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North American students of slavery and race relations have long used comparative approaches to examine the troubling phenomena of racial discrimination and violence in a society committed to democratic processes and equality. Implicit in these studies is the idea that understanding gained through a comparative perspective will facilitate action to reduce the gap between the ideals and the reality of North American life. Two societies in particular have been studied: South Africa and Brazil. While the example of South Africa has provided insight into aspects of North American culture deplored by most Americans, the example of Brazil has traditionally offered a positive model, one worthy of emulation.

Although people of African descent constitute a minority of the population, more Africans were brought to Brazil as slaves, slavery lasted longer, and today more black and brown people reside there than in any other Western Hemisphere nation. Despite the heritage of slavery, Brazil has traditionally been perceived by North Americans and white Brazilians as a social or racial democracy. According to the myth of the racial paradise, slavery was relatively mild in Brazil, relations between masters and bondsmen were softened by extensive miscegenation, slavery was ended without bloodshed, and since abolition in 1888, skin color has played little if any part in social stratification since. If there are relatively few dark-skinned Brazilians at the higher levels of society, it simply reflects disadvantages rooted in slavery. Above all, one finds no tradition of racial violence or of Jim Crow.

While the image of Brazil as a social democracy is still common in North America and even more so in Brazil, it has been seriously challenged since the end of World War II. In the 1950s UNESCO sponsored a thorough re-examination of Brazilian race relations by international teams of scholars. Though such
international recognition reinforced the Brazilian elite’s belief in their racial
democracy, in fact the studies did as much to undermine as to affirm the traditional
image of Brazilian society. Studies done in the 1960s and 1970s by Brazilian
scholars such as Florestan Fernandes, the Argentine-Brazilian Carlos Hasenbalg
and the French sociologist Roger Bastide were even more critical of Brazil’s
reputation as a society remarkably free of racism.4

Black North Americans participated in the affirmation of the racial paradise
myth until the mid-twentieth century, and in the contemporary attack upon it.
Their critique was a product of the scholars’ re-examination of Brazil and
reflected the greater knowledge of Latin America acquired through enhanced
opportunities for formal study and travel there. More important, however, were
black Americans’ domestic experiences following the gradual dissolution of Jim
Crow after World War II and the resurgence of black nationalism in the late 1960s
and 1970s.

Black Americans have observed that in contemporary Brazil, as in the U.S.,
dark-skinned people continue to constitute a disproportionate percentage of the
poor and dispossessed despite repeated assurances by dominant groups of
acceptance and advancement based on individual merit. Black people in both
societies have been victims of a run-around: made promises and guaranteed rights
but at the same time denied the education and financial resources needed to
transform rights and opportunities into better jobs, housing and health care.
Furthermore, given the low level of racial identity and unity among Afro-
Brazilians, the likelihood of them altering their status within Brazilian society
appears, if anything, even less likely than for black North Americans.

An early reference to Brazil in the Afro-American press—the major source
used in this study—reflects the way North Americans sympathetic to the plight
of black people have cited Brazil as a cause for optimism. A group of white
Ohioans wrote the statement, an essay appearing in the April 12, 1838, Colored
American (published in New York City), that sought to discredit the fears that led
to the establishment of black codes in Ohio. The authors noted that in Trinidad
and Brazil free blacks and whites harmoniously co-existed. The 600,000 free
Brazilians were “generally speaking, well conducted and industrious persons,
who compose, indiscriminately, different orders of the community.” The contribu-
tions of black merchants, farmers, doctors, lawyers, priests and military
officers were so significant that whites were contemplating emancipating all
Negroes. Perhaps it was this image that led Frederick Douglass in 1848 to include
Brazil with Turkey and Persia as providing evidence that color prejudice did not
necessarily correlate with the enslavement of colored peoples. Anti-Negro
prejudice, he remarked, was primarily a trait of whites in the United States. In
Brazil there were more than two million slaves, but free blacks and mulattoes
occupied important positions in the state, church and army.5

While free blacks may have gained acceptance denied them in North
America, the bulk of black people in Brazil remained in slavery after the
institution ended in the United States. The black North American historian
William T. Alexander in his *History of the Colored Race*, published a year before the 1888 termination of slavery in Brazil, deplored the slowness of the abolition process in Brazil. Fourteen years after passage of the Free Womb Law of 1871, the number of registered slaves had only fallen from 1,533,000 to 1,330,000. Most of the decline had occurred through deaths, with legal manumissions totaling one-fifth of the decrease. "The rapid extinction of the institution is not desired by the government," he observed, "and at the present rate of progress it will take something like fifty years to eradicate it." Alexander urged his fellow black North Americans to organize and agitate for the release of "their brothers in Brazil."\(^6\)

Despite Alexander's plea, the image of Brazil as a paradise for people of color went practically unchallenged in black North America during the half century following abolition. The characterization in a 1902 editorial in the *St. Paul Appeal* was typical:

In Brazil there are no racial prejudices or social distinctions based on race or color. Many of the leaders in society, politics and business are jet black, and there are homes and comfort in Brazil for all men willing to work.\(^7\)

As with most pre-World War II comments pertaining to Brazil, the author did not indicate the source of his or her information. The *Indianapolis Freeman*, however, based its equally flattering picture of Brazil on the observations of Indianapolis resident Dr. Henry W. Furniss, U.S. Consul to Bahia. In 1903 the diplomat noted that despite the recent abolition of slavery, the dividing lines between races so apparent in North American society were absent in Brazil. Amalgamation was widely accepted; "men of mixed bloods are seen everywhere, in all kinds of positions; education and refinement being the line of cleavage only."\(^8\)

While Furniss's first-hand knowledge did not lead him to challenge the image of Brazil as an El Dorado, he rejected the idea advanced by the *St. Paul Appeal* and by some emigrationists in the late nineteenth century that Brazil was a potential refuge for those seeking escape from the deteriorating racial and economic environment in the post-Reconstruction South. Cultural and climatic differences as well as the low wages in Brazil all made emigration unwise, Furniss advised.

The growing involvement of the United States in the world, along with the expansion of international trade and travel in the twentieth century, made black and white Americans more aware of Brazil and Latin America in general. One visit to South America, that of ex-President Theodore Roosevelt in 1913, was widely reported in the black and white press. The article Roosevelt wrote on "The Negro in Brazil" for the popular weekly *Outlook* in February, 1914, reinforced the prevalent image of race relations in Brazil. The *Philadelphia Tribune* was pleased to note that Roosevelt found colored professors in the state-supported schools,
black and mulatto judges, extensive miscegenation, and no segregation or lynchings. His findings, it commented, were “of more than passing interest to us as a race” in highlighting the different treatment of the black race in Brazil and many other societies and in the United States. If wise, the United States would adopt the racial pattern existing in Brazil and avoid racial polarization and violence, the paper warned. A Chicago Defender editorial also praised Roosevelt’s article, telling readers “There is little or no prejudice in Brazil, therefore the problem, as we term it, is being solved in the only possible and effective way of solving it, by absorption, the intermarriage of the races a common occurrence, a man or woman being solely judged on their individual merit, upon their standing in life, the color of their skin playing little part.”

Throughout the 1910s, 1920s and 1930s the black American press continued to endorse a highly flattering assessment of race relations in Brazil. Leaders such as Booker T. Washington, Kelly Miller, W.E.B. DuBois and William Pickens agreed that Brazil offered people of color opportunities denied in the United States. J.A. Rogers in his classic 1924 history, From “Superman” to Man, also confirmed the traditional view. “In Brazil...the Negro is taught not only to regard himself the equal of the white man, but he is given an opportunity to prove it. There is no walk of Brazilian life, official or unofficial, where he is not welcome and which he has not filled.” Rogers added that more than one Brazilian president had been of Negro descent, an observation often included in references to Afro-Brazilians. At least two articles published in the Journal of Negro History, Herbert B. Alexander’s “Brazilian and U.S. Slavery Compared” in 1922 and Mary W. Williams’ “The Treatment of Negro Slaves in the Brazilian Empire” in 1930, developed the thesis Frank Tannenbaum later popularized in his influential work Slave and Citizen that the status of Negroes in Brazil differed dramatically from the United States in large part because of the marked difference in the institution of slavery in the two societies.

One consequence of Brazil’s reputation was a desire by some to exploit the opportunities afforded people of color there, either directly through settlement or indirectly through investment. As was the case in the late 1880s and 1890s when a wave of nationalism led by Bishop Henry McNeal Turner swept black America, many nationalists of the post-World War I period looked to Brazil as a potential base for the establishment of a proud black homeland. One such individual was the New York City based Marxist and emigrationist, Cyril Briggs, editor of the radical Crusader. Others were affiliated with Marcus Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association. Attracted to Brazil because of its reputation as a racial paradise, the efforts of the Brazilian government to promote immigration, and the frustrations black Americans experienced in northern cities and the southern countryside, nationalists concocted a number of schemes in the 1920s to promote emigration. These efforts, however, were uniformly unsuccessful, in part because the Brazilian government, while desirous of newcomers, opposed the entrance of people who might retard the whitening process or stimulate greater race consciousness among Brazil’s large non-white population.
While rejecting large scale or permanent emigration as impractical and potentially damaging to black North Americans, some black leaders urged their followers to take advantage of the economic opportunities Brazil presented to all regardless of race. The best known of such individuals was one of Garvey's leading critics, Robert S. Abbott, owner of the nation's leading black newspaper, the Chicago Defender. Unlike most who wrote about Brazil, Abbott had first-hand knowledge of the republic, acquired during a two month visit to South America in 1923. His experiences were recalled in a series of Defender articles that painted a glowing portrait of Brazil. Despite obvious racial diversity, absolute social harmony prevailed. Children of all colors—black, white, brown and yellow—could be seen playing together everywhere. Racial intermarriage was not just accepted, it was encouraged, "the ideal being a perfect political state thoroughly homogeneous in blood." Citizens were "Brazilians," not "Negroes" or "whites." It was common in Brazil, for example, for men who would be classified as Negroes in the United States to have hundreds of white women working under them, he reported.

Abbott's trip, however, was not without some unpleasantness related to his color. The Brazilian Consul in Chicago initially refused to issue him a visa. On his first attempt to secure hotel accommodations in Rio de Janeiro he and his wife were turned away while his white fellow passengers were served, an event that was to be repeated. Abbott responded to these insults as Brazilians were wont to do when confronted with experiences challenging the myth of the racial paradise. He discounted them as exceptional occurrences, carry-overs from the days of slavery and the empire, or as evidence that North American racial ideologies and norms had contaminated Brazilian society.

Instead of re-examining the myth of the racial paradise, he combined it with another—the myth of the frontier and its riches, a myth with deep North American and Brazilian roots. Brazil was a land of untapped wealth, Abbott reported, as well as one short of the entrepreneurial and technological skills abundant among Yankees, including black ones. For people with skills and capital—the "practical idealists" of the race—but only for them and not for those primarily interested in fleeing poverty and racial oppression, Brazil represented a new frontier, one where enterprising individuals who had been excluded from the North American frontier could participate fully. In pursuing their personal material interests they would contribute to the progress of the race as a whole, much as Abbott and other members of the new middle class had done as they moved out of the South and established business in northern and western cities.16

Regardless of the lesson—if any—to be learned from the condition of people of color in Brazil, the image of the nation as an El Dorado persisted throughout the 1930s and 40s. Flattering characterizations of Brazil appeared in the Crisis, the Negro History Bulletin and the Journal of Negro History, the latter two edited by the dean of black historians, Carter G. Woodson.17 In 1943 the new Negro Digest contained an article on "Black Brazil" with the sub-title "Color line non-existent in [the] South American republic."18 The inaugural issue of Ebony in
1945 included an article professing "The Truth About Brazil." Acknowledging that it was "more than coincidental that most Negroes are in the poorer classes," it asserted that "Brazil is one of the few countries in the world where there is no racial discrimination." In Brazil one drop of white blood seemed to make a person white, and wealthy Negroes were welcomed in high society.\(^\text{19}\)

While the view of Brazil as presented in *Ebony* continued to be the prevalent one, in the 1940s it was often advanced with less certainty and more qualifications than in the past. Furthermore, a substantial number of black Americans began to reject the traditional view altogether.\(^\text{20}\) These critics included journalists that two major Afro-American newspapers sent to Brazil to examine race relations first hand. One was the *Baltimore Afro-American*’s Ollie Stewart, who spent 20 days on assignment in Brazil during the spring of 1940. In each of the articles he wrote about his trip he sought to correct misleading if not totally erroneous reports about Brazil circulating in North America. Brazil, he remarked, had a "hell of a color line." One might not find old Jim Crow there, but one would quite likely encounter a run-around, Brazil’s version of the color bar. "Brazil told its dark people that they were free to do what anybody else did, then promptly made it impossible for an ignorant, untrained and poverty-ridden man to get out of the gutter." Consequently, "the descendants of slaves in Brazil face the same problems that the descendants of slaves face in the United States: poverty, ignorance and lack of opportunity." In Brazil as in the United States, dominant whites used every means available to keep blacks down and feeling inferior. Relative to their numbers, few were found in universities or in well-paid positions in the professions or business world. Disproportionate numbers, however, could be found working as day laborers and domestics, in police and fire departments, and especially in the armed forces where they would serve as cannon fodder for white officers should a revolution occur.\(^\text{21}\)

A young “colored” English-speaking sailor who befriended Stewart in Rio—the only part of Brazil visited by the journalist—told him that there was “no such thing as color in Brazil” because of the extensive race mixture. Others said the same thing. But such was not Stewart’s experience, starting on the first day when he was turned away from several hotels. Certain streets and areas of the city, as well as casinos, cafes, theaters and hotels were all-white while others catered to people with dark skins. Life for people of color in Brazil was the same as in the deep South, except that in the South whites were frank enough to tell blacks to stay away. As far as Stewart was concerned, he said he’d rather be colored in the U.S. where one knew what he was up against and where all the light-skinned women were not dying to marry white men. Furthermore, in the United States black people perhaps had a little more to fight with than in Brazil.\(^\text{22}\)

George Schuyler, associate editor of the *Pittsburgh Courier*, was the other journalist who wrote extensively on Brazilian race relations. He visited Brazil twice, in 1948 and again in 1949, on tours that took him to several Latin American and West Indian republics. Schuyler’s response to the racial situation in Brazil was only slightly more favorable than Stewart’s. What impressed him most were
the contradictions present in Brazil. Black and brown people were found everywhere, often interacting with whites, including members of the other sex, with a camaraderie not found in the U.S. Brazil’s colored population was more widely employed than their brethren to the north. There were people of obvious African ancestry in prominent positions throughout the society. Racial intermarriage was legal, and people of all races could exercise the suffrage. So Schuyler could understand why some saw Brazil as a “chromatic democracy.”

The flip side of the picture and the one emphasized by Schuyler, however, was far less appealing. It was true that whites did not hate blacks, but often they pitied them and were reluctant to associate as equals. Miscegenation was indeed common, but intermarriage was probably more frequent in the United States. Black and brown Brazilians engaged in a variety of occupations, but invariably they were restricted to the less well paid and prestigious positions in each field. This was particularly noticeable in the armed forces where “Negro and Negroid officers are scarce, ... despite all the talk about absence of color discrimination in Brazil.” When a person of African heritage did achieve distinction, he or she invariably sought to avoid identification as a Negro. The presence of blacks in the business life of the nation was almost nil, and apparently no one voted for obviously Negro candidates. While there was no clear-cut social or economic color line in Brazil, the residents of Rio’s favelas were mostly pretos (blacks) and pardos (browns), and in Salvador da Bahia, where the concentration of people of color was greatest, one saw few blacks in stores, shops, restaurants and hotels along the major commercial thoroughfares. Worse, in the more rapidly growing, prosperous and predominantly white southern Brazilian states, racial prejudice and discrimination were on the rise. In certain areas of life, notably the theater, blacks were virtually excluded altogether. Indeed, several racial organizations, some similar to the NAACP, had been established in recent years to fight signs of racism in Brazilian life.

Schuyler’s experiences led him to conclude that “the picture of Brazil as a land without a color line had been painted by white rather than black Brazilians.” Poverty, illiteracy, subtle forms of discrimination, and the tendency of Afro-Brazilians to reject their blackness had resulted in a “color caste system” with similar albeit not identical outcomes to those found in the United States.

Some important black intellectuals also visited Brazil in the 1940s. Among them were the anthropologist Irene Diggs and one of the country’s leading black sociologists, E. Franklin Frazier, both of whom devoted a major part of their careers to the study of race relations. In mid-decade Diggs spent seven months in South and Central America, including one month in Brazil, under a grant from the U.S. State Department; Frazier studied the black family in Brazil for six months in 1940-41 as a Guggenheim Fellow. Their observations about Brazil, while essentially supportive of the traditional image, also reflected the tendency of black Americans to be more critical than in the past.

In an article addressed to black readers in 1947, Diggs referred to the evidence of racial discrimination she observed in Latin America as “a paradox
without logic.” In Brazil as elsewhere during her 21,000 mile trek, she did not find brown or black people in important positions in the arts, sciences and politics relative to their proportion in the population. While racial amalgamation was advancing, a premium was placed on whiteness. Yet in South America segregation was unthinkable, racial violence rare, and public opinion overwhelmingly against racial prejudice, she reported.26

Frazier summed up his assessment of race relations in Brazil for his fellow social scientists in articles published in 1942 and 1944. He acknowledged that it was “exceedingly difficult” to explain relations between Negroes and whites in Brazil to North Americans. For one thing, in discussing Brazil it was important to distinguish between color and race prejudice. Attitudes toward persons of African descent were influenced by skin color in Brazil, but “Negro blood” as such was not regarded as a taint, nor did it identify one racially as in the United States. Partly as a result of extensive miscegenation, racial consciousness among blacks and whites was low. The general recognition of African cultural contributions to Brazilian society also promoted acceptance of the Negro. Since skin color did not determine one’s place in society, it was possible to declare, as he did, that there was “no race problem in Brazil.” Yet he confessed that when one studied the situation closely one could detect signs of distinctions based upon color and the maintenance of social distance by a subtle system of etiquette, especially in the upper classes. This was particularly true in marriage and in social clubs and the larger hotels and in southern Brazil where large numbers of new European immigrants had settled among the more open and flexible Portuguese Brazilians.27

It is important to note that in these articles both Diggs and Frazier presented a very mixed picture of race relations in Brazil. Yet in other articles written essentially at the same time, but addressed to largely white and non-academic audiences, they set forth a much more favorable image of Brazil. In 1947 in the Catholic journal America Diggs accentuated the differences in ideology and practice regarding race in North and South America. “The problem of race and color in South America is in great part a matter of economics and cultural status,” she observed. A new species, a criollo population, had evolved through amalgamation. These people, she continued, were committed to the proposition that all citizens be treated as equals, divided only by national boundaries, not race or color.28 In a 1942 article in the liberal monthly Common Sense, Frazier proclaimed that “Brazil Has No Race Problem:"

There is some color prejudice against those of black complexion but such prejudice is a personal matter and is not legalized or institutionalized. But no matter how poor or how humble his station in life, the Brazilian black does not cringe but is dignified and has a sense of personal worth.
The distinguished sociologist conveyed this image of Brazil on a University of Chicago public affairs radio program in 1943 as well.29

The reason for the contrast in tone in Diggs’ two 1947 essays is not evident from the articles. Conceivably she was seeking to inform the predominantly white readers of America of what she assumed black readers knew—that alternatives existed to the North American pattern of race relations—and in so doing encourage people of conscience to work for changes. Such thinking, in part, was clearly behind Frazier’s efforts in Common Sense, where he spoke as a social critic rather than as a social scientist. Writing during the first year of America’s participation in World War II, he began by alluding to the low morale of American Negroes and the fact that allies in Asia and Africa—as well as those in the Western Hemisphere—would be looking at the nation critically because of its treatment of people of color. The United States could learn from Brazil, he suggested, and by doing so not only solve a major domestic problem but enhance its security in the world.30

Nowhere was the trend of black Americans in the 1940s to question the existence of racial democracy in Latin America as apparent as in the comments of the premier black intellectual of the twentieth century, W.E.B. DuBois. His observations are especially instructive not only because of his status as a scholar and activist but because of the sharp change in his assessment of Brazilian race relations over the years. In the 1910s and 1920s DuBois expressed opinions shared by others regarding Brazil. The absence of a color bar and the absorption of the Negro race into the larger society without tension and violence testified to the baselessness of North American fears regarding race.31 It was important, he felt, for North Americans to challenge the view implicit in most books on Brazil that it was a white country and to read books such as The Conquest of Brazil by Roy Nash, a former Executive Secretary of the NAACP. This work, published in 1926, stressed both the presence of blacks in the nation’s history and the acceptability of race mixture in Brazil, DuBois noted.32

In the 1930s DuBois said little if anything about Brazil. Early in the next decade, however, he reversed his previous position and presented a hard-hitting critique of Brazilian race relations and ideology. North American blacks “long pretended to see a possible solution in the gradual amalgamation of whites, Indians and blacks” in South America, he remarked. They “have grown used to being told the settlement of the Negro problem in Brazil is merely a matter of time and absorption: that if we shut our eyes long enough, a white Brazil . . . will emerge and Africa in South America disappear.” Such a belief was both unfounded and dangerous, DuBois now insisted. Racial amalgamation had meant neither “social uplift” nor greater power and prestige for mulattoes and mestizos in Latin America. While “dark blood” ran through the veins of many whites, dark people continued to experience social barriers, economic exploitation and political disfranchisement. White immigration was encouraged at all costs.33
One deplorable consequence of the ideology of whitening was that many Afro-Brazilians no longer identified with their African ancestry. Despite facts, no Brazilian . . . dare boast of his black fathers," DuBois observed. The tendency of the "darker people" of the West Indies and South America to "think white" was so ingrained that they were losing awareness of their cultural patterns. In Brazil as elsewhere, people who knew themselves to be of Negro and Indian descent consented to their government presenting the nation to the world as "white" by appointing only Caucasians to diplomatic posts. To DuBois such behavior was a "tragic mistake" that would "tend to eliminate the darker races from the world because of a concerted rush and scramble on their part to become white." In short, absorption of the Negro was not only biologically difficult, it was culturally and politically damaging for African people in South America and the world as a whole.

DuBois' dramatic shift in attitude no doubt reflected his growing Pan-African consciousness and radicalism. Stimulated by his travels in Germany, Africa and elsewhere, and by his life-long study of the African diaspora, he had long seen the black experience in an international context. World War II, like the first world war, was caused in large part because of western colonialism and the racism it nurtured and fed upon. To DuBois racial policy in Brazil and elsewhere in the New World stemmed from the on-going efforts of the imperial powers and their allies within the largely non-white and non-western world to maintain hegemony. While race relations in Latin America might superficially appear dramatically different from and superior to the North American experience, the attempt to bleach Latin America through amalgamation and European immigration represented but a variant on North American efforts to subjugate the Negro through segregation and violence. Brazil did not provide an alternative to North American arrangements but rather a more subtle and indirect way for white people and nations to maintain domination over the world.

In the last two decades of his long life—from the mid-1940s to 1963—DuBois had little to say about Brazil or Latin America. In this period his attention, like that of other black Americans, increasingly focused on domestic politics, the Cold War and the struggles of black people in the United States and Africa.

Perhaps the most important indication of the continued interest black Americans gave to Brazilian race relations in these two decades is contained in John Hope Franklin's impressive and widely read history, From Slavery to Freedom. Like his predecessors, William Alexander, J. A. Rogers, Carter G. Woodson and DuBois, Franklin saw the history of Afro-Latin Americans as relevant to the story of the black North American. In the first edition of his text, published in 1947, Franklin devoted more than 15 pages to slavery, abolition and the position of former slaves in Latin America, especially in Brazil. As textbook writers must do when they deal with topics outside their research areas, he avoided taking a strong position for or against the traditional portrayal of Brazil. But generally he adhered to the then standard interpretations about the nature of slavery, abolition, miscegenation and the relative ease with which ex-slaves were
accepted into the life of the larger community. Franklin’s concluding paragraph is indicative of the approach he took:

Thus Negroes have become a basic element in the life of the republics of Latin America. They are co-partners with Indians and whites in the development of their countries. In many areas they are in the minority, but they do not constitute a minority problem in the sense that persons in the United States understand the term. They are among the best examples that can be found of what happens to peoples when acculturation is permitted to proceed without legal restrictions and racial inhibitions.37

Between the mid-1960s and the mid-1970s there was a sharp upsurge in Afro-North American interest in Brazil. Occasionally, the image of the country widely accepted prior to World War II was reiterated, but the great majority of commentators agreed with the critical assessments of Stewart, Schuyler and DuBois in the 1940s.

A number of developments in American society and particularly within the black community contributed to the new interest and the reinterpretation of race relations in Brazil: the prolonged and heated academic debate over Stanley Elkins’ thesis in Slavery that enslaved Africans in North America were turned into Sambos, a widespread sense of crisis in race relations, and the ideological conflicts among black activists and intellectuals that accompanied the fragmentation of the Civil Rights movement.38 The notion that people of African ancestry in Brazil were better off than their cousins to the north and that this different status had its roots in disparate slave systems was implicit in Elkins’ writing and in much of that by other white scholars. The extensive social and biological mixture of the races in Brazil and the absence of overt segregation and violence seemed to give credence to the gradualistic, non-violent and integration oriented Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and early 1960s. As the racial environment in North America became more heated in the late 1960s and as the ideology and tactics of Martin Luther King, Jr., came under increasing attacks by young, more nationalistic and impatient black Americans, the Brazilian experience was re-examined. These activists, supported by many black intellectuals, gave more emphasis to the role of social class in perpetuating the plight of the bulk of black Americans who had not benefitted from the Civil Rights movement. In affirming the beauty of blackness, in both its physical and cultural expressions, activists contributed to the trend within black America, ongoing since the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s, to reject miscegenation.

The increased attention to class in the United States led black intellectuals to see fewer differences in the systems of social stratification in Brazil and the United States. Class oppression, they noted, produces the same conditions as systematic forms of racial discrimination. The affirmation of black unity and
pride in North America also made Brazil seem less and less attractive since Afro-
Brazilians as well as white Brazilians tended to attach significance to variations
of complexion among people of African descent. If black people were to improve
their position in the United States or in Brazil, they would need to surmount
barriers rooted in color and class differences.

The reason for black interest in Brazil was clearly articulated by Era Bell
Thompson in a 1965 two-part feature article she wrote for *Ebony* following a two
month visit to the country. She explained the purpose of her trip as follows:

I wanted to know why, in a country with almost four times as
many (37%) colored people as the USA, where slavery began
earlier (1532) and lasted 111 years longer [sic] (1888), there
are no sit-in demonstrations or little Selmas; why a nation
which granted the Negro full civil rights along with abolition
passed an anti-discrimination law 13 years before we did; why
there are disproportionately more dark people sweeping office
floors than sitting behind office desks.39

For a popular magazine, Thompson’s response to the question posed in the
title of the article, “Does Amalgamation Work in Brazil?,” was remarkably
sophisticated. Brazil was neither a Negro haven nor a Negro hell, she wrote. The
overwhelming majority of Afro-Brazilians were still “at the bottom of the
economic ladder and the foot of the social hierarchy.” Education, culture and
money all helped one transcend color but only to a certain point. Although
African culture was acknowledged in Brazil, the word “Negro” was rejected by
people of African descent in favor of “dark Brazilian.” Despite the Afonso Arinos
anti-discrimination law of 1951 and the frequent professions to the contrary, there
were places in Brazil where dark-skinned people were unwelcomed and firms that
would not hire them. “The darker a man is the greater his problems,” she noted.
Yet despite these and other qualifications she answered the question posed in the
title positively:

Amalgamation may not be the complete answer to the racial
problem, but so far it is the best. Should a serious problem of
racial discrimination develop in Brazil they have the frame-
work of a solution, the temperament to cope with matters racial
and a law to prosecute those who violate the Brazilian concept
of justice for all.40

Even Thompson’s qualified endorsement of the Brazilian model was very
much a minority perspective in the late 1960s and 1970s. Three years after her
article, for example, a *Negro Digest* editorial characterized the emphasis on
whitening of the population in Brazil as “disgusting.” While racism, as black
Americans had always known it, did not exist in Brazil, it was absurd to assert,
as Brazilian “apologists” in this country and at home did, that racial prejudice and discrimination did not occur there. Humiliation and degradation of people of color was but more subtle in Brazil; the “official policy of assimilation” merely made discrimination less respectable, not less real. When “the poor and uneducated and ostracized” Afro-Brazilians woke up to their reality, as they inevitably would when “the wind of revolution” blowing from Havana, Panama City and the United States reached them, the black revolution in North America would look like a Sunday school picnic, the editor predicted. 41

In the early and mid-1970s a new generation of black scholars sought to lay to rest once and for all the idea that Brazil provided a model for the United States to emulate. Unlike earlier scholars who wrote about Brazil, these men and women typically were Latin American specialists who had spent time in Brazil. In conjunction with white scholars and Brazilians who also had been active since the UNESCO studies of the 1950s in re-thinking the experience of Afro-Brazilians, they left few of the assumptions associated with the myth of the racial democracy unattained. In a 1975 dissertation, “Language Attitudes, Ethnicity and Class in São Paulo and Salvador da Bahia,” Angela Gilliam observed that, as in the United States, blacks and mulattoes in Brazil identified those regions possessing the heaviest concentration of non-white people as the centers of the language of least prestige. Given the low value placed on Africanisms, the tendency to define any characteristic associated with slavery as bad, and the ideology of whitening in Brazil, this finding was not surprising. Two years later in his dissertation, “Political Attitudes and Behavior of Blacks in Sâo Paulo, Brazil,” Michael Mitchell refuted the assertion that Afro-Brazilians lacked racial consciousness. He argued that in contemporary Brazil, as in the past, racial consciousness helped shape black attitudes and their efforts to redress explicit racial grievances. 42

Probably the most influential revisionists of the past two decades have been scholars best known for their work on Spanish America, Richard L. Jackson and Leslie Rout, Jr. In his 1975 essay “The Color Crisis in Latin America,” Jackson set forth themes later developed in his books and applied them to Portuguese as well as Hispanic America. He argued that “racial amalgamation is not necessarily a sign of racial harmony.” While the somatic norm was darker in Latin America and people with brown skin may be preferred as the aesthetic ideal, blackness continued to be a stigma as in the United States. He labelled the rejection of blackness through pressure to create a whiter population “ethnic lynching.” The “problem of color” in both Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking societies, some hoped, would be erased by eliminating the black race. White racism in Latin America was promoting “pathological behavior” among Afro-Latin Americans similar to past practices in the United States when some dark-skinned people tried to lighten their features and light-skinned Afro-Americans often turned their backs on their darker brothers. 43

Although Leslie Rout was best known for his 1976 pioneering synthesis, The African Experience in Spanish America, 1502 to the Present Day, his interest in Brazil was long standing. 44 By the mid-1970s he had visited the country four
times and published three accounts of his experiences. Brazil, he recalled, had long been for him, as for other black Americans, "a kind of tropical Shangri-La." Despite the long heritage of slavery, high illiteracy rates, and at best uneven experiences with democracy, Brazil seemingly had satisfied the hopes and aspirations of its non-white citizens.

But the numerous "racial misadventures" he had experienced there put him "eye to eye" with grim reality. Black was not beautiful in Brazil. The official ideology of "Brazilianization" or amalgamation aimed at whitening the population had generated animosity between pardos and pretos, whereas in the United States mulattoes and blacks were forced to work together. Marriage typically had little to do with the extensive miscegenation apparent in Brazil. Even disregarding the general poverty of Brazil, the economic status of people of African descent was markedly inferior to that in the United States. Schools and universities gave little recognition to Afro-Brazilians after the abolition of slavery. One university student told Rout that "all we were taught was that social prejudice is an un-Brazilian trait and that the country generally is becoming white." To Rout and a growing number of other black North Americans this type of society was far from an El Dorado.

In an unusually insightful 1972 essay entitled "Equality in Brazil: Confronting Reality," Cleveland Donald, Jr., sought to explain why the image of Brazil as a racial paradise had existed for so long in black North America. Part of the answer, he suggested, lay in the tendency of popular black-oriented periodicals, notably Ebony, to highlight stories of black success. This tendency was reinforced by intellectuals who, by virtue of limited knowledge of Brazil and their acceptance of white liberal ideology, offered a highly idealized version of Brazilian society. The illusion that the races lived together in peace and harmony and that Afro-Brazilians played an integral role in white-dominated Brazil was terribly appealing to black Americans and liberal whites. It was, however, both false—as other had shown—and dangerous—as Donald sought to demonstrate.

The utopian vision of Brazil was dangerous in that it resulted in a discounting of race as a factor in domestic social problems. Also, "the idealized Brazilian case proves that some whites are capable of humanity toward Blacks and, consequently, implies that certain technical and cultural changes in the United States might result in a social system akin to her neighbor's to the south." Efforts to apply the Brazilian model to the United States would promote undue optimism among black Americans, and reinforce both the desire of white conservatives to do nothing, and the efforts of liberal whites to pursue gradualistic, colorblind policies. In effect, the myth of racial democracy in Brazil could have the same effect in North America as it had Brazil: legitimization of the status quo.

Ironically, Donald continued, the image that dominant whites in Brazil and the United States had of race relations in each other's country worked to the disadvantage of non-whites in both societies. White Brazilians who emphasized segregation and violence in North America became complacent about their attitudes toward, and treatment of, black Brazilians. Similarly, white North
Americans who accepted the myth regarding Brazil employed that image to advance approaches to America’s ills that would not benefit the bulk of Afro-Americans.\textsuperscript{46}

The North American critic of the myth of the Brazilian racial democracy, Elisa Nascimento, was essentially correct when she observed in 1980 that “conventionally, the notion of the Pan-African Triangle has not included South and Central America, except in sparse and sporadic references.”\textsuperscript{47} Students of black American thought have produced numerous studies of the links between Africa and African people in the United States.\textsuperscript{48} With the exception of Haiti and, to a lesser extent, Cuba, scholars have overlooked the links between black North Americans and their cousins in other parts of the New World. Yet developments in Latin America and especially the experiences of Afro-Latin Americans have long interested black North Americans.

In the nineteenth century and through most of the twentieth, black Americans found hope in the notion that even in a country with a long heritage of slavery whites and people of color could live together in harmony, free from segregation and a climate of fear and violence. The need to hold on to the belief that a viable alternative to the North American pattern of race relations—as well as the absence of direct experience in Brazil—resulted in blacks affirming the myth of the racial democracy as strongly as white Brazilians and North Americans.

Starting in the 1940s black North Americans began to raise questions about the validity of the traditional interpretation of race relations in Brazil. The few black Americans who traveled to Latin America often experienced discrimination, especially when they sought service at first class hotels, restaurants and other places seldom entered by black Brazilians. They noted that while non-whites and whites usually interacted with little friction and were not segregated by law, in Brazil as in the United States, people of African descent, be they mulattoes or blacks, seldom occupied prominent positions in the nation’s military, religious, economic or political life. New studies of race relations in Brazil confirmed much of what black North American visitors observed. The Brazilian situation increasingly appeared to fit the pattern of black subordination to whites found in Africa and North America rather than stand out as an exception.

By the late 1960s the view of Brazil held by black North Americans was sharply counter to that once widely accepted by blacks and whites in the United States. Whereas the South American republic had long represented the possibility of a raceless society devoid of prejudice and racial animosity, since the 1960s it more and more has provided insight into but another system by which one group uses its dominance to perpetuate a social system favoring its interests. Blacks who increasingly questioned the American Dream with its promise of abundant opportunities for all in a colorblind, integrated society vigorously challenged the notion that Brazil was a racial paradise worthy of imitation. Afro-Brazilians have not been seen by themselves or others as beautiful. While miscegenation has been more common and accepted in Brazil than in the United States, people of color have not melted with Euro-Brazilians on a basis of equality. As a group they have
lacked power, wealth and prestige. Having been socialized to think of themselves as Brazilians and not as blacks they have lacked the self-consciousness essential to unite in a concerted effort to alter their subordinate status.

Black North Americans continue to look to Brazil as a way to understand their situation at home and in the world—as they have done for well over a century. But what they learn is very different from what their ancestors learned. Brazil is increasingly examined for the lessons it offers about the interaction of racial and class variables and the perils of identifying with whites who devalue the color and heritage of people of African descent. The condition of Afro-Brazilians testifies to the fact that legal equality and social integration and even amalgamation do not necessarily end the subordination of non-whites to white people. As black North Americans continue to be frustrated in realizing the gains they anticipated from the demise of Jim Crow in the 1950s and 1960s they find less and less solace but considerable understanding in the run-around Afro-Brazilians have long faced.49
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