

DRAFT

**RACE, NATION AND IDENTIFICATION:
ARTICULATING PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL DIFFERENCE**

Ruth Simms Hamilton
Professor of Sociology and Urban Studies
Director, African Diaspora Research Project

Vera Lucia Benedito
Department of Sociology and Urban Affairs Programs
Research Assistant, African Diaspora Research Project

Lorein Powell-Benard
Department of Sociology
Research Assistant, African Diaspora Research Project

Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan, USA

CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS AFRO-ASIATICOS
BIBLIOTECA

For presentation at "International Seminar on Racism and Race Relations in the Countries of the African Diaspora", Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, April 5-10, 1992, and "International Africana Studies Seminar," Rio de Janeiro and Salvador, Bahia, April 10-15, 1992.

I. SOME CONCEPTUAL CONCERNS

This paper is part of a longer one focusing on understanding how racial inequality is constructed and transformed over time and space. We believe that racial inequality is one of several spheres of social activity contributing to identity formation and definitions of the peopleness or peoplehood of African descent populations in the Americas.

We will discuss one example: the relationship of race to the formation of national identity and national development in selected countries in the Americas, and within the context of regional and world transformations. Two countries are of particular interest, Costa Rica and Brazil. The time frame encompasses the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Of particular interest are how issues of racism and racial inequality are used as articulating principles in various stages in the development of nations; and how they contribute to the process of consolidating nations and states and the formation of national identities. The examples used in this discussion will draw from the actual content of national immigration policies and the ideological discourses directly related to them.

In another paper we argue about the implications and relationships of race and immigration to the changing identities of African diaspora peoples. Because of time limitations, we shall not focus on these particulars. Instead we shall use part of our findings to raise some conceptual concerns about how we study and approach the subject and reality of race and racial inequality.

One of the assumptions that we make is that race becomes real only in its social constructions to be understood within the context of time and place. Moreover, race and racial inequality, like other structures of inequality such as immigrant status, gender and class, consists of patterns, strategies, ideas, the range of behavioral actions that are cumulative in nature. It is interesting, however, that as scholars and lay persons we treat or engage race and racial inequality as part of a reality that will go away with a leap of faith and will. As we have experienced and observed, in Central and South America especially, there exists an insidious socially defined racial milieu which earlier Charles Wagley has nicely discussed in his paper "On the Concept of Social Race." [1] Yet the pervasive approach is to simply ignore race and racial inequality as a legitimate area of scholarship and/or policy analysis. One can simply proclaim "racial democracy" and the problem will take care of itself. Moreover, everyone knows that the United States is the only place that is truly racist or that has a racial problem. We know that because North Americans talk about it all the time and they act on it some of the time.

We exist within an "intellectual field of action" especially in Latin America where class has always taken precedent over race as a meaningful approach to the analysis of social inequality.

We urge a strategic approach to the study and analysis of race and racial inequality as phenomena so intricately tied to the institutions and meanings we characterize as the modern world. In the process of developing economic, political and social systems from the fifteenth century onward, race and racial inequality have been central in the development of civilization as we know it nationally, regionally and transnationally. We suggest that race and racial

inequality are as intrinsic to our thinking and everyday life, actions and behavior, as God, family and taxes. We do not necessary posit priorities or a "which came first mentality," but rather to come to grips with a phenomena that has been with us for centuries and will continue well into the twenty first century.

Our view is to place race and racial inequality, in its various social constructions, at a strategic location in the "general history" of the modern world and its various historically specific sub-localities. [2] We must ask a range of focused questions about the interplays and correlations, about the relationships of race to other phenomena, other structures of inequality, and the vast terrain of individual and institutional life.

The work of historians, many in this room, have been important in writing and in interpreting the long span of colonialism and slavery. We are more intelligently aware of how people and societies were molded during this time, destroyed, produced and reproduced. All of this adds to our cumulative knowledge about the preconditions for future changes and transformations. That which occurred, is occurring, or will occur can be imagined as layers of actions thoughts and behaviors. To paraphrase Stuart Hall, Race, as part of the culture of a complex world is never a homogeneous structure. It is layered, reflecting different interests and experiences, containing different traces from the past, as well as emergent elements in the present. [3] It is never fully formed, always in a state of formation and transformation.

Can we begin an approach to this subject matter by conceptualizing "Race as an Archeological Process?" The point is that over time and space, we must study the

intersections of events and ideas related to the ongoing formation of race and racial inequality. In much the same way as Foucault calls for an "archaeology of knowledge" regarding language and discursive phenomena, perhaps we can begin to think about clues to approach our subject matter. It brings me back to our original argument that race and racial inequality reflect patterns of relations over time and space, not to be interpreted as fixed in time or as a linear series of events. Rather the idea is to focus on sequences and successions of interactions, conflicts, contradictions, discontinuities, similarities, ruptures, gaps, and sudden redistributions, or major and abrupt disruptions such as the kind of events that occur during major world crises, or changes at local or regional levels. We must pay more attention to the temporal vectors of the processes that impact race relations and vice versa. [4] Race relations and conflicts are social constructions which as processes are necessarily subject to transformation. How do the transformations occur and what are the differences that make the difference?

Are social hierarchies such as race, subject to particular incidences and shifts in particular ways and in many combinations of social actions, e.g. shifts in ideological discourse, behavioral practice, policy and legal frames of reference? Who participates, under what conditions, over what periods of time? How does it relate to the general as well as the specific? For example, if we are talking about events in Costa Rica and Brazil, as we do in this paper, how do they relate to larger changes that are going on? What happens internally and/or externally with respect to a people or to countries of people? How does all of this contribute to the social fabric or social milieu undergirding the social construction of people and nations? Definitions of the inclusive are directly related to exclusivity or the definition of the "Other."

These are some of the issues and concerns that we grapple with in our comparative research on African diaspora peoples. However, for the remainder of this discussion we shall focus on one aspect of how race articulates with other factors to define nationality. We focus on political-economic elites and cultural actors as a way of understanding the role of the state in articulating race with the social construction of national identity and nation. This emphasis reflects one small dimension of the cumulating intersecting layers of relationships so central to the understanding and development of an "Archeology of Race."

II. CONSOLIDATION OF THE NATION STATE

After the struggle for independence from the Spanish and Portuguese, a major concern of new republics was to consolidate the new nation state. This consolidation required definitions of the territorial aspect of national sovereignty by establishing clear and permanent national boundaries; an increase in the levels of economic production to allow self-sufficiency and growth; incorporating the nation into the international market system to attain a meaningful presence in an evolving world political-economic system; and attaining an optimal population base, quantitatively and qualitatively.

At another level, and one of our major concerns, was the necessity to create a sense of themselves as a different and substantively distinctive socio-cultural quality, e.g. Brazilianness or Costa Ricanness... The formation of a national identity would define and accord them recognition as discernible people. It also

implied relating and incorporating that socially constructed or invented identity into a transnational or global system of socially and culturally constructed differentiation and control. In Europe in the 19th and 20th centuries it was also a period leading up to national consolidations, major scientific and technological change and revolutions, emergence of new urban and commercial classes, increasing scale of capitalism and the emergence of imperialism exemplified by the partitioning and colonization of Africa and the spreading of its tentacles to Asia and the Middle East.

The Spanish and Portuguese criollos constituted the power elite and "Cultural Actors" [5] of these struggling American republics. Their identity with their Europeanness was very strong and it was important to incorporate this into their emerging national identity. Moreover, as former objects in a colonial system of power and domination they were still "underdeveloped" in their accumulation and production capacity but needing and wanting to be part of the global system of production and control. [6] Nationalistic elites in places such as Brazil and Costa Rica related to their metropole compatriots through the bonds of class and race. It was important to crystallize that identity within the emerging and consolidating nation state. [7] Yet there would be obvious contradictions and structural situations which made this process problematic.

III. PROBLEMATICS IN THE CONSOLIDATION THE NATION-STATE AND THE INVENTION OF NATIONALITY: BECOMING A WHITE NATION WITH A MAJORITY POPULATION OF COLOR

Costa Rica emerged from the colonial period composed predominantly of a newly produced people having formed throughout the period of Spanish domination over the territory. They were the Mestizos, admixtures of European and Indigenous peoples; the Pardos or Mulattoes, mixed offsprings of African and European peoples; and the Zambos, children procreated in the union of African and Indigenous parents. The population of Costa Rica by 1801, twenty years before independence, included around 58% Mestizos and no less than 17% who were descendants of the African peoples initially brought as slaves. The situation in Brazil was not too different except that Brazil had the largest number of African people than any place in the world except for Nigeria. This was the reality facing the dominant elite wanting and needing a stronger European identity to participate socially, politically and economically in the global system of European control and domination.

A. Expanding and Controlling Population Composition in a Changing Political Economy

In Brazil, the period from 1907 to 1912 was characterized by massive foreign investment in the country where a successful export-oriented economy, based primarily on coffee, rubber and other raw materials, had gained European and North American markets. [8] This period marked fuller incorporation of Brazil into the modern world economy with the development of means of transportation and

communication, especially the construction of railways, in the North and extreme South of the Country.

A not too dissimilar situation characterized Costa Rica. With the decline of the Atlantic cacao plantations in the early 1800s, landowners in the Central Valley were looking for other alternatives. A transition would be made to coffee production by the 1840s. This would become a problem, however, due to inadequate transportation facilities. In 1871 the Costa Rican government obtained loans from English and North American lenders, and hired the services of a company to build a port and a railroad that would be instrumental in its incorporation to the international trade system. The construction of the railroad was under contract with North Americans Minor Keith and Henry Meiggs who would later develop a monopoly vis-a-vis the United Fruit Company.

A major condition of this incorporation and expansion was the increasing need for lots of cheap labor. In Costa Rica the population base was inadequate thus the conditions were created for the migration and recruitment of a "stranger" or external labor force. The Costa Rican railroad construction necessitated the recruitment of non-native and non-white laborers (Blacks, Chinese and others) and ushered in the second major surge of the African diaspora in that country. African origin people, primarily from the Caribbean, moved and established themselves in Costa Rica - this time as free laborers. Numerically important, the West Indians started out in the 1870s as a temporary population made up basically of male, railroad construction laborers, often accompanied by their families, and who were established in Limon on the Atlantic coast of the country.

With investment capital pouring into Brazil the Labor shortage also became acute. Labor was recruited from all over the world. From 1810 to 1893 almost 3,000 Chinese workers came to Brazil to work on plantations of the South. From 1908 - 1941 more than 150,000 Japanese emigrated to Brazil. The period between 1924 and 1941 had the highest numbers entering. They established agricultural colonies on the jungle frontier and were subsidized by Japanese colonization societies. These societies used to purchase or contract tracts of uncleared land in the states of Parana, Mato Grosso, Para, Amazona and Sao Paulo. [9] The Japanese labor in particular represented two major advantages for the Brazilian national economy at that time: 1) they would supply the coffee producers with an abundant labor force, and 2) in exchange, Brazilian production would have a new outlet: the Far East Markets. [10]

Like other parts of the Americas, Brazil received enormous investments in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. They too, experienced the construction of railways in the North and extreme South financed by British and North American capital. The Madeira-Mamore Railway project was important to the production and exportation of rubber. For this project alone, over 21,000 workers were brought in between 1907 and 1912. They included Brazilian and foreign born workers from Spain, Portugal and Italy. It is interesting, however, that the peak year, 1910 saw numerous West Indians entering and constituting the largest single group of immigrant workers. Their total numbers were over 5,000.

There is a basic question here: How does one create an optimal size population to meet production needs, yet recruit primarily non-white labor, and at the same time move toward becoming a white society? This is even more challenging when

one starts out with a majority non-white population. What are the myths and realities of this situation?

IV. ADVANCING AND DEVELOPING STRUCTURAL AND IDEOLOGICAL MECHANISMS OF DIFFERENCE

A. Creating Whiteness Through the Imposition of Race on Population and Immigration Policy : The Role of the State

Recognizing the scarcity of labor to facilitate the development of its Agricultural industry, the Costa Rican government created the Junta Protectora de las Colonias to stimulate the migration and permanent settlement of European peoples. This was followed up in 1862 with a formally articulated law, the Ley de Bases y Colonizacion. Further, it authorized the Executive to establish recruiting agencies in the European countries and to invest up to 5,000 pesos per year in campaigns to stimulate and favor European migration to the country.

Various contractual recruiting agents made commitments to bring in Irish settlers. In 1888 the government issued an Executive Decree to finance transportation and establish families of several hundred Italians who entered the country as railroad construction laborers under contracts with the Company that built the railroad to the Atlantic port of Limon. However, these Italian laborers went on strike protesting the inhuman conditions of labor to which they were subjected and demanded their repatriation to Italy.

Duncan shows the ultimate extreme of Costa Rican color-consciousness, citing an 1893 contract in which the Costa Rican government authorized an agent to bring

Spanish colonists to Costa Rica, but specified that only people from the northern provinces of Spain would be acceptable.

In reality, the migrants that entered the country had to face the hostility of the natural environment and the backward social and economic conditions of the country from the moment that they stepped off the ships. In order to get to the isolated plots granted by the government, most would have to travel by foot or on mules backs for several days exposed to all kinds of hazards.

The fertile land and the democratic institutions of the country were not enough to attract large numbers of foreign migrants to Costa Rica as had occurred in North America and the El Plata (Argentina). [11] In Costa Rica the attempt to whiten the population by immigration of white Europeans and restricting the entry of Asians and Africans was not successful. The number of Europeans entering in relationship to the total population, between 1864 and 1927, could not make a demographic difference in population composition. (See Table 1)

Similar to Costa Rica, Brazil also expressed a strong preference for white European immigrants. Sao Paulo became the leading state in the elaboration of such programs with leadership coming from the Sociedade Promotora de Imigracao. From the 1880s until the 1930s more than three million immigrants came to Brazil, especially to Sao Paulo state which absorbed about 2,321,130 foreign workers. Of this total about 60% were originally from Italy. At the turn of the century, Northern Italians were ^{the} predominant. ^{flow} But toward the end of the 1930s Southern Italians became the predominant flow. Most of them were unskilled agricultural workers. [12] From the total immigrant population of 2,578,992 coming to Sao Paulo state from 1889 to 1934, about 1,151,354 came subsidized by the state

because of the scheme implemented by the Sociedade Promotora de Imigracao. In the first years of this century, working conditions in the coffee zones of Sao Paulo were not satisfactory. Denouncements came primarily from Italians whose complaints were reported by the international press and thus motivating the Italian government to restrict immigration of its citizens to the coffee region of Brazil. [13]

In the early stages of national development, the Brazilian and Costa Rican ^{elites} ~~states~~ were instrumental in facilitating European immigration to build a population like themselves and to expand the number of small farmers actively engaged in agricultural production. In neither case did this entry obliterate the large presence of the mestizo and African derived population bases. Thus the problem of whitening the population remained a major problem.

B. Restricting the Entry of Africans and Asians

Much of the debate in Brazil at the earlier period of nation building in the late 19th century focused on the acceptance of Chinese and Japanese labor although large scale Chinese immigration never occurred.

Given the large number of African peoples already in Brazil it might have been expected that more Africans would have come as free laborers. A couple of examples will help to clarify why this did not happen. In 1890, Decree 528 established the free entry of "healthy and able people to work" in the country, except for Africans and Asians who could be admitted only with the approval of the National Congress. [14] Two years later, in 1892, a new immigration law,

n.97 of October 5, was introduced guaranteeing the free entry of Chinese and Japanese workers. Only Africans coming from the Canary Islands were allowed entry. The restrictions against Africans would continue until 1907 when new immigration legislation decreed free entry of peoples from all over the world. [15] It should be noted that foreign companies in operation in Brazil at the time of the restrictions were allowed to recruit and repatriate workers from other places. This is how the West Indians entered.

Perhaps one of the most interesting dimensions of the restrictions placed on racial immigration to Brazil is reflected in state collusion, Brazil and the United States, against North American Black people. A recent study shows how North American and Brazilian authorities cooperated on matters related to emigration of African Americans to Brazil in the 1920s. [16] Since the international campaign to attract North American and European potential immigrants had far-reaching consequences, African-Americans from the United States readily answered the call of recruitment advertised in prominent African-American newspapers such as the Baltimore Afro-American, Crisis, and the Chicago Defender. [17] As the campaign promoted by the Brazilian government did not stipulate exclusion of any single group based on race, sex, or religion, African-Americans saw the opportunity to emigrate to a country where, in their opinion, a Black man could even become president without much concern by the white population. [18] Their expectation was to found a republic governed by people of color following the same imperialist steps as their white countrymen.

African-American colonization companies like the Brazilian American Colonization Syndicate (BACS) of Chicago were founded. [19] The success of the call of

African-American newspapers provoked reactions by white North American and Brazilian authorities not willing to accommodate black immigrants. [20]

In 1921, the federal government of Brazil issued Decree 4247 of January 6 Article 5 clearly stating that immigrant blacks were prohibited from entering Brazil. [21] Moreover, the governor of Mato Grosso state suspended a land concession to developers linked to a group of North Americans because the project included the recruitment of Black North American immigrants to the region. [22] The state of Bahia issued the law n. 1,729 in 1924, stressing that:

...The immigration service sought 'to promote the settlement of Brazilians and of acceptable foreigners of the white race, preferably agriculturists, on the unoccupied lands of the state'. [23]

As Meade and Pirio pointed out, from 1921 until the end of that decade, consular officials refused to grant permits to black North Americans to enter Brazil. [24] The same authors observe that:

The case was probably a delicate one for the Brazilians since they did not want to discourage white immigration, but wanted to prevent the entrance of blacks. Moreover, Brazil seems to have been unwilling to go public, at least internationally, with its policy of denying entrance to Blacks. [25]

The United States State Department was aware of the Brazilian policy of exclusion of Blacks:

...the Brazilian government ascertained that a syndicate had been formed in the United States to send American negroes to the states of Mato Grosso and Coyaz for colonization purposes...the government issued confidential instructions to its consuls in the United States to discourage American negroes from going to Brazil. [26]

Perhaps it is not surprising that Brazil did not want African descent immigrants. But what is instructive about this particular case is that the complicity of the U.S. demonstrates the earlier point that there is a common interest of the center of the periphery with the center of the center. There is a reinforcing linkage of the race-class bonding. Throughout the debate on racist immigration policy, the Brazilian state consulted with its great North American neighbors. Representatives were sent to Washington to consult on the "Chinese problem." [27] The constitution of 1934 incorporated the system of national quotas, based on the U.S. model. Article n. 121, section 6 stressed:

The entry of immigrants into the national territory will be subject to the restrictions necessary to guarantee the ethnic integration and the physical and legal capacity of the immigrant; the immigrant arrivals from any country cannot, however, exceed an annual rate of two percent of the total number of that nationality resident in Brazil during the preceding fifty years. [28]

In 1945 Brazil issued a new immigration law, n. 767 of September indicating:

...the necessity to preserve and develop, in the ethnic composition of the population, the more desirable characteristics of its European ancestry. [29]

In Costa Rica, the Black presence in Limon province was tolerated first to get the railroad built and later as a concession to the United Fruit Company. However, beginning with 1862 Ley de Bases y Colonias and reiterated in national legislation in 1891, 1892, 1893, 1904 and 1942, the immigration of people of the "African and Chinese races" (las razas africana y china) was prohibited. [30] The Banco Agricola in 1892, which was to promote agricultural development through

credit, also prohibited the settlement of "beggars, invalids, criminals, Asians and Negroes" (mendigos, invalidos, criminales, asiatico y negros). [31]

Although dispensing with the details, Costa Rica and indeed other countries in Latin America followed a model similar to Brazil. They placed restrictions on non-whites and encouraged whites. The policy was a conscious one, designed to change the color and composition of predominantly "colored nations." The state-colonial-church-commerce (SCCC) complex which conceived and fostered the politics of control and difference has been transformed. It is now the national commerce-state complex in collusion with the related complex in dominant centers.

C. Creating Nationalist Discourse Utilizing "race as the articulating principle"

One of the calamities that sway over the agricultural industry in Costa Rica, the main source of national wealth, is the scarcity of labor...To remedy this problem the Executive Power resorted first to Spain to seek workers, who because of racial and linguistic factors were ideal as compared to other European laborers. This attempt did not fulfill the expectations. It was then, that due to repeated and general instances, the government resolved to protect the Chinese migration, not withstanding the repugnance that this race causes. [32]

This quote is taken from an 1875 report written by the Costa Rican secretary of state, Joaquin Lizano. It went on to describe Chinese migrants as having educational vices, damaging to "our customs." Moreover, even though the Chinese are the best as laborers, they are inferior and cost more than national workers. In fact, during the period of the construction of the Limon-San Jose railroad most labor contracts had explicit clauses prohibiting the use of Chinese and Black

labor, except for the few instances in which special exceptions to the law allowed them to work temporarily in the country.

In a 1930 letter addressed to the Congress of Citizens and written by a former deputy to the Constitutional Assembly the significance of race in nationality construction is more obvious.

When the census of 1864 was carried out, Steber recorded only 26 individuals born in the islands of Puerto Rico, Jamaica, and Haiti, and only 4 from Africa... By the closure of the 1927 census, ... 19,136 Blacks were recorded... This is the most serious and transcendental imbalance of that ethnic characteristic in the population evidenced in the last fifty years... The banana industry is entirely responsible for this injection to the white majority and the mestizo population... Wherever it moves it drags a large inventory of maladies... Blacks are the shadow of the banana plant. The extraction of the "green gold" cannot do without these elements because of their language, their submissiveness and obedience,... and because of their natural lack of ethical ideals... We [the Costa Ricans] have gained international respect and sympathy based on our social and political order, and all of us know that such virtues are the consequence of our racial unity. It is logical then, to suppose that once the racial homogeneity of our population disappears, degraded by a high percentage of Blacks - which is perfectly possible if the United Fruit Company invades the southern and Pacific regions with its industry--the quintals of international esteem will decrease, and the only ones that will suffer the consequences will be us, the Costa Ricans... [33]

At one level the explosive, racially biased views advanced by the late nineteenth century political leadership make clear their agenda to achieve a national identity void of ethnic Africans and Asians. On the other hand, it is clear that great value is placed upon acceptance into the world European community: The more European we are as a people and as a nation, the greater our acceptability into their [Europe] dominant cultural, political and economic milieu. To attain this end, ideological unity becomes a priority. One possible way of achieving it is to use "race as the articulating principle." [34]

For these purposes, the political, economic and intellectual leadership of the countries might be conceptualized as a Racial-Political Class (RPC). Desiring to become hegemonic they nationalize themselves, using "race as the articulating principle," which manages to resonate with the widest range of population elements. [35] It is interesting that in the case of Costa Rica there was a real need to supplement the population quantitatively. But it was the qualitative population dimension that was at issue. Later when world market prices dropped during the depression of the 1930s, economic crisis and increasing unemployment for agricultural workers throughout Costa Rica unleashed widespread resentment against the "stranger" West Indians. Unemployed workers streamed into Limon province in search of work and bitterly resented the black labor force.

On July 1933, 543 whites in Limon signed a letter addressed to the National Assembly asking for a stop to black immigration:

We want to address ourselves especially to the black problem...in Limon province there exists a situation of privilege for this race which is manifestly inferior to the white race to which we belong. It is impossible to coexist with them because their bad customs don't permit it...they live in disgraceful promiscuity which puts in danger our families founded in accord with religious precepts and good Costa Rican customs.[36]

In 1934, the Costa Rican legislature passed a law to fix quotas favoring native Costa Rican laborers in the Atlantic zone and prohibiting employment of blacks in the new Pacific plantations. Companion legislation restricted West Indians from becoming naturalized citizens and restricted the "free entry into the country of people of the coloured strain." [37] It can be argued, therefore, that given the political and economic situations, the demographic facts and

population changes linked to race and immigration status, a window of opportunity emerged to create unity of the leaders and the led. Racist ideology became central to articulating discourses of difference and inequality.

In Brazil political elites and cultural actors were instrumental in providing leadership for the development of state policy. Their thoughts and actions provide important insights regarding the development of a racialized social order. Exemplary is the Sociedade Central de Imigracao founded in 1886. Their ideas were propagated through their newspaper, A Imigracao; and their members served as lobbyists for reform. Their ideal was to transform the Brazilian scenario into the image of the European scenario, whereby small farming would be carried out by European agricultural colonists. One scholar who studied the group contends that they saw Europe as the center, absorbed principles of Social Darwinism, and were directed by a mentality of an epoch where Europe was the center of attention, the standard and patterns that should be followed by the rest of the "civilized world." [38] As cultural actors, the members of the Sociedade were instrumental in affecting policy in Brazil, e.g., who should come into the country, what should the country be, and very important, what it should be like in terms of population composition and color. Through such relations and legal outcomes boundaries are constructed and the ground work is laid for the production and reproduction of difference, for the parameters of exclusion and inclusion, and for the construction of nationality and nationhood.

C. Creating and Advancing the Mythology of Whiteness

At independence, Costa Rica's population was 65,000, 84% of which resided in the Central Valley of the country. The last preceding census that included race was that of 1801, which showed that of a total population of 52,591, ⁵¹75% were racially mixed (mestizos), ^{1770 were} zambo and mulattoes), 16% were pure Indians and 9% were pure Spanish. Only 30 pure Blacks were recorded. [39] In the span of 100 years, from 1700 to 1801, the "racially pure" population had plummeted from 88% to 25%. As evidence that the trend of mestizaje would clearly continue, records show that between 1771 and 1829 only 6% of the children baptized in Costa Rica's principal city, Cartago, were white. [40] A fascinating phenomenon of the mid-19th century is that this racially mixed population, in census terms, becomes "white." This is substantiated by census figures from 1927, the first census since 1801 that included race. The definition of "White" in this census is "all inhabitants in which the proportion of white blood is very high." [41] According to the 1927 census the population distributions are as follows: White, 80.2%; Mestizo, 14.1%; Black, 4.1%; Indian, 0.9%; Mulatto, ^{ca}0.5%; Yellow, 0.1%; and other, 0.1%.

Today, Costa Rica projects itself in tourist literature in particular as the "Switzerland of the Caribbean," the white state of Central America. Much national identity and pride revolves around this view. Scholars who have carried out historical, geographical and anthropological studies on Costa Rica, point to the myth of the "whiteness" of its people and the racial attitudes of the Costa Rican state and citizenry.

Historical evidence, as well as modern anthropological studies, suggest that together with the rest of Central America and the adjacent regions of Colombia

and Venezuela, Costa Rica falls into the category of mestizo-America. [42] Traveling from coast to coast in Costa Rica one cannot help but agree with these observations. The people are not "phenotypically white." They are "socially white," because of the way race is defined and constructed.

The experience of a Costa Rican entertainer who visited the United States is instructive. The presence of "African biological remembrances" characterizing the persona of the performer would be obvious to most observers. When he visited the United States he was subjected to the everyday experiences of racism. The important point, however, is that he announced on TV, upon returning to Costa Rica from the United States, that he would not visit the U.S. again. Why? Because he was treated like a Black person. At best this example might point us in the direction of understanding how Costa Rica became white in less than a century without significant quantitative or qualitative population shifts. Although biological remembrances are strong, the entertainer believes he is white. Whether others, especially "whites," believe this is an empirical question, our recent field experiences in Costa Rica's Pacific Coastal provinces might provide a resounding "NO" to this problem.

An hypothetical question may be relevant in this context: In many Latin American countries African people were numerically dominant. Many were instrumental in creating the difference that made the difference by fighting in the wars of independence. At the onset of independence, if you were part of the Euro-political class what would be your strategy for incorporating this large group of people of color, particularly African descendants? Since the South African model was not used, one strategy might have been to down play the significance of race, and create a mythology of inclusion while practicing exclusion. Was the

idea to make it appear that everyone, through mestizaje, and moving in the direction of whitening can look forward to being included? As Harmannus Hoetink has pointed out, an ideology which places emphasis on the "whitening" of the population is unavoidable in societies where a racist ingredient in the mechanisms of social selection operates by definition. [43] He further argues that "...the vision of the future can be inclusion-oriented for the darker strata, even if their present self-perception is being influenced by the, ideologically speaking, as yet functioning principles of racist selection." Thus one can speculate that mythology and ideology achieved what the "demographic transition" could not. It allowed the powerful to create a white nationality using race as the "articulating principle," and their own dominance and power to relegate all other heritages to the category of reject, to be obliterated in the future. What cannot be ignored, however, and what requires further study is the issue of cultural negotiation which may make the transformation to whiteness not the total result of unidirectional cultural and political hegemony.

V. COMPLEXITIES OF RACISM AND RACIAL INEQUALITY: TOWARD AN ARCHEOLOGICAL PROCESS OF DISCOVERY

The discussion of racism and inequality in the formation of nationality and nations was advanced to illustrate the role of the state and that of the political and cultural elites in the process of creating difference. It served to illustrate how one sphere of actions, primarily in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, created additional layers of relations on top of those preceding it in the earlier colonial period. The politics of creating "Otherness", is a process of cumulative social behavior and actions over time and space. Racial inequality by definition implies power differentials with

implications for both ideological and structural dominance. We argue that race has been an "articulating principle" within and between nations over the vast span of the history of the modern world. It is ongoing, continuing, and cumulative. The examples we used represent a small segment of the relations to be unearthed, analyzed, and understood.

Racism and racial inequality are complex phenomena in the modern world and cannot be reduced to simplistic analyses or solutions. The discourse and institutional structures linked to the manifestations and systems of inequality have been molded over centuries forming complex webs of social relations. One task is to discern the ways that race and racism have been articulated with other arenas of social life and related spheres of inequality. One assumption undergirding this discussion is that racism and racial inequality, as practice and ideology, have been central to the formation and development of the social, political and economic parameters of contemporary world order. Moreover, the very process of creating nations, maintaining and incorporating them into a global political economy and accompanying system of social differentiation and domination, imposed enormous significance on racial differences. This process created the conditions for producing and reproducing distinctive peoples and inventing nationalities rooted in the politics of difference.

Borrowing from Michel Foucault it is argued that there is a need to understand and unearth an "Archaeology of Race."^[44] Over time layers of relations, rooted in socially constructed differences, cultures of domination and control are additive, intersecting and transforming social reality. It is necessary to unearth the ideological and structural forms of the system of transformations that constitute the changing substance and character of racial inequality. An

"Archaeology of Race" allows us to discern the complexity and cumulative nature of a phenomena so central to the operation, function and transformation of everyday life.

In constructing the nation state and in facilitating incorporation into the world system of social, political and economic relations, the racial factor constituted an important dimension. This can be used as a basis to take us back to the earlier argument that race and racial inequality were central to the formation of the modern world. We further argue that many of the obvious and more insidious aspects of racial identification and inequality today must be understood in its cumulative nature. As pointed out by Helge Hveem, systems of domination and inequality have a cumulative character. [45] That is, present relations and structures and any past or future ones, are the result of a process of accumulating control opportunities. [46] "The structure becomes a set of control layers, the more recent ones imposed on the past, but without abandoning subordinate layers." [47]

Footnotes and
Conclusion missing

TABLE 1

Population of Costa Rica and European Migration: 1864-1927

YEAR	TOTAL POPULATION	EUROPEAN MIGRANTS
1864	120,499	330
1833	182,073	1,261
1892	243,205	2,434
1927	471,524	5,820

Source: Chester Lloyd Jones²⁸