

# State-Sponsored Indemnification, the Materiality of Money, and the Meanings of Community in Salvador, Brazil's Pelourinho Cultural Heritage Center

John F. Collins

**Abstract.** This paper is an ethnography of state-citizen relations around the exchange of money for working-class Brazilians' living spaces coveted by the state in its efforts to establish a UNESCO World Heritage Site. It argues that money, as a material sign of experience and suffering, has become a mnemonic and a source of insightful analyses of state power on the part of people subject to the indemnification process from 1992 to the present.

In August of 2004 I returned to the Pelourinho Historical Center in the Brazilian city of Salvador, Bahia, after an absence of two years. I did so to visit friends and to share a book manuscript based on their fierce battle to hold on to their homes in the face of the state's attempt to remove occupants and reconstruct these edifices while transforming the neighborhood into a properly historical and sanitary UNESCO World Heritage Site. As we reminisced, a woman asked about "Dois Pés," a dance teacher she used to tease due to his supposedly effeminate occupation. I responded that I saw Dois frequently in New York and that he had been unable to visit because of green card problems. I told them with a bit of malice that Dois's proof of residency had been printed incorrectly. When specifying sex, the government had inserted an "F" for female. He returned the document and could not travel. This thrilled my audience since these capoeira fighters, aluminum can collectors,

tourist hustlers, construction workers, reggae musicians, domestic servants, and small-time drug dealers I was visiting had long teased Dois about his lack of macho swagger.

In response to this news, a man I call Ordep announced, introducing this article's concerns with the results of the exchange of money for living quarters,

Coitado de Dois. Eu lembro quando a gente foi pegar fila no Baneb pra pegar a indenização. Dois estava falando do serviço militar, que era fusileiro naval, e o praça, aquele que fica no canto pra eles não levar o cofre, ele olhou pra Dois e falou "Pare de rebolar, que porra é isso, rapaz? Eles não lhe ensinaram como ficar em pé na marinha?!? Você vai deixar o dinheiro cair se não dar um jeito." Coitado de Dois.

[Poor Dois. I remember when we were standing in line together to cash our indemnification checks at the Baneb (Banco do Estado da Bahia). Dois was telling me about serving in the marines and that cop, you know the one who stands on the corner to make sure they don't rob the place, he looked at Dois and said "Stand straight, what the hell is wrong with you, man? Didn't they teach you how to stand in the marines?!? You're going to drop all your money if you don't fix that!" Poor Dois!]

Soon the group began to recall Dois's foibles as part of stories about the removal of Pelourinho residents during the neighborhood's mid-1990s reforms. They remembered how he came home wobbling after taking a depressant and had his pocket picked by a street child. And then they laughed more as they remembered how Dois had tried to avoid rent on a room he occupied after receiving a government indemnification and moving out of his condemned quarters in the Pelourinho. He had tried to plead poverty to a landlord who broke into his room and confiscated his clothing. But when Dois paid and retrieved the clothes he found that the almost R\$1000 indemnification he had hidden in a pocket was gone.

Dois's friends found it hilarious that he had tried to be *esperto*, or a successful trickster, and ended up "quebrando a cara" ("breaking his face"). This led them to recall the Pelourinho's 1992–2002 indemnification process that had forced them to give up homes in exchange for payments that ranged from US\$800 to \$2000. They talked of the binges, parties, and commodities that this windfall allowed them. Soon a rosy feeling filled the room as we remembered with glee the pratfalls of drunk neighbors or people's pride in

new outfits that appeared “xique” (“chic”) at the time but that we now found “brau” (“tasteless”). Nonetheless, the effect was one of connection as people talked of events they had understood as difficult and trying when their community was being ripped apart by the combined forces of cultural heritage officials, police who enforced the culture managers’ dictates, and the temptations of cash money.

Yet as nostalgia took over, these former residents who frequently fought bitterly and usually argued that they were individuals and not a group, found themselves united by a structure of feeling that pointed to the fact that they had lived together for decades. And this emanated from an experience with state-directed evaluation, pricing, and eventual takeover of their living spaces. It is worth pointing out here that a significant body of social scientific works in and of Latin America, as is true elsewhere, approaches money as a source of anomie and thus a threat to personal relations. Yet in the Pelourinho, together with our friend’s perceived weaknesses, money appeared to serve as a mnemonic and a source of communion among old friends. Of course, this locus of good feeling was not quite money. Rather, the group came together around memories of money or, put slightly better, the human relations associated with or counterposed to its circulation.

At the center of this article lie issues that emanate from Marx’s now paradigmatic treatment of commodity fetishism and the relations between production, exchange, and consumption. Through social scientific research and cultural heritage management I wish to examine what I term a “commodification of humanity itself” and begin to assess the sorts of insights, divergences, and group identifications that arise in light of this process closely related to the forms of alienation that Marx identified as responsible for the abstractions and misrecognitions that are so much a part of capital’s exploitation of labor in the modern world. This paper is thus a consideration of a specific ethnographic problem in the Pelourinho as well as a broader process of capital accumulation around the production and marketing of multicultural identities. It engages the cultural specificity of Brazilian working-class approaches to capital as well as historically situated subject production around money without reifying something like a “Brazilian” approach to cash and commodification.

Instead, it examines a cultural heritage zone, a site of self-consciously Brazilian production of culture as a commodity, as a means of mapping shifts in the value of culture and the role of money in the forms of everyday life girded by, and productive of, such new cultural manifestations (Collins, “Culture”).

In short, I argue here that fetishism is, in the Bahian historical center, a cultural discourse that may be employed for various ends and that may result in defetishizations that reveal novel perspectives on historical processes. In doing so, I offer a discussion of the theoretical bases for this approach. Next I give an outline of Pelourinho social relations and Bahian history before moving to the ethnographic investigation that forms the paper's backbone.

### **Neo-liberalism, Bahia, and their forms of community**

The Pelourinho reveals processes of great interest in response to recent calls for "new combinations of community and market" (Gudeman 163). In this neighborhood, class status and capital accumulation depend in a variety of ways on the performance of blackness. In other words, although social scientists have long examined how the production of a nation and a people gird state formation, in Bahia today the grooming of a symbolic national people in a cultural heritage center has given rise to a type of human export commodity. This is something I have explored at length elsewhere (Collins, *Revolt*) and here I would like to examine in detail one aspect of this process, namely the bureaucratic interactions so much a part, and the results, of state-citizen negotiation of government payments to residents.

One of the most basic results of the state-sponsored indemnification of Pelourinho residents in the 1990s is related to Hacking's "looping effect," or "how the structure and implementation of knowledge-framing relate to the validation of current experience" (Guyer 21). In the Pelourinho of the 1990s, this was a process whereby sanctioned representations, even if they bore little actual resemblance to practices "on the ground," returned to provide cognitive models and patterned cultural schemas much utilized by people in making sense of their world. Thus the categories employed in ascertaining the social features and habits of the often unruly population of the Pelourinho—Salvador's red-light zone since 1945—as that state struggled to make it into a symbol of national pasts, reappear in discussions of that process. The objectifications fomented by the state gain new lives when refracted and redeployed by the people subject to them. And this co-production of social types demystifies aspects of the commodification process and provides remaining residents with a contradictory but nonetheless powerfully effective notion of community. It does so, however, through a quite iconoclastic treatment of money. Thus the exchange of money for dwellings has both destroyed a neighborhood and reconstituted a somewhat different community in its place.

This argument turns on a recognition that “representations are [indeed] social facts” (Rabinow) and that their facticity provides subaltern populations with labile resources for refashioning futures (Scott). It builds on the recognition that specific commodities have lives of their own (Appadurai; Parry and Bloch). But this is tempered by the realization that studies have focused for the most part on exchange rather than objects’ circulation and that too often in social thought, “once conceptually removed from circulation, commodities and money are also removed from the space and time of their genesis” (Eiss 293; Lemon; Maurer). But what happens when subalterns interpret their state’s actions as generative of human commodities and those people/commodities continue to circulate within sanctioned and unsanctioned spaces of historical representation? As these people move about the city, and, especially, the Pelourinho’s carefully groomed plazas, what sorts of interpretations do they put together of the process of commodification and monetarization of their everyday habits, or vernacular “culture,” that in turn generates that landscape through cultural heritage management? How does this give rise to alternative histories of Brazil and of the making of commodities around money and exchange, and how does it reproduce the official stories told by the Bahian state in the Pelourinho?

For Marx, money is a homogenizing force without a history in itself. Its history is one of the progressive appropriations of the value of human labor and its illusory crystallization as an apparently inert yet circulating object divorced from contextual specificity and human being. From this perspective, money is unable, unlike, for example, “the cow, symbolic or substantial, to embody a biography, let alone bear with it an entire grammar of social relations” (Comaroff and Comaroff 151). Yet when one examines the relations between money, culture, and the Pelourinho resident constructed by the Bahian state as a living representative of national origins, it appears that both people and money contain and stand metonymically for particular histories in Bahia’s cultural heritage zone today.

**The invention of tradition, the undoing of degeneracy, and the control of territory: Pelourinho, 1967–2006**

Until the mid-1990s, “respectable” Brazilians avoided Salvador’s downtown Maciel. This region of crumbling buildings and soiled cobblestones much photographed by outsiders exhibited extremely high rates of crime. This changed in 1992 when the state began to remove the residents so as to declare

eminent domain over buildings, restore these landmarks, and lease them to the tourist industry. This was conceptualized as a “recuperation” of Salvador, the nation’s birthplace and oldest major city. It represented an attempt to make tourism and culture a linchpin of the state’s economy and their profits. And it was possible because since 1985 the Maciel, which is now known as the Pelourinho, has been classified as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. This is due to its several hundred Portuguese baroque buildings and to the effervescence of its residents’ cultural production. And, given UNESCO’s involvement, the state came to focus on the safeguarding of “traditional” Bahian culture and the provision of security to visitors. This has involved a social science–based governmentality in which the careful nurturing of gendered moralities, health, and cultural production has allowed the state to occupy a region that for most of the second half of the twentieth century was out of its direct control. For this reason, among many others, the payment of indemnifications so as to remove more than 4000 residents was a fraught process that has remained an area of concern for both the state and those who received, or failed to receive, indemnifications. Yet such payment was not the first step in remaking the Pelourinho.

The Bahian state set out in 1967 to reassert control over this neighborhood that had been abandoned by elites at the end of the nineteenth century by establishing the Bahian Institute for Artistic and Cultural Patrimony (IPAC). IPAC employed social scientific methods to map the Maciel/Pelourinho and establish it as a community that might be associated with Bahian and Brazilian identity (Collins, “X Marks”). This mapping during the 1970s and 1980s became, by the 1990s, a form of quantifying the value of the real estate occupied by working-class Bahians often involved in the drug trade, prostitution, or informal services for tourists. A concern for the family structures, health, and gendered morality of a population was mobilized to construct an image of state care of groups configured as problematic. And this resulted in the reappropriation of a section of the city that had been effectively off-limits to the bourgeoisie and out of its direct control for decades. But the careful ethnographic and sociological mapping of the Pelourinho in the 1970s and 1980s is most important to understanding what happened in the 1990s because it accustomed residents to the workings of social science.

Residents, accustomed to interacting with IPAC, interpreted data production in preparation for indemnification as but another iteration of a long line of attempts to know them. People did not treat the payment as conceptually

new but as part of a long line of interactions with IPAC. Nonetheless, many were excited about the possibility of receiving monies. Others, however, were less sanguine. How this process played out in the mid-1990s, and the lessons about interactions with state bureaucracies and the value of their everyday habits to that state's political economic policies, have much to do with the role of money in the construction of community in the Pelourinho as cultural heritage center, as opposed to red light zone.

### **Indemnification: a source of ideal types?**

The payment of indemnifications may appear at first glance to have ripped apart a threatened community of people who struggled to survive. Nonetheless, this has not been the case over the long run. Before detailing how indemnification helped define community and hence certain forms of solidarity among working-class Bahians, I examine the disruptions generated by this process in the mid-1990s. And my fieldnotes contain graphic evidence of such. On 14 May 1999, I wrote, after visiting a building in which a majority of residents had been indemnified even as a core group held out for higher indemnifications or possession of the building under Brazil's usufruct laws:

Got in touch, for first time in over a week [with the residents of number 18 Saldanha da Gama Street] since when I went by last Tuesday I found only Fabio and Roberto around. The place is now a mess, with empty wallets and diarrhea sprayed all over. Everyone in the "Rasta Resistência" has now given up hope, has decided that they're gonna run and get the money before it is lost. Mandela and Garimpeiro are desperate to get their hands on the loot and Zé Eduardo says that he doesn't want to be living in a place like this, in which there are huge fights in the courtyard at night, "altas divisões (or was it *divisa* he said?) de roubo, pedra, a barreira toda. E os caras, só porque voce é mais esclarecido, tem fé em Jah mesmo, acha que voce é covarde, que tem medo de agir." ["They come here to split up the loot [...] the spoils of robbery, crack cocaine, the whole gang is here. And those guys, just because you're a bit more informed, you believe in Jah, they think that you're a coward, that you're afraid of acting."]

Garimpeiro agrees, saying "John [2 second pause] tem cada treita de madrugada [1 second] não da nem pra dormir. É muita onda aqui neste lugar de noite." ["John, late at night shit happens. You can't even sleep. There's a lot of trouble in this place at night."]

Due to the rates of violence inside the building, its deteriorating physical state, and the threat that IPAC would stop paying indemnifications to those who failed to accept offers, residents felt pressured to turn over their spaces. Yet many did not want to leave their homes in the center and end up in impoverished neighborhoods where jobs and the excitement of the city center would be difficult to find. As people insisted, “o dinheiro não corre no bairro” (“There is no money in the neighborhood”). Due to resistance, IPAC social service professionals worked to tailor a moving package to each family or individual. At the center of this process was the negotiation of the amount of money to be paid, but residents also received the services of a moving truck and help in opening bank accounts and obtaining identity documents so that they could cash government checks.

Despite, or perhaps because of, the emphasis on indemnification, residents talked incessantly of the monies they would receive from the state. Many tried to collect more than one. People would sign over their homes, cash their checks, and then quickly set up house on an adjoining block only to greet IPAC teams happily as those social scientists expanded their mapping and quantification of the neighborhood. Residents also worked diligently to slip family or friends onto the lists of people indemnified and they would divide up these monies between the person named and the person who signed up that individual.

IPAC calculated indemnifications with a formula it would never release to me. They claimed it was based on time of residence, area occupied, family size, and the uses to which the space was put. Yet the most important determinants of indemnifications were residents’ previous relationships to IPAC, state agents’ perceptions of residents’ contact or friendships with populist politicians or police, and inhabitants’ ability to blackmail or negotiate with IPAC employees. The result of this lack of clarity, together with the conversion of previous IPAC research activities into more narrowly focused attempts to understand what it would take to dislodge residents, was increasing strife and distrust between community members and in regards to their state.

For example, on 10 May 1999, the head of IPAC legal services, Lucia Sepulveda, called to her office recalcitrant residents of 18 Saldanha da Gama. One, an Evangelical Christian, summed up the meeting as “Jesus Cristo fez ela ver a luz. Ela, com o espírito de Jesus Cristo, deu para entender melhor a nossa situação e disse que possivelmente ía reaver a nossa situação, ía ver se dava para conseguir uma relocação depois. E ela ofereceu uns 2 conto para cada um de nos” (“Jesus Christ made her see the light. She was able to, with help



from the spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, understand our situation a bit better and she said that perhaps she'd be able to reconsider our situation. She was going to see if she could relocate us. And she offered about R\$2,000 to each of us"). This person had fought so as not to have to give up his home and it seemed to him that IPAC had relented and would grant not only R\$2000, but the right to return to live following the reconstruction. However, the same man went back the next day with all the building's holdouts and found that the offer had changed. He reported: "O diabo fez ela endurecer. Não tinha mais aquela proposta que ela colocou no outro dia" ("The devil made her take a harder line. That proposal from the other day was now off the table"). The deal was off and a man I will call Caborê offered the following explanation: "Na hora da reunião cada um vem com uma fala diferente, vai cortando a conversa do outro, a gente fica brigando entre nos, e ela só sentada, oh, espiando, esperando, sentada alí pra espalhar as treitas" ("At the moment we meet everyone comes in with a different speech, cutting one another off, and we end up fighting between ourselves, and she's just there sitting there watching, waiting, and getting ready to make our petty squabbles bigger"). The problem, he continued, is that there is no unity among the members of the community or even of the residents of his one building.

An example of this lack of unity exacerbated by easy money took place the next week when the residents returned, again, to see what they might extract from Sepulveda and IPAC. Perhaps sensing their disunity, she discussed the possibility of offering R\$20,000 to the group so that they could buy a house together. Not only did such houses cost much more at the time, but another resident claimed this would result in death since whoever got the check would steal the entire amount and either skip town or kill the others for their shares. For this reason all agreed that such a plan would never work. Instead, each preferred to go off and build their own place.

The residents were eventually dislodged by a police patrol. A number won indemnifications for themselves and even for family members who never lived in the building. Nonetheless, people talked about this money as if it were cursed. They argued that it was impossible to hold on to, that it caused death, destruction, and divorce, and that their neighbors wanted to rob them of it. But most agreed that one way, and perhaps the only way, to hold on to money was to buy a house. As Dona Pió told me, she was one of two residents in her building on the Ladeira do Mijo able to buy a house upon leaving the Pelourinho. She explained that the previous owner told her it was 65,000 *cruzeiros*,

“[...] mas meu dinheiro demorou uns 15 dias para sair e quando voltei para pagar o homem—que eu tinha visto a casa e eu disse ao dono que quis, que ía pagar ele quando eu recebia meu dinheiro ele disse ‘agora é 80,000.’ Por causa da inflação que foi na época do cruzeiro e as coisas subiam toda semana. Mas o que eu fiz era meter a mão no bolso. Peguei esse 80,000.”

“A senhora recebeu mais de 80,000 do governo?” interrompe o João.

“Recebi. Sim. [nodding her head a lot, but matter-of-factly] E os outros, que colocaram o dinheiro na poupança. Hoje, não tem nada. Foram mexendo, foram pegando para comer e [...].”

[(...)“but my money took 15 days to be paid and when I went back to pay the man—you see, I’d seen the house and told the owner that I’d pay him when my indemnification came out, he was like ‘Now it’s 80,000.’ Because it was the days of the *cruzeiro* and inflation made it go up. But what I did was stick my hand in my pocket. I got that 80,000.”

“Ma’am, you received 80,000 from the government?” interrupts John.

“Yes I did. And the others, those who put their money in savings accounts. Today they have nothing. They went and touched their money, taking out some to eat, and [...].”]

As we shall see below, families able to hold on to money and purchase property in far-off neighborhoods have played a significant role in a general appreciation of the restored Pelourinho in working-class Salvador. But for the moment it is worthwhile to focus on the effects of the indemnification process.

On 13 May 1999, a resident I call Caborê responded to my question about who it was who received indemnifications and of what size, with the claim that,

John, aqui tem cinco tipos de pessoas que recebe a grana. Primeiro, tem os saci. Depois vem o pessoal que nunca nem pisou seus pés aqui e vem de Brasília, do interior, para assinar [the indemnification agreement with IPAC]; o pessoal que vende drogas e está quebrado, querendo pegar nessa grana para levantar seu guia de novo; o pessoal que está devendo seu advogado; e por final quem não tem onde morar mas não aguenta mais morar nesta bagunça, não quer os filhos no meio das covardias que rolam aqui.

[John, there are five types of people here who receive money. First, there are crackheads. Then there are those who’ve never even set foot here and come from

Brasilia, from the countryside in order to sign (the indemnification agreement with IPAC). Then there are the drug traffickers whose business is bad who want to get a hold of some capital to set themselves up again. Then there are those who owe their lawyers. And finally, there are those who don't have anywhere else to live and don't want to stay in the middle of these dirty dealings any more.]

The word *saci* is slang for a crack cocaine abuser. And as should be clear from Caborê's statement, he, like his neighbors, painted a picture of a neighborhood faced with a lack of solidarity, people who engaged in illegal activities, and those who struggled to leave. Caborê made this statement about "Pelourinho types" in relation to indemnifications. For Caborê, the struggle to receive state monies, or the choice of not receiving and instead facing police violence and eviction, defines the people of the Pelourinho. But it does much more than establish a population as a group that "corre atrás" ("chases after") indemnifications. It delineates attitudes toward indemnification in a manner that provides a taxonomy for differentiating the group. This man who has lived his adult life in the city center creates an array of types around indemnification that thus becomes a diacritic for differentiating people by defining their morality in relation to cash. There are hardworking people who just want the money so as to escape the neighborhood's dangers. And there are those who owe money and treat the apparent largesse as a source of liquidity. There are the failed dealers unable to protect their capital and hence unable to finance future business opportunities. And finally, before and below all other human types, are the *sacis*.

Indemnification allows for the differentiation of these people into not-quite-ideal types. That money allows for the separation of orders of humanity is not novel. But what is new is the extent to which money, rather than functioning simply as an objectifying and homogenizing force, permits also the narration and analysis of this process. And as the following section will demonstrate, it is not just money's function, but its form that brings to the fore these analyses of Pelourinho social life and historical process.

#### **Defetishization: remembering and analyzing indemnification**

Money has come to play a critical role in the constitution of the contemporary Pelourinho community and hence in defining interpersonal relations. This has happened not only in relation to the filters provided by memories and the bitter divisions among residents who received, or failed to receive, monies. Rather, in

the struggle to put together a cultural heritage center, to expel the majority of that neighborhood's seemingly unruly population, and to do so by exchanging money for their personal spaces, the State Government of Bahia managed to create admittedly complex forms of solidarity. This is not to say that the commodification of Pelourinho residents' everyday habits during this process did not result in a variety of dislocations and feelings of estrangement among those subject to the process. Rather, it is to claim that via this process of reifying social relations as things certain new conceptions of community and identity were put together in the terrain of state-citizen exchanges.

One way to understand what happened is to look closely at the uses to which money is put. I do not mean its deployment in the purchase of goods, but rather, following Eiss, its function as a symbol circulated among people. For example, a former prostitute I call Dinda, now married to a retired policeman and living in a home in the suburb of Boa Vista do Lobato, told me,

What they're really doing is paying us for our "pessoa" ["personhood"]. IPAC would go and check us out and then decide what we're going to get. Every time I look at my house now I am content. I know that I was smart enough to divide up my family and make everyone eighteen or older receive a separate indemnification as a "chefe de família" ["head of household"]. Then we put them together and bought this place. I paid 9000 [*cruzeiros*] to a mason to erect the "laje" ["second floor"] you see there and that's where my sons live with their families. Every time I look at this house I know that I was smart enough to understand what IPAC was doing with indemnification. They didn't want to help us. They never help the poor. But I was smart enough to help myself and I convinced them that I was the right type to receive [adequate government monies].

Dona Dinda claims to be able to perceive much by looking at her house, a symbol and a property she bought with indemnification money. This commodity, purchased with cash money, becomes a symbol in the account above of her ability to see through the historical process of indemnification. This knowledge of what happened complements what she presents retrospectively as a similar ability to understand, at the time of indemnification, the moral criteria on which IPAC paid out monies. Dona Dinda told me she argued that she was a mother, a head of household, and an upstanding member of the community who rented out rooms, took in wash, and prepared meals for neighbors. By presenting herself in a vocabulary readily understandable to

social scientists, who usually recognized in discussions with me the importance of what they called the Pelourinho's "informal" economy, Dinda combined economics and morality to argue for inclusion in payments. And her way of tracking the material results of this history of her influencing of government policy is a glance at the home that she associates with money.

Significantly, Dona Dinda argued to me on many an occasion that she felt at home in her new neighborhood because it was filled with former Pelourinho neighbors as well as people who never lived downtown but who, nonetheless, "respect me because they know me from the 'mangue' ['red-light zone']". They know that I bought my house with money the state paid me for my suffering there, downtown." Here she makes clear the importance of the Pelourinho as red-light zone in mid-twentieth-century Bahian self-representations, and hence the power of the people who controlled its brothels, streets, stores, numbers operations, and drug-dealing locations. Similarly, whenever I visited Salvador's prison I noted that inmates from downtown earned respect from those from peripheral areas, in part due to these people's involvement in the circulation of products, ideas, and news throughout the city of Salvador.

Dinda, who considers herself an upstanding citizen and opposes the practices that lead many to serve time in Salvador's jails, bragged to me that her son had opened up a Bar do Reggae in her new neighborhood. A Bar do Reggae is significant because Salvador's first reggae bars were established in the Pelourinho to celebrate a marginalized musical form much liked by its residents. They were much maligned by IPAC, middle-class visitors scared of black youth, and hence the police (Sansone, *Blackness*; "O Pelourinho"). The spread of reggae bars is thus a diffusion of Pelourinho-based practices.

Through the diffusion of the people, and the practices, of the Pelourinho the state contributed inadvertently to the memorialization of the pre-restoration historical center. But this argument is not simply a demographic. Rather, it is about ways of analyzing the world. The same well-known and highly symbolic (as resistant, as black, and as *marginal* yet essential to the city's commerce in ideas and money) people who were removed from the city center on the basis of indemnification came to analyze this process through the idiom of indemnification and the token of money. Thus their understanding of state power woven around the expressive culture of Afro-descendent people as part of a UNESCO-inspired heritage development project emanated from that state's mode of dislodging them. And even as they were removed their neighborhood came to grow even more in popular consciousness throughout

Salvador. This took place due to former residents' dispersal throughout the city and in terms of experience as these people carried with them the knowledge of fighting for indemnification that generated in turn shrewd analyses of the operations of their state government around territory, race, and their everyday habits, or what IPAC defined as Afro-Bahian culture.

A scene in June of 1999 in the building on Saldanha da Gama Street reinforces this contention. Visiting, I was surprised to find three normally abstinent residents using powdered cocaine. They were embarrassed as they had, as a group, often condemned such behavior. One looked at me and began to justify his actions:

Look what we're doing with IPAC's money. I mean our money. We earned it by caring for these buildings while "gente" ["people"] turned their backs on us and the historical center. And we answered all those stupid questions for years by the IPAC guys wanting to figure out how much to pay us to get out. We also deserve it for being the historical center. We are the historical center. And what we get for being patrimony is this shit. Cocaine. It's vice, it's ruin, and it's death. It's a drug. I know that. But IPAC is like this [rolled up] bill I'm using to snort. It's the road to perdition. It's the funnel that allows us to experience that which they want for us but which we know is wrong.

In an important transposition, the pink R\$10 that the men employed to ingest cocaine became a symbol of the facilitation of residents' ill-conceived behavior. The bit of money itself came to define the talk of immorality and unhealthy temptation that residents used to represent IPAC's unhealthy "carrot," as they called it, dangled so as to dislodge them. Thus, even as money ripped apart the community, its materiality helped residents represent this process as immoral, or at very least it provided an excuse for their illegal activities. They were able to mark its historical unfolding through such symbols of corruption even as they found themselves, like these men guiltily abusing cocaine, embroiled in and unable to escape them. And as this process pushed people out of the Pelourinho, their analyses of IPAC, and by extension their state in general, became a widely diffused aspect of working-class discourse in Salvador.

I will not detail how Pelourinho residents' claims about state power were received and reinflected in the neighborhoods to which they moved. Rather, I emphasize simply that the interpretations forged in the Pelourinho traveled throughout the city and they did so in large part due to residents' discussion of,

and experiences with, money paid by their state in exchange for their domestic spaces. The materiality of money in this process is reinforced by a final example.

One night in June of 1999, as I sat at the tables set up by the beer sellers on the Pelourinho's Ladeira da Praça, a black Mercedes roared up and a well-dressed man jumped out. He sat down at the edge of our group and engaged me in conversation. I did not speak much, wary of this drunk man driving an expensive car on a street known for drug dealing. But one of my companions looked up from conversation and said, "Alligator! How ya doing? What brings you down here to the ghetto?!?" as the two clapped one another on the back. The interloper was the producer of one of Brazil's best-known musical groups and he and my friend told me they knew one another from the "old days" of the Maciel. The producer offered to buy us a round of beer but my companion declined, standing up and pulling a R\$10 bill from his pocket. He announced, "Here it is. My last bit of cash from IPAC. You, Alligator, who know me 'da antiguidade' ['from the old days'], know what I suffered through to earn this. Let me buy you a drink and let's not forget what it is to be from the Maciel."

This claim is quite extraordinary in the extent to which it encourages communion between an impoverished resident and a producer who, before he became a success, frequented the Maciel. And the sign of the now quite different men's mutual experiences, and of the role of analysis of state-directed practices in this recognition of common ground, was a R\$10 bill that would purchase a libation to be consumed communally. Yet the marking of the bill as special suggests that its power is not generalized, homogenized, and a function of the goods and services it may purchase as an ostensibly neutral arbiter of value or price. By means of this material token my friend materialized his link to people that most Brazilians would be hard pressed to imagine would have been regulars in the old Maciel and would spend their nights at the end of the 1990s cruising the stigmatized 28th of September. The knowledge practices developed in the Maciel/Pelourinho were exported to far-off neighborhoods via the state-directed indemnification of the Pelourinho residents. But it also suggests the extent to which the use of money instantiates a memory of this process and hence recognition of what the Pelourinho is, and was. Money is thus a mnemonic that carries with it traces of past lives in the Pelourinho.

## Conclusion

The valorizing—some would say fetishizing—of moral attributes and living spaces established by IPAC in the 1990s, a form of "pricing the planet" with a

number of problematic implications, nonetheless resulted in a critical perspective on this process on the part of those subject to it. Residents who managed to stay on after the 1992 reforms, either by resisting or accommodating their state, have come not only to constitute themselves as a community in great part through talk of money, but also to read this process as a historical unfolding. And they do so on the basis of such money. Money becomes a material sign of their struggle to understand what their state is working to produce in the Pelourinho through the banishment of most of the population to outlying areas and the careful celebration and archiving of aspects of their everyday lives. In other words, for the most part IPAC has replaced Afro-Bahians with representations of these same people's former lives in the historical center. Yet this is a conclusion that is fairly clear to those involved in the process.

By and large the hundreds of residents of the Pelourinho with whom I have lived and worked for more than a decade manage to produce a remarkably sophisticated reading of state power and, especially, the actions of IPAC. And one of the tools for doing so is money. This money allows them, paradoxically, to defetishize the role of the very medium—money—that induced a majority of them to leave their homes in the city center. Today they return to sell wares, look for work, visit friends and family, and to enjoy themselves, often at the original Bar do Reggae located in the Pelourinho. With them come thousands of similarly underemployed, Afro-descendent, and often angry youth who desire the symbols of global consumption available in the Pelourinho (Sansone). Yet money as employed by the state to bring about this conjuncture contains a biography and carries traces of its workings and symbolic re-appropriations by common people (Eiss). This money spread the residents of the Pelourinho out all over Salvador, and even the interior of Bahia. Many, like Dona Dinda, started bars do reggae in their neighborhoods. And they continue to enlist new neighbors to head back downtown with them.

Thus the reading of money in the Pelourinho is not just a matter of rich and poor, of who has money and who does not. It is rather, as in Caborê's hands when he constructs a typology of Pelourinho types around money, an argument about the ways that money responds to people's abilities, or inability, to work the system. Money is thus an arbiter of abilities. But it is something more. Although configured as essentially unjust during the removal of people in the 1990s, by the first years of the new millennium money came to be understood as a form of understanding the state's logic. And it did so through its very materiality and its ability to conjure up images through signs of its own materiality.



As the discussion of bills itself indicates, as a bearer of supposedly abstract or objectified value, money is reinterpreted by people as a sign of particular histories of struggle, popular agency, and reinfection of government programs. Perhaps this continual resignification of money will work to provide not just new interpretations of state practices, but forms of modifying those policies that might, in the future, prevent the removal of another 4000 people from spaces supposedly dedicated to the shared heritage of the Brazilian nation.

### Works Cited

- Appadurai, Arjun, ed. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1986. Print.
- Collins, John. "Culture, Content, and the Enclosure of Human Being: UNESCO's 'Intangible' Heritage in the New Millennium." *Radical History Review* 109 (2011): 121–135.
- . *The Revolt of the Saints: Memory and Redemption in the Twilight of Brazilian "Racial Democracy"*. Durham: Duke UP. Forthcoming.
- . "X Marks the Future of Brazil': Protestant Ethics and Bedeviling Mixtures in a Brazilian Cultural Heritage Center." *Off Stage/On Display: Intimacy and Ethnography in an Age of Public Culture*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2004. 192–221. Print.
- Comaroff, John, and Jean Comaroff. *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*. Boulder: Westview, 1992. Print.
- Eiss, Paul. "Money, Meat and the Memory in Teriz, Yucatán." *Cultural Anthropology* 17.3 (2002): 291–330. Print.
- Gudeman, Stephen. *The Anthropology of Economy, Community, Market and Culture*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2001. Print.
- Guyer, Jane. *Marginal Gains: Monetary Transactions in Atlantic Africa*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2004. Print.
- Hacking, Ian. *The Social Construction of What?* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2000. Print.
- Lemon, Alaina. "Your Eyes are Like Green Dollars': Counterfeit Cash, National Substance and Currency Apartheid in 1990s Russia." *Cultural Anthropology* 13.1 (1998): 22–55. Print.
- Maurer, Bill. "Chrysography: Substance and Effect." *Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 3.1 (2002): 49–74. Print.
- Parry, Jonathan, and Maurice Bloch, eds. *Money and the Morality of Exchange*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989. Print.
- Rabinow, Paul. "Representations are Social Facts: Modernity and Postmodernity in Anthropology." *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986. 234–261. Print.
- Sansone, Livio. *Blackness without Ethnicity: Constructing Race in Brazil*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. Print.
- . "O Pelourinho dos jovens negro-mestiços de classe baixa da Grande Salvador." *Pelo pêlo: História, Cultura e cidade*. Salvador: EDUFBA, 1995. 59–70. Print.
- Scott, David. *Refashioning Futures*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999. Print.

**John F. Collins** received his PhD from the University of Michigan in 2003 and is associate professor of anthropology at Queens College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. His first book, *The Revolt of the Saints: Memory and Redemption in the Twilight of Brazilian "Racial Democracy"* is forthcoming from Duke University Press. He is currently at work on new projects on the extinguishing of the slave trade in nineteenth-century Brazil and the cultural politics of deer hunting in the modern United States. Please do not hesitate to contact the author with comments or suggestions at john.collins@qc.cuny.edu