

structure, strategies, formalization, and professionalization. By arguing that infighting and organizational breakaways can contribute to the longevity and enduring efficacy of social movements, Kretschmer challenges scholars to think beyond traditional assumptions about conflict within SMOs. By moving beyond the false dichotomy of cohesion as healthy and conflict as unhealthy, this book provides a framework with which to develop deeper understandings of the role factionalism plays in the evolution and longevity of social movements.

The Prism of Race: The Politics and Ideology of Affirmative Action in Brazil. By David Lehmann. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2018. Pp. xvii+247. \$75.00.

Howard Winant
University of California, Santa Barbara

Can racial injustice and racial inequality be *ended*? Slavery was abolished, colonialism terminated, and apartheid and Jim Crow were brought to a close—more or less. None of the great revolutions of the 20th century succeeded in ending racism, although some adapted it, mitigated it, and reformed it. Still, these measures often led to racial reaction.

Nevertheless, racial reform has occurred now and then. Instead of seeing reform as racial “progress,” perhaps it should be studied and understood as a *limit*. Perhaps we should explore why sporadic efforts to undo the immense toll of racial rule have thus far been so constrained, rather than perpetuating meliorist illusions about ending racism.

David Lehmann’s *The Prism of Race* does not make that kind of argument. Although the book is cautious about racial reform in Brazil, it is supportive in a realistic and clear-eyed way. Lehmann barely considers the legacy of slavery or abolitionism in Brazil, offering instead a thorough political sociological study of contemporary Brazilian racial formation.

Indeed this book is a model for how to do an empirical political sociological study of race. Its focus on the establishment of affirmative action policies in Brazil is methodologically mainstream. Through extensive ethnography, by consulting a good deal of quantitative data, and by drawing on many archival sources, Lehmann analyzes the institutionalization of the 2012 *Lei de Cotas* (quotas law) in Brazilian higher education. Along the way he explores Brazilian racial theory (mainly from the mid-20th century forward), the political contours of corporatism in the country, the development and limits of Afro-Brazilian social movements, the role of NGOs, and, perhaps most important, the influence of academic social scientists, particularly anthropologists, in advancing the cause of *cotas raciais* as a racial reform measure.

This exemplary affirmative action program had both class-based and race-based elements. Linked to the redistributive policies of the *Partido dos Trabalhadores* (Workers Party) and enacted during the presidency of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, it reserved 50% of the places in federal universities for students from low-income families, with a substantial fraction of these places reserved for *pretos* (blacks), *pardos* (browns or mixed race), and *indígenas brasileiros*, based on their proportion of the population in the states where they sought university admission. State universities and private universities also deployed affirmative action schemes.

This set of racial reforms raises enormous questions that Lehmann works diligently to answer. He explores how it was brought about, employing insights from the social movements literature and a solid recognition of the corporatist logic of Brazilian politics. Lehmann departs from the usual focus on “contentious politics” to draw instead on the social movements theory of Alain Touraine, who stressed three key criteria for evaluating social movement practices: identifying a constituency, specifying an adversary, and recognizing a socially transformative objective. In Lehmann’s account, the *cotas sociais* movement met these criteria by adopting a corporatist strategy, an “established way of doing politics” (p. 171) in Brazil. The push for racial quotas sought to incorporate previously excluded or neglected social sectors into the state by means of material concessions, with the public universities acting as the key state agencies of reform.

Lehman’s analysis has much to teach us as social scientists because, as it turns out, it was the importance of the higher education sector itself, and the *intensive mobilizing role played by social scientists* (aided by NGOs) that energized the passage of the *Lei de Cotas*. In Lehmann’s account, affirmative action in Brazil succeeded because demand for access to higher education was very high; higher education was seen as an engine of national development and social mobility; and the recruitment into the middle classes of *carentes* (economically disadvantaged students) as well as *pretos*, *pardos*, and *indígenas* was viewed as a preemptive move toward social peace and stability.

This last point deserves some elaboration. Lehmann argues that “the real objective of the quotas campaign was to get blacks into the upper reaches of the country’s decision-making elite” (p. 213). I will merely note the implicit contradictions of this purported reform: while elite recruitment may address a racially discriminatory social system, it is hardly egalitarian in any large sense. As far as I can tell, those “upper reaches” remain entirely out of reach. Are we dealing here with symbolic antiracism?

Beyond these issues, Lehmann also suggests that affirmative action policies had significant social consequences for racial formation in Brazil, since they rearticulated the meanings of racial identity and racial discrimination in important ways. An important source of opposition to the *Lei de Cotas* was led by social scientists as well, notably Peter Fry, Yvonne Maggie, and Loïc Wacquant. These figures stressed the instability of racial identity in the country and thus linked their objections to those of white and elite

opponents of the measure who emphasized the potential for fraud in applications for university admissions. Lehmann incisively points out that this argument has a converse, progressive, or even antiracist side: indeed for many whose racial identities had not been previously acknowledged as partially black—or in this case, more likely *pardo*—the possibility of applying as a *cotista* might involve a sincere reevaluation of one’s own racial identity and experience of *preconceito* (prejudice) and *discriminação*. Perhaps a student’s lack of academic success up to now has been the result not of personal deficits but of educational (and indeed structural) racism.

Lehmann concludes with a cautious celebration of the *Lei de Cotas*, which he describes as a measure by which “a political class otherwise noted for its venality and conservative instincts . . . set aside, at a stroke, half of all the places in prestige institutions for disadvantaged people who previously had been largely unable to gain access” (p. 213). While these reforms brought some gains, it is important to recognize their limits as well. It is too soon to assess their outcome, but their promise for accomplishing real social mobility is relatively small in a country where only about 11% of the population holds a university degree. Like every other racial reform, the *Lei de Cotas* is at best incremental. To say that it does not challenge the Brazilian racial regime is to state the obvious.

Meanwhile, Jair Bolsonaro’s authoritarian populist regime now rules in Brazil and is ramping up state violence against blacks. Former president Lula da Silva is in jail, and the *Lei de Cotas* will almost certainly lapse in 2022.

Searching for Marx in the Occupy Movement. By John Leveille. Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2018. Pp. xxvii+303. \$110.00.

Justin Paulson
Carleton University

Should we search for Marx in the Occupy movement? What would be gained by doing so? It is a more interesting question than it might at first appear. While Occupy participants had a greater affinity for anarchism than for Marxism—an affinity that ought to be taken seriously—the Marxian tradition nevertheless poses useful questions about the composition of the movement’s participants, its formal characteristics, its choice of venue, the nature of the grievances, its novel invocation of the 1% versus the 99%, and its relationship to party building. Marxism has also produced insights on the questions of identity and privilege that were brought to the fore in various Occupy assemblies and working groups.

Yet for John Leveille, a participant-observer in Occupy Philadelphia (“Occupy Philly”), searching for Marx was less of an analytical than a prescriptive task: the Occupy movement, he insists, *needs* Marx—or at least a