to make up their own secure universe. They lived in the
only world that was allowed them, and they made it intimate and friendly
though the institution of Candomblé, whose vigor and pageantry and
promises of security lured others too in Bahia, and were a matter of excite-
ment and pride to the rest of Brazil also.

In his review of *The City of Women*, Melville Herskovits (1948: 125)
observed that, despite the considerable merits of Landes’s work, she was
unfamiliar with and ill-equipped to handle certain aspects of field research:

She knew so little of the African background of the material she was to study
that she had no perspective. This fact comes out in detail as well as in basic
orientation. It is responsible for misreading, or a failure to understand the significance, of much fine data. . . . The fact that she was so little trained in handling what might be called the diplomatic aspects of field-work, and that in so many cases she missed the point of her data because of unfamiliarity with their historic background, shows that these broader requirements for the field-work were not met.

Versed in Malinowski’s methods of participant observation, Landes believed herself to be “living among black Bahians,” “participating in their lives,” and “plainly understanding them.” She perceived certain ambiguities in the relationships between blacks and whites, intellectuals and the poor, and in the color, class, social status, and structural differences between men and women in Candomblé. She saw social and economic inequalities between black and white worlds and even made note of police persecution of black religious groups. Nevertheless, she ended her research confirming what she already knew: that Brazil enjoyed a distinct harmony and lack of conflict between the barbaric black and the civilized white worlds. She came to this conclusion because, in contrast to anything Malinowski (1978) would have done, she lived “among Negroes” while rooming at one of the best hotels of the time and paid practically all her informants and interviewees for their depositions. She never explored in any detail the contradictions and the racial context in which her subjects lived, nor did she seek sources other than those to whom she was introduced by Édison Carneiro.

Placated by the ease of access attributed to the “sweetness of the Bahian people,” Landes proved incapable of truly understanding her subjects, who were trapped in a racial system rife with institutional inequality, constantly suffering police persecution and the hostility of society. Even though she recorded these instances of unfairness and harassment in her field notes, Landes could not bring herself to sympathize with her interview subjects. Instead she regarded them as malicious, false, greedy characters who were motivated only by the promise of money in exchange for information. Sadly, corruption, insincerity, and submissiveness to white money and prestige represented a style of negotiation often employed by “Candomblé people” and one that is still quite popular in Bahia, “basically characterized by interlocution in relationships of interdependent interests” (Braga, 1995: 70), with calculated distancing and approximation of a subaltern to a figure stereotyped as powerful and superior. It appears that Landes did not participate in the lives of the people she studied and was able to interpret her own exaggerated ethnographic encounter with native Bahians only through the “constant companionship” of Carneiro.

To his credit, however, for Carneiro the study and registry of black culture and religion in Bahia was his life work. He wrote about the Ketu,
Angola, and Caboclo traditions of Candomblé and produced works on the Capoeira style of martial arts and samba music. From a young age he worked alongside other intellectuals and devotees to found the Union of Afro-Brazilian Faiths, demanding freedom of religious expression at a time when the police were openly and violently attacking terreiros (temples). While in a certain way still monitoring them (Dantas, 1982: 203), he recognized the dignity and intellectual authority of black leaders in the Bahian Candomblé community and gave them voice in matters of great importance. In 1937 with Aydano do Couto Ferraz and Reginaldo Guimarães, he organized the Second Afro-Brazilian Congress in the Bahian capital of Salvador, inviting the high priest Martiniano Eliseu do Bonfim to be its president and commissioning the high priestess Eugênia Ana dos Santos, Mother Aninha from the Axé Apô Afonjá temple, to write and present a paper on African foods. Later, Carneiro’s role as an intellectual fighting social and racial injustice during the dictatorship of Getúlio Vargas would force him to spend 1937–1938 hiding from political imprisonment as a “communist” (Oliveira and Lima, 1987: 46).

In *Candomblés of Bahia* (1961), Carneiro mentioned the names of priests and priestesses of powerful Bahian temples with the intimacy and naturalness of someone who lived very close to them and knew them extremely well. He was influenced by the work of Rodrigues, and very familiar with the “master’s” genetic method of identifying Africa in Bahia, but he criticized what he felt was Rodrigues’s exclusive focus on the Sudanese, which in his opinion, impeded a true understanding of black Bantus, Capoeira, certain styles of drumming, popular Bantu celebrations, and the Congo/Angola Candomblé tradition (Carneiro, 1980: 56). Obsessed with the preservation of Bahia’s African roots, he created a genealogical tree of the Jeje-Nagô/Ketu-tradition temples Casa Branca, Axé Opô Afonjá, and Gantois that he hoped would serve as the physical, institutional, ritual, and mystical representative of all Candomblé traditions including Congo and Angola. The anthropologist Beatriz Dantas (1982: 190–191) observes, however, that eventually Carneiro changed his approach to Afro-Brazilian religions and popular cultural manifestations from the search for origins to a more sociological perspective:

During the period in which he lived in Bahia (until 1940) his work on Afro-Brazilian religions was considerably influenced by Nina Rodrigues and Arthur Ramos. Continuing the line already established by these authors, Édison Carneiro sought not only legitimization but also legalization for Candomblé, and he did so focusing quite exclusively on Africa. . . . Carneiro’s argument in favor of legalizing Candomblé was that it was a legitimate religion—an idea that Nina Rodrigues had also posited. However, whereas
Rodrigues had promoted the legitimization of Yoruba or Nagô Candomblé only, Carneiro sought to legalize all religious traditions originating from Africa. His only restrictions were that the particular faith be expressed only within the limits of its African heritage in the purest, most traditional form. In his opinion witchcraft, charlatanism, and exploitation ran rampant in Caboclo Candomblé, and Carneiro viewed these facets as a threat to the legal recognition of African religions. Thus, he felt that it was necessary to find some way to regulate and control the orthodoxy of established groups.

Various writers (Fry, 1982; Birman, 1982; Santos, 1995; Carvalho, 1990; Moura, 1988) argue that Carneiro’s obsession with an idyllic and pure Africa, his rejection of magic and insistence upon supporting only what he felt were the legitimately religious, most “traditional” aspects of the “real Candomblé,” and his refusal to recognize the validity of the reinterpretation of Africa and the symbolic cultural deconstruction initiated by Afro-Brazilians unaffiliated with Jeje-Nagô temples compromised and limited the scope of his work. Dantas goes even farther to observe that the theoretic/methodological perspective of writers such as Carneiro contributed to the exotification of Afro-Brazilian religions and the transformation of Candomblé into a domesticated symbol of the supposed racial and cultural democracy so strongly desired by whites.

One aspect of Carneiro’s research neglected by the above-cited critics is the implications of Carneiro’s race, given that his work maintained a referential dialogue with two white anthropologists, Rodrigues and Arthur Ramos, and a fellow black writer, Manuel Querino (1938). It would probably be asking too much for the 1930s to expect that Carneiro would openly have discussed the color or class status problems he faced. It is, however, quite reasonable to infer that as an educated middle-class black man he was affected by these specificities in his relations in the field and the theoretical construction of his study objects. So relevant is this issue of his race that even though Carneiro makes no mention of it the subject is constantly discussed by others. Furthermore, during this period the sociological study of blacks in Brazil was very white, according to Carneiro (1980: 9),

When we say white, we are not referring to the author’s race as being black, white or mulatto, but instead, we point to the existence of underlying white concepts and beliefs employed to analyze the reality of black Brazilians, as if they were mere objects of study and not dynamic subjects in one of the most important issues in the structural readjustment of Brazilian society. As we can see, Brazilian social thought, our literature, and our cultural ethos are impregnated on every imaginable level by this very out-of-touch white vision, oscillating between equally offensive poles of paternalism and false impartiality.
Whereas Carneiro often elevated the work of Rodrigues and one of his principal disciples, Arthur Ramos (Corrêa, 1998: 207–313), to the pinnacle of infallible intelligence, impartiality, and scientific objectivity, he criticized Querino for what he viewed as empirical errors and lack of intelligence. Carneiro long put great stock in the superiority of Sudanese blacks and the unquestionable purity and authenticity of the Jeje-Nagô Candomblé practiced in the “traditional” temples previously cited. His main informants and the bulk of his field research came from these temples, which built close friendships with and protected Carneiro and other intellectuals of the time. Generally the relationships were of mutual benefit, and the temples, in exchange for cultural legitimization and political shelter, granted these powerful and influential intellectuals considerable academic space (Dantas, 1982: 202). I would assume that Carneiro was quite eager to be associated with the prevailing tradition of white, objective, paternalist, and supposedly impartial science. This must be why he showed “extreme severity, often bordering on critical injustice” (Oliveira and Lima, 1987: 97), when referring to the “insignificant little public functionary” Querino, a home-grown researcher of Afro-Brazilian religions, and sympathized complacently with the racist and evolutionist theories of Querino’s contemporary, the “master and scientist” Rodrigues (1980: 55, 56, 57; 1991:128):

First and foremost, Nina Rodrigues was very unilateral. In his view, the problem of all blacks in Portuguese America could be traced back to black Nagôs, Jejes, and Sudanese. . . Was this his fault? Perhaps not. The provisional republic government ordered all slavery records to be burned. . . . Another major error committed by Nina Rodrigues—a mistake Arthur Ramos rightfully attributed to his entire generation—was the deification of the white race, originating from the Lombroso and Ferri anthropological school of thought, which reduced cultural problems to mere issues of skin pigmentation and cranial measurements. This reactionary school . . . terribly hindered Nina Rodrigues’ ability to set a clear and rightful course of reasoning. . . . However, not even Manuel Querino, born from the womb of a black woman, who had his color to help him and who moved among fetishist circles during his entire life as an insignificant bureaucrat in the Department of Agriculture, not even Manuel Querino produced such an impressive body of work. . . . If Nina Rodrigues were alive today, he would be our comrade down here in the trenches. . . . He was one of ours.

Worse than Nina was Manuel Querino, who didn’t even know about these divisions among blacks from Africa. He just went around announcing everything he saw with his characteristic lack of intelligence, never thoroughly investigating anything, but offering, instead, juvenile explanations for his observations. Today, we can use the material he immortalized in the ethnography and social psychology of blacks only after reinterpreting everything in light of new discoveries about the African continent.
So here we have Carneiro, with pretensions of whiteness, adamantly opposing the magic and mysticism that Querino observed and perhaps witnessed himself. In his position of intellectual subordination, Carneiro assigned tremendous value to the apparently critical and scientific distance Rodrigues employed in constantly citing amorality and deceitfulness in his observed “natives.” I endeavor to address issues that in the past might have been impossible for Carneiro to discuss, and, suspended in time and space, I feel obligated to cite the glaring contradictions inherent in the position of an important black intellectual, “communist,” and proponent of public policies in favor of blacks, who was thoroughly uncritical of the racist and evolutionist arguments of Rodrigues. Shielded from suspicion of bias by scientific objectivity, Rodrigues predetermined the inevitability of black backwardness and moral degeneracy and the lack of integrity among mestiços, suggesting, however, that salvation could be found in “whitening.” Although Carneiro writes that black religions, “however they present themselves, are their own world, style, and subculture,” he still falls into the trap of judgment and salvation, suggesting that “they can be overcome [my italics] only through profound, substantial alteration of archaic objective and subjective conditions that are inherently reflexive and automatic” (1961: 36).

In contrast to Carneiro, Thales de Azevedo did not concentrate on the study of religion, but he too failed to theorize the idea of the backwardness and inferiority of blacks and in his most important study, Elites of Color (1996) [1953], was equally as assimilated into the mainstream and as uncritical of Establishment thought as his predecessor. In her preface to the 1996 edition, Maria Brandão contextualizes the study as a project commissioned by the UNESCO Department of Social Sciences under the secretary general of the United Nations, which, after the traumas of racial and ethnic hatred witnessed during World War II, had become quite interested in an analysis of the race issue in Brazil, “a model nation with respect to the positive integration of blacks and whites.” In the beginning, the study focused on Bahia, in a continuance of the tradition of studying blacks in the city of Salvador since the end of the nineteenth century and in light of the great attraction that its model of “harmonious” race relations held for many foreign writers in the 1930s and 1940s (Maio, 1999). From 1951 on, however, the scope of the project was broadened, and Alfred Métraux was charged with organizing studies conducted in São Paulo, Rio, and Recife. In Bahia, Anísio Teixeira, then state secretary of health and education, coordinated the project in conjunction with the Social Research Program of the State of Bahia and Columbia University (1949–1953) and chose his childhood friend Thales de Azevedo to direct it.

Maria Brandão (1996: 16) quotes Antônio Sérgio Alfredo Guimarães on the resulting book: “From a theoretical point of view, the study innovates
little, since it borrows from Pierson the thesis that Brazil is a *multi-racial class society*. From an ethnographic perspective, however, there is much innovation in the documentation of the fact that attributed status, such as color and family origin, takes great precedence over acquired status, such as wealth and occupation.” The originality of *Elites of Color* did indeed contribute greatly to the study of race relations in Brazil. Identifying “native” race categories white, black, mulatto, *pardo*, *moreno*, and *caboclo*, Azevedo demonstrated the complexities of class, color, and status suggested by Landes and touched upon by Rodrigues in distinguishing those blacks whom he deemed worthy of respect from their race as a whole. Azevedo even introduced a new “ethno-racial background” to the study of race relations that revealed the racial and “ethnic flavor” of his “natives.” In a racialized context in which the subject of discrimination and prejudice was very uncomfortable, Azevedo’s notion of an ambiguous, relativist racial and ethnic “flavor” identified a fundamental distinction between “attributed” and “acquired” status clearly elaborated in his essay “Prestigious Groups and Social Classes” (1996).

Unfortunately, however, as in the case of Carneiro, Azevedo did not discuss or make explicit his privileged status among the subjects of his research and promoted the idea that the best or only possible interpretation of sociocultural phenomena came from within the establishment (Sansone, 1999). His commitment to his own knowledgeable “insider” status was such that, throughout the book, he did not reproduce but instead merely described the ambiguous depositions of his interviewees. Consequently, his account of these statements became a confirmation of the existence of a multiracial class society in which the white world tended toward racial and cultural cohesiveness and the black world evidenced incongruities and contradictions in every imaginable attribute and acquired category. Thus, according to Azevedo (1996 [1953]: 34–35),

> Whites are generally individuals who display a Caucasian phenotype: light-skinned and light-eyed individuals with equally light and fine hair. They are often referred to as fine whites, as they do not present any sign of mixture with other races. Individuals who are wealthy or of an elevated status, independent of their physical aspect, may also be called white. When one hears a poor person, perhaps a white or black maid or laborer, refer to someone as “my white man,” however, it is difficult to imagine that the term is being applied to a fairly dark mestizo.

Sheltered, educated, and economically privileged but still scrutinized blacks were the ones who were elevated and inserted or inserted themselves into the white world, and, despite Rodrigues’s warning of the encroaching threat of blackness and the sheer magnitude of black presence and culture,
this world still controlled politics and the economy, determined religious
and cultural values, and enjoyed full dominion over scientific knowledge.
Unquestionably a member of the favored group and a beneficiary of its dom-
ninance, Azevedo theorized the social integration of “people of color” and the
supposed lack of racial conflict with the same ambiguity found in the state-
ments of his field subjects. While promoting the assimilation model of
accommodation, he exposed subtle sources of structural conflict that went
unexplored. Interpersonal relationships described in Elites of Color legit-
imized the idea of overall harmony and minimal racial tension and charac-
terized hierarchies and inequalities among blacks and whites as benign and
unproblematic. Under the harmonious surface, however, they suggested a
hidden suspicion and threat that blacks assimilated by their acquired status
might one day revert to their temperamental defects, corporal postures, dis-

Just as Carneiro recognized the methodological errors and racism in the
work of Rodrigues but continued to refer to him as “one of ours” and an
opponent of “the intellectual slavery of blacks in Portuguese America” (1980:
56–57), Azevedo perceived weakness in Donald Pierson’s (1967) arguments
but still supported his views on the assimilation and acculturation of blacks
into the white world and the idea of Bahia as a conflict-free multiracial class
society. Pierson in fact admitted to the existence of racial inequality in Bahia,
but Azevedo did not mention this when referring to his work. In clear contrast
to observations made in the book’s ethnographic notes, Elites of Color
glossed over any significant record of race-based problems, demonstrating
instead “a commitment to certain race politics and UNESCO’s racial-strife-
minimization agenda. Azevedo toed the UNESCO party line and used the
book to illustrate the possibility of harmonious living among diverse groups
with a minimum of tension and ethno-racial conflict” (Guimarães, 1999:
130). Azevedo’s loyalty to the organizers’ program is curious, however, given
that in 1953 Métraux had requested that he exclude two articles from the final
French publication of Elites of Color. Only three years later, Azevedo pub-
lished the article “Prestigious Groups and Social Classes” in the annals of the
University of Bahia School of Philosophy, raising the suspicion that the essay
had been one of the articles suppressed.5

As Guimarães suggests (1999: 131), Elites of Color demonstrated that
Azevedo was familiar with the dominant assimilationist ideology of his era
and understood that intellectuals were supposed to promote this official and
popularly sanctioned view on race in Brazil. I would even go farther and
assert that Azevedo did not sincerely believe that Bahia could serve as an
example of convivial race relations for the rest of the world but allowed
his work to serve the dominant hegemony because he was simply unable to
challenge a political agenda so devoutly promoted by the government, public opinion, and UNESCO.

The criticism that Azevedo repressed in *Elites of Color* was developed in a sophisticated way in “Prestigious Groups and Social Classes.” According to Guimarães (quoted in Azevedo, 1996 [1953]: 19):

[Azevedo breaks with] Pierson’s theory of racial democracy clearly and unceremoniously. He introduces an innovative characterization of Brazil’s transition from colonial to modern society as a passage from a status to a class society. He also demonstrates how the link between status and color remains wholly intact throughout this change. Borrowing from the Weber model, Azevedo theorizes status as its own social structure (such as class and caste) and not a mere category of social interaction. . . . Through this utilization of the status structural model, Azevedo found a basis with which to theorize the extreme rigidity and importance of color distinctions in Brazil. The perception of status as a structural phenomenon (according to Azevedo) allows an observer to understand that in Bahian society, one’s status results from a combination of innate factors, such as birth and physical aspect, as well as other attributes that can be modified up to a certain point, such as fortune, occupation, and education. The status conveyed by birth and skin color limits and ultimately determines the extent of one’s social upward mobility, regardless of all other mutable and conditional characteristics. Our understanding of this fact was, without doubt, the most significant contribution the Bahian master made to the study of race relations and the fight against racism in Brazil.

In a later work, Azevedo (1975) asserted that in Brazil there was no shortage of evidence that interactions between whites and blacks were exceptionally peaceful and that prejudice, discrimination, and “racial” exclusion were antagonistic to accepted values. Therefore, the ideal of racial democracy, for both elites and the masses, was not just a historical reality but also a unique and spontaneous virtue of the Brazilian populace. Nevertheless, Azevedo warned, when “put into practice, theory is quite different.” For that reason, he said the mere discussion of how some experienced race in Brazil was “a prohibited subject whose analysis is forbidden perhaps because one feels that it should not matter or, more truthfully, because it calls attention to issues that must be denied to avoid inciting the victimized populations” (Azevedo, 1975: 5).

In Guimarães’s (1999: 145) view, Azevedo acutely understood the need to shift from “scientific” posturing to a more politically correct perspective on racism in Brazil:

An heir to the noblest legacy of Brazilian scientific racism, Azevedo’s research helped destroy his own line by proposing a new culturalist vision that negated the idea of genetic race and instead affirmed color differences in an idyllic racial democracy. This new trend did not last, however, and
Azevedo shifted once again, this time condemning idealized notions of race, unmasking the fallacies inherent in such views, and discussing the prevalence of racial prejudice and discrimination in Brazil.

Although he remained a practitioner of the imposition of “white sociology on black subjects,” Azevedo advanced with the social current of his time and made an indelible mark on the study of race relations in Brazil. More important than even this considerable influence on his academic field, however, was the fact that politics and allegiance to the social establishment cost Azevedo the chance to make equally great inroads in the fight against racism. When he agreed to limited publication of *Elites of Color*, exclusively in the French language and with considerable censorship by UNESCO, Azevedo missed a golden opportunity during a strategic era to demystify a Brazilian taboo—to exercise his ethical obligation to convert scientific thought into political action and lend the supposedly nonexistent victims of Brazilian racism credence and voice.

This myth of a Brazilian racial democracy, in which one finds some truth and countless lies, has also seduced black intellectuals, who dream of inclusive values, communal social solidarity, scientific belonging, and legitimation (Souza, 1997). These individuals unfortunately run the risk of buying into the myth, thus legitimizing its fantastic portrayal of Brazilian reality. After all, we supposedly live in a racial democracy where, according to Datafolha polls, 89 percent of Brazilians believe that our society as a whole is racist but only 10 percent of these same individuals consider themselves “black” and “colored” report constant experiences of discrimination and racial inequality. Even more unfortunate is the fact that empirical statistics on the experience of race in Brazil gathered in the 1990s differ not at all from Azevedo’s research in the 1950s. Our stymied evolution in race relations results directly from the myth of a Brazilian racial harmony that promotes the annulment of race and color in the biological and cultural realm but “ignores racial discrimination on the sociological plane. How can you discriminate against someone who doesn’t exist? . . . Here we see manifested another characteristic of the myth of racial democracy in Brazil: the invisibility of the black and *mestiço* masses. This invisibility denies the existence of blacks, essentially and radically negating their humanity” (Oliveira, Lima, and Santos, 1998: 57).

In a curious twist, while racism dehumanizes the oppressed, it still lends them a circumstantial, ambiguous validity as suspicious characters whose inferiority and exclusion reinforces the belonging and superiority of their masters. In *The City of Women*, Landes reported warning Carneiro as a black man to avoid visiting the U.S. South. According to Landes, upon
hearing this Carneiro’s face “twisted as though I had cracked a whip over his eyes.” Mortified, Landes thought to herself that “an American should not have to do such things to other human beings” (1967: 14). The agony in Carneiro’s scowl belied the fear of an out-of-place black intellectual from the mulatto aristocracy whose “psychological scars” were made visible through his temporary disfigurement. But why should we be mortified by and avoid discussing the “psychological scars” of black identity?

Today, more than a century after the abolition of slavery, data published by the Department of Statistics and Socioeconomic Studies show that more than 60 percent of the Brazilian population is black, and within this group one finds the lowest salaries, the lowest educational levels, the highest indexes of unemployment and underemployment, the least stability, and the least chance of advancement into management positions among the employed regardless of relevant education and or personal achievement (Prates, 1999). While conducting field research for her University of São Paulo Graduate School of Education dissertation entitled “From the Silence in the Home to the Silence in the Classroom: Racism, Prejudice, and Discrimination in Childhood Education,” Eliane Cavalleiro observed an enormous difference in the way public preschool teachers treated white and black students. With black children the teachers were more impatient and less caring and might even go as far as to humiliate the children with words and expressions that should be unthinkable for someone responsible for educating them to utter (Cavalleiro, 2000). In Bahia State, arguably “Brazil’s blackest region,” with 80 percent of its population being so identified, the situation is considerably worse. Whereas 72.3 percent of white youngsters in Bahia attend school, the same can be said for only 53.2 percent of their black counterparts. While the number of blacks who eventually make it to the university level has risen in Bahia, these students are overwhelmingly tracked into the least prestigious fields and institutions (Queiroz, 2000).

As a black intellectual in Brazil, much of what I have experienced has been determined not by my academic merit but by my imposed status as a product of the discursive history of my race. Reflection on these experiences leads me to trace the history of the individuals or forces that produced them in an attempt to interpret what it is that has repeatedly deemed blacks inferior, suspect, foreign, out of place, and destabilizing.

Exactly what, however, can I say about my own condition? What words, ideas, representations, or categories can I use to characterize my experiences if I am still learning to talk about race and racism in a field that objectifies and refuses to acknowledge my autonomy? How can I speak when I am silenced by subalternity? I have been forced to become familiar with isolation, inferiorization, and the sheer perversity of any attempt by a black intellectual to insert him or herself into Brazilian academia. I am also proving
that the legitimization achieved by Pelé, the *mulata* figure, and young Afro-Brazilian intellectuals like me comes with at least a modicum of torture. This suffering is most apparent in academia, where the presence of blacks is not in any way considered “natural”—or at least has not been naturalized as has that of whites—and we are forced to wage a constant battle against the image of our inherent inferiority, implicit assimilation to whiteness, and a myriad of other intellectual confrontations.

In clear contrast to the headway gained by counterdiscourses such as feminism and queer studies in Brazilian academia, the counterdiscourse of black identity does not enjoy much support and solidarity when it probes sensitive issues of nationality and the ordination of power (Ribeiro, 1997). In my experience it is race, not gender or sexuality, that inspires in others certain expectations of my intellectual product and creates a gap in understanding for all involved. As a black intellectual, I have experienced a displacement that expresses itself not only in perspective but also in space, time, social status, and political hierarchy. My black identity, like that of Pelé or the *mulata*, is an example of how ethnic and racial origin blocks societal interlocution, determines relationships, and naturalizes deliberately constructed identities and inequities: “Brazilian racism exists without a face—decked out in the drag of illustrious universalism, calling itself antiracism while negating the integral presence of blacks and natives. In the eyes of our racism, real racism segregates and does not merely negate the humanity of whomever it deems the other. Real racism is the neighbor’s racism, American racism” (Guimarães, 1999: 57). I believe, therefore, that if we subaltern black intellectuals are unable to flee the system of symbolic dominance in which we operate, we must at least recognize that our work is no more academic than it is political. Immersed in an Establishment in which we lack the autonomy to represent ourselves, we should not simply seek recognition as superior scientists but also create and embrace our own truths, even if they remain incomplete.

**NOTES**

1. I do not use terms such as “race,” “black,” “black culture,” and “racism” in an essentialist fashion. As Antonio Sérgio Alfredo Guimarães has said, “race is a concept which does not correspond to any natural reality. On the contrary, it denotes only a form of social classification based on a negative attitude toward certain social groups (racism), and it is informed by a specific subjectively determined notion of nature, clearly limited to the social world” (1999: 109). It is in this sense that Mireya Suárez asserts that “while white men are classified as cultural beings, women of all races and black men are positioned in nature, an essentially controllable, yet unchangeable force that has shown itself to be impermeable to the arbitration of history. . . . The dominance exercised over women and blacks is generated by practical interests, which constitute substantial social relationships. However, these relationships of dominance can only
persist fueled by the existence of an intelligible and sufficiently persuasive ideal in which people can find reasons binding them to the social realities they live, be they as dominators, the dominated, or, most frequently, a little bit of both” (1991: 7, 13).

2. Michel de Certeau examines the power of ethnographic writing to put objects and identities in their determined place, thus creating history from that which has been dissipated through the cultural lens of otherness, orality, unconsciousness, space, and social systems without written records. In this particular instance de Certeau poses writing “that invades space and capitalizes time” against words “that do not last or retain their integrity.” In other words, if the “act of writing isolates that which is significant in our very presence, the written word is then the enunciated body that cannot be separated or lost in the utterance” (de Certeau, 1989: 217). It is in this way that writing produces “leftovers”—an ethnographic excess, which is heard and seen, but not understood, that is not written but still defines.

3. Among the critics of Landes’s work, Dantas (1982: 206) was unique in asserting that Landes perceived the utilization of the Bahian as a symbol of Brazilian national identity and observed inequalities among races in Bahia but still proclaimed Brazilian racial and cultural democracy.

4. Vivaldo da Costa Lima (Oliveira and Lima, 1987: 40) employs curious word choices in stating that in Carneiro’s view “the African religions” referred to by Rodrigues were already “black religions” and that “Carneiro, himself a black man albeit an ‘educated one,’ lived quite intensely during this period and actively participated (as a black or a scientist?) in the religious communities of the time.” Landes describes him as a mulatto aristocrat who “viewed the Candomblé people as from across a gap. To him they were specimens, although of course human beings with an inalienable right to live as they chose” (1947: 60).

5. According to Brandão, “Prestigious Groups and Social Classes,” along with another 1956 piece entitled “Indians, Whites, and Blacks in Colonial Brazil,” “was originally meant for inclusion in the earlier manuscript that eventually became Elites of Color. In the preface of Essays on Anthropology (1959), a compilation which includes both pieces, Thales de Azevedo informs us that the two essays would not have been excluded from Les élites ‘if Métraux had not wanted things presented in a specific way . . . [which is to say] a book about racial relations and the upward mobility of people of color in a Brazilian city that would serve as an example for other nations with interrelational problems among different ethnic groups.’ Regardless of any such motivation, the essay is too important to exclude from this edition” (Brandão in Azevedo, 1996: 167). It seems obvious to Guimarães (1999: 130) that Azevedo was referring to “Indians, Whites, and Blacks in Colonial Brazil” as one of the articles excluded per Métraux’s suggestion, but he finds it harder to believe that the other was “Prestigious Groups and Social Classes.” The essay was published in 1956, and five of its nine cited references were published after 1954. Both Guimarães and Brandão seem to agree that “Indians, Whites, and Blacks in Colonial Brazil” placed considerable emphasis on prejudice and racial discrimination.
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