Foreword

Antonio Sergio Guimarães

David Lehmann’s book appears at a very opportune moment: it can be read in detail, providing food for careful reflection, or more quickly for those seeking a rapid overview of its subject. If I may go straight to the point, however, what struck me most forcefully in Lehmann’s argument was his “structural” explanation for the adoption of race quotas in Brazil.

Seen from a traditionalist point of view, quotas present a paradox. In the early 1990s an electoral victory by Lula was nothing more than a utopian fantasy in left-wing circles, not least because it contained within itself a contradiction: not only was Lula seen to be ill-prepared for the office of president, having refused to stand for election to the Chamber of Deputies, but also the Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT) itself showed little interest in exercising power, having avoided any electoral alliances and even refusing to sign the Constitution of 1988. Likewise, even in the mid-1990s, affirmative action and multiculturalism seemed to belong to an unfamiliar international agenda, far removed from Brazilian traditions, as both social democrats and PT supporters did not fail to point out. In 1996, therefore, it was unthinkable that the country might start adopting race quotas as early as 2003.

The paradox lies precisely in the speed with which a seemingly unthinkable agenda came to be not only discussed but also implemented in a space of seven years. What can explain the capitulation of the Brazilian state to pressure from such a small group? What can explain the fact that public opinion itself moved so quickly, first taking Lula to the presidency and then accepting race quotas in the face of the almost unanimous opposition of the main news outlets and leading intellectuals?
In this book David Lehmann proposes a promising reply to the first question: the institutional structure of the Brazilian state, heir to a history of corporatism and perpetual recompositions of elite interests, and always on the lookout for ways to accommodate emerging social forces, enabled it, in his view, to come to terms with demands coming from organized sectors of popular movements and the movimento negro. What Antonio Gramsci called *trasformismo*—the absorption of representatives of the oppressed classes via the political system—is in this view an institutional arrangement peculiar to the Brazilian state that exists for the purpose of dampening conflicts and reaching accommodations between emerging social forces and more traditional sectors.

But how to explain the shift in public opinion? On this point the facts and arguments presented by Lehmann must be followed carefully, for they call for constant reflection on the part of the reader, because, although he provides all the clues, the book is open to various interpretations.

We should begin by recalling that already in the 1990s various tendencies pointed to the need to contain the growing mobilization of social forces outside the political system. We can see, first, in bills presented in the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, that sectors of the oligarchy began to take preemptive steps toward race quotas in both higher education and the labour market. Second, a younger generation of intellectuals had already, since the 1980s, been building a new theory of Brazilian racism and the country’s race relations, attacking both the “myth of racial democracy” and the “genocide of Brazil’s black population.” Third, after a long period of stagnation since the 1960s, the federal system of higher education was again becoming a target for the profound discontent of the middle classes, which had emerged from the rapid economic growth of the 1970s, creating broad popular support for the idea of a massive expansion of free public university education. Finally, social movements and trade unions began to produce a strong political leadership able to operate with ease in the corridors of power. Union leaders securely installed in both the public sector—mainly in education and health—and the private sector—in the metallurgical and petroleum sectors and banking—were ready to reach for the higher levels of political power.

Thus the decline in Fernando Henrique Cardoso’s popularity at the end of his second period made it hard to envisage a continuation of the centre-right alliance led by the PSDB (Partido da Social Democracia Brasileira) and opened the way for a new alignment secured by the PT’s victory in 2002. From then on, the accommodation of new social forces...
accelerated and the organized negro movements increased their access and influence. Lehmann follows the steps of a few political figures—black activists—who occupied pivotal roles in state assemblies, universities, the judiciary, and federal ministries. Quotas could now be seen as an efficient means of advancing the interests of emerging groups while protecting those of more established ones. He also makes quite a convincing sociological argument for the use of the theory of social movements as a way to understand the organization of the quotas campaign and the relative autonomy of black organizations as they gained access to state agencies.

Another point that caught my attention in this book is the role of university leaders, mainly rectors and their staffs, in the development of quota policies—a role that would be expanded in 2008 thanks to the minister of education himself. How can one understand this leadership role in the face of the substantial power of the academic and administrative trade unions? I also want to draw readers’ attention to another paradox: although they almost invariably owe their election to union support, the rectors were not captured by the “class-based” and anti-quota ideology of those unions, whose focus was almost exclusively on pressing for increased government education budgets. On the contrary, perhaps seeking an independent base for their own political leadership, the rectors, and later Lula’s minister of education, Fernando Haddad, were moved to open up to the demands of the black social movement so as to create a counterweight to the unions. This shift was eased, as Lehmann explains, by a discourse based on social and racial justice, which meant that the adoption of race quotas was always accompanied by, or rather stuffed into, social quotas, thus neutralizing in one fell swoop the more radical class-driven demands of the unions and the more radical race-driven demands of the social movements. As of 2008, federal ministries, the judiciary, and other state agencies had taken over the leadership of the quotas cause, and the expansion of the federal higher education system, as well as the social and racial inclusion of the “new middle class”—the beneficiaries of the PT government’s income redistribution policies—found a place at the heart of the government’s project.

Through this book’s fluid narrative, with its firm empirical basis and solid sociological arguments, the English-language reader will be able to follow the trajectory of a social movement—namely, the quotas campaign—which reveals the mechanics of the contemporary Brazilian state and also helps us to understand the crisis unleashed by the overthrow of the PT government in 2016.
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Preface

This book comes with two warnings to the reader. The first is that it is a study of a milieu of which I myself have been a member—albeit an intermittent one—for some forty years, namely, Brazilian academia. As a result I have had the good fortune to pick the brains and hear the stories of many people who would quite possibly not have responded if I had been a doctoral student at the other end of my career. This intimacy with the subject matter has also led me to write in a slightly different style than that which can be found in my work on Pentecostal churches, for example, where I am most definitely an outsider in standard ethnographic mode. The style is different both because it pays attention to the portrayal of an atmosphere and because it deals quite often with personalities, even though sometimes I hide the true identity of a source, an informant, or the holder of one or another opinion. My hope is that this makes the story more readable than it otherwise would be.

The second warning is that the book engages with some quite sensitive and controversial normative questions that have surrounded the debates about race-based quotas in the allocation of university places and public sector jobs, or affirmative actions as they are also known in Brazil. In this respect I have taken a different approach from most (though not all) writing by outsiders on race in Brazil and Spanish America, because I have listened to and considered different sides of the argument rather than declaring a partisan position at the outset. My position as an outsider has (I hope) helped me to maintain friendships even with people with whose opinions I have in the end not been able to fully agree. I am convinced that, although social scientists—local or foreign—are perfectly entitled to take openly partisan positions, to do so aggressively in their writings weakens their contribution and risks making them into
mouthpieces of local political factions. The corollary is that their scholarship may be dismissed as partisan by those in the local or international arena who disagree with them. I occasionally remark in this book that scholarly activity in Brazil and other Latin American countries is excessively shaped by political-tribal loyalties. As I argued in my introduction to the recent collective work *The Crisis of Multiculturalism in Latin America* (2016), it is perverse to use the recognition of inevitable ideological bias in social science as a reason for pursuing and deepening that bias; rather it should encourage us to handle it warily. But we have to be aware that the explicit and more often implicit pressures in Latin American academic life to adopt and remain faithful to one or another ideological, political, or party loyalty can be very strong. I am no more immune to these pressures than others, but I have tried to deal as impartially as I can with the normative issues raised by the quotas debate and I hope thereby to bring about further exploration of how political philosophy—of which I am far from a seasoned practitioner—can play a role in political argument in Brazil and other countries of the region.

Nonetheless, I have in the end taken a position and I have to recognize that to spend all those years studying this subject in order then, in the end, to take a position against quotas would have been very surprising, if not perverse. In those circumstances, I would probably not have written the book at all.

London, October 2017
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