

**CITY OF FLESH**  
**URBANISM, COLONIALISM AND BODILY**  
**INTERVENTION IN COLONIAL LUANDA**

By  
Caio Simões de Araújo

*Submitted to*  
Central European University  
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of  
Arts

Supervisors:                      prof Andreas Dafinger  
   prof Prem Rajaram

Budapest, Hungary  
2012

## ABSTRACT

This thesis is a historical ethnography of colonial urbanism in the city of Luanda, capital of Angola, Portuguese colony in West Africa, in the last decades of the Empire (i.e., from the mid-1940s to mid-1970s). I argue that urbanism is a modern form of spatial intervention whose effects are not restricted to transformations in the built environment and material structures of the city. Rather, I will explore how urbanism is also articulated with culture, social relations, images of order, systems of meaning, fields of knowledge and, finally, bodies and bodily experiences. In this endeavor, I suggest colonial urbanism was deeply embedded on the biopower of colonialism, *tout court*. It performed, simultaneously, the colonization of space and the intervention over the colonial body. Moreover, I will re-situate urbanism in the historical trajectory of Portuguese colonial situation and its modalities of discourse on race, law, culture, and citizenship. In this regard, I look at particularly two constructs pervading the making of colonial rule in Angola: the *Luso-tropical* theory of cultural change and acculturation, in Anthropology, and the *Estatuto do Indigenato*, in Law. I claim these elements reveal a central contradiction in colonial urbanism: the competing projects of cultural integration and legal differentiation. I analyze how this contradiction is played in two moments of colonial urbanism; first, the segregation of indigenous populations in neighborhoods; second, with the rise of anti-colonial insurgency in the city, attempts to erase the race as a meaningful signifier of colonial difference through an idiom of class and projects of pacifying the *musseques* (slums). Urbanization as a historical teleology is dislodged and presented instead as a “spatial drama”, as an ongoing, unsolved, struggle over space.

## Contents

ABSTRACT .....	2
PROLOGUE.....	4
FIRST ACT: Spaces of Colonialism: re-assembling theories of spatiality, power, and bodies.....	12
SECOND ACT: Indigenous and Creoles: acculturation and citizenship in Portuguese colonialism.....	23
THIRD ACT: Reform and Containment: bifurcated urbanism and bodily intervention.....	33
FORTH ACT: Universal citizenship, Fractured space: disciplining urban multiculturalism .....	45
EPILOGUE: Urbanism, Persistence, Failure.....	57
REFERENCES .....	61

## PROLOGUE

### Colonialism, space, history

Every culture has its characteristics drama. [...]  
The stage on which this drama is enacted, with the  
most skilled actors and a full supporting company  
and specially designed scenery, is the city.  
(Lewis Mumford, *The Culture of Cities*)

Persistence [is] a striking aspect of change.  
(Victor Turner, *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors*)

In the late 1940s, the first comprehensive legislative project on the regulation of urban construction in the city of Luanda, established, in its Article 99, that “each house must have at least two bathrooms and two toilets, (...) being one bathroom and one toilet exclusively dedicated to indigenous servants, with no direct connection to the interior of the house”<sup>1</sup>. In a copy of the document found in the Historical Archive of the Portuguese Institute for Development Support (IPAD), some marks of manual annotation – as underlines, scratches and erasures – disturb the unchallenged authority of the law. Particularly, the reference to the physical separation of bodies in the basic organic function of excretion is erased, expressing the contested nature of spatialized segregation of white masters and black servants in the domestic space. Except for this anonymous over-writing of the text of law, no further explanation is provided as to why this particular rule was rejected. Some years later, in 1962, a radically different approach would be institutionalized in the words of Mário de Oliveira,

---

<sup>1</sup> General Regulation for Urban Construction in the city of Luanda (Regulamento Geral da construção urbana na cidade de Luanda). IPAD. Reference: IPAD/MU/DGOPC/DSUH/1898/02017.

Architect of the Portuguese Department of Urbanism and Housing (*Direcção dos Serviços de Urbanismo e Habitação*). In a statement that would be published, in Portuguese and English, and distributed as colonial propaganda, at home and abroad, Oliveira affirms that, in the Portuguese African territories, “the urban structure of social integration and conviviality (...) aims, primarily, to enhance collective life and avoid any ethnic discrimination” (Oliveira, 1962: 11). Here, the signifier of “race”, though dislodged, is residually integrated in the bodily fixation of culture that is the idiom of “ethnicity”. Co-presence, rather than separation in space, is advised.

These two diachronic statements raise the question of how an institutionalized structure of racial segregation is replaced by spatial, multicultural, conviviality. In this sense, they call for a closer examination of the cultural forces (and agents) underlying this displacement within “colonial urbanism” – here broadly defined – as a system of meaning, field of knowledge and structure of spatial intervention. Perhaps even more importantly, they put in evidence the contested place of the body as a central element, object, and image, in the colonial politics of space. This study explores the production of urban space under Portuguese colonialism in the city of Luanda, capital of Angola, West Africa, in the last decades of the Empire. Most of the studies on colonial Luanda tend to focus on urbanism and architecture in a strict sense, focusing their gaze on the effects of colonialism in the built environment (see: Fonte, 2007; Martins, 2000).

I am here opting for a different path of inquiry. I will be particularly interested in addressing urbanization as a both historical and spatial project whose impact is not restricted to the transformations on the built environment and material city. Rather, I will explore how

urbanism is also deeply articulated with culture, social relations, images of order, systems of meaning, fields of knowledge and, finally, bodies and bodily experiences. More specifically, I will re-situate urbanism in the historical trajectory of Portuguese colonial situation and its modalities of discourse on race, law, culture, and citizenship. In this endeavor, I suggest colonial urbanism was deeply embedded on the biopower of colonialism, *tout court*. It performed, simultaneously, the colonization of space and the intervention over the colonial body. Here, Luanda emerges as a city of flesh, in which urban intervention is not limited to opening avenues, erecting building, but also assigning particular meanings, functions and spaces to particular kinds of the body.

As the periodization of my object in time – and as past – insinuates, this study emerges in the intersection of History and Anthropology. This interdisciplinary cross-fertilization, I believe, must be operated in both methodological and epistemic terms. For Jean and John Comaroff (1992), the condition for a “historical anthropology”, then, is a “historicized anthropology”. This double-edged movement is not limited to the disclosure of the convergences and affinities between anthropological theories of cultural and biological evolution, on the one hand, and the narrativization of history in a chronological, linear, slope (Fabian, 2002), on the other. To historicize anthropology, furthermore, means that the notion of culture should be problematized, and seen not as a coherent system of meaning that is persistent in time, but instead as a field of symbolic struggle that unfolds historically. The question to be asked, at this point, is how these contesting meanings are naturalized and crystallized in and as cultural forms (Dirks, 1996). In this perspective, a historical anthropology challenges any realist formulation of history, as it does not intend to tell events

“the way they happened”, but to understand the ways in which symbolic and social processes are historically articulated. Or, put differently, to understand “how realities become real” (Comaroff and Comaroff, 1992: 20) or the “being or essence of things” is historically “ascribed” (Stoler, 2009: 4).

In methodological terms, a historical anthropology requires an ethnography of the archives – to use the Comaroffs (1992) term. It hardly needs saying, this means to challenge the epistemic authority of the official record, particularly in the institutional form of the colonial archive, as the sanctioned holder of social memory and historical truth<sup>2</sup>. Thus, an ethnographic approach to the historical record involves moving both within and beyond the limits of the colonial register. It requires drawing on both the documental sources and the diversity of texts – such as books or articles, newspapers, photographs, novels, public statistics, political summaries, to name just a few – which constitute the archive’s “surplus production” (Stoler, 2009). There is, in this sense, a miscellaneous complementarity between the documental referent and the lesser solid – though not lesser meaningful – network of knowledges and imaginaries aggregating what Mudimbe (1988) has called the “colonial library”. As to how to “interpret” this collected material, one should examine the traces of what Stoler has called “minor histories”, which signals “a differential political temper and a critical space [...] that in ‘major’ history might be otherwise displaced” (2009: 7).

This study is a historical anthropology of a colonial city. As such, it rises from the ambiguous interiors of both the colonial archives and library – in a theoretical and practical sense. I have collected extensive documentation on the myriad of institutions that now share

---

<sup>2</sup> As it is widely known, this point has already been insistently raised in Subaltern Historiography (see: Chakrabarty, 2000; Guha, 1983; Spivak, 1985, 1988, 2006).

the black boxes of Portuguese colonialism. Moreover, I have consulted the (post-)colonial library of the most important research institution of the Portuguese Empire. After this archival encounter, I had crafted my record – documents (public or secret), heterogeneous reports (on scientific missions, inspections, colonial policies), legal texts, propaganda, magazines, newspapers, letters, poems, novels, dissertations, statistics, master plans, architectural blueprints, photographs, and articles. These texts are the ethnographical data upon which my interpretative gaze is located. It is through their mediation I can, as a *bricoleur*, seal the fragments of the colonial city together.

I am, furthermore, articulating the colonial production of space in the urban form, the city, with the “naturalization” of the Empire as world-history (Guha, 2002, Spivak, 1985), as embodied in the projects of urbanization, modernization, and development, particularly in the last decades of the Portuguese Empire (i.e., the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s). Here, historical anthropology performs a critical incision – as it pluralizes historical experience, it debunks these narrative projects of universal(ized) history. If the Empire domesticated time, framed it into a linear trajectory from primitivism to modernity, it also de-activated space. As Carter (1987) puts it, these imperial histories must be challenged by strategies of re-activating, re-historicizing, space: what he calls “spatial history”. The critical problem to raise here, it seems to me, is how to re-assert the agency of space in historical anthropologies. And by space, it must be clarified, I mean not only landscape, cities or buildings, but also bodies.

Both Mumford (1958) and Banks (2011) have resorted to the image of the drama to describe urban processes. However, none of them have explored the full potentiality of this metaphor. I propose that Victor Turner’s notion of “social drama” might be insightful here.



By “social drama”, Turner (1974) indicates that social life is not a fixed structure, but a processual transformation. Obviously, social drama is eminently a temporal, not a spatial, metaphor. Yet, the radical historicity it introduces in the anthropological practice could be re-oriented to the historicization of space. Turner (1974) suggests that social interactions are “dramatized”, thus putting in evidence that “social world is a world in becoming, not a world in being” (1974: 24). If we just replace “world” for “space”, we have a valuable proposition so as to think in terms of “spatial dramas”. I believe “spatial dramas” would evidence precisely how space “comes into being in power and history” (Carter, 1987). More importantly, I consider that the metaphor of the “drama” reveals the historical, conflictual and the culturally mediated nature of space. Imperial histories are based on the “power of writing”, on the stability of the written text (Stoler, 2009). What Carter (1987) calls spatial history, I believe, is better achieved through the analysis of the how space emerges in the theaters of colonialism.

As a closer reading of Turner shows, conflicts are also dramatized in relation to processes such as “the incorporation of the Ndembu into the Zambian nation, the modern African world, the Third World and the whole world” (1974: 39). Allow me to ignore the reification of a Western history of escalating global penetration present here. Yet, this passage reveals the conflictive nature of these processes as experienced from a bounded social location (the Ndembu). Similarly, I consider that the notions of “drama” enables the re-tracing of social processes in time and space in a contingent, unstable, and heterogeneous assemblage, thus allowing me to displace the narrative centrality of universalized histories of capital (e.g., world-system theory) or the teleologies of modernity (i.e., urbanization and

development) that still inform most of historical practice. The focus on “drama”, finally, insinuates the “role” of the body (text) in its contradictory engagement with the social structure (context): both tragic and comic, in the script and in improvisation, in the stage and out of it, in rebellion and reproduction.

In the following pages, I will present the (hi)story of colonial urbanization as a spatial drama. This study will be organized in four acts. In the first act, I will explore my theoretical location in the intersection of the politics of space, postcolonial studies and Foucauldian sociology. I will be particularly interested in dis-locating the notion of biopower to the colonial encounter, thus clarifying how this move points to a specific understanding of the associations of anthropology, race, law, urbanism and, of course, the body. In the second act, I will put both Portuguese anthropology and colonial legal system in context. I will follow the historical career of two particular constructs: the so-called Luso-tropical approach in anthropology, and the *Indigenato* system in law. I will briefly explore how these elements relate to the emerging urbanization in Luanda. In the third act, I will elaborate on Portuguese colonial urbanism, particularly looking at the articulation of the contradictory projects of segregation and integration. In order to clarify the argument, I will interpret how this tension is played out in a particular urban structure – the Indigenous Neighborhoods. I am keen to evidence how urbanism intervened over the body through reform and containment. In the fourth act, I explore the transformations related with the rise of anti-colonial violence and securitization of the urban space. I will be mostly interested in understanding the operation of a creole urbanism, which, I argue, produces new configurations in terms of culture, race, and class. Finally, I will look at a political disposition that aims to integrate the *musseques*

(slums) into the city through a contradictory process of both criminalization and legal incorporation. In the end, this study is a journey – the metaphorical image of a body in movement in time and space is not coincidental here – through the interstices of colonial power, its modes of operation across socialized spaces and its inscription on bodies.

## FIRST ACT

### Spaces of Colonialism: re-assembling theories of spatiality, power, and bodies

Just as none of us is outside or beyond geography, none of us is completely free from the struggle over geography.

(Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism*).

When Paulo Dias de Novais landed in the West African coast in 1575, he held a piece of paper – the letter of donation (*carta de doação*) – that “authorized” him, in the name of the Portuguese crown, to take over the land. Now invested with the power of colonial writing and Law, Novais would be defined, as the official history goes, as governor and explorer of the kingdom of Angola – a Portuguese transliteration of the native term N’gola, meaning “ruler”. The Church of São Sebastião, real or imaginary symbol of the political attack based on the cosmological word of God, becomes the ground zero of the imperial history of a colonial city: São Paulo da Assunção de Loanda. But when Novais first put his feet down on the sands of the Island of Loanda, the *Axiluandas* – Ambundo “people of the sea” – already lived there, in a settlement organized around a fishing and monetary economy. Their land was, in fact, integrated in the Kingdom of Ndongo, and subjected to the Kingdom of Kongo. The Portuguese did not – could not – simply “conquer” the space, but had to make their way through a complex topography of power alliances and contesting polities. The coastal enclave, central to the European project of penetration, in our alternative history is de-centered to the margins of an intricate, in-land, political system.

This incident is revealing of the modes in which imperial history operates. The political distress of colonization is blurred as pre-colonial African politics is ignored, and the

conflictual nature of the colonizing gesture is subsumed to the heroic figure of the explorer. Space is ontologically given and politically available: inert and timeless object that is dragged into history through colonial intervention. But as the *Axiluandas* make it crudely visible, colonized space has never been an empty land. The critique of these imperial histories indicates, on the contrary, that the ideology of *terra nullius* is both the symbolic expression and the political possibility of universalized histories of capital and European engulfing imperialism. If my aim here is to historicize space and the peoples inhabiting it, it is necessary to examine how meanings are assigned, fixed, and contested: how space performs in the theaters of imperialism. In what follows, I will clarify both the grounds on which I base my analytical gaze, as well as the ways I aim to intervene in this ongoing debate.

*Colonialism, Space, Text: re-establishing the nexus*

Henri Lefebvre (1991) famously declared the produced, thus political, nature of social space. Far from being an a-political, natural or fixed category, social space is always embedded in political struggle, cultural systems and processes of hegemony formation. Naturally, Lefebvre (1991) was mainly concerned with the historical conditions of an increasingly global capitalism. Other authors interrogated the spatial transformations induced by capital, either as related to the “space-time compression” (Harvey, 1989), to “dependent urbanization” as result of uneven global development (Castells, 1977), or the entangled histories of urbanism, colonialism and the world-system (King, 1991). Even if these accounts had their role in clarifying the operations of capital in a global scale – and a symptomatic view of colonialism as a globalizing force is fundamental here –, a historical anthropology

cannot ignore the “epistemic violence” (Spivak, 1988) of these narratives. Particularly, the historical linearity and the passivity of the “other” – the “dependent” *urbe* or incorporated “periphery” – that is presumed cannot stand before the historical record (Cooper, 2005).

At this point, I believe, with Jacobs (1996), that Postcolonial Studies may shed some light on the struggles of history, space and social meaning evolving in the urban arenas of colonialism. Said’s path-breaking study on the discursive construction of the Orient is particularly relevant. Said (1995) described how imaginative geographies are central to imperial projects, as long as they articulate geographical knowledge and the textuality of power, thus naturalizing spaces as framed by colonial imaginaries. Said (1995) argues that the construction of the Orient as a region – as a “textual universe” – erases the heterogeneity and complexity of this space, rendering it colonizable. This “textuality” of space is, of course, not an esoteric one. On the contrary, it depends on a web of power relations, political dispositions, economic arrangements, and social codes (Jacobs, 1996) that render the text intelligible, authorized, “truthful”. Here, it must be clarified, Postcolonial scholars, and particularly Said, drawn on the work of Michel Foucault. Briefly put, Foucault (1977) has demonstrated how the emergence of modern power – in the State form and out of it – was grounded on the intimacy between forms of knowledge and technologies of government and surveillance.

Following Foucault, Mitchell closely examines the colonization of Egypt as a process of ordering and disciplining based on the ability of power to infiltrate in and re-arrange social relations, thus inscribing a “new conception of space” (1991: ix). Social life is “enframed”, i.e., segmented and organized in specific, and policed, spaces. As object of the colonizing

gesture, space – as much as individuals – can be “measured, re-assembled, multiplied, and controlled” (Mitchell, 1991: 48). Similarly, Rajaram (2006) describes how the boundaries, the form and the content of colonial space are drawn and redrawn in the junction of discipline and representation. This “spacing” process is often mediated by both discourses of normalization and by the abstract power of a metaphysical framework – an overwhelming grid – underlying the colonial projects of discipline and ordering (Rajaram, 2006). As I read them, these accounts point out that to reduce the colonial production of space to the modern technologies of spatial intervention – such as urbanism and planning – over a strictly defined territory, is to, surreptitiously, re-produce and reify the colonial doctrine of an empty and, thus, available land. Here, we are finally reminded that, as space has never been “empty”, the textualization of the colonies was always bound to map, document, fix and control this slippery and resistant space: the colonial body.

*The Ethno-politics of Colonialism: Urbanism, Anthropology and the Law*

Paul Rabinow (1989) has associated the birth of modern urbanism with the world of disciplines of power Foucault described as emerging in Europe in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. For Rabinow (1989), urbanism involved the framing of the city as an object of socio-technical intervention, the ordering a social *milieu*, and the creation of micro-spaces embedded in values of comfort, standard of life, centrality. More importantly, this new discipline was born from the combination of “the normalization of the population with a regularization of space” (Rabinow, 1989: 82). This proposition opens a path of inquiry into the dangerous liaisons I see between power, bodies and intervention on the urban space. Returning to the Foucault is

fundamental here. Foucault (1978) differences between the individual body as a machine, thus subject to reform, discipline, and control; and the body as a life form, inscribed in a population group to which a set of biological functions is ascribed: birth, maturation, death, and so on. In the junction of these “anatomy-politics of the human body” and the “bio-politics of the population” – which Foucault (1978) describes as the two expressions of biopower – the “subject” is insidiously infiltrated by the ramifying technologies of the modern State.

However engaging biopower as a striking aspect of modernity is, as I displace Foucault to colonial situations, certain limitations begin to erupt – the most evident of these being the marginality of race as a signifier of power. “Race” is not an individual quality of the body, nor it can be merely subsumed to the biology of the species (even if earlier anthropometry and eugenics were obviously disciplinary attempts in these directions). It is, moreover, not an “undisputed” category of governance and colonial regimentation, but a particularly contentious one. Race is the structuring element of the colonial state and the main element upon which multiple and insidious forms of colonial power intervene (Chatterjee, 1993; Steinmetz, 2007; Goh, 2008). Under these circumstances, Foucault’s notion of biopower requires relocation and refinement. In fact, as the historical examination of the colonizing process discloses, more than just transferring familiar frameworks and cultures from the metropolis, the disciplines of colonial society, more often than not, had to invent new categories through which to operate (Chatterjee, 1993; Cooper and Stoler, 1997). I believe that the colonial body demands a distinctive articulation of both discipline and representation (Rajaram, 2006) that holds together physicality, biology and culture.



In this study, I consider that the colonization of the body was fundamentally rooted in anthropology as the most evident disciplinary expression of what I will call ethno-politics. Here, I argue, along operations over the body as “machine” and the body as “species”, colonial power also – and perhaps in a much more entrenched form – intervened in the body as *ethnos*. By that I mean the body becomes the bio-social (both racial and cultural) unity in which the minimalist projects of colonization, modernization and development would be performed. That means colonial cognition needed to be re-organized from a metrics of race, embodied in anthropometry, to the idiom of “cultural traits”, upon which an emerging cultural anthropology was to be based. In this context, cultural anthropology operated a crucial transformation in the disciplinary methods of documenting colonial difference: race as a central signifier of a mostly biological expression is dislodged. However, it is re-introduced through a set of traits, elements, and phenomena – the colonial inventory of culture – that, when inscribed over the body, give it shape, solidity, and meaning: render it visible, legible, to the ethnographer’s gaze and pry it open to anthropological classification. Ethno-politics mediates the contradictions, similitudes, and translations between “racial ontologies” (Stoler, 2009) and assemblages of culture in the theaters of colonialism. My position here coincides with Stoler’s notion of “cultural racism” (1997: 203), through which she explains how visualized difference (color) is always in a contradictory relation of competition and complementarity with the invisible essences (of culture and morals)

It would certainly not be an overstatement to argue that Anthropology enjoyed a structural, nodal, centrality in the networks of power and knowledge that would hold the colonial State together. The ways in which ethnography structured colonial native policies

and the public administration of the colonies have already been the object of insightful studies (Mamdani, 1996; Steinmetz, 2007). However, the multiple contests and contaminations taking place in the interaction between the incipient disciplines of cultural anthropology and urbanism under colonial rule of law are still to be mapped. Here, of particular importance is Leslie Bank's (2011) work on the heterogeneous and ambivalent ties between ethnographies of the city and the Urbanism of the Apartheid. Bank (2011) documents how a particular anthropological account of rural exodus and urban settlement – the Mayer's ethnography of East London – was contradictorily and unwittingly entangled with ideologies of cultural fixity or acculturation, resistance or urban modernization, all of which resonated Apartheid's policies of segregation. Bank draws loosely on Rabinow (1989) and defines Apartheid's urbanism as “the desire to re-engineer urban social relations and subjectivities at the local level” (2011: 24) – the Foucauldian echoes are clear here. Although Bank's work is a valuable update of the “anthropology of urbanism” in South Africa, it does not address the structural nexus I identify between anthropology and urbanism as associated modalities of textualization of colonial space and bodies. Similarly, Popke has noticed that the colonizing effort in defining and controlling particular kinds of urban space has deeply relied on the law – as a territorialized representation of order – as a form of spatially fixing communities “around the symbolically boundaries of race” (2003: 255). I believe both Bank (2011) and Popke (2003) provides some clues on how Anthropology, Urbanism and Law are mutually implicated on the production of space, the disciplining of urban life, and the reform of differentially classified bodies (in racial or ethnic groups).

My study of urbanization in colonial Luanda demands a further articulation of these fields. At this point, I understand, with Said (1989), that the study of colonial disciplines must be based not only on the critical assessment of the theories produced, but also on the material ways in which information was gathered, organized into disciplines, and finally functionally re-oriented, or applied, to social realities. As I see it, this assumption means not only to situate anthropology, urbanism and the law in the broader trajectory of Portuguese colonialism, but also to challenge any ontological difference between these fields. Because Portuguese colonial urbanism in Luanda was bound to face the problem of how to organize and order a highly differentiated space, in terms of physical and imaginative topographies, the ethno-politics of the body, as it was provided by anthropology, and the racial boundaries of rule, as sanctioned in the authority of the law, were always integrant elements of the urbanizing impetus. It is, therefore, from these convergences of urbanism, law and anthropology, I believe, that the body makes its appearance as a critical vortex: an articulating element between the colonial production of space, the territorialization of order, and the ethno-political fixation of race and culture.

### *Spaces, Bodies and Spatial Dramas*

In the early 1960s, a report on the workings of the Luanda Municipality shows great concern for the state of the institution. The facilities were in bad conditions, due to lack of resources. Technicians were unproductive as there was no official vehicle to conduce topographic missions or visits to the fields of intervention. The *rapporteur* is shocked with the lack of reliable population statistics, topographical surveys or even land cadastre. By

1961, the *rappourter* is outraged to notice, the Municipality did not even know what lots of available urban land belonged to the state or private parts. The colonial anxiety expressed in the report is a call against overemphasizing the effects of power. Here, colonial disciplines are more “fantasies of control” (Mitchell, 1991) than flawless consummation. In this sense, there is always a contest, a disjuncture, between the grid of power and the social spaces upon which it inflicts its totalizing gaze (Bhabha, 1994). The further we go into the historical record, the more we find these utopians images of power crashed and fractured by the inconsistent, contingent and incoherent modes in which colonial authority was exercised and challenged. Colonial space, in this sense, is never fully dominant or dominated, but multiple and crosscut by tensions.

The same is true for the colonial body. We must not forget that the body does not only exist *in* space, as mere a supplement. As Simonsen (2005) puts it, Lefebvre himself insisted on the generative and creative potentiality of the living body. In fact, for Lefebvre the body not only (1) “is” space but also (2) produces itself “in” space while also (3) producing the space in which it is “embedded”. Here, the body, in its lived experience as and in space, becomes an articulating element of human agency (Simonsen, 2005). By the one hand, if body is space it is also materiality, that is, physicality. Here the central question is how these physical bodies are spatialized in culture and incorporated in broader spatial imaginations – nature, tribe, and nation. Though certainly shaped by disciplines and biopower, the physicality of the body can never be entirely subsumed to discursive practices: even the most powerful narratives of symbolic exclusion cannot ignore the fact that, in the last extent, these bodies are, materially speaking, there. In this sense, the body is not a *tabula rasa*, nor merely

a product of culture and power (Comaroff and Comaroff, 1990;). However, the ways in which the materiality of the “phenotype” (Saldanha, 2006) is translated, textualized and naturalized into idioms of race (Stoler, 2009) is an effect of power and its cultures of distinction and dominations.

The main purpose of my ethnographic intervention is not to invest more effort in revealing the fragility of ontological fixes. The “produced” nature of space and the “socially constructed” situation of the body are already documented. Rather, my focus is understanding how these historical ontologies (Stoler, 2009) are assembled as true experiences of the real: how they gain their reality effect; how race and ethnicity gain their “truth” as qualifiers of what a body “is” and authorized explanations of how a body “behaves”; how these categories become bases for colonial action; how they are inscribed in law and entangled with a legal framing of the body, with urban practices of emplacement, fixation and circulation. I have already insinuated that I consider the notion of “social drama” as expressive of the underlying heterogeneity and processual character of social life. However, for Turner (1974), social dramas are bounded moments of conflict unfolding according to a given script – not only the script of the cultural system being distressed, but also the phasic procedure of resolution through change or containment. In this sense, Turner speaks of a Greek drama, in which the hero is perpetually under society’s vigilance – the authority of the choir – and doomed to meet his destiny – the power of structure.

By “spatial drama” I mean something fundamentally different. First, I look at historical rather than merely processual time. As such, any *telos*, linearity or direction is challenged. As much as world history does not translate in increasing globalization (Cooper,

2001), urbanization is also not a coherent and escalating process, but rather an articulation of contradictory tendencies and intercalation of change and persistence in the urban space. Secondly, I operate a generalization of the metaphor of the drama, which I take not as a moment, a particular conflict, but as expression of the contested nature of space and the multiple experiences it entails. In this sense, the spatial drama is never “solved”, but rather reflects the ongoing struggle over space. Urbanization as a spatial drama does not mean the conflict between polarized versions of spatiality – e.g., white and indigenous –, which is solved through the incorporation of one into the other. Rather, the metaphor of the spatial drama suggests that subjected spatialities – the indigenous house, land or body – are in constant negotiation of their status, being never simply of fully absorbed by the colonizing process.

## SECOND ACT

### Indigenous and Creoles: acculturation and citizenship in Portuguese colonialism

Throughout history, cities appear always as indispensable instruments in the progress of civilization.

In Africa, they could be a melting pot of racial fusion, where blacks and whites would integrate harmoniously.

(Ilídio do Amaral, *Essay on a Geographic Study of the Urban Network of Angola*).

The 1950s and 1960s, as world-history goes, were times of intense change. All over the world, the emergence of a development complex would bring the notions of modernity and backwardness, welfare and poverty, to the core of political debates and economic agendas (Escobar, 1995). Modernization became a motto and *the* historical destiny of humankind, while urbanization was the spatial, cultural and demographic outcome of this global transformation. However, by 1957, as the Anthropologist Jorge Dias would warn, the models of development and industrialization could undermine the Portuguese guidelines in overseas policy. Dias' observation was based on the idea that there was some distinct, specific, form in which the Portuguese engaged with the tropical "peoples of color". In a context of modernization, migration and urbanization, Dias remarked, it must not be forgotten that "material progress brings great danger" (1957: 249). These comments are evidence that the situation of the Portuguese Empire in this global context is ambivalent. For

a metropolitan society whose economy had been based on agriculture and whose population faced poverty and emigration, the dreams of modernity held an unstable status<sup>3</sup>.

But as the 1940s went by, the political stability of colonialism was put under pressure, while development, modernization and urbanization were emerging as the fundamental *tropes* in which the post-war political order would be expressed. Despite Dias's concerns, in this context the legitimacy and viability of Portuguese presence in Africa would require a change in the regime's policies, symbolic structure and levels of public investment (Léonard, 1999). As a response to these contexts, in 1946, the Colonial Act of 1933 was revised and the nomenclature of the Empire shifted from "colonies" to "overseas provinces", in a cosmetic move (Cairo, 2006). In 1951, a new Constitution was enacted: the notion of "Portuguese Colonial Empire" was abolished and replaced by the "Overseas". The Empire transmuted itself in a multi-continental and pluri-racial nation, thus performing the "nationalization" (Alexandre, 1993) of the colonial space. Once sanctioned by law, this "Empire-as-Nation" (Sanches, 2006) had to textualize itself, produce a imaginative geography. The integrity of this political form would only be complete with the inscription of the natural space in the world of culture. In what follows, I will clarify the contribution of both Anthropology and Law in the production of Portuguese colonial space and in its transformations.

### *Acculturation as History: from Anthropometry to Luso-Tropicalism*

---

<sup>3</sup> This ambiguous situation has been described as resultant of Portugal's semi-peripheral position in the world-system. See: Fortuna, 1994; Santos, 2002.



In Portugal, what may be defined as “colonial anthropology” assumed a clear form only in the 1930s, as an institutionalized moment, the 1<sup>st</sup> Congress of Colonial Anthropology of 1934, indicates. This emerging discipline was extensively based on anthropometric methods and related to ideologies of evolution and racial sanitation, as provided by biology and medicine (Roque, 2006; Martins, 2006). The integrity of the Portuguese race, the danger of racial decay (posed by miscegenation), and the impetus to map the “exotic customs” of the natives is revealed in the iconic book *The Races of Empire*, published in 1945 and authored by Mendes Corrêa, considered the father of the discipline in Portugal. In fact, miscegenation was, for most part of the 1930s and 1940s, undesirable both politically and anthropologically (Thomaz, 2001: 71). It was an aspect of the colonial encounter, as Corrêa suggested, to be prescribed against by anthropology and prevented by colonial policy. Rather, the controlled management of colonial diversity – of the races of the Empire – was advised (Corrêa, 1945).

In this context, it is remarkable that some years later, in 1951, the Minister of the Overseas, Sarmiento Rodrigues, had invited the Brazilian Anthropologist Gilberto Freyre for an official visit throughout the Portuguese territories in Africa and Asia. The reason behind this cordial gesture is that during the 1930s and 1940s, Freyre (1987[1933]) had concluded that given its racially mixed origins – outcomes of centuries of contact with Arabs, Jews, Africans and Asians – the Portuguese people had historically developed new forms of interaction with populations from tropical zones. According to Freyre (1961), the typical Portuguese showed no racism, revealing instead an inclination to cultural and racial miscegenation, as expressed on a Christian humanism and materialized in high levels of inter-racial sexual contact in the zones under colonial influence. Having been trained at Columbia

University under the supervision of Franz Boas, Freyre dealt with the Boasian notion of culture area by proposing that Portuguese colonization in Africa and Asia produced a heterogeneous, but coherent and integrated, culture: the *luso-tropical complex of civilization*. On her insightful study, Castelo (1998) argued that in a post-1945 context, in which colonialism was under the increasing tensions of decolonizing forces, Freyre's *Luso-tropicalism* provided scientific legitimacy to geo-political claims regarding the discontinuous unity of the Portuguese nation.

While often dismissed as a political ideology, the distinctively anthropological substratum of Luso-tropicalism has been so far overlooked. Here, Freyre's affiliation with Franz Boas is an important element. Boas (1920) had argued that the changing nature and permeability between cultures should be recovered in a historical fashion, through surveying the geographical distribution of "definite cultural phenomena". In the convergence between the part – a cultural trait – and the whole – a cultural system –, culture areas of shared values, customs, and histories could be identified (Verdon, 2007). Freyre extended this framework by assuming that these "integrated cultures" need not be geographically continuous. Therefore, assumptions about the integrity of the Luso-tropical space were based on the surveying of similar cultural elements the ethnographer would be able to scientifically identify in different imperial territories, such as shared rituals, religion, customs, cooking styles, folk tales, to name a few.

While supporting political attempts of nationalization of the Empire, Luso-trpicalism secured the anthropological authenticity – and the authorization – of this enlarged space in which metropolitan Portugal and the Overseas were, from 1951, merged. This narrative,

cultural change is historicized as a teleological transition from “colonial diversity” to incorporation into “national multiculturalism”. Acculturation becomes destiny as history is depoliticized. Ethno-politics signals a political teleology and spatial displacement, a bodily transformation from the racialized tribal black to the culturally miscigenated national subject. Freyre was an armchair anthropologist with no actual field experience on the territories he theorized upon. Yet, in the 1950s and 1960s, his theory was appropriated as colonial propaganda and enjoyed the sympathy of Portuguese – both metropolitan and colonial – academic and political circles (Castelo, 1998)<sup>4</sup>. In Luanda, where an urban *creole* elite had to legitimize its distinct status in the midst of a black majority, this Luso-tropical identity was particularly welcomed (Neto, 1997)<sup>5</sup>.

The city would be described as a “*creole* island” (António, 1968), and in many occasions its urban multiculturalism would be praised. Generally, the Luso-tropical textual universe had always depended on the image of the Portuguese coastal enclaves and the cultural and racial mixtures they presented. Cities, moreover, were the spaces in which these narratives would find their audience and institutional expression. In fact, just one year after Freyre’s visit to Angola, a Centre of Luso-Brazilian Studies (*Centro de Estudos Luso-Brasileiros*) was founded in Luanda, on his honor (Dávila, 2010). The Luanda Municipality (*Câmara Municipal de Luanda*) would publish on its “Cultural Bulletin” (*Boletim Cultural*) a variety of texts expressing the luso-tropical temper. This promise of the city as a space of “racial fusion”, “integration” and “civilization” is reproduced in the words the geographer

---

<sup>4</sup> That is not to say that Luso-tropicalism was undisputed. In fact, Castelo (1998) has shown that these appropriations were always partial or contradictorily assembled. As any hegemonic culture, the Luso-tropical text was, of course, unsettled.

<sup>5</sup> In 1960, Luanda accounted for 32,9% of the entire mixed population in Angola. See: Sarmiento, A. (1960). “Aspectos demográficos da população de Luanda”. *Garcia de Orta*, 8(1), Separata.

Ilídio do Amaral, quoted in my epigraph. Being himself a natural of Luanda and mixed Portuguese, he documents the state of mind of a colonial culture obsessed with “acculturation” as “progress”. But for much of the 1950s, the path of cultural evolution was not left to history, but by sanctioned by law.

*Law and spaces of order: Indigenato and the bio-legality of citizenship*

Though presented by Freyre and other anthropologists<sup>6</sup> as natural and trans-historical expressions of the “national character”, the Portuguese “lack of racism” and disposition to multiculturalism are overridden before the historical record. Portuguese colonialism, as any other, was structured on practices and doctrines of discrimination along racial and ethnic lines (Bender, 2004; Cruz, 2005; Péliissier and Wheeler, 2009; Neto, 1997). The processes through which colonial difference is symbolized through idioms of race are evidenced in a fundamental aspect of the colonizing project: law. In Angola, as in Mozambique and the Portuguese Guinea, a particular legal formation was the epicenter of the colonial predication of difference: the *Estatuto do Indigenato* (Statute of the Indigenous). As Meneses (2010) has argued, as a legal abstraction the category of the Indigenous dates back the late 19<sup>th</sup> century<sup>7</sup>. However, it is only in the 1920s, in parallel with the emergence of the corporativist *Estado Novo* (New State) in metropolitan Portugal, that the *Indigenato* system would be enacted as law for Angola and Mozambique.

---

<sup>6</sup> In a notorious article published in 1953 by the Institute for Overseas Research (*Junta de Investigação do Ultramar*), Jorge Dias described as a main feature of the “national character” the fact that the Portuguese has “never felt disgust for other races and was always relatively tolerant towards cultures and religions professed by others” (Dias, 1953: 32).

<sup>7</sup> A full account of all the legislation that paved the way to the Indigenato is beyond the scope of this paper. For a detailed description, see: Meneses (2010).

The *Estatuto*<sup>8</sup> defined the Indigenous as “individuals of the black race or their descendents who, by their illustration or customs, are not distinguished from the ordinary of that race”. The text established that, for “lack of a practical reason”, the Indigenous would not respond to the universal law of Portuguese citizenship. Instead, they would belong to “a legal order proper to their faculties, their primitive mentality, their life”. On the other hand, of course, the colonial state would not prescind the humanitarian function of elevating their “level of existence”. By 1929, reforms in public administration integrated traditional authorities, the *regedores* and *sobas* in the case of Angola, in the administrative structure of the colonial state (Meneses, 2007).

Two decades later, the nationalization of the Empire, as already said, posed a series of legal changes, which included further metropolitan control of diverse aspects of colonial life (as expressed in fundamental texts as the Constitution of 1951 and the new Organic Law of the Overseas, of 1953). The *Indigenato* system was also dragged into these winds of change. In 1954, the Decree-Law n° 39.666 approves the *Estatuto dos Indígenas das Províncias Portuguesas da Guiné, Angola e Moçambique* (Statute of the Indigenous of the Portuguese Provinces of Guinea, Angola and Mozambique). The new text introduces three meaningful changes. First, it enhances the incorporation of traditional authorities in the colonial state, to a status of nearly local administrators (for example by being included in the official payroll<sup>9</sup>). Second, as a “legal category” the indigenous is refined, to include not only black uncivilized natives, but also their descendents, if they happened to be born in the provinces in which the

---

<sup>8</sup> Decree-Law n° 39.666, of 1929

<sup>9</sup> By 1951, the King of Congo was the only traditional authority to receive payment from the Colonial State. Source: Information on “Main causes of deficiency in the indigenous census for the collection of indigenous tax in Portuguese African colonies”, High Inspection of Indigenous Affairs, 1951.

*Indigenato* did not operate<sup>10</sup>. Third, the *Estatuto* extends its regulatory force to the transition between Indigenous and non-Indigenous worlds by creating a new category. The *assimilados* (assimilated) are those indigenous by birth who through the path of labor (exercise of a profession) and culture (Portuguese language, illustration and civilized habits), was considered evolved enough to be granted citizenship rights and placed in the universe of modern law<sup>11</sup>. The assimilated is subject to have his citizenship abolished, in which case he would regress to his indigenous status.

As I interpret it, the revised version of the *Estatuto* operates sensible shifts on the ways both the spatiality and bodily physicality of colonial rule are articulated. By the one hand, legal authorities are inscribed into space and boundaries are traced<sup>12</sup>. On the other hand, the definition of indigenous introduces a modality of legal inscription that is not defined on a territorial basis, but follows the black body as it is invested with legal and cultural meaning. Thus, the *Estatuto* reveals a contradictory interplay of territorializing and de-territorializing tendencies, i.e., the simultaneous production of colonial territory and bodies as “spaces of order”. But more importantly, here the body is inscribed in law not merely in its individual or productive qualities (labor), nor only as an element of the species (reproduction). The body is framed as *ethnos*: the collective regimentation that is neither purely anatomical nor biological, but also cultural. Of course, race as a category of governance is not erased (as the text of the *Estatuto* evidences). What I am claiming is that

---

<sup>10</sup> Cape Verde, São Tomé, Portuguese State of India, and Macau.

<sup>11</sup> If the Indigenous was defined in 1929 as those who do not differ from the common of race, the previous *Estatuto* implies the figure of the *assimilado* (those who do differ). However, no explicit reference was made as to how assimilation as a legal process must proceed.

<sup>12</sup> From this point, the register of the population in each *regedoria* (as a bounded traditional polity) is required and any individual change in residency must be informed and authorized.

the *Indigenato* ritualizes – in the law – the familiar tensions between race and culture, phenotype and education, biology and ethnography, that underlie the very symbolic fabric of Portuguese rule.

As John Comaroff (2001) has argued, colonial legal cultures are fractured by a basic contradiction. On the one hand, narratives of benign colonialism are structured on modern premises of universalism and legal entitlement, whose full realization is the institution of citizenship. On the other, this modern project is undermined by and overlapped with the imperatives of colonial difference and its idioms of the tribe, race and ethnicity (Comaroff, 2001). This disjunction expresses what I will call, in the case of Portuguese colonialism, the *bio-legality of citizenship*. Here, citizenship is not a universal framework, but a structurally differentiated<sup>13</sup> legal culture. This argument is not new, but has been raised, in different contexts, by Holston (2008) and Chatterjee (2004). As I will explore in what follows, the peculiarity of the *Indigenato*, however, is that this differentiated distribution of legal value and meaning is predicated on a contradictory, and confused, assemblage of spatial binaries (as tribe and nation; rural and urban; the city center and the slums), biologies of phenotypes (black, white, and colored bodies) and cultural judgments (the civilized or primitive subjects). This articulates what Stoler (1997) has called the “internal frontiers” of colonialism, i.e., the complex processes through which difference and equality, entitlement and disfranchisement are assigned differently within a conceptually homogeneous space (in my case, citizenship).

---

<sup>13</sup> Here, I refer to differentiation in a similar way as Holston (2008). The author argues that citizenship in postcolonial Brazil has never been an igualitarian project, but, on the contrary, has been historically structured on the attribution of difference to diverse kinds of citizens: therefore the term differentiated citizenship (Holston, 2008).

The *Estatuto* of 1954 was promulgated by the same Sarmiento Rodrigues who three years before had invited Freyre for a tour around the Overseas<sup>14</sup>. It goes without saying that it holds a Luso-tropical sub-text, particularly in the centrality assumed by acculturation as a function of the colonial state. The definition of indigenous as those who are “not yet” eligible for citizenship is revealing of the historical directionality upon which this legal text is based. Here, Portuguese modernity becomes a teleology of racial philanthropy: the idea of leading the Blacks to citizenship. In the *Indigenato*, the projects of “universal humanism” and “colonial difference” are not competing, but mutually enforcing each other. Discrimination is encouraged, but as both transitional and exceptional.

Articulated with similar tendencies in anthropology<sup>15</sup> and in colonial discourse at large, the transmutations of the *Estatuto* is expressive of the shifts in the political temper around issues of indigenous policy and miscegenation. However, as Cruz (2005) has argued, the modifications of 1954 were also a reaction to a broader process that was already being perceived as a problem in Angola: urbanization. As the black populations in the cities rose, dragging black labor into the servants’ quarters of urban colonialism, the *Indigenato* became not so much about distributing a bifurcated justice, but about crystallizing groups “around the boundaries of race” (Popke, 1992). In Luanda, from the other side of the *creole* island, in the underworlds of the Luso-tropical ideology, the legal framing of bodies in space would be operated by urbanism and expressed in a particular spatial unity: the indigenous neighborhoods.

---

<sup>14</sup> In addition to ideological and political connections, by 1951 Freyre and Rodrigues were already good friends (Dávila, 2010).

<sup>15</sup> Thomaz (2001) has explored the transition in anthropological thinking by comparing the work of two iconic figures: Mendes Corrêa, who would keep on believing on the “integrity of race”, and Jorge Dias, closer to the Luso-tropical approach.



### THIRD ACT

## Reform and Containment: bifurcated urbanism and bodily intervention

The problem of the popular neighborhoods (why call them “indigenous”?) in the great African urban centers will only be solved through the maximum utilization of technical resources and social anthropology and only when there is a firm intention to address them. Nothing of this sort has happened in Angola.

(Carlos Krus Abecassis, Sub-Secretary of State for Overseas Development<sup>16</sup>).

In his study of the urban network of Angola, the Geographer Ilídio do Amaral described the Luanda of the 1930s as still showing the “aspect of an old city, [and a] decadent air” (1962: 51). It would be only in the 1940s, he admits, that the city would “awaken from its lethargy [and] turned into a dynamic and active capital” (Amaral, 1962: 49). Amaral’s imagery is one of violence – the explosive or brutal urban growth – and nostalgic ambiguity: he was not sure how to respond to the replacement of the distinct Portuguese characteristics of the city by the modern architectural style, which he considered as “not always of good taste” (Amaral, 1962: 51). This description, as it was, made by a prominent connoisseur, both a natural and a thinker of the land, shows the state of Luanda’s predicament. Increments in the city’s commercial and industrial activities, “disorganized” indigenous settlement and the

---

<sup>16</sup> Hand-written comments on the Report on Indigenous Affairs in Angola, of 1958. These comments were then circulated to the General Governor of Angola by the High Inspector of Overseas Administration, in the Opinion nº3/60, of 17<sup>th</sup> of February of 1960.

construction *boom* associated with the increase in coffee prices<sup>17</sup>, brought up a set of urban dynamics, and tensions, that had to be addressed. If it was obvious, as a contemporary observer cried, that the Portuguese tropical cities required “new, urgent and drastic” solutions (Silveira, 1956: 00), no dominant doctrine or clear strategy as on how to proceed existed.

By 1960, as my epigraph evidences, Carlos Abecassis, in an opinion on a report on indigenous policy in Angola, asserts that the problem of indigenous housing could be solved with a combination of technique and social anthropology. However, Abecassis continues, the “firm” (political) intention to address this problem would also be needed. But in 1960 Angola already had a legislation on indigenous housing for twelve years. A commission had been created. Master Plans had been drawn and topographic surveys conducted. Yet, Abecassis’s criticism undermines the conceptual framework on which colonial urbanism was based – “why indigenous”, he asks – and expresses his deep concern for the political apathy he sees in the province. His temper was of misgovern. These statements, as I read them, reveal that despite efforts at different levels in conceiving and conveying urbanism and planning as techniques to be applying by means of engineering and tropical architecture, these were never completely expunged from the political and social field. Colonial urbanism, specially, was embedded in a “techno-political” (Mitchell, 2002) theatre in which the familiar distinctions between technique and politics are constantly blurred. Moreover, it was only a precariously bounded disciplinary science. It interacted with and was dragged into rather complex and unstable arrangements. Here, I argue the historical and spatial linearity of acculturation as the

---

<sup>17</sup> As Amaral (1962) demonstrates, the urbanization of Luanda – and the pace of urban construction in particular – has been closely articulated with variations on coffee prices. The Angolan coffee economy not only produced the surplus capital to be re-invested in the city, but also encouraged the settlement of workers associated with the export of the product from the Port of Luanda. Thus, the increase in urban population in the 1940s is connected, though not determined, to this “coffee rush” (Martins, 2000).

key concept that holds urbanism, anthropology and law together. In what follows, I will explore these entangled processes in the first phase of colonial urbanism that I identify as engaging with practices of segregation in space. However, as I will show, fantasies of urban sanitation and bodily segregation were not completed, but contested from within, by competing colonial discourses. I will examine a particular space – the indigenous neighborhood – and the strategies of bodily intervention it entails.

*Manufacturing a colonial city: Bifurcated urbanism and segregated planning*

In metropolitan Portugal, urbanism had emerged in the 1930s, under the close influence of the French School and Modern Architecture<sup>18</sup>. Salazarism, however, while suspicious of modernist ideologies, preferred to encourage the nationalist concept of a genuine Portuguese architecture (Amaral's "distinct characteristics" *vis-à-vis* "modern style"). In this context, in 1944, the Cabinet for Overseas Urbanization (*Gabinete de Urbanização Colonial*) was created as a technical institution directed to centralize the urban expertise and provide the guidelines for action on an imperial level<sup>19</sup>. Moreover, it had the symbolical and political function of "imprinting" on the colonial cities the "spiritual mark" of Portuguese traditions, as expressed in a particular urban aesthetics (Dias and Milheiro, 2009).

---

<sup>18</sup> These influences were as embodied in the CIAM Conferences and the Athens Charter. The CIAM (International Congress of Modern Architecture) was a privileged space in which modern ideologies of urbanism would form, particularly as focused on the idea of a "functional city" able to express urban development and social welfare under the *mottos* of labor, leisure, circulation, habitation. Published by Le Corbusier, the Athens Charter would formalize similar points by articulating urban planning and housing – the city and habitat – thus enhancing a more holistic and socially oriented understanding of the urban phenomena. For a full account of these influences in Portugal and Angola, see: Fonte, 2007.

<sup>19</sup> Decree n° 34:173, 6 of December of 1944.

Soon enough, increasing criticism of the centralized model of planning<sup>20</sup> and the inherent limitation of the esoteric idea of Portuguesism effected the turn towards modernism and tropical architecture. As influenced by Le Corbusier and Brazilian architects, the Portuguese focus is placed on ventilation, openness and cleanness of spaces (Fonte, 2007). Here, the concern with climate and other natural conditionalities evidences the violent physicality of the colony as a rough, savage and insalubrious space, to be transformed, made bearable, through modern technologies of urbanism, planning and architecture.

But while these debates took place in the metropolis, the Luanda Municipality had already commissioned a new Master Plan<sup>21</sup>. Based on the concept of satellite-cities so as to reverse urban congestion and enable a more even population density, the 1943 Luanda Plan can be seen as the first Portuguese experiment on “modern urbanism” in the tropics (Fonte, 2007). But by the time it was completed, it was already obsolete<sup>22</sup>, and as other projects designed for Luanda, it has never been fully applied (Martins, 2000). The following plans, prepared in 1947 and 1952 by the Cabinet for Overseas Urbanization were not successful either. In fact, a report signed by the President of the Luanda Municipality, in 1957, recognizes that till then the city never really had an urbanization plan. It is claimed that “the urbanization of Luanda must be studied in Luanda – and by Luanda”<sup>23</sup>, in an obvious

---

<sup>20</sup> As Fonte (2007) points out, the Cabinet worked from Lisbon and lacked knowledge of the ground, which should be remedied by documentation provided by each local authority. Then criticism towards this detached model encouraged the creation of provincial offices and later, the very extinction of the institution and its replacement by the Office of Urbanization and Housing, part of the General Office of Public Works and Communications, in 1957. Later, provincial offices would be created.

<sup>21</sup> Completed in 1943, this Master Plan was designed by the French Architect Etienne De Groer, and the Portuguese Moreira da Silva.

<sup>22</sup> Ante-Plano de Urbanização de Luanda, Memória Descritiva. IPAD.  
Reference: DGOPC/DSUH/2036/01534

<sup>23</sup> Report by Álvaro Cabral, “Luanda Municipality. Fundamental necessities and endeavors”. Luanda, April, 1957, p. 61-63.

criticism of the imperial intromission in local affairs. Moreover, the same document emphasizes that the new Urbanization Plan prepared by the Municipality would launch a new phase for the city as “the true begin of its ordered growth”, made possible by combining new legislation and urbanistic discipline. Finally, it is said that, after much debate, the chosen solution to the “urgent problem” of the “diverse ethnic and social groups” was, after all, a principle of integration. No detail is provided about what integration, in this context, means.

Whatever the Municipality meant<sup>24</sup>, the fact is that by 1957, strategies of urban planning in Luanda were still predicated on the idea of segregating uncivilized blacks in indigenous neighborhoods. In fact, an attentive examination of the Master Plans (1943, 1947, 1952, 1956) and reports on planning reveals a process of *zooning*, in which residential areas based on the legal premises of the Indigenato system would be demarcated. A central factor in colonial urbanism at this point is that, from the 1940s, the Empire’s directive of turning Angola and Mozambique into settlers’ colonies assumed extended proportions, with large movements of Europeans to these colonies (Castelo, 2007). The abrupt increment in white population would transform the racial relations in Luanda<sup>25</sup> and, naturally, be a source of much tension about who could occupy and circulate through particular urban spaces – and how and why. By the mid-1950s, an Ante-Plan of Urbanization (*Ante-Plano de Urbanização*), in fact, would use a rather “sanitary” language to describe that – given their lack of “basic hygiene” – it was impossible to maintain indigenous and civilized zones “in a

---

<sup>24</sup> Although no explanation is provided by the Municipality itself, I can speculate that by “integration” it refers to the debate about where to situate indigenous neighborhoods, as I will point out later. It can also mean the transition from a policy of “indigenous” to “popular” neighborhoods, as declared by Abecassis in my epigraph. Either way, the point here is to reveal that the contradiction between policies of integration and segregation had always been at the heart of colonial urbanism.

<sup>25</sup> Though Portuguese colonial statistics are not completely reliable, the racial proportions in Luanda were reduced from 1 white for 7,4 blacks, in 1930, to 1 white for 3,6 blacks, in 1960 (Amaral, 1968).

certain proximity”<sup>26</sup>. The problematic nature of indigenous presence, and particularly their uncontrolled growth, in an urban space that was in the process of becoming white (*braqueamento*), is at the heart of concerns about how to manage the contact between the racial worlds, both in terms of proximity in space and distance in civilization.

Moreover, the public anxiety about the growing accumulation of rural, tribal, and uncivilized migrants in the urban outskirts challenged the policed boundaries of the city, rather revealing its porosity and connectivity with the rural world. If mobility was enhanced as transport infrastructures (railways, roads, ports, etc) flourished under Salazar’s Development Plans, it is also true it became a sensible problem in terms of indigenous control and fixation. In 1958, an official report, result from a mission on the attraction of great cities, concluded that the migration of rural Africans to urban centers, as Luanda, “threatens in such ways the peaceful development of co-existence [of whites and blacks] that it is now, with no doubt, the central problem in Angola’s domestic policy”<sup>27</sup>. It must be recognized, the *rapporteur* recommends, that “solutions to the problems of indigenous neighborhoods have to converge with the development of structured plans of rural welfare”<sup>28</sup>.

As I read them, these entangled processes evidence the political, contradictory and multiple nature of colonial urbanism. While some authors have chosen to describe colonial cities as a dual urban structure – white and black areas – I agree with Bank (2011) that this framework does not do justice to the complexity these cities entail. As I suggest here, rather

---

<sup>26</sup> The given solution to this problem is a public transport system for those indigenous working in the European city. See: Ante-Plano de Urbanização de Luanda, Memória Descritiva, p. 22. IPAD. Reference: DGOPC/DSUH/2036/01534

<sup>27</sup> Amadeu Castilho Soares. Report on “The Mission for the study of attraction of great cities and rural welfare”. Lisbon, March, 1958, p. 58.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid*, p. 60.

than “dual”, Portuguese colonial urbanism was bifurcated. And I borrow the term from Mandani (1996), who used it to describe the segregated nature of colonial legal systems. However, by “bifurcated urbanism” I mean not so much the fact that colonial segregated planning was engaged in producing differentiated space: the white and black areas, the civilized center and the primitive slums. Even if it was, my usage of the image of bifurcation indicates, however, that the distinctiveness of colonial urbanism is that it worked by simultaneously articulating the contradictory projects of segregation and presence, differentiation and integration. In this sense, racial segregation in space never appears as racism *per se*, but rather as a functional, necessary, and transitory strategy towards an end: cultural, social and legal integration and spatial multiracialism. In what follows, I will explore the case of the indigenous neighborhoods as an expression of bifurcated urbanism and bodily contention.

*Stabilized or Floating: Indigenous Neighborhoods between reform and containment*

The term indigenous neighborhoods (*bairros indígenas*) may represent either a zone, generally, in which most of the inhabitants are indigenous, or, in the urbanistic sense of the term, a planned neighborhood meant to accommodate surplus indigenous population. In the latter sense, though the concept had been present in Angolan law from the 1920s, the lack of financial resources prevented their construction till the 1940s. In Luanda, the first Indigenous neighborhood was built only in 1942, by the Provincial Government, and in 1943 transferred

to municipal administration<sup>29</sup>. Yet, no overall urbanistic or legal framework existed, but rather each project was isolated and enacted by punctual ordinances. Probably this political apathy encouraged an observer to write, in a passionate letter of 1947, that “given their illiteracy and backwardness, the indigenous have no possibility of building their *cubatas* [houses] in conditions of habitability”<sup>30</sup>. The author considers it a human duty to “help the black fellows to build their houses according to modern techniques”, arguing that such a move would be an important step towards enhancing the “civilization of the natives”.

Following the lead of a legal project presented by the Luanda Municipality, in 1948 the Provincial Government approved the regulation on the construction and administration of the Indigenous Neighborhoods<sup>31</sup>. An administrative commission was created (*Comissão Administrativa dos Bairros Indígenas*), to design, regulate and study the construction of these residential units, in addition to operating as a mediator between the directives of the state and private parts<sup>32</sup>. The law commands, moreover, that only those with “irreproachable conduct” would be allowed, while access would be denied to “rowdies, alcoholics, pimps, witches and *quimbandas*, women of careless life, prostitutes generally, and all those with no proper occupation”. In 1957, the Law is revised<sup>33</sup>, counting with a preamble that evidences the changes in the political tone. According to the new version, “the problem [of the increase in indigenous migrants in certain urban centers of Angola] goes beyond the question of

---

<sup>29</sup> Report of the High Inspection of Colonial Administration of 8 of February of 1949.

<sup>30</sup> Letter by António de Barros Júnior, Representative of the Portuguese Red Cross, 26<sup>th</sup> of June of 1947. The letter was circulated and reached the Minister of the Colonies.

<sup>31</sup> Legislative Diplom n° 2.097, of 17 of November of 1948.

<sup>32</sup> The Ordinance n° 5.921, of 4 of June of 1947, which makes some changes in the Code of Indigenous Labor (*Código do Trabalho Indígena*) of 1929, stipulates that employers must provide housing to their employees. Under this directive, the Commission should also address these private initiatives.

<sup>33</sup> Legislative Diploma n° 2:799, 9<sup>th</sup> of May of 1957.



habitation, but it also involves education, social service and labor discipline”. This broader project would be carried out not only by the State – the Commission – but also, unsurprisingly, by the Catholic Church, through missionary social service.

Though, at this point, there was little contest over the fact that these separate indigenous areas should exist, their location in the overall urban scheme was not at all pacific. An overview of the issue is presented in the policy-oriented *Journal Overseas Studies* (*Estudos Ultramarinos*<sup>34</sup>). The article identifies two competing solutions, as provided by colonial urbanism. On the one hand, to restrict indigenous areas to the urban outskirts, beyond the zones included on urbanization directives. “There”, the argument goes, the land was public, the indigenous groups would be able to preserve their – non hygienic – habits, and their labor could serve nearby industrial complexes or the white city (through a transport system). This solution, it is said, prevents racial conflicts. On the other hand, it is argued the native areas should be located within the urbanizing city, thus facilitating access to the indigenous labor force. Moreover, it also forces conviviality and enhances the “progressive assimilation” and “elevation of the habits and culture” of the natives, as it was the Portuguese tradition in indigenous policy. From this point of view, the first solution is “disgusting”, for “it implies racial segregation” (Soares, 1960: 143).

The author himself, the same Castilho Soares who had worked, two years before, on the Mission on the attraction of great cities, proposes a solution. For Soares (1960), the indigenous groups in the city can be divided in two types – stabilized and floating. The first

---

<sup>34</sup> The Journal was published by the High Institute of Overseas Studies (*Instituto Superior de Estudos Ultramarinos*), a hybrid of graduate institute and think-tank that ended up training many individuals who would be integrated in colonial administration. For a full impact of the role of the institute in the government of Angola, see: Neto, J. P. (1964).

refers to individuals who, “being from the city or living there regularly”, are “stable” in occupation (work) and family. Though not necessarily assimilated in legal terms, these individuals are “assimilated in the social and cultural sense”. On the other hand, floating individuals are those in “constant dislocation between the city and the rural sanzala”. They have “no professional stability” and are “free of any discipline”, being at “the margins of both tribal and civilized society” (Soares, 1960: 139). According to Soares (1960), the stabilized indigenous could be harmlessly integrated in the city, but the floating populations should be kept away (thus allowing better urban sanitation and preventing the danger of sudden epidemics). This “bifurcation” would enhance the “progressive integration in urban society”, thus respecting the fundamental principles of the Portuguese “missionary colonialism, free of racial or color prejudices” (Soares, 1960: 144).

Both the law on Indigenous neighborhoods and Soares’ opinion of the matter, I believe, reveal the convergences between urban planning, cultural framing and legal entitlement. If the European city – the city of concrete – is the repository of law and Portuguese (tropical) culture, the indigenous neighborhood is the space in which the legal-anthropological project of assimilation and acculturation is performed. Here, the connections between the bifurcated orientation in urbanism and planning, the ethno-political framing in anthropology and the bio-legality of citizenship are beginning to irrupt. The ascension to citizenship was predicated on an ethno-political reformation, i.e., the ability to imprint, on the body, a series of traits (clothes, gesture, posture, and a whole corporeal symbolism). This process, on the other hand, would be spatialized in terms of the “degrees” of acculturation and their expression on the colonized body. Here, cultural and spatial approximation overlap:

the closer one is to civilized culture, the closer one is to the urbanized city. In this context, citizenship becomes a mimicry of racial erasure. Mobility, circulation, and accessibility to certain spaces would be, in this sense, predicated on the ability of the colonized body to perform a “culture” and a “way of life” suitable to each of the different spaces.

The convergence between location in a residential zone, labor discipline, legal elevation in terms of the *Estatuto* and catholic education – as expressed in the Law – is representative of the forms in which the production of colonial space comprises not only urban transformation, in a strict sense, but also the intervention on the body. As a particular expression of bifurcated urbanism, the indigenous neighborhoods were also trapped in a contradiction between reform and containment. While strategies of bodily reform were certainly put in practice, through Christian morals and labor discipline, the neighborhoods also operated the containment of bodies and fixation of boundaries of culture and rule. The law commanded that, once assimilated, the indigenous must move from the area, indicating the overlap of dislocation in both the legal frame and in space. However, as Soares reveals, the distinction between the assimilated *de facto*, and the de-tribalized, meant that, in many cases, policy would not so much be one of a reform – civilizing the primitive body –, but of containment, i.e., prevent the decay of the assimilated *de facto*, discourage their adhesion to citizenship, while keeping them apart from rough primitive fellows – divide to rule, as Cruz (2006) pointed out. The fact that housing policies sometimes addressed the *de facto* assimilated (Fonte, 2007) evidences the official attempt to fix this particular injunction of cultural discipline with legal submission: cultural brothers but not fellow citizens, “almost the same but not white” (Bhabha, 1994: 89). Of course, that would also involve the production of

a basically educated labor force with no access to citizenship rights and ready to secure the functioning of the white city.

The articulation of indigenous housing in the broader political and legal frame of the *Indigenato* system had already been made clear before. In fact, by 1952, the Engineer Eurico Machado<sup>35</sup> had observed that – given that to be an “indigenous” is a situation of “transit” (in terms of legal and cultural evolution) – the “house and the immediate surroundings” were the most efficient means to favorably transform the habits and improve the social status of the natives. However, for most of the Angolan people, assimilated *de facto* or not, the “transit” would never be completed<sup>36</sup>. Here, I argue that, despite of its discourse on the contrary, the colonial state’s strategies of bodily containment were a call *against* and not *for* legal assimilation. If the group of *assimilados de facto* was peacefully incorporated in Luanda’s urbanism, the same can not be said of the “de-tribalized natives” that would insist on settling beyond the edges of the urban civilization and its techniques: in the *musseques* (slums). Here, the colonial city can be divided between the planned side (white city and the indigenous neighborhoods) and the unplanned, chaotic, spontaneously occupied (Fonte, 2007). If in under the pressures of urban growth, the Municipality had opted for pushing all the informal settlements further and further, as the formal city was extended, in 1961 the *musseques* talked back. A group of revolting subjects crossed the “frontier of asphalt” and attacked the Prison of Luanda. Hours later, they were either arrested or killed: but that was only the beginning of the urban racial carnage.

<sup>35</sup> Report on “Indigenous Housing in Angola. Subsidy for the study of the problem”. Luanda, August of 1952.

<sup>36</sup> The statistics of assimilation under the *Indigenato* were nearly insignificant. For example, in 1959, the 532 citizenship status granted in Luanda accounted for 49% of the overall concessions in the whole province, in a population of over 4 million. Source: Direcção Provincial dos Serviços de Administração Civil, 1959, Documentos nº 4469, 5053, 6576, 4100.

## FORTH ACT

### Universal citizenship, Fractured space: disciplining urban multiculturalism

The truth is that lies and silence were so widespread in Angola that the truth itself had become suspicious. The search for truth was an exercise in the art of relativism: advancing only meant to get further entangled.

(René Pélissier, *History of Angola*)

In the 1960s, when the French historian René Pélissier was in Angola trying to assemble the truth of Portuguese colonialism, the multiple and contradictory histories he found led him to a position of imminent skepticism. He showed particular discontent about the generalized “rumours” and their pernicious effect in distorting the historical facts of life. Pélissier’s “warfare for truth” is expressive of the political sensibility that took Angola since the outburst of anti-colonial insurgency, in 1961. By March, the *União dos Povos de Angola* (Union of the Peoples of Angola) attacked Portuguese farms (*colonatos*) and administrative posts in the North and Northeast regions. The brutality of the attacks – the rapes, mutilations and killing of children – silenced the Portuguese Ambassadors in the United Nations, who had been always keen to call the “prevailing peace” in the provinces as a proof of the benign nature of Portuguese rule. Later that year, the violence spread to Mozambique and the Portuguese Guinea. In December, the Indian Union occupied Goa, Daman and Diu, expelling the Portuguese from the Indian subcontinent.

In the UN, attacks against the “institutionalized racism” embodied in the *Indigenato* system compelled the Portuguese to re-think their indigenous policy. By September, 1961, a legislative package revoked the *Estatuto*. As the “duality” of the Portuguese legal system

vanished under the extension of universal citizenship for all the provinces, difference was re-introduced as legal multiculturalism. While claiming to respect the Portuguese practice of recognizing “traditional institutions and cultures”, the new legal regime aimed at integrating “all the structural elements of the Nation [in public administration and law-making]”<sup>37</sup>. The transformations were never associated with a “reform” of bad laws, but were vindicated on the idea that “we have reached a point in evolution where our historical mission will be facilitated by such uniformization” (Moreira, 1961: 5).

However, by the time Adriano Moreira, Minister of the Overseas, was praising Portuguese legal multiculturalism, Luanda was burning in tension. From the 1940s onwards, the white population had grown abruptly, a distinct underclass of impoverished whites began to emerge, absorbed by the unqualified labor market and pushed to the slums. In the 1960s, the military demands, development policies and controlled migration of citizens from the metropolis would increase the proportion of whites citizens in the city at large. At the same time, the *musseques* kept on growing, as black populations escaping from the violence and poverty in the countryside would settle in these areas. If blacks and whites had to compete for jobs and a subaltern space in the city, they also had to live side by side. This image would be readily appropriated and conveyed as a metaphor of racial ecumenism: blacks and whites, “brothers in poverty”, as Almeida dos Santos, a poet, engineer, and politician, would put it (Santos, 1966: 62). However, it also reflected the dramatic demography of the colonial war. Here lies the central predicament of late Portuguese colonialism: urbanism had to articulate the imperatives of citizenship, integration and multiculturalism, with the escalating violence

---

<sup>37</sup> Decree-Law n° 43893, of 6<sup>th</sup> of September of 1961.

and securitization of the urban space. This fractured situation produced sharp frictions between the entangled projects of segregation and conviviality. In this section, I will explore how urbanism engaged with this new moment, by looking at attempts to enhance pluri-racialism in the urban space, while increasing the securitization and disciplining of the *musseques* (slums), in this context understood as a deviant, dangerous, space.

*Spaces of conviviality: Creole urbanism and the ambiguity of race*

In 1961, the Ministry of Public Works (*Ministério das Obras Públicas*) hosted the I Congress on Urbanism (*Colóquio sobre Urbanismo*), in Lisbon. On this occasion, the Office of Urbanism and Housing presented a paper arguing that “the idea of great *Indigenous Neighborhoods* [...] must be put aside, cause once the transition from the state of indigenous to citizenship is completed, one would be facing a case with all the appearance of racial segregation” (Direcção dos Serviços de Urbanismo e Habitação, 1961: 53-54). In the same event, Engineer Castro Cabrita would affirm that “even if I am against [racial] discrimination, I cannot help considering unpleasant the inclusion of indigenous housing in civilized neighborhoods” (Cabrita, 1961: 220). These claims put in evidence the underlying tensions pervading urbanism in the early 1960s. Made well before the *Indigenato* was abolished, but already after the attacks in Luanda, they exemplarily reveal what kind of positions were at play in this restructuring process of Portuguese rule and its forms of intervention on the urban space.

By 1962, the first opinion seemed to have overcome the latter. In the hangover of both violence and the legal reform, multi-racialism and co-presence would express the new *ethos*

of colonial urbanism. In the same year, Mário de Oliveira, architect and public servant in the Office of Urbanism and Housing, wrote an essay that would be published and distributed as colonial propaganda – *Essential problems of urbanism in the Overseas: urban structures of integration and conviviality*. Oliveira (1962) argues that inter-racial conviviality is the key to harmonic integration in the urban space. For him, the spatial proximity to “obviously more evolved groups” would provoke in the underdeveloped native a central transformation on his “psico-biological personality”, fostering his integration in civilized urban life. Here, the very notion of urbanization is displaced, from an idiom of modernity and materiality, to a grammar of affection and salvation. Re-defined, urbanization becomes “essentially, a social phenomena as it is necessary and urgent that collective mentalities are formed with a strong sense of humanistic feelings and love to the motherland, where religion is also a primordial factor” (Oliveira, 1962: 20).

As Oliveira had to document the moment of racial contact, photography would be extensively used: the celebratory visualization of racial proximity in a fragmented society. Oliveira’s project involved also the creation of a number of venues for public utility – from sanitation to leisure –, meant to encourage inter-racial conviviality. It is, he goes on, in the daily contact in public spaces that the non-specified majorities (i.e., the blacks) would be assimilated through “suggestion” and “imitation”, absorbing the “habits, customs and gestures” of the minority (i.e., whites) (Oliveira, 1962: 20). As I interpret it, Oliveira’s exemplary essay expresses, in an iconic form, what I will call Creole urbanism. By that I mean it performs in urbanism the realization of the dream of a creole existence, the Luso-tropical expectation of racial contact and acculturation. The superiority of the Portuguese



culture is presumed, in a cultural Darwinism that places urbanization in the teleology of Portuguese Luso-tropical modernity. The basic distinctiveness in this urbanism is that it attempts to erasure the contradiction between presence and segregation by choosing the first while displacing the later.

But when he wrote this piece, Oliveira had just authored the Project of Popular Neighborhoods for Bissau, in the Portuguese Guinea. Here, the shift in terminology is remarkable: from indigenous to popular as qualifier of these planned spaces<sup>38</sup>. The rise of “popular housing” in the post-1961 context, I argue, performs in colonial urbanism the strategic displacement of race, which will be re-inscribed in a culturally-informed notion of (economic) class and social status. Following the legislative transformation in imperial policy, the CABI<sup>39</sup> was abolished and replaced by a Commission meant to construct and manage popular neighborhoods<sup>40</sup>. In 1962, the Governor of Angola hired the Laboratory of Engineering (*Laboratório de Engenharia*)<sup>41</sup> to conduct a study on the problem of housing in Luanda, the target being “the elimination of the *musseques*”<sup>42</sup>. The commission in charge divided the populations “in need” of housing aid in three socio-economic clusters: a) Group 1, of “modest economy”, composed of families whose social behavior and standard of living expressed a “high degree of evolution” (representing 5,3% of the targeted population); b) Group 2, of “weak economy”, with families presenting a medium degree of social evolution

---

<sup>38</sup> My reader will remember Abecassis’ acid comment on urban policies in Angola: “why indigenous?”, and his proposition of the term popular instead. In fact, in the 1950s, Luanda had already experimented in the area of low-cost, popular, housing, as exemplified by the Bairro Operário, built in 1952. Still, as I will argue in what follows, in the post-1961 context the issue of popular housing re-emerges under a new light, as it will absorb the efforts – and rationalities – previously directed to indigenous housing.

<sup>39</sup> Administrative Commission for Indigenous Neighborhoods.

<sup>40</sup> Legislative Diploma n° 3117 of 1961.

<sup>41</sup> The laboratory was a section of the General Office of Public Works and Communications.

<sup>42</sup> Governador Geral de Angola. Despacho n° 6, de 21<sup>st</sup> of July of 1961.

and standard of living (25% of the sample); and c) Group 3, formed families whose economy was “so weak” and standard of living “so low”, that “if abandoned to themselves, will not evolve or reach a minimally acceptable life style” (69,7% of the sample).

While the blacks were distributed in Groups 1, 2 and 3, the whites and mixed only figured in Group 1. Based on the directive that urbanistic projects should “effect the maximum dissemination of populations of all somatic types”<sup>43</sup>, the Comissão concluded that these groups could be clustered in three types of “neighborhood units”, of roughly 5000 habitants each:

- a) Type 1: whites, mixed and the blacks of Group 1 (housed in buildings), and blacks of the Group 2 (placed in one-family houses);
- b) Type 2: blacks of Groups 2 and 3;
- c) Type 3: blacks of Group 3<sup>44</sup>;

The Comissão highlighted that the project had been conceived in accordance to the principle that urbanism should be purged from “any solution that might contribute directly or indirectly to racial segregation”<sup>45</sup>. Just one year later, the *Bairro Prenda*, designed by the Architect Simões de Carvalho under the request of the Municipality, was inaugurated as an example of inter-racial conviviality. However, as it dialogued with some of the Comissão’s proposes, whites and blacks were not only housed in different buildings; also, the blacks were only those whose cultural level and standard of living was already considered evolved enough for that matter (Fonte, 2007).

<sup>43</sup> A Comissão. Estudo Preliminar do Problema da Habitação em Luanda. Boletim nº 3459/LEA/1962, p. 33.

<sup>44</sup> The neighborhoods of the Types 2 and 3 would be formed only by uni-familiar houses (of one or two floors). In the proposed budget, the amount to be invested in each of these units was defined as follows: a) Type 1, from 50000 to 60000 contos; b) Type 2, from 25000 to 30000 contos; c) Type 3, from 20000 to 25000 contos.

<sup>45</sup> A Comissão. Estudo Preliminar do Problema da Habitação de Luanda. Information nº 34/LEA/1962, p. 8.

This conceived planning and its (rough) application expose the basic strategy I can now identify in Creole urbanism: while racial segregation is dislodged, class and culture – the “life style” – are centered as the main signifiers of colonial difference. However, as Oliveira makes clear, the notion of culture itself remains intimately entangled with familiar images of phenotypical dispositions – and his notion of psycho-biological transformation is the key here. Again, I believe, we face the overlap of an urbanism of difference and integration with the bio-legal and ethno-political framing of bodies. As it was, the regimentation of populations “in need” – a class bias to begin with – in the three groups presented by the Commission, manifest the transmutation of race into the world of culture (and as ethno-political imposition on the body). On the other hand, it will be precisely this classification – irrupting from the confusion of somatic evidence and cultural judgment – that will inform a certain kind of legal entitlement and spatial distribution (in terms of the different types of neighborhood units). In the juncture of cultural distinctiveness and emplacement, the bio-legality of citizenship is manifested: even though universal citizenship had been extended for all individuals in Angola, the policies of the colonial state would keep on producing difference on the basis of race (phenotype), culture (education, religion, life style) and location (residence). Here, the solidity of racial boundaries is distorted, but keep on being an ambiguous, pervasive, referential.

The Comission’s project was an attempt to secure the equal distribution of the urban population in terms of somatic groups, while also supplying the labor force needed to related

plans of decentralizing industrialization throughout Luanda<sup>46</sup>. But when the Laboratory of Engineering sent their project to the General Governor, it contained an opinion by the Provincial Secretary Manuel Pimentel dos Santos. He argued that urbanism had to consider “the numerical inequality between the black population and other races, the issue of public transport, and, inclusively, questions of security and public order”. Finally, he recommended, it was necessary to “eliminate *sanzalas* and *musseques* [...] secure their total or partial demolition”<sup>47</sup>. Here, (brutal) intervention is vindicated on a perception of danger: the threat posed by the other side of the frontier of asphalt.

*Integrity and Danger: urban lawfare and the integration of the musseques*

The legislative reform following the abolition of the *Estatuto* performed some cosmetic transformations in the spatial grid of the colonial state. The multicultural *ethos* of the law indicated that it was not convenient to impose a “municipal formula” if there were no “conditions of implementation”. Rather, other forms of local institutionalism were to be encouraged, such as *regedorias*<sup>48</sup>, said to be embedded in the local culture. The novelty of this framework was twofold: on the one hand, rather than a bifurcation of power, it suggested the internal legal pluralism of the colonial state, better suited as an administrative policy in a international context in which the *Indigenato* was under fire; on the other, it territorialized the disjunctions inherent to what I am describing as the bio-legality of citizenship. Under the

---

<sup>46</sup> For example, regarding the location of these neighborhood units in the urban scheme of the city, it is advised that Type 3 should occupy industrial or port zones.

<sup>47</sup> Manuel Pimental Pereira dos Santos. Secretário Provincial. Estudo Preliminar do Problema da Habitação em Luanda. Despacho nº 25/LEA/1962, pp. 16-17

<sup>48</sup> Decree nº 43896, of 6<sup>th</sup> of September of 1961. Here, my reader must be reminded that the *regedorias* had already been established by the *Estatuto*.

excuse of “social and economic progress” or “the development of population of each area”, the law differentiated the citizens, and their legal entitlements, in terms of culture (customs and traditions) and residence. As it was, that produced two forms of citizens’ access to the colonial state, one in relation to the modern, municipal, *Junta de Freguesia* (Local Council); other, in relation to the traditional, customary, *Regedoria*. The *Indigenato* is transmuted in multi-level, multi-cultural, governance.

In Luanda, for most of the 1950s the administrative communication between the *musseques* and the Municipality had relied on the mediation of the chiefs or other forms of local organization<sup>49</sup>. By the end of the decade, however, the escalating urban development would require the division of the city in three administrative districts<sup>50</sup>. As universal citizenship was installed, and the figure of the “Indigenous” disappeared, the areas located under the Municipality’s jurisdiction, now organized as Districts and *Freguesias*, would respond to modern law only. I believe this transformation must be understood in relation to two related process. First, the aftermath of the racial carnage of 1961<sup>51</sup>, demanded policies of security and control. Bender (2004) has affirmed that the basic contradiction of this post-1961 era was one of development *versus* control. I believe, however, that in Luanda the political disposition was one of enhancing control *through* urban development. Second, the colonial securitization of development would be put forward through law and the disciplinary powers

---

<sup>49</sup> João Barros Paralta. Report on the Ordinary Administrative Inspection of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Distric of Luanda. Inspection of Administrative Services, 1972.

<sup>50</sup> The Decree n° 42757, of 23<sup>rd</sup> of December of 1959 established that more developed municipalities should follow the administrative division, in districts, that operated in Lisbon and Oporto. In 1960, Decree-Law n° 3.042, of 11<sup>th</sup> of May, created the three administrative districts of Luanda. In 1964, the Ordinance n° 13.489 creates a forth district, in response to population and urban growth.

<sup>51</sup> Péliissier (2009) describes how the months following the attacks of February were of intense urban violence. Radical white militias would invade the *musseques* and indiscriminately kill black people, generating a spiral of violence and retaliations..

related to modern citizenship – legal identities, civil registration, property ownership, and so on. John Comaroff (2001) has employed the term *lawfare* to describe the strategic use of legal means in the colonial subjection of indigenous peoples. I appropriate the term to suggest that in Luanda the securitization of the urban space would be carried out through the forced legalization of the *musseques*, i.e., its re-inscription in the legality of the city.

But law and offence are not given instruments. They are, rather, cultural and political constructs embedded on the “dialectics of law and disorder” (Comaroffs, 2006) upon which colonial rule is based. Thus, to integrate, re-inscribe these “marginal spaces” into the force of law, meant to, precisely, document, demonstrate, expose, their illegality in the first place. It had to be invented in an interplay of both utopian and dystopic representations (Rajaram, 2006). In the 1960s, images of development would be instrumental in marking the modern identification of the “city of asphalt”. This fetishism of change, urban welfare and modernity would conceal the reality of the war elsewhere, while narrating the *musseques* as a “dystopic space”. While strategically displaced to the margins of law, the *musseques* would become a territory crying for colonial intervention. In 1961, an observer documented the “generalized state of discontent in the *musseques*, as well as the existence of agitators willing to explore the situation”<sup>52</sup>. One year later, Ilídio do Amaral referring to, once more, the migration of rural groups to the urban space, affirmed that “these unrooted populations, which constitute the major part of urban population living in the *musseques*, cause socio-geographic problems of a certain gravity” (1962: 81-82). In 1965, José de Sousa Bittencourt claimed that the “cultural marginality” of these groups, trapped in-between systems of value could give rise to

---

<sup>52</sup> Vasco Telles da Gama. Report on the Inspection of the Council of Luanda: 2<sup>nd</sup> Administrative District. High Inspection of Administrative Services and Indigenous Affairs, 1961, p. 11.

“personality disorders” or “neurotic” behavior (1965: 125). Some year later, on his iconic book *A Família nos Musseques de Luanda* (The Family in the Musseques of Luanda), Ramiro Monteiro interpreted the “criminality and deviance” widespread in these areas as a result of the “cultural desintegration” (1973: 376) inherent to the rural-urban transition. He described moral degradation, alcoholism, youth crime, homosexuality, prostitution, and drug abuse as facts of life in these areas<sup>53</sup>.

Based on anthropological theories of conflicts of culture<sup>54</sup>, these descriptions are representatives of the ways in which the (bio-)legality of citizenship is inscribed in ideas of cultural integrity, bodily disposition and urban location. The frontier between the legal and the illegal, the moral and the deviant, reenacts cultural judgments and the racial boundaries of rule and legal identities. The criminalization of the *musseques* in terms of mental sanitation reveals the fractured nature of colonial society; it exposes how the “internal frontiers” (Stoler, 1997) of colonial citizenship are drawn on the basis of residence, racialized behavior, cultural regimentation and bodily action. Here, the psycho-anthropological concept of “cultural sanity” performs the de-politization of insurgency, and the culturalization of political discontent. My incursion through police records and counter insurgency plans reveals the underlying political topography of colonial (bio-)legality: the *musseques* would be object of constant raids and supervision<sup>55</sup>. In 23<sup>rd</sup> of February of 1966, police forces surrounded the *musseque* Calema,

---

<sup>53</sup> Monteiro’s book was the result of more than one decade of observation and colonizing practice in the city. The author had worked as a colonial administrator in Luanda and, later, in the Angolan Services for Information Control. His wife worked on the *Junta Provincial de Habitação* (Provincial Committee for Housing).

<sup>54</sup> Title of the lecture delivered by Jorge Dias in the *Congresso sobre Problemas Humanos nas Regiões Tropicais* (Congress on Human Problems in Tropical Regions). According to Dias, individuals who are in a “transitional state” between two cultures “evidently go through periods of psychic anxiety. [...] This situations are often followed by an emotional outflow of more or less violent nature” (Dias, 1961: 109).

<sup>55</sup> I found multiple references to these police raids in the *musseques* in documentation of the Comissão for Counter-Insurgency.

identifying 2000 individuals and arresting 768. It was feared that “tribal disputes” between ethnic groups were masking intentions of political subversion<sup>56</sup>. This event demonstrates the overlap, in colonial reason, between cultural instability and urban public order.

But the disciplinary intervention was also coupled with ideals of development, quality of life, urban welfare, and, generally fight against poverty and denigration. Yet, even here the privilege role of law would be expressed. The report for the new Master Plan commissioned by the Luanda Municipality, in 1973, provides a series of legal strategies to “legalize” the space as a necessary step towards urban development<sup>57</sup>. In 1974, the project would be launched under the motto “reconverting the *musseques*”. The journal *A Cidade*, of the city of Luanda, affirmed: “[the Master Plan] will now be (finally) the beginning of a true policy of urban integration of impoverished social classes and groups recently settled in the city”<sup>58</sup> (*A Cidade*, 1974: 26). Published after the Carnations Revolution in Portugal, the “(finally)” works as a disclaimer of everything done so far. Even if it still holds on to the project of manufacturing a colonial city, it exposes urbanism in its most striking aspect: in its failure.

---

<sup>56</sup> Information nº 167-SC/CI(2). On an attempt of terrorist activity in the city of Luanda. PIDE, 23<sup>rd</sup> of February of 1966.

<sup>57</sup> Luanda Municipality. Master Plan. Report A: preliminary studies, 1973.

<sup>58</sup> *A Cidade* was the official magazine of the city of Luanda, published by the Municipality.



## EPILOGUE

### Urbanism, Persistence, Failure

My story.  
If it is beautiful, if it is ugly, you are the one to  
judge. I only swear I have told no lies, and  
these cases happened here in Luanda.  
(Luandino Vieira, *Luuanda*)

When the Angolan writer Luandino Vieira, a white Portuguese-born *musseque*-dweller, published his first book, *Luuanda*, in 1964, he caused some furor. Written in the Luanda's prison, where Luandino was arrested for political subversion, the book recollects events of daily life under colonial rule. In 1965, it was awarded the Annual Prize for a Novel, of the *Sociedade Portuguesa de Escritores* (Portuguese Writers' Society). Accused by the secret police of "betraying the nation", the society was shut down. Though banished, the book kept on circulating in the *musseques*, in the original or later illegal editions. It became an icon of Angolan "consciousness" and expression of an affective topography of the city that differed profoundly of that conveyed by the colonial effort. It was a counter-mapping of Luanda, a displacement of the spatialized experience in language: *Luuanda*<sup>59</sup>. All these events show the contested nature of rule, the multiplicity of experiences of space, and the surreptitious intervention of cultural forces along, against and beyond the colonial divide.

As I have posed in this study, colonizing efforts have never been overwhelming grids, but rather ambiguously and contradictorily engagements with the social realities upon which

---

<sup>59</sup> Later in an interview, Vieira himself described the book as a counter-mapping of the city. See: Ribeiro, M. (2010). "E agora José, Luandino Vieira? An interview with José Luandino Vieira". *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies*, 15/16, pp- 27-35.

they aimed to intervene. In the case of urbanism, particularly, the colonial city – never fully colonized – was a space in which competing projects of governance and fractured images of rule, bodies and culture, would be performed. Here I advance to the center of the argument of urbanization as “spatial drama”: colonial urbanism, as it was, crosscut by tensions, contradictions, and confusions, could only undermine its own project. As my analysis has showed, the overlapping of ideals of segregation and conviviality (in urbanism), integration and differentiation (in citizenship law), biology (visualized race) and culture (measured bodily increments) (in anthropology) suggests that the mentality of colonial governance – or colonial governmentality – was a rather confused assemblage.

Here, the problematic to which I referred earlier, in the beginning of this text, must be re-addressed. The strategic displacement between one urbanism of segregation and one of conviviality, I have suggested, can only be fully understood if positioned in relation to co-incident transformations unfolding in colonial law and anthropology. Regarding the former, I pointed out the abolition, in 1961, of the legal system of the *Indigenato*, which effected the universalization of citizenship. As related to the later, I have emphasized the shifting epistemic assumptions within the anthropological field, and particularly the increasing de-authorization of anthropometric methods, ensued by the hegemonization of cultural anthropology. These related displacements, as images of transformation and multicultural reform, were openly conveyed by Portuguese rule as a form of re-positioning the Empire in world-history, in relation to wider (hi)stories of modernization, urbanization and (post-)colonial multiculturalism.

But, as Turner has argued, persistence is not opposed to, but “a striking aspect of

change” (1974: 34). As I have exposed, the “reforms” of Portuguese rule in Luanda was always doomed to re-enact the contradictions they were trying to solve: race was, via the ethno-politics of culture, re-introduced in idioms of ethnicity and “education”; legalized racism persisted in the bio-legality of differentiated citizenship; segregation in space, through racialized and “cultured” inequalities of class, was re-centered in the urbanism of popular housing. Expressing of these entanglements, the criminalization of the *musseques*-dwellers was a legal, urbanistic and anthropo-biological project. My ethnography has posed, finally, that the understanding of colonial enframing, spacing, naming, imagining – generally put, modes of production of colonial space – should consider the intervention over the body not only as a mere “result” but as an integrant element of the colonizing effort upon urban space.

But the interpretation of urbanization as spatial drama demands the unveiling of a striking aspect of the urbanism in a colonial situation – its inevitable *failure*. Banks (2011) has referred to the failure of planning projects in subsuming ground realities by their totalizing grid. Although this is clearly true for Luanda as well, my study has showed that a more entrenched failure is not place in the encounter of the “frame” and the “ground” (which is always doomed to a mismatch). Rather, I have emphasized the *failure* within, i.e., the stubborn confusion, the pervading ambiguity, the uncertainty of closure, the instability of the sign of power. Urbanization as spatial drama performs the transformation on our understanding of the historical process. Urbanism not as the colonizing project (it considers itself to be), but as an agonizing gesture. As the acts of my drama have exposed, in colonial Luanda urbanism could never efface the erasure of the signs of race, the abandonment of biology for culture, the transition from ideals of segregation to others of conviviality. These

competing sensibilities co-existed with and undermined each other. They reveal that in this inevitability of failure, in the play of anxiety and mission, resides the main source of spatial drama.

## REFERENCES

- A Cidade (1974). “Re-converter os Musseques”. *A Cidade: revista de divulgação*, 26, Mar/Jun, pp. 1-47.
- Alexandre, V. (1993). “Ideologia, Economia e Política: a questão colonial na implantação do Estado Novo”. *Análise Social*, XXVIII (123-124) (4º-5º), pp. 1117-1136.
- Amaral, I. (1962). *Ensaio de um estudo geográfico da rede urbana de Angola*. Lisboa: Junta de Investigações do Ultramar.
- Amaral, I. (1968). *Luanda. Estudo de geografia urbana*. Lisboa: Junta de Investigações do Ultramar.
- António, M. (1968). *Luanda, “ilha” crioula*. Lisboa: Agência-Geral do Ultramar.
- Banks, L. J. (2011). *Home Spaces, Street Styles: contesting power and identity in a South African city*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Bender, G. (2004). *Angola Under the Portuguese. The Myth and the Reality*. Trenton, Asmara: Africa World Press.
- Bettencourt, J. S. (1965). “Subsídio para o estudo sociológico da população de Luanda”. *Boletim do Instituto de Investigação de Angola*, 2(1), pp. 83-130.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Londres: Routledge.
- Boas, F. (1920). “The Methods of Anthropology”. *American Anthropologists*, New Series, 22(4), pp 311-321.
- Brandão, J. (2008). *Cronologia da Guerra Colonial: Angola-Guiné-Mozambique, 1961-1974*. Lisboa: Prefácio Editora.
- Cabrita, C. (1961). “Comunicação do Engº Castro Cabrita”. In Ministério das Obras Públicas (Org.). *Colóquio sobre Urbanismo*. Lisboa: Ministério das Obras Públicas.
- Cairo, H.(2006). ““Portugal is not a small country’: Maps and Propaganda in the Salazar Regime”. *Geopolitics*, 11(3), pp. 367-395.
- Carter, P. (1987). *The Road to Botany Bay: an exploration of landscape and history*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Castells, M. (1977). *The Urban Question: a Marxist approach*. Cambridge: MIT University Press.

Castelo, C. (2007). *Passagens para a África. O povoamento de Angola e Moçambique com Naturais da Metrópole (1920-1974)*. Porto: Afrontamento.

Castelo, Cláudia (1998). *O modo português de estar no mundo. O luso-tropicalismo e a ideologia colonial portuguesa (1933-1961)*. Porto: Afrontamento.

Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe*. Princeton: University Press.

Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The Nation and Its Fragments: colonial and postcolonial histories*. Princeton: University Press.

Chatterjee, P. (2004). *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Political Society in Most of the World*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Comaroff, J and Comaroff, J (2006). *Law and Disorder in the Postcolony*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Comaroff, J. (2001). “Colonialism, Culture, and the Law: A forefront”, *Law and Social Inquiry*, 26, pp. 305-14.

Comaroff, John and Comaroff, Jean (1992). *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*, Boulder, San Francisco. Oxford: Westview Press.

Cooper, F. (2005). *Colonialism in question: theory, knowledge, history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cooper, F. and Stoler, A. L. (Eds.). *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Corrêa, A. A. M. (1945). *Raças do Império*. Porto: Portucalense.

Dávila, J. (2010). “Raça, etnicidade e colonialismo na obra de Gilberto Freyre”. *Desigualdade & Diversidade – Revista de Ciências Sociais da PUC-Rio*, 7, Jul/Dez, pp. 153-174.

Dias, J. (1957). “Contactos de Cultura”. In *Colóquios de politica ultramarina internacionalmente relevante*. Lisboa: Junta de Inventigação do Ultramar, pp. 55-82.

Direcção dos Serviços de Urbanismo e Habitação (1961). “Alguns aspectos do urbanismo no ultramar”. *Ultramar*, 5, Jul/Set, pp. 43-54.

Direcção dos Serviços de Urbanismo e Habitação (1961). “Aspectos do Urbanismo no Ultramar”. *Ultramar*, 5, Jul/Set., pp. 43-54.

Dirks, N. (1996). "Is Vice Versa? Historical Anthropologies and Anthropological Histories". In McDonald, T. (Ed.) *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*. University of Michigan, pp. 17-51.

Escobar, Arturo (1995). *Encountering Development: the making and the unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fabian, Johannes (2002). *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Others*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fonte, Maria (2007). *Urbanismo e Arquitectura em Angola: de Norton de Matos à Revolução*. PhD Dissertation presented to the Lisbon Technical University (UTL).

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Allen Lane, Penguin.

Foucault, Michel (1978). *The History of Sexuality, Vol. I: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon.

Freyre, . (1987) [1933]. *The Masters and the Slaves: A Study in the Development of Brazilian Civilization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Freyre, G. (1961). *O Luso e o Trópico: sugestões em torno dos métodos portugueses de integração de povos autóctones e de culturas diferentes da europeia num complexo de civilização: o luso-tropical*. Lisboa: Comissão Executiva das Comemorações do Infante D. Henrique.

Goh, D. P. S. (2008). "From colonial pluralism to postcolonial multiculturalism: race, state formation and the question of cultural diversity in Malaysia and Singapore". *Sociology Compass*, 2/1, pp. 232-252.

Goswami, M. (2004). *Producing India: from colonial economy to national space*. Chicago: University Press.

Guha, R. (2002). *History at the Limit of World-History*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Harvey, D. (1995). *The condition of postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Holston, J. (2008). *Insurgent Citizenship. Disjunctions of democracy and modernity in Brazil*. Princeton: University Press.

Jacobs, J. (1996). *The Edge of Empire: postcolonialism and the city*. London: Routledge.

King, A. (1991). *Urbanism, Colonialism and the World Economy*. London: Routledge.

- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Léonard, Y. (1999), "O Ultramar Português". In Bethencourt, F., Cuadhuri, K. (Eds.) *História da expansão portuguesa, Volume V, Último Império e Recentramento (1930-1998)*, Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores, pp. 31-50.
- Mandani, M. (1996). *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Martins, Isabel (2000). *Luanda: cidade e arquitectura*. PhD Dissertation presented to the Univeristy of Oporto (UP) (photocopied).
- Meneses, M. (2010). "O 'Indígena' Africano e o 'Colono' Europeu: a construção da diferença por processos legais". *E-cadernos CES*, 7, pp. 68-93.
- Meneses, M. P. (2007), "Pluralism, Law and Citizenship in Mozambique: Mapping the Complexity ", *Oficina do CES*, 271.
- Mitchell, T. (1988). *Colonising Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mitchell, T. (2002). *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Monteiro, R. L. (1973). A Família nos Musseques de Luanda: subsídios para o seu estudo. Luanda : Fundo de Acção Social no Trabalho em Angola.
- Moreira, Adriano (1961). "Política de Integração". *Boletim Geral do Ultramar*, 434-435 (XXXVII), pp. 3-28.
- Mudimbe, V. Y. (1988). *The Invention of Africa: gnosis, philosophy and the order of knowledge*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Mumford, L. (1958). *The Culture of Cities*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Neto, J. P. (1964) *Angola: meio século de integração*. Lisboa: Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Política Ultramarina.
- Neto, M. C. (1997). "Ideologias, Contradições e Mistificações da Colonização de Angola no Século XX". *Lusotopie*, pp. 327-359.
- Oliveira, Mário (1962). *Problemas essenciais do urbanismo no ultramar: estruturas Urbanas de Integração e convivência*. Lisboa: Agência-Geral do Ultramar.
- Pélissier, R. and Wheeler, D. (2009). *História de Angola*. Lisboa: Tinta da China.



Popke, E. J. (2003). "Managing colonial alterity: narratives of race, space and labor in Durban, 1870-1920". *Journal of Historical Geography*, 29, 2, pp. 248-267.

Rabinow, P. (1989). *French modern: norms and forms of the social environment*. Chicago: University Press.

Rajaram, P. K. (2006). "Dystopic Geographies of Empire". *Alternatives*, 31, pp. 475-506.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Said, Edward (1995). *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin Books.

Saldanha, A. (2006). "Reontologising race: the machinic geography of phenotype". *Environment and Planning D: society and Space*. 24, pp. 9-24.

Sanches, M. R. (2006) (Org.). *Portugal não é um país pequeno: contar o império na pós-colonialidade*. Lisboa: Livros Cotovia.

Santos, A. (1966). "Poema amarelo". *Boletim Cultural da Câmara Municipal de Luanda*. 12, Jul/Ago/Set, p. 62.

Simonsen, K. (2005). "Bodies, Sensations, Space and Time: The Contribution from Henri Lefebvre". *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, 8 (1), 1-14.

Soares, A. C. (1960). "Introdução a um estudo do urbanismo em Angola: bairros indígenas nos centros urbanos". *Estudos Ultramarinos*, Maio, pp. 119-155.

Spivak, G. C. (1985). "The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives". *History and Theory*, 24(3), pp. 247-272.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography". In: Guha, R. and Spivak, G. C (Eds.). *Selected Subaltern Studies*. Oxford: University Press, pp. 3-32.

Spivak, Gayatri C. (2006). *In other worlds: essays in cultural politics*. New York: Routledge.

Steinmetz, G. (2007). *The Devil's Handwriting: precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Qingdao, Samoa and Southwest Africa*. Chicago: University Press.

Stoler, A. L. (1997) "Sexual Affronts and Racial Frontiers: European Identities and

Stoler, A. L. (2009). *Along the archival grain: thinking through colonial ontologies*. Princeton: University Press.

the Cultural Politics of Exclusion in Southeast Asia". In Cooper, F. and Stoler, A. L. (Eds.). *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley:

Thomaz, Orlando Ribeiro (2001). ““O Bom Povo Português”: Usos e Costumes D’Aquém e D’Alem-Mar”. *Mana*, 7(1), 55-87.

Turner, V. (1974). *Drama, Fields and Metaphors: symbolic action in human society*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

University of California Press.

Verdon, M. (2007). “Franz Boas: cultural history for the present, or obsolete natural history?”. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institue* (N.S.), 13, pp. 433-451.

### **Archival Sources**

All non-published sources consulted are referenced in footnotes throughout the text. Sources that has been published were integrated on the reference list. I have consulted the following archives:

Arquivo Histórico Ultramarino

Arquivo Histórico-Diplomático

Arquivo do Instituto Português de Apoio ao Desenvolvimento

Centro de Documentação e Informação

Instituto de Investigação Científica Tropical/Acervo de Geografia

Museu de Etnologia/Espólio de Jorge Dias