



Introduction

*Warwick Anderson, Ricardo Roque,
and Ricardo Ventura Santos*

In thinking about racial difference and race relations in the Global South, Gilberto Freyre's theories, propounded in the 1930s and formalized in the 1950s, of Portuguese (and therefore Brazilian) racial exceptionalism should immediately come to mind. Notwithstanding the ambivalence of his prose, Freyre's work fostered an appreciation that Portugal had been more benign and racially tolerant as a colonizer than had other European powers, that Brazil as a nation might one day constitute a racially mixed Arcadia, and that the vast Portuguese imperial world was ultimately a successful, if sometimes troubled, interracial experiment. Preoccupied with cultural particularism and autonomy, Freyre helped to concoct the myth of Brazilian racial democracy, arguing that peculiarities of Portuguese colonialism cultivated a convivial mixed-race society, which had incorporated Africans. His major study, *Casa-grande & senzala* (1933)—poetic and impressionistic, and bearing the imprint of his association with anthropologists at Columbia University—was largely an aversive reaction to the rigid racial regime he had experienced in the Southern United States, that other “exceptional” society.¹ In this influential tract, Freyre implicitly juxtaposed American racial segregation and Lusophone racial mixing—racial exclusion and racial “harmony”—looking back nostalgically to what he imagined to be the relatively benign patriarchal structures established under Portuguese colonialism.² But what was the true valence of this supposed Lusophone exceptionalism? Was it self-deceiving? Was it even distinctive compared to other racial regimes in the Global South?

In this interconnected collection, we reconsider Freyre's *Luso-tropicalismo*, testing the concept against racialized practices elsewhere in the southern remnants of the Portuguese Empire, South America, and Portugal itself. We reassess its exceptionalist argument by exploring a variety of scientific forms of racialization beyond the trope of “race mixing”: from concerns with human plasticity to attitudes toward Indigenous peoples; from issues regarding race

and environment to discussions of population and demography; from anxieties associated with whiteness and settlement to those tethered to control, education, and labor. We thus expand the range of theories and knowledge formations through which “race” was conceived, materialized, and put into practice across the Portuguese-speaking world in this period. Through the privileging of comparison and entanglement, we seek to revise and reevaluate Luso-tropicalist claims. Consequently, distinctiveness is imagined more as an unpremeditated outcome of contingent patterns of intellectual exchanges and connections than as a historical, cultural, or geographical ontology, or a kind of national or imperial trait. Accordingly, the volume is concerned with exploring how a variety of racial conceptions emerged in the twentieth century within the Portuguese regions of the Global South, that is, through multiple southern connections and cohabitations.

Here we use “Global South” as shorthand for the colonies of exploitation and settler societies located principally, though not exclusively, in the Southern Hemisphere. This has proved to be a useful heuristic in exploring other patterns of racial thought and practice, and for differentiating them (at least partially) from notions of racial difference prevailing along the North Atlantic littoral.³ Accordingly, our book extends and enriches the study of “southern” racial distinctiveness. These chapters contribute, from a Lusophone point of departure, to the critical reassessment of discourse on the exceptionality of southern racial thought, as well as the broader historiography of racial sciences in the twentieth century. They unearth plural scientific fabrications and transnational or diasporic intellectual geographies; they expose conceptual fissures and interrogate essentialist logics. Importantly, our studies challenge and resituate—in a sense, “provincializing”—the standard view of twentieth-century racial thought, especially race science, upsetting the conventional North Atlantic bias.

This represents an unrivalled opportunity to interrogate exceptionalism in all its guises—whether biological, cultural, or political. To do so effectively, we are seeking to recuperate or reactivate a comparative imaginary in the Lusophone world, a vision of affinity and difference across the empire and former empire that often has been occluded. Both the earliness and lateness of decolonization in the Portuguese Empire make postcolonial and south-south comparative readings more difficult and demanding—yet also more necessary. We want to juxtapose the supposed exceptionalism of the modern nation-state with the cosmopolitanism—or at least interconnection—of an empire sharing, in part, political structure, culture, and language. This means, in effect, attempting to link racial exceptionalism to the nation-state, and then contextualizing or resituating this cognate nationalism as a “variation” on transnational and even imperial themes—thereby challenging the moral valence, the virtuous teleology, of exceptionalist assertion.⁴ These essays, then, can be read

together as a contribution toward the “comparative analysis of exceptionalism as a cultural phenomenon.”⁵

We echo Sigmund Freud’s translator in emphasizing “discontent” in our title, since we are seeking a *critical* engagement with theories of racial exceptionalism and virtue in the twentieth century—their evasions, fantasies, and bad faith.⁶ We thus reveal complex and heterogeneous patterning of racial thought across the Global South, and we trace fraught and intricate relations of human biology and state power, or nationalism. At the same time, we want to recapture here the hopefulness and generative potential of concepts of racial distinctiveness during this period: their imbrication with the nation, and uneasy connections with modernity and science. In multiple ways, we explore how such subject positioning provided a ready-made population—perhaps as much “content” as discontent—for late-colonial, national, and developmental projects.

Racial Connections in Portuguese Colonialism

In the twentieth century the Portuguese-speaking world stretched from Portugal itself to the jungles and vast cities of Brazil; it included remnant colonies such as Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde, São Tomé, Guinea-Bissau, Goa, Macau, and Timor-Leste, as well as a widespread diaspora. Its population numbered over two hundred million. It constituted an extremely active cultural and intellectual network, particularly across the Southern Hemisphere. Hitherto, little has been said about the history of race and science in the twentieth-century Portuguese-speaking world in its own terms, let alone from a comparative global perspective, emphasizing south-south connections. While some studies of racial thought along national lines, and comparative studies of Brazilian and other Latin American racial formations, have recently been published, until now we have lacked any comparative study of racial thought and practice across the diasporic Lusophone world in the twentieth century.

Luso-tropicalism and Its Discontents builds on a set of valuable, though isolated, case studies that have treated the history of Portuguese and Brazilian nineteenth-century and early-twentieth-century racial science, anthropology, and eugenics.⁷ The history of “Latin eugenics” provides perhaps the sturdiest platform for experiments in comparison. Following on Nancy Stepan’s studies, collective works have sought to address the “specificity” of eugenics and genomics in Spanish-speaking Latin America and across the so-called Latin world (including Brazil and Southern Europe) more widely.⁸ Francisco Bethencourt and Adrian Pearce’s collection on “race relations” in the Portuguese empire since the 1500s is an important contribution to understanding comparatively the forms of racial prejudice and discrimination in Lusophone colonial history.⁹ However, the significance of twentieth-century racial thought

in the human sciences produced in the vast Portuguese-speaking world has not been systematically assessed. Moreover, the existing literature on race and science in Latin and Luso-Brazilian contexts has not yet examined in depth the assumptions of exceptionality that underlie Latin and Lusophone racial regimes—their characterization not only as “unique” but also, in some cases, as particularly “benign.”

“Race mixing” has been central to claims for telling a Latin and particularly a Lusophone-centered history of racial conceptions in contrast to Northern Hemisphere racial formations. *Luso-tropicalismo* since the 1950s has argued for the specificity of race mixing in Portuguese-speaking countries, with broad political implications in post-World War II decolonization processes in Africa and in other parts of the Southern Hemisphere. But as several chapters in this book demonstrate, Freyre’s views of race mixing and sexual intimacy were hardly “consensual”: they could be rejected, criticized, ignored, or at best tolerated with difficulty in some Portuguese (and even Brazilian) intellectual and political circles. Whether or not miscegenation was flagged, the extolling of the Portuguese colonies as “nonracist” was a recurrent trope in the defense of Portuguese colonialism, gaining momentum after World War II as Portugal faced growing international pressure to decolonize. Even so, assertions of the unique benignity of Portuguese colonizers, revealed in their lack of racial discrimination and an innate psycho-ethnic capacity to integrate distinct races and peoples into one single national community, might sound implausibly hollow and self-serving. Detractors found much to criticize. Thus, in the 1960s, the British historian Charles R. Boxer convincingly documented the many deceptions and obfuscations of Luso-tropical rhetoric, in work that proved profoundly influential in later rebuttals of colonial ideologies.¹⁰ In this context, informal comparison of race relations and labor exploitation in Portugal’s colonies vis-à-vis other former empires (such as the British) became more common, feeding lively international debates.¹¹ And yet, political claims to a uniquely Portuguese way of dealing with “race” through integration and mixing were still voiced. Many politicians, academics, social scientists, and intellectuals—sometimes in reference to Freyre—evoked either racial miscegenation per se, or the absence of racial prejudice more generally, as a trait of national character.¹²

Focusing on scientific imaginaries, *Luso-tropicalism and Its Discontents* explores specifically the making, as well as the unmaking, of *Luso-tropicalismo* and other variants of “racial exceptionalism” across Brazil, Portugal, and Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa and Asia during the twentieth century. In the past two decades, a series of important historical studies have explored the intellectual and political origins of Freyre’s Luso-tropicalism, as well as its postcolonial impact on the conceptualization of nation, colonialism, popular culture, and social sciences in both Brazil and Portugal.¹³ The critique of the

ideological fallacies of Luso-tropicalism has also become well established in Lusophone academia since the early 2000s.¹⁴ However, most of this critical scholarship on Luso-tropicalism remains obscure to English readers.¹⁵ Furthermore, these studies (especially in the Brazilian context) often reveal a double tendency to concentrate on singular nation-based approaches and on circumscribed intellectual biography.

In the early twenty-first century, the broad, comparative, and critical reassessment of Luso-tropicalism is not just academically timely but also politically relevant. It is, after all, the specter that continues to haunt contemporary debates on *lusofonia* and to suborn discussions of the legacies of colonial racism in Portugal.¹⁶ Recent implementation of multiculturalist public policies concerning race and racial disparities in Brazil stem from the perceived after-effects of Freyre's thought, and these policies have repercussions well beyond Brazil's borders, including some African countries.¹⁷

Picturing and Reading Freyre

The book begins with chapters written by Jerry Dávila and Cláudia Castelo, which vividly trace Freyre's trajectory, followed by Lorenzo Macagno's fascinating study of the parallel career path of the African missionary and Pan-Africanist intellectual Kamba Simango. Dávila and Castelo take us from the early days of Freyre's life, including his birth and privileged intellectual formation in Northeast Region of Brazil, one of the poorest areas in the country, through his later peregrinations, when he was present in major centers of knowledge production in the United States and Europe. These two initial chapters help to explain how the Brazilian intellectual's work became so popular and compelling in the Lusophone world during the second half of the twentieth century. Dávila and Castelo offer analyses through which Freyre is revealed as a character deeply embedded in, and marked by, the historical, social, cultural, and political contexts that he experienced. At the same time, they unveil the figure of a social scientist constantly worried about building and cultivating his identity as a public intellectual. The chapters show Freyre's supposed debt to the anthropology of the American Franz Boas at Columbia University; the personal ties and inclinations that led him to approach and be appropriated by the repressive Salazar regime, which dominated political life in Portugal for decades during the second half of the twentieth century; and, not least, the polyphony of voices, concordant and discordant, in the expression of his ideas. Macagno's chapter sets Freyre's self-mythologized intellectual trajectory in perspective through comparison with that of the more obscure Mozambique-born Indigenous ethnographer and activist Simango, for some time also Boas's de facto collaborator.

Dávila asks how we might weigh Freyre's influence. "One way is to subtract him," he writes, "to consider the ways in which race relations and their interpretation in Brazil in the 1930s and since then would be different in the absence of his work." But as Dávila shows, "subtracting" Freyre is a difficult exercise because of the ubiquity of his personality and work, not only in the Brazilian national context but in the Lusophone world more generally. The attempt at "subtraction" can be understood as a strategy to counterbalance, or even to deconstruct, the mystique built around the persona and work of the Pernambuco sociologist—much of it fueled by him, according to Dávila. Themes that Dávila explores, which up until the present had been sparsely investigated in the extensive literature about Freyre's personality and career, include "the careful ways in which Freyre constructed an identity as a public intellectual: how he imbued that role with moral and scientific authority, and how he used that role to delegitimize the voices of Brazilians of African descent and subjects in Portuguese colonies who spoke out and resisted against the political, social, and cultural values systems to which they were subordinated."

Castelo's text, like Dávila's, offers us a window into Freyre's work and its sociopolitical implications in the Lusophone world. Essentially comparative, the chapter creates a dialogue between various perspectives regarding the Brazilian sociologist's ideas about miscegenation. In order to do so, Castelo explores the writings of intellectuals and politicians from different Portuguese-speaking countries including Portugal, Cape Verde, Angola, Mozambique, and Goa. Specifically, she addresses the debates prompted by Freyre's ideas about race and miscegenation during two periods: the 1930s through the early 1940s, and 1950 to 1960. As she puts it, during the first period, "Portuguese imperial policy was anchored in white racial superiority, and anti-miscegenation was the predominant position among physical anthropologists." After the war, though, the "Portuguese dictatorship (*Estado Novo*) was confronted with the anticolonial contestation and independence movements." Castelo reveals the varied reception of Freyre's miscegenation ideas across Portugal and its remnant empire, with responses ranging from "applause" to "rejection." Significantly, intellectuals and politicians in Portugal before World War II felt little pressure to justify the empire or decolonize, so they could afford to ignore Freyre's assertion of their racial beneficence and special tolerance, while in the 1950s, pressed to rationalize distant territorial claims, they often took up Lusotropicalism as the rhetorical basis for "Portuguese pluricontinental national unity."

Macagno's fine-grained intellectual biography of Simango displaces and disperses Freyrean Lusotropicalism, emphasizing instead the hidden role of African agency and voices in the intellectual and political fabric of the twentieth-century Portuguese colonial world. The later trajectory of Simango, born in the Portuguese colony of Mozambique in 1890, was utterly cosmopol-

itan. His travels soon exceeded the limits of the Lusophone world, connecting African American social movements and American social science with missionary work in Mozambique and non-Portuguese African colonies. Protestant missionaries sent Simango in his youth to study at Columbia University in New York City. There, he met Boas with whom he collaborated in ethnographical works on Africa, especially on his own Vandau culture. Impressed by his skills, Boas saw Simango as more than an informant; he expected him to become, upon his return to Mozambique, what we now might call a “native ethnographer,” who would produce work of independent scientific worth. In the United States, Simango also became involved in the Pan-Africanist movement, a commitment that persisted on his return as a missionary to Africa. Macagno’s focus on Simango—who was contemporary to Freyre at Columbia—throws critical light on Freyre’s claimed connection to Boas, which was often more imagined than real. While Freyre was celebrating Boas as mentor of emerging *Luso-tropicalismo*, Boas was in fact investing his time in creating bonds not with the Brazilian but with a promising Indigenous intellectual who endorsed W. E. B. Du Bois’s visions and the Pan-Africanist critique of Portuguese colonialism.

Imagining a Mixed-Race Nation

With a focus on Brazil as a “racial laboratory,” the chapters by Robert Wegner and Vanderlei Sebastião de Souza, Marcos Chor Maio, and Rosanna Dent and Ricardo Ventura Santos reveal the eventual disintegration of those visions of Brazilian national exceptionalism that once coalesced as *mestiçagem*, anti-racism, and racial democracy. These concepts and practices are considered within the sciences of eugenics, physical anthropology, cultural anthropology, and human population genetics. Read together, the chapters encompass the period from about 1920 to 1970, addressing complex and interconnected circulations (of knowledge, expertise, intervention projects, etc.) surrounding the issues of race relations constructed in Freyre’s work. In principle, the focus is on the Brazilian national context, but the authors repeatedly emphasize that we cannot lose sight of international scenarios. In this sense, the multiple notions of Brazil as a “racial laboratory,” as demonstrated by the three chapters, came saturated with framings and expectations from elsewhere, haunted by other places and other racial regimes. This is particularly evident following World War II, when the Brazilian socio-racial experience, once encapsulated in Freyre’s earlier work, might serve as a monitory projection onto the rest of the world.

In their contribution, Wegner and Souza consider conditions for the production of knowledge surrounding the issues of race and miscegenation present in Brazilian scientific fields during the first decades of the twentieth century.

The 1990s witnessed the emergence of the critical history of eugenics in Latin America between the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Wegner and Souza argue that Freyre's work has strongly shaped the historical understanding of eugenics in Brazilian social thought. According to them, "The immediate success of [*Casa-grande & senzala*], with its scientific underpinnings, may have had the effect, in hindsight, of making the intellectual circles immediately before its publication appear predominantly neo-Lamarckian, a view that recent studies have tended to moderate." As shown in their chapter, debates about race and eugenics in Brazil during the early twentieth century prove far more complex. The perspectives that prevailed in various intellectual and political circuits were more commonly aligned with Mendelian principles—more rigid than the presumed Lamarckian intellectual matrix—and thus supporting "negative eugenics." Wegner and Souza investigate a heterogeneous and often conflicting group of Brazilian theorists of anthropology, medicine, and genetics. They map the surprisingly difficult and complex Brazilian conceptual terrain from which *Casa-grande & senzala* emerged in the 1930s.

Taking us into the late 1940s and the 1950s, Maio examines the influence of Freyre and his work on UNESCO-sponsored race relations projects in Brazil. These studies were a crucial part of the anti-racist agenda the agency adopted after World War II. Indeed, Freyre's scholarship was one reason why UNESCO selected Brazil as a research site, hoping to find support for his views that race relations were more "benign" there. The project involved a transatlantic network of social scientists from the United States, France, and Brazil. Maio addresses the role Freyre played in the expansion of the UNESCO project in Brazil beyond the original planned research sites, resulting in the inclusion of Recife, in his home state of Pernambuco. There he could exert significant influence over the study led by the Brazilian anthropologist René Ribeiro. Additionally, Maio explains Brazilian and foreign scholars' growing criticism of Freyre's theories—reproval he tried to counter using the UNESCO research findings. Well before the 1960s, when Freyre's Luso-tropicalism came under ever more intense criticism, many scholars had questioned his views on race relations in Brazil.

In the third chapter of this part, Dent and Santos analyze an influential monograph on the genetics of human populations, published in 1967 by the Brazilian geneticists Francisco M. Salzano and Newton Freire-Maia. The English version appeared in 1970 as *Problems in Human Biology: A Study of Brazilian Populations*. Dent and Santos inquire into the dialogues in which geneticists engaged with social scientists, especially as they touch on race relations and racism in Brazil. Of particular interest is the lack of *explicit* reference to Freyre—who was perhaps nonetheless present in his absence, for the geneticists do cite frequently authors such as Florestan Fernandes, Octavio Ianni, and Fernando Henrique Cardoso, sociologists who issued decisive critiques

of Freyre's interpretations of race relations in Brazil. This chapter also explores how geneticists situated Brazil as a research site on the international stage. As Salzano and Freire-Maia wrote, an "aspect which makes Brazilian populations an excellent field of research for the geneticist, the anthropologist, and the sociologist is the interracial relations which are different from those prevailing in many other countries."¹⁸ Probing the notion of a "racial laboratory," Dent and Santos suggest that *Populações brasileiras* can be read as a defense of the specificity of Brazil, even as it refuses to enlist, or retain in any explicit way, Freyre's Luso-tropicalism. According to Dent and Santos, "echoing both Freyre's early work and his subsequent *Luso-tropicalismo*, the geneticists set Brazilian bodies and genes apart from other populations due to historical, environmental, and cultural factors, particularly *mestiçagem* (race mixing), promoting Brazil as a specific site of cognition."

The Colonial Sciences of Race

Subsequent chapters by Ricardo Roque, Samuël Coghe, and Ana Carolina Vimieiro-Gomes move beyond Freyre's emphasis on miscegenation to explore the racializing of Indigenous "primitives" within Brazil, Portugal, and the vast Portuguese colonial world. This part considers the Portuguese program of "colonial anthropology," which the physical anthropologist António Mendes Correia designed in the 1930s as a form of Lusophone racial and colonial exceptionalism in parallel to Freyre's theories. Developed and sponsored by the imperial state in the postwar years, the metropolitan visions of Portuguese colonial anthropology led to several colonial field studies, the so-called anthropological missions. In this context, these chapters examine the theories and practices of Portuguese exceptionalism accompanying the racialization of the Indigenous inhabitants of "Portuguese Timor" and the "Bushmen" (Khoisan) in Angola. Vimieiro-Gomes supplements this analysis with critical study of the creation of "biotypes" of national and colonial populations more widely. Central to the chapters is a concern with identifying intercolonial and transnational connections, with tracing the dispersive frameworks within which Lusophone racial conceptions were articulated and contested—beyond the metropole-colony nexus, beyond even self-declared claims to the "Portugueseness" of such conceptions. Coghe's contribution shows the significance of non-Lusophone south-south transits in Portuguese colonial visions of the Angolan Bushmen, particularly in relation to German Namibia and South Africa. In contrast, in Vimieiro-Gomes's chapter, similar modes of comparison and tracing of connections bring to light differences and fractures, as that revealed in Mendes Correia's and the Portuguese anthropologists' divergent approaches to Brazilian biotypology.

Roque's chapter charts the intellectual context of Mendes Correia's singular racial mind-set, paying close attention to his obsession with populations of the Portuguese colony of Timor-Leste. Addressing particularly the work of Mendes Correia and his role in the Timor Anthropological Mission from 1930 to 1960, Roque investigates the repositioning of the East Timorese—and of colonial “natives” or *indigenas* more broadly—as “patriotic primitives.” While Freyre toured the Portuguese world to confirm and promote his belief in the uniqueness of Portuguese race mixing and colonization, Mendes Correia was visiting the colony of Timor-Leste. Unlike Freyre, Mendes Correia was highly skeptical of the benefits of miscegenation. Instead, he insisted on a kind of Portuguese national-colonial exceptionalism grounded on a combination of racialized visions of difference and spiritualized notions of affect. As Roque argues, “racial theories that circumvented miscegenation and emphasized biological difference were articulated in conjunction with ideas of spiritual unity and ‘cross-racial’ affect between Portuguese and Indigenous.” Hence, this chapter demonstrates—along with Castelo's—that Freyrean celebration of interracial sexual contact was far from being the only way of imagining Portuguese national and imperial distinctiveness. In contrast, nationalist and Christian notions of interracial *spiritual* fusion—again, a unique product of Portuguese colonization—pervaded certain scientific circles concerned with the study of supposed biological “primitives.” A similar conjunction between race and affect, difference and communion, appeared to structure the wider racial program of the colonial anthropological missions in the postwar years, including those launched in Portuguese Africa.

Tracing a wide chronological arch, from the late nineteenth century to the end of the empire in 1974, Coghe's chapter follows the changing racial conceptions and colonial policies regarding the “Bushmen” of Angola. The author draws out the historical nexus between administrative policies and anthropological understandings, a kind of coevolution of racial conceptions and colonial governance. By adopting a comparative and transcolonial approach, Coghe proposes a critique of the apparent distinctiveness of Portuguese ideas about Bushmen. Rather than deriving from intellectual translations between metropole and colony, or among Portuguese-speaking scholars, the making of the Bushmen—as the racialized object of anthropological reasoning and administrative intervention—was shaped by debates outside Lusophone circuits. In particular, Coghe shows how anthropological stereotypes and colonial policies concerning the Bushmen as a “dying race” at the turn of the century resembled similar postulates and programs in the British, French, and German empires. These characterizations tracked especially closely those prevailing in German Southwest Africa (Namibia) and in South Africa. After World War II, Coghe reveals, scientific and colonial administrative notions of Bushmen as doomed to extinction gave way to representations that emphasized their “capacity of cultural and socioeconomic adaptation,” as far

more malleable figures. Accordingly, these peoples were to become subject to demographic, physical anthropological, and nutritional considerations, among which the recommendations of the medical doctor and anthropologist António de Almeida stood out. Leader of the Angola Anthropobiological Mission, Almeida dedicated himself to the study of the Bushmen and over time developed a complex racial typological approach that questioned their relations with Bantu-speaking peoples while recognizing their biological and sociocultural plasticity and adaptation. The latter notion was key to administrative policies regarding the Bushmen in the same period, when active policies of “Bantuization” became relevant in the colonial governance of Bushmen. Throughout this period, Portuguese racial conceptions remained subordinate to pragmatic adoptions from the neighboring non-Lusophone colonies and dominions. “For Portuguese scholars and administrators,” Coghe concludes, “it was much easier and more intuitive to borrow and/or adapt concepts and practices from their Germanophone and/or Anglophone (colonial) neighbors trying to manage very similar populations.”

Intellectual exchange and cross-reactivity are also themes of Vimieiro-Gomes’s chapter. We now shift focus from southern Africa to the Luso-Brazilian Atlantic. Vimieiro-Gomes here proposes an exercise in historical comparison between the ways in which scholars in Brazil and Portugal adapted and appropriated the tradition of racial “biotypology”—created in continental Europe—according to distinct theoretical and political agenda. Particular Lusophone variants of biotypology emerged within the authoritarian regimes in different countries. At the same time, Portuguese and Brazilian anthropologists, including Mendes Correia, were aware of the independent developments across the Atlantic. In Brazil, the concern with nation building—visible in preoccupations with the “problem” of racial heterogeneity—was expressed in a strong and strict application of Italian methods and models and in the search of “body normality.” In Portugal, mostly at the University of Porto under Mendes Correia’s directorship, concerns with heterogeneity and race mixing were secondary, and a more methodologically diverse form of biotypology, subsidiary to an anthropobiology of colonial populations, emerged. In the context of “anthropobiology,” the issue of the “constitution” of individuals was seen as but another possible method, a complementary pathway, to address the problem of biological and racial characterization—as promoting racial classification, which prevailed in some Portuguese circles, even as Freyrean Luso-tropicalism gained ideological importance in the 1950s.

Portugueseness in the Tropics

To comprehend Lusophone racial conceptions in the twentieth century, it is necessary to consider how “Portugueseness” was fashioned, and sometimes

discarded, as a mode of identity among migrant and settler communities. Freyre's fantasies of the uniqueness of the Portuguese-speaking world conjured up mixed-race communities, maybe gradually whitening, inhabiting the territories of offshoot nations and remnant empire, shaped by centuries of overseas expansion and colonization. The chapters in the final part question these assumptions and disrupt the colonial geography that underlies the Luso-tropical valorization of race mixing. They thus expand the scope of comparative analysis to reflect on the making and unmaking of racial exceptionalism beyond the imagination of empire. Cristiana Bastos and Pamila Gupta offer a critique of Freyre's theory of Luso-tropical exceptionalism through intensive studies of the multiple practices of Portuguese identity formation among diasporic communities. Both chapters consider the complex patterns of human mobility that generated vernacular perceptions of racial whiteness, within and beyond the borders of the Portuguese empire: Goans in British Zanzibar, in Gupta's chapter; and Portuguese migrant laborers in New England and Hawai'i, in Bastos's analysis. Critical to the chapters is a concern with how Lusophone communities are racialized by others (including social scientists and physical anthropologists), as well as how these communities racialize (or deracialize) themselves.

Bastos compares "racialized lives and racist theorizations" in three distinct formations in the twentieth century: the physical anthropological studies of the Goan medical doctor and anthropologist Alberto Germano da Silva Correia on Portuguese Madeiran settlers, so-called *eurafrikanos* or *lusodescendentes*, in Angola in the 1920s; the white American sociologist Donald Taft's work on the Portuguese migrants in industrial New England and the heated reactions to his work by members of the same Portuguese communities; and finally, a case study of Portuguese in the plantation economy of Hawai'i and the complexities surrounding the history of their racialized and deracialized (self-)definitions. Bastos's starting point is a critique of Luso-tropicalism and its legacies in contemporary Portugal. Thus, she describes prevailing myths of the exceptionally benign and nonracist nature of Portuguese colonization—a trope that has again gained wide significance in the Portuguese public sphere, serving to obscure past and present racisms. Instead of regarding positive valorization of race mixing as *the* essential trait of Portuguese racialization, Bastos argues, one must heed historical and contemporary "practices and theorization in Portuguese-speaking contexts that go in opposite directions." In particular, she urges us to consider the obsession with whiteness professed by both racist scholars and Portuguese settler communities—the compulsion with the manifold social, cultural, and biological indices and categories of whiteness. The three case studies provide strong examples of the overarching and abiding significance of whiteness in diasporic communities. Correia's studies sought to bypass, or ignore, the problem of miscegenation in order to

secure and celebrate the whiteness of Madeiran settlers in Angola. Countering Taft's negative and degrading view of Portuguese racial character, the Portuguese migrant communities in New England asserted their racial purity and superiority. In Hawai'i—where Portuguese migrants (against the Freyrean grain) apparently preferred to marry among themselves—a rapid process of social, cultural, and racial differentiation of the Portuguese settlers from other plantation workers took place, conferring on them a whiter racial identity. Never in these three cases, Bastos concludes, “were the tropes of Luso-tropicalism ever evoked as distinctly Portuguese traits.”

In the closing chapter, Gupta, describing practices of self-representation and identity making among the Goan diaspora in Zanzibar, explains the failure of Luso-tropical racial rhetoric to take hold on diasporic communities. She contrasts the inherently essentialist views of Portuguese identity proposed in Luso-tropicalism with the heterogeneous ways in which Goans abroad perceive and articulate their own Goan Portugueseness. Moreover, the cosmopolitan world in which Goans circulated, Gupta shows, hardly coincided with the boundaries of Portugal's former empire or the so-called Lusophone world; instead, an “intercolonial world” connected different national and imperial geographies. Gupta's points are grounded on her ethnographic studies of the uses and meaning of photography among the Goans in Zanzibar. By following the history of a Goan-owned studio, she is able to trace how, through photographic image and practice, people manufacture their own historical sense of Portugueseness and Goan identity. Using the metaphor of stitching, Gupta argues that, in Zanzibar, rather than a quality prescribed by some external and abstract Luso-tropical theory, “the category of ‘Goan’ was always relational . . . and was very much connected to the ability to harness Portugueseness (and Roman Catholicism) as signifiers of their community's civility and modernity.” Portugueseness was stitched as an adornment, Gupta suggests, such that “race” was often a loose and absent marker. The self-perception of Goanness as a cultural embodiment of Europeanness, associated with certain civilizing behaviors and religious beliefs inherited from Portuguese Roman Catholic pasts, was crucial in marking and differentiating “Goans” in an African setting.

Conclusion

Taken together, these chapters should cause us to rethink what we believe about “race mixing” or “human hybridity”—not simply in Brazil and the Portuguese-speaking world but also wherever population variability and difference are perceived to matter socially, economically, and politically. Conventionally, Freyre has been extolled for describing exceptionally mixed and congenial social relations, derived from the Portuguese colonial heritage of

tolerance and sympathy, and tending toward a racial democracy. But as the contributions to this collection demonstrate, this Luso-tropicalism was not limited to Brazil, Portugal, and the Portuguese Empire; indeed, it was not even particularly prevalent in Brazil, Portugal, and the Portuguese Empire, though it could often serve in these places as convenient rhetoric for purposes of self-aggrandizement and amour propre. We have shown that there was little “exceptional” about Brazilian and Portuguese racial thought in this period, for the preoccupation of nations and empire with race mixing and harmonization was commonplace, even if multifarious: everyone across the planet seemed intrigued by interracial sex, engrossed by prospects of blending and amalgamation, though rarely did such concerns fit as well with national self-fashioning as in Brazil. These chapters challenge us to question further what race mixing and human hybridity might mean: evidently, the concept of somatic mixedness had different connotations depending on the time, the place, and the political exigencies. They illuminate the useful pluripotentiality and constitutive ambiguity of concepts of race mixing, the relations of these polysemous thought styles to biological and genetic investigation, their contested and controversial political and social implications, and their occasional function as hopeful tropes for whiteness or whitening. Freyre’s preoccupation with race mixing clearly did not conjure up racial democracy in Brazil, but it did at least represent the heterogeneous population as modern, thus making persons visible and amenable to the state and global capitalism in unanticipated, and often contested, ways. It was no accident that, for Freyre, race mixing took place originally on the colonial plantation. Luso-tropicalism provided a productive and lasting idiom in which imperial and national forms of governmentality could—and can still—be articulated in Portuguese-speaking countries.

We have pieced together here a mosaic of Luso-tropical knowledge and practice in the twentieth century. As William James observed, “it is as if the pieces cling together by their edges, the transitions experienced between them forming their cement. . . . Life is in the transitions as much as in the terms connected.”¹⁹ One might therefore reimagine the history of racial thought, not as concentrated in Western Europe or North America, or even in Brazil or South Africa, but rather as a series of “edge effects” scattered around the world, in this case the Lusophone world.²⁰ Thus, we hope to contribute critically to the global ecology of racial knowledge.

WARWICK ANDERSON is the Janet Dora Hine Professor of Politics, Governance, and Ethics in the Department of History and the Charles Perkins Centre at the University of Sydney. From 2018 to 2019 he was the Gough Whitlam and Malcolm Fraser Chair of Australian Studies at Harvard University. He has written extensively on histories of colonial science, medicine, and racial thought.

His books include *The Cultivation of Whiteness* (Melbourne University Press, 2002; Duke University Press, 2006); *Colonial Pathologies* (Duke University Press, 2006); and *The Collectors of Lost Souls* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008). Among his edited collections are (with Richard Keller and Deborah Jenson) *Unconscious Dominions* (Duke University Press, 2011); (with Miranda Johnson and Barbara Brookes) *Pacific Futures* (University of Hawaii Press, 2018); and a special issue (with Ricardo Roque) of the *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* (vo. 49, no. 3, 2018) on comparative racialization in the region.

RICARDO ROQUE is Research Fellow at the Institute of Social Sciences (ICS) in the University of Lisbon (Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa), and Honorary Associate in the Department of History at the University of Sydney. He works in the history and anthropology of colonialism, human sciences, and cross-cultural contact in the Portuguese-speaking world, from 1800 to the twentieth century. He has published widely on the history of racial science and the anthropology of colonialism in Timor-Leste, and on the theory and ethnography of colonial archives and museum collections. He is the author of *Headhunting and Colonialism* (Palgrave, 2010) and the coeditor of *Engaging Colonial Knowledge* (Palgrave, 2012). At the ICS, he coordinates the research group Empires, Colonialism and Post-colonial Societies.

RICARDO VENTURA SANTOS is an anthropologist affiliated with the Fundação Oswaldo Cruz (Oswaldo Cruz Foundation) in Rio de Janeiro and Professor in the Department of Anthropology at the Brazilian National Museum. He received his PhD in anthropology from Indiana University, Bloomington, in 1991. He has been a visiting scholar in MIT's Program on Science, Technology, and Society (1998–1999) and at the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science (2012–2013). He is one of the authors of *The Xavante in Transition* (University of Michigan Press, 2002) and the coeditor of (with Sahra Gibbon and Monica Sans) *Racial Identities, Genetic Ancestry, and Health in South America* (Palgrave, 2011); (with Susan Lindee) *The Biological Anthropology of Living Human Populations: World Histories, National Styles, and International Networks* (special issue of the journal *Current Anthropology*, vol. 53, no. S5, 2012); and (with Peter Wade, Carlos López Beltrán, and Eduardo Restrepo) *Mestizo Genomics* (Duke University Press, 2014). He recently received a Wellcome Trust Senior Investigator Award in Humanities and Social Science (2017–2021).

Notes

1. Gilberto Freyre, *Casa-grande & senzala: Formação da família brasileira sob o regime de economia patriarcal* (Rio de Janeiro, 1933); Gilberto Freyre, *O mundo que o português criou: Aspectos das relações sociais e de cultura do Brasil com Portugal e as colônias portuguesas* (Rio de Janeiro, 1933); Gilberto Freyre, *O luso e o trópico* (Lisbon, 1960).

- See also Dorothy Ross, "Historical Consciousness in Nineteenth-Century America," *American Historical Review* 89, no. 4 (1984): 909–28; Carl Degler, *Neither Black nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States* (New York, 1971).
2. Dain Borges, "'Puffy, Ugly, Slothful, and Inert': Degeneration in Brazilian Social Thought, 1880–1940," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 25, no. 2 (1993): 235–56; Jeffrey D. Needell, "Identity, Race, Gender, and Modernity in the Origins of Gilberto Freyre's *Oeuvre*," *American Historical Review* 100, no. 1 (1995): 51–77.
 3. Warwick Anderson, "Racial Conceptions in the Global South," *Isis* 105, no. 4 (2014): 782–92.
 4. Ian Tyrrell, "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History," *American Historical Review* 96, no. 4 (1991): 1038; Laurence Veysey, "The Autonomy of American History Reconsidered," *American Quarterly* 31, no. 4 (1979): 455–77; and George M. Fredrickson, "From Exceptionalism to Variability: Recent Developments in Cross-National and Comparative History," *Journal of American History* 82, no. 2 (1995): 587–604.
 5. Michael Kammen, "The Problem of American Exceptionalism: A Reconsideration," *American Quarterly* 45, no. 1 (1993): 33.
 6. Sigmund Freud, *Civilisation and Its Discontents*, trans. Joan Rivière (London, 1973), originally published as *Unbehagen in der Kultur* (Vienna, 1930).
 7. Lilia Schwarcz, *The Spectacle of the Races: Scientists, Institutions, and the Race Question in Brazil, 1870–1930* (New York, 1999); Antonio Sérgio Guimarães, *Racismo e anti-racismo no Brasil* (São Paulo, 2005); Patricia Ferraz de Matos, *The Colours of Empire: Racialized Representations during Portuguese Colonialism* (Oxford, 2013); Ricardo Roque, *Antropologia e império: Fonseca Cardoso e a expedição à Índia em 1895* (Lisbon, 2001); Ricardo Roque, *Headhunting and Colonialism: Anthropology and the Circulation of Human Skulls in the Portuguese Empire, 1870–1930* (London, 2010); Omar Ribeiro Thomaz, *Ecos do Atlântico Sul: Representações sobre o Terceiro Império Português* (Rio de Janeiro, 2002); Marcos Chor Maio and Ricardo Ventura Santos, eds., *Raça, ciência e sociedade* (Rio de Janeiro, 1996); Marcos Chor Maio and Ricardo Ventura Santos, eds., *Raça como questão: História, ciência e identidades no Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro, 2010); Sahn Gibbon, Ricardo Ventura Santos, and Mónica Sans, eds., *Racial Identities, Genetic Ancestry, and Health in South America Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, and Uruguay* (New York, 2011); Vanderlei Sebastião de Souza and Ricardo Ventura Santos, ed., "Corpos, medidas e nação," special issue, *Boletim Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi—Ciências Humanas* 7, no. 3 (2012); Richard Cleminson, *Catholicism, Race and Science: Eugenics in Portugal, 1900–1950* (Budapest, 2014).
 8. See Nancy Stepan, *The Hour of Eugenics: Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America* (Ithaca, NY, 1991); for Latin America, see Peter Wade, Carlos López Beltrán, Eduardo Restrepo, and Ricardo Ventura Santos, eds., *Mestizo Genomics: Race Mixture, Nation, and Science in Latin America* (Durham, NC, 2014); Peter Wade, Vivette García Deister, Michael Kent, María Fernanda Olarte Sierra, and Adriana Díaz del Castillo Hernández, "Nation and the Absent Presence of Race in Latin American Genomics," *Current Anthropology* 55, no. 5 (2014): 497–522; for Latin eugenics, see Marius Turda and Aaron Gillette, *Latin Eugenics in Comparative Perspective* (London, 2014); Gilberto Hochman, Nisia Trindade Lima, and Marcos Chor Maio, "The Path of Eugenics in Brazil: Dilemmas of Miscegenation," in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*, ed. Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine (New York, 2010), 493–510; Ana Carolina Vimieiro-Gomes, Robert Wegner, and Vanderlei Souza, eds., "Eugenia latina em contexto transnacional," special issue, *História, Ciências Saúde—Manguinhos* 23, no. 1 (2016).

9. Francisco Bethencourt and Adrian Pearce, eds., *Racism and Ethnic Relations in the Portuguese-Speaking World* (Oxford, 2012).
10. Charles R. Boxer, *Race Relations in the Portuguese Colonial Empire, 1415–1825* (Oxford, 1963). See also Alberto Luiz Schneider, “Charles Boxer (contra Gilberto Freyre): Raça e racismo no Império Português ou a erudição histórica contra o regime salazarista,” *Estudos Históricos* 26, no. 52 (2013): 253–73.
11. See Marvin Harris, “Portugal’s Contribution to the Underdevelopment of Africa and Brazil,” in *Protest and Resistance in Angola and Brazil: Comparative Studies*, ed. Ronald H. Chilcote (Berkeley, CA, 1972), 209–23; Gerald J. Bender, *Angola under the Portuguese: The Myth and the Reality* (Berkeley, CA, 1978); Diogo Ramada Curto, “The Debate on Race Relations in the Portuguese Empire and Charles R. Boxer’s Position,” *E-Journal of Portuguese History* 11, no. 1 (2013): 1–42; Miguel Bandeira Jerónimo and António Costa Pinto, “A Modernizing Empire? Politics, Culture, and Economy in Portuguese Late Colonialism,” in *The Ends of European Colonial Empire: Cases and Comparisons*, ed. Miguel Bandeira Jerónimo and António Costa Pinto (London, 2015), 51–80.
12. For an overview in English, see Cláudia Castelo, “Luso-tropicalism and Portuguese Late Colonialism,” *Buala*, 28 May 2015, <http://www.buala.org/en/to-read/luso-tropicalism-and-portuguese-late-colonialism>.
13. E.g., Ricardo Benzaquen de Araújo, *Guerra e paz: Casa-grande & senzala e a obra de Gilberto Freyre nos anos 30* (São Paulo, 1993); Cláudia Castelo, *O modo português de estar no mundo: O luso-tropicalismo e a ideologia colonial portuguesa (1933–1961)* (Porto, 1998); Marcos Cardão, *Fado tropical: O luso-tropicalismo na cultura de massas (1960–1974)* (Lisbon, 2014); Marcos Cardão, “Allegories of Exceptionalism: Luso-tropicalism in Mass Culture (1960–74),” *Portuguese Journal of Social Science* 14, no. 3 (2016): 257–73; Joshua Lund and Malcolm McNee, eds., *Gilberto Freyre e os estudos latinoamericanos* (Pittsburgh, 2006); Alberto Luiz Schneider, “Iberismo e luso-tropicalismo na obra de Gilberto Freyre,” *Revista de Historiografia* 10 (2012): 75–93; Maria Lucia Pallares-Burke, *Gilberto Freyre: Um vitoriano nos trópicos* (São Paulo, 2005).
14. Cristiana Bastos, Bela Feldman-Bianco, and Miguel Vale de Almeida, eds., *Trânsitos coloniais: Diálogos críticos luso-brasileiros* (Lisbon, 2002); Peter Fry, *A persistência da raça: Ensaios antropológicos sobre o Brasil e a África austral* (Rio de Janeiro, 2005); Cláudia Castelo and Marcos Cardão, eds., *Gilberto Freyre: Novas leituras, do outro lado do Atlântico* (São Paulo, 2015).
15. E.g., Peter Burke and Maria Lucia Pallares-Burke, *Gilberto Freyre: Social Theory in the Tropics* (Oxford, 2008).
16. On the resilience of Luso-tropicalism, cf. Jorge Vala, Diniz Lopes, and Marcus Lima, “Black Immigrants in Portugal: Luso-tropicalism and Prejudice,” *Journal of Social Issues* 64, no. 2 (2008): 287–302; Margarida Calafate Ribeiro, “Between Europe and the Atlantic: The Melancholy Paths of Lusotropicalism,” in *New Dangerous Liaisons: Discourses on Europe and Love in the Last Century*, ed. Luisa Passerini, Liliana Ellena, and Alexander C. T. Geppert (Oxford, 2010), 215–32; Adriano de Freixo, “Ecos do luso-tropicalismo: A presença do pensamento de Gilberto Freyre no discurso da lusofonia,” *Textos e Debates* 27, no. 2 (2015): 471–84.
17. Jerry Dávila, *Diploma of Whiteness: Race and Social Policy in Brazil, 1917–1945* (Durham, NC, 2003); Jerry Dávila, *Hotel Trópico: Brazil and the Challenge of African Decolonization, 1950–1980* (Durham, NC, 2010).
18. Francisco M. Salzano and Newton Freire-Maia, *Problems in Human Biology: A Study of Brazilian Populations* (Detroit, 1970), 178.

19. William James, *Essays in Radical Empiricism* (New York, 1912), 41, 87.
20. Warwick Anderson, "Edge Effects in Science and Medicine," *Western Humanities Review* 69, no. 3 (2015): 373–84.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Warwick. "Edge Effects in Science and Medicine." *Western Humanities Review* 69, no. 3 (2015): 373–84.
- . "Racial Conceptions in the Global South." *Isis* 105, no. 4 (2014): 782–92.
- Araújo, Ricardo Benzaquen de. *Guerra e paz: Casa-grande & senzala e a obra de Gilberto Freyre nos anos 30*. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1993.
- Bastos, Cristiana, Bela Feldman-Bianco, and Miguel Vale de Almeida, eds. *Trânsitos coloniais: Diálogos críticos luso-brasileiros*. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 2002.
- Bender, Gerald J. *Angola under the Portuguese: The Myth and the Reality*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
- Bethencourt, Francisco, and Adrian Pearce, eds. *Racism and Ethnic Relations in the Portuguese-Speaking World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Borges, Dain. "Puffy, Ugly, Slothful, and Inert": Degeneration in Brazilian Social Thought, 1880–1940." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 25, no. 2 (1993): 235–56.
- Boxer, Charles R. *Race Relations in the Portuguese Colonial Empire, 1415–1825*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Burke, Peter, and Maria Lucia Pallares-Burke. *Gilberto Freyre: Social Theory in the Tropics*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2008.
- Cardão, Marcos. "Allegories of Exceptionalism: Lusotropicalism in Mass Culture (1960–74)." *Portuguese Journal of Social Science* 14, no. 3 (2016): 257–73.
- . *Fado tropical: O luso-tropicalismo na cultura de massas (1960–1974)*. Lisbon: Edições Unipop, 2014.
- Castelo, Cláudia. "'Luso-tropicalism' and Portuguese Late Colonialism." *Buala*, 28 May 2015. <http://www.buala.org/en/to-read/luso-tropicalism-and-portuguese-late-colonialism>.
- . *O modo português de estar no mundo: O luso-tropicalismo e a ideologia colonial portuguesa (1933–1961)*. Porto: Afrontamento, 1998.
- Castelo, Cláudia, and Marcos Cardão, eds. *Gilberto Freyre: Novas leituras, do outro lado do Atlântico*. São Paulo: Edusp, 2015.
- Cleminson, Richard. *Catholicism, Race and Science: Eugenics in Portugal, 1900–1950*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2014.
- Curto, Diogo Ramada. "The Debate on Race Relations in the Portuguese Empire and Charles R. Boxer's Position." *E-Journal of Portuguese History* 11, no. 1 (2013): 1–42.
- Dávila, Jerry. *Diploma of Whiteness: Race and Social Policy in Brazil, 1917–1945*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.
- . *Hotel Trópico: Brazil and the Challenge of African Decolonization, 1950–1980*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Degler, Carl. *Neither Black nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States*. New York: Macmillan, 1971.
- Fredrickson, George M. "From Exceptionalism to Variability: Recent Developments in Cross-National and Comparative History." *Journal of American History* 82, no. 2 (1995): 587–604.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Civilisation and Its Discontents*. Translated by Joan Rivière. London: Hogarth Press, 1973. Originally published as *Unbehagen in der Kultur* (Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1930).

- Freixo, Adriano de. "Ecos do luso-tropicalismo: A presença do pensamento de Gilberto Freyre no discurso da lusofonia." *Textos e Debates* 27, no. 2 (2015): 471–84.
- Freyre, Gilberto. *Casa-grande & senzala: Formação da família brasileira sob o regimen de economia patriarcal*. Rio de Janeiro: Maia & Schmidt, 1933.
- . *O luso e o trópico*. Lisbon: Comissão Executiva do V Centenário da Morte do Infante D. Henrique, 1960.
- . *O mundo que o português criou: Aspectos das relações sociais e de cultura do Brasil com Portugal e as colônias portuguesas*. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1940.
- Fry, Peter. *A persistência da raça: Ensaios antropológicos sobre o Brasil e a África austral*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2005.
- Gibbon, Saira, Ricardo Ventura Santos, and Mónica Sans, eds. *Racial Identities, Genetic Ancestry, and Health in South America Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, and Uruguay*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Guimarães, Antonio Sérgio. *Racismo e anti-racismo no Brasil*. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2005.
- Harris, Marvin. "Portugal's Contribution to the Underdevelopment of Africa and Brazil." In *Protest and Resistance in Angola and Brazil: Comparative Studies*, edited by Ronald H. Chilcote, 209–23. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- Hochman, Gilberto, Nisia Trindade Lima, and Marcos Chor Maio. "The Path of Eugenics in Brazil: Dilemmas of Miscegenation." In *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*, edited by Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine, 493–510. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- James, William. *Essays in Radical Empiricism*. New York: Longman, Green & Co., 1912.
- Jerónimo, Miguel Bandeira, and António Costa Pinto. "A Modernizing Empire? Politics, Culture, and Economy in Portuguese Late Colonialism." In *The Ends of European Colonial Empires: Cases and Comparisons*, edited by Miguel Bandeira Jerónimo and António Costa Pinto, 51–80. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Kammen, Michael. "The Problem of American Exceptionalism: A Reconsideration." *American Quarterly* 45, no. 1 (1993): 1–43.
- Lund, Joshua, and Malcolm McNee, eds. *Gilberto Freyre e os estudos latinoamericanos*. Pittsburgh, PA: International Institute of Latin American Literature, University of Pittsburgh, 2006.
- Maio, Marcos Chor, and Ricardo Ventura Santos, eds. *Raça como questão: História, ciência e identidades no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Fiocruz, 2010.
- , eds. *Raça, ciência e sociedade*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Fiocruz / CCBB, 1996.
- Matos, Patricia Ferraz de. *The Colours of Empire: Racialized Representations during Portuguese Colonialism*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2013.
- Needell, Jeffrey D. "Identity, Race, Gender, and Modernity in the Origins of Gilberto Freyre's Oeuvre." *American Historical Review* 100, no. 1 (1995): 51–77.
- Pallares-Burke, Maria Lucia. *Gilberto Freyre: Um vitoriano nos trópicos*. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2005.
- Ribeiro, Margarida Calafate. "Between Europe and the Atlantic: The Melancholy Paths of Lusotropicalism." In *New Dangerous Liaisons: Discourses on Europe and Love in the Last Century*, edited by Luisa Passerini, Liliana Ellena, and Alexander C. T. Geppert, 215–32. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2010.
- Roque, Ricardo. *Antropologia e império: Fonseca Cardoso e a expedição à Índia em 1895*. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 2001.
- . *Headhunting and Colonialism: Anthropology and the Circulation of Human Skulls in the Portuguese Empire, 1870–1930*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Ross, Dorothy. "Historical Consciousness in Nineteenth-Century America." *American Historical Review* 89, no. 4 (1984): 909–28.

- Salzano, Francisco M., and Newton Freire-Maia. *Problems in Human Biology: A Study of Brazilian Populations*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1970.
- Schneider, Alberto Luiz. "Charles Boxer (contra Gilberto Freyre): Raça e racismo no Império Português ou a erudição histórica contra o regime salazarista." *Estudos Históricos* 26, no. 52 (2013): 253–73.
- . "Iberismo e luso-tropicalismo na obra de Gilberto Freyre." *Revista de Historiografia* 10 (2012): 75–93.
- Schwarz, Lilia. *The Spectacle of the Races: Scientists, Institutions, and the Race Question in Brazil, 1870–1930*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1999.
- Souza, Vanderlei Sebastião de, and Ricardo Ventura Santos, eds. "Corpos, medidas e nação." Special issue, *Boletim Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi—Ciências Humanas* 7, no. 3 (2012): 639–43.
- Stepan, Nancy. *The Hour of Eugenics: Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Thomaz, Omar Ribeiro. *Ecossistemas do Atlântico Sul: Representações sobre o Terceiro Império Português*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 2002.
- Turda, Marius, and Aaron Gillette. *Latin Eugenics in Comparative Perspective*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.
- Tyrrell, Ian. "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History." *American Historical Review* 96, no. 4 (1991): 1031–55.
- Vala, Jorge, Diniz Lopes, and Marcus Lima. "Black Immigrants in Portugal: Luso-tropicalism and Prejudice." *Journal of Social Issues* 64, no. 2 (2008): 287–302.
- Veysey, Laurence. "The Autonomy of American History Reconsidered." *American Quarterly* 31, no. 4 (1979): 455–77.
- Vimieiro-Gomes, Ana Carolina, Robert Wegner, and Vanderlei Souza, eds. "Eugenia latina em contexto transnacional." Special issue, *História, Ciências Saúde—Manguinhos* 23, no. S1 (2016).
- Wade, Peter, Carlos López Beltrán, Eduardo Restrepo, and Ricardo Ventura Santos, eds. *Mestizo Genomics: Race Mixture, Nation, and Science in Latin America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014.
- Wade, Peter, Vivette García Deister, Michael Kent, María Fernanda Olarte Sierra, and Adriana Díaz del Castillo Hernández. "Nation and the Absent Presence of Race in Latin American Genomics." *Current Anthropology* 55, no. 5 (2014): 497–522.