Oberlin

Digital Commons at Oberlin

2022

Racial Domination Through the Grey Areas: The Categorization of Mixed-Race in the United States and Brazil

Arman Luczkow
Oberlin College

Racial Domination Through the Grey Areas:

The Categorization of Mixed-Race in the United States and Brazil

By Arman Luczkow

Honors Thesis Completed for the

Oberlin College Politics Department

April 2022

1

Table of Contents

Introduction

Within the United States of America, the number of multiracial people is increasing dramatically. Between the 2010 and 2020 census in the U.S., "the number of non-Hispanic Americans who identify as multiracial had jumped by 127 percent over the decade."[1] While this number is tied to a growing self-identification of mixed-race people as multiracial, it also reflects changing demographics. Despite a growing population of multiracial people, there remains a limited understanding of how multiracial identity has been categorized. In the U.S, mixed-race categories are in a constant state of change, yet they always operate through a "monoracial framework," with some racial backgrounds prioritized as a means of categorization, and other racial backgrounds pushed aside. Notably, in the U.S. mixed-race categories are largely defined by two distinct tracks, that of Native mixed-race and Black mixed-race.

To clarify: the term monoracial will be used in this paper to refer to people of one racial background, in contrast to those with multiple racial backgrounds, who will be referred to as multiracial. However, when using a "monoracial framework," someone who is multiracial is classified by either an amalgamation of monoracial categories or is sorted into a single monoracial category. For example, someone with Black and white heritage would say either that they are Black, and that they are white, or would default to a single aspect of their heritage, identifying only as Black or white. They would not call themselves, for example, "mulatto," a term used to indicate someone's Black and white heritage within a single word.

---

[1] Sabrina Tavernise, et al, "Behind the Surprising Jump in Multiracial Americans, Several Theories," *The New York Times,* 13 Aug. 2021.

Brazil, in contrast to the United States, has a system of racial categorization with extensive color classifications. Racial mixing was far more common in Brazil, and high levels of miscegenation contributed to a supposed "racial democracy," where serious racial strife was avoided throughout Brazil's history. Yet in truth, by obscuring ideas of race and favoring a discourse of class, Brazil enabled the proliferation of racial inequality and suppressed dissent.

In both cases, governments manipulated racial categories to maintain white supremacy, with underlying objectives of growth and stability. Throughout this process, mixed-race categories altered relatively rapidly. In the past century, political groups beyond the state have had the power to influence categories of mixed-race. How they choose to do so reflects how the state originally situated mixed-race to whiteness.

This paper lays out a timeline of the categorization of mixed-race from early colonization until the modern day, with a historical focus on Black and Native mixed-race in both Brazil and the U.S. As some scholars have neglected to analyze mixed-race with the same intensity and breadth as other racial topics, by simply accepting pre-existing racial designations, and in failing to critically assess why and how these categories were created, scholars may be missing important political implications of mixed-race. Political scholarship cannot investigate basic claims — such as whether multiracial people need to be represented better — because scholars have failed to engage appropriately with the history of mixed-race. Even more importantly, proving historical patterns of mixed-race categorization provides an essential framework for countries now struggling to redefine their multiracial population. This is a turning point that will likely strain our existing racial systems and make its flaws evident.

While this paper focuses on various racial categorizations, often those made by the state, it is important to recognize that just because certain racial categories exist, this does not mean

that all multiracial people have experiences that fit neatly within these categories. Throughout history, the experiences of individuals are varied, falling in various grey areas. Multiracial people are often more than aware of the difference between being monoracial and multiracial, even if the state slots them into one or the other category. However, how multiracial people have experienced these racial categorizations is largely beyond the scope of this paper.

Pre-Colonial Roots of Race

In American societies, race is so deep-rooted as to appear timeless. While this is hardly true, the origin of racial delineations and the corresponding prejudices were present in Europe far before 1492, predating Europeans' colonization of the Americas.[2] Once colonization began, however, specific racial projects and ideologies solidified. According to historian Barbara Fields, official racial domination — where hegemonic powers reinforced projects of racial discrimination — began with the creation of the nation-state.[3] Yet despite arising from similar pre-colonial ideas of race, racial ideologies and racial domination in these nation-states diverged from each other's paths, often quite drastically. Investigating the shared origins of racial ideologies helps pinpoint these consequential moments of separation.

It wasn't until 1835, in the sixth edition of the Dictionnaire de l'Academie francaise, where race was first defined in a way similar to how it exists in the modern context, as "A multitude of men who originate from the same country, and resemble each other by facial features and by exterior conformity."[4] The solidifying of this definition was preceded by a

---

[2] James H. Sweet, "The Iberian Roots of American Racist Thought," *William and Mary Quarterly* 54:1 (January 1997): 144

[3] Anthony W. Marx, *Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of South Africa, the United States, and Brazil* (Resource Services Library: Provincial Schools Branch Division, 2008), 5.

[4] Nicholas Hudson, "From 'nation to race': The origin of racial classification in the Eighteenth Century thought," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 29:3 (1996): 247.

phenomenon that occurred during the late eighteenth century, when descriptions of racial appearance were prevalent throughout European travel literature discussing the non-European world.[5] This is not to say that race did not exist up until this point, only that it had not been well-defined. At least through the fifteenth century, various European countries had words for a form of race, even though "the words *razza* in Italian, *raza* in Castilian, *rafa* in Portuguese, and *race* in French simply referred to a group of plants, animals, or humans that shared traits through a shared genealogy."[6] This definition, of course, remained a far cry from contemporary interpretations of race. By the time the more modern definition of race was published in the Dictionnaire in 1835, Brazil was still a slave-holding state with a colonial government, half-a-century shy of abolition, and the United States had yet to engage in the Civil War which would redefine race for its foreseeable future. Even if dictionary definitions had only just caught up, racial projects had been ongoing in these colonial states for hundreds of years, propagating from spores of racism stowed on European slave ships traveling to the New World.

The enslavement of Africans by the English and Portuguese can be traced back through early examples of slavery in Europe. From 711 until 1492, Muslims controlled a large portion of the Iberian Peninsula, and as early as the ninth century they had begun creating distinctions between black and white slaves. European slaves were called *mamluks,* while black slaves were called *abd*, a more traditional term for the word "slave." *Mamluks* were a higher price than *abds* since they could receive a higher Christian ransom, and while black slaves were given arduous labor, white slaves were usually assigned to the household.[7] Not only were enslaved Blacks referred to by the traditional *abd* term and subjected to more intense labor, but freed blacks were

---

[5] Hudson, "From 'nation to race,'" 250.
[6] Sweet, "Iberian Roots," 144.
[7] Sweet, "Iberian Roots," 145.

still called *abd*. By defining freed and enslaved Blacks with the same term, Muslims began

blurring the distinction between race and enslavement.[8] Much of the rationale for the inferiority

of Blacks, thus justifying discrimination against them, originated with the story of Ham from the

Old Testament, and relatively quickly Iberian Christians adopted Iberian Muslims' ideas of

Black slavery.[9] As early evidence of this discrimination, in 1332 "documents relating to the sales

of slaves show Christians differentiating white from black Moors."[10] These centuries old ideas of

Black inferiority influenced the institution of slavery throughout Europe and eventually in the

Americas.

The slavery of Africans in Portugal began partially as a consequence of geography. Given

Portugal's location on the Western side of the Iberian Peninsula, the Portuguese were isolated

from Mediterranean trade routes for slaves. Instead of trade, they relied on armed conflicts to

collect prisoners of war for slave labor. But when the Portuguese Reconquest — where Christian

states in Portugal and Spain sought to recapture land held by Muslims — wrapped up by the

middle of the thirteenth century, the Portuguese no longer had a large-scale territorial conflict

which they could rely on to acquire slaves.[11] With prisoners of war no longer available, the

Portuguese began exploratory missions down the West African coast in 1441. After raiding the

coast, the sailors brought home a single slave.[12] While this was the first slave to be captured in an

increasingly organized slave trade, "Lanqarote de Freitas's delivery of [235 'blackamoor'] slaves

from Guinea in 1444 was the first large cargo of black slaves to arrive on Portuguese soil."[13]

Some estimate that Portugal took 150,000 slaves from sub-Saharan Africa before 1492, as blacks

---

[8] Sweet, "Iberian Roots," 146.
[9] Sweet, "Iberian Roots," 148-149.
[10] Sweet, "Iberian Roots," 150.
[11] Sweet, "Iberian Roots," 155.
[12] Sweet, "Iberian Roots," 156.
[13] Sweet, "Iberian Roots," 160.

became the dominant source of slave labor throughout much of Portugal.[14] Although there was

not a clear racial ideology during this time, there was frequent skin-color-based discrimination,

leading to an idea that "the treatment of black Africans from the Middle Ages to the early

modern period appears to be racism without race."[15] Although it has been argued that European

explorers believed themselves to be superior due to ideas of civilization, the Portuguese at the

time did also believe in an early form of *limpieza de sangre* (blood purity) based on skin color,

an idea that would later come to be prevalent in Latin America.[16]

 While ideas of race in Europe pre-colonization were underdeveloped, racism was clearly

present. In the Americas, this racism was solidified by nation-states into forms of racial

domination, relying upon more transparent racial categories. Both Brazil and the United States,

then, emerged from similar racial origins. The vast disparity in racial regimes in both countries

today thus arises not out of their European history, but out of events that took place in the New

World.

<div align="center">The United States</div>

Introduction to the United States Racial System

 In the U.S., there exists a "monoracial framework" for mixed-race, meaning that mixed-

race people are placed in monoracial categories, rather than being grouped by their multiracial

identity. Starting in 2000, citizens of the United States can select multiple races on the census,

but only from a preset list of races.[17] This means someone with African American and Asian

---

[14] Sweet, "Iberian Roots,"163.
[15] Sweet, "Iberian Roots," 165.
[16] Hudson, "From 'nation to race,'" 250; Sweet, "Iberian Roots,"163.
[17] Kerry Ann Rockquemore et al, "Racing to Theory or Retheorizing Race? Understanding the
Struggle to Build a Multiracial Identity Theory," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 65, no. 1, (2009): 13.

ancestry can select only those two terms, becoming, in the eyes of the government, two separate races in one body. This is also a system which prioritizes ancestry, in contrast to other racial categorization systems. For example, in much of Latin America, each separate racial mixture has its own title, instead of choosing which pre-existing monoracial category to stick with, and physical attributes such as skin color can take predominance over ancestry percentages. In Brazil, someone of combined European, Native, and African ancestry might be called "Pardo," a word that encompasses each of these identities, but does not specify any of them.[18]

However, monoracial categorization within the United States differs greatly for individuals of varying racial mixes. If a person is half Black and half white, they will most likely be categorized as Black. By contrast, someone who is half Asian and half white may more frequently experience being categorized as either Asian or white in separate instances. Yet this is not a hard rule, nor a constant one. These categories alter over time, and how someone is racially categorized can even depend upon what region of the U.S. they live in, or what the racial make-up of their community is. This ongoing process is termed "racialization."[19] Thus, in asking why mixed-race exists the way it does in the U.S., one must recognize that multiracial identity is a fluid, shifting category, not a concrete designation.

Through the frameworks of Black and Native racialization, colonial and United States government officials — including state legislatures, courts, and the federal government — were able to manipulate mixed-race categories to achieve their goal of acquiring land and capital. Mixed-race was thus a method to separate or unite groups when necessary. Whereas Black mixed-race was shuttered under the Black categorization to separate Blackness from Whiteness,

---

[18] Robert M. Levine, *Race and Ethnic Relations in Latin America and the Caribbean: An Historical Dictionary and Bibliography*, (Scarecrow Press, 1980), 102.
[19] *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice*, edited by Karim Murji, and John Solomos, *Oxford University Press*, (2005), ProQuest Ebook Central, 1.

with mulatto categories only occurring when a Black population needed to be divided, Native mixed-race has been far more malleable, with removal and assimilation used to achieve elimination, so that the United States government can acquire Native lands.

The construction of the United States' racial regime is unique in several regards. With a white majority population throughout most of the nation, and no comprehensive history of slave revolts, the U.S. did not need to fracture Black identity through the introduction of mixed-race categories, as Brazil did. Instead, the U.S. separated races early on. The Black population, sustained through a system of slavery that allowed for and encouraged reproduction, was kept segregated from the white population through slavery. Once slavery was abolished, Jim Crow and anti-miscegenation laws worked to solidify Black race, keeping Black and white people separate, and unifying a white nation fraught from years of war. For people of Black mixed-race, the only option was to identify as Black. Most of these actions were taken by state governments, as the U.S. was a relatively decentralized power. Supreme Court cases served as the final say in many of these issues, with the federal government delaying the decision-making process until cases happened to be brought before the Court. With the Native population, the federal government had a much more involved role, and a heavier hand. Due to the nation's availability of land to the west, Native peoples were removed to other lands whenever possible, and the few who remained behind were easily assimilated. This is unlike Brazil, where Natives were often assimilated within urban areas. State governments generally had little place to be making these laws, since once Native peoples were removed out of their borders, Native race was no longer their prerogative. The result is that Native mixed-race shifted frequently based on U.S. policy and due to increased settlement and migration throughout the U.S.

In the past three decades, with federal and state governments passing fewer laws regulating or altering mixed-race categories, the census has become a focal point of multiracial identity. The debate over census categories generally has revolved around the motivations of legislators and powerful minority advocacy groups, operating within an existing monoracial framework to advocate for their own interests. In a country with deep racial lines, civil rights advocacy leans into monoracial identity formation, whereas conservative voices often work to conceal racial history altogether. Most recently, multiracial categories have been introduced into congressional legislation, for the first time eschewing a monoracial framework in a public and official way. While this development hints that we are nearing new forms of multiracial categorization in the United States, it could be that this nascent stage is merely the next step of any path-dependent monoracial framework, within a country that allows for citizens to resist their government's racial regime.

Black Mixed-Race

When colonization first began, North America had three groups of people from separate continents — Native peoples, white colonizers, and Africans — even if at the time, they were not strictly kept within these groups. Instead, identity was often malleable, and "during the first decades of colonization, socioracial flexibility existed for certain people of blended African, European, and Indigenous descent in Virginia and Maryland, as it did in Latin America and other English colonial regions across the Atlantic."[20] This amorphous blend of races did not last too long, however. Planters soon realized that wealth-making could be tied to race as a form of social

---

[20]A. B. Wilkinson, "People of Mixed Ancestry in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake: Freedom, Bondage, and the Rise of Hypodescent Ideology," *Journal of Social History*, vol. 52, no. 3, (2019): 594.

stratification.[21] Related to this, of course, were pre-existing ideas of racial prejudice which had been carried over from Europe. Although there was a period where Native slave labor was used by colonizers, with a historical precedent of African slavery already set, and African slaves valued less than white slaves in Europe, planters in North America shortly instituted African slave labor to work Native lands. The result was a racially separated society, yet for the goal of increasing wealth. The development of Black and Native mixed-race is inherently connected then, even as they diverged in form. The driving force behind categorizing Black race was labor, and the force behind categorizing Native race was land. Understanding these fundamental differences illuminates the nascent categorizations of mixed-race in the United States.

Throughout most of North America, the white population outnumbered that of Africans. Yet the white population soon found their social status challenged by racial mixing. The grey area around racial-identity chipped away at the foundation of power held by planters, as creole people, of mixed-European and Black descent, were in some cases considered nearing whiteness. This came to be a problem for the planters: "since the Africans would shortly be creoles and since creoles shared so much with whites, distinctions among blacks threatened the racial division that underlay planter domination."[22] Such a scenario would warrant the abolition of mixed-race categories; after all, they allowed for mixed-race people to get closer to whiteness and undermined the idea of an immutable white category. Without white superiority clearly established, justifying a plantation system that relied on the labor of a single race would be challenging.

However, in regions where white people were the demographic minority, such as the labor-intensive rice economy of South Carolina, the opposite was sometimes the case. Mulatto

---

[21] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race*, (London: Verso, 2016), 1571.
[22] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History*, 1571.

categories served as "a buffer population to stave off the threat of slave revolt."[23] This tactic, while rare in the United States, was fundamental to the development of mixed-race categories in Brazil, with its noticeably smaller white population. This would indicate that earlier acceptance of mixed-race categories did rely upon demographic situations. In both cases, the choice of how to categorize mixed-race had ramifications for the planter elite maintaining control. When whites were in the minority, they could fracture the Black majority with intermediate racial categories. When whites were in the majority, categorizing everyone with Black heritage as Black supplied planters with more labor. A mulatto category allowed the minority population to be split into two groups, connecting to the larger goal of creating wealth through domination, yet a form of domination not necessarily intended to be explicit racial hierarchy.

Although there may have been conscious decisions on how to construct race and mixed-race at the time, there was never a singular effort to develop an all-encompassing policy. Instead, these racial categories shifted continually with the motives of the people in power in each region and were not instituted through a centralized power. This resulted in the lines between mixed-race and monoracial categorization being highly dynamic. For example, "for a brief period in eighteenth-century Georgia, free Blacks could even become White, though this extraordinary exception only obtained while Georgian Whites were in a frontier situation and needed assistance to suppress Native Americans and, to the south, the Spanish."[24] Racial categorization was simply another tool to achieve distinct goals, such as defending territory, and it could be altered as needed. Furthermore, racial categorization was highly situational, due to regionalized power and demographic differences in each of these regions. One of the constants, however, was the importation of ideas of racial prejudice to these regions.

---

[23] Patrick Wolfe, "*Traces of History,*" 1716.
[24] Patrick Wolfe, "*Traces of History,*" 1716.

Although there was no federal body passing race-based policy at the time, English officials and Chesapeake authorities took several steps during the seventeenth century to define race. These are some of the earliest official government mandates dictating racial laws, and they are a precursor to state laws passed in the subsequent centuries to define Black-mixed race, as well as actions by Congress to dictate Native mixed-race. Although at the start of colonization English society did not have strict laws governing race-mixing, within the first half of colonization Chesapeake officials began introducing laws to restrict miscegenation, with penalties such as slavery and prolonged servitude for mixed-race people. In Brazil, such legislation may not have been possible or favored, due to higher levels of miscegenation and a need for intermediary racial categories. But in the U.S., this process continued from the 1660s onwards, as English officials began to believe that subordinating people of mixed African or Native ancestry was necessary to create a well-ordered society. Mixed-race people resisted these efforts at subordination, claiming their European heritage and Christian faith should absolve them of race-based restrictions and afford them higher social status. However, states responded to this dilemma with legislation designed to keep mixed-race people from escaping their lower status; "Virginia's legislature reacted to freedom suits brought by people of mixed descent by passing the first slave statute that instituted heritable slavery in North America. Likewise, in 1664, colonial officials in Maryland introduced their first provincial slave code, in part to define the inheritance of slave status for growing numbers of children."[25] A Virginia statute passed in 1691 spoke of "preventing abominable mixture and spurious issue" between Europeans and people of African, Native, or mixed ancestry.[26] For Black people in North America, these state laws were the start of the idea that a Black woman can give birth only to a Black child, but not a

---

[25] Wilkinson, "People of Mixed Ancestry," 594.
[26] Wilkinson, "People of Mixed Ancestry," 595.

child of any other race. For African Americans, unlike as will be seen in the Native case, "difference was rendered absolute, ancestral and immutable."[27] Thus, Black mixed-race was shuttered under the category of monoracial Black by these legislatures, with exceptions arising when mixed-race categories were needed to achieve some form of political or military control, such as the cases in Georgia and Virginia. These laws indicated the beginning of a monoracial framework that maintained white dominancy by placing all people with Black heritage within a Black categorization.

A notable exception to the wider American system of racial categorization existed in Louisiana, which adopted a model more like that of Latin America, where a mulatto category existed separately from a Black category. Despite legislation passed in Louisiana to curtail the rights of the free mulatto population, "many in this free mulatto class were wealthy planters and merchants; some were even extensive slaveholders. In parts of Louisiana, this group regularly voted in defiance of the law's restriction of the ballot to white men."[28] However, as elsewhere across the country, the social separation between Black and mulatto faded after the Civil War, and the legal reality changed as well.

Abolition

When slavery ceased to exist after the Civil War, racial lines were hardened to continue a separation between Black and white people. Although the Civil War was won by abolitionists, the U.S. embraced policies of discrimination afterward.[29] This may seem unusual; however, after the war had ended, the industrializing power of the North had to reform with the Southern

---

[27] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History*, 1494-1511.
[28] Raymond T. Diamond and Robert J. Cottrol, "Codifying Caste: Louisiana's Racial Classification Scheme and the Fourteenth Amendment," *Loyola Law Review*, vol. 29, no. 2, Spring 1983: p. 270.
[29] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 11.

agrarian states. Resolving the conflict between them was essential to continuing the United States, and for economic prosperity, and this was prioritized over racial justice.[30] The federal government allowed segregation to proliferate precisely because it wished for the white majority to reunify, and if the cost was horrific discrimination and a hardening of racial lines, so be it.[31] According to W.E.B. DuBois, "all the hatred that the whites after the Civil War had for each other gradually concentrated itself on [Blacks]... Had there been no Negroes, there would have been no war. Had no Negroes survived the war, the peace would have been difficult because of hatred."[32] For the U.S., abolition necessitated overt racial domination to achieve white unification. This is in direct contrast to Brazil, where abolition was a peaceful process, and there was no need to reunify a country torn apart from conflict. Brazil also had the benefit of state centralization, whereas the Civil War clearly demonstrated just how deep the regional divides were in the U.S.

As slaves were emancipated, the mulatto category began to recede. Now that slavery was over, governments needed to establish a clear boundary between white and Black, and "in dispensing with the 'free black' and 'mulatto' categories, emancipation marked out the unqualified Blackness that would become the object of persecution in the Jim Crow era."[33] Race became more consistent and clearer after abolition, as during slavery race was essentially redundant as a method of domination. Race did not need to be enforced if slavery already separated white and Black populations. After the Supreme Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896 found segregation to be legal so long as it was "separate but equal," there was also a trend toward the one-drop rule, where any amount of Black ancestry rendered an individual Black.

---

[30] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 12.
[31] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 13.
[32] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 136.
[33] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 1733.

Before abolition, freed mulattos were an intermediary category that didn't disrupt the slave versus non slave racial order. Yet in 1896, the Supreme Court determined that octoroons were subject to segregation under "separate but equal." Miscegenation and "mixed marriages" shortly became illegal. Clearly, the lack of a central design for segregation did not mitigate its effects.[34] Ideas of miscegenation and race-mixing were also evaluated more thoroughly, especially by state legislatures.[35] In Virginia, long-lasting racial categories changed relatively swiftly through the Racial Integrity Laws passed from 1924-1930:[36]

> "From the Act of 1785 to 1910, a mulatto, or 'colored' person was someone who had one-fourth or more Negro blood. In 1910, that category was expanded to include anyone with one-sixteenth or more Negro blood, and many people previously classified as white became legally colored. Then, in 1924, in a statute frankly entitled 'Preservation of Racial Integrity,' the legislators for the first time defined 'white' rather than 'mulatto' or 'colored.' The statute, which forbade a white person to marry any non-white, defined 'white' as someone who had 'no trace whatsoever of any blood other than Caucasian' or no more than one-sixteenth American Indian blood. In 1930, the Virginia legislature defined 'colored' in a similar, though slightly less restrictive way as any 'person in whom there is ascertainable any negro blood.'"[37]

---

[34] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 141.
[35] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 1762.
[36] Brendan Wolfe, "Racial Integrity Laws (1924–1930)," Encyclopedia Virginia, 1 Apr. 1691.
[37] Al Higginbotham and Bk Kopytoff, "Racial Purity and Interracial Sex in the Law of Colonial and Antebellum Virginia," *The Georgetown Law Journal*, vol. 77, no. 6, 1989: 14.

The frameworks of racial categorization that began during the colonial period were thus solidified in the post-slavery context, shutting down further avenues to multiracial identity. Not only were mixed-race people with Black heritage more decidedly Black, but for a while mixed marriages remained illegal. Virginia's Racial Integrity Act remained intact until *Loving v. Virginia* in 1967, when the U.S. Supreme Court found the prohibition of interracial marriage to be unconstitutional.[38] The influence of the Supreme Court to determine Black mixed-race was far more extensive than in determining Native mixed-race in the U.S., and also different from the development of mixed-race in Brazil, where the central state reigned supreme. What can explain this difference? Since in the U.S., Black mixed-race was determined state by state — due to a combination of factors including states' rights, demographics in favor of a white majority, and a colonial Crown that resided overseas — the process of categorizing Black mixed-race was ultimately decentralized. The federal government never wished to be directly involved. But the Supreme Court didn't really have a choice. The Court was involved in setting precedent because when cases come to the Court, they must give a verdict. The heavy involvement of the Supreme Court is not a reflection of the Court wishing to be involved in racial issues; it's a reflection of the rest of the state apparatus ignoring racial issues until they inevitably rise to the level of a Supreme Court case.

Black racial identify coalesced throughout the 20th century. With a disappointing end to Reconstruction, Black nationalists advocated a return to Africa, seeing little chance for incorporation and inclusion within the United States.[39] W. E. B. Du Bois even condemned the mixing of races, for fear it would create divisions in the Black race, and that mulattos would see themselves as more akin to white or even white, joining the white cause. At this point, racial

---

[38] Brendan Wolfe, "Racial Integrity Laws."
[39] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 218-219.

identity had not yet consolidated enough to rule out this possibility.[40] Once again, due to the

United States' varied geography and power structures, the experiences of Black people varied by

region. There was no nationally unifying target for protest since discrimination was decided at a

state level. Thus, 1877-1955 was a period of relative quiescence and division among Black

people, and ideological identity formation was not matched by mass mobilization.[41] But white

fears of political and economic competition from Black people led to disenfranchisement and

segregation in the South, which further unified Black people as a self-conscious group.[42] The

Black population in the North was inspired by protests in the South, as although there was

discrimination in the North, there was no official racial order forcing their unity.[43] Eventually,

Black Power sought to assert a positive racial identity, replacing the term "Negro" with

"Black."[44] Although the government's policy responses to the Civil Rights movement benefited

the Black middle class far more than the poor, the idea of linked-fate between all Black people

persevered.[45] In the 1990s, there was more confusion over Black identity, as the "backpedaling

of policy, omission of further gains and discrimination provoked a Black separatist response

similar to that of the late 1960s, but with less coherence." Some Black people advocated the

return to the "one-drop rule," to unify blacks and replace Jim Crow's unifying definition with

one of their own.[46] This rise of Black separatist identity reflected a Black interest in defining a

category no longer imposed by the state, as the state no longer had power over race through

formal rules. Physical distinctions that had been used to enforce racial domination were now a

---

[40] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 220.
[41] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 223.
[42] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 224.
[43] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 234.
[44] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 242.
[45] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 245.
[46] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 247.

source of unity and power.[47] This shows the power of a hegemonic racial narrative. Black race in the U.S., which had been separated so harshly from white race to maintain white supremacy, was now used by Black people to create a singular identity and push back against the state. While Black people were taking the racial framework and using it for their own purposes, they did not destroy it entirely. It had already been so ingrained in American society. As this racial order diminished, "the target of identity formation and mobilization faded. The recent result has been a crisis of uncertainty and some fracturing of racial identity, though efforts at retained solidarity have continued, informed by continued discrimination."[48] The racial frameworks remain, they are just no longer supported as solidly by the state.

While the political categorizations or obstructions of mixed-race have therefore been undermined, they have had long-lasting social ramifications. For example, Natalie Masuoka finds that, "the willingness to self-identify as multiracial varies depending on the racial 'mixture' of the respondent. Those normally classified as either Black or Latino are more likely to self-identify as multiracial than those classified as either White or Asian."[49] One could easily theorize that this a long-lasting effect of state laws that reinforced the one-drop rule.

The creation of a monoracial Black framework, then, was first introduced along with slavery, tying itself to existing ideas of European prejudice. This system worked mainly due to a white majority existing throughout much of the United States, without an overwhelming number of Black or multiracial people. A decentralized government allowed this racial categorization to proliferate, with the Supreme Court only stepping in when it was unavoidable. Abolition was not necessarily a turning point, but rather a doubling down on the existing racial system. Without

---

[47] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 248.
[48] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 249.
[49] Natalie Masuoka, "The 'Multiracial' Option: Social Group Identity and Changing Patterns of Racial Categorization." *American Politics Research*, vol. 39, no. 1, Jan. 2011: 185.

slavery, and with a white nation desiring reunification, Black identity was solidified, and miscegenation was discouraged. Eventually, however, Black people seized on their identity formation to fight back against state racial restrictions. While this shows that identity formation was not solely within the hands of the government, it also demonstrates that Black monoracial identity had become a staple of America's racial system. To this day, this racial identity remains largely the same.

Native Mixed-Race

In contrast to the case of Black mixed-race, Native racialization can be traced through federal domestic policy as well as blood quantum criteria. Since Native mixed-race was tied to land, the U.S. government was able to move Native peoples off their land, avoiding greater racial mixing and making Native race the federal government's prerogative, not that of states. This means that Native race shifted frequently — as the geographic and political situation changed within the U.S. — and existed far differently than that of Black race. The option of removal and fewer cases of miscegenation also allowed for the U.S. government to keep Native peoples separate from other racial groups, a reality which did not occur in Brazil.

During Congress's first decade, it passed the first four acts (in 1790, 1793, 1796 and 1799) of a series of legislation intended to regulate trade with Natives. It also created the Department of War to manage hostile relations with Native peoples. Indian affairs thus became a federal preserve shared between the executive branch and the Senate, through governmental land acquisitions, trade controls, and Native court proceedings.[50] Geographically, it makes sense that Native affairs would be handled by the federal government; states are not mobile, but the

---

[50] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3544.

government forced Native populations to be mobile. Once a native population was moved out of a state, the state no longer had any need to concern itself with Natives and their race. Mobility and space led the federal government to take control, as unlike states, the federal government was capable of geographic expansion, and thus was concerned with claiming territory in the west. In *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* in 1831, Chief Justice John Marshall coined the term "domestic dependent nation," whereby Native tribes are considered distinct entities, but not separate nations. This meant, for example, that while Native peoples could occupy land and cede it to the government, they were not considered to have dominion or ownership of those lands. In the outcome of the case, "as a state of the Union, Georgia was precluded from engaging in international relations. That was the prerogative of the federal government alone. For relations with the Cherokee to be international, the Cherokee had first to be a sovereign nation, capable of independent self-regulation."[51] This court case, and the legislation passed by Congress, created a dynamic where relations with Native peoples were shaped at the federal level, and moreover, where states could not independently manage their own relations with Native tribes. The federal government could dictate the terms of Native racialization, rather than state governments, unlike what happened with Black mixed-race identity.

Whereas Black race was manipulated to exact labor, Native race was categorized to allow the government access to Native lands, through the tactics of removal and assimilation, all contributing to a larger goal of elimination.[52] Removal was considered faster, but once treaty-making was abolished by Congress in 1871, and there was little available land left for white civilization to expand to, assimilation became the preferred method of elimination.[53]

---

[51] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3719.
[52] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3834.
[53] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 1834.

Assimilation was also viable since the Native population was relatively small by this point. When tribes were removed, it was also easier to assimilate those who stayed behind, since most of the tribe had left. Either way, however, a cohesive Native group was eliminated from the original area.

During the period of Indian Removal from 1830-1847, the Five "Civilized" Tribes — Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole peoples — were targeted. Mixed-race Natives, several of whom were prominent tribal leaders, were blamed by government officials for the reluctance of many tribes to agree to removal. In 1826, for example, Choctaw leaders Greenwood LeFlore, David Folsom, and Samuel Garland, who were all against removal, had replaced the old "full-blood" leadership. Due to their multiracial upbringings, these leaders were able to cross the boundaries between both worlds. With many "mixed-blood" Natives in positions of power, "opposition to removal was routinely attributed to the machinations of self-serving half-breeds, who allegedly connived to frustrate the intentions of full-blood traditionalists who saw removal as an opportunity to protect their people from the disruptive influence of Whites."[54] In 1816, President Andrew Jackson blamed 'designing half-breeds and renegade white men' for Chickasaw's refusal to cede land. The Cherokee leader John Ross, who was opposed to removal efforts led by the Cherokee Treaty Party, as were Creek leader Alexander McGillivray, Chickasaw leader Levi Colbert and Choctaw leader Greenwood LeFlore, were all criticized by government officials for their European ancestry, which supposedly made them more likely to seek freedom.[55] While being mixed-race helped certain Natives gain command and lead effectively, they also faced racial prejudice, as they were seen by the U.S. government as a stubborn obstacle to its aims.

---

[54] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3850.
[55] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3859.

The Southeast was not the only region undergoing removal during this time. In the "Treaty with the Winnebago, 1937," the Winnebago people (now known as the Ho Chunk) were forced to cede their land and move west. In this treaty, $100,000 were set aside for the mixed-blood "friends and relations" of the Winnebago, known as métis. The métis who qualified for the fund could not have less than one-fourth Winnebago blood. Although these requirements and allocations varied from tribe to tribe, it was a normal procedure for money to be set aside through treaties for mixed-blood Natives. The métis were stuck in a particular difficult position, however, as many of them were poor and uneducated — they were further marginalized as immigration to the Old Northwest Territory increased, the fur trade declined, and their value as interpreters and intermediaries decreased. Government officials, who needed the cooperation of the métis to make removal run smoothly, exploited this situation by offering métis sums of money. Métis then had to choose between becoming "Indians" or assimilating into white society, neither of which fit within their current identity.[56] Not only is this revealing about the dilemma faced by mixed-Natives, but it also demonstrates how federal government policy determined Native mixed-race. For example, why was one-fourth the fraction of Native heritage that determined Native identity? Through these somewhat arbitrary deliberations, the government had the ability to shape Native mixed-race.

During removal, half-blood Natives could remain behind and become citizens, whereas most full-blood Natives would stick with the tribe, moving west. This physical separation between multiracial and monoracial Natives all began, then, with the Indian Removal Act signed in 1830, and the subsequent efforts by the federal government to enforce the act. In an 1858

---

[56] Linda M. Waggoner ed. (2002), "'Neither White Men nor Indians': Affidavits from the Winnebago Mixed-Blood Claim Commissions, Prairie Du Chien, Wisconsin, 1838-1839," *The Annals of Iowa*, vol. 62, no. 3, (2003): 371–372.

Treaty with the Poncas, for example, mixed-blood Poncas — mainly upper-class elites — could assimilate into white society through land allotments, while the tribe ceded its land.[57] This treaty is an early example of blood-quantum discourse in comparison to the internal categorization of Indian societies. Although mixed-bloodedness allowed for assimilation, it did not prohibit or interfere with tribal membership. For mixed-blooded Poncas who were removed with the tribe, their racial identity was largely irrelevant. This distinction was motivated by the U.S. government's goal of gaining tribal territory: "For treaty purposes, it was in the US's interest for tribes to be composite. Breaking them down into smaller units would only necessitate additional treaties. Prior to internalization, in other words, the U.S. government relied on the very tribal governments that it would subsequently seek to dismantle."[58]

In 1871, an individual member's rider to a House appropriations bill marked the end treaty-making, largely because the House of Representatives no longer wished to be appropriating funds that were going to be allocated by the Senate. Treaty-making existed to make it seem that the United States government negotiated with tribes as domestic dependent nations. After this act, Congresspeople had more unilateral control over Native peoples, moving away from at least the semblance of bilateral agreement that treaties entailed.[59] This process was complete with the 1901 decision in *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock*, where the Supreme Court essentially gave Congress the power to deal with Native lands without needing Natives' permission. The Court also acquiesced its ability to review Congressional activity around Indian affairs, determining Native concerns to be the prerogative of Congress. This choice marks a significant difference Native and Black race. It allowed the U.S. government to develop a proactive racial

---

[57] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3934.
[58] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3930.
[59] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 4319.

policy, rather than reactive. The government could change policy much more frequently to achieve their aims. The Supreme Court generally operates slower; not only do they wait for a case to be brought before them, but once precedent is set it usually stays for a while. This is another reason why Native mixed-race changed so often, and Black mixed-race did not.

During the nineteenth century, Congress shaped Native mixed-race through its efforts to claim more Native lands. As the federal government's control over the land changed, policy also changed. In 1887, the Dawes Act, or General Allotment Act, expanded on previous efforts to allow Native peoples to sell tribal lands in allotted pieces. This process was apparent in the 1830s, when federal officials assumed that Native tribes would sell their land through allotment and move west, but instead thousands of Choctaws chose to stay, becoming homesteaders and citizens. This was acceptable because through allotment, the Choctaws became individuals; "without the tribe, though, for all practical purposes they were no longer Indians. Here, in essence, is assimilation's Faustian bargain – have our settler world, but lose your Indigenous soul. Beyond any doubt, this is a kind of death."[60] Mixed-bloodedness thus became a synonym for an assimilation that would dissolve Indianness and the tribe. Within Congress, there was little uncertainty about what this would achieve. As said by Senator Higgins: "It seems to me one of the ways of getting rid of the Indian question is just this of intermarriage, and the gradual fading out of the Indian blood; the whole quality and character of the aborigine disappears, they lose all of the traditions of the race."[61] Assimilation inherently meant the end of race entirely. Mixed-bloodedness without the tribe was synonymous with a Native de-racialization, or of no longer being Native. Since there was no pre-existing spectrum of race, such as in Brazil, and the tribe was gone, the only alternative was to quickly be slotted into a monoracial category. This option

---

[60] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 4369.
[61] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 4393.

was not available in Brazil because of much more racial mixing, a racial spectrum system, and no Native removal period.

Allotment necessitated refining the idea of Native mixed-race, but it's true that not everyone agreed on how to handle Native race. While Attorney-General Caleb Cushing recommended that all "mixed-bloods" be treated as Natives as long as they maintained tribal relations, in 1892 Indian Affairs Commissioner T. J. Morgan argued that looser restrictions of earlier times, as recommended by Cushing, were no longer applicable. The outcome was that thousands of mixed-blood Natives were excluded from the Dawes land allotment rolls.[62] Again, without land, mixed-race Natives were often forced to assimilate, relinquishing their tribal and Native identity.

In the twentieth century, blood quantum criteria — determining racial identity by percentages of racial heritage — became more prevalent in determining race. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 stated that Indians would include any members of a tribe residing within a reservation, or other persons of one-half or more Indian blood. In contrast to the Dawes Act of 1887, which fragmented the tribe through mixed-race, the Reorganization Act did not address mixed-race among tribal members: "Rather than tribal organisation, blood quantum discourse was now aimed primarily at people living off the reservations, the 'all other persons' who were not 'of one-half or more Indian blood.'"[63] Here, the federal government chose to determine the mixed-race for Native peoples not on reservations. This approach is more similar to Native mixed-race during the Indian Removal era, when the tribe could not be assimilated, but instead was removed, resulting in mixed-blood individuals remaining behind and assimilating into white society. During the time of the Dawes Act, the situation was different; tribes were not

---

[62] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 4476.
[63] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 4573.

considered to be assimilable into white society, and therefore the option to get rid of tribes was to use mixed-race to break apart tribal designations, as was done through allotment. In this third period, when blood quantum discourse took hold and through the Indian Reorganization Act, mixed-race once again reverted to being inconsequential within tribes. All mixed-race Natives living within the tribe were considered Native. This was because, with the end of the frontier space, tribes were now considered assimilable into white society — race ceased to exist on reservations, because there was no need to regulate an Indianness that had a designated place.[64] This dynamic was evident from a House Committee hearing into the Indian Reorganization Bill, between Senator Elmer Thomas and Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier:

> SENATOR THOMAS: Well, if someone could show that they were a descendant of Pocahontas, although they might be only five-hundredth Indian blood, they would come under the terms of this act.
>
> COMMISSIONER COLLIER: If they are actually residing within the present boundaries of an Indian reservation at the present time."[65]

The implication of this policy is that racial identity was tied to location rather than heritage. Why was this determined? Primarily because it allowed for assimilation. The flip side of anyone with the smallest bit of Native heritage being considered Native on a reservation is that off the reservation, these mixed-race Natives would be white. To overall eliminate the Native population, the federal government chose to consolidate and assimilate.

---

[64] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 4582.
[65] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 4598.

Once Natives with less than one half of Native ancestry stepped off the reservation, their race could change. Those with white ancestry could be considered white, although those with any Black heritage would instantly be considered Black. In both ways, however, they ceased to be considered Natives. Notably, the rules on Native race could not supersede those of Black race. Black mixed-race is immutable Blackness and unchanging. Allowing Natives with both Black and Native heritage to be Native would undermine the one-drop rule, and open access to whiteness for mixed white and Black people. Also, with Native race subject to far more frequent change, Black monoracial categorization had to take precedence over Native racial categorization. The one-drop rule separated Black identity from whiteness and allowed for further assimilation, by making people with Native ancestry Black. While the identity of mixed-race Natives was perpetually malleable and capable of transformation, Black mixed-race was fixed and rigid as solely Black.

Legally, tribal governments now have the authority to institute blood quantum requirements for tribal membership if they so choose, determining who could be in a tribe by their percentage of Native heritage. U.S. courts follow this precedent as set by *Waldron v. United States* in 1905. Even though the federal government does not require blood quantum criteria, most federally recognized tribes require some degree of Native blood for potential members. Yet the government has still had a large influence over this process through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which "provides patronizing step-by-step process guidance on tribal enrollment, emphasizes federal review of tribal law, and even provides charts on how tribes should determine blood quantum."[66] To this day, blood quantum criteria remain a prominent factor in

---

[66] Kimberly TallBear, "DNA, Blood, and Racializing the Tribe," *Wicazo Sa Review*, vol. 18, no. 1, (2003): 89.

determining tribal relations, with Native mixed-race being tied to a person's amount of Native heritage.

Significantly, the U.S. federal government was heavily involved in determining Native race, and Native mixed-race was often caught in limbo, altered frequently as the government needed to acquire more land. This was possible because Native peoples were always inherently kept separate from whiteness, whether through removal, reservations, or assimilating Native peoples into white society. In Brazil, Native peoples mixed early on with much more of society, and so the federal government would have had a much harder time instituting laws for a body of people that was not distinct.

U.S. Census

In the past several decades, the U.S. census has had a large hand in shaping mixed-race in the United States. The United States Census Bureau is run by the Department of Commerce, and its director is appointed by the President of the U.S. This places the census under the purview of the executive branch of government. However, in relatively recent years, Congress has had a degree of influence over substantial changes to the census, so both the executive and legislative branches have had a degree of control over the census.

In 1890, the census was divided into numerous racial categories, including 'mulatto', 'quadroon' and 'octoroon,' the latter two terms meaning one quarter and one eighth Black descent, respectively. These categories slowly faded, until the mulatto category disappeared after 1920, as with the end of slavery, "the subsequent stabilization of classification schema coincided

with the hardening of racial segregation and the adoption of the one-drop rule in the South."[67] Within a loosely defined multiracial system, these categories reflect how the ramifications of the Civil War and segregation turned Black race into a more hardline monoracial system.

"After the elimination of the mulatto category, mixed-race people of various ancestries were classified in accordance with rather complicated equations that largely reinforced the one-drop rule for all non-white races. Black/white mixes were classified as 'Negro', no matter how small 'the percentage of Negro blood'; black/Indian were categorized as 'Negro' in most cases unless the person was regarded as an Indian in the community; Indian/white were considered Indian in 1930 and were classified in accordance with blood quantum in 1940 and 1950; white/non-white were recorded as non-white; and the offspring of two non-white parents would be categorized as the race of the father."[68]

In 1977, Statistical Directive 15 mandated the use of four racial categories, and Hispanic as an ethnic category, in all federal statistics. With over seventy federal agencies interpreting racial data, a standard classification system was required. In this system, "people of multiracial descent were asked to select one category 'which most closely reflects the individual's recognition in his community.'"[69] Racial identification under this metric was based more on community than personal identity or heritage. While giving people the ability to mark multiple races, this system was a natural extension of pre-existing racial designations and reflected a path-

[67] Debra Thompson, "Making (Mixed-)Race: Census Politics and the Emergence of Multiracial Multiculturalism in the United States, Great Britain and Canada," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 35, no. 8, (2012): 1411.
[68] Thompson, "Making (Mixed-)Race," 1411.
[69] Thompson, "Making (Mixed-)Race," 1412.

dependence of racial categorizations that are already ingrained. At the time, it was safe to assume that mixed-black people in a Black community would identify as Black. Mixed-Native people on a reservation would identify as Native. It was likely assumed that other minorities would follow the same logic. Since many minority communities live together, most mixed people would likely be closer in identity to their surrounding community. Generally-speaking, community-based identification implies a monoracialism reinforced by historical, geographic, and cultural racial clustering. Still, this is not absolute. While upholding a monoracial framework, this policy is a slow relaxation of strict racial identity rules and starts re-introducing racial grey areas and flexibility.

In the later part of the twentieth century, groups outside of the government began lobbying for multiracial categorization, where mixed-race people could select the term "multiracial" on forms. In the 1990s, grassroots organizations pressured school districts and state legislatures to add a multiracial category on administrative forms, and during a congressional review of federal classification standards in the 1990s, Project RACE (Reclassify All Children Equally), the Association for Multiethnic Americans, and Interracial Family Circle testified in favor of counting multiracial people.[70] Rather than being motivated by civil rights or material interests, these activists sought recognition, accuracy, and self-identification. This is a more recent example of multiracial people pushing against the government's methods of categorization. This is not the only time mixed-race people have resisted the government's chosen method of categorization, but it was much more effective in a contemporary context, where the government has less autonomy over racial categorization, and the people have more ability to organize. Why did these activists seek self-identification and recognition? Primarily

---

[70] Thompson, "Making (Mixed-)Race," 1415.

because this is what had been denied to them as the government washed away multiracial recognition. With only monoracial categories, or racial identity based off communities, it is impossible to develop a cohesive multiracial identity. The aims of the opposition were formed in direct contradiction to the ideology of the state.

From 1993 to 1997, a series of congressional hearings was initiated by Representative Tom Sawyer (D-OH), the chair of the congressional subcommittee considering the census, to review racial classification standards. While the activists did shape the debate around multiracial categorization, Representative Sawyer (D-OH) stated that "the primary drivers of congressional hearings were the demographic changes stemming from immigration and intermarriage patterns and the shifting perceptions about the validity of Statistical Directive 15 for measuring American demographics at the dawn of the twenty-first century."[71] The explicit purpose of the hearings was not multiracial categorization, but activists pressured the hearings to encompass the topic. Multiracial identification was not in itself an issue for the government; they were only interested due to the relation of multiracial identity to their larger objectives. Overall, they were more concerned with immigration, intermarriage, and improved ways to measure demographics.[72] The Office of Management and Budget wanted the census categories to 'reflect the community,' as the success of the process required the categories to align with current social conceptions of race. Clearly, social conceptions of race were more important than individual identification. This was very different from Brazil, where people were judged individually based on skin color and physical appearance. Brazil also embraced a form of racial mobility that moved toward whiteness. In the U.S., the government was not concerned about moving toward whiteness, but

---

[71] Thompson, "Making (Mixed-)Race," 1415.
[72] Thompson, "Making (Mixed-)Race," 1416.

wanted to keep whiteness separate and have mixed-race people live in minority communities. This policy was a holdover from Black monoracial ideology.

Civil rights organizations and members of the Democratic Party pushed to protect the legislative gains of the civil rights movement by embracing a "color-conscious" version of multiracial multiculturalism.

Representative Meek (D-FL): "There's no court or any legislative or legal record of discrimination against multiracials.... The multiracial category will just make it more difficult to identify where discrimination has taken place and where it has not taken place, because it will cloud census counts of discrete minorities…"

Within a civil rights mindset, the goal is to identify and prevent discrimination. How does disallowing a multiracial category protect gains from the civil rights movement? By this point, monoracial categorization had been so ingrained in society that modes of resistance, created within this system, might be undermined by altering the foundation of the system. As an analogy, imagine a group of mountaineers are scaling a snowy mountain. They've hammered metal stakes into the rock, laid ropes and ladders, and over the course of months built a pathway to scale the mountainside. However, an avalanche sweeps the face of the mountain, tearing off the manmade structures and leaving the mountain bare. After the avalanche hits, the face of the mountain turns out to be easier to scale. While it took the mountaineers months to attach their stakes and ropes to the mountain the first time, they could now do it in weeks. Inevitably, they will not find much solace in this. The mountain may be easier to climb now, but that doesn't change the fact that they need to spend several more weeks putting a whole new set of ladders and ropes. Similarly,

Democrats and civil rights advocates who opposed multiracial categorization were more comfortable with the geography they already knew and had already scaled. Introducing a multiracial category would require them to implement new methods of activism, fracturing their reliance on minority identity coalitions.

By contrast, the Republican Party employed a color-blind variant of multiracial multiculturalism was employed by Republican Party elites.

> Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich: "it is wrong for some Americans to begin creating subgroups to which they have a higher loyalty than to America at large … it is time for the government to stop perpetuating racial divisiveness."[73]

Essentially, they wished to ignore race. This is interesting because a color-blind narrative is indeed very different than what the government had done in the past. Civil rights-minded Democrats learned that to fight discrimination, they had to acknowledge the existing racial system, and therefore, it would be a nightmare for them if that racial system fundamentally changed. Meanwhile, Republicans tried to erase the existence of a racial system. This is similar to the racial democracy discourse of Brazil, where people argued that race is largely nonexistent, and therefore racism is not a pressing issue. The highly notable difference is that the history of Civil War and Jim Crow in the United States, leading to a Civil Rights movement, created a political opposition whose rhetoric and tactics were rooted in race. Civil Rights activists' power came from racial collectivism and a shared ideology. Mixed-race categories would chip away at that power. In Brazil, this was not possible; with no racial identity cohesion in the first place,

---

[73] Thompson, "Making (Mixed-)Race," 1417.

there therefore was obviously no backlash to mixed-race as an idea, and racial democracy was allowed to reign. However, Brazil and the Republicans in the United States advocated different types of color awareness. In the U.S., Republicans were largely white due to lower levels of racial-mixing, and they wanted to ignore race through color-blindness. In Brazil, with far more racial mixing, the government wanted to ignore race through emphasizing how multiracial the country is. Yet both groups relied on the assumption of no existing racial tension or conflict as means to suppress racial discourse.

In the U.S., the outcome of the congressional hearings was that in the 2000 census, several years after the hearings had concluded, individuals were now able to select multiple races, but there was no specific "multiracial" option.[74] Yet this is still operating through a monoracial lens. Due to a form of path-dependence, the U.S. was incapable of breaking away from the idea that a mixed-race person is simply distinct racial components stapled together. By not upending the racial system entirely, it allowed minority groups who gained power through racial solidarity to work within a system they already know how to navigate, while also not embracing the color-blindness and racial blurring that Republicans wanted. However, there remains the possibility that this could open the avenue to fracturing minority coalitions.

Recent Legislation

Despite multiracial racial categorization in the 2000 census being instituted through a monoracial framework, now language seems to be moving toward a multiracial option over a monoracial framework. This shift is evident in the rhetoric and statistics used in Congress, even

---

[74] Margaret Shih and Diana T. Sanchez, "When Race Becomes Even More Complex: Toward Understanding the Landscape of Multiracial Identity and Experiences," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 65, no. 1 (2009): 4.

if it is yet to be reflected in the census. In the most recent Congresses, including the 117th and

116th Congresses, there has been a proliferation of bills passed which use the category of

"multiracial," even if the bills are not specifically addressing a racial issue. For example, in H.

Con. Res. 29, which brings attention to anti-LGBTQ+ harassment in schools, a statistic is

included that cites multiracial people: "44 percent of multiracial LGBTQ+ students felt unsafe in

school based on the way they express their gender." This statistic is presented alongside similar

numbers for Asian-American, American Indian, Latinx, and Black students. Bills about the

Transgender Day of Remembrance and No Name-Calling Week also include statistics of

multiracial populations.[75] By measuring issues with a specific multiracial demographic, there

seems to be an acknowledgment that multiracial people, in many cases, have experiences that are

different from monoracial people. This also shows that the U.S. is slowly moving toward a

multiracial framework. Does this mean that path-dependence is weakening? Or can we look at

multiracialism as simply another stage in a path-dependent colonial-monoracial system? At this

point in time, no real historical precedent for this exists. However, it seems to make sense that in

a country with social progressivism, restrictive racial structures would be one day be unfurled.

While the government's ideas of mixed-race categories have changed much in recent

years, they have not entirely given up their power to shape mixed-race categories. In the 111th

Congress, H.R. 2761 (IH) was introduced, "to sever United States Government relations with the

Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma until such time as the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma restores full

tribal citizenship to the Cherokee Freedmen disenfranchised in the March 3, 2007, Cherokee

Nation vote." Interestingly, this bill, even as it deals with recent affairs, is in opposition to an

---

[75] House of Representatives, Congress. H. Con. Res. 29 (IH) - Supporting the goals and ideals of GLSEN's 2021 Day of Silence in bringing attention to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ+) name-calling, bullying, and harassment faced by individuals in schools. U.S. Government Publishing Office, 18 Apr 2021.

argument presented by the Office of Indian Affairs on behalf of the Chickasaw and Choctaw

Nations, against the reopening of their citizenship rolls to mixed-blood individuals of both Black

and Native ancestry.[76] This policy is divergent from the earlier Statistical Directive 15, as here

racial identity is no longer community-based, but individualized. Whereas the federal

government was once in favor of separating Black mixed-race people from Native groups, it now

pushes back against those same actions carried out by the Cherokee. This is further evidence of a

growth in multiracial ideology. One could only guess that the motives of Congress have shifted;

it's possibly that minority advocacy groups or ideological Congresspeople now have the power

to pressure Native groups to expand their definition of Indian. However, this behavior is

consistent with the past acts of Congress, in that the legislative body is determining the racial

make-up of a tribe, instead of granting them the ability to decide on their own.

While the government still has a hand in shaping racial identity, now at times their

actions are in opposition to that of the federal government in the past, influenced both by those

seeking a multiracial framework or seeking the recognition of multiracial identity through a

monoracial framework.

Most recently, between the 2010 and 2020 census in the U.S. "the number of non-

Hispanic Americans who identify as multiracial had jumped by 127 percent over the decade."[77]

While this is partly due to more racial-mixing in the U.S., it also reflects a growing desire for

people of a mixed-racial background to identify as multiracial. With these numbers being so

recent, it is not 100 percent certain what is causing this jump in people identifying as multiracial.

---

[76] House of Representatives, Congress. H.R. 2761 (IH) - To sever United States Government relations with the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma until such time as the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma restores full tribal citizenship to the Cherokee Freedmen disenfranchised in the March 3, 2007, Cherokee Nation vote and fulfills all its treaty obligations with the Government of the United States, and for other purposes. U.S. Government Publishing Office, 7 Jun 2009.

[77] Tavernise, "Jump in Multiracial Americans."

U.S. Conclusion

The dominant frameworks of Black and Native mixed-race categories were both manipulated to the ends of the colonial and U.S. governments seizing more capital and land. It's also clear that mixed-race categorization is an ongoing process, with the federal government and minority groups still shaping mixed-race categories today.

While Congress was actively involved in the categorization of Native mixed-race, it took a back seat with Black mixed-race categories, leaving decisions to state legislatures and the Supreme Court. This was at least partly due to the existing legal frameworks; with Native peoples, Congress had the ability to engage with them as domestic dependent nations, whereas enslaved peoples were primarily controlled by state governments, whose economies were tied most directly into slavery. It also reflected a desire of the federal government to take a proactive approach to Native racial policy, expanding the land available to the whole country, while taking a back seat with Black mixed-race categories and letting states make their determinations for themselves.

Black mixed-race categories operated through the lens of the one-drop rule, even if this specific legal term was not initiated until post-slavery. During slavery, mixed-race categories such as mulatto were allowed very rarely in white minority areas, with such categories serving to fracture groups of people with Black heritage and prevent slave uprisings. Even at this time, however, Black heritage was more likely to determine one's racial categorization than white heritage. The benefit of this system for white slaveholders is that it allowed for mixed-race Black people to remain enslaved, both increasing the labor force and avoiding the uncomfortable situation of people categorized as white being enslaved, the implications of which would

undermine slavery and white supremacy. Once slavery ended, however, this latter issue became even more prevalent: without slavery to establish hierarchy, racial categorizations had to be more distinct, and the one-drop rule was officially created. This rule was reinforced throughout Jim Crow.

Native mixed-race changed far more frequently and changed based on one's surrounding community. During the time of Indian removal, mixed-blood was only relevant outside the tribe, as mixed-blooded Natives could assimilate into white society or remain within the tribe, where many rose to be influential leaders. This allowed for tribes to be reduced in size and their lands seized. After the Dawes Act, mixed-blood was necessary to divide the tribe, as tribes were not being removed, but rather their reservations were split into allotments. Thus, gaining tribal land could only be achieved by splitting tribes apart, not by removal and assimilation. In the final stage, with the Indian Reorganization Act, tribes were now considered assimilable by broader society, so mixed-blood ceased to be relevant within tribes. This also coincided with the government already having seized most of the valuable lands they needed from Native peoples. Blood quantum discourse increased, which determined both Native identities outside of the tribe, and whether people with Native heritage could join tribes.

With the census, instead of race being determined solely by the motives of the state, it was shaped by activists and minority groups through congressional hearings, alongside actions taken by the executive branch. Unlike with other instances of mixed-race categorization, there were now political players who were seeking identity and recognition, not more tangible goals such as labor and land. These activists also had more power than at other points in history when mixed-race people resisted categorization by the government. At the same time, the executive branch wanted designations that would be helpful for policy, and minorities sought to maintain

their civil rights accomplishments by refusing a "multiracial" category. While this is an interesting instance of minorities having a say in racial categorization, it was again for explicit political motives, not for the needs of mixed-race people. Finally, Republicans wanted to embrace a color-blind multiculturalism by getting rid of racial categories, making it harder for minorities to advocate for their interests. This form of oppression, through abolishing race, contrasts with earlier forms of oppression supported by racial categories, yet they work toward similar ends.

With recent bills passed in Congress, "multiracial" has become a frequently used term, showing an ongoing process of racialization. Also, through contradicting bills passed in different eras of Congress which address freedmen with Native heritage, it's clear that although political motives change, the fundamental idea remains that mixed-race is used to achieve other motives. It also proves that even to this day, the state has control over racial categories.

Overall, there are many distinct reasons why mixed-race developed in the U.S. the way it did. The U.S. began with a demographic imbalance toward a white majority, and a colonial power overseas rather than in their colony allowed for a decentralized government. This limited miscegenation in the early colonial days of the States and encouraged regional powers to abolish mixed-race categories and uphold white supremacy. Natives were not as involved in this deliberation since they were always either removed or assimilated, and not heavily mixed into white society, an option that was possible because of a white majority population and available land to the west where settlers could force Natives. While Native mixed-race categories were altered frequently in accordance with increasing western expansion, and were handled primarily by the federal government, the main stakeholder in expansion, Black mixed-race categories were less of a concern during the time of slavery. Slavery already effectively separated Black people

from white people. Due to the U.S.'s decentralized power and regional conflict, however, the

Civil War resulted in an abolition that necessitated a stricter, monoracial Black identity to

reunify the white population and ensure that a clear divide existed between the Black and white

population. During Jim Crow, a monoracial identity framework was solidified, and around the

same time Native mixed-race also became less important than tribal identity. Opposition to the

government's racial policies worked along those same lines of cohesion, embracing a monoracial

Blackness to assert civil rights. However, contemporary opposition now leans toward multiracial

identity categorization, pushing back against the monoracial framework. Where this will lead is,

at the moment, uncertain.

<p align="center">Brazil</p>

Introduction to the Brazilian Racial System

Unlike in the United States, where mixed-race people are sorted into monoracial

categories, Brazil's system of racial categorization is defined by extensive color classifications.

This color gradient maintains Black and white at the poles, and people of varying skin colors

falling somewhere in between, a notable departure from the United States' distinct Black and

white racial binary.[78] Individuals exist not within a preset list of categories, but anywhere along

this spectrum, depending upon their skin color and other physical characteristics. There are only

a few terms which refer to Native mixed-race, and even these terms create an indigenous identity

that exists along lines of Black and white identity, simultaneously erasing Native identity while

---

[78] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2724.

preserving a Black and white system of classification.[79] In the U.S., by contrast, Native identity

isn't rolled into the umbrella of Black/white, but rather operates in parallel to the Black case, not

in tandem. Black and Native race in the U.S. each have their own distinct rules, compared to in

Brazil, where Native race is subsumed by Black and white identity. In Brazil, race, and by

extension mixed-race, has largely been hidden in plain sight. Historically, Brazilians and the

Brazilian government have chosen not to recognize race, opting to define people by skin color

and physical traits. This choice was influenced heavily by Brazil's historical form of slavery and

the retention of African culture. The result is that even though most of the country's population

is multiracial, Brazilians have been reluctant to define themselves by such a term. Instead, the

purported ideology of Brazil is that of a "racial democracy," where race has become irrelevant to

the daily lives of Brazilians and structures of Brazilian society. By dismissing race as a

consequential element in Brazil, the Brazilian government has presumed that Brazil is beyond

the racial strife of identity-torn countries such as the United States. Supposedly, underlying this

racial harmony is the mobility of mulattos, or multiracial people, who in their pursuit of greater

social and economic outcomes are unhindered by their race.[80] The ideas behind racial harmony

were popularized by Gilberto Freyre in his seminal text published in 1964, *The Masters and the*

Slaves: A Study in the Development of Brazilian Civilization. Although Freyre never used the

term "racial democracy" in his text, its concept is generally attributed to him.[81] Portuguese

colonialism, Catholicism, more "humanitarian" slavery, and higher rates of racial mixing, are

often pointed to as the factors behind Brazil's lack of legal racial domination and corresponding

---

[79] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2719.
[80] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 9, 167.
[81] Gilberto Freyre, *The Masters and the Slaves: A Study in the Development of Brazilian Civilization*,
(Knopf, 1946).

dearth of explicit racial conflict.[82] On the surface, racial democracy seems to support equal

opportunities for all peoples, regardless of racial heritage. Yet this ideology, which has been

embraced and promoted by the Brazilian government, has been used to suppress identity

coalition and mobilization among Afro-Brazilians. After all, how can a people advocate for

equality when the very basis of that inequality, and the basis for their identity formation as a

singular group, does not exist? According to the sociologist Carlos Hasenbalg, "Freyre created

the most formidable ideological weapon against blacks" by claiming that racial inequality did not

exist in Brazil, and thus removing any elements that Black people could fight against.[83] It is

important to recognize early on that even talking about "race" in Brazil requires using a

classification that Brazil itself has shunned for most of its history. However, it's also essential to

examine why race was deprioritized, and how the color gradient and lack of Black or multiracial

solidarity was ultimately a boon to the Brazilian government's continued political and social

strength. Only then can one answer the question of how a country with extensive racial mixing

can claim to be a racial democracy, where racial mixing is celebrated even as race itself is

ignored.

Colonization by the Dutch

Although compared to the United States' prominent North/South racial divide, Brazil's

racial narrative can be interpreted as more nationally cohesive rather than regionally segregated,

this interpretation should not overlook Brazil's history of colonization by two separate European

powers. From 1624-1654, northeastern Portuguese Brazil was occupied by the Dutch, through an

initiative spearheaded by the Dutch West India Company. In 1636, German Count Johan Maurits

---

[82] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 27.
[83] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 29, 167.

van Nassau-Siegen was named by the WIC as the first governor-general of the colony, known from that point onward as Dutch Brazil.[84] During this time, early deliberations over mixed-race were evident. There was a significant amount of miscegenation between Dutch colonists and African and indigenous peoples, and in the seventeenth century "the main non-European ethnic groups recognized by the Dutch in Brazil were limited to Brasilianen, Tapuyas, Africans, mulattos, and mamelucos,"[85] referring to Brazilians, indigenous peoples of Brazil, Africans, mixed-European and African, and mixed-European and Native, respectively. Racial terms were fairly flexible at this point in time: "Caspar Schmalkalden, another German in the service of the WIC in Brazil, labels the children of a white father and a black mother ('von einem weissen Vater und schwarzer Mutter') not mulattos, but 'Mestizen' (mestizos)," even though mestizo typically refers to someone with European and indigenous heritage.[86] By the sixteenth century, the term mulatto was widely used in Spain, Portugal, and their colonies to classify mixed peoples as a distinct group,[87] yet while mulatto was initially used to describe any person of an intermediate color between black and white, the term progressed to mean a person with a black mother and European father. Mulacken was another term used interchangeably with mulatto early on.[88] Mameluco is an exclusively Brazilian term that refers to the offspring of a Brazilian woman and a European man. Although originally the father could be Portuguese or Dutch, by 1681 texts only use the term when the person in question has a Portuguese father, reflecting the Dutch's surrender of their Brazilian colony in 1654. The term *mameluco* also might not be primarily Dutch, but instead come from a Tupí term, which labels someone as having "mixed-

[84] Rebecca Parker Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise: Albert Eckhout, Court Painter in Colonial Dutch Brazil, 1637-1644*, (Amsterdam University Press: 2007): 12.
[85] Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise,* 154, 131.
[86] Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise,* 159.
[87] Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise,* 154.
[88] Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise,* 155.

blood."[89] At this early stage of colonization, without official decrees recognizing or separating race, terms and ideas around mixed-race changed frequently and fluidly, slowing settling into singular, specific meanings. There were no clear lines between races and no easy categories partly because of demographic reasons: there were a lot of unmarried European men.

Many people who lived in the colonies at the time encouraged miscegenation as a means of survival, with the caveat to be cautious about supposed racial "backsliding" into the primitive behavior of nonwhite peoples.[90] Miscegenation was considered necessary because there were large groups of unmarried European men, including soldiers, colonists, and members of the WIC, but very few European women.[91] As a consequence of this, in seventeenth century European colonies women of mixed racial heritage were frequently desired as sexual partners, but generally not considered to be suitable for marriage.[92] By contrast, mulatto men were distrusted and used as additional manpower in colonial armies.[93] A revealing saying, one which is still referenced by authors in Brazil today, captures the Dutch attitude of the time: "white woman to marry, mulatto woman for sex, and the black woman to work."[94] Thus existing racial ideas, influenced by demographics, merged into a clearly racialized society within the Dutch colonies in Brazil. Miscegenation was considered necessary, and it occurred between multiple races. It would have been hard to reverse that reality without extreme immigration, which was not possible for the Portuguese because the Portuguese population was small and not inclined to leave Portugal. While African slaves were imported in high numbers but did not reproduce within their own group as much, as Brazilian slaves were worked very hard and usually died

---

[89] Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise,* 162.
[90] Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise,* 133.
[91] Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise,* 154.
[92] Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise,* 164.
[93] Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise,* 157.
[94] Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise,* 162.

from their labor. The Native population was also slowly eliminated but was not removed into separate territory as frequently. Thus, it was difficult to maintain large, distinct groups to the extent that the U.S. did.

Indigenous Slavery

Native slavery in Brazil, while relatively short-lived, ended up reinforcing miscegenation, in contrast to the U.S. The Portuguese arrived in Brazil in 1500, and after repelling repeated Dutch incursions, they became the sole rulers of Brazil. Although they began importing slaves by 1538, they were worried about the costs of transporting African slaves. Portugal also had a small home population, since unlike England they never endorsed a system of pasturage. Pasturage entailed the fencing of land, which pushed a population surplus off their land and into cities. This encouraged English settlers to travel to the Americas in greater numbers and resulted in less miscegenation in the English colonies.[95] Without such a population surplus in Portugal, they were wary of sending settlers overseas.[96] So, as in North America, before settlers in Brazil began importing the bulk of their slave labor force from Africa, they relied mainly on indigenous slave labor to staff their plantations and work in mines.[97] In another parallel to the United States, indigenous Brazilians faced marginalization through elimination.[98] After their population was devastated by conflict, forced enslavement, and epidemics, by the late sixteenth century indigenous people were far outnumbered by the millions of enslaved Africans imported to replace Native labor.[99] The combination of elimination tactics and solidified minority status has

---

[95] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2851.
[96] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 48.
[97] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2773; John M. Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land: Indian Slavery, Settler Society, and the Portuguese Colonial Enterprise in South America*, (Cambridge: 2018): 204.
[98] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2749.
[99] Patrick Wolfe*, Traces of History,* 275; Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 160.

pushed indigenous peoples to the margins in Brazilian discussions of race, as is evident by a

racial classification system that has few terms to describe mixed-race people with Native

heritage.[100] When Europeans first arrived in Brazil, they found the coast and much of the interior

populated by Native peoples; these initial societies, which Europeans found to share certain

similarities, were defined under the umbrella of Tupi-Guarani culture. Although the Tupi, who

resided near the coast, interacted with Europeans the most, large parts of Brazil were occupied

by at least 76 non-Tupi groups, also referred to as Tapuia.[101] Initially, relations between Natives

and Europeans were not marred by serious conflict: "when the Portuguese arrived in 1531–1532,

the Tupinikin had accepted the European presence precisely because it did not present a direct

threat to indigenous wellbeing."[102] Indeed, one early example of a mixed European and Native

family had an outsized impact on relations between the two populations. João Ramalho was a

Portuguese who married the daughter of the chief Tibiriçá, and then founded a village which

would eventually become the Portuguese town of Santo André da Borda do Campo. An alliance

between the Portuguese and the Tupinikin was largely successful due to Ramalho's influence.

Fairly soon into the Portuguese's colonization of Brazil, particularly in the 1540s, their demand

for Indian labor swelled as they nurtured colonial enterprises on the coast. Although some larger

business units imported slaves from West Africa, most relied on the indigenous population.[103]

Native slavery in Brazil had brutal origins. Indigenous slaves were taken by Europeans

through either barter or capture, with *saltos* ("raids") carried out with the goal of returning with

Native captives. Natives resisted both methods, as they traditionally relied on barter as a means

of forging alliances and wished to ritually sacrifice prisoners of war rather than turn them into a

---

[100] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2719.
[101] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 9.
[102] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 17.
[103] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 18.

labor force. In an outcome similar to that on the west coast of the United States, Jesuit missionaries in Brazil created mission villages (*aldeamentos*) where Natives were supposed to live and restructure their society to a European model.[104] For many Natives, living in missions was an inevitable choice, as their villages were destroyed, and their societies left in ruin. The Paulistas (European settlers in the São Paulo region) massacred Natives in the area, bringing 60,000 Guarani captives to São Paulo.[105] This fundamentally shifted the calculus of Portuguese settlement: "While on the one hand, it had freed up lands for future settlement, on the other, in diminishing and destroying the local labor force, it imposed the need to introduce workers from other regions, which would mean the redefinition of the role and identity of the Indian in colonial society."[106] It was assumed at this point in time that Natives would form the base of colonial labor in São Paulo, especially since settlers were lacking the capital and access to credit needed for the large-scale importation of African slaves.[107] Yet relying on Native labor was hardly ideal, as "the stubborn resistance of indigenous peoples, the unyielding opposition of the Jesuits, and the ambiguous position of the Crown on the Indian question: all stood in the way of the settlers' access to Indian labor."[108] Eventually, however, the Portuguese Crown gave consent to the widespread enslavement of Natives in São Paulo, prioritizing the development of the colony more than the freedom of Indians.[109] Within the city, there were many cases of intermingling, which could be tied to an elimination of Native population through assimilation. This is somewhat parallel to the U.S., except that with a white minority in Brazil, Natives did not

---

[104] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 28.
[105] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 62.
[106] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 39, 79.
[107] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 126-127.
[108] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 124.
[109] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 129.

assimilate into whiteness, but into multiracialism. Pretty soon, Natives were unable to supply a consistent base of labor, which eventually led to an increase in African slavery.

In a similar fashion to Iberian slavery pre-colonization, racial divisions became noticeable through the prices assigned to slaves based on their racial backgrounds. Indians born into slavery, or *Crioulos* ("creoles"), commanded higher prices, with colonists expecting them to have greater longevity and productivity. *Ladinos*, who were slaves that were assimilated into the racial regime, were valued the highest, with recent Indian captives only a fraction of the cost of *crioulos* or *ladinos*. Over the course of a century, Indians were subsumed into the chattel slave system, losing their identity as a Native people in the eyes of Europeans. This can be seen in how the term *índio* was used only to describe Indians from mission villages, whereas *negros da terra* ("blacks of the land") was applied to the majority of the indigenous population. *Mestiços* (usually the offspring of European fathers and Indian mothers) also commanded high prices, in some cases costing more than an African slave.[110] Therefore, while the cost of a slave was tied to the community they were born into, their cost was more accurately a function of their estimated productivity, and the terms applied to Natives reflected this measurement.

Yet the term that was most often used to describe Natives was *negro*. This lasted through the late seventeenth century, until the enslaved African population increased to the point where *negro* was substituted for other terms: "by the end of the seventeenth century, colonists called their Indians *gentio do cabelo corredio* ("straight-haired heathen"), *administrados* ("administered ones," in deference to the 1696 agreement), *servos* ("servants"), *pardos* ("dark-skinned ones"), and, finally, *carijós*."[111] These terms indicated work status, skin color, and other physical traits such as hair. This was not only not racial heritage, and indeed formed a basis for

---

[110] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 150.
[111] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 157.

Brazil's racial gradient. While *mamaluco* and *bastardo* both implied a European father and an indigenous mother, *bastardos* were not recognized by their fathers, whereas *mamalucos* were. *Mamalucos* were therefore generally considered Portuguese and free, but by the eighteenth century the term *mamaluco* was supplanted entirely, with *bastardo* encompassing anyone with Indian ancestry.[112] In this instance, terms with a negative connotation were prioritized over those with a more neutral connotation.

During the latter parts of the seventeenth century, rates of mixed marriages increased between Indians of different ethnic groups, between Natives residing in missions and personal servants, and between African and Indian slaves. As a result of this increase, a "royal decree in 1696 expressly prohibited marriage between personal servants and the Indians of the mission villages, as well as between personal servants and African slaves."[113] This decree marked one of the earliest attempts by the state to regulate miscegenation. As the mixed-race population increased rapidly, the need increased to manage race. But by the point of this first law, miscegenation was already extensive; remember that similar racial mixing had also happened with Dutch Brazil. Even so, there did not appear to be many cases of marriage between Indian and African slaves in the seventeenth century, a dynamic which changed in São Paulo in the eighteenth century. São Paulo had an increase in African slaves, which increased labor competition, resulting in forced marriages between Natives and Africans — who were mainly male — to increase slaveholdings.[114] Miscegenation was both encouraged and compelled to achieve material gains of increased labor. This was very different from the U.S.; with Native

---

[112] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 159.
[113] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 161.
[114] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 161.

slavery more rooted in a single geographic place, there was a resulting overlap with the African

population. Natives were not pushed elsewhere or supplanted entirely.

In 1695, the discovery of gold in southeastern Brazil and the subsequent gold rush gave a

short-term second wind to Indian slavery and revived Portugal's economy, before production

peaked in 1712.[115] But the few indigenous groups living near the mines were soon gone, killed

by epidemics or pushed out of the land by increased white settlement. At the same time, São

Paulo found itself with a large population of mixed-race people, due to numerous "illicit unions

and illegitimate births."[116] With few European women, miscegenation by this point had already

been extensive. This led to complicated relations between masters and Indians. For example,

"Amador Bueno da Veiga, the master of more than one hundred Indians and a few dozen African

slaves, [became] disgusted with his half-sister, a *mamaluca* born to an Indian woman, when she

agreed to wed one of his Indian slaves." Slavery resulted in uncomfortable situations where the

boundary between white masters and Native slaves seemed to blur, and masters watched the

distance between the two close. If the fathers chose to recognize their mixed-race children as

their own, the children were then considered free, despite the legal stipulation that a child's

status should follow that of its mother. In this case, some fathers would grant freedom to the

mother's as well. This includes "Pedro Vaz de Barros, the founder of the great estate of

Carambeí and the chapel of São Roque, [who] sired fourteen bastards with six different slaves,

all of whom were freed and showered with landed property and Indians upon his death." Yet as

former slaves increasingly joined free society, Indian slavery declined while the numbers of rural

and urban poor surged.[117] The result was a highly multiracial society where free slaves and the

---

[115] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 203; Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 43.
[116] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 204.
[117] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 205.

mixed-race descendants of indigenous slaves were far more likely to live a life of poverty,
creating a sharp divide between the wealthy white masters and all others. With this population
being urbanized, societies were not kept separate, as they were in the U.S. Although this divide
could be construed to be a separation based entirely in class, its origins were in both slavery and
race.

The decline of Indian slavery began in the mid-seventeenth century and only
accelerated.[118] In the early eighteenth century, indigenous people took advantage of the Crown's
more favorable views on freedom. A series of administrative reforms beginning in the 1690s
sought to subordinate the region to the authority of the Crown, and in doing so the Crown slowly
dissolved the institution of Native slavery, even as it chose not to go so far as complete
abolition.[119] The "descendants of *Carijós*" who won litigation were able to join Paulista
society.[120] In this way, mixed-race indigenous people used the legal system to their benefit,
gaining acceptance in society even if that acceptance was contingent upon them occupying the
bottom rungs of the social ladder. Because of these administrative reforms, and importantly
because of the centralized power and tension between the Portuguese Crown and the region,
Native peoples were able to join society as free people. By contrast, the English colonies in
North America did not have the same conflict with the British Crown, and the British Crown
never demanded that Native peoples be allowed to join colonial society. This remains an
important distinction that allowed for a highly mixed society in Brazil that included people of
Native heritage. In the end, even though Native peoples in Brazil were eliminated through armed
conflict and disease, assimilation further eliminated Natives from the national narrative.

---

[118] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 217.
[119] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 208.
[120] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 211.

Although Native peoples were able to assimilate into Brazilian society to a larger extent than occurred in the U.S., this assimilation still resulted in an overall elimination of Native identity. As the population of African slaves in Brazil grew to dominate that of indigenous peoples, "the endless gradations of Black/White admixture sustain[ed] a twin project that combines the subjugation of African Brazilians with the elimination of Native Brazilians."[121] This elimination was ruthlessly effective, with an indigenous population of 800,000 in 1570 reduced to 360,000 by 1825.[122] Without as intense of a removal period as the U.S., the most direct option for Brazil to achieve elimination of the Native population was through assimilation.

While the similarities between the Brazil and U.S. cases include the use of Native labor and the goal of Native elimination, the extensive differences of a Crown within the colony versus overseas, white minority versus white majority demographics, and an urbanized Native population versus a Native population that was removed west, led to a higher mixed-race population within Brazil, creating a foundation of numerous definitions and terms for multiracial people. By this point, Brazil was already heading in the direction of multiracial society. The U.S. was distinct societies that interacted as such; as white society expanded, it pushed Natives west. African slaves were kept separate on plantations and not able to be manumitted as in Brazil, and therefore did not mix as much with the white or Native populations.

Foundations of the State

A large difference between the U.S. and Brazil lies within their political history. Mainly, beginning in the nineteenth century, Brazil was a colony with the Crown residing within it, while

---

[121] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3086.
[122] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 49.

the control of the U.S. from overseas was supplanted by colonial powers through the Revolutionary War, resulting in decentralized, weaker states.

In 1807, Napoleon invaded Portugal. Four days before the French took Lisbon, Portugal's king, Dom João IV, was escorted by the British to Brazil. Napoleon's war created the conditions for the Haitian revolt of 1791-1803, and the disruption to Haitian sugar production ended up bolstering Brazil's sugar trade.[123] The Haitian revolt was essential to the proliferation of Brazilian slavery; just about the only commodity that West African merchants had to sell the Portuguese were slaves, and without a robust sugar economy, the Portuguese would have had a surplus of slaves without any projects for their labor.[124] In addition to suppressing Brazilian nationalist urges, the presence of the royal family in Brazil solidified Brazil's power structure, with Brazil developing state consolidation and centralized rule as profits from Brazil went straight to the Portuguese crown.[125] Brazil thus existed as a state with a strong central government, as "the Brazilian Empire was consolidated around the symbolism of the 'moderating power' of the crown. The result was a remarkable degree of unity and stability, reinforced by state-controlled exports and British support for its trading partner." Heirs of the crown benefited immensely from this centralization, remaining in command of Brazil until 1889. When protests against the regime did occur, they were put down when the sons and heirs of the regents simply aligned themselves with the protestors and declared themselves to rule in the protestors' name.[126] The strong crown and weak private sector led to the consolidation of state power as a form of "tropical feudalism" with governments, church, businesses, and other

---

[123] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 44, 32.
[124] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2867-2875.
[125] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 31.
[126] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 32.

enterprises or institutions all controlled by the regent.[127] All regional captaincies and elites had their power funneled through and dependent upon the Crown, and this "greater state centralization brought relative stability, with the Portuguese rulers in situ peacefully able to finesse the transition from colony to empire."[128]

This centralized power structure is a key difference between the U.S. and Brazil, and a large part of why their racial categories developed differently. In Brazil, the control of the Crown over regional powers allowed Native peoples to gain freedom from slavery and merge into society, resulting in higher levels of mixing and less separation between different races.

African Slavery

Although Brazil similarly adopted African slavery over Native slavery, as the U.S. did, these systems of slavery were ultimately highly divergent, with substantial ramifications for their eventual categorizations of mixed-race. For approximately the first two hundred years of Portuguese colonization in Brazil, Black slaves made up a small fraction of the labor force. Even though African slaves were imported as early as 1549, it was only near the end of the seventeenth century that the population of African slaves in Brazil swelled, especially as the demand for slave labor in the mines increased in the early decades of the eighteenth century, also coinciding with an overall decline in Native labor. The price of African captives also raised substantially.[129] In the end, Brazil imported ten times the number of slaves than did North America. This amounted to a total of 3.5 million imported African slaves by the end of the slave trade in 1850.[130] There were primarily two groups of settlers who imported African slaves. The

---

[127] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 33.
[128] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 45.
[129] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 49; Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 213.
[130] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 49.

first group were immigrants from Portugal who married local elites, introducing greater capital to Brazil and linking the region more to the Atlantic economy, which subsequently bolstered the trade in African slaves for mining. The second group were settlers who had previously relied on Native labor for agriculture, but had made enough money doing so to import Black slaves.[131] These slaves were overworked and exposed to tropical diseases, and even as many died, more were replaced through greater importation.[132] The high mortality rate of slaves in Brazil is in notable contrast to slavery in North America, for even as North American slaves were widely mistreated, they were considered a valuable commodity, and masters sought to avoid their deaths. Africans on Brazilian plantations, however, were highly likely to die working, unless they were freed before such a point. This was not sheer carelessness, however; by controlling both ends of the slave trade, Portugal cut out middlemen and reduced the cost of slaves. In addition to the relative affordability of slaves, Brazil's proximity to Africa — resulting in shorter and cheaper trips — meant that slaveowners did not feel the need to keep slaves alive for reproduction.[133] It was economically viable to let slaves work themselves to death and simply import more to do the same. Furthermore, women and children cost far more to buy as slaves in Africa, and "the cost-effectiveness of reproducing slaves by way of purchase outweighed that of reproducing them by way of upbringing, a factor that militated against expenditure on women and children."[134] Whereas slavery in North America was self-perpetuating through reproduction, slavery in Brazil was reliant upon importation. This resulted in greater miscegenation in Brazil; in São Paulo, African slaves were forced to marry Natives to produce more slaves and Europeans reproduced with Natives and Africans because of the lack of European women.

---

[131] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 214.
[132] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 49.
[133] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2797.
[134] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2835.

Slavery in Brazil was unique in its allowance of manumission, as slaves could buy freedom by reimbursing their owners for original price. As early as 1639, "Black Brotherhoods" banded together to collectively raise the funds to buy their freedom. While the official guarantee of slaves to buy freedom came about in the 1880s, by abolition in 1888 there were already three times the number of freed blacks as slaves and a disproportionate number of freed mulattos. Legal status was often favored over race, as it wasn't uncommon for freed Blacks and indigenous peoples to work as slave catchers, or even to own slaves. Yet until the 1870's, a slave's savings that they could use to buy their freedom were subject to seizure, with freed slaves often treated as if they were in bondage.[135] Freed slaves could also be re-enslaved if they did not have proof of manumission, and rural slaves often could not make enough money to buy freedom.[136] Widespread manumission clearly did not arise out of the goodness of settlers' hearts. By freeing slaves, "slaveholders could relieve themselves of liability for the upkeep of old slaves and the unproductive children of freed slaves, a consideration that casts light on the fact that, despite the demographic preponderance of male slaves, slaveholders disproportionately manumitted females, who – in contrast to their men – would automatically transmit their status to children." Freeing women thus freed children, so slaveholders did not have to pay the costs of living for children who were less productive than adults. By freeing women and children, slaveholders also opened many more avenues to miscegenation and the growth of a mixed-race population. Additionally, the offer of eventual freedom gave planters an extra tool with which to subdue their slaves.[137] While manumission meant that African tribal heritage was not broken up, with culture and traditions passed down, since mainly the old, ill, and weak were manumitted, freed peoples

---

[135] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 51.
[136] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 52.
[137] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2989.

were frequently worse off than slaves.[138] High levels of freed slaves provided a better chance for miscegenation, especially since freed female slaves were more common, even considering that the slave population was mostly male. Lots of manumission equaled higher levels of mixed-race people.

The combination of high mortality rates among slaves and the promise of manumission also served to protect the planter elite from slave resistance. Not only did this prevent the development of kinship networks among slaves, but "unlike dead slaves, disgruntled slaves who had been around long enough to become savvy in the ways of planter society posed a pressing threat from within. The constant replacement of experienced slaves with fresh imports from Africa militated against the development of a culture of resistance among them."[139] As there were relatively few Portuguese in Brazil, they were massively outnumbered by the African population. Preventing solidarity among slaves and freed peoples, even through working slaves to death and offering freedom to some, was essential to maintaining dominance.[140] Yet as an African population persisted in Brazil, the Portuguese minority needed to continually devise ways to divide the majority.[141]Although Afro-Brazilians were primarily divided into slave versus free, they were further divided into those who had been manumitted (*libertos*), those who had been born free, and those who, after 1830, had been released from slave ships captured by the British (*emancipados*). This process continued in 1871 with the passing of the 'free womb' law, where "children born to slave mothers but destined for freedom became known as *ingênuos*."[142] But beyond the legal distinctions, there were numerous informal social divides, such as African

---

[138] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 52.
[139] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2917.
[140] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2931.
[141] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2939.
[142] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2947.

versus creole, Black versus mulatto and *Caboclo* (mixed indigenous and white or indigenous and Black), and regional variations in physical features.[143] Remember that this also occurred in regions in the U.S. where slaves outnumbered the white minority. The difference is that this demographic disparity was largely a reality all throughout Brazil, and thus they needed more degrees of separation to break apart the majority. Interestingly, full siblings with differing physical traits could even be given different classifications, and these classifications themselves could alter over time, lending to Brazil's racial regime the foundation of color and physical traits over race.[144] This supported the creation of a color spectrum focused on the physical traits of the individual, rather than heritage or community.

Portuguese worries of African solidarity and resistance were not unfounded. Brazil's history of indigenous slave revolts remained branded in the elites' memory. In 1652, Native slaves on the estate of Antonio Pedroso de Barros, in the barrio of Juqueri, carried out the first great indigenous slave revolt. The 600 Indians owned by Pedroso de Barros, a producer of wheat, broke out and murdered Pedroso de Barros and other whites on the estate, as well as destroyed crops and livestock.[145] Several other protests and revolts broke out during the next decade, with five rebellions occurring in 1660 alone.[146] Slave revolts continued to be a problem in Brazil, with runaway slaves forming communities called *quilombos*.[147] Since slaves imported in large numbers retained their African roots, culture, and traditions, they were more likely to form their own communities and to revolt.[148] Revolts increased concerns of a powerful majority, making the need to split up the majority with racial categories all the more pressing. The U.S. did not

---

[143] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2947.
[144] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3078.
[145] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land,* 168.
[146] Monteiro, *Blacks of the Land* 169-170.
[147] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 53.
[148] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 251.

have this history of revolts or a powerful African majority, so the white majority felt less of a

need to fracture the Black population.

These revolts were one factor that created pressure for abolition. Slavery was also viewed

as a costly diversion of capital, by making the country less attractive to foreign investment. Elites

realized that not only would slavery hamper Brazil's economic prospects, but it could underpin

further conflict, which would in turn threaten the social hierarchy upon which they roosted.

Especially after watching the Civil War in the United States, elites realized that abolition was

preferable to social revolution.[149] The Paraguay War from 1865-70, where 20,000 slaves were

freed for service, led the Brazilian army to favor abolition. The British also pressured Brazil to

end slavery — as it was unfavorable for Britain's own economic endeavors — with a naval

blockade in the early 1850s, which stopped Brazil from receiving imports of slaves from

Africa.[150] As Brazilian slavery relied upon the constant importation of slaves from Africa, once

the slave trade ended, it was inevitable that Brazilian slavery would break down.[151] Slave

children were freed in 1871, although they were still obligated to work until 21 years of age. In

1885, slaves over 60 were freed. In 1888, the final "Golden Law" of abolition was passed, which

freed the remaining 600,000 slaves. Abolition thus came about from the fear of revolts,

economic interests, immigration, and international pressure.[152] Without a Civil War spurring

abolition, and with Brazil already having a history of freeing slaves, abolition in Brazil did not

have the same consequences as it did in the U.S.

In Brazil, abolition was a continuance, not a clean break. Whites earned profits while

avoiding serious conflict. Peaceful abolition maintained the social order and avoided revolution

---

[149] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 53-54.
[150] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 54; Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2761.
[151] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2813.
[152] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 54.

while maintaining whites as the ruling elite.[153] Fragmentation among the Black population was so severe that "some freed slaves even resist[ed] the end of the slave trade out of fear that decrease supply would lead to their own re-enslavement."[154] This was largely possible due to the centralization of the Brazilian state, as "Brazil's colonial inheritance of a strongly unified state provided an institutional center capable of managing a potentially explosive transition."[155] Indeed, many Brazilian planters welcomed abolition as it allowed them to employ workers who they deemed to be more "governable" than slaves, as well as the large numbers of freed Brazilian men and women. As the amount of available land decreased, and the labor market drastically tightened through abolition and an influx of foreign labor, workers' wages were depressed. Ultimately, this was a benefit to planters.[156] Abolition was therefore not overly negative for the elites in Brazil, and even possibly was a positive. Elites avoided having to reunify their country and maintained their dominance. Whereas in the U.S. racial lines hardened after abolition, in Brazil miscegenation continued. This isn't to say that Brazil did not favor whiteness, as it very much did. But with different methods of achieving abolition, different racial legacies formed, resulting in a solidifying of a monoracial framework in the U.S. versus a continuance of a multiracial spectrum in Brazil. This was the result of centralized versus decentralized power structures and disparate approaches to slavery and the slave trade.

Miscegenation

In an approach reflecting the Crown's desire for stability, the state reinforced its racial order through a nonconfrontational strategy, relying upon the fragmentation of groups that could

---

[153] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 55.
[154] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 251.
[155] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 56.
[156] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3022.

pose resistance. In 1755, equal status was not afforded to people of all racial heritage in Portugal or Brazil. Portugal allowed limited "mixed marriages," enforced discrimination through religious distinctions, and only permitted Portuguese to serve as ministers of the empire. Few "darker skinned" officials were employed by the governments in Portugal or Brazil.[157] In Brazil, Black people were at the bottom of the well-entrenched hierarchy, with Portuguese elites in clear control of the country.[158] Low state investment in education worked to reinforce the low socioeconomic status of Afro-Brazilians.[159] Yet beyond slave revolts — as admittedly frequent as they were — Brazil never reached a racial reckoning on par with the Civil War and abolition in the United States. This occurrence has partly been attributed to "the myth that the Portuguese had been relatively benign slavers."[160] High levels of manumission were pointed to as evidence of Brazil's more benign form of slavery, with Brazil's racial hierarchy mistakenly taken as the opposite of a ruthless, polarized society.[161] Some scholars have argued that the Catholic Church was responsible for Brazil's racial harmony, noting that the Church condemned the slave trade and encouraged baptism and manumission. Yet the side effect of these policies was that the Church — in line with the state's ideology of stability — encouraged obedience above all else. The Church also reinforced the idea of inferiority through religion and condemned miscegenation.[162] With high mortality among slaves, manumission implemented primarily as a tool to save money and suppress solidarity among non-Europeans, and the Catholic Church suppressing dissent through its own hierarchical standards, the Brazilian government was not a benign slaver, and its talk of racial harmony was simply another way to cover up the country's

---

[157] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 34.
[158] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 35.
[159] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 33.
[160] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2733.
[161] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2733.
[162] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 50.

inequalities and maintain authority. Brazil's more modern and explicit idea of "racial democracy" stemmed from this origin of valuing stability and centralized power overall. Instead of explicitly reinforcing segregation between races, as the U.S. did, denying inequalities in effect accomplished the same goal; if inequalities do not exist, they cannot be discussed or fixed. While both tactics achieved the same goal, they still operate as distinct forms racial domination.

The other notable argument for Brazil's lack of racial conflict is that it was a result of greater racial mixing among the population. In 1732, the Brazilian crown forbade women from migrating to Brazil, as they wanted to grow the population in Portugal. The obvious result is that there were few Portuguese women in Brazil, a situation mirroring the one the Dutch found themselves in when they settled in Brazil.[163] This is in direct contrast to the large English settler population with North America. Although the Brazilian state and the Church condemned miscegenation, most women were of darker skin.[164] This demographic imbalance also gave way to a romanticized idea of the "cult of the mulata," where mixed-race women, specifically those of slightly lighter skin, were romanticized as the perfect woman. Miscegenation was also more likely since there were close to equal proportions of Europeans and Africans in Brazil. In 1818, the population of 3.5 million was 60 percent black and 10 percent mulatto, increasing to 41 percent mulatto by 1890. This is a shockingly large jump in the multiracial population, and it mostly happened during the time of slavery. This is not something that would have been possible with slavery in the U.S. since there was no widespread system of manumission.

Without precise color lines, Brazil's racial system allowed for the emergence of an intermediate category of mulattos: "mulatto offspring were treated as an intermediary population both before and after abolition. This mixing and social fluidity supposedly made it impossible for

---

[163] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 65.
[164] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 66.

Brazil to develop a strict biracial order, thereby also diminishing the prospect for racial conflict."[165] As the mulatto population increased, the black population diminished, and Brazilians welcomed a "whitening" of all Brazilians through miscegenation. Essentially, mixed-race was acceptable as long as the end result was that the overall population was whiter. Mulattos (many of which were recently freed slaves) served an economic role in between white masters and black slaves, working as craftsmen, soldiers, overseers, and slave catchers. They effectively filled functions that whites did not want to, and since there was not a large population of whites, including poor whites, the jobs were able to be filled by mulattos. In the U.S., a poor white population did exist, and mulattoes did not have a separate role to fill. In Brazil, the prospect of social advancement for mulattos through whitening might have made it more difficult to institute segregation between racial groups. It also posed the danger of mulattos and blacks joining to form a larger, potentially antagonistic group. Instead of allowing this coalition to form, it was better to absorb — or whiten — mulattos. In this way, top down, state-instituted racial domination was prevented by extreme racial-mixing, as society could not distinguish groups from each other, and groups could not establish their own identity.[166] The system of numerous color classifications, combined with the other factors of manumission, high mortality rates, and staggered legal distinctions between free and enslaved, "prevent[ed] a hyperexploited majority from realising its community."[167] In reality, there was not a fluid social ladder which one could climb through whitening, but a three-way racial division, with mulattos stuck in an intermediate category. Their position may have been better than being enslaved, but they certainly still suffered racial discrimination. This confusion of identity was apparent in how

---

[165] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 65-66.
[166] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 67.
[167] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3063.

mulattos were willing to join black revolts and movements, but also avoided marriages with blacks.[168] Whereas reforms instituted through pressures from black movements might benefit mulattos, marrying blacks would ensure darker-skinned children, moving the family's lineage lower down the proclaimed social color ladder.[169] Some freedmen even supported slavery and the privileges they received because of it.[170] If the myth of mulatto mobility was created by whites, it was also accepted and proliferated by Black people. Black people embraced the prospect of social advancement through mixing with whites; black women giving birth to lighter children were praised for having "clean stomachs."[171] Even if miscegenation did not produce true mobility beyond acceptance into the intermediate category, the myth of mobility suppressed potential conflict.[172] After all, why tear down a system if following the rules will acquire the same results? The image of class mobility for mulattos encouraged accommodation, as "Black solidarity and potential mobilization were diluted; as long as it was possible to become white, there seemed little reason to insist on defining oneself as black, with all of the associated negative stereotypes."[173] The consequences of this national narrative have reverberated for generations: in 1960 and 1976, the average income of whites was still twice that of nonwhites, and whites were eight times more likely to be employers.[174] Even as whitening was encouraged, whiteness still ensured a separate pathway to success. The U.S. feared an encroachment on whiteness through racial mixing because they believed that it would shatter the ideal of the white majority and white superiority. Once the government had a system with clear racial delineations,

---

[168] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 68.
[169] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 66.
[170] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 251.
[171] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 66.
[172] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 69.
[173] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 163.
[174] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 68, 253.

they stuck with it, reducing conflict through domination. Yet Brazil had so much racial mixing, it was hard to achieve total domination through population numbers. Instead, the Brazilian government embraced whitening to suppress conflict.

Contrary to the popular idea that a preponderance of multiracial people in Brazil created a racial democracy, racial mixing was not a solution; it was a problem that required solving. Whereas the United States solved the problem by creating a strict biracial divide, Brazil created an intermediate mulatto category with discrimination toward all those with Black ancestry. In the mid-nineteenth century, when slavery was nearing extinction and whites needed allies and intermediaries, mulattos in Brazil were provided a distinct status.[175] But after abolition, the juridical distinctions which divided Afro-Brazilians into different categories of free and enslaved were removed. It was at this point that the unofficial distinctions of color and physical traits became the dominant forms of racial and social categorization.[176] Abolition in Brazil may not have been as fundamental of a shift as in the United States, yet in both countries the disappearance of slavery necessitated the solidification of a racial order to keep non-whites separated and beneath the white population. The U.S. racial order leaned toward a monoracial framework during slavery, and after abolition this framework was much more predominant. Brazil had some flexible racial categories and intermediary roles for mulattos, and after abolition embraced an entire racial spectrum based on color and physical features.

Post-Abolition

Extensive immigration also shaped the racial order in Brazil, to a different effect than immigration in the U.S. Whereas in Brazil white immigration to a population with lots of

---

[175] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 77.
[176] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3040.

miscegenation encouraged whitening, white immigration in the U.S. only increased an existing

white majority. In Brazil, even during the time of slavery, some employers favored importing

unenslaved labor from overseas. During periods where there was little work for slaves to do,

providing slaves with sustenance and housing was a financial drain on masters without the

requisite profits. Free workers, however, could be hired when there was work to do, and then left

to their own devices when the masters no longer needed them.[177] Slave labor was inelastic, yet

could be supplemented by free labor when necessary. Masters also sought to employ free

workers for more dangerous or high-risk tasks, instead of risking slaves, who they had invested

large sums of money into.[178] By the end of slavery, however, the demand for free labor

increased, and a push toward industrialization culminated in widespread white immigration to

Brazil, supplied through private funds before 1889 and public funds afterward. From 1870-1963,

five million people immigrated to Brazil, and by 1920, 50 percent of industrial workers were

foreign born. These workers filled the intermediary economic role once occupied by mulattos,

and diluted the Black population, in an effort to "purify the race." Not only did immigration

policy serve the purpose of whitening, but it mitigated worries about an overwhelming Black

majority, as "fears of earlier slave revolts and racially based resistance to dependence on black

workers had motivated state support for white immigration as an alternative source of labor." An

1890 ban on black immigration was upheld and reinforced in the 1920s and 1930s. Even until

1945, Brazilian legislation favored white immigration, with the policy of whitening shifting the

population toward lighter shades of skin color.[179] The white population rose from 44 percent in

1890 to 62 percent in 1950, with a corresponding fall in mulatto numbers. Black population

---

[177] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 2964.
[178] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History*, 2972
[179] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 162.

numbers were diminished by white immigration, intermarriage, low reproduction, and the social

rewards to identify as lighter-skinned. The combination of white immigration and the myriad

color classifications "helped prolong the oppression of African Brazilians into the post-slavery

era."[180] Immigration did not serve the same purpose in the U.S. The U.S. did not need to whiten

a Black minority already oppressed through Jim Crow, so while immigration may have favored

Europeans, it wasn't explicitly to whiten or fragment a Black majority.

Between 1880 and 1940, Brazilian discussions of race Brazil borrowed racist theories

from Europe to rationalize their racial regime of color discrimination, while also getting rid of

two central tenets of European racial theory: the innateness of racial difference and the impurity

of mixed-bloods.[181] Instead, they assumed that white genes were stronger, and therefore more

mixing would result in more whitening. Mulattos were encouraged to identify as white, and

Black people to identify as mulatto. The resulting increase in mulatto categories served not only

as whitening, but arguably a form of "browning."[182] These adapted racist European theories

served as the backbone for Brazilian whitening ideology. In the nineteenth century, the idea of

"hybridity" in humans arose, with scientists arguing that miscegenation would lead to degenerate

or infertile offspring.[183] Then from the 1880s-1920s, the "medicalized" social thought of Brazil,

which employed concepts originating in medicine and science to support racist practices,

diagnosed the country as suffering a national "degeneration." Originating through psychiatric

criminology, the idea of degeneration proliferated through literature and sociology.[184]

Degeneration was not just a measure of Brazilian racial-mixing and the color gradient, but also

---

[180] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3070.
[181] Dain Borges, "'Puffy, ugly, slothful and inert': Degeneration in Brazilian social thought, 1880-1940," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 25:2 (1993): 235.
[182] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 163.
[183] Brienen, *Visions of Savage Paradise,* 133.
[184] Borges, "Brazilian social thought," 256.

served to explain a national decline through the metaphor of progressive hereditary illness.[185]

The sociologist Arthur de Gobineau, in his 1825 text *On the Inequality of the Races*, "defined degeneration as the inevitable historical process in which pure conquering races, through mixture with pure inferior races, lose their special qualities and energy."[186] Yet many Brazilian social scientists pushed back on this perspective, embracing race-mixture as a "whitening" that had a purifying and elevating effect on the nation.[187] The intellectuals debating miscegenation divided into two camps, one arguing that degeneration through racial-mixing was harming the country, and the other choosing to view racial-mixing as a beneficial whitening. Unsurprisingly, both sides operated on the assumption that any racial-mixing with the result of a darker-skinned country was to be avoided. Economic policies instituted by the state reflected these ideas. Urban reforms in Rio de Janeiro from 1903-1906 — including a sanitation campaign, building drainage systems, and widespread smallpox vaccination — were seen by some scientists as a racial project, with the underlying acceptance that modernization would lead to racial progress. In interpreting the purpose of these reforms, "the crudest reading was that brown Afro-Brazilians embodied degeneration, while whites represented progress."[188] Degeneration underpinned the reform proposals of the government, the goals of which were to modernize the country as much as restore its "energy and health," a euphemism for a racial cleansing of the country.[189] While the U.S. borrowed the same racist theories from Europe, they did not need to alter them as much for their situation. Innate racial difference made much more sense in a segregated society. In Brazil, however, to justify their version of this ideology political and economic projects became tied to a

---

[185] Borges, "Brazilian social thought," 235.
[186] Borges, "Brazilian social thought," 236.
[187] Borges, "Brazilian social thought," 237.
[188] Borges, "Brazilian social thought," 249.
[189] Borges, "Brazilian social thought," 256.

racial cleansing. Brazil's language was far more coded then with Jim Crow; theoretically, Brazil was embracing miscegenation and moving toward racial democracy.

This policy of whitening has distinct implications when referred to the case of indigenous peoples in Brazil, who are generally marginalized in Brazilian discussions of race. Through the lens of whitening, this omission is purposeful, supporting the ideology of Brazil's racial regime.[190] The promise to mulattos of mobility through whitening would unravel without the clear Black and white poles on the color gradient. A recognition of Native race would effectively create a third pole, undermining the logic that mulattos could either be whiter (advancing socially) or blacker. Native elimination was thus essential to maintaining racial order in Brazil, as "the existence of a third pole to which Blackness could be drawn would undo the majority's stake in the Whiteness they are supposedly destined to share."[191] Only by silencing the indigenous racial narrative could the Brazilian state maintain an effective system which kept the majority population docile and striving for advancement within their rigged system.[192] How would this have played out in a U.S. context? While the U.S. government did also seek Native elimination, there wasn't the danger of disrupting a racial color gradient. However, the U.S. racial system did assume that people of Native and Black heritage would be identified as Black; the monoracial Black framework overpowered the Native blood quantum. The details may be dissimilar, but the result of Black heritage being more important in determining racial identity than Native heritage remains true for both cases.

In enforcing a racial order, the Brazilian state often acted by omission. Racial categories were present in the census, but there was no legal discrimination based upon these categories.

---

[190] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3086.
[191] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3102.
[192] Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History,* 3110.

After the 1890 census, the state encouraged the categorization of as many people as possible in intermediate categories (interestingly, the 1890 census in the U.S. also had multiple categories for mixed-race, including quadroon and octoroon). Measures of segregation against Afro-Brazilians were debated, but ultimately rejected. And for several years, 1891 through 1907, the Brazilian Parliament debated establishing a formal color bar, but in the end did not decide to do so.[193] In part, this contributed to obscuring the history of Brazil, and to the overall project of reinterpreting Brazil as a racial democracy to suppress antagonism or mobilization.[194] Since 1890, the census included Black, white, and at least two intermediate groups, and "surveys consistently found multiple self-identifications reflecting the physical variations produced by generations of miscegenation."[195] The censuses in 1900 and 1920 omitted racial specifications, with no census in 1910 and 1930. Other censuses measured for mixed "color," obfuscating the true racial divide.[196] While the U.S. slowly moved away from mixed-race categories in the census through the twentieth century, before allowing multiple people to select multiple races in the 2000 census, Brazil oscillated between having no racial categories on the census and having numerous racial categories for mixed-race people. The U.S. also instituted formal discrimination against people of other races, enacting racial laws that relied upon census categorizations to delineate between peoples. Census categories in Brazil, however, did not translate into official racial domination. Both states could theoretically have chosen the path of the other, yet they stuck to the ideologies they already had. The U.S. continued legal discrimination, relying upon precedent, and Brazil perpetuated ideas of a racial democracy by not instituting laws of racial domination. Both strategies suppressed minorities; the U.S. by overtly discriminating against

---

[193] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 166.
[194] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 167.
[195] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 252.
[196] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 168.

minorities, and Brazil by ignoring racial inequities. Their tactics for domination were tied to their history and their pre-existing racial ideology.

Throughout the twentieth century in Brazil, race was hidden, and racial inequality was rampant. A period of resurgent state centralization in the 1930s, led by Getúlio Vargas, encouraged racial democracy and ended support for white immigrants competing against Black people.[197] In 1934, Vargas supported the first national Afro-Brazilian Congress, and in 1951 signed the Arinas anti-discrimination law.[198] This change in policy, however, did not shift Brazil's national racial narrative. There was even a period when the very concept of "race" was banned in Brazil. In 1969 the National Security Council outlawed studies of racial discrimination as subversive, and scholars studying race were exiled or forced to retire. In 1970, race categories were excluded from the census. This made it appear that race was not an issue in Brazil, even as Black mean income in 1960 was less than half of whites, with mulattos' income level closer to that of Black people than whites. 52 percent of Black people were also illiterate in 1950, compared to 26 percent of whites, and a disproportionate number of Black people lived in the *favela* slums. By focusing on problems of inequality yet ignoring the racial roots of this inequality, "class differences were projected to camouflage racism."[199] Other Black people were more often looked at as competitors than sympathetic fellow victims. Class divisions also overlapped with racial identity, as lighter-colored peoples tried to distance themselves from Black people and sometimes mistreated darker-skinned peoples. Challenges were viewed as class-based, not race-based, and Black people were more likely to work within union movements and corporatist state structures to achieve change, rather than racial organizations.[200] Without

---

[197] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 170.
[198] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 171.
[199] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 172.
[200] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 253.

any legal discrimination, Afro-Brazilians struggled to find an explicit cause to mobilize against, or to even develop the framework to think of themselves as one group.

Around this same time, the Civil Rights Movement was ongoing in the U.S. The consequence of a monoracial order and segregation was identity formation among Black people, which allowed them to band together. Official legal racial domination by the state gave Black people something explicit to fight against, helping them coalesce and mobilize. But the multiracial spectrum in Brazil denied identity formation, making resistance and the Civil Rights movement highly unlikely. Furthermore, without explicit racial domination by the state, nonwhite people in Brazil had nothing they could pin a target to. So, while the U.S. racial order was pressured to change by activists, Brazil's was not. Notably, however, their chosen racial frameworks remained in each place. By this point, path-dependence was so far along that the form of racial categorization was never challenged as method of resistance; only the results of racial categorization were challenged.

Mobilization and Suppression

Where it was possible, the narrative of class inequality superseded that of racial discrimination. As the activist-official Carlos Alberto Medeiros said, "when you are black and poor, you think your problems are due to being poor. That is more comfortable, since I can be not poor, say if I win the lottery, but there is no escape from being black."[201] De-emphasizing race engendered hope. Yet even as the Brazilian government was effective in muffling discontent and maintaining stability, there were notable instances of resistance. Rising black protest in modern Brazil proves that racial identity and mobilization are not reliant on state policy; Afro-

---

[201] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 254.

Brazilian solidarity flows from strong cultural and religious traditions, which are reinforced by shared experiences of discrimination. An indirect consequence of African cultures being retained in Brazilian slave communities was that it made it difficult for an overarching Black identity to unify those of varied African heritage. These numerous cultures also added another dimension to Brazil's racial categorization spectrum. But still, in some cases, state policy provoked mobilization, as greater repression led to greater militancy.[202] In the late 1980s, with increasing democratization and industrialization, more people pushed back on the idea of racial democracy, with Brazilian racial movements beginning with the Black, urban, middle class. As there were more middle-class Blacks in the South, this is where mobilization was greatest, even though overall the North had a greater proportion of Blacks. Wealthier blacks were more likely to attribute their struggles to race. As said by Carlos Alberto Medeiros: "When you are poor and still facing problems, then (racial) consciousness is unavoidable." With a small elite base, most black protest did not seek to fundamentally disturb the social order.[203] While poorer Blacks had bought into the racial democracy and class inequality narrative in Brazil, this didn't happen in the U.S. because segregation was explicitly in terms of race.

Several attempts at Black movements took place during the twentieth century. With the restoration of democracy in Brazil in 1945-1964, Abdias do Nascimento focused on asserting Black culture and identity, which would theoretically lead to mobilization. But his philosophy of "negritude" was limited to the small Black middle class of Rio de Janeiro and avoided wider class rhetoric.[204] Although African traditions were asserted as a distinct Black culture, they became symbols of unity across Brazil, being incorporated beyond Blackness. In this way, Afro-

---

[202] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 250.
[203] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 255.
[204] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 256.

Brazilian culture was folded into the ideology of racial democracy, instead of unraveling it.[205]

The Movimento Negro Unificado worked to keep race as a central issue and challenge

discrimination and achieved greater militancy and national following in the 1970s. Yet since

activists were working on identity formation, mobilization was still limited. The movement was

also small, elite, and middle class, and the MNU did not gain widespread support.[206] Benedita da

Silva from Rio de Janeiro, the first Black women elected to National Congress in 1986, and who

was later elected to the Senate, openly denounced racism and challenged racial democracy. But

Silva also recognized that talking about racial identification was often more of an impediment

than electoral boost, and while her Worker's Party (PT) put forward many Black people for

election, they generally avoided speaking about race.[207] Brazil's lack of racial identity formation

put Brazilian activists behind the U.S. in their ability to organize.

Generally, the Brazilian left focused more on class and gender than race. Activists first

had to argue that the state is an appropriate vehicle for addressing racial demands and grievances,

citing how the state has worked to maintain racial distinctions, and therefore was familiar with

asserting itself into racial issues. In 1991, a campaign by activists sought to work against

whitening and encouraged Afro-Brazilians to identify as Black on the census. But the effort to

focus on African roots and find racial consciousness through culture was subdued by the state's

appropriation and absorption of Black culture, which incapacitated much racial resistance.[208]

While the U.S. government tried to keep Blackness distinct and far away through segregation,

the Brazilian government was able to appropriate Black culture, again subduing conflict. This

was a tactic afforded to them due to high miscegenation, and not an unfamiliar one; a variation of

---

[205] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 257.
[206] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 257-258.
[207] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 258-259.
[208] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 260.

this appropriation and embrace of multiracialism and multiculturalism had been used for countless years.

The social order ultimately sought to accommodate racial demands to avoid larger conflict, ignoring widespread violence through the murder of Black children and police brutality. The greatest task of Movimento Negro has been to establish the fact of racism, with movement beyond that point being far more challenging. Ultimately, during most of the twentieth century, mobilization did not occur. When Afro-Brazilian mobilization has occurred, it has been limited and focused on identity consolidation, with activists being more moderate when the state was receptive and more militant when the state was repressive.[209]

Brazil's struggles with Black identity movements originated with a lack of Black identity formation. By suppressing discussions of race, and not instituting legal racial domination, the Brazilian state limited Black identity formation and hid racial inequities, not giving minorities anything explicit to fight against. The existence of extensive miscegenation and mixed-race categories were used in combination with bans on surveys and discussions of race to provide an image of a racial utopia. Class inequality was offered as the reason for inequality, even as inequalities also ran closely along racial lines. This made it difficult for Brazil to have a civil rights movement on par with that in the U.S. Brazil stuck with its multiracial spectrum of categorization, just as the U.S. stayed within its monoracial framework.

However, Black identity formation seems to be increasing in recent years. In the 2000 and 2010 censuses, the "Black" category on the Brazilian census included 2.2 million and 3.1 million new, reclassified members, respectively. This is not just due to an increase in the Black population, as "by 2010 at least one in every three people in the black population was a newly

---

[209] Marx, *Making Race and Nation,* 261-262.

reclassified black. The increase was particularly strong among males and the younger generations."[210] For whatever reason, multiracial people in Brazil are choosing to identify with a category on the census that entails darker skin, going directly against the idea of whitening, where multiracial people were encouraged to identify as whiter to achieve greater socio-economic status and success.

Brazil Conclusion

Throughout Brazil's history, it has embraced miscegenation and racial democracy, as both allowed the central power to maintain control. The result has been a lack of Black identity formation and a racial color gradient where individuals could be categorized based upon their physical appearance.

Colonization by the Dutch and Portuguese resulted in high levels of miscegenation early on in Brazil's history; both European populations had largely male populations and fewer settlers overall than the slave population. A flexibility of racial categorization and the creation of numerous racial categorization terms during this time laid the groundwork for Brazil's racial color spectrum.

The indigenous population lived close to the European population and the African slave population, and during this time more terms for racial mixes occurred. This is despite some early legislation that prohibited miscegenation between Natives and other populations within Brazil. Natives were treated cruelly by colonizers and were an early source of slave labor for planters. Eventually, due to conflict between the Crown and regional powers, indigenous peoples were

---

[210] Vítor Miranda, "A Resurgence of Black Identity in Brazil? Evidence from an Analysis of Recent Censuses," *Demographic Research*, vol. 32, 2015: 1603.

freed from slavery and assimilated into society. However, they have been largely obscured from Brazilian history, and hold little place on Brazil's racial and color spectrum.

Brazil's racial system was largely defined by a system of slavery that worked slaves to death and occasionally allowed manumission, as well as a centralized power in the Portuguese Crown reigning directly within Brazil. With abolition, elites maintained control, and the racial spectrum became even more dominant. This made it difficult for Brazil's Black population to form a singular identity and resist racial inequalities.

Overall, the idea of a "racial democracy" within Brazil is hardly true. Inequality between white and nonwhite populations is extensive. In talking about mixed-race in Brazil, it's important to also realize that "race" itself is a relatively new concept to Brazil, not so much in as they were unaware of the concept, but that they chose not to let it apply to them. Thus, mixed-race people have composed a large part of Brazil's population without forming a singular multiracial identity, or often even any "racial" identity. Brazil's philosophy was always one of stability, quiescence, and continuance. It never had the same grandiose racial conflict that shook the United States, and many countries have seen that relative calm and bought into Brazil's myth of racial equality. All it shows, however, is that two entirely different racial systems can both be maneuvered to maintain white superiority. These are arguably the most important takeaways from Brazil's racial system: peace does not equal harmony, and a multiracial society is not inherently a racially equitable society.

Conclusion

Comparative Analysis of the United States and Brazil

On the surface, Brazil and the U.S. had highly similar origins. Demographically, both nations began with three main populations: Natives, Europeans, and Africans. They were both colonized states, with Natives slowly eliminated and Africans used primarily as a form of slavery labor, after Native labor proved insufficient. Both nations wished to achieve land and wealth, and a racial hierarchy relying upon European ideas of racial discrimination helped them do so. It is here, however, that the similarities largely end. Firstly, the demographics are not as equal as they might appear. England had a population surplus, and thus the English colonies in the Americas had a white majority population. Portugal did not have the same surplus, and neither did the Dutch, and so Brazil had a white minority population. This increased miscegenation in Brazil more than it did within the U.S.

The U.S. split away from its colonial power, developing into powerful regional governments tied loosely together for much of its history. The priority of the federal government was to keep these regions together. The Portuguese Crown was exiled to Brazil and ruled there as a strong central power. This suppressed regional conflict and allowed for greater political stability.

This political disparity is evident in how Native mixed-race was handled in both countries. In the U.S., Native populations were kept separate from white society; the option to continuously remove Native populations made it easy to assimilate a few mixed-race Natives into white society, without them forming a distinctive identity. The rules around Native mixed-race thus changed often, as expansion continued, and the goals of the federal government

changed accordingly. In Brazil, conflicts between the Crown and other regional powers resulted in the manumission of Native slaves. Natives in urban areas, which already had higher degrees of miscegenation, found it easier to assimilate into society. They also assimilated not directly into whiteness, but into a multiracial society that valued lighter skin.

In both cases, Native elimination was contrasted with a system of slavery that came to rely upon African labor. The U.S. had a white majority population and no substantial history of slave revolts, so it was easier to rely upon force and demographics to subdue the slave population. In Brazil, slavery unfolded much differently. Due to their advantages in the slave trade, slaves were much cheaper. Given this economic factor, a history of slave revolts, and a worry about the Black majority, Brazil both allowed for higher rates of manumission and the creation of intermediary racial categories to separate the Black majority. Freed slaves also contributed to Brazil's larger mixed-race population, and mulattos filled economic roles that a smaller white population was not able to. Before abolition, the U.S. already had a system that valued Black monoracialism and Native removal, and Brazil had a system with many historical pathways to racial mixing.

Abolition tested the strength of these racial ideologies. In the U.S., regional conflict bubbled over into a Civil War. To reunify the white population after the war, a decentralized government allowed Jim Crow segregation to proliferate and Black racial identity to become more distinct as the one-drop rule spread across the country. Power was maintained through regional, legal discrimination and keeping mixed-race Black people within the Black racial category. In Brazil, abolition came about naturally with the end of the slave trade. There was no regional conflict; the powerful state slowly eased into abolition, true to its ultimate objective of stability. No racial divisions were drawn; there were no warring sides to unify. Instead, without

slavery as a visible boundary, Brazil's racial spectrum became far more predominant, with every individual member of its population existing somewhere on a racial gradient depending upon their physical features.

In the twentieth century, Black identity in the U.S. continued to coalesce. Eventually, Black activists pushed back against legal discrimination through the Civil Rights movement, relying upon their strong group identity. In Brazil, Black identity movements struggled to gain as much traction. The state's policies of whitening, racial democracy, and racial discourse suppression kept race as a secondary issue. Without explicit racial domination, there was no sustained drive for identity formation or a civil rights movement.

In the most recent years, the U.S. has seen a large increase in the number of people identifying as multiracial, just as Brazil has seen a jump in the number of people identifying as Black. These censuses indicate an ongoing and fundamental shift in multiracial categorization in both countries, even if these shifts look somewhat different in each place.

Recent Trends

It is interesting that these recent trends in racial identification in both countries mirror the original regimes' paths toward white supremacy. In the U.S., white unity was achieved by consolidating Black identity during Jim Crow, through a monoracial framework. Currently, far more people in the United States are choosing to identity as multiracial. In Brazil, white stability was maintained through a color classification system that encouraged whitening. In the 2000 and 2010 censuses, however, people are choosing to identify themselves as darker-skinned. Their choice is a method of undoing "whitening." Thus, contemporary racial resistance and identity formation in both countries appear to be occurring in a direct, negative correlation to the initial

racial structures created by the state. Not only can political categorization of race decide predominant racial categories, but it also preordains the path of racial resistance.

Based on these two cases, when given the choice, mixed-race people coalesce an identity in opposition to structures of white supremacy. What is essential is that, as these two countries head to the precipice of a possible new racial order, there is deliberate examination of the racial histories that got them to this point. Brazil's ban on studying race should not be the legal harbinger of a cultural preference for building new structures without first examining their foundation. The dearth of serious conversation around mixed-race is concerning at such a point in time when racial orders are being strained past their original definitions. If they are not to snap back into unpleasant shapes, multiracial history must be acknowledged and accurately examined.

As has been seen with abolition, seemingly positive turning points in history can result in overwhelming negative racial categorizations when not overseen with the proper care. In the case of Jim Crow, the federal government looked the other way or actively encouraged racial discrimination, knowing that the resulting racial solidification would ultimately support the government. In Brazil, racial democracy and abolition were seemingly ideological flash points, yet smoothed the way for the ruling class and kept non-white peoples in poverty. It is not as if, by ignoring mixed-race, we will fail to create positive racial orders. Rather, our indifference will open the door to unequivocally negative and exploitative definitions of race. The recent re-identification of mixed-race people provides hope that this does not have to be the case.

In the U.S., I predict that a growth in multiracial identity will follow the path of other minority groups, within the existing monoracial framework. Minority strength in the U.S. is tied, among many other things, to the size of the group and the cohesiveness of their identity. Once the multiracial community is large enough and has a sense of community identity, its influence in

the country will grow in accordance with its size. Whether or not this fundamentally cracks the monoracial framework in the U.S. would be harder to guess at — as would any understanding of the consequences should such a thing happen.

In Brazil, an increasing identification of multiracial people as Black may result in a cohesive Black identity more in line with that of the United States. Discourse on race and inequality will likely continue to grow over a long period of time. However, with a history of multiracial identity and strong African cultural traditions, this identity formation is undoubtedly going to look far different than it does in the U.S. Beyond that, the future is uncertain.

Final Thoughts

A recurring question from my peers when I proposed this project was, simply: why? Why study multiracial people in these countries instead of just studying racial categorization overall? At the time, these questions frustrated me. Looking back now, I almost agree. But I do so for different reasons then I think were shared by my peers. In tackling the history of racial categorization in these two countries, I had to extend my scope far beyond mixed-race categories. Often, my analysis of mixed-race categories was so tangled with monoracial minority identity that it was difficult to differentiate the two. However, I think what this proves is that mixed-race categories are not some niche project or research addendum. They are an inseparable yet frequently invisible or minimized part of racial categorization. When research on race fails to acknowledge multiracial people, it is not simply choosing to study one aspect of race over another; it is unwittingly omitting that which is already there.

When discussing race in the U.S., talking about mixed-race categories tends to feel like discussing something that exists on the margins of race, not something which is at the forefront

of this country's racial history. In Brazil, there is the opposite situation; discussing multiracial people is often redundant, since most nonwhite race operates on some form of multiracial spectrum. Both countries have large populations of mixed-race people, yet our scholarship on race varies so much. Unwittingly, our scholarship is built upon a foundation of racial frameworks that we rarely question — much as how Black activists in the U.S. did not want a multiracial category to exist but chose Black identity coalition to resist the government, and the poor Black population in Brazil believed that their struggles were due to class, not race. But an analysis which specifically looks at how states choose to categorize mixed-race people quickly exposes how racial categories have been used as tool by governments. Racial domination unravels when its incongruities are drawn to the surface.

Bibliography

Brienen, Rebecca Parker. *Visions of Savage Paradise: Albert Eckhout, Court Painter in*

    Colonial Dutch Brazil, 1637-1644. Amsterdam University Press: 2007.

    Borges, Dain. "'Puffy, ugly, slothful and inert': Degeneration in Brazilian social thought,

    1880-1940," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 25:2 (1993): 235-256.

Diamond, Raymond T., and Robert J. Cottrol. "Codifying Caste: Louisiana's Racial

    Classification Scheme and the Fourteenth Amendment." *Loyola Law Review*, vol. 29, no.

    2, Spring 1983: p. 255-286.

Freyre, Gilberto. *The Masters and the Slaves: A Study in the Development of Brazilian*

    Civilization. Knopf, 1946.

Higginbotham, Al, and Bk Kopytoff. "Racial Purity and Interracial Sex in the Law of Colonial

    and Antebellum Virginia." *The Georgetown Law Journal*, vol. 77, no. 6, 1989: 1967–

    2029.

Hudson, Nicholas. "From 'nation to race': The origin of racial classification in the Eighteenth

    Century thought." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 29:3 (1996): 247-264.

House of Representatives, Congress. H. Con. Res. 29 (IH) - Supporting the goals and ideals of

    GLSEN's 2021 Day of Silence in bringing attention to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual,

    transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ+) name-calling, bullying, and harassment

    faced by individuals in schools.. U.S. Government Publishing Office, 18 Apr 2021,

    https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/BILLS-117hconres29ih.

House of Representatives, Congress. H.R. 2761 (IH) - To sever United States Government

relations with the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma until such time as the Cherokee Nation

of Oklahoma restores full tribal citizenship to the Cherokee Freedmen disenfranchised in

the March 3, 2007, Cherokee Nation vote and fulfills all its treaty obligations with the

Government of the United States, and for other purposes.. U.S. Government Publishing

Office, 7 Jun 2009, https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/BILLS-111hr2761ih.

Levine, Robert M. *Race and Ethnic Relations in Latin America and the Caribbean: An*

Historical Dictionary and Bibliography. Scarecrow Press, 1980.

Marx, Anthony W. *Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of South Africa, the United States,*

and Brazil. Resource Services Library: Provincial Schools Branch Division, 2008.

Proquest Congressional™.

https://about.proquest.com/en/products-services/proquest-congressional/.

Masuoka, Natalie. "The 'Multiracial' Option: Social Group Identity and Changing Patterns of

Racial Categorization." *American Politics Research*, vol. 39, no. 1, Jan. 2011: 176–204.

Miranda, Vítor. "A Resurgence of Black Identity in Brazil? Evidence from an Analysis of Recent

Censuses," *Demographic Research*, vol. 32, 2015: 1603–1630.

Monteiro, John M. *Blacks of the Land: Indian Slavery, Settler Society, and the Portuguese*

Colonial Enterprise in South America. Cambridge: 2018.

Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice, edited by Karim Murji, and John Solomos,

Oxford University Press, (2005). ProQuest Ebook Central.

Rockquemore, Kerry Ann, et al. "Racing to Theory or Retheorizing Race? Understanding the

Struggle to Build a Multiracial Identity Theory." *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 65, no. 1,

(2009): 13–34.

Shih, Margaret, and Diana T. Sanchez. "When Race Becomes Even More Complex: Toward

Understanding the Landscape of Multiracial Identity and Experiences." *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 65, no. 1 (2009): 1–11.

Sweet, James H. "The Iberian Roots of American Racist Thought." *William and Mary Quarterly* 54:1 (January 1997): 143-166.

TallBear, Kimberly. "DNA, Blood, and Racializing the Tribe." *Wicazo Sa Review*, vol. 18, no. 1, (2003): 81–107.

Tavernise, Sabrina, et al. "Behind the Surprising Jump in Multiracial Americans, Several Theories." The New York Times, 13 Aug. 2021.

Thompson, Debra. "Making (Mixed-)Race: Census Politics and the Emergence of Multiracial Multiculturalism in the United States, Great Britain and Canada." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 35, no. 8, (2012): 1409–1426.

Waggoner, Linda M., ed. (2002)."'Neither White Men nor Indians': Affidavits from the Winnebago Mixed-Blood Claim Commissions, Prairie Du Chien, Wisconsin, 1838-1839." *The Annals of Iowa*, vol. 62, no. 3, (2003): 371–372.

Wilkinson, A. B. "People of Mixed Ancestry in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake: Freedom, Bondage, and the Rise of Hypodescent Ideology." *Journal of Social History*, vol. 52, no. 3, (2019): 593–618.

Wolfe, Brendan. "Racial Integrity Laws (1924–1930)." Encyclopedia Virginia, 1 Apr. 1691.

Wolfe, Patrick. *Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race*. London: Verso, 2016.