

COMPARING IBERIAN (SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE) AND ENGLISH COLONIES FROM INSTITUTION OF MASS AFRICAN SLAVERY UNTIL ABOLITION OF SLAVERY (IN 19TH CENTURY)

I. WITH REGARD TO SYSTEMS OF RACIAL OR PHENOTYPIC CLASSIFICATION

IBERIAN	ENGLISH
Differences between groups is matter of degree; not sharp boundaries [Afro-Brazilian movements are challenging this]	Sharp, rigid boundaries between groups ("Black" "Indigenous/Native American" "White")
No laws against intermarriage	Laws against intermarriage and social/residential mixing
Large number of classifications	Small number of racial groups
Classifications based largely (but not completely) on skin color/shade/ other phenotypic characteristics.	Classifications based on assumption of basic biological difference and superiority/inferiority
Skin color words did not define distinct social groups, but were seen as characteristics of individuals	Skin color terms were taken to define distinct social groups ("races")
Highest value placed on whiteness and lightness. Light always preferred to dark, even among darker-skinned persons. [NOTE: Whereas racism, including skin-color preference, has been challenged in the U.S. as part of anti-racism efforts, the same is not true in Latin America, where the preference for whiteness is very strong, not entirely acknowledged, and so is difficult to challenge]	Highest value placed on whiteness. Although tendency to always value lightness over darkness, racial classification is more important than pure skin shade; so dark-skinned "white" person is always "higher" than light-skinned "black" person. But, in my estimation, skin color preference within US is much weaker than in Brazil and probably in most of Latin America.
Color terminology applied partially on basis of wealth or class-related considerations. So dark-skinned person with money is referred to with lighter skin color term than same-skin-color person without money	Racial terminology based on combination of ancestral and phenotypic characteristics, but <i>not</i> socio-economic ones.
As result of above, socio-economic status becomes, in a sense, "colorized". ("money whitens")	"Racial" factors seen as entirely distinct from socio-economic factors. Wealthy free black is still black; poor white is still white.
Phenotypically based classifications not seen as distinctive social groups; not seen as having distinct mental and psychological characteristics	Implication that each "racial" group possessed distinctive, unchangeable, and heritable characteristics
Skin color <i>not</i> taken to be sign of inner mental and psychological characteristics of mind and temperament. None, few or undeveloped stereotypes associated with skin color.	Skin color taken to be sign of inner mental and psychological characteristics. Elaborate stereotypes associated with each racial group.
Recognition of persons of mixed ancestry. In later period, mixedness ("mestizo" and "mulatto") become part of national self-image, in many Ibero-American countries	No recognition of persons of mixed ancestry; they are assigned to single race (i.e. black or Native American): the "one drop" rule. Census 2000, Obama, other recent developments have begun to change this
"Racial" (i.e. ancestral or phenotypic) groups not segregated. Segregation not seen as necessary or appropriate.	Social segregation of racial groups seen as appropriate, and officially sanctioned.