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New multicultural regimes now characterize much of Latin America, creating opportunities for ethno-racial populations to fight for social inclusion. Yet, the literature identifies uneven patterns of success in those endeavors. Scholars argue that states more readily consider claims based on the recognition and protection of cultural difference as legitimate, but are resistant to calls for the remedy of racial discrimination. As a counterexample, we examine the case of affirmative action in higher education in Brazil, and specifically in the state universities of Rio de Janeiro. We explore how issues of racial exclusion and discrimination gained traction in public policy in that context. Perhaps more importantly, though, we show that race was only one component of that policy; instead, race was combined with class to establish a new type of beneficiary status for affirmative action: poor black students. Beyond Rio de Janeiro, we suggest the wider diffusion in Brazil of the combined race and class category for determining target populations.
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Throughout much of the 20th century, ethno-racial assimilationist narratives and practices predominated in Latin America. Indeed, an amorphous mestizo identity came to symbolize some nations of the region during that century’s early nation-building. In the process, indigenous and Afro-descendant populations were often systematically ignored or blended into a national homogenized culture where both class and ethno-racial inequality and discrimination ensured their impoverishment and marginality. In the later decades of the century, however, Latin American states began a shift from official ideologies of mestizaje to multicultural regimes that offered recognition and granted collective rights to some ethno-racial populations (Paschel and Sawyer 2008; Van Cott 2000). Although minority populations continue struggling to assert the legitimacy of their claims, ethno-racial inequality is clearly a core issue confronting Latin America – as is its dramatic class inequality – and the trend in many regions is toward challenging the ethno-racial status quo.

Nonetheless, scholars note important gaps in the types of ethno-racial populations that have benefited in Latin America’s nascent multicultural regimes. Specifically, in
most cases, indigenous groups have received collective rights and state intervention, whereas Afro-descendants have not fared as well. Hooker (2005) proposes the following explanation, which echoes in the works of others (French 2009; Golash-Boza 2011; Paschel 2010; Paschel and Sawyer 2008):

While the goal of multicultural reforms may have been the promotion of democratic legitimacy by remedying social exclusion, the criteria used to determine the appropriate subjects of collective rights have not been racial discrimination or socio-economic and political marginalization. I argue that the main criterion used to determine the recipients of collective rights in Latin America has been the possession of a distinct cultural group identity. (Hooker 2005, 291)

Bolstering this argument, Afro-descendants have gained special rights in contexts where they have been perceived as possessing cultural specificity mirroring that of indigenous populations. In Honduras, for example, the Afro-descendant Garifuna have won rights by directly claiming indigenous status (Hooker 2005). In Brazil, some rural Afro-descendant communities have been able to claim indigenous-like status and win rights (French 2009). In the case of Colombia, Paschel and Sawyer (2008, 209) write, ‘Ultimately, Afro-Colombian movements have been successful precisely because they couched their claims in terms of ethnic group identity and the preservation of culture, steering away from questions of racial exclusion, discrimination, and urbanization’ (see also Paschel 2010). In sum, there may be a dynamic where foregrounding ethnicity and downplaying race is associated with success in the battle for collective rights and social inclusion in Latin America.

The case of Brazil seems to qualify such a framing on ethno-racial inclusionary struggles in Latin America. The largest country in Latin America, Brazil is also where the large majority of Afro-descendants reside. These predominantly urban Afro-descendant populations do not easily fit the model of ethnic specificity (Bailey 2009; Fry 1976; Hanchard 1994; Sansone 2003; Telles 2004), yet it is in Brazil where the most explicit and far-reaching inclusionary legislation is being enacted. Both Hooker and Paschel address this Brazilian anomaly. Paschel (2010, 736) notes that her arguments pertaining to Colombia ‘contrast sharply with legislation in both Brazil and the United States, where the emphasis has been on racial equality and equity in opportunities for the black population’. For Hooker (2005, 309), affirmative action in Brazil remains controversial and may not be a model for Latin America, further suggesting that urban Afro-descendants may have difficulty finding their place in new multicultural regimes.

In this article, we argue that the premise of achieving collective gains under Latin America’s new multicultural regimes is contingent on the ability to successfully assert cultural distinctiveness is in need of some revision, at least in Brazil. It is not the case, however, that ‘race’ and issues of racial discrimination simply replace ‘ethnicity’ and culture-based claims as criteria for state intervention in Brazil. In that country, for example, being ‘black’ by itself appears generally insufficient to merit inclusion in Brazil’s new affirmative action initiatives in higher education, unlike the situation of race-based affirmative action at certain times in the United State’s history. Instead, we explore the development of a novel type of affirmative action policy in the state universities of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, which combines race and class criteria to
demarcate beneficiary status, thereby targeting a specific portion of the Afro-descendant population: poor black students. Moreover, beyond our exploration of the case of Rio de Janeiro, our data demonstrate that this new, dual race-class conception for beneficiary status dominates race-only frameworks among Brazil’s public institutes of higher learning. Whether the example of Brazil might resonate in other Latin American countries with significant Afro-descendant populations remains to be seen, but it is clear that Afro-descendant cultural specificity is not central to the debate in Brazil.

Race- and Class-Based Affirmative Action in Brazil

According to the 2010 census, Brazil’s population is 47.7 per cent white (branco), 43.1 per cent brown (pardo), 7.6 per cent black (preto), 1.1 per cent Asian, and 0.4 per cent indigenous. By comparison, in 2009, of the population of individuals 25 years or older in Brazil that had finished 15 years of schooling, 73.7 per cent were white, 20.9 per cent were brown, and 3.5 per cent were black (IBGE 2009). Although the capacity of the Brazilian higher education system has expanded in recent years, from 3.4 to 4.8 million students between 2001 and 2005, the proportion of white university students has outpaced the proportions of pretos and pardos (Schwartzman 2008). This trend has a long history in Brazil. Telles (2004) shows that 1.4 per cent of whites finished college in 1960, and about 11 per cent did by 1999; whereas for nonwhites, almost none completed college in 1960, and only 2.6 per cent had done so by 1999. Hence the racial gap in university completion marks a stark reality (Gentili et al. 2012).

The disproportionate share of whites in higher education may be partially explained by class mechanisms (Schwartzman 2008; Telles 2004).1 Brazil is characterized by extremely high levels of socioeconomic inequality, but that inequality is not equally distributed across color groupings (World Bank 2004). It is not the case that whites are absent from the lower rungs of Brazilian society, but rather that racial inequality in Brazil is derived in large part from the near absence of nonwhites in the middle and upper classes (Telles 2004). This notorious income inequality and over-representation of browns and blacks among working and lower classes reverberates in the realm of higher education.

One structural dynamic producing that reverberation is a combination of the low quality of basic education in Brazil’s public school system and the tendency of more privileged students to attend better private schools. Entrance into Brazil’s public universities, which are tuition free, is determined entirely by a student’s score on the standardized Vestibular exam. The Vestibular process is very competitive, and students who have attended private schools for their basic education have an advantage, as do those who pay for expensive pre-Vestibular preparatory courses. Those students whose social class facilitates a private education or preparatory courses, or both, more readily gain the privilege of postsecondary study. Hence, because the large majority of the relatively small middle and upper classes in Brazil is white (although there are many whites among the lower classes as well), white educational privilege is in part furthered through this largely class-based educational divide.
The effects of racial discrimination on educational attainment in general, however, cannot be overlooked. Nonetheless, the fact that few argue racial discrimination’s direct effect on university entrance is due in part to the anonymous Vestibular process. Instead, scholarship points to cumulative and indirect effects of racial discrimination (see Hasenbalg 1988). Telles (2004, 148–150), for example, presents what he labels a unique ‘natural experiment’ constituting a ‘rigorous test of racial discrimination’ in early educational attainment. He examines the basic education outcomes of siblings categorized in different color categories and finds white children do better than their nonwhite siblings. He concludes that his results ‘provide strong evidence that race makes a difference [in early educational outcomes], independently of class’ (Telles 2004, 150). In the same vein, in their study of social mobility, Pastore and Silva (2000, 96) conclude, ‘the hard nucleus of disadvantage that pretos and pardos appear to suffer is located in the process of educational acquisition’, and they specifically reject the premise that Brazilians of all colors have equal educational chances. In sum, then, scholarship suggests that both race and class hierarchies work against the majority of Brazil’s population – the poor and working classes – among whom blacks are overrepresented and uniquely disadvantaged (World Bank 2004).

Although social activists and politicians began proposing and debating class- and race-based affirmative action measures in higher education as early as the 1980s, as we discuss below, there was very little consensus on the issue. Then, in the late 1990s, Brazil’s approach to race policy dramatically changed, moving from antidiscrimination laws to targeted affirmative action. In accounting for this shift, scholars point to the galvanizing role of international events and transnational activist networks, specifically the work of Brazil’s social movements and state officials surrounding the 2001 United Nations World Conference Against Racism held in Durban, South Africa (Htun 2004; Maggie and Fry 2002; Martins et al. 2004; Peria 2004; Telles 2004). Indeed, it was soon after signing the Durban Declaration that the Brazilian executive branch established quotas for Afro-Brazilians in government hiring. The first such instance was a federal government order signed on 4 September 2001, by Minister of Agrarian Development Raul Jungmann (Folha de São Paulo, 5 September 2001). The order enacted the first legally defined employment quotas for blacks in the country, and established a hiring quota of 20 per cent in the institutional structure of the Ministry and Institute of Colonization and Agrarian Reform (INCRA). Later, the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Agrarian Development, and Federal Supreme Court announced similar policies. Then in 2003, the newly elected President Lula extended the federal government’s commitment to affirmative action with the establishment of the Special Secretariat for the Promotion of Racial Equality Policies (SEPPIR).

Brazilian affirmative action policies have perhaps been most highly visible in the arena of public higher education. In 2001, the first university racial admissions quotas were legislated in Rio de Janeiro, when state deputies passed a law establishing a 40 per cent quota in Rio de Janeiro state universities – the State University of Rio de Janeiro (UERJ) and the State University of North Fluminense (UENF) – for ‘self-declared blacks (negros) and browns (pardos)’. The year before, the state legislature of Rio de Janeiro passed a law allocating 50 per cent of the slots in the same universities to students from public schools (a proxy for low income). By 2005, 24 of the 95 public
universities in Brazil had adopted a variety of affirmative action policies in admissions, some based on class, some on race, and some on both. By 2007 that number had grown to 37, and as of 2012, 73 had some type of affirmative action in admissions.

Another important factor in the implementation of higher education quotas has been the Movimento Pre-Vestibular para Negros e Carentes (Vestibular Prep Movement for Blacks and the Poor, or PVNC). Beginning in the early 1990s, the Black Catholic Pastoral and local black movement leaders in Rio de Janeiro began creating courses to prepare poor students, both black and nonblack, for the highly competitive university entrance exams. Because of the high cost of private exam preparation courses, PVNC and other later programs inspired by its model attracted a large pool of low-income students (Maggie 2001). The popularity of PVNC in Rio de Janeiro led to the emergence of other organizations, such as Educafro (Education and Citizenship for Afro-descendants and the Needy), and of hundreds of other pre-Vestibular courses across Brazil (Ramos 2005; Santos 2003). The unique focus on class and race factors in the pre-Vestibular movement, as we will show, proved influential in the design of affirmative action policy.

Although class- and race-based affirmative action policies have burst onto the Brazilian higher education scene, these policies are not supported by all segments of Brazilian society. There is legitimate, ongoing debate about them, especially regarding whether a race-based approach is sound (Bailey and Peria 2010). Scholars critiquing racial affirmative action view it as misguided for at least three core reasons (see Fry et al. 2007; Maggie and Fry 2002; Magnoli 2009; Maio and Santos 2005; Risério 2007; Schwartzman 2008). First, the clearest causal factor in differential educational outcomes across color groupings is Brazil’s low-quality basic education systems; therefore, they argue the state should focus its efforts there: improvements in basic education would act as a tide that lifts all boats. Second, enacting policies that require official racial sorting produces a racialization process based on a distorted vision of human diversity. Third, policies based on racial status contradict Brazil’s universalist principles, as enshrined especially in its constitution. Regarding the last criticism, Brazil’s highest court ruled in April of 2012 that differential treatment based on racial status is not unconstitutional (see Veja, 26 April 2012). It is unclear, however, what effect this historic ruling will have, as we address in our conclusion.

Following, we explore how these new policies developed in Rio de Janeiro. We bring to the forefront the intricacies of how class and race come together to create a novel approach to affirmative action for disadvantaged populations. Next, we document the wider diffusion of the combination of race- and class-based criteria for beneficiary status in the Brazilian national context. Whereas the data on the diffusion of affirmative action is drawn directly from descriptions of affirmative action policies on official university websites, the Rio case study is grounded in a qualitative methods approach carried out by this paper’s first author. That qualitative research entailed (1) participant observation in university and state meetings in Rio de Janeiro during the process of reforming the quota laws (2001–2003); (2) in-depth interviews with key politicians, state officials, social movement activists, lawyers, academics studying race relations in Brazil, and university administrators who were instrumental in the reform
process; and (3) documentary research in social movement, court, government, newspaper, and university archives.

The Case of Rio de Janeiro: Initial Proposals for Separate Class and Race Quotas

The early efforts of politicians, state agencies, and social movement activists in Rio de Janeiro to target both class inequality and racial inequality are overlooked in scholarly accounts of the affirmative action policies in Brazil (Bailey 2009; Htun 2004). Throughout the 1990s, Rio de Janeiro Workers Party (PT) State Representative Carlos Minc collaborated with local black movement organizations and politicians, student groups, public university representatives, and Rio de Janeiro’s Special State Secretariat for the Defense and Promotion of Black Populations (SEDEPRON) to develop affirmative action proposals. In 1996, Minc introduced Bill No. 89/96, which proposed that an additional number of slots in Rio de Janeiro’s public state universities and technical schools be created for ‘historically disadvantaged ethno-racial groups’ (10 per cent) and ‘low-income’ students (20 per cent). After debate in the university system and the legislature, the bill was eventually amended and reintroduced to the state legislature in 1999. This revised proposal defined historically disadvantaged ethno-racial groups as Afro-Brazilians – classified in Brazil’s census categories as black or brown – and Indians, referring to ‘all those individuals of pre-Columbian descent’ (Legislative Proposal No. 89/99, 25 February 1999). Neither of these bills specifically addressing ethno-racial groups passed the legislature.

In 2000, however, a bill targeting class inequality successfully became law. On 28 December 2000, Governor Garotinho approved Law No. 3.524/2000, establishing a 50 per cent quota for public school students in the allocation of seats in Rio de Janeiro’s state universities. This law was the first of its kind in the nation, and although it does not explicitly mention class, it assumes that public school students are predominantly poor and working class. Brazil’s national student movements, who had long recognized the problems with the public university selection process, namely its bias toward private school graduates, actively championed the law. In contrast, top university administrators criticized it. In a written report to the state legislative assembly, university officials argued that instead of imposing quotas, legislators should work to improve public primary and secondary education, so that public school students would score better on the entrance exam (Report from the State University of Rio de Janeiro, 19 September 2000). They also expressed concerns that the law would increase discrimination against public school students on campus. In Brazil, class divisions are rigid, and creating a class-based quota could further label these students as not truly deserving of their spaces. Finally, they cited the potential for fraud, whereby students might enroll in public schools in order to benefit from the quota, but actually attend private schools. Perhaps in part due to these criticisms, the law was not actually implemented until 2003.

In contrast to these earlier failed attempts at passing affirmative action for ethno-racial minorities, it was a bill from Rio de Janeiro State Representative José Amorim of the Brazilian Progressive Party (PPB) that became the first racial quota law. Enacted in November 2001, Law No. 3.708/2001 established a ‘40 per cent (forty
percent) admissions quota for black (*negro*) and brown (*pardo*) populations in public institutions of higher education in the state of Rio de Janeiro’. Amorim, a politician with no prior connection to the black movement or racism issues, drafted his proposal in the context of Brazil’s extensive organizing and media coverage surrounding the 2001 World Conference Against Racism. The official Brazilian delegation to this UN conference proposed the development of affirmative action policies to benefit Brazil’s black population in public university admissions and federal government hiring, proposals that received wide coverage in Brazil’s national print media outlets (Peria 2004). As Amorim explained in an interview, the World Conference, and principally the media coverage of it, inspired and served as an important source of content for his proposal:

> Originally a journalist friend of mine brought us the idea for the proposal and then as we developed the idea, my cabinet assistants relied on the news and opinions being published on the Internet and the newspapers about the World Conference in South Africa, Benedita da Silva’s trip to the conference, and statistics from IBGE as well as a previous law of Senator Sarney. (personal communication with first author, 19 August 2003)

Amorim marshaled political resources acquired in his more than 45 years in public office, 10 of these as a Rio de Janeiro state deputy, to get his bill passed within just a few weeks of its introduction. Indeed, he explained that it was only ‘with skill’ that a deputy could get the signatures required for a proposal to be fast-tracked through the political process (personal communication with first author, 19 August 2003). Fast-tracked proposals are scheduled for discussion and a vote in the plenary assembly within two sessions of their introduction onto the schedule, thus considerably limiting the opportunity for any kind of debate, public or otherwise. As the record shows, the state assembly voted to pass the first racial quota law in Brazil on 18 October 2001, a little more than 1 month after its introduction onto the agenda.

Although the bill’s rapid trajectory through the state assembly likely facilitated its passage, this may also have reduced its perceived legitimacy. Amorim largely acted alone. Incredibly and tellingly, most black movement leaders and university officials found out about Amorim’s bill only *after* its passage. Black movement activists were divided in their opinion of the new law. Some wished there had been more discussion and debate on this novel piece of legislation, but others simply wanted to push forward (first author, participant observation, 2001–2003). As one black activist and researcher from a public policy center in Rio de Janeiro explained, ‘Even with all the criticism that we might have of the law, it’s the mechanism that we have today, and we can’t afford to lose that’ (personal communication with first author, 13 November 2001). Still, many activists thought the law needed improvement. For example, it failed to provide any plan for financially supporting black students once admitted to the university. This is a critical issue because economic disadvantage could sabotage the intent of a racial quota law by giving space to students without making it practical for them to attend. Although higher education in Brazilian public universities is tuition free, there are many other costs involved (e.g., transportation and materials). Moreover, sending a working-aged child to the university hampers her or his ability
to contribute to household income in the short term, which in some situations may be crucial.

Another problem concerned the confusing wording of the law. By establishing a quota for negros and pardos, the law drew from two different systems of classification: the mixed color category pardo used by Brazil’s national census and the politicized racial category negro employed by the black movement (Telles 2004). As Renato Ferreira, an activist with Educafro explained, ‘By using the terms negro and pardo, the law ignores the thinking of the black community in recent years. For a large part of the community negros and pardos don’t exist, but rather we are all negros’ (personal communication with first author, 1 November 2002). Ferreira, echoing earlier criticism of public school quotas, also noted that ‘the term pardo can open the possibility for fraud. People who do not suffer prejudice may want to benefit and look in the closet for a black grandparent.’

Whereas leaders of the black movement criticized aspects of the law but were generally in favor of moving ahead with implementing the policies, top university officials actively opposed it, using arguments similar to those raised against the 2000 public school quota law. Most pointedly, they argued that the law violated the university’s right to an autonomous decision-making process. As then chancellor of UERJ Nilcéa Freire stated in an interview published in O Globo newspaper: ‘The way that the debate was introduced at UERJ wounded the basic principle of university autonomy and harmed the discussion of the merit of the laws’ (O Globo, 23 February 2003). Moreover, the fact that neither university officials nor black movement leaders had been invited to participate in drafting the law heightened criticism of the policy.

Although the two bills establishing racial and public school quotas had both been signed into law by Governor Garotinho, provisions for implementing the new policies had not yet been made by January 2002, when Rio de Janeiro’s state universities (UERJ and UENF) officially announced the 2003 Vestibular exam. Also in 2002, Garotinho announced his candidacy in the national presidential race and stepped down as governor of Rio de Janeiro in order to campaign full time. In his absence, Rio de Janeiro vice-governor and longtime community organizer Benedita da Silva took over. Under pressure from Educafro, on 4 July 2002, she issued Decree 31.468, which ordered immediate implementation of the law reserving 50 per cent of spaces in the state universities for public school students. This was accomplished by creating two entrance exams, one for public school students and another for private school students. And to comply with the racial quota in Law 3.708/2001, all students (from public as well private schools) were asked to declare on their enrollment form ‘under penalty of law’ whether or not they self-identified as negro or pardo. However, just what penalty would be applied in cases of ‘fraud’ was not specified, and at the time of the entrance exam, no one was sure how such cases would be prosecuted (UERJ-DSEA administrator, personal communication with first author, 8 October 2002).

As was customary each year, in 2003 UERJ and UNEF released the Vestibular exam results to local newspapers at the end of the first week of February, which is how students learn whether they have gained a coveted seat in the university system. For the first time, the results were structured by public school and racial quotas. The
public announcement of these results fueled an intense debate over the use of quotas. The country’s leading newspapers published articles, editorials, and letters to the editor discussing the results of the Vestibular, debating the laws and their effectiveness, with many questioning the legality of quotas. Sectors of the black movement and other proponents of the new policy argued that deep racial inequality prevented Afro-Brazilians from exercising full citizenship, cited the public universities of excellence as an area particularly closed to blacks, and stated that racial affirmative action was necessary to change this situation. Others argued that socioeconomic inequality, not color, was the major barrier to higher education and that what was needed were universal policies targeting poverty. Many declared a biracial system antithetical to Brazil, a country where race mixture has been a cornerstone of national identity (see Fry et al. 2007).

Backlash to Race-Based Quotas

Very shortly, students that had taken UERJ’s entrance exam but had not gained a seat in the university began seeking legal recourse. In the first weeks after the results of the entrance exam were made public, close to 100 individual lawsuits were filed against the affirmative action policies. Over the following weeks and months, the number of lawsuits continued to grow, eventually surpassing 200. The vast majority of these suits were filed by white students seeking admission into the Schools of Medicine and Law. UERJ’s medical and law schools are among the top in the country, admitting approximately 2 per cent and 7 per cent, respectively, of the thousands of candidates who apply each year (UERJ/DSEA 2012). Lawyers representing these students demanded that the court order UERJ to reserve vacancies for their clients. They argued that reserving spaces for public school students, negros, and pardos violated the constitutional guarantee of equality for all and represented an excessive approach to dealing with historical inequities, thus also violating principles of reasonability and proportionality. Determining the ‘race’ of candidates became a polemic issue; lawyers argued that the lack of ‘objective criteria’ for judging race undermined the process. Notably, the public school quota was much less often contested in these cases, suggesting that class was apparently viewed as less vulnerable to criticism than race. Eventually, UERJ received 108 preliminary injunctions obliging it to reserve vacancies for white students who had been denied admission.

The first student to file suit against UERJ was 17-year-old Nino Donato Oliva, who took the law exam and would have qualified for one of the 304 vacancies that year if not for the new affirmative action laws. The second case, that of Bruno Gomes, age 25, was different. Gomes’s score on the state entrance exam for medicine ranked him 144th among students seeking one of the 92 vacancies available. Gomes’s score was not high enough to have gained him admission regardless of the quota laws. But because 15 candidates who self-identified as negros or pardos had earned lower scores than him and had been accepted via the quota system, Gomes argued that he too should be accepted. In both cases, the judge ordered UERJ to reserve vacancies for these students because the school year was scheduled to begin that month, meaning that extensive analysis of the cases would be equivalent to rejection. However, in
Gomes’s case, the judge also based his ruling on the possibility of fraud in the system of self-identification for negros and pardos, given that UERJ had no means to ‘objectively verify’ the race of each candidate. Several other judges also made similar arguments in deciding other lawsuits, as this opinion illustrates:

because of the way in which the law was established, we are unable to confirm, concretely and objectively, as this situation requires, if the registered candidate who self-identified as negro or pardo is a member of this group. As such I consider reasonable and plausible the allegation that the system of reservation of spaces in the university for negros and pardos wounds the constitutional principle of equality before the law. (Decision in case no. 2003.001.017978–6, Rio de Janeiro 6th Public Court)

The issue of fraud takes on another dimension when we consider that close to 70 per cent of lawsuits were filed by individuals like Bruno Gomes who did not score well enough for admission to UERJ, regardless of the quota law. As mentioned in an e-mail communication from R. Cesar, 13 February 2004, only some 10 students were like Donato, whose admission was arguably compromised by the quota. In other words, the majority of lawsuits were filed by students who were not directly denied admission by the new affirmative action policies, but claimed discrimination anyway. Seemingly, the new policies became something of a means for disappointed students to air their grievances.

As reported by the newspaper *O Globo*, one lawsuit was filed by a student who self-identified as negro but did not declare his race when he signed up for the Vestibular, because he opposed the establishment of the negro quota and felt that it would be ‘hypocritical’ to take advantage of it. This student, 18-year-old Ricardo Menezes da Silva, scored 74 points on the state exam but was not accepted to the law school. Ricardo challenged the fact that students taking the public school exam got into the law program with a score of 58.75 (Fry 2003). Several lawsuits were also filed on behalf of students who declared themselves negro or pardo when they signed up for the Vestibular and were accepted to UERJ under the quota system, but now felt they needed court protection to guarantee their place at UERJ (Humberto Adami, personal communication with first author, 1 June 2003).

Although UERJ had initially opposed the quota laws, as evidenced in their report to the state assembly, the barrage of lawsuits effectively forced university administrators and lawyers into a position of defending the new admissions process and coming out in favor of the quotas in court. Perhaps more than anything else, university officials were concerned with the institutional costs the university would incur should it be forced to recognize the preliminary court injunctions and admit some 108 additional students, potentially establishing a precedent for future challenges to its entrance examination. As the vice-chancellor of UERJ explained in an interview:

Through the enormous quantity of individual lawsuits, the results of the entrance exam are at risk of being voided. UERJ offers 92 places in the School of Medicine – an extremely expensive course, with extensive laboratory time. We can’t just add one more chair. And even for courses with less laboratory time, like law, how would we hire more professors? Arrange classrooms? If we could afford to have more students, we would have done this a long time ago. (personal communication, 4 April 2003)
Based on this argument – the serious threat that the lawsuits presented to the university’s ability to begin the school year should it be forced to admit the students that had sued – the UERJ legal team was able to get the preliminary injunctions reserving slots for the plaintiffs suspended. Other lawsuits were subsequently dropped, due in large part to plaintiffs’ lack of interest in pursuing them further.

Reform of Affirmative Action Laws

In the aftermath of this public backlash, the Rio de Janeiro state government announced the formation of a special working group within the State Secretariat of Education (SECTI) to reform the new laws prior to the 2004 Vestibular. The chancellors of UENF and UERJ, professors, state attorneys, leaders of Educafro and the student movement, were all invited to participate in the reform of the policies. Relatively quickly the group recognized that in order to ensure the survival of affirmative action, it would be necessary to draft an entirely new law that would address the legal challenges and criticism launched at the quota laws: the lack of (1) precise definitions of race/color categories; (2) a means to verify students’ racial self-identification; and (3) input from university and social movement leaders in the process. University administrators and Educafro leaders Friar David and Renato Ferreira took the lead in modifying and reforming the affirmative action laws.6 For Educafro, a grassroots community education movement active in the poor suburbs of Rio de Janeiro city, the process provided an opportunity to validate the conceptions of social justice it had constructed during the 1990s. Throughout this decade, Educafro and similar social movements had worked on behalf of poor black and nonblack students, creating a close connection between racial and class classifications in their advocacy. This conception clearly shaped the reform of the Rio de Janeiro affirmative action laws.

Defining ‘Race’ for Inclusion

Educafro and university leaders presented several new proposals to the working group. The university proposed the creation of three separate quotas: (1) 20 per cent for public school students, (2) 20 per cent for negros and pardos, and (3) 5 per cent for ethnic minorities and disabled students. In contrast, Educafro proposed the establishment of an income criterion for all students and excluded the intermediate category of pardo. One proposal specified ‘a 50 per cent quota, distributed as follows: 25 per cent for low-income public school students and 25 per cent for low-income black (negro) students.’ In addition, the proposal sought to precisely qualify the negro category using a phenotypical definition of blackness to be applied by an admissions verification committee; a negro student is ‘someone with dark skin, thick curly hair, a wide nose, and thick lips’. Another article of the proposal further stated, ‘Black students will declare their status by means of a signed declaration under legal penalty. In the case of doubt, the university or a third party will consider as negro anyone who presents a negro phenotype’ (first author, participant observation, SECTI meeting 2 May 2003).
Educafro’s concern with establishing better control over student racial self-classification was mirrored in their public legal actions. At the time, Educafro and local black movement lawyers had filed a civil inquiry with the state supreme court, defending the new policies and requesting an investigation of claims that white students had fraudulently declared themselves to be negros in order to benefit from the admissions quotas. During the judicial process, more than 50 witnesses submitted handwritten affidavits that they had seen white students committing such fraud (Humberto Adami, personal communication with first author, 4 September 2004). Furthermore, university data revealed that 14.4 per cent of the candidates who had declared themselves as negros or pardos and sought affirmative action status when they took the 2003 Vestibular had later declared themselves as white on the university’s socioeconomic questionnaire (DSEA-UERJ data).

In Brazil, there is no dichotomous black-versus-white identification schema based on an explicit rule – like that of hypodescent in the United States (Davis 1991) – so many Brazilians see themselves as racially mixed. As mentioned above, about 43 per cent opted for the mixed category pardo in the 2010 national census. Pardo is a very ambiguous category that can include many shades of skin color (Bailey 2009; Telles 2004). Because the law provided a 40 per cent quota for pardos and negros, it opened up the possibility for Brazilians of a wide range of skin tones or backgrounds to qualify. In contrast, Educafro considered those students with darker skin tones as more likely to suffer racism and as such as the group that should be targeted by the policy. Furthermore, in the opinion of many black movement leaders, targeted affirmative action not only provides access to higher education for Afro-Brazilians but also constitutes a step toward establishing greater symbolic recognition of pardos and pretos in Brazil as members of a single racial group: negros or afro-descendants (Bailey 2008). The institutionalization of the negro category in policy for the first time in the country’s history – and the requirement that students self-identify as negro for inclusion in that policy – could help achieve long-sought gains in collective identity (Bailey 2009).

Even though they recognized the concern with establishing a more precise means to verify students’ racial self-identification for beneficiary group status in the majority racially mixed context, Rio de Janeiro University administrators ultimately resisted the idea of establishing an interview committee charged with determining which students were and were not black. Nonetheless, they concurred with black movement leaders that the pardo category (brown, or light-skinned black) was a weakness in the original policy, and all parties agreed that the pardo category should be removed for more consistent identification of the ‘racial group’ targeted in the law (first author, participant observation, SECTI meetings February–May 2003).  

Combination of Class and Race Criteria

In their effort to refine the target population, social movement and state actors agreed on the addition of a low-income requirement for eligibility. Indeed, Educafro activists and lawyers were adamant on the addition of a low-income criteria for all students targeted by the quotas:
Educafro asserts that the law should only protect members of excluded groups: negros, Indians, people with special needs, and students from the public school system. Family income, for us, is a fundamental factor; per-capita family income should not be above two minimum-wage salaries per candidate. (first author, participant observation, SECTI meeting 2 May 2003)

Educafro representatives argued that, given the scarcity of state resources, it was important to ensure that the neediest students would benefit from the new policies. They further asserted that the public school criterion by itself was not sufficient to accomplish this objective. Indeed, they criticized the public school quota as not having actually benefited poorer students from state-operated public schools. According to UERJ data, only 1 student from the 100-plus high schools maintained by the Rio de Janeiro State Secretariat of Education had qualified in the 2003 entrance exam, while 599 came from Rio de Janeiro’s relatively prestigious federal and technical public schools (Cesar, forthcoming). The federal and technical public institutions admit students on a competitive basis, are attended by Rio de Janeiro’s middle class, and have well-established records of qualifying students in the Vestibular absent affirmative action.

As the working group continued wrestling with the issue of verifying candidates’ declared racial status, it became clear that the university could not be pressured into adopting criteria for formally verifying students’ racial self-identifications. Educafro’s proposal to remove the term pardo, together with the addition of the income criterion, became a way to minimize this impasse in negotiations and ensure that the black students who would benefit from the racial quota system were those with the greatest need. Without a low-income criterion, Educafro leaders argued, only middle-class and upper-middle-class black students would benefit from the new laws (see also Ramos 2005). Other local activists and politicians also favored the addition of an income criterion in order to mitigate some of the thorny issues surrounding the issue of racial classification and thereby help to legitimize the policy on several fronts. Moreover, the addition of an income criterion helped eliminate the relatively prosperous students from the prestigious federal and technical public high schools, opening up opportunities for the truly disadvantaged students, who are the majority in the state-operated public schools. Public school attendance as a stand-alone criterion for admission under affirmative action, then, was considered deficient in Rio de Janeiro as a measure for identifying a clearly disadvantaged social class, whether white, black, or brown.

The close relationship between class and race in the new laws was further revealed in the debate and discussion among Rio de Janeiro’s state deputies as they prepared to vote on the fourth and final version of the quota laws (Proposal 520/2003). As Fry (2005) has previously noted, the discussion revolved around the issue of social disadvantage to such a degree that, at times, negro became synonymous with ‘needy’. In reality, although these two categories do overlap significantly, they are not identical, leading to Educafro’s concern that the quota system might neglect the majority of negros, i.e. those who are poor. This final proposal established a total affirmative action quota of 45 per cent distributed across four categories of individuals: students from public schools (20 per cent), students self-identifying as black
(20 per cent), and disabled and Brazilian Indian students (5 per cent combined). The new item in the final law was a baseline requirement that all groups of affirmative action candidates also be low income; two groups, Educafro and UERJ officials, helped with drafting the final language of the policy.

Because of the polemic surrounding the quotas, state assembly leaders decided not to put the legislation on the agenda for debate. Thus, it was left to state legislators to approve Law 4.151/2003, which they did on 14 August 2003. This new legislation replaced the earlier three affirmative action laws, and according to Ramos (2005), an agreement was made between Rio de Janeiro’s state deputies, university chancellors, and social movement activists to postpone the date of the 2004 entrance exam in order to allow time for the law to be sanctioned, regulated, and implemented that year. See the timeline in Table 1 for a summary of the chronology of the development of these different affirmative action policies in Rio de Janeiro. In sum, the process from the sanctioning of class-based affirmative action in 2000 to the adoption of a combination class- and race-based policy and its implementation in the 2004 Vestibular resulted from a complicated combination of events, actors, countermeasures, and reformulations. From one perspective, an important end result was the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Law 3.524/2000, the first law of its kind in the country, establishes a 50 per cent quota for public school students in RJ’s state universities. Regulations for the implementation of the law are left undefined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Law 3.708/2001, again an unprecedented law, sets a 40 per cent quota for negros and pardos in RJ’s state universities. It is the first law of its kind in the country. Regulations for the implementation of the law are left undefined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Decree 30.766 regulates Laws 3.524 and 3.708, setting criteria for selecting candidates. The state universities must reserve 50 per cent of slots for public school students and select from among this group students self-identified as negros and pardos to fulfill the 40 per cent quota defined in Law 3.708. Any remaining slots are to be filled by other candidates declared negro or pardo regardless of school background. Decree 31.468 further defines selection criteria for public school students, permitting implementation of Laws 3.524 and 3.708 in the 2003 Vestibular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Law 4.061/2003 establishes a 10 per cent quota for people with disabilities in RJ’s state universities. Law 4.151/2003 combines the previous three quota laws (3.524, 3.708 and 4.061) into one law. Establishes a 45 per cent quota for low-income students distributed as follows: 20 per cent from public schools, 20 per cent negro, and 5 per cent Brazilian Indians and students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Text of all legislation available at www.alerj.rj.gov.br
creation of a new type of racial beneficiary category in the state of Rio de Janeiro’s public universities: poor black students.

**Dominance of Combined Race and Class Criteria for Affirmative Action in Brazil**

Since these events in Rio de Janeiro between 2000 and 2004, class- and race-based affirmative action has become widespread throughout Brazilian higher education. We do not argue here that Rio de Janeiro’s legislation served directly as a sole or even central catalyst to the creation of similar policies. Instead, we document the prevalence across Brazil of the concept employed in Rio de Janeiro, which created a unique approach to afro-descendants, generally granting beneficiary status only to those that meet additional criteria: low-income, public school attendance, or both. In an effort to map this distribution and reveal the relationship of ‘race’ and ‘class’ categories in these new policies, we collected information on current affirmative action admissions policies at all Brazilian public universities. The data were collected in 2011 from university regulations governing its entrance exam and from student manuals, both published on university websites. These documents were reviewed for information on the origin of the policy (whether it originated as state law or internal university decision), the year of implementation and type of affirmative action, and the populations targeted by the policy.

Brazil has separate state and federal systems of public universities. Overall both types of public universities are more prestigious and competitive than private institutes of higher learning, and they are 100 per cent government funded. Federal universities are located throughout the country and are under the control of the federal Ministry of Education. State governments fund state universities, and their quality varies according to the wealth of the state. Both state and federal public universities enjoy administrative autonomy.

Brazil has a total of 95 public universities (37 state and 58 federal universities). In total, 73 public universities have some sort of affirmative action program or policy. Of these, 19 state universities have adopted programs via legislative mandate, as did Rio de Janeiro; in all other cases the policy change was the result of internal university decision, maintaining university administrative autonomy. For instance, at the Federal University of Brasilia (UnB), affirmative action was implemented by University Council decision after five years of internal university deliberation and debate.

The target populations of the policies vary, targeting one or a combination of public school students, Afro-Brazilians, Brazilian Indians, low-income students, students from quilombos (largely African rural settlements originally founded by escaped slaves), residents of the state, and students with disabilities. Although there are many types of programs, those establishing quotas are by far the most common (80 per cent of all federal and state programs combined). The most frequent target group is public school students \(N = 60\), followed by Afro-Brazilians \(N = 39\) and Brazilian Indians \(N = 34\). Most universities have established programs for more than one beneficiary group. For example, the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC) sets aside an admissions quota for public school students (20 per cent), one for Afro-
Brazilian public school students (10 per cent) and seven extra slots for Brazilian Indians. The Federal University of Pará (UFPA) reserves 50 per cent of all slots for public school students, and within this quota, establishes a 40 per cent quota for students self-identifying as either black or brown (preto or pardo). In addition, UFPA created extra slots in each course for Brazilian Indians (two per course) and for people with disabilities (one per course).

One of the areas of the greatest controversy in the new programs concerns the guidelines and processes used to verify the racial identity of student applicants. Most universities require students seeking to qualify for programs for Afro-Brazilians to self-identify as such, and sign a legal declaration of this identity status upon penalty of fraud. Concerns over the fair administration of affirmative action have prompted some programs to require students interested in qualifying to submit a photo for review by a committee, or to pass an interview examination intended to verify the candidate’s racial status; however, in the large majority of cases, racial status has been combined with a class criterion (public school attendance or low-income status), with only the class criterion requiring corroborating documentation. Nonetheless, there has been some criticism that universities reserving slots for low-income students require families to undergo a prohibitively involved process to verify family income. By contrast, neither public school attendance nor indigenous status has attracted criticism as a criterion or in terms of verification.

Out of the 73 universities with affirmative action programs, 39 address Afro-Brazilians. As stated, the majority of these programs are designed such that, in order to qualify, Afro-Brazilian students must also fulfill additional criteria: public school attendance, low income, or both. Table 2 summarizes the distribution of the 39 policies specifically addressing Afro-descendants. As shown, 28 of 39 programs define a beneficiary class of Afro-Brazilian public school students. An example is the Federal University of Juiz de Fora, which established a 50 per cent quota for public school students, and within that quota, 25 per cent is reserved for negros. Five universities, including the state universities of Rio de Janeiro (UENF and UERJ) discussed earlier, require documentation of family income. Finally, only 6 of 39 (15 per cent) programs target race alone, without any secondary class-based criterion. These statistics suggest, then, that the dominant approach is to define a beneficiary group of ‘poor black students’, rather than black students in general. A similar pattern prevails as well in federally funded affirmative action initiatives in private universities, established through ProUnis (University Program for All) in 2005.

Conclusion

We began this paper by noting the significant gap between the ability of indigenous versus Afro-descendant populations to procure group-based rights and state intervention in Latin America’s new multicultural citizenship regimes. The literature explains that gap as due primarily to the greater legitimacy conferred on cultural difference than on racial discrimination. Hooker clearly expresses the problem of privileging culture in the struggle for collective rights: ‘as a result Afro-Latinos who are unable to assert an ‘ethnic’ identity lack a solid claim to collective rights even
Table 2  Qualification criteria for university affirmative action programs addressing Afro-
Brazilians (N = 39).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification Criteria</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race plus public school (N = 28)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>The majority of programs create a beneficiary category of Afro-Brazilian public school student. With few exceptions, these schools also provide benefits to public school students regardless of race/ethnicity, as well as other groups.&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; For example, the Federal University of Juiz de Fora (UFJF) reserves 50 per cent of slots in each course for public school students, and within this quota, 25 per cent are reserved for students also self-identifying as negros.&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Income (N = 5)&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>To qualify for this dual race/income beneficiary category, students self-identifying as black must also fulfill a low-income requirement. Most programs also have spaces for low-income nonblack public school students and other groups. For example, to qualify for affirmative action slots at the state universities of Rio de Janeiro (UERJ and UNEF), candidates must have a gross per capita household monthly income equal to or less than $960.00 Brazilian reais (US$480.00) (UERJ/UNEF Candidate Manual 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (N = 6)&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>These universities have affirmative action programs targeting various groups, but reserve certain slots for Afro-Brazilians, regardless of income. For example, the Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM) reserves 13 per cent of slots in each course for Afro-Brazilians, 5 per cent for special needs students, 20 per cent for public school students, and 8 spaces for Brazilian Indians. To qualify, Afro-Brazilians must submit a signed declaration that they are ‘Afro-Brazilian negro’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: <sup>a</sup>State University of Amapá (UEAP), State University of Feira de Santana (UEFS), State University of Londrina (UEL), State University of Ponta Grossa (UEPG), State University of Southeastern Bahia (UESB), State University of Santa Cruz (UESC), State University of Piauí (UESPI), Federal University of ABC (UFABC), Federal University of Alagoas (UFAL), Federal University of Bahia (UFBA), Federal University of Goiás (UFG), Federal University of Juiz de Fora (UFJJ), Federal University of Maranhão (UFMA), Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Federal University of Pará (UFPA), Federal University of Paraíba (UFPB), Rural Federal University of Amazônia (UFRA), Federal University of Recôncavo da Bahia (UFRR), Federal University of South Rio Grande (UFRGS), Federal University of Sergipe (UFS), Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC), Federal University of São Carlos (UFSCAR), Federal University of São João del Rei (UFSJ), State University of Mato Grosso (UNEMAT), State University of Campinas (UNICAMP), Federal University of São Paulo (UNIFESP), Federal University of Pampa (UNIPAMPA), and the Federal University of Rio Grande Foundation (FURG).

<sup>b</sup>The five public universities with affirmative action programs that target Afro-Brazilian public school students, but not nonblack public school students are Federal University of Alagoas (UFAL), Federal University of Bahia (UFBA), State University of Bahia (UNEB), State University of Mato Grosso (UNEMAT), and the Federal University of São Paulo (UNIFESP).

<sup>c</sup>In real numbers: UFJF offers 50 slots in courses like medicine and law. Under the program, 25 slots are reserved for Afro-Brazilian public school students and 19 for public school students. (Source: www.ufjf.br/secom/2012/04/10/governador-valadares-conheca-a-distribuicao-das-vagas-pelo-sistema-de-cotas/)

<sup>d</sup>State University of Minas Gerais (UEMG), State University of North Fluminense (UENF), State University of Montes Claros (UNIMONTES), State University of Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), and State University of Bahia (UNEB). UNEB differs from the other schools in this category, in that Afro-Brazilian students must both meet a low-income requirement and have graduated from a public school.

<sup>e</sup>State University of Santa Catarina (UDESC), State University of Goiás (UEG), State University of South Mato Grosso (UEMS), Federal University of Paraná (UFPR), Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM), and Federal University of Brasília (UNB).
though they may also suffer from political exclusion and racial discrimination’ (2005, 307). Paschel (2010) illustrates how that dynamic played out in Colombia, where Afro-Columbian activists focusing on combating racial inequality were largely unsuccessful, whereas activists who strategically framed claims around ethnic difference did secure some recognition and rights. We have presented the case of affirmative action in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, as a counterexample to that literature. In the case of Rio de Janeiro, and perhaps in much of the national context of higher education in Brazil, racial discrimination does appear to be a solid base for the struggle for inclusion. The cultural specificity of Afro-Brazilians, on the other hand, appears a nonissue in this struggle.

However, unlike the experiences characteristic of the United States, minority racial group status alone is not enough. Brazil’s history of extreme class hierarchy, and perhaps too the reluctance of Brazilian society to imagine itself in purely racial terms, has produced a hybrid category for targeted intervention: poor blacks. Black movement activists in Rio de Janeiro recognized that a wholly race-based approach was problematic. Without the addition of a class criterion, Brazil’s most vulnerable population, poor blacks, might fail to benefit. Instead, social movement actors and administrators from Rio’s state universities came together to construct a hybrid category of beneficiary status that addressed these concerns. Moreover, our research shows that the combination of race and class criteria for affirmative action inclusion has diffused widely across Brazil, whereas exclusively race-based quotas remain limited.

Attitudes in Brazil regarding who merits beneficiary status might be expected to become more fluid following recent high court rulings upholding the constitutionality of racial quotas. These rulings could increase the legitimacy of Afro-Brazilian descent alone as a beneficiary status in at least three ways. First, the ruling might embolden other universities that may have feared race-specific programs would face legal challenges. Second, the prestige of the court could lend symbolic power (Bourdieu 1991) to a racial lens on human diversity in Brazilian society that trumps class, a change that some scholars have called negative racialization (see Magnoli 2009). Third, it could affect the way that the public explains the underrepresentation of blacks in higher education, which has been shown to affect policy attitudes on affirmative action in Brazil (Bailey 2002, 2004). For example, regarding the high court’s decision, one justice argued, ‘The racial oppression of the years of slavery in Brazil left scars that remain especially evident in the sphere of education, resulting in alarming degrees of differences between white and Afro-descendant students’ (Veja, 26 April 2012). This argumentation proposes a structural racial origin to what many may have previously considered only a class-based problem, thereby more robustly justifying a race-based solution. Further research will certainly be needed to document and understand the evolution of the unique combination of race- and class-based affirmative action in Brazil.
Notes

[1] There are many other justifications that various actors offer in support of implementing race-based affirmative action in Brazil. For a list, see Gentili et al. 2012, 67. Perhaps central among these is the legacy of slavery.


[3] Students and leaders of Educafro informed the governor and the State University of Rio de Janeiro that they would take legal action against the university if this law was not implemented immediately. In a letter to UERJ Chancellor Nícéa Freire dated 25 June 2002, Educafro representatives stated, ‘We see that UERJ has ignored the law. We are calling a meeting of our legal advisors and we will be forced to prosecute the state university in the courts. With this attitude, UERJ runs the risk of having the results of the 2003 entrance exam forfeited.’ In another letter to Vice-Governor Benedita da Silva, Educafro presented a signed petition requesting the immediate implementation of the quota and promising that ‘if necessary, a group of pre-university students will chain ourselves to the university gates until the quotas are given back to the public school students’ (11 June 2001, UERJ/DSEA).


[5] In addition to these individual lawsuits, three lawsuits challenging the constitutionality of the laws were filed: two at the state level and one with the federal Supreme Court.

[6] Renato Ferreira is a former student member of Movimento Pre-Vestibular para Negros e Carentes (Vestibular Preparation Movement for Blacks and the Poor). He studied law at the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro and today works for the Special Secretariat for the Promotion of Racial Equality (SEPPIR) in Brasília. Friar David is director of Educafro.

[7] Much of the literature on racial inequality in Brazil posits that pretos and pardos do not differ significantly in terms of average incomes in comparison to whites; see Hasenbalg (1988). However, other scholars disagree, finding significantly greater differences between pretos and whites than between pardos and whites (Telles 2004).

[8] See Maio and Santos (2005) and Racusen (2009) for discussions of approaches to identifying the targeted minority in other Brazilian universities.

[9] In some cases, instead of quotas, universities have designed systems of bonus points on the entrance exam for certain populations, or the creation of a small number of additional slots in select courses to be filled by qualifying students, which is how most programs for Brazilian Indians are designed.
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