

LATIN AMERICA

PRE-CONGRESS VOLUMES

GENERAL EDITOR:
MARÍA LUZ MORÁN

**SOCIAL
KNOWLEDGE:**
*HERITAGE,
CHALLENGES,
PERSPECTIVES.*



*Sociology
in
Latin America*

Editors:
Roberto Briceño-León
Heinz R. Sonntag



INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE
ASOCIACIÓN INTERNACIONAL DE SOCIOLOGÍA

PRE-CONGRESS VOLUMES SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE: HERITAGE, CHALLENGES, PERSPECTIVES

GENERAL EDITOR: MARÍA-LUZ MORÁN

The Pre-Congress Colloquia are intended to prepare the discussion at the 14th World Congress of Sociology (1998) on its theme "Social Knowledge, Heritage, Challenges, and Perspectives". The International Sociological Association sponsored, in conjunction with local associations, ten regional colloquia in ten different regions of the world. These volumes are the edited, and sometimes abbreviated, versions of the papers given at these colloquia. In addition, ISA commissioned an eleventh, worldwide volume, of essays written from a feminist perspective. After the volumes were prepared, ISA convened an "integration" colloquium in which the editors of the eleven volumes discussed with each other the findings on a series of major themes. These discussions were filmed and exist in form of four video-cassettes.

The object of this collection of volumes and cassettes is not to present the state of knowledge in a region (or of feminist studies) but the state of social knowledge throughout the world from a regional or feminist perspective. ISA hopes thereby to underline the fact that, however general the propositions we hope to put forth, they often tend to come out differently when the social contexts within which the authors write are different. We hope that these differences (and of course the similarities that we may find despite the different perspectives) may be a starting-point for our collective effort to look at our heritage, at the contemporary challenges that are being made to the heritage, and the possible paths that may be taken by the social sciences in the twenty-first century.

Immanuel Wallerstein
President, ISA.

ISA REGIONAL CONFERENCES

Sociology in Latin America
Editors: Roberto Briceño-León
and Heinz R. Sonntag

**Proceedings of the ISA Regional
Conference for Latin America
Colonia Tovar, Venezuela, July 7-9, 1997**

LIST OF VOLUMES

1. **Arab World**
Editors: Abdelkader Zghal and Ahmed Iadh Ouederni
2. **East Asia**
Editor: Su-Hoon Lee
3. **East-Central Europe**
Editor: Piotr Sztompka
4. **Feminist Perspective**
Editor: Linda Christiansen-Ruffman
5. **Latin America**
Editors: Roberto Briceño-León and Heinz Sonntag
6. **Lusophone World**
Editor: Ana Nunes de Almeida
7. **North America**
Editor: Janet L. Abu-Lughod
8. **Nordic European Countries**
Editors: Margareta Bertilsson and Göran Therborn
9. **South Asia**
Editors: Partha Nath Mukherji, Jacop Aikara and Chandan Sengupta
10. **Southern Africa**
Editors: Ari Sitas and Teresa Cruz Maria e Silva
11. **Southern Europe**
Editor: Caglar Keyder

CONTENTS

List of Contributors	p.7
Introduction <i>Latin American Sociology Caught Between People, Time and Development</i> Roberto Briceño-León and Heinz R. Sonntag.....	p.9
Chapter 1 <i>The Colonial Nature of Power and Latin America's Cultural Experience</i> Aníbal Quijano.....	p.27
Chapter 2 <i>Past and Future of Sociological Analysis in Latin America: the Case of Sociology of Education</i> Orlando Albornoz.....	p.39
Chapter 3 <i>The Challenges Facing Latin American Sociology: Something of What We Have, Something of What We Seek</i> Raquel Sosa Elizaga.....	p.51
Chapter 4 <i>The Forthcoming Sociology. Thinking After Post-Modernity</i> Rigoberto Lanz.....	p.57
Chapter 5 <i>Eurocentrism and Colonialism in the Latinamerican Social Thought</i> Edgardo Lander.....	p.65
Chapter 6 <i>Sociology and Science: Towards a Fruitful Dialogue Between the Two Cultures?</i> Hebe M.C. Vessuri.....	p.77
Chapter 7 <i>Some Dilemmas and Challenges for Social Sciences in Brazil</i> Paulo César Alves.....	p.89
Chapter 8 <i>The Roots of Brazilian Sociology's Contributions to Latin American Social Thought</i> Emir Sader.....	p.101
Chapter 9 <i>Reinventing the Craft: The Challenge of Restructuring Social Science Research in Latin America for the Next Millennium</i> Marcia Rivera.....	p.111

Chapter 10 *The Future of Social Sciences in Latin America and the Caribbean*

Francisco López Segrera.....p.127

Chapter 11 *Restructuring the Social Sciences: Toward a New Paradigm*

Pablo González Casanova.....p.137

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

ORLANDO ALBORNOZ

Sociologist, professor emeritus at the Central University of Venezuela, former president of the ISA - Research Committee on Sociology of Education.

PAULO CÉSAR ALVES

Anthropologist, Chair of Social Sciences Post-Graduate Courses at the Federal University of Bahia/Brazil.

ROBERTO BRICEÑO-LEÓN

Sociologist, professor at the Central University of Venezuela, director of the Social Sciences Laboratory (LACSO) and member of ISA Executive Committee.

PABLO GONZÁLEZ CASANOVA

Sociologist, professor emeritus at the National Autonomous University of Mexico, director of its Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Humanities and Sciences.

EDGARDO LANDER

Sociologist, professor at the Central University of Venezuela, member of the Executive Committee of CLACSO.

RIGOBERTO LANZ

Sociologist, professor at the Central University of Venezuela, director of its Post-Doctoral Studies Center.

FRANCISCO LÓPEZ SEGRERA

UNESCO Regional Council.

ANÍBAL QUIJANO

Sociologist, professor emeritus of San Marcos University in Lima/Peru, permanent visiting professor at the Fernand Braudel Center of SUNY .

MARCIA RIVERA

Sociologist, professor at the University of Puerto Rico, current Executive Secretary of the Latin American Council of Social Sciences - CLACSO.

EMIR SADER

Sociologist, professor at the University of Sao Paulo/Brazil, current president of the Latin American Sociological Association - ALAS.

HEINZ R. SONNTAG

Sociologist, professor at the Central University of Venezuela, ex-director of its Center for Development Studies - CENDES.

RAQUEL SOSA ELIZAGA

Sociologist, professor at the Center for Latin American Studies - CELA of the National Autonomous University of Mexico.

HEBE M.C. VESSURI

Social anthropologist, senior research fellow at the Venezuelan Institute for Scientific Research - IVIC.

INTRODUCTION

LATIN AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY CAUGHT BETWEEN PEOPLE, TIME, AND DEVELOPMENT

Roberto Briceño-León, Central University of Venezuela
Heinz R. Sonntag, Central University of Venezuela

Introduction

When the sociology, the other social sciences, and even the 19th Century social philosophy in Latin America have not been limited to mere transplants from or imitations of their counterparts in the metropolitan countries, or Eurocentric versions of our reality (which have been very common), their evolution over time has followed two major trends, which can be symbolically and synthetically expressed in a sentence written by José Martí at the end of the last century: "*When one is born in a society that is behind the times, one must simultaneously be a man of one's people and of one's time.*" The expression of these tendencies has taken the form of a search for *progress*, for *development*, for *modernity* in a unique form, in short, for some kind of organization of society on a par with—or at least similar to—the highly developed societies based on endogenously generated capitalism, one which combines autochthonous and imported features in a particular form of dynamic.

In this respect, Latin American sociology in its different periods and facets has tended to focus on the society and the people, on their suffering, their poverty, and their fears, but also on their hopes, their dreams, and their utopias; in a word, their evolution over time and their identity. At the same times and at other times, and through the same or other practices, it has also attempted to describe the period, i.e., the culture, thought, science, and technological advances—in a word, society's development. These two trends, expressed in the collective representations and sets of images, reveal the strain between the commitment to society's transformation and Latin America's uniqueness (expressed in the question: Who are we?), on the one hand, and on the other, the commitment to universality and uncertainty *vis-à-vis* explicit science (expressed in the question: "To which West do we belong, or how do we belong to it?").

The answers to both questions, given concrete form—completely or partially—through the behavior of the different collective actors (nation-states, peoples, social classes, fractions of classes, sectors, castes, etc.) have molded the history of our societies, at least since the time of political

independence (and perhaps before then), to such an extent that they strongly influence society's march toward the future. We will now proceed to analyze these questions.

The Tendency to Focus on the People

This current of Latin American sociology has some features which are inextricably intertwined and comprise the mixture which is so characteristic of it.

a) The Search for Uniqueness as a Society

This tendency, of a deeply particularistic nature, singles out what is unique about Latin America: its native peoples, its mixture of races, its social organization at different times and expressed in combinations of cultures, and the unique nature of Latin American identity as a form of social solidarity or as a specific way of understanding the world and dealing with it.

But that search for uniqueness as a society, which is established and re-established in a dynamic game of continuity and change, is often based—at least in the lower classes and intellectual vanguards (though not in the dominant economic and political groups)—on the negation of others. It is accordingly a form of identification reflecting a comparison with others, whereby Latin American society defines itself as contrary to non-Latin American society. That means that, in spite of the region's colonial past and the process by which it was populated, Latin America understands itself as contrary to the West which subjugated and dominated it for centuries and still continues to influence it. This is a kind of revenge against Eurocentric tendencies. In this perspective, others are not accepted; either they do not exist or they are wrong and have a deformed understanding of what Latin American society really is. Otherness is negated because that is a way to negate the universality which would imply that we resemble others in Europe or the North.

b) Feeling Others' Pain

All of Latin American sociology has been permeated by a strong social and political orientation grounded in a protest against injustice and aimed at producing transformation and change; even 19th Century positivist social philosophy and the structural-functionalism of recent decades underwent a significant metamorphosis among us: their focus is not on equilibrium but on change, and what exists is not an ideal society but one to be built. Sociology expresses shock in the face of poverty and other inequalities and inequities, but does so with a commitment that arises from a form of expressing anger,

rebellion, or grave dissatisfaction with the tremendous inequalities and the suffering of others. In general and as is the case in other parts of the world, this sociology is usually practiced by people who are not from a poor background, but rather come from the middle and upper-income groups. Sociologists therefore do not protest against injustice to themselves, but against what they observe in the lives of others. This has been a deeply empathetic sociology, which seeks in its analyses and formulations to give expression to those to whom no one listens, and provide a voice for those who have no words.

c) *Sociology as a Tool of Social Control*

While sociology in other parts of the world — chiefly though not exclusively in the developed countries — was turned into a tool by which the powerful legitimize their domination, it has never been an instrument of power in Latin America. The dominant sectors held it in contempt. Quite simply, they did not need it — or did not believe they needed it — to consolidate and legitimate their domination. When they needed some sociological knowledge for *social engineering* purposes (often indispensable to keep the system running), they used externally generated knowledge contained in the theories imported from Europe or North America and also disseminated among us.

As a result, Latin American sociology has been experienced as a tool for fostering social change. Its goal has been to transform society, whether the traditional society with a view to modernizing it or the imposed society in an attempt to restore some kind of *original condition*. One part of this sociology was inspired by Max Weber's concepts of the irresistible movement toward instrumental rationality as a basic characteristic of the West; another part took as its starting point Spencer's theories and North American anthropology's concept of the *folk-modern* social continuum, and mixed these elements with its own orientation (as noted above). From these approaches arose the well-known works of José Medina Echavarría and Gino Germani in the 1950s and 1960s, which introduced the sociology of transition — that of modernization. This approach was even incorporated into the doctrinal grounding of what was the most influential theory of economic development for the underdeveloped — or developing — world: that of the UN's *Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)*. Among other things, this was the first theory to view the problems of underdevelopment in the framework of the worldwide capitalist economy.

Still another part of Latin American sociology also focused on social change, but looked for its roots in the uniqueness of Latin American sociology. This school spoke of the possibility of another path, *a path of Latin America's own*. A nativist orientation prevailed, with an emphasis on indigenous culture, which has imbued many thinkers intent of recapturing experiences from the

past, such as the peasant movements in Brazil, the Jesuits' experiments with the Guarani Indians in Paraguay, or the communal societies in countries with large Native American populations (Mexico, Guatemala, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador).

The social change perspective also inspired a sociology of Christian inspiration which focused on all the social orientations of the Catholic Church in a long-lasting search for a third path lying between those of capitalism and socialism. *Liberation theology* and certain positions taken by the Church toward *adjustment policies* provide illustrations of this approach.

Finally, we cannot fail to mention Marxist sociology in this overview. It has been characterized by orientations ranging from the purest expressions of *orthodox Marxism-Leninism*, through original attempts to express Marxism in Latin American terms (of which Mariátegui is the clearest example), to the more recent formulations such as the historic humanism of critical theory and Althusser's structuralism. All these currents have had strength and impact, especially at some universities and among academic and intellectual groups which have viewed themselves as vanguards for national and worldwide revolution. It has also shared the explanation of backwardness as a result of Latin America's place in the world system with the ECLAC developmentalist approach.

This sociology has generated two especially significant products. One is the orientation of *committed sociology* and the other is *the close linkage between sociology and politics*.

Committed sociology was and is the construction of knowledge for use. It could not and cannot imply knowledge for knowledge's sake, but rather, a knowledge which had and has to be identified with the people's causes, with social transformation or revolution. In a word, it denied and denies the possibility of a sociological knowledge with a value in and for itself, because that knowledge was and is important only if it was and is useful for a reformist or revolutionary transformation, for the construction of an *autochthonous modernity*, and not for preservation of the *status quo*.

This orientation has been at the root of the *research-action* approach, also known in other parts of the world as active research. From a strictly technical and methodological standpoint, research-action is a form of research based on a quasi-experimental method. The fundamental difference is that research-action implies an initiative to produce desired results which are actively sought by the researcher himself, while the quasi-experimental method tends to be more skeptical and to have a cognitive purpose—to gain the ability to assess the consequences of the proposed initiative based on a comparison between the end results and the conditions prevailing before the action was taken. Research-action is a full-scale expression of committed sociology: it wants to act, have an impact, and transform reality. That is its fundamental purpose, and the research work is subordinated to it, though it is assumed that social

reality can be better understood when viewed in the context of a change initiated by the researcher himself as an external actor working together with the human beings he is studying.

The second product — the intertwining of sociology and politics — is a logical result of committed sociology. Its content and rationale are obvious. What is more, some writers assert that sociology *is* in its essence politics.

The Tendency to Focus on the Time

This tendency features an orientation toward the use of current knowledge, i.e., the theories, philosophy of history, and epistemological approaches that varied in the world and in the ways in which sociology has been understood. A classification into the actoral, thematic, and temporal categories will reveal the existence of five types of sociology.

Lawyers' Sociology

This was the dominant approach between the 1930s and the 1950s. It was a non-professional sociology, performed mainly by lawyers concerned about the social conditions they saw around them. In 1950 they founded the Latin American Sociology Association (ALAS) and introduced sociology courses into the law curriculum.

Strictly speaking, this sociology was a variant of positivism's response to Latin American social conditions. It sought explanations and interpretations of those conditions on the basis of a positivist training and foreign sociological thought, sometimes including the aforementioned metamorphosis, and on other occasions remaining trapped in Eurocentric imitation and the *conservative dream* of being the other. There was a reliance on the essay as a way to generate an intuitive understanding of reality, as a dominant form of work. Where metamorphosis was present, a folkloric orientation sought to redeem the strange and unique things that are characteristic of Latin America and part of its heritage.

This was a sociology that referred basically to a rural society. It studied the organization of rural life, that of haciendas and plantations, slavery, in a word the rural condition that its practitioners wanted to civilize from an urban standpoint.

It was unquestionably a sociology based on keen intuitions, which called attention to society's contradictions (those which generated the metamorphosis). It had no methodological tools at its disposal, but it did have a remarkable sensitivity and a logical organization of thought which made it possible to formulate interpretations of Latin American society, sometimes with higher quality and sometimes with lower. In its two versions (Eurocentric and

autochthonous) this school of sociology was at bottom an expression of civilization's response to barbarism.

Regarding the other tendency, focusing on the people, lawyers' sociology (once again in both its variants) placed a great deal of emphasis on the uniqueness of Latin American society, but the Eurocentric variant felt very little empathy for others' pain and even less interest in social change.

The Sociology of Modernization

This school of sociology is closely linked to the emergence and evolution of the ECLAC's economic development theory, and enjoyed its most important growth, importance, and dissemination in the 1950s and 1960s. It focuses on a Latin American society that had become urbanized and had begun to industrialize during the interwar period (and before); these trends are stressed in the ECLAC's first study on the social implications of economic development, published in 1954. This sociology was strongest in the Southern Cone countries, since urbanization and industrialization appeared earliest and proceeded most rapidly there (and also in Sao Paulo/Brazil and Monterrey/Mexico), starting even before the turn of the 20th Century. But Brazilians, Mexicans, and even Venezuelans made important contributions.

From the theoretical standpoint, this was a sociology focused on society's goals. It worked with the concept of the rural-urban continuum drawn from modernity theory, but its emphasis was on the urban pole and modernity — and especially on the formulation of measures (social policies among others) to achieve modernity. It reflected a structural — functionalist approach, though for many of its practitioners it was imbued with the metamorphosis concept. It coincided with the stronger presence and influence of North American sociology in Latin America (which lent itself, through some of its most outstanding representatives, to participation in an ultimately frustrated attempt at *social espionage* by the CIA known as *Project Camelot*). It fostered the institutionalization of sociology through the creation of sociology and anthropology schools, research institutes, and postgraduate programs at national universities, as well as sociology associations, regional academic bodies (the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences — FLACSO, founded in 1957), and networks of centers devoted to research and teaching in sociology and the other social sciences (Latin American Social Science Council — CLASCO, created in 1967).

This sociology is attentive to Latin America's uniqueness, but for the purpose of demanding that it change in order to adopt the values of modernity — because its present condition is one of backwardness, rurality, and traditionalism. The call to modify the region's uniqueness obviously implies the need to eventually do away with that condition, because it is incompatible with

modernity. What Latin America must do is come to resemble the West, the developed and modern countries.

There is little concern for others' pain; this is a technical sociology, which claims to be scientific and has an orientation toward social change; what is more, its fundamental concern is how to generate, how to foster, and how to accelerate social change in the direction of modern society. Its aim is to spur the transition through which the Latin American societies are passing, having ceased to be entirely rural and backward but being still far from completely urban and modern.

The Sociology of Dependency

This is a curious product of a symbiosis among different elements which vary according to the meaning given to its core concept: *dependency*. It came into being toward the end of the 1960s, as a reflection of the dissatisfaction felt by some ECLAC associates with the explanatory power of the economic development doctrine and the concomitant social sciences (for example, the sociology of modernization), as well as the meager ability to induce modernity conceived as development (economic, social, political, cultural) with the public policies derived from that doctrine. It was then (at least at the outset) the outcome of a confrontation between professional sociological training and skepticism regarding ECLAC developmentalism; shortly thereafter some dependentologists attempted to integrate Marxism into their construct, leading to the *dependency theory* in contrast to the *dependency approach* followed by the concept's originators. The fundamental concern of both variants of dependentism is to understand how Latin America is and formulate an explanation for its backwardness and poverty in the context of world society, by analyzing the internal and international power structures. This implies a return to the ECLAC tradition and to previous-simultaneous contributions of the Marxist schools.

It has always been asserted that the emergence of the sociology of dependency was a reflection not so much of the Cuban revolution, but of its radicalization. That influence may indeed have been present, especially among those who viewed dependency theory as a kind of complement to the traditional Marxist theory of imperialism. But the advocates of the dependency approach did not see such a linkage as at all clear, except in the generic sense that one of their theoretical-conceptual elements was the idea that the unequal distribution of power in the world system had become incorporated into the underdeveloped countries' internal systems of domination (the core concept of dependentism, after all).

Dependentism believes it is necessary to redeem the uniqueness of Latin American society, but from a political and economic (i.e., macrosocial), rather than a folkloric or psychosocial perspective. It feels others' pain. It calls for

social change, but understands it in global terms, positing the need to overcome the external domination which has become internalized in the regional systems of domination and subjects Latin American societies to a vicious circle under which foreign interests are pursued by national actors and States, and which either prevents capitalist development (dependency theory) or allows it to take place only in the form of an associated and subordinated development (dependency approach). In both cases, capitalist development does not overcome the grave problems of backwardness and poverty among the great majority of the population.

The sociology of dependency in either of its two variants exerted very strong influence on the orientation of research in the 1970s and 1980s.

Marxist Sociology

This school of sociology, though always present in the region, enjoyed another surge in the period between 1970 and 1980. Its renewed variant emerged from the events emblematically summarized in the expression *French May of 1968*. It was strongly influenced by the 1970 victory of Salvador Allende and the Popular Unity movement in Chile, which was to provide a starting point for the evolution of a democratic socialism. From the theoretical standpoint, it struggled with the contradiction between French structuralism as expressed by Louis Althusser and the Frankfurt School as popularized by Herbert Marcuse (but this second current never matched the Althusserian one in influence).

If the orthodox Marxism-Leninism of prior decades had erred in its Eurocentrism, the Marxist-structuralist sociology of the 1970s erred in its ahistoric and antihumanist approach. It was unquestionably grounded in the *objective necessity* of social change (i.e., revolution). That need was understood as scientific, and would be achieved by the operation of history's laws having nothing to do with the subjective behavior of social actors. This school's influence was also exercised chiefly through the *historical materialism* manuals that became best-sellers at Latin American universities. That involved a simplification of sociological analysis, since it assumed that all the answers were on hand and questions were idle. This is a sociology which loses sight of society as the object to be studied. It turns its back on the search for uniqueness and has no way to feel others' pain, because those others are unnecessary; the structures and forces above and beyond the social actors will teleologically determine social change.

The Sociology of Sociology

Finally, and as a consequence of Marxist-structuralist sociology, there has arisen a school whose basic goal is to know and understand sociology. Here society disappears completely from sociological concern. Attention no longer

goes to Latin America's uniqueness, nor to feeling others' pain, nor to the social field, but to theory itself. This sociology systematically contemplates its own navel. In response to the previous schools' demonstrated inability to produce social change, it turns its back on society and circumscribes itself to an exercise more appropriate to social philosophy than to sociology. It is a sociology dominated by epistemology, by analysis of discourse where there is never a real discourse that analyzed, since the important thing is the theory *per se*. This sociology is lacking in the three features we have encountered in the tendency to focus on the people; its practitioners devote themselves to management, the cinema, tourism, analysis of the mass media. In a word, after so much theoretical and sociological purity they look for society in history or in economics, and for uniqueness in the movies and in psychological studies of identity. There is little or no action *vis-à-vis* social reality.

The sociologies described above have, as said above, their times and their rates of evolution. They overlap, interpenetrate, reject each other, communicate with each other. They were capable of creating a scientific-social community in the Latin American region, among whose specific features were its diversity and ability to communicate. At the present time, what prevails is dispersion and indefiniteness. There are many small-scale initiatives —some with scientific orientation, others with political aims— which have emerged in the region, but they have yet to come together as an important, hegemonic, or dominant school. The sequels to Marxist sociology and the sociology of sociology still dominate the official discourse of Latin American sociology.

The Contradictions of Latin American Sociological Practice

Latin American sociology, like that of other regions and virtually worldwide, is now burdened by a set of contradictions (or opposing positions) in its practices and activities, and in its way of breaking down and then building and rebuilding the objects to which it gives its attention. These contradictions are an integral part of the transformations taking place in all of today's science, which have inspired the introduction of the term *new science*. But as usually happens when the basic thing is common to all, the forms of expression are those of each cultural region and reflect its own sociological heritage.

Below we will attempt to specify some of these contradictions, which we understand as challenges, in the form in which they manifest themselves in Latin America at the present time.

The Humanistic and Philosophical Tradition vs. the Scientific Tradition

Latin American sociology has been characterized, for many years and for many of its practitioners, by the exercise of a philosophical-conceptual self-examination, often involving a historical analysis much in the Latin (Spanish,

Italian, and even French) and German (which has strongly influenced the Spanish and Italian) tradition. Indeed, it continues to be so characterized. This is a sociology of long essays, which attributes little importance to empirical methodology and a great deal of importance to theory, philosophy, and—more recently—epistemology. This sociology is in opposition to a scientific tradition (at times a pseudoscientific tradition) which has developed very vigorously in the last 15 to 20 years, of an empirical character with great emphasis on methodological refinement and little concern for theorizing, much less for philosophy and conceptualization, which limits itself to writing *papers* in which research results are reported while cautioning that they are valid only for the place and the time at which the data were collected, and which considers any theoretical concern to be useless and dispensable.

Macrosociological vs. Microsociological Analysis

There is a confrontation between a sociology on the macro level which focuses on analysis of society as a whole, the State, processes of change, social stratification structures, revolution, or dependency, and a sociology on the micro level devoted to the study of groups, companies, cooperatives, and individual behavior. Macrosociology has always been more closely linked to the humanistic and philosophical tradition, while microsociology has been more identified with the North American empirical tradition.

Verification of Universal Theories vs. Understanding of Uniqueness

There are two fundamental ways to approach the object to be studied. One focuses chiefly on theories, the other on reality. This confrontation gives rise to a sociology that reflects the hegemonic or dominant sociologies (or to the one preferred by the researcher), while the other addresses the society, i.e., the unique properties of Latin American reality. The first always runs the risk of distorting reality by neglecting its specificities or trying to reconstruct reality exclusively from the theoretical perspective. It may be Eurocentric or simply distinct, but in all cases it distorts reality. The other sociology, which is attentive above all to the uniqueness of a given society, has always run the risk of being limited to a simple description of reality, usually with amazement and often with *naïveté*.

Holistic Theories vs. Regional Theories

From a theoretical standpoint, there is also a confrontation between the use of global holistic theories which seek to explain all of a given society—and sometimes all of Latin America as if it were a single unit—and others of an intermediate or local scope which attempt to explain specific aspects of a given

society, such as peasants and their forms of production and social interaction, problems in the management of cooperatives, or gender problems, and which does not make reference to any aspects of the society beyond the ones being studied. The holistic theories have been extremely successful in Latin American sociology and have contributed strongly to the improvement of our understanding of ourselves and the identification of what is common among our societies — from the structural-functionalist perspective in its Latin American version or from the Marxist perspective (orthodox or structuralist), whether applying the dependency approach and theory or being more heterodox in nature. However, the difficulties in operationalizing the holistic theories and the need for more specific professional practice have led to an abundant use of intermediate and local-scope theories —most of them taken from economics, psychology, or anthropology — to perform sociological work.

Theoretical Research vs. Applied Research

There is still another divide, between pure and applied research. Theoretical research seeks to be attentive to its time and has been closely linked to hermeneutics and the entire development of Latin American sociology. But there is also an applied sociology which focuses on the particular features of the society and seeks to be useful and applicable to companies, cooperatives, the government, political parties and their ambition for power, tourist offices, or the preservation of historic patrimony.

Deductive Sociology vs. Inductive Sociology

From another perspective, there is a tension between deductive and inductive sociology. The first seeks to approach reality from a theoretical starting point and interpret it on the basis of theoretical assumptions and conjectures about it. The second is an outgrowth of reconstructive sociology or *grounded theories*. Latin American sociology has traditionally been deductive on the whole, reflecting the influence of the modernization, Marxist, and dependency schools, in addition to the sociology of sociology. However, the search for Latin America's uniqueness and specificity has posited the need to work from an inductive perspective, though unfortunately this has achieved little development or respectability in academic circles.

Observational vs. Experimental Methods

Still another tension exists between the observational and experimental methodologies. Paradoxically, in Latin America unlike other parts of the world, sociology's tendency to focus on the time has oriented it more toward observational methods than experimental ones. The latter have been applied

more by those who want to focus on the people, and who have been identified with the research-action methodology, or simply with the political implications of sociological practice. On the other hand, observational methods — unsystematic or systematic — have predominated in Latin America. Sociology has developed a great deal of unsystematic methods of observation as its dominant form of work, reflecting an essay approach which has characterized most of sociological writing in the region.

Qualitative vs. Quantitative Methods

Finally, there is a confrontation between the use of qualitative and quantitative methods. It can be asserted in very general terms that those who rely most on qualitative methods are closest to the philosophical and humanistic tradition of Latin American sociology, while those who take a quantitative position tend to identify with the scientific (sometimes pseudoscientific) tradition. Qualitative methods have gained ground and become more widely accepted in the last 20 years, perhaps due to a perception that their use yields a scientific way to focus on the people while at the same time opposing the quantitative methods, which are visualized as more dominated by universalistic theories and conceptions of science. In any case, there is an important trend under way in Latin America as well as other regions of the world to combine the two approaches, and the results achieved thus far are promising, though they do not provide a final confirmation of that trend.

Conclusions and a Final Note

Following our review of these contradictions —and noting once again that some of them are not contradictions in the strict sense while others are simple dilemmas— there arises a temptation to divide Latin American sociology into two clearly distinguishable categories. On one side is the sociology stemming from a nomothetic philosophical and humanistic tradition, inclined toward a macro approach oriented to grand holistic theories, of a deductive nature and seeking to conduct pure research with qualitative and observational methods, and having no concern for whether its results are useful or not. On the other is a scientific sociology of an ideographic nature, inclined toward a micro focus and oriented to collecting data, inductive in nature, relying on intermediate and local-scope theories and quantitative and experimental methods, keenly interested in the applicability and utility of the results.

This classification will certainly not be repeated in other parts of the world. If one had to construct a typology of what is being done in Europe or Southwest Asia using the same categories, one would reach the conclusion that their experiences differ from those of Latin America in certain respects.

However, this classification is nothing but a Weberian *ideal-type* exercise in Latin America. These two categories do not exist in pure form and clear separate; in fact they intermingle and overlap.

In that case, how does each of these types of sociology respond to the tension mentioned at the outset, between a sociology focusing on the people and a sociology focusing on the time? We would suggest that, on the whole, the scientific tradition tends to be more concerned with the people and generates advances in the understanding and transformation of reality — provided we are speaking of the new science, not the mechanistic one, and not based on iron laws or assuming linearity and equilibrium; rather, a science that attempts to explain complexity and not reduce it to minimalisms, etc. In this scientific tradition knowledge is confronted with reality; conjectures must be tested against society. Moreover, this scientific tradition tends to describe and define findings more fully, and to be more precise. Though it can also be described as more limited and less exciting than the grand theories, it allows for a better focus on specific realities and for the generation of knowledge that can be accumulated, while the principle whereby empirical research without theoretical references explains nothing but fragments of reality and grand theory without empirical references is nothing but speculation retains all its validity. Finally, the knowledge produced by the scientific tradition is refutable, while many of the assertions of Latin American sociology inspired by grand theory are not.

The scientific tradition makes it possible to focus on the people without pretensions and without rhetorical flourishes.

Two postures are present in current Latin American sociology: one is to say that *everything is questioned*; the other, that *we need to think again about who we are*. We agree with this orientation, but how can we build a knowledge of reality and society if we do not try to go beyond simple questioning and attempt to generate assertions and postulates regarding the true nature of reality? Sociology must make assertions about society. They will always be fragile, transitory, subject to refutation and questioning, but they must be assertions made with science, with the methods and procedures of the scientific tradition. It is also true that we must think again about who we are, but how can we do so with a simple reconstructivist critique? This has a function; it is a way to show what is important. But it is done by scientific testing against reality; the strongest critique is provided by an approach to reality, naturally reflecting the epistemological vigilance and sincerity with which one should put forward one's fragile and transitory conjectures to be tested against the real world.

Finally, we must insist on the scientific path of empirical sociology as the way to confront the Eurocentric theories and discover our uniqueness as societies.

However, we consider it important for Latin America not to abandon the philosophical and humanistic tradition, the essay approach and the taste for

theory, which have characterized sociological practice for so long. To abandon this tradition would imply the loss of an important symbolic capital and a significant uniqueness of our sociology.

At the professional level it is clear that in response to the tensions discussed above, it is necessary — as José Martí said — to meet both demands. We must focus on the people, on the uniqueness of our societies, and not lose the empathy and ability to feel others' pain that has characterized Latin American sociology and given it a large part of its strength and vitality. But neither should we abandon the idea of social change and the contribution sociology must make to the transformation of the unjust and underdeveloped societies in which we live.

In addition, we must focus on the time, with all the scientific tools at our disposal, with all the possibilities they offer us, in an eclectic and mixed way resembling Latin America itself. We should seek to combine everything that is useful in order to know, understand, interpret, and thereby strengthen Latin America's uniqueness.

Latin American sociology must continue to address the great challenge with which José Martí concludes. At the end of the sentence cited at the beginning of this work, he said: "*But if it becomes necessary one day to choose between being a man of one's people or a man of one's time, one must be a man of one's people.*"

Bibliography

- Aricó, J. (1986), "Debemos reinventar América Latina, pero ¿desde qué conceptos pensar en América?", *David y Goliath* (Revista de CLACSO), XVI, 49, Buenos Aires.
- Bambirra, V. (1974), *El capitalismo dependiente en América Latina*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Bambirra, V. (1978), *Teoría de la dependencia. Una anticrítica*, México, DF: Ed. Era.
- Betancourth, R. (1969), *Venezuela: política y petróleo*, Bogotá: Senderos Ediciones.
- Briceño-Iragorry, M. (1954), *Obras Selectas*, Madrid-Caracas: Ediciones Edime.
- Briceño-León, R. (1990) *La Casa Enferma*, Caracas: Fondo Editorial Acta Científica Venezolana.
- Briceño-León, R. (1991) *Los Efectos Perversos del Petróleo*. Caracas: Fondo Editorial Acta Científica Venezolana.
- Briceño-León, R. (1994) *Venezuela: Clases Sociales e Individuos*. Caracas: Fondo Editorial Acta Científica Venezolana.
- Camacho, A. (comp.)(1968), *La Colombia de hoy*, Bogotá: Fondo Editorial CEREC.

Cardoso, F.H. & Faletto, E. (1969), *Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.

Cardoso, F.H. (1968), *Cuestiones de sociología del desarrollo en América Latina*, Santiago de Chile: Ed. Universitaria.

Cardoso, F.H. (1973), "Las contradicciones del desarrollo asociado", *Cuadernos de la Sociedad Venezolana de Planificación*, nº 113-115, Caracas.

Cardoso, F.H. (1977), "La originalidad de la copia: la CEPAL y la idea del desarrollo", *Revista de la CEPAL*, segundo semestre, Santiago de Chile.

Carmagnani, M. (1948), *Estado y Sociedad en América latina: 1958-1930*. Barcelona, España: Grijalbo Grupo Editores.

Carrera Damas, G. (1969), *Temas de historia social y de las ideas*, Caracas: Ediciones de la Biblioteca de la UCV.

CENDES (Equipo Sociohistórico) (1981), *Formación histórico-social de la Venezuela*, Caracas: Ediciones de la Biblioteca de la UCV.

CENDES (Equipo Sociohistórico) (1982), *Formación histórico-social de América Latina*, Caracas: Ediciones de la Biblioteca de la UCV.

CEPAL (1951), *Estudio Económico para América Latina*, Santiago de Chile: ONU-CEPAL.

CEPAL (1963), *El desarrollo económico de América Latina en la Postguerra*. ONU, Nueva York: CEPAL.

CEPAL (1969), *El pensamiento de la CEPAL*, Santiago de Chile: Ed. Universitaria.

Córdova, A. & Silva Michelena, H. (1967/1982), *Aspectos teóricos del subdesarrollo*, Guadalajara.

Dos Santos, T. (1970), "La crisis de la teoría del desarrollo y las relaciones de dependencia en América Latina", *Cuadernos de Estudios Socio-Económicos*, nº 11, Santiago de Chile.

Dos Santos, T. (1972), *Socialismo o fascismo: el nuevo carácter de la dependencia y el dilema latinoamericano*, Buenos Aires: Ed. Periferia.

Faletto, E. & Kirkwood, J. (1977), *Sociedad burguesa y liberalismo romántico*, Caracas: El Cid Editor.

Fals Borda, O. (1967), *La subversión en Colombia*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional y Tercer Mundo Editores.

- Fals Borda, O. (1985), *Conocimiento y poder popular: lecciones con campesino*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Frank, A.G. (1970), *Capitalismo y subdesarrollo en América Latina*, Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Frank, A.G. (1979), *Acumulación dependiente y subdesarrollo*, México, DF: Ediciones Era.
- Freyre G. (1970), *Casa Grande & Senzala*, Brasil: Record.
- Furtado, C. (1970), *La economía en Latinoamérica desde la conquista hasta la revolución cubana*, Santiago de Chile: Editorial Universitaria.
- Furtado, C. (1978), *Prefacio a una nueva economía política*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Furtado, C. (1979), *Creatividad y dependencia*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Germani, G. (1963), *Política y sociedad en una época de transición*, Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Germani, G. (1964), *La sociología en la América Latina*, Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
- González Casanova, P. (1969), *Sociología de la explotación*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- González Casanova, P. (Ed.) (1977), *Historia de América Latina*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- González Casanova, P. (Ed.) (1979), *América Latina - Historia de medio siglo*, 2 tomos, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Guzmán, A.L. (1840/1961), *La doctrina liberal*, Caracas: Ediciones de la Presidencia de la República.
- Lechner, N. (1968), *La conflictividad y nunca acabada construcción del orden deseado*, Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, Siglo XXI Editores.
- Lowy, M. (1980), *Le marxisme en Amérique Latine*, antologie, Paris: François Maspero.
- Mariátegui, J.C. (1928/1973), *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana*, Lima: Biblioteca Amauta.
- Marini, R.M. (1970), *Subdesarrollo y revolución*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Marini, R.M. (1973), *Dialéctica de la dependencia*, México, DF: Serie Popular Era.

- Medina Echavarría, J. (1941), *Sociología: teoría y técnica*, México, DF: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Medina Echavarría, J. (1964), *Consideraciones sociológicas sobre el desarrollo económico en América*, Buenos Aires: Ed. Solar.
- Medina Echavarría, J. (1967), *Filosofía, educación y desarrollo*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Mijares A. (1980), *Lo afirmativo de lo venezolano*, Caracas: Dimensiones.
- Nieto Arteta, L.E. (1970), *Economía y cultura en historia de Colombia*, Medellín/Bogotá: Ed. Oveja Negra.
- Paz, P. (1981), "El enfoque de la dependencia en el desarrollo del pensamiento económico latinoamericano", *Economía de América Latina*, N° 6, México.
- Picon-Salas M. , (1987), *Suma de Venezuela*, Caracas: Monte Avila Editores C.A.
- Prado Jr., C. (1958), *Historia económica do Brasil*, Sao Paulo: Ed. Brasiliense.
- Prebisch, R. (1963), *Hacia una dinámica del desarrollo latinoamericano*, México, DF: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Prebisch, R. (1981), *Capitalismo periférico: crisis y transformación*, México, DF: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Quijano, A. (1977), *Dependencia, urbanización y cambio social en Latinoamérica*, Lima: Mosca Azul Ediciones.
- Quijano, A. (1978), *Imperialismo, clases sociales y Estado en el Perú: 1890-1930*, Lima: Mosca Azul Ediciones.
- Ribeiro, D. (1968/1970), *El proceso civilizatorio*, Caracas: Ediciones de la Biblioteca de la UCV.
- Ribeiro, D. (1969), *Las Américas y la civilización*, 3 tomos, Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina.
- Ribeiro, D. (1971), *El dilema de América Latina. Estructura de poder y fuerzas insurgentes*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Rodríguez, O. (1980), *La teoría del subdesarrollo de la CEPAL*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Rodríguez, S. (1828/1975), *Sociedad americana en 1828: cómo serán y cómo podrían ser los siglos venideros*, Caracas: Centauro Editores.

- Samper, J.M. (s/f), *Ensayo sobre las revoluciones políticas y la condición social de las repúblicas colombianas*, Bogotá: Biblioteca Popular de Cultura Colombiana.
- Segall, M. (1953), *Desarrollo del capitalismo en Chile*, Santiago de Chile: Editorial Universitaria.
- Serra, J.; Cardoso, F.H. & Marini, R.M. (1978), "Polémica sobre la dependencia", *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, XL, México.
- Silva Michelena, J.A. (1970), *Crisis de la democracia*, Caracas: UCV-CENDES.
- Silva Michelena, J.A. (1976), *Política y bloque de poder: crisis en el sistema mundial*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Sonntag, H.R. (1988), *Duda/Certeza/Crisis: la evolución de las ciencias sociales de América Latina*, Caracas: UNESCO-Nueva Sociedad.
- Sunkel, O. & Paz, P. (1970), *El subdesarrollo latinoamericano y la teoría del desarrollo*, México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Tirado Mejía, A. (1971), *Introducción a la historia económica de Colombia*, Bogotá, Universidad Nacional.
- Torres-Rivas, E. (1971), *Interpretación del desarrollo social: procesos y estructuras de una sociedad dependiente*, San José de Costa Rica: EDUCA.
- Touraine, A. (1987), *Actores y sistemas políticos en América Latina*, Santiago de Chile: PREALC.
- Varsavsky, O. (1969/1982), *Obras escogidas*, Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina.

CHAPTER 1

THE COLONIAL NATURE OF POWER AND LATIN AMERICA'S CULTURAL EXPERIENCE

Aníbal Quijano
San Marcos University, Lima, Peru

In Latin America and the Caribbean, there has always been a conflict between tendencies oriented toward a cultural reoriginalization and others seeking to repress them or reabsorb their products under the aegis of the holders of powers in the society. That conflict is present throughout our most profound historical experience, because it not only lies at the root of our identity problems but also characterizes our entire history from the very creation of the New World, as a permanent tension of subjectivity wherein the nature of imagination and the ways to know and produce knowledge are always open questions. And at certain times that tension can become extremely strong. In the 20th Century, it was especially strong between the end of World War II and the 1960s. Today, on the eve of a new millennium, we are experiencing another reassertion of this protracted conflict in the encounter between the reoriginalization tendency and that of continuation of cultural dependency.

"Globalization" and Regionalization of Experience and Culture

Since the formation of colonial society, each of these turning points in our cultural history was produced by a process of reoriginalization of experience, which was turbulent and massive but did not find or could not create a secure perspective and path along which to continue defining and structuring itself as a new norm for social life, and ended up being recaptured by the established structure of power. For example, the "cholo" (mixed-race population) as a specific element in Peru's cultural process emerged in association with the society's urbanization in a very rapid, turbulent way accompanied by a massive reoriginalization of the population's social experience, and in particular, an equally massive and turbulent emergence of the cultural experience of the dominated population, together with its demands and pressures on all the other spheres of society.

A similar situation is under way at present. Since the worldwide crisis that broke out in the mid-1970s, a process has come into being that affects each and every aspect of the social life of peoples in all countries. The world that came into being 500 years ago is coming to an end with the formation of an increasingly integrated productive, financial, and commercial structure. That

trend is characterized by a drastic reconcentration of control over political power and productive resources among the holders of capital (especially speculative capital), a universalization of capitalist civilization, and the creation of a central power bloc which acts as the authority for the entire world order. All this is called "globalization", a term whose ability to describe these trends is undeniable but which also serves to conceal the social nature of the process from the dominated populations since the drastic reconcentration of power in the hands of the capital holders takes the form of a capitalist counterrevolution conducted on a global scale. As a result, it is not difficult to recognize that a profound and massive alteration in all societies' and all peoples' ways of life has occurred. This is a real mutation, not merely a change within the context of a greater continuity.

These modifications do not organically, systematically, and coherently affect all countries or groups of countries, all social phenomena, all aspects, and all institutions of contemporary social life. On the contrary, all this is happening in an irregular, discontinuous, heterogeneous, contradictory, and conflict-ridden way. The brutal reconcentration of political power, military force, and productive resources is a concomitant of the fragmentation, disintegration, and destructuring—especially in the sphere of work—of the great social groupings, classifications, identifications, and social conflicts. The formation of the imperial bloc of the Big Seven (now seven and a half with Russia's partial and subordinated incorporation) is a concomitant of the denationalization of weakly nationalized states, the de-democratization of societies where the colonial form of power was not or did not come to be completely eliminated. But all this is also a concomitant of the globalization of the struggles by the exploited and dominated of the world, the birth of a new period of social conflict characterized precisely by its globalization. And this entire mass of contradictions further intensifies the current time of profound and radical reoriginalization of experience. As always under such circumstances, impulses and tendencies toward the creation of new perspectives and new cultural paths are engendered. That is why the universalization of a capitalist civilization is accompanied by the explosion of diversity and the heterogeneity of cultural experiences in the world, all traveling along the same highways of global communication. Some of these lead—or can lead—to cultural reoriginalization processes. The open crisis of Eurocentrism as an approach to knowledge is illustrative. In Latin America, given its fundamental role in the history of capitalism, the creation of the world we know, and of modernity, these are core issues which urgently call for inquiry, debate, and decision.

The Colonial Nature of Power, Historical-Structural Dependence, and Eurocentrism

It may be less difficult to clearly visualize these issues if we briefly return to the historical experience of the formation of colonial power in the Western Hemisphere, which is unquestionably one of the key examples of those times of sharp and drastic mutation of historical experience in the world. As is well known, the destruction of the indigenous societies and cultures meant condemning the dominated populations to be integrated into a power structure basically characterized by the following features:

1) The pattern of domination between the colonizers and the others was organized and established on the basis of the concept of "race", with all its implications for the historical evolution of the relations among the different types of human beings. (1) In other words, the social classification and identification criteria were not conceived as instruments of immediate conflict or requirements for the control and exploitation of labor, but as historically necessary and permanent relations, whatever might be the needs and conflicts arising from the exploitation of labor.

2) From this perspective, the colonizers defined the new identity of the colonized indigenous populations: they were "Indians". For the populations in question, colonial domination therefore meant being stripped of their original identities (Maya, Aztec, Inca, Aymara, etc., etc.), losing these identities and in the long run coming to have a common —and pejorative— identity. The population of African origin, also coming from a wide variety of historical experiences and identities (Congolese, Bacongo, Yoruba, Ashanti, etc., etc.) was subjected to the same process and made to accept a common —and equally pejorative— colonial identity: "black". The colonizers, for their part, originally identified themselves as "Spanish", "Portuguese", "Iberian", "British", etc., etc., but by the end of the 18th Century, and above all after the so-called wars of "emancipation", they came to identify themselves as "European", or more generically, as "white". And the descendants of the genetic crosses among all these new identities were known as "mixed-bloods".

3) This distribution of social identities was later to become the basis for the entire social classification of the populations in the Western Hemisphere. With it and on it would be articulated —in ever-changing ways reflecting the needs of power in each succeeding period— the different forms of exploitation and control of labor, as well as gender relations.

4) In this way a structure of power with the following specific foundations was imposed: a) the existence and permanent reproduction of these new historical identities; b) a hierarchical and unequal relationship among these "European" and "non-European" identities and the latter's domination by the former in every sphere of power (economic, social, cultural, interpersonal, and political); c) as a result of the foregoing, the institutions and mechanisms of

social domination (beginning with the interpersonal and political ones) had to be designed and used above all for the preservation of this new historic basis of social classification, the birthmark of the Hemispheric historical experience, subsequently reproduced and imposed throughout the world in the course of Eurocentric colonial capitalism's expansion.

5) The colonized populations were reduced to the status of illiterate peasants. The most developed original societies had a sophisticated urban culture, and some of them had writing. The alphabet was indeed an exclusive possession and tool of the dominant strata and urban groups, but that urban culture and its writing were original products of the societies in question, i.e., they were autonomous forms and vehicles for the expression of the subjectivity of an old and rich history, and an exceptionally active and creative imagery. That was unquestionably a dominant cultural pattern, one of the expressions of the domination that prevailed in those societies. But as in all cases of domination based on an autonomous culture of one's own, it was also an expression of the historical experience of the population as a whole. When those who had had them were stripped of their urban culture and their alphabet, the subject populations were encased in subcultures which were not only peasant and illiterate, but even worse, repressed and continually penetrated by alien and enemy patterns and elements. Moreover, in colonial society, only some of the colonizers could read and write, exclusively in the language of the dominators and for their own purposes.

6) They would be prevented from creating their own images, symbols, and subjective experiences in an autonomous way, i.e., with their own patterns of visual and plastic expression. And without that freedom of formal objectivization, no cultural experience can develop.

7) They could not meet their needs and exercise their powers of visual and plastic objectivization, save only and exclusively with and through their dominators' patterns of visual and plastic expression.

8) They were compelled by repression to abandon their own sacred practices or to observe them in secret, with all the distortions that implies.

9) They were led to admit—or pretend to admit when in contact with their dominators—the dishonorable status of their own imagery and their own previous universe of subjectivity.

10) Only in what could be preserved of their own world (although its institutional forms were modified to reflect the dominators' patterns), especially in their "communities" and within their families and kinship and ritual relations, could their own values, reciprocity, social equality, and control of public authority be practiced, even though they had to be continually readapted to the changing demands of the overall colonial way of life.

11) From the structure of power built on these bases, features, and tendencies of historical change or evolution, and from their long-range implications, we can appreciate the concept of "the colonial nature of

power".(2) Given this configuration of power, conflict was inherent and was explained as a necessary and permanent feature of life. That is why, though the indigenous populations' initial armed resistance was defeated in a few decades during the 16th Century, rebellions of "Indians", "blacks", and "mixed-bloods" —with their new identities and in a new interpersonal and cultural universe— were frequent occurrences throughout the 18th Century, and political and cultural resistance became massive and generalized. The wars of emancipation arose from those rebellions, though for historically determined reasons they ended up under the control and for the benefit of the dominators.(3)

12) Given the colonial nature of power and the conflict it inevitably implied, the core historical antagonism was the one between the "Europeans" or "whites" and the "Indians", "blacks", and "mixed-bloods". The dominant social groups were therefore always more inclined to identify their interests with the dominators of the Eurocentric world in spite of their reciprocal differences and sectoral conflicts; they submitted themselves and subjected their societies to that world's structures of power, to the demands of its historical "logic" of development, its overall historical movement. The colonial nature of power necessarily implied -and still implies since that time- a historical-structural dependence.(4)

13) For these reasons, the dominators tended to perceive the relations among the "centers" of the capitalist imperial world and the colonial societies exclusively in terms of their own social interests, i.e., as if those relations were taking place among historically homogeneous units, in spite of the radical historical-structural heterogeneity existing between the societies of both parts of the capitalist world and within each of them. Both the colonial nature of power and historical-structural dependency imply the hegemony of Eurocentrism as a perspective of knowledge.(5)

14) In the context of the colonial nature of power, the dominated populations of all the new identities were also subjected to the hegemony of Eurocentrism as a form of knowing, especially to the extent that some of them could learn the dominators' alphabet. Thus, through the long period of colonial society —not yet over— these populations ("Indian", "black") were caught between the indigenous epistemological pattern and the Eurocentric one, which also moved in the direction of instrumental or technocratic rationality, particularly with respect to the social relations of power and relations with the surrounding world.

Caught Between Imitation and Cultural Subversion

In this way, the colonized populations were subjected to the most perverse experience of historical alienation. But the same history that is cruel to the defeated is often vengeful toward the victors as well. The consequences of

that cultural colonization were not only terrible for the "Indians" and "blacks". Those groups were forced into a culture of imitation, a simulation of alien cultural patterns, and feelings of shame about their own. But no one could prevent them from soon learning to subvert everything they had to imitate, simulate, or venerate. The artistic expressions of cultural societies clearly evidence this continuous subversion of the visual and plastic patterns, the themes, motifs, and images of alien origin, to express their own subjective experience—if not their prior, original, and autonomous experience, then their new one, dominated and colonized to be sure but continually subverted and thereby transformed into a space and form of resistance. To see that process in action, it is sufficient to look at the paintings of the Cuzco and Quito schools, Aleijadinho's sculptures, the magnificent door of the Potosí church, the baroque altars, the ceramics and weavings of the Mexican-Central American and Andean-Amazonian areas, or the clothing, decorations, festivals, and dances of the Caribbean islanders and Brazilians or those of the residents of the Peruvian-Bolivian Altiplano. And now everyone—including the most recalcitrant sectors of the Christian churches—knows that their theologies, their rites, and their religious practices were likewise subverted everywhere. In a word, the dominated learned first to give new meaning and sense to alien symbols and images, and then to transform and subvert them by including their own elements in all the images, rites, or expressive patterns of alien origin. In the end it was not possible to practice the imposed patterns without subverting them, appropriating them, reorganizing them. That is what the dominated populations did.

On the other hand, the heirs and continuers of the colonizers had only two paths at their disposal. One was a servile and imitative repetition of European models. And since that had to be done in the absence of all the material and subjective resources of the European sociocultural experience, the inevitable result was and continues to be the mediocrity—even banality—of everything they tried to do by themselves within that perspective. The other—to express their own experiences (however much they lamented not being European), develop their own talent and resources and creative powers—would have required learning and imitating the work of the dominated, or better still, identifying with them, because only in them could they have found the sources and perspectives of something different, original, and of their own, in contradistinction to the Eurocentric patterns.

In fact this second path could not be taken by any but the members of the middle strata lying between the "European" and the "Indian" or "black", which had come into being in social and cultural terms as the space won by the struggles against the colonial nature of power was gradually expanded. In most of Latin America, that could not happen in clear-cut form until the beginning of this century—undoubtedly and by no means coincidentally together with the century's first great social revolution, the Mexican revolution.

It is probably no coincidence, either, that in the plastic arts as in music and literature, the great Latin American cultural renewal that has taken place in this perspective since the 1920s was simultaneous with the European artistic vanguard's discovery of African plastic and visual arts and the emergence of "black" music in the Caribbean and the United States, in the context of the first great social and political conflicts of worldwide scope.(6)

Cultural Subversion-Reoriginalization and Revolution-Social Counterrevolution

Subversion, whether of a global structure of power or only of its expressive patterns, images, and symbols, or the patterns of knowledge and the production of knowledge, never produces other alternative patterns alone, unless it is successful or continuous and lasts a long time. It is only a step in that direction. It is true that in the absence of subversion there is no way to produce any alternative, much less one that is victorious and consolidates itself as a new hegemony. But by the same token, if subversion takes place alone and does not triumph, its products, statements, and virtualities are most likely to be co-opted and assimilated by the dominant pattern, to the extent they are useful and compatible with the required changes and adjustments in it, and naturally, at the expense of their adaptation to that pattern's ends and demands; in a word, they are likely to be undermined, distorted, and even denatured or degraded.

If the global power structure is immediately challenged by subversion, the latter cannot last, it cannot continue over time. The level and intensity of the resulting conflict always leads to its prompt and drastic resolution. If the subversion is radical and massive, and leads to a revolution, i.e., a democratic redistribution of authority and not another reconcentration of power, all the relations among the different cultural currents, institutions, and elements can develop in the same direction and with the same depth. But if the subversion is defeated, the most likely follow-on is a counterrevolution and not merely the preservation of the order prevailing up to that time. In that case, if any of the elements produced by the dominated population and the subversion appear useful for the readjustment of power, they will be totally expropriated from their producers and returned to them as original products made by their dominators. That is, they will have mutated into tools of domination.

That is precisely what appears to have happened to the elements that were coalescing into the "cholo" current in Peruvian culture, after the defeat of the subversion implied by the popular movement that developed between World War II and the end of the 1970s. At the outset "cholo" emerged as a complex which not only articulated the features celebrated by the dominant culture —tremendous energy, persistence, sobriety, discipline, organized capacity for work, and certainly, quick learning of the techniques and rules of the capital

market, with all that might imply regarding the behavior and subjectivity of the bearers of this new cultural orientation— but also reciprocity, solidarity, and the complex density of subjectivity produced by the conflict-laden encounter between the indigenous approach to knowledge and the growing power of capital's technological reason. In a word, the sense of social equality elaborated in a long communal history, undoubtedly, but also the prolonged subjection to a new, "Indian" identity imposed on a heterogeneous and unequal group of pre-existing but later all-but dissolved identities. All this was a product of a long history of relations between colonialism and resistance, between the State and the community, of resistance and subversion against domination by capitalism—both colonial and republican.

In this sense, the "cholo" movement could be viewed as the first major product of the development of that cultural imitation-subversion-reoriginalization dialectic among a part of the dominated population, under the new conditions created by the urbanization of Peruvian society. All these components were already producing a new social, cultural, and political identity among a large part of the Peruvian population, which pointed to democratization, i.e., the decolonialization and nationalization of Peruvian society and of its institutions of authority, beginning with the State. That was the peculiar association of heterogeneous elements in a specific articulation which gave the "cholo" movement its potential for autonomy and cultural originality, and placed it in conflict with the "creole oligarchy" of the coast and the "Andean local boss" elite of the mountain region, which represented the two basic forms (now all but destroyed) of the pattern of cultural domination that prevailed in Peru until the urbanization process reached its end.(7)

Thus, "cholo" implied a first attempt at cultural reoriginalization in Peru, and perhaps in all the so-called "Andean" world, because this was the first time that a restructuring of cultural elements took place - not simply an "acculturation" or "transculturation", or a "mixing" or "hybridization", i.e., something still dependent on another pattern of structuring, but a process built with new elements and changes in previously acquired ones, of whatever origin, and new patterns of articulation, development, and change. It was above all an attempt to decolonize the imagery, practice, values, and institutions of the cultural relations among the country's population. In that sense, it was a genuine attempt to reconstruct an identity for the great majority of the Peruvian population.

Given these conditions, to develop the process implied a restructuring of Peruvian society as a whole, a change in its core patterns of articulation. In the first place, a change in the relations between the "European" and the "Indian", "black", and "mixed-blood" elements, in which differences and heterogeneity would cease to be a mode of or argument for inequality, thereby leading to the decolonialization of the material and interpersonal relations of power. That is, to the democratization of society, of social relations among all the inhabitants

of the country and to the democratic generation and management of its structures of authority —and in this specific sense, to the transformation of all the members of that society into citizens.

This democratic redistribution of control over the country's resources and political authority would have meant, at that time, more than just the nationalization of society and the State. Because the democratic redistribution of power was not really possible except in the context of an overall social and cultural revolution, which at that time would have implied a decisive presence of the virtualities of the "cholo", the same process would also have included tendencies toward the consolidation and expansion of reciprocity relations, with their accompanying values of social equality and solidarity, and authority structures of a communal nature or tendency. But the process could not take place in that way. Other social tendencies and interests in Peruvian society proved stronger, and the process as a whole was rechanneled toward a successor movement, "Velasquism".

"Velasquism" was a political regime with very particular characteristics. It was on the one hand an expression of and vehicle for the interests and aspirations of the emerging middle-status groups, anxious to play a political role of intermediation between the bourgeoisie and the dominated sectors of the population and win a place for themselves in the State and the administration of capital. And to that end, they pressed for the "modernization" of power.(8) On the other, it was an association between the two groups most representative of the interests conceived by the middle strata of the time, both imbued with "modernization theory": first, in command and control of the regime, the military technocracy, with its own needs for authoritarianism and efficiency, and second, an "intelligentsia" which embraced (not without conflict) professionals with a strong technocratic bent and politically trained intellectuals who envisioned a vague "humanist utopia". The latter were soon subordinated or —in many cases— won over to the technocratic needs of a regime led by the armed forces. And very soon the regime formed an alliance with the more "modern" sectors of the local and international bourgeoisie.(9) Given these characteristics, "Velasquism" in practice stimulated pragmatism, social mobility aspirations, and imitation in interpersonal relations, as well as authoritarianism and corporativism in political and social relations. In this way, the virtualities and possibilities of the "cholo" phenomenon; especially in regard to the democratic redistribution of power, legitimation of diversity, and autonomous and equal relations among all the historical currents present in our society, ended up being mutilated.

The decomposition of "Velasquism" in the midst of the world crisis of the 1970s and the internal conflicts among its participants opened the doors to resistance movements among workers, but they were contained and defeated by the early 1980s. That defeat has facilitated the current capitalist counterrevolution now under way around the world, whose ideology is labeled

"neoliberalism" and whose first fully representative political regime in Peru is that of Fujimori, which has taken the counterrevolution to its most extreme limits. This counterrevolution has generated a tremendous pressure to channel interpersonal relations in Peruvian society as a whole in a way that only accepts and encourages individual association for personal benefit, the search for profit at any cost, pragmatism and social mobility, on the one hand, along with the celebrated qualities that emerged with the "cholo" movement (energy, sobriety, work, and discipline) on the other. In this way the "creole oligarchy" has co-opted the population's "cleverness" but without its "grace". And it has also co-opted the "force" of the "Andean local bosses" but without their "delicacy".⁽¹⁰⁾ "Fujimorism" is an expression of and vehicle for this cultural pattern which is imposing itself on society and fits the needs of present-day capitalism like a glove. The results are easy to see. In the short run, the strongest trend in social subjectivism among Peruvians is the link between private search for advantage, pragmatism, and roughness among the "wild colts of barbarian Attilas" upon whose backs capital gallops over the backs of the great majority of Peruvians, with a saddlebag in which the absence of scruples is crowned with cynicism.

However, to recognize a pattern in a society's interpersonal and intersubjective relations as dominant at a given time does not imply ignoring the existence—or rather coexistence—in the same history and the same sociocultural space of other patterns, including elements not easy to assign to a given pattern, which are or may be not only subordinate to and integrated into the dominant pattern but also different from, in conflict with, and alternative to it, much as the "cholo" movement in Peru was at the time of its emergence.

Notes

(1) The concept of "race" probably originated during the so-called wars of the "reconquest" in the Iberian peninsula. In those wars, the Christians of the counter-reform fused phenotypical with religious differences in their perceptions. It is difficult to find another explanation for the demand for "certificates of cleanliness of blood" which the victors imposed on the Muslims and Jews. But as a location for and source of concrete social and cultural relations grounded in biological differences, the concept of "race" arose together with the New World as a part of and in the same historical movement with the world of colonial capitalism, with Europe as the center of this new world and modernity. On this issue, see my text "Race, Ethnicity, Nation, Open Questions", in *José Carlos Mariátegui y Europa, el otro descubrimiento* (Lima: Ed. Amauta, 1992.)

(2) On this category, see, for example, my texts: "Colonialism and Modernity/Rationality" (*Perú Indígena*, 29, Lima, 1992); with Immanuel Wallerstein: "Americanism as a Concept and the World Economy System" (*International Journal of Social Sciences*, Paris, 1992); "Modernity, Identity, and Utopia in Latin America" (Lima:

Ed. Sociedad y Política, 1988); "Colonialism, Citizenship, and Democracy in Latin America" (Amérique Latine: Démocratie et Exclusion, Paris: Eds. L'Harmatan, 1994.)

(3) A general discussion of this point is provided in: Anibal Quijano and Immanuel Wallerstein, *op. cit.*

(4) This is the basic idea underlying my positions on "historical-structural dependency" in Latin America. As is evident, this is only partially and tangentially related to those which have enjoyed greater influence and been more widely published in the debate on "dependency". I initially suggested it in 1964, following "Sociologie de l'Afrique Noire" by George Balandier, in "The Emergence of the 'Cholo' Group in Peru" (originally published in *Memorias de IV Congreso Latinoamericano de Sociología*, Bogotá). I returned to the same subject in the summer of 1966 in "The Urbanization Process in Latin America" (Santiago de Chile: CEPAL.) I presented it in general form in "Dependency, Social Change, and Urbanization in Latin America" (Santiago de Chile: CEPAL.) See also "The Dependencies" (Appendix to *La emergencia de otro social en America Latina*), written in 1994 and forthcoming.

(5) There is a worldwide debate on Eurocentrism under way, part of which focuses on the issues posed in Latin American social scientific research, first in the 1920s and again after the Second World War, especially regarding the historical-cultural heterogeneity of every complex of social relations which can be perceived as a totality or whole. In addition to my writings cited above, I have considered these issues in: "The Dogmatic Dream"; the Prologue to Mariátegui or the Experience of Otherness by Oswaldo Fernández (Lima: Amauta, 1994); the "Introduction" to *Textos básicos de José Carlos Mariátegui* (Mexico-Lima: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1990); "The New Latin American Structural Hegemony" (in Heinz R. Sonntag et al., *Duda, certeza, crisis*, Caracas: Cendes, 1988); and "The Price of Rationality" (*Gaceta Sanmarquina*, V, 22, p. 4, Lima: Universidad de San Marcos.) Outside of Latin America, Samir Amin has published "Eurocentrism" (Monthly Review Press, New York, 1989.)

(6) The revolutions in Mexico in 1910, China in 1911, Russia in 1917, and Turkey in 1919; the anticolonial struggles in India in the same period; the revolution-counterrevolution process in Europe between 1917 and 1936; and the two world wars of 1914-1918 and 1939-1945.

(7) On this issue, see my text "The 'Cholo' Movement in the Peruvian Cultural Conflict", written in the summer of 1964, originally reproduced in the Papers of the Fourth Latin American Congress of Sociology held at Bogotá, Colombia, and published separately much later by Mosca Azul Editores, 19, Lima.

(8) The "modernization" discourse at that time was almost opposite to what prevails today. It focused on the need to make every aspect of the power structure more flexible, so as to broaden opportunities for the middle strata, increase the social representation of the State and its agencies, and make a place for the more organized groups of workers. In some countries, changes of this kind were—and above all, seemed—radical, coming to include a pararevolutionary discourse, but in a long-range perspective they were really of a counterrevolutionary nature since they were intended to block

tendencies toward a true subversion and a profound and massive democratic redistribution of power, i.e., toward a revolution, which were undoubtedly present. "Velasquism" was among the clearest examples of these "modernization" policies with pararevolutionary discourse.

(9) The bibliography on "Velasquism" is quite large. My participation in the debate can be found chiefly in "Nationalism, Neoimperialism, and Capitalism in Peru" (Buenos Aires, 1971); "Imperialism and State Capitalism" (Sociedad y Política, 1, Lima, 1972); and "The 'Second Phase' of the Peruvian Revolution" (Sociedad y Política, 5, Lima, 1975.)

(10) "Grace" is a term denoting a personal manner in which a certain levity and extroversion of character are combined with a form of gesture and expression that is highly appreciated by the coastal "creole oligarchy", pertaining to the previous dominant cultural pattern and presumed to be a product of the coexistence between "Hispanics" and "blacks". The term "delicacy" denotes the association between courtesy, modesty, and discretion, an expected conduct among the "Andean local boss" group and the product of the conflict-ridden encounter between "Indians" and "local bosses".

CHAPTER 2

PAST AND FUTURE OF SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS IN LATIN AMERICA: THE CASE OF SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Orlando Albornoz
Central University of Venezuela

Introduction

Sciences do not build their conceptual framework isolated from the development of whatever their concern is. In the case of sociology of education, a branch of sociology as well as a very special area of interest to educators, changes in the elaboration of theoretical thoughts are very close to the changes in the social dynamic of the society in this part of the world as it would happen elsewhere. I am speaking, for instance, about concepts like globalization. Due to the very impressive consequences in social life of the technological advances that has taken pace in the last decade the world is a single unit integrated through instruments like the Internet, an instrument through which the old ideal of the global market is almost a reality, associating consumers and business in a large scale unknown and not thought before the electronic device of the electronic world. Globalization has had positive effects like those through which the region has become part of the international network but on the other hand the more this process takes place the more neglected is the analysis of countries and areas within them. In as much as the region become part of the global arena the characteristics and patterns of behavior on different cultures and societies became unified and local trends are lost in the so call total approach. Needless to say, however, the fact remains that sociological analysis is insufficient to single handed allow intelligent interpretation of social phenomenon such as education in view of the available methodologies, meaning that the more global is the unit of analysis more variables are involved and more difficult the scientific analysis. Of course, in absence of this type of analysis rhetorical thought become rampant and probably is more accepted through the region that the cautious conclusion of scientific analysis.

It must be said also that whenever we speak about sociology of education as a level of scientific analyze the argument should be carefully worded. More so when sociological analysis is confronted with the one made of the educational endeavor by other social scientist as well as by educators,

professional that are not generally accepted as members of the professional membership of the social sciences.

Macro or Micro Level of Analysis?

The level of analysis in social sciences depend upon the dynamics of society. I would say that in the last decade and perhaps for the time being, the level of analysis has changed from the national unit of analysis to the overall consideration of the whole region, a fact that came as a consequence of the approaches to see the region as a single unit of analysis, particularly after the dependence theory. It would also be interesting to point out the role of international organization like UNESCO, through which the region has been seen as a whole. This does not mean that the country analysis has been discarded or that the units of educational systems within each country are not important, like the micro level of the school and the classroom. But sociology is a science mainly concerned with global and theoretical approaches that even if they fail try to view these total social environments at the macro level more than at the micro level. Of course, units like the family, one of the main agents of educational activity, as well as the school and the classroom are and always will be of crucial importance to sociological analysis in the era of education but I would say that at present the approach tends more to the general than to the particular, to the macro more than to the micro level of analysis.

The tendency these days try to reconcile the two views, the macro and the micro. It must be said that in the last two decades the division between macro and micro level of analysis has grown apart. However, perhaps the field of education is an excellent one to generate both macro and micro level of analysis in sociological thought. On the one hand the unit of the nation and country analysis allows for the use of a macro level of interpretation and the approach of the micro world can emphasize the role of the different actors in the school setting. This means that both macro analysis inspired in the total theories of Weber and Marx as well as the micro interpretation coming mainly from role analysis can coexist in the field of sociology of education. Yogev has expressed this approach: "Though the problem involved in linking micro-and macro perspectives in the sociology of education are not new, the active search for mechanism of linkage between the two realms is quite recent. Obviously, it has been inspired by general developments in sociology, both theoretical and methodological. But the need for such a linkage has also emerged out of the current bifurcated sate of the sociology of education, which is both the objective state of affairs and a reflective state of mind among sociologists in the field".(1) However, instead of searching for a linkage my belief is that in Latin America sociology of education has accepted the bifurcated way suggested by Yogev and we are still seen education and school

through the two sides of the same instrument, one from the macro level of analysis the other from the micro level.

Pure or Apply Sociology of Education?

Education is an area where policy making is the order of the day. That is to say, education is vital to society, as it is health and any other service. More than anything else, however, education is a social process quite difficult to change though the rhetorical thought is found all over the region, concerning these changes. That is to say, in spite of the fact that educational reform is quite difficult to achieve and policy making in the area equally difficult to formulate political promises and expectations are quite high.(2) So much in fact that in any of the countries in the region the daily newspaper will carry on either information or pages in which educational problems are both denounced and solved, most of the time by people searching for the simple and improbable explanation that is always looking for the single variable to explain a very complex institutional area of society, education.

In fact, most sociologists in the region devoted to the area of education would agree with what Anthony Giddens has expressed in relation to social sciences, in general: "The business of the social sciences is to try and make sense of this world and also to translate this intellectual endeavor into practical policy making, in politics and in business".(3) There are also those who would say that the role of social sciences is to analyze but not to commit themselves to the need to offer solutions to the pressing problems of humanity, a role attributed more to the politicians and to the policy makers than to social scientist. It could be said that the views expressed by Giddens are part of a long tradition in British sociology, a kind of Fabian social reformism social and political theory. Implicit in the approach was a theory of the social democratic state, as the rational directing center of society, the main means whereby, through growing knowledge and social awareness, more informed social policies could be implemented. For this reason "pure" sociology was seen as a contradiction to the needs of society, a naive view of knowledge, of course. This "pure" and "neutral" view of sociology of education was first pointed out by no other than Durkheim, the French sociologist that deserves his reputation as the sociologist of education, *par excellence*. However, in the best idealist tradition of Kant and Descartes, Durkheim believed that through the new science of sociology there could be generated those practical insights and informed social policies which could improve social organizations and advanced social welfare in the direction of distributive justice and social harmony.

Can Sociology of Education Live in the Post Marxist Era?

In a short book of mine published in the most radical period of the Marxist era in the region I made the comment that in some public universities in the region the homogeneous ideological domination of Marxism had no analogy anywhere in the world, including even the Soviet Union universities. In that era the bibliographical references about education came from Marxist books and particularly text books and the every day life of academic enterprise was dominated by the changes in the ideological trends of those years, be in one occasion the Chinese Marxism or the Soviet brand.(4) These days Marxism is gone from academia, in the region. Fernando Henrique Cardozo, the brilliant Brazilian sociologist is now President of his country and working along the lines of the current prevalent ideology, that of the free market and capitalistic expansion. In Venezuela the former guerrilla leaders are in power and in fact some of them have adopted the most conservative points of view concerning development. When the dependency theory was fashionable the accepted view was that the region would not develop as long as the exogenic factors were prevalent meaning the dominance of the United States as a power that would either allow or be an impediment for development. The many versions of dependency theory "all put the burden of underdevelopment in (factors) more or less perpetrated upon a defenseless periphery by core countries, whose own economic survival demands specific types of political-economic domination of their vulnerable neighbors".(5)

Sociology of education was totally dominated all over in the region by Marxist thought, in those two decades between 1960 to the collapse of the Soviet Union. Curricula design in that subject was homogeneous in two directions, one being pro and the other against Marxism, the first found mainly in the public universities, the contrary either in private institutions or in those few in the public sector that are able to get away from the tendency through which ideological dilemmas were essential. Catholic universities, for instance, were very much against "communism" and so they represented the other view from Marxism. Of course, on the other hand, the parallel tendency was to turn to the USA for ideas and experiences in the field of sociology of education. So the curricula was fully designed to almost imitate the American sociological thought and the books and textbooks were those who could be used in any American campus. It was the time in which sociology of education was seen as the social aspect of education, the social elements of the educational process, the analysis of the different actors in that process, being teachers, students and principals those main actors. The relationship between the school and the community was an important area in that field as well as the analysis of the school as a social organization.

The Marxist view of sociology of education used to point out the advantages of the Soviet Union as compared to the American society and vice versa. In

fact during those two decades the Cold War was in full development and sociology of education could not escape that ideological struggle, being sociology a social science very much embedded in ideological and political views. This question drives me, by the way, to discuss the value of sociological though in education as science, but I shall proceed here as if we are in fact social scientists and in any case I will do as many, that is to say ignore the discussion altogether.(6) Let me proceed by saying that those two views, the Marxist and the pro USA, were universalistic in their conceptualization. In relation to the Soviet Union and according to those who favored that point of view "The communist ideal...is based on the principle of the brotherhood of all peoples, irrespective of their race, creed, language, nation or sex, and is aimed at the liberation of all oppressed groups from economic exploitation or nation and racial subjugation".(7) It was in those years that Eduardo Galeano, a prominent *homme de lettres* from Uruguay, published his book "*Las venas abiertas de America Latina*", which happens to be one of the books more read in the region, a brilliant however false dossier of American imperialism in the region. At the same time Carlos Rangel, a Venezuelan that used to conduct a popular talk show on television, published his book "*Del buen salvaje al buen revolucionario*", a *pro domo sua* defense of American imperialism and an attack on the inefficiency of Latin-American people to conduct their own development. That is to say both these two books are side of the same coin, one explains underdevelopment through exogenous factors the other one emphasizing internal variables.(8)

Sociology of education in those years came under these two contradictory ideological views. We can still analyze this question by discussing these two views on education, from the sociological point of view. It must be said at this point that being education and schooling processes multivariate realities they accept these two views, what is call "The liberal theory and the crisis in capitalism (bourgeois) society" which emphasizes the individual and the small group as well as the Marxist views that allow for global and international analysis as well as the neo-weberian approaches. I would mention two approaches to the sociological analysis of education that can be useful to understand where this field is at the moment. One of the interpretation almost ethnographic of Pierre Bourdieu. His theory of cultural reproduction is premised upon an assumption that societies are divided hierarchically into classes and that these class structures are maintained and legitimated by symbolic violence. Bourdieu suggests that dominate symbolic systems or as he calls them cultural capitals, are produced, distributed and consumed in a set of social relationship relatively autonomous from those who produce other forms of capital. A distinctive intellectual field exists, with its own logic and processes, its own institutional forms like the educational system, academic societies and journals; its own hierarchy, and ideology of independence and autonomy, but it is not independent of the class structure.(9)

Of course the monumental work of Basil Bernstein is a key element to understand contemporary sociology of education as well as other British sociologists like Margaret Archer. The idea of reproduction and cultural capital has taken roots in American sociology. For instance the thought of people like Carnoy, Apple, Giroux and actually those who have made the bulk of what is call the radical school of thought in education.(10) The more conventional way to look upon sociology of education in the United States of America can be seen in the may textbooks that are sold all over the country, which do indeed makes the emphasis in institutions like the family, the school and their actors and the community and less on the role of the state and on problems and conflicts, either ethnics or class struggles. Indeed the minority problems are mentioned and analyzed but equilibrium more than conflict is the subjacent way to look upon the issues in sociology of education. But coming back to the different views of the schooling process we have the view expressed by Bourdieu and others that society reproduces herself through the school systems meaning that is it an imperative of the social structure to duplicate their organizations and indeed it would be absolutely impossible to have a society that would create an official educational system destined to organize a different kind of society, since education is the main way for society to perpetuate and for that reason, education is by definition a very conservative approach to society. The reproduction idea, however, implies that the dynamic of society is a narrow possibility and that ideological forces struggle to do so using the symbolic elements with an open violence in order to guarantee that society runs along the expected ways of those who rule and govern. This view accepts that in many ways society is run by the state, by dominant social classes and by power. That is to say, an elite is trained to run society.

However, there is another opposite view, closer to idea of the market as such. According to this view the educational system is not a close proposition and actually works in such a way that many actors can play around the established ways and do profit to move upward the same way that some people travel downward, in both cases if they do not fulfill the meritocratic expectations of society. This thesis is exposed by the British sociologist Diego Gambetta, in a brilliant book that has received a less than enthusiastic support in the academic community.(11) The theory advanced by Gambetta implies that the structural view is not altogether right and instead of seen society as a kind of mechanical orientation very much governed by groups pressure, either social classes or other similar groups, there is room in society for the actions taken by individuals, that would profit form the dynamics of the social market: "The path leading from totally heterodetermined behavior to perfect rationality seems to be rather twisting, steep at some time and gentler at others. Structural constraints, by defining the feasible set, also define how far the individual can climb uphill before being blocked by an obstacle which only a collective effort can actually remove. However, it is a slope and not a precipice,

and in this sense the question is not so much at which extreme individuals tend to cluster —whether they jumped or were pushed- but rather where on the slope they are likely to stop. It is only through empirical analysis that an answer to this question can be provided".(12)

Conclusion: the Future of the Sociology of Education in the Region

Sociology of education, in Latin America and the Caribbean should be seen along the lines of these thoughts though there is still a heavy debt to ideological leaning when judging the behavior of educational systems. Most people in education, for instance, would still claim that the Cubans are at the front line of the region in terms of educational quality, a belief that is quite difficult to challenge due to the fact that Cuba is still and will probably remain the victim of the imperialistic forces that have stopped their development, in this case USA.(13) Of course, in terms of the works being done in the region on sociology of education one could be safe to say that Brazil is the leading country in the production of knowledge in that field, a tradition since the work of people like Fernando de Azevedo, who wrote which has been one the most influential book on the area in the region, having had many editions and being actually still in use no matter how out of fashion it might be.(14) It would be unfair to discuss in this paper the leading thought in the sociology of education in the region. It would be enough to say that around the universities in Mexico, Chile and Buenos Aires is being produced most of what is written in sociology of education in the region. Most of it comes from the empirical research done in those places and also through the statistical information collected by international organizations like UNESCO and CEPAL.

Sociology of education is an accepted scientific discipline in Latin America and the Caribbean, as it is elsewhere. Margaret Archer, in her chapter on the state of the art in the field, in 1982, said that there were three theoretical possibilities for the sociology of education: neomarxism, neofunctionalism and newweberian.(15) That is a long way to go from the balance made by Jean Floud and A. H. Halsey in 1958.(16) Today we should take away the neomarxism approach and better refer to the postmarxist era, as we have done in this paper. Nevertheless, Marxism as an ideology is a very strong ideological force to be reckon with and it has not entirely abandon the academic state and perhaps right now is beginning to come back in as much as Marxism can do explain social behavior from a very unique and useful perspective.

Of course, this a very tentative paper with limited perspective. It does not offer a full analysis of the field of sociology of education in Latin America and the Caribbean but just some of the current theoretical and methodological perspectives. I should mention that sociology is always full of questions regarding epistemology and the philosophy of sciences and here is also

present the need to justify particular research in terms of a theoretical stance, whatever that might be. However, for the benefit of synthesis I could say that this field in the region is paying attention to the global and the comparative approach, a region with many nations and many ethnic and class divisions with populations living mainly in cities but also in numerous rural areas and in the poor settlements around almost every large city in the region. The sociology of education being done in the region takes these problems as key issues to be tackled. We could add questions like comparative type of analysis and the search for what we could call the idea and identity of the region, as such. On this question there are many studies trying to do cross-cultural comparisons within the region and between the region and the rest of the world, mainly with developed countries because little if at all is done in relation to Africa and to Asia. The role of the state and the strategies for social change is a topic of interest as it is also the bifurcation between education and schooling process, a distinction which is rather new in the region, where most people would refer most of the time to education as analogous to schooling.

It should not be lost in this paper that sociology of education is not coterminous with educational theory or with pedagogy. On the other hand no matter how powerful is the ideological and political ingredient within the field, sociology of education is not a servant of power and ideology and should not be. In fact it is the belief of the author that sociology should not be entirely an instrument either for rationalization of social life neither an instrument for policy makers. If we are going to preserve some notion of identity as a social science, we should keep in mind the need for objective analysis and to strengthen the capacity to maintain a critical view of whatever we study as sociologist, in this case the educational system and any other educational component of society. Of course even the most cynical will say he or she wants a better educational and school system but quality is still a metaphor that suppose a direction of social affairs, a desire to intervene and perhaps to do social engineering. That is to say sociology of education is an end in herself not just an instrument able to please any direction that policy makers are willing to take.

It can be easily seen that I have not said a word about the "old" and the "new" sociology of education. Of course one could say, for instance, that the Brazilian Fernando de Azevedo represents in the region a leader of the "old" sociology of education, the era of the non professional sociologist and that the generation to which belong the Chilean José Joaquín Brunner, to take one of the most prominent names, represent the "new" sociology of education, that of the professional sociologist. However, as it happens with sociology and as a matter of fact with any other social science in the region their development is not lineal but segmented, meaning that there are people still doing the "old" type of sociology as well as many are trying to do the "new" type of sociology, closer to the international theoretical and methodological paradigms, closer ever more to the quantitative analysis and in touch with the way sociology of

education is done all over the world, making in fact true the essential aphorism of science, their universality.

Notes

(1) See the paper by Abraham Yogeve, "Multilevel Theories and Methods in the Sociology of Education: in search of a linkage", *International Review of Sociology*, 1-1987, Issue edited by Margaret Archer and Abraham Yogeve, on Multilevel theories and method in the sociology of education in search of a linkage.

(2) A good example of the failure of education reform *per se* is the paper by Inés Aguerrondo, "Educational Reform in Latin America: A Survey of Four Decades" (*Prospects*, XXII, 3, 353-365, 1992.) It has always been said that the region and particularly countries like Bolivia has had their large amount of political instability but it would be easy to say that in no area there are more stated reform than in education. In fact every government in the region would claim an educational reform though very few countries have indeed accomplished to change their educational systems throughout these numerous reforms. Changes have come from exogenous factors, like the educational revolution generated in the information area in the last decade all over the region and in fact all over the world. Aguerrondo contends that, although educational improvement policies in Latin America during the 1960s and 1970s achieved quantitative goals, structural deficiencies blocked efforts to make education equitably available through society.

(3) "Changing times", Anthony Giddens talks to Meena Ahmed about his role as Director of LSE (LSE Magazine, IX, 1, Summer 1997).

(4) See my book *Recursos humanos en educación* (Caracas: Monte Avila Editores, tercera edición, 1990). Of course it is easy these days to remember with certain nostalgia that Marxist era but it could be said that Marxism was used as an instrument of academic terrorism so much that those who did not accept the prevalent view had to pay a price as in any other authoritarian situation. This makes quite ironical the fact that many of those who were at the first line of the almost fanatical way took upon academic affairs are now in political power. I am speaking only about Venezuela, by the way.

(5) See the paper by Alan Sica and Harland Prechel, "National Political-Economic Dependency in the Global Economy and Educational Development" (*Comparative Education Review*, October 1981, pp. 384-402.)

(6) The professional meetings in the field of sociology as well as in other social sciences have become mammoth events. I was personally involved in the organization of a World Congress of Sociology and was very impressed by the bureaucratic steps that had to be taken in order to sit down one sociologist to read a paper. The production process to do so was not only a kind of bureaucratic nirvana but also quite irrational, in as much as sociology came to be divided in so many segments as to lose sometimes any scientific identity whatsoever. In fact social sciences are becoming or they have always been subspecialties each one with many models and theories, resulting in

almost fractal fragmentation. In relation to this Alan Cromer asks the following question: "Can the social sciences be considered sciences in any sense comparable with the natural sciences?" The answer to me came from an unexpected source. Marcel Roche, one of the great father of science in Venezuela recently wrote his memoirs and at a given moment he says that unable to keep track with the current advances being produced in the natural science he used to work in, he decided that after 50 years of age he was too old for that and instead decided to devote his time to sociology of knowledge, an academic enterprise he thought would be lighter (See by Marcel Roche his book *Memorias y Olvidos*, Caracas: Fundacion Polare IVIC, 1996). The comment made by Cromer is the following: "The question (made above) is important because it is the social scientist who tells us how to fight poverty, educate our children, and formulate foreign policy. And since many social scientists are leading the postmodernistic attack on the natural sciences, it is not inappropriate for me to examine the foundations of the discipline". Of course I am not going here to discuss neither Cromer arguments neither my own views about the question made by the Professor of Physics at Northeastern University but I can only say how this question is rather pertinent when apparently anything happens to be considered social science no matter how far apart from empirical evidences and logical analysis. See by Alan Cromer his book *Connected Knowledge, Science, Philosophy, and Education* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997). It should be said that the Cromer book has been attacked. Joan Solomon and John Ziman, for instance, have published a review in *The Times Higher* September 5 1997 where they say the following: "Like most of the zealots for "science", he is utterly scornful of the social sciences... Most of the book is not only tendentious: it is also pig ignorant and often completely incorrect". I am not qualified to judge Cromer's book on this short space available on this paper but I find the issue relevant: Are the social sciences sciences and to what extent are we able to separate scientific analysis from rhetorical thought? In any case much of what is produced under the sociology of education in the region, belongs to subjective knowledge and in many cases just wishful thinking.

(7) This was the view expressed by Soviet teachers. See by Hans H. (1967) his book on *Comparative Education* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul).

(8) The book by Galeano has been reprinted more than thirty times in Mexico, Siglo XXI and the book by Rangel, less popular than the first, has had two editions, the last one in 1976, the first in 1973. Both are first class books and of course should be read by any one interested in the historical aspect of the sociological thought that was dominant in those two decades in Latin America, especially in the field of sociology of education.

(9) It is not my intention in this opportunity to discuss at length the ideas of any author, neither sociologists like Bersntein or Bourdieu or Latin-American sociologists like say José Joaquín Brunner, perhaps the most quoted sociologist in the region. For a discussion of the thought of Pierre Bourdieu, however, see by Patrice Bonnewitz his book *La sociologie de P. Bourdieu* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1997). Bourdieu has been often described as a Marxist sociologist, among others by John Kenneth, in his paper "The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu" (*Educational Review*, XXV, 3, 1973.)

(10) See for instance the book edited by Michael W. Apple, *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education, Essays on class, ideology and the State* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982), a book that actually initiated many of the discussion in the field in the United States of America.

(11) See the book by Gambetta, *Were they pushed or did they jump? Individual decision mechanism in education* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1987). I would hate to make comments that some one could find irrelevant, but this is an opportunity to point out the role of the publishers and the propaganda that some social scientists can make in order to make their ideas more freely available to the academic community. First of all political power, at least in the region of Latin America and the Caribbean, is almost essential for an author to be able to disseminate his or her ideas. Persons linked to institution of relevance generally grow with their institution and manage to become members of pressure groups that at the same time are able to coopt chances and opportunities. Wright Mills did not really thought about it but there is a powerful *academic elite* that act the same way that other dominant groups. If one can make an analysis of the ways a book is successful or not in the region it can help to see the power linkages of the author and in some cases this helps to explain that success, without implying here that the chances to access to power exclude academic quality, because in fact in many occasions they come together. In any case, the book by Gambetta is a case in point. A book that would deserve larger recognition than other British authors as good as Gambetta but who has the privilege to have created their own publishing houses, like the case of Giddens, owner of Polity Press, a successful publishing house that has been used as an excellent instrument for the dissemination of the ideas of this otherwise first class British sociologist, which is now Director LSE, with all due credentials to be so. No wonder that in the interview to Giddens quoted above the British sociologist is defined "As both a respected academic and a successful businessman with clear managerial abilities, he may embody the type of synthesis that LSE needs at an uncertain time for the future of higher education". I would like also to point out how, in the region, the fact that a social scientist is at the same time member of any political party or political pressure group that fact will always improve their chances for academic mobility to successful positions and to get access to all the paraphernalia of what means success in academic life.

(12) *Op. cit.*, p. 29. What I personally like about the Gambetta approach is that goes against the accepted view that extraindividual factors are so strong as to eliminate the chances of personal efforts in order to travel up in the hierarchy of society. It is true, however, that in many societies in the region some factors like ethnic differences or income distribution would be in fact powerful obstacles for personal determination but at least from the theoretical point of view no society is close enough to stop some people from "jumping" and to move upward in society. Certainly societies like India with their caste system are more rigid than the so called class societies but at least in the region no matter how close a society can look, there are always chances for social mobility. In any case, what I find unacceptable is the view that society is a deadly mechanism that reproduces herself like obeying a perpetual movement. I find Gambetta a much more flexible approach than others that support the opposite view, speaking of course about the approach made by the sociology of education.

- (13) An indication of this emotional support that is still prevalent in the region toward the Cuban regime can be mentioned in the opportunity when Fidel Castro, the unique Cuban leader addressed the UNESCO Meeting on Higher Education in Havana in November 18-22 1996. In that opportunity Castro made a quite general speech expressing some political banalities and nevertheless hundreds of higher education people attending the meeting from almost every country in the region were hysterical in the presence of the *líder máximo* in such an outpour of emotion and proto religious respond that some people present at the meeting could not understand the rationality of the event. In any case it was lost to me. See the speech by Castro, "The Revolution of the Consciences", in *Toward a New Higher Education (CRESALC/UNESCO: Caracas, 1997)*
- (14) To many Brazilians Fernando de Azevedo is one the founding fathers of sociology of education. His text book on the sociology of education was first written in 1943 and is still being published by Fondo de Cultura Económica, in Mexico. The last edition I have seen is from 1969. The first edition, in Portuguese, was published in 1940 and the first publication in Spanish in 1942. Interesting to say that the full title of the book is *Sociology of Education, Introduction to the Study of Pedagogical Phenomenon and its relationship with the rest of the social phenomenon*. It was a book that followed to the point the book of Durkheim on *Education et sociologie* (1922).
- (15) See the chapter by Margaret Archer, "The Sociology of Educational Systems", in T. Bottomore, S. Nowak and M. Sokolowska (eds.), *Sociology The State of the Art* (London: Sage, 1982).
- (16) See *Current Sociology, The Sociology of Education, A trend report and bibliography* (Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell, 1958).

CHAPTER 3

THE CHALLENGES FACING LATIN AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY: SOMETHING OF WHAT WE HAVE, SOMETHING OF WHAT WE SEEK

Raquel Sosa Elizaga
National Autonomous University of Mexico

Neoliberalism has dealt a hard blow to Latin America's educational, health care, and social security systems. Opportunities for decent employment have disappeared and living conditions have deteriorated seriously, to the point where the end of the century will have seen nearly thirty years of economic and social decay.

But the worst thing of all may have been that the region's capacity for thought as a critical activity with historic projection toward the past and the future alike has been severely undermined. Dirty wars of low and high intensity, and dictatorships; government and private sector interventions to purge and reorganize the higher educational institutions, mass media, and cultural organizations; self-censorship, resignation, and the environment; all have combined to produce a true cataclysm in what had been the sources of creativity and collective elaboration of ideas.

For years the region's most widely circulated publications have proclaimed the end of history, the closing of the "cycle of revolution", the inevitability of opening up to the outside world, and the idea that true modernity lies in mass consumption, globalization, and postmodern skepticism.

In particular, the concept of a "transition", and now of a "consolidation" of democratic government based on European experience since the 18th Century has filled pages and pages of writings by those who could compete with their First World colleagues - if not in quality then at least in salary and fringe benefits completely alien to the context in which they study and to the worries and daily experience of most of their fellow citizens.

Everything that has no place in this scheme has been rejected as an interested effect, an inevitable remnant, a pathological behavior, an archaism or a fundamentalism. And we have thus reached a point where it is beginning to be impolite to talk about external intervention, loss of national sovereignty, and economic, social, cultural, and political exclusion.

In this context, the public universities have been harassed and purged, partly through the trend toward technocracy and privatization of thought. Their public budgets have been cut, research funding has come to be allocated according to rules and criteria established by and for companies and

international financial institutions, and there has been a decline or elimination of ideas that do not turn a profit, such as the humanities and the so-called basic sciences.

Moreover, academic activity has come to be assessed under criteria of efficiency, with differential salary increases benefitting only the "most productive" professors and researchers. Curricula have been reorganized in favor of specialization, professional training, and terminal efficiency; full-time faculty staffing has been reduced and drastic restrictions placed (by tightening admission controls and increasing tuition) on the growth of enrollment.

The adoption of these institutional norms has completely altered the principles, procedures, and content of higher education, and radically changed the relations among the members of the university community and those between the university and the society. The development of critical thought has become increasingly difficult; the relative isolation of the university communities has increased; and scientists' language and concerns have been transformed to the point where they have become incomprehensible to the rest of society.

At the times of greatest crisis, independent centers of intellectual creation have sprung up, many of which have aspired to become privileged recipients of private funding. These centers have tried to be more flexible and efficient in response to the market's changing demands; they have small infrastructures and limited staffs in order to avoid the fixed costs that larger institutions must bear.

Outside the commercial sphere there have been countless associations fighting for human rights, pursuing social, cultural, and political movements, and championing minorities. Their marginal status, their predominance in voluntary work, and the political role they have acquired through successive confrontations with the governments or the presence of political party representatives in their organizations have led them to follow paths very different from those of the private research centers. Among other things, that path has allowed them to survive in closer linkage with their communities of origin, but it has also given them a horizon of critical studies (though one of narrow scope and meager dissemination) relating to their own experiences, failures, changes of direction, and new perspectives.

In this way, while the development of private research centers and public institutions of higher learning has been essentially determined by criteria alien to both these categories of entities, leading them to compete in terms of funding and immediate efficiency, the "free associations" have come to fill a vacuum of key importance for social thought, in close and mutually enriching relations with their communities, in communication often in conflict with the authorities, but also in the creation of broader spaces for collective action.

It is possible that the public universities may be strengthened by competition, having survived even their partial privatization. The private centers have found it much more difficult to stay afloat when international

financing has dried up, or have changed their thematic priorities and/or regional support. The "free associations", on the other hand, have been sustained by the communities' growing interest and demand for knowledge about themselves and their societies and by a linkage, that has turned out to be less ephemeral than originally thought with public institutions, political parties, and groups of the so-called civil society.

Under current conditions, derived from the reconfiguration of the institutions devoted to producing knowledge on our societies, unprecedented theoretical challenges and problem areas have arisen, but above all the need for an institutional and organizational recapitulation which will allow us to honestly meet the demands of our societies.

To begin, I believe it is impossible to do serious social research today unless we work for a thorough reform of our institutions, which do not foster and even less carry out the necessary generational replacement, inclusion of women, and use of information sources and networks of information exchange with the active social organizations (including the public institutions, "free associations", and private centers). Without that reform, they are unlikely to survive their current crisis.

By the same token, unless we overcome the current division of labor among teachers (trainers, educators) and researchers, through adequate mechanisms for the constant renewal of curricula, updating of bibliography, and incorporation of research into the teaching-learning process, so as to achieve the necessary linkage among what is produced by research, what is taught, and the public to whom academic work should be directed, the abyss that separates academics from the overall evolution of our societies will tend to become too wide to bridge.

The obsession for homogeneous forms of evaluating different activities, as well as the ranking of foreign products and international exchanges as higher than the national, regional, and community fabric of networks and feedback channels, has already done serious damage to creativity and left academic activities unrelated to the market's priorities completely ineligible for funding.

The dehumanization of knowledge, the frivolization of academic products, the vacuum created around areas considered unproductive or unnecessary, impoverishes our universe and separates us from the possibility of sensitizing ourselves to the true state of social problems. It also prevents us from playing a significant role in the search for relevant solutions that can be assimilated by those to whom we wish to speak.

Furthermore, if researchers do not seriously address the problem of the visible, the hidden, and the negated in each phenomenon to be studied, we run the risk of losing ourselves in partiality and triviality. Unfortunately, we too often find that an author who has made a significant contribution falls in love with his discovery and repeats it for years in texts with different titles, or even publishes the same text with almost no change, though under a different title.

By the same token, those who adopt a work scheme, even a theoretical model or a concept from whose standpoint they attempt to approach all the specific research problems, but without considering the inclusion of opposing viewpoints, blocks, obstacles, or even facts that are difficult to fit into their schemes, tend to reduce reality to unconnected and even absurd fragments, and do nothing but make the task for those seeking to achieve true knowledge that much more difficult.

Finally, some works that do not include a regional perspective, a multidimensional search, and an interdisciplinary approach are equally unable to fully explain any social problem. I do not believe it is at all appropriate to foster a technical pride in the dissection of an event, a political regime, certain economic policy measures, or a social organization. The first question that continues to be indispensable is not about the "relative autonomy" of each fragment of reality, but just the opposite, to what experiences and events is the one we are interested in related, and from what standpoint can we study it to make it understandable.

Latin America continues being, as said by Sergio Bagú, an exceptional horizon of knowledge from which to study the phenomena that take place within it and their links to realities that are shared, even though differentiated in every dimension. I keep thinking that to be a Latin Americanist, i.e., to consider an object of study as a principle of problematic approach rather than a disciplinary definition, leaves us more open to pursue social research than to be simply a sociologist, an historian, an anthropologist, and economist, etc. And that is essentially because we have shown our ability to critically identify ourselves and recognize our community of interest in events far removed in time and space, without losing sight of our regional context.

Even so, I believe our greatest concern should be to develop our ability to recognize our societies in movement, to recover a way of transmitting knowledge and experience in them, the relation between history and the future. Undoubtedly, the most fascinating and terrible thing the indigenous communities of our countries can teach us is a variety of forms of struggling for survival; the wisdom to know when to fight and when to retreat before powerful enemies; an invulnerable dignity which has allowed them to associate their knowledge of the past with their present relations and future imagination; a way to keep the power of their voice when almost no one has ever wanted to listen to them.

For all these reasons, I want to assert that we can and must put aside all pride and attachment to ideas that momentary competition makes us view as original. It is time to stop denying what strikes us as alien or unpleasant, such as that there is political violence and state terrorism, that our democracies are dominated by an unbridled militarization, that we face a growing loss of sovereignty in our strategic, everyday, and even communicational decisions, that insecurity and the lack of credibility among our political leaders have become almost unbearable.

It is time to stop insisting on the end of the century, the end of the peasants or Indians, the end of the unions and the end of armed struggle. But above all, it is time to recognize that what we have today is inevitable, that the past does not help us to learn from ourselves, and that exclusion is simply a necessary, though odious, effect of the purging of the system.

Today we must make an enormous effort to learn from the societies in which we really live, to understand and share the logic of their survival, their unbreakable dignity, and their way of facing up to the future. It is absolutely indispensable for us to focus on producing scientific knowledge from the depths of exclusion, which is now the backbone of our countries, and for us to reformulate without pretensions but also without conveniently prefabricated schemes our horizon of visibility, our options, those of all of us, for the future.

Notes

Bagú, S. (1979), *Tiempo, realidad social y conocimiento*, Mexico, DF: Siglo XXI Editores.

Cueva, A. (1988), "Sobre exilios y reinos (notas críticas sobre la evolución de la sociología sudamericana)", *Estudios Latinoamericanos*, III, 4.

Marini, R.M. (1993), *Democracia e integración*, Caracas: Nueva Sociedad.

Marini, R.M. & Millán, M. (coord.) (1996), *La teoría social latinoamericana. Cuestiones contemporáneas*, IV, Mexico: UNAM-El Caballito.

Oliver, L. (1996), *Balance y perspectivas del pensamiento latinoamericano*, Mexico: ALAS/Centro de Investigaciones Sociales - Universidad de Colima.

Petras, J. (1988), "La metamorfosis de los intelectuales latinoamericanos", *Estudios Latinoamericanos*, III, 5.

Sosa Elizaga, R. (1994), "Evolución de las ciencias sociales en América Latina (1973-1992)", *Estudios Latinoamericanos*, Nueva Epoca, I, 1.

Sosa Elizaga, R. (coord.) (1996), *América Latina y el Caribe: Perspectivas de su reconstrucción*. Mexico, DF: ALAS/Coordinación de Humanidades-UNAM.

Sosa Elizaga, R. (1994), "La sociología frente al fin de siglo: formas de conocimiento, planteamiento de problemas", en J.F. Leal, A. Andrade, A. Murguía & A. Coria (eds.), *La sociología contemporánea en México: Perspectivas disciplinañas y nuevos desafíos*, Mexico, DF: UNAM.

Vilas, C. (1990), "Intelectuales, dólares y compromisos: un momentario a James Petras", *Estudios Latinoamericanos*, V, 3.

Zemelman, H. (1992), *Los horizontes de la razón I. Dialéctica y apropiación del presente*, Mexico, DF: Anthropos/El Colegio de México.

CHAPTER 4

THE FORTHCOMING SOCIOLOGY. THINKING AFTER POST-MODERNITY

Rigoberto Lanz
Central University of Venezuela

Introduction

The sociological debate has long abandoned its dwelling to inhabit almost all cognitive territories where the different ways of thinking are held questionable by the human matter. The intellectual presence of sociology, as a discipline, has lost its outline to an expanding effect that confuses it with another migrant: philosophy. In both cases, the theoretical nomadism to which we refer, discloses a certain greatness: in the horizon of the disciplinary twilight the merit will pertain to the anticipated renouncement to establish a sociological knowledge, legitimated upon the limits of the epistemological taxonomy of the academic culture.

The graciousness of the sociological thinking of Modernity proceeds from its global character, meaningly, from its pretension to offer a "certain view of the world", as a specific reading for the understanding of the social rationality. The comprehension of man within his actuality, was always a characteristic of the intellectual strength of sociology. All of which, is associated in a very intimate manner with the different appropriations possible, from that point, towards other ambits of knowledge.

On the following pages I intend to examine, in an exploratory manner, the connections between the *sociological thinking* and the socio-cultural processes of post-modernity. We believe that the crisis of Modernity has a conclusive impact upon all the epistemological logics where the academic knowledges rests. (1) What is happening today with the sociological tradition vis-a-vis the challenges of postmodernity? In many instances bets are openly placed in favor of a *post-modern sociology*. How does this tendency affect the *statu quo* of the academic sociology? Which are the Latin American conditionings of this agenda?

What is Gone And Will Not Return

The current theoretical debate has the possibility to evolve with certain fluidity, if we are in the capacity of properly clearing up the limits and restrictions that until not long ago strongly conditioned the agenda to be discussed. Under this

perspective, there is a broad stripe of issues left behind, concepts not longer being used, approaches in retreat, intellectual positions in open decadence. Adjusting to this past is not a matter of style, something that could comfortably be viewed as a personal trend. I believe that this critical distance from the sociological happening, hegemonic until not very long ago, is part of the epistemological surroundings of this time; of the theoretical inputs essentials to thought in this era.

The sociological production of today may well obtain benefits from the dismantlement of scientificism as an ideology. A great part of the epistemological dilemmas of sociology have been connected with its traumatic relationship with "normal science", being that its formal protocols are designed to satisfy the demands of that cognitive legality, or being that the different "sociologies of knowledge" make evident the relativity of the scientific parameters.

The crisis of Modernity has signified the vanishing of the universality of reason, science, technique or subject. The deconstruction of these centralities dissolved the pretensions of that discourse. As a result, the legitimacies of technical scientific bureaucracy have been erased. The fall of the scientific paradigm, as an exclusive and hegemonic cognitive model, signifies an opening of great meanings for the sociological production. This fall has an effect of *epistemological autonomy* that directs towards a *negotiated referent*. The relationships of power through which the social knowledges move, have not disappeared. But, at least, the automatic mechanism that turned "true" all cognitive operation based on the scientific method, has been overthrown.

In the same way, the crisis of paradigms has a liberating effect for the sociological production. The collapse of the great theoretical forms that ruled the performance of the different sociologies in the world, has had a double effect: On one hand, the image of emptiness left by the absence of referents strong enough to legitimate the sociological production. On the other hand, the propelling effect of new developments at the inside of a disciplinary discursivity that always tended to the conceptual approximations of all fields.

I believe, we have definitely entered a phase of recomposition, where the initial impact of the crisis of paradigms, gives way to an intellectual dynamics less traumatic and sorrowful. The fall of the great ideological narrative, has been beneficial for the liberation of thought from the tutelage of dogmatism (being it from a neo-positivist origin or from all forms of Marxist mechanicism).

The extra-cognitive interests have not disappeared from the sociological happening. What has taken place is a displacement of the ideological centralities that, in the past, performed the leading part of the theoretical disputes. The clash between the Sociological Schools, has given way to a virtual combat, where the positions are movable, the concepts fluctuating, the authors inter-changeable. The atmosphere of post-modernization of the

theoretical practices, greatly conditions the new cognitive map drawn at this end of the Century.

On the specific epistemological field, there has been an outburst of the disciplinary logic, giving way to the different modalities of integration of fields: Interdiscipline, multidiscipline, *transdiscipline*. Under the perspective of a growing post-modernization of the academic culture, the main problem posed is that of the statute of the sociological discourse itself. It is possible to imagine a double scenery: One, characterized by the reproduction of the academic knowledges where we find the predominance of a socio-technical profile, meant to consolidate professional skills (any discipline can last for centuries nourishing the circuits of the professional market). Another scenery would be the transversality of a social thought, explicitly detached from the disciplinary logic, having openly renounced to a presumable "identity" of methods and objects. A social thought that deliberately intends a cognitive reappropriation of substantial theoretical fields, of categories, strategies of knowledge, of theorisations proceeding from different traditions.

To speak today in the name of sociology, is a precarious exercise of self-affirmation, ending in the syndical aberrations (or, perhaps, in the no less aberrating juridical protection of knowledge). In a post-modern culture, these old limits have been void. Not to feast the void itself, but in the sense of a rearticulation of practices, of the strengthening of intellectual spaces and of a reformulation of views upon the society, that place us on a completely different territory.

The postulate of the epistemological transversity of the sociological production in post-modernity, only reaffirms the impossibility of the disciplinary discourse. Facing this discourse raises the perspective of a transdisciplinary work, at which end, the theoretical production acquires contents completely opposite to the academic exercises that legitimate sociology as a profession.

The kingdom of certitudes has come to an end. Gone is with it, a whole scientificist culture implacably imposed through all these centuries of Modern expansion.

The task of the sociologist today consists of a new learning signed, basically, by uncertainty, by the game of undeterminations, by the predominance of the irruption, by the fragmented logic breaking the unifying pretensions of the great theory, by the nomadism of the social actors, by disorder and chaos. A new learning signed the acceleration of times, by the downfall of the criteria of reality, by the efimerous characteristic of what is social, by the obsolescence of concepts and the fragility of the observation sites.

I consider good news, that the epistemic protocols and the demands of validity of knowledge have no other reality than negotiation (no matter if being inside the frame of a "discursive ethics", or in the pragmatics of pure and simple power).

The post-modern sociological thinking has joyously dismissed all these epistemological constrictions. Not because it has suddenly attained the kingdom of no contradiction, but because it begins another rationality for the thought of the humane, because it is set on the limits of a new *episteme*.

The Disciplinary Transfiguration

The sociological thinking cannot avoid the path of the post-modern happening, partly as a great intellectual tension face the old ways of thinking, and partly, also, as a celebration of the fall of the tyranny centered on the subject. At present, a ductility of the theoretical possibilities is imposed, nearer to eclecticism than to paradigmatic purities. This is the reason why the sociological production loses much of its identity mark and enters the twilight climate where all things merge.

The initial discomfort caused by this environment is quite reasonable. It is easy to understand the discomfort produced by the basic ambiguity of almost everything coming from sociology. Putting aside all strictly instrumental exercises (as the advisory reports requested from professionals that work empirically for their clients), all existing theoretical production carries the seal of uncertainty of the identifying origins. This blurred personality of the sociologist within his theoretical performance, is directly conditioned by the nature of the cultural processes of objective post-modernization of this epoch.

With the initial confusion overcome (the decade of the eighties), it is possible, today, to visualize a more encouraging scenery. Not so much because we are heading towards a new discipline of thinking, but because the epochal transit in which we are found, is leaving more visible and permanent marks of the socio-cultural depth of these times. This signifies that the social practices seem comprehensible under the light of the emerging theoretical instrumentals. Likewise, post-modern thinking becomes denser, passing from the extended stage of a critics of Modernity, to a constructive dimension, characterized by the autonomous nature of thinking itself.

Post-modern, in as much a cultural climate, a mesh of sociality, a fragmentary social practice; as the discursivity of a completely new form of individuation, has opened a vast field of research where, at present, the sociological thinking is re-created. Independently of the intellectual accent and of the higher or lesser sensibility to accord with the post-modern standards, the issue raised in this theoretical conjuncture, is the overflow of a disciplinary optic placed at the base of certain ways of thinking of society.(2)

There is an exhaustion of the approaches and disciplinary methodologies. Sociology is no longer practiced as a solitary social science. The socio-professional performance of all social sciences, as well as the so called autonomy of its objects and methods, have been shattered by the ruthless effect of the dissolution of the old disciplinary centers.

Only the inertia of curricular life at universities, still transmits the feeling of "good health" of these human sciences. This is quite understandable if due note is taken of the anachronism of the university system as a whole, *vis-a-vis* any of the levels of social life, legitimated, at its moment, by the cognitive map reproduced by the academic culture.

There are two precise ambits where the caducity of an approach (and of a structure) reveals: One, the diversity and growing complexity of performances long ago undertaken in other spheres (including the great corporations). A second one being the inter-subjective outfits, introducing new cognitive devices, new practices, as well as a different sensibility into the generation living its vital experience in post-capitalism.

Those two statements would be sufficient to acknowledge the always present delay between the socio-cognitive dynamism raising from all sides, as well as the unmovable bureaucratic frame of the school system, functioning by means of entropic inputs with scarce rational control. The rituals of the professional formation may inertially continue for long periods of time, without its performance being greatly affected by what occurs in social life.

The process of objective post-modernization of organizations, seems to me a relentless course of these times. But its "conscious" translation to the everyday practices will still take time.

Meanwhile, the post-modern fragmentation of the identifying chains (family, church, school, political party, territory, nation) produce a roving look to the new collective negotiations. The discomfort of the public space allows for the appearance of unknown forms of representation. The depletion of the moral rationality of Illustration permits the construction compromise weaving led by a *minima moralia*. The cultural decentralization permits the proliferation of transversal aesthetic experiences. The pathethism of the bureaucratic-instrumental organization pushes towards new forms of organization at all levels. The fracture of the logic of work due to the over presence of the computer technological platform, gives way to the *éclat* of a new sociality which privileges hedonism, ludicrousness and erotism. The disjoint of the formal space of education (The School), due to the unrestrained effect of communication, has opened the doors to infinite modalities of self-management of knowledge. The disuse of corporal discipline has caused the explosion of control devices based on the medication, dietetic and cosmetic of Modernity. In the same manner, the "demodernized" practices (Touraine, 1997) in occidental sexuality, launch with unknown force. The revolution produced in the society of information, introduces another experience of time, of the idea of the world; the chronological cadences are modified, the urban rhythms change, the metaphor of the *Web* establishes in the imaginary, as a new symbolic order where what is virtual is the only reality.

What is Sociology Doing Face to this New Map?

I understand that there is no direct and automatic answer vis-à-vis these very complex processes. But a previous issue should be sufficiently clear: To understand what is happening in post-modern society, is very little what can be expected from the discipline we inherited in the apogee of Modernity, the sociology that dwelled in the universities (by far, as it should have) and that has perdured basically the same for almost two centuries. This does not condemn, as a whole, what is being done in academic sociology, since it is true that from there, great efforts are being made to think different. What I sustain is, that in the horizon of the university dynamics of sociology in Latin America, there is no evidence of a change of paradigm, or of anything that resembles a dynamics for updating the forms of "teaching", as well as in the way of living the reality surrounding the school space.

Something More than a Critic of Modernity

The forthcoming sociology cannot avoid taking charge of post-modern society. It does not matter to which linguistic resources it will have to appeal to name the new times. It will be, anyway, unappealable, to meet the processes of social fragmentation that caused the explosion of the centered subjectivity. We are heading towards a sociology of emptiness and deconstruction. We will assist to the growing development of the tribal logic that fights, in the everyday life, the tyranny of the instrumental rationality. The technological, inter-subjectives and discursive re-equipments, approach us to new modalities of individuation (new regards, new performances). The weakening of the identity chains and the slackening of moral discipline, open a path for the experience of a new ethic-aesthetic (Maffesoli, 1996). Post-modern sociology has to take charge of the healthy fall of Modern representation. The uneasiness of politics and the exacerbation of narcissism are not the trivial traits of a "pathology" easily preached by the traditional disciplines. A post-modern sociology can abundantly nourish from the emphatic sociality that rises periodically in all spheres of social experience. Likewise, the forthcoming sociology can fruitfully dialogue with the various multicultural aspects, with differentialism, with the outburst of the gender. The future sociology can also speak, without concessions, with the radical recovery of political ecology. There is a sociological dimension of *Hybridity* that can develop new concepts to re-think Latin America.

The networks for structuring power relations, violence and exclusion are being fastly restored. But exploitation, coercion and hegemony keep being at the base of the flows that make social life.

Post-modern sociology may critically reappropriate the immense epistemological contribution of the deconstructive-archeological-genealogical

tradition. Confronted to the methodologic reductionism of the "isms" now in downfall, a post-modern sociology may journey towards new fundamentation referents ("weak"), that will redefine a new idea of *theoretical consistency*.

Post-modern sociology has given up, without traumas or epistemological complexes, all disciplinarian identification. Its nomad and dependant character points mainly towards an exercise of instant reading of the social sphere. Therefore, it is a thought of discontinuity, of what is irruptional, of transversality, of what is submerged. This "vagabond sociology" (Maffesoli, 1996), appeals to the weakness of the intellectual constructions.

I believe, finally, that sociology in post-modern times may outcrop into a new epistemological horizon, should it be capable of learning the lesson common to all human sciences: The enrichment of the complexity of social life is, at the same time, the limit to the old codes for reading, which are no longer able to answer the everlasting question: *Where are we today?*

Notes

(1) I have thoroughly gone over this subject in my work: *El pensamiento social, hoy*, Caracas: Edit. Trópykos, 1992.

(2) "Sociologists must raise early to perceive, from the dawn, the new landscape created by the commotion of the night".

Bibliography

- Del Aguila, T. (1995), *Modernidad y posmodernidad, la reflexión política*. Bogotá: Tercer Mundo.
- Featherstone, M. (1995), *Cultura de consumo e posmodernismo*, Sao Paulo: Studio Nobel.
- Follari, R. (1990), *Modernidad y posmodernidad una óptica desde América Latina*, Buenos Aires: Alque.
- Follari, R. (1995), *Territorios posmodernos*, Mendoza: UNC.
- Höpenhayn, M. (1994), *Ni apocalípticos, ni integrados*, Santiago de Chile: FCE.
- Maffesoli, M. (1996), *Éloge de la raison sensible*. Paris: Fayard.
- Richard, N. (1994), *La insubordinación de los signos*, Santiago de Chile: Cuarto Propio.
- Sarlo, B. (1994), *Escenas de la vida posmoderna*, Buenos Aires: Ariel.
- Touraine, A. (1997), *Pourrons-nous Vivre ensemble?*, Paris: Fayard.

CHAPTER 5

EUROCENTRISM AND COLONIALISM IN THE LATINAMERICAN SOCIAL THOUGHT (1)

Edgardo Lander
Central University of Venezuela

Political and social thought regarding Latin America has been cut through by a tension between the search for its specific characteristics and an external view, which has always seen these lands from the narrow point of view of European experience. There has also been an opposition between the challenge of the rich potentialities of this New World, and the distress because of its difference, in contrast with the ideal represented by European culture and racial composition. Nonetheless, the external colonial views, and the regrets because of the difference have been widely hegemonic. A brief revision of the texts of the first republican constitutions is enough to illustrate how liberals, in their attempt to transplant and install here a replica of their understanding of the European or North American experience, make almost complete abstraction of the specific cultural and historical conditions of the societies about which they legislate.

The affliction because of the difference, the awkwardness of living in a continent which is not white, urban cosmopolitan, and civilized, finds in positivism its best expression. Sharing the main assumptions and prejudices of the nineteenth century European thought (scientific racism, patriarchy, the idea of progress), the colonial discourse is reaffirmed. The continent is imagined from a single voice, with a single subject: white, masculine, urban, cosmopolitan. The rest, the majority, is the "Other", barbarian, primitive, black, Indian, who has nothing to contribute to the future of these societies. It would be imperative to whiten, westernize, or exterminate them.

The Institutionalization of the Social Sciences

The institutionalization of the social sciences in the Latin American universities in this century, only partially altered the hegemony of this discourse. The liberal dogmas of progress and the binary *backwardness-modernization*, were incorporated as premises of an understanding that consequentially made few concessions to the particularities of the reality under study. The sociology of modernization has been the clearest expression of this twentieth century scientific colonial positivism. (2) In spite of vigorous and original critiques of this tradition by Mariátegui and others, the hegemonic trends within Latin

American Marxism also remained within Eurocentric confines both in the academy and in politics.

It is not necessary to attempt a global assessment of its contributions and limitations, to assert that the most significant collective effort to explain these societies—their past, present and potentials for the future—from an original Latin American perspective, is to be found in CEPAL's structuralism and in the wide scope of theories globally known as dependency theory in the sixties and seventies.

In the social sciences of those decades there is a strong trend which departs from metropolitan practices, not only in content and problems, but also in intellectual style. The rigid demarcations between fact and value judgements, typical of positivistic science, are not presumed. An association between the creation of knowledge and political commitment is not feared. The barriers between the disciplinary compartments, specially typical of the North American social sciences, become extremely porous. More than interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary approximations, the tendency is to give little consideration to those demarcations. Global interpretative efforts which seek to recognize Latin American and world historical, political, social and cultural process—as a reality which cannot be decomposed into static compartments—are favored over empirical research and quantification. The most important conceptual categories of that period, many of them original to Latin American social sciences, illustrate the richness of the quests which characterized that particular intellectual endeavor: *dependency, internal colonialism, structural heterogeneity, pedagogy of the oppressed, marginality, exploitation, research-action, intellectual colonialism, imperialism, liberation*. No doubt as a consequence of the international political context—particularly decolonization and Third World—Latin American social sciences interrupt their exclusive dialogue with the central countries and—for once—feed on, and more importantly, enrich the production of the other continents of the peripheral world. Nonetheless, this theoretical production remained within the limits of the universal metanarrative of modernity and progress. Only timidly did it explore the enormous implications of the plurality of histories, subjects and cultures which characterize this continent.

In the last decades, there has been a clear tendency to reverse these efforts to think the continent from within. The outlooks, theories, methodologies and research agendas of Eurocentric perspectives have been once more embraced. These displacements ensue in a context of defeat of the revolutionary and reformist movements, the profound imprinting of the authoritarian experience in the Southern Cone, the crisis of Marxism, the collapse of real socialism, and the consequent loss of a utopian confidence.

A central feature of the changes that have taken place in the social sciences is its institutional transformations. In the Southern Cone, the social sciences were practically expelled from the universities, with consequences

which are difficult to overestimate, even after the return to democracy. A severe schism was created between the previous academic traditions and the new generations of students. The displacement of social science towards private centers, where short term research projects and consultancy work prevail, under the constraint of a constant search for external financing, represented fundamental shifts in the prevailing intellectual styles, with well-known results.(3)

In other countries, the extraordinary expansion of student enrollment, the acute reduction in the public funding for higher education and the transformation of the university campuses into the privileged arenas for political confrontation -a territory of the reflux for leftist movements- defeated in other domains of society, led to a profound decline of academic life. The potential of the university -in particular the main national public universities- as a site for the creation of alternative knowledge about Latin American societies, was sacrificed in favor of corporatism and short term political interests.

The ongoing reform processes are part of a necessary recovery of the universities for intellectual endeavors. Nonetheless, the dominating tendencies today point in disturbing directions. The construction of social science knowledge within XIX century paradigms establishes formidable obstacles for the possibility of thinking outside the limits defined by liberalism. Today's institutionalization does not question the clear disciplinary boundaries of the social sciences. This is a consequence, among other things, of the growing emphasis on empirical studies. Some of the primary questions which should be subject to a critical analysis are taken as basic assumptions, as metatheoretical axioms in relation to history and society. The transformations in the schools of economics are -in this respect- particularly notorious. The definition of economics as a separate field of study, a rigorous objective scientific discipline, with a growing emphasis on quantification, disconnects economics from reflexive traditions and renders it an instrumental discipline. The growing formalism, which characterizes the dominant literature on democracy and transitions to democracy in the continent and the progressive disengagement of the idea of democracy from all substantive and normative notions, are equally significant of the movements that are taking place today in the social sciences in the continent (Lander 1997).

A limited, but significant indicator, with potentially menacing consequences for the possibility of more autonomous outlooks, is the evaluation model currently used for academics and universities, which take the Mexican experience as a model. Underlying the greater part of these systems lies a universalist criteria according to which the production of the universities in Latin America should follow the scientific production of central countries as models of excellence. An expression of this is the privileged consideration that is given in these systems of evaluation to publishing in foreign scientific journals. Under the mantle of objectivity, what has in fact been established is

that the intellectual creation of the social scientists in the Latin American universities should be ruled by the disciplinary frontiers, truth systems, methodologies, problems, and research agendas of metropolitan social sciences, as these are expressed in the editorial policies of the most prestigious journals in each discipline. Strictly individualized evaluation systems, based on productivity, seem to be purposely designed to hinder the dynamics of collective work and reflective, open analysis, without immediate pressure of time or financing, required to rethink the epistemological assumptions, historical interpretations and present forms of institutionalization of historic and social knowledge.

Neoliberalism and Postmodernism and Postcolonial Theories

Two of the prevailing theoretical influences in contemporary Latin American social sciences are: *neoliberalism* and *postmodernism*. From the point of view of the tensions referred to earlier, neoliberalism has an unequivocal content. It is a dogmatic reaffirmation of lineal conceptions of universal progress and the "imaginary of development". It assumes the central countries as models towards which all must, inexorably, turn. A colonial perspective is reaffirmed in which the only significant subjects are those with roles in the modernizing project: entrepreneurs, technocrats, middle class neighborhood associations and other members of a mythological civil society. The indifference towards "Others", who cannot find a place in this utopia of market and liberal democracy, suggests the presence of vestiges of the fundamental racism characteristic of all colonial thought. The darkest assumptions on the sociology of modernization have been taken up with renewed devotion. From the perspective of the *imaginary of modernity*, all differences are redefined as obstacles to be overcome. On the other hand, such modern values as equity and autonomy become archaic, obsolete. In this radicalization of universalism, all historical singularity disappears. International financial experts can jump from country to country and indistinctly advise Russia, Poland, or Bolivia, in the virtues of the market. Economics is a science, the places, people, customs in which it operates, are accidents of minor importance compared to the universality of its objective laws.

The potential of postmodernism is an altogether different one. In contrast to the monolithic character of the theoretical formulations of neoliberalism, postmodernism covers a large scope of perspectives, methods and sensibilities. On the whole postmodernism has had an ambiguous effect in terms of the issues discussed in this text, offering both rich potentialities as well as new obstacles for the goal of rethinking the continent.

The main currents in postmodernism have not been able to escape from the limits of a grand Western, Eurocentric narrative. The recognition of the colonial experience is essentially absent.(4) According to Gayatri Chakravorty

Spivak, "Some of the most radical criticisms coming out of the West today is the result of an interested desire to conserve the subject of the West, or the West as Subject. ... Although the history of Europe as subject is narrativized by the law, political economy and ideology of the West, this concealed Subject pretends it has no 'geo-political determinations'" (1994, p. 66). Exploring Foucault's and Deleuze's contributions, she concludes that their findings are drastically limited by ignoring the epistemic violence of imperialism, as well as the international division of labor. Spivak argues that once the version of a self-contained Western World is assumed, its production by the imperialist project is ignored (1994, p. 86). Through these visions, the crisis of European history—assumed as universal—becomes the crisis of all history. The crisis of the metanarratives of the philosophy of history, of the certainty of its laws, becomes the crisis of the future as such. The crisis of the subjects of that history, turns into the dissolution of all subjects. The disenchantment of a Marxist generation who experienced in its own flesh the political and theoretical collapse of Marxism and socialism and lived through the existential trauma of the recognition of the gulag, evolves into universal scepticism and the end of collective projects and politics. This justifies a "cool" attitude of non involvement where all ethical indignation in the face of injustice is absent. In reaction to structuralism, economism and determinism, the discursive processes and the construction of meanings are unilaterally emphasized. Economic relations and all notion of exploitation disappear from the cognitive map. The crisis of the political and epistemological, totalizing models leads to a withdrawal towards the partial and local, rendering the role of centralized political, military and economic powers opaque. The Gulf War thus becomes no more than a grand show, a televised super production.

For these perspectives, crisis is not of modernity as such, but of one of its constitutive dimensions: historical reason. (Quijano 1990). Its other dimension, instrumental reason (scientific and technological development, limitless progress, and the universal logic of the market), finds neither criticism nor resistance. History continues to exist only in a limited sense: the underdeveloped countries still have some way to go before reaching the finishing line where the winners of the great universal competition towards progress await for them. It seems a matter of little importance that perhaps the majority of the world's inhabitants will never reach that goal, due to the fact that the consumer patterns and the levels of material well-being of the central countries are only possible as a consequence of an absolutely lopsided use of the resources and the planet's carrying capacity.

These perspectives do not fully explore the immense potentialities of the recognition of the crisis of modernity. Radically different ways of thinking about the world are possible if we assume this historical period as the crisis of the hegemonic pretensions of Western civilization. Different consequences would arise from an interpretation that recognizes that this is not the end of History,

but the end of the phantasmagorical universal history imagined by Hegel. The implications for non-Western societies and for subaltern and excluded subjects in all the world would be quite different if colonialism, imperialism, racism, and sexism were not thought of as regretful byproducts of modern Europe, but as part of the conditions which made modern Europe possible. We could assume a different perspective on the so-called crisis of the subject, if we were to conclude that the extermination of natives, transatlantic slavery and the subordination and exclusion of the "Other", were nothing more than the other face, the necessary mirror of the self, the indispensable contrasting condition for the construction of modern identities.

This is the way modern history is read today from different parts of the world in very heterogeneous ways by subaltern studies (Guha y Spivak 1988); the analysis of the colonial discourse and postcolonial theory (Spivak 1988; Williams & Chrisman 1994); and Afrocentrism (Asante 1987, 1992; Diop, 1974, 1981). These perspectives go beyond Eurocentric interpretations of the crisis of modernity. Other spaces are explored, other voices are heard, as well as other histories and subjects that had no room in the universalizing, western project. These theoretical tendencies share with postmodern theories some preoccupations and methodological emphasis, such as the critique of determinism and economism. They partake in the centrality assigned to the study of cultural and symbolic processes as well as the analysis of discourses and representations. In the same fashion, some authors considered to be founders of postmodernism —particularly Foucault— have had a significant theoretical influence on these perspectives which could be generally called postcolonial. This is the case, for example, of one of the seminal works of this approach, Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1979).

These debates create possibilities for new intellectual strategies to address the challenges posed by the crisis of modernity for Latin American critical theory. In view of the fact that, "We are at a point in our work where we can no longer ignore empires and the imperial context of our studies." (Said 1993, p. 6), it is absolutely necessary to question whether postmodern theories offer an adequate perspective from which to transgress the colonial limits of modern social thought. Some of the main issues of postcolonial perspectives have been formulated and taken anew at different times in the history of the Latin American social thought of this century, (Martí, 1987; Mariátegui, 1979; Fals Borda, 1970; Retamar, 1976). (5) There has been an extraordinary development in the last decades, associated with the revitalization of the struggles of indigenous peoples. (6) Nonetheless, paradoxically, this has been a relatively marginal concern in the academic world, outside anthropology and some areas of the humanities. Western social sciences are still assumed as "the best of universal thought", which must be applied creatively to the study of the realities of the continent. Due both to institutional and communicational difficulties, as well as to the prevailing universalist orientations (7) (intellectual

colonialism? subordinate cosmopolitanism?), today the Latin American academy hardly has any contact with the vigorous intellectual production to be found in India, some regions of Africa and academics of these regions working in Europe or the United States. The most effective bridges between these intellectual traditions is being offered today by Latin Americans who work in North American universities (Escobar 1995; Walter Mignolo 1996a and 1996b; Coronil 1996).

In Latin America, as in the rest of the world, the artistic and literary creation and cultural studies have not been tied to the biases imposed by the disciplinary molds and truth systems of the social sciences. For that reason they have been much more permeable to diversity and the possibility of non colonial views on this continent. Today they provide a particularly rich experience from which to assume the challenges of opening and unthinking the social sciences formulated by Immanuel Wallerstein (1991).

Post Script: the Gulbenkian Report

The Gulbenkian Report (Wallerstein 1996) makes a fundamental contribution to this discussion. It contextualizes both temporarily and spatially, the institutional constitution and consolidation of the disciplines of the social sciences as they are known today. Further explorations of the implications of the way in which these disciplines were established are possible.

As is pointed out in the Report, modern social sciences were developed in England, France, Italy and the United States, and were meant to deal with the social reality of those same five countries (Wallerstein 1996, p. 23). From the fact that the rest of the world was segregated to be studied by other disciplines —anthropology and Orientalism— (Wallerstein 1996, pp.23-28), it is not possible, however, to conclude that those other territories, cultures and peoples were not present as an implicit reference in all the disciplines. The separation between the studies of the Euro-North American and the Others is made on the assumption that there are essential differences between them.

The problem with Eurocentrism in the social sciences is not only that its fundamental categories were created for a particular time and place and later used in a more or less creative or rigid manner to study other realities. If this were so, it would suffice to add some local or native knowledge to overcome these limits. The problem resides in the colonial imaginary, from which Western social sciences constructed its interpretation of the world. This imaginary has permeated social sciences of the whole world, making a great part of the social knowledge of the peripheral world, equally Eurocentric. (8) In those disciplines, the experience of European societies is naturalized: its economic organization —the market— is the "natural form of organizing production. It corresponds to an individual universal psychology" (Wallerstein 1996, p. 20). Its political organization —the European State— is the "natural"

form of political existence. The different peoples of the planet are organized according to a notion of progress: on one hand the more advanced, superior, modern societies, on the other, backward, traditional, non-modern societies. In this sense, sociology, political theory and economics have not been any less colonial nor less liberal than Anthropology or "Orientalism", disciplines where these assumptions have been more readily acknowledged. This is the basis of the cognitive and institutional network of development. (9)

It is not the same to assume that the historical patrimony of the social sciences is parochial, as to conclude that it is colonial: the implications are drastically different. If our social science patrimony were merely parochial, it would be enough to expand the reach of the experiences and realities studied. We could thus complete theories and methods of knowledge which are adequate for a determined place and time, and less adequate for others. The problem is a different one when we conclude that our knowledge has a colonial character and is based upon assumptions that imply systematic processes of exclusion and subordination.

To recognize the colonial character of the hegemonic forms of knowledge in the contemporary world, would imply more difficult and complex challenges than those identified in the Gulbenkian Report. This knowledge is intertwined in complex and inseparable manners in the articulations of power of contemporary societies. Only a timid and partial dialogue with other subjects and cultures would be achieved by incorporating into the social sciences representatives of those subjects and cultures that were once excluded. This requires long learning and socializing processes in certain truth systems at the end of which, one could well expect that only internal criticisms of the discipline would be likely. Given, for example, the current demarcations of economics, there are limited possibilities for the formulation, from within that discipline, of radically different alternatives to mainstream liberal economics. Liberal cosmology (a conception of human nature, of wealth, of the relationship of man to nature, of progress) is incorporated as a fundamental metatheoretical premise in the disciplinary constitution of that field of knowledge.

The achievement of effective inter cultural, horizontal democratic communications, non colonial, and thus free of domination, subordination and exclusion requires a debate beyond the limits of the official disciplines of modern sciences, open to dialogues with other cultures and other forms of knowledge. Apart from epistemological rigidities, and the overwhelming burden of the institutional inertia, the main obstacles are political. The possibilities for democratic communications are severely limited by the profound differences of power that exist today between different cultures and between different peoples.

Notes

- (1) A preliminary, shorter version of this text has been published as: Lander, E. (1997), "Las ciencias sociales en el atolladero. América Latina en tiempos postmodernos", *Nueva Sociedad*, 150, 19-23.
- (2) The efficacy of this colonial discursive order has —obviously— not been uniform, nor has its hegemony been free from challenges. The Mexican Revolution is the paradigmatic case of the presence of other voices, subjects and perspectives in a context of a profound social convulsion.
- (3) As a positive result, from the point of view of the issues discussed in this text, it can be noted that these new institutional contexts are much more flexible than university departments and research is more likely to be oriented to problems than along disciplinary lines
- (4) According to David Slater, "...Western ethnocentrism does not terminate with the modern, and its presence in the postmodern genre requires far more critical analysis." (Slater, 1994, p. 88) In this text, Slater analyzes the Eurocentric limitations of some of the most representative postmodern authors: Foucault, Baudrillard, Rorty and Vattimo.
- (5) For a more recent contribution, see: Quijano, 1992.
- (6) The richest display of these debates is the abundant collection of books and journals covering a wide range of issues related to indigenous peoples that has been published in Quito by Abya Yala over the last few years.
- (7) That is, to assume the Western-liberal as universal.
- (8) As a matter of fact, some of the more cogent critiques of Eurocentrism in the social sciences are to be found today in the work of academics in Europe and the United States (Bernal, 1987; Stocking, 1987; Young, 1990 and 1995.)
- (9) For a substantial study of the creation of the discourse and imaginary of development in the postwar period, and its complex and efficacious international institutional framework, see: Escobar, 1995.

Bibliography

- Bernal, M. (1987), *Black Athena. The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization I. The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Coronil, F. (1996), "Beyond Occidentalism: Toward Nonimperial Geohistorical Categories", *Cultural Anthropology*, XI, 1, 51-87.

Escobar, A. (1995), *Encountering Development. The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fals Borda, O. (1970), *Ciencia propia y colonialismo intelectual*, México: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo.

Kuper, A. (1988), *The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of an Illusion*, London: Routledge.

Lander, E. (1997), *La democracia en las ciencias sociales contemporáneas*, Serie Bibliográfica FOBAL-CS N° 2, Caracas: Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Sociales, Universidad Central de Venezuela and Instituto Autónomo Biblioteca Nacional.

Mariátegui, J.C. (1979), *7 Ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana*, Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho.

Martí, J. (1985), *Nuestra América*, Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho.

Mignolo, W. (1996a), "Posoccidentalismo: las epistemologías fronterizas y el dilema de los estudios (latinoamericanos) de área", *Revista Iberoamericana*, LXII, 176-177, pp.676-696.

Mignolo, W. (1996b), "Herencias coloniales y teorías postcoloniales", in B. González Stephan (ed.), *Cultura y Tercer Mundo. Cambios en el saber académico*, Caracas: Editorial Nueva Sociedad, pp.99-136.

Quijano, A. (1990), *Modernidad, identidad y utopía en América Latina*, Quito: Editorial El Conejo.

Quijano, A. (1992), "Raza, etnia y nación en Mariátegui: cuestiones abiertas", *José Carlos Mariátegui y Europa: La otra cara del descubrimiento*, Lima: Amata.

Ranjit, G. & Spivak, G.C. (1988), *Selected Subaltern Studies*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Retamar, R.F. (1976), "Nuestra América y Occidente", *Casa de las Américas*, XVI, 98, pp.36-57.

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

Said, E. (1979), *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books.

Slater, D. (1994), "Exploring Other Zones of the Postmodern", in A. Rattansi y S. Westwood (eds), *Racism, Modernity and Identity. On the Western Front*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp.87-125.

Spivak, G.C. (1988), *In Other Worlds. Essays in Cultural Politics*, New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G.C. (1994), "Can the Subaltern Speak?", in P. Williams y L. Chrisman (eds.), *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory. A Reader*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp.66-111.

CHAPTER 6

SOCIOLOGY AND SCIENCE: TOWARDS A FRUITFUL DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE TWO CULTURES?

Hebe M.C. Vessuri
Venezuelan Institute for Scientific Research

Introduction

The century comes to a close with a much publicized controversy between those who do science and those who analyze it as a phenomenon of culture and society—"hard" scientists and social analysts—in connection with the image of scientific knowledge the latter convey. The hoax of American physicist Alan Sokal, when he published a paper purposefully written with a flavour of post modern criticism of an abstruse topic of modern physics, full of quotations from well known humanists and social analysts of science, served to call attention upon what some scientists consider a deterioration of the standards of rigour in the scientific community, charging the social analysts of science with sharing the burden of responsibility for it (Sokal 1996; Weinberg 1996, pp.11-15).

Would it be the case that the gap in understanding between scientists and other intellectuals continues to be as large as when C.P. Snow wrote his book three decades ago? Today there is talk about "science wars" and difficult "science peace processes" in this highly disturbed domain, specially due to the visibility the debate receives from its wide coverage through the most varied media, including some which have the widest circulation.

Why this disturbance? The criticism of science has been as old as science itself, so one would expect a more sober attitude towards it, in order to appreciate its meaning for the future of science. As Ravetz pointed out twenty years ago, all, both critics and science practitioners

"know that science is intimately linked to society, that science cannot be perfect in an imperfect society, and yet the future of science cannot simply be reduced to that of society." (Ravetz 1977, pp.71-89).

In reviewing the back and forth movements of this deaf dialogue between scientists and social analysts of science, however, what is found in the arguments of the parties to the debate is more noise than stones the river carries. It is even possible to envisage the possibility to build bridges across. This opportunity of a frank dialogue with scientists opened by Sokal's hoax is

invaluable for the practitioners in the sociology and history of scientific knowledge. We must not forget that different from other criticisms in the past, sociology and history of scientific knowledge are fundamentally in agreement with the statement by scientists that "science is still the best game in town when it comes to producing knowledge" (Begley 1997, p.55). In their studies these analysts precisely do try to *extend* the scientific method (Edge 1997).

Nevertheless, it is also true that so far this activity has been largely restricted to the bounds of the social sciences. In order to establish a dialogue with our colleagues in the sociological and humanities camps, verbal imagery and expressions common in those fields developed, that when today they reach the ears of scientists make them sound alarm signals. It is likely that in the future the words of the sociological discourse about science will have to be more restrained, on behalf of other audiences. This would not necessarily mean to resign to the discipline's specificity nor to the sociological "gaze". In any event, it would be something analogous to what an important laboratory in one of the most intimidating enclaves of particle physics, the Fermilab, has decided to do: to distribute in the world wide web a version in "plain English" of all the technical articles that it publishes. This apparently revolutionary experiment aims at bringing particle physics to a wider audience and to facilitate the task of scientists who try to be up to date in special fields different from their own (Science 1997, vol. 276, p.199).

What stands out more meaningfully from reading the ongoing intense exchanges in the most prestigious journals of scientific communication (for example but not exclusively Science and Nature), is that there begins to be an increasing interest by scientists to read the case studies produced by sociologists and historians of science. And that recognition is made by scientists of the rigour and detailed scholarship of the socio-historical analyses; scientists even admit a high degree of technical understanding of the scientific matters that make up the subject of some of the best studies.(1) There are, however, unrelenting issues of profound disagreement in connection with the assumptions and conclusions of the social analyses of scientific knowledge.

Science and its Critics in Different Times and Places

Ever since the Scientific Revolution in the 17th century, scientists have faced a perturbing question: do the fruits of their labour provide them with privileged access to 'reality'? (*Nature*, vol. 385, p.373). Initially it was science that with its methodical forms of exploring the natural world threatened the certainties of the Church and of those who held religious beliefs. Since then, the power of science grew, achieving for a long time the unquestioned hegemony of academic and epistemological respectability. Even philosophy kept a prudential distance from science until well into this century. And when sociologists began to be interested in it, they generally exercised self-

ensorship, inhibiting themselves from considering the cognitive dimension of science while studying the social relationships within the scientific community and of the latter with society. It was only in recent decades that they began to make incursions into the forms and mechanisms by which the experimental observations and manipulations of scientists get stabilized acquiring the value of "objective facts". They sought to offer models of social interpretation of them, applying to the activity of scientific research the same approaches and tools of analysis used in the social study of other human manifestations.

As this approach became more popular in university institutions and reached the mass media, particularly in the United States, it coincided with a shift in preoccupations in the academic world. The changes in academic life represented one aspect of a wider shift in attitudes and orientations, a change that has extended not only across the world of learning and the arts, but into the practical realms of politics and social life also. The most varied social movements exacerbate the "isms" of any sort, among them the irrationalist ones. In these circumstances, some members of the scientific community have begun to raise their voices calling their colleagues everywhere to close ranks in defence of what they perceive as a major onslaught on "reason" and science (cf. Gross, Levitt & Lewis 1996). However, from all these complex processes, it might turn out, as at other times in the past, that

"the current shift in our attitudes toward rationality need involve no rejection of "rational" inquiry or action in practice; rather, it [may need to involve] a reanalysis of the nature and content of "rationality" on the theoretical plane." (Toulmin 1977 p.156)

What is at stake? Current society does no longer accept a social contract with science such as the one that prevailed since the 19th century, by which the State funded scientists and their works and the latter reciprocated by contributing to the national cultural prestige and increasingly by grating economic and political power through the feats of science-based technology. Gradual changes gave rise to a qualitative transformation and thus today's scientific-technical-industrial apparatus bears little resemblance to the academic science of the end of the 19th century. Throughout this century, university management, government and society became eroded in most countries. Many experts agree that in this context three interrelated trends can be identified: the "scientification" of society, that is to say, the increasing use of innovations unleashed or directly produced by research; the massification of higher education, that is, the growth of the proportion of persons of the respective age group that enter institutions of higher education; and finally, the increasing public expenditure in higher education and research, that increases the pressure to legitimate the costs of science, in terms of control of its use and of evaluation of its benefits.

Sociological, historical, anthropological and philosophical analyses, with different emphasis and perspectives, try to penetrate the "sacred" spaces of

science, for long out of sight from the public. But what these students try to do with science not always nor necessarily agrees with what scientists think they should do (apart from the fact that the outcomes of their labours are not primarily directed to scientists). The results of these analyses do not always agree with the traditional collective self-image of scientists and in some manifestations are considered by them to be unacceptable. It is quite natural that this mistrustful and unsympathetic attitude to the interpretations other groups make of their activities is related to the fact that science is today the source of economic growth and competitiveness of industrialized nations. Thus, anything that may be perceived as eventually developing into a threat of the public support it rouses must be summarily dismissed. This has been a frequent line of argument among social analysts involved in the controversy with natural scientists.(2)

The Power of Images

What kinds of images of the scientific enterprise different from their own support myth of the naive realism of science, expressed in notions such as "the search of objective truth that pushes scientists forward", can be accepted by them? Admitting the deficiencies of the myth of objectivity, scientists (for example, Mermin 1996) adduces that sociology and history of science have created another myth according to which all that scientists do is to exercise their exceptional abilities to reach consensus by which they agree that the "truth of the matter" in connection with particular cases has been established. Given these polarized perceptions, it would seem that the relevant question to explore is whether it is possible to reach a satisfactory equilibrium between these two viewpoints with regard to the scientific phenomenon.

A scientist like Mermin, critical of the social studies of science but open to reading some of its literature, considers that even recognizing that within the sociological production there are fascinating first quality stories about episodes of the history of science, they "cannot cover all the parallel activities with the same degree of scholarly detail". The problem, according to Mermin, is that the case study traces a string in a huge tapestry of facts and analysis. Social analysts observe that the string is very thin in some places. They can often demonstrate that the contribution to the general picture of a particular string has been very exaggerated. But, says Mermin, sociologists of scientific knowledge pay little attention to everything else that makes the tapestry what it is. Mermin's reproach to the social analysts of science is that in his view they ignore the fact that a huge multiplicity of strings of evidence, although many may be weak and ambiguous, can make a coherent logical link whose strength is enormous. When sociologists get near this logical link, the resulting consensus is not, however, attributed to reason, as scientists do, but rather to the internal politics of the groups involved. Thus, argues Mermin, the case

studies produced by sociologists and historians of science end up with an incomplete story of how science acquires knowledge about the world, because they concentrate exclusively on individual strings, producing only one possible picture of "what science is" but disregarding the crucial role played by the intricate structure of the tapestry resulting from the interweaving of the strings. The existence of many different strings of evidence can transform a hypothesis in a fact, even in the absence of any impeccable crucial experiment.

It is ironic that the social analysts of scientific knowledge are accused of not taking into account different strings of evidence, when it has been precisely them who have from the very beginning called attention to the need of taking into account different narratives of the same phenomenon or event, different versions according to who the narrator is. Even the notion of tapestry, of weft, with heterogeneous strings, for interpreting the dynamic of scientific knowledge at a given time, is an image that social scientists have long used to demonstrate the multiplicity of components, some of them discrepant with the dominant theories but which nevertheless contribute to the final result (Fleck 1935; Barnes 1974; Callon & Latour 1986, for technological innovations). At least in intention, if not fully fulfilled in practice, it must be granted that sociologists of science have been attentive to a variety of pieces of evidence and have rejected the lineal accounts in the explanation of successful results typical of the naive myth of science characteristic of textbooks.

Another example of discrepancy of appreciation between the two groups, curiously analogous to the previous one, is the objection raised by other physicists, Gottfried and Wilson (1997a, 1997b), against Pickering's conclusion (1984) in his study about particle physics, that "objective merit" was not what "induced to move the majority of physicists". They quote Pickering in p. 411 of his book: "... the world of old physics was conceptually and socially fragmented. The traditions organized around different problems generated little support for one another ... With the advent of the new physics, the conceptual unification of forces was accompanied by a social unification of practice. The quark-gauge theory world view was at the heart of a community-wide symbiosis of experiment and theory". In their essay, both scientists agree to an edited version of the historian's statement. In "their" version, they say: old physics was fragmented because there were few theoretical connections between its various models and recipes, whereas the new one was a powerful theory that provided a unified theory and unambiguous predictions, some of which were quickly confirmed. According to them, Pickering wants his statement to be read as saying that the unification was mainly a social phenomenon, "a community search of a congenial world: a world where practice could be socially organized", and it is this pretension, which they attribute to Pickering, the one that in their view underlines Pickering's final verdict against the objectivity of modern science.

Pickering's reply (1997 p.543) is that nothing in the abundant evidence he collected, convinces him that it was the "objective merit" (as defined by Gottfried and Wilson in the quoted text) what induced the majority of physicists to move from one domain of knowledge and practice to the other. On the contrary, the same evidence persuaded him that such changes could be easily understood in terms of what he called "the dynamic of practice", relating research trajectories to the prior expertise of the physicists involved, symbiotic circuits of experimental and theoretical practice, and so on.

Maybe what all this is about, after all, is understanding that both types of study are concerned with illuminating different aspects of the processes involved. Sociology and history of science do not compete with natural science for the establishment or evaluation of scientific results. Rather, the former busy themselves with what caused changes of vision and perspective before the new beliefs or certainties were definitely established, in order to propose ways of interpretations that may eventually serve as models to understand what happens in contemporary controversies. This implies accepting a "symmetric" treatment of the processes through which knowledge develops, without prejudging their empirical study with the current assessments of truth and falsity. Scientists get irritated at the emphasis of social scientists upon the *subjective influences in the initial phases* of a scientific revolution, while for them the important topic of analysis ought to be "the *objective reality of the end result*" (cf. Ellis 1997, p.13).

The Knots of Discord

Among the topics that demand a greater effort of inter-cultural "translation" are those referred to notions such as truth and falsity, certainty and error. For the scientists it is irritating and incomprehensible that sociologists do not take into account these notions as the fundamental axis in their analyses of science. According to the scientists' understanding, facts are irrelevant for the sociologists and historians who study of scientific practice. A scientist who is prepared to talk with social analysts, is ready to admit that the construction of facts is a subtle mix of the social and the objective, but he argues that sociologists cannot produce a comprehensive picture if they ignore the second dimension, in the same way as scientists would not be able to understand the character of their profession if they ignored completely the social dimension (Mermin 1996).

In his 1976 book, Bloor said that scientists accept a "sociological explanation of error", but consider inadmissible to think of a "sociological explanation of true knowledge". For most scientists it is unthinkable to accept that there may be social influences on the production of that knowledge.(3) Nevertheless, sociologists of science have already accumulated an extensive list of case studies where the "social and cultural influence" upon the content

of science is demonstrated. From the point of view of the sociology and history of science it is an error and a distortion of reality to make the public image of science rest upon the belief that once the social and political values are eliminated and when all prejudices have been neutralized, then scientific truth can be reached, thus becoming "objective". Supporters of the socio-historical approach argue that what science can honestly offer is constant argumentation about specific claims to knowledge, on the basis of the best independent evidence available. Beyond this, "certainty" about any kind of "truth" and "objectivity" is unreachable -and the honest action would be to admit it.

Many scientists accept a good deal of what social analyses say (including much of what constructivists maintain) about the importance of social processes in science, that go from the influence of fashionable ideas about the design of experiments to the negotiations that take place through the peer review process. The intellectual world of scientists is not a clinical and dispassionate vacuum, but it is full of personal and interpersonal feelings. This aspect of research may often have little impact about what eventually comes to be accepted as scientific truth.

But, as pointed out by Nature, one of the most prestigious communications channels of the international scientific community, those scientists who continually urge journalists to write about the human face of science, recognize implicitly that these social aspects of science continue to be an essential ingredient of scientific progress (*Nature*, 1997, p.373).

The predictive power of science, which natural scientists present as the strongest evidence that they have an objective hold over reality is in their view, together with truth and objectivity, largely debased by social analysts. But perhaps the greatest discrepancy between the two groups, we insist on this point, lies precisely in the stages that are deemed significant or crucial by each group. For scientists, the important thing is the "final" result, when "objective reality" is consolidated. On the contrary, for social analysts, the interesting question to study in connection with the scientific process is what caused the changes before the new belief, form of understanding or "[new] objective reality" becomes successfully established.

Another area of disagreement has to do with the relativist argument. There is a range of opinion about the *status* of scientific knowledge among scientists, as there is a range of opinion about relativism among the social students of science. In the social sciences there have been heated debates and questioning about different versions of relativism. The relativism called into question today by scientists has also been intensely debated by the social scientists, who have moved beyond the moment in which the reductionist social constructivist approach was common among them (which postulates that truth is nothing but discourse, power and interests). It is not the one that causes received ideas to be doubted or historical relativism, with its critical function that has been very healthy in historical analysis, but the one that

professes that everything is on the same level, for example, physics and shamanism (Salomon 1997). As a result of repeatedly treating symmetrically the different forms and sources of rationality, scientific knowledge ends up being portrayed as a narrative (or the technology of a text) among others, ultimately mystifying.(4)

But Still Those Social Scientists Have Something Worth Listening To?...

Let us come down to earth again, urges J.J. Salomon (1997): social studies of science have contributed to put into perspective the scientific institution, its boundaries and derivations; they have shown how research activities and their protagonists depend on the social and political context, on different modes of organization and funding, and on the strategies of individuals, teams and institutions. They have also contributed to curb the arrogance and positivism of some scientists and the ideology of "pure" science, that could serve as an alibi and good conscience to the scientific-military-industrial complex.

It is true that among the social studies of science are to be found works keen in showing that the construction of knowledge is the exclusive product of gender, race and/or religion, as argued by Salomon. But it does not seem to me to be fair to characterize all the social approach in these terms. I suspect that if we view the nineties against the whole historical background of the relationships of science and culture in society, the changes we are all living through in the academy may be analyzed as "one more swing of a familiar pendulum, by which thought and art have moved, every sixty or hundred and twenty years, between formal and functional, classic and romantic, timeless and temporal, Platonist and Aristotelian extremes" (Toulmin 1977, p.160).

But it is also true that in recent decades, as a consequence of the transformation of the scientific endeavour in its growing commitments with economic growth, science entered the "domain of the temporal, the contingent, the negotiated. The Pandora's box of epistemological and social privilege that scientists enjoyed before Kuhn's time has been open" (Rosenberg, quoted by Gregory 1997). This does not mean that the human circumstances of a scientific discovery are considered now more important than the discovery itself, it is not a question of having to choose between them as if they were exclusive factors. The novelty lies in the fact that science can no longer be captured by a simple or even homogeneous set of categories; no single individual, be it a scientist, sociologist or historian, can pretend to be the true spokesman for science or its history. It is necessary to learn to accept and respect different interpretations, subjecting them to a healthy practice of criticism.

Besides, beyond disagreements on certain basic issues, there are broad areas of activity in which the social approach has an important contribution to make to the scrutiny of scientific research. There is a growing demand for data

about what is known and about the gaps and uncertainties in the empirical baseline of the public Research & Development system, with an interesting role for social analysis in policy-making. Precisely the availability of the kind of data that social analysts provide may come to expose scientists as partisans who favour their subjective experiences in the research trenches against the trends of national data. Sociologists and historians of science, together with science journalists and science 'popularizers' are criticized by researchers who nonetheless continue to lament an elusive 'public understanding' of science. Social analysts of science, to the extent that they are prepared to persevere in their work of analysis and "cultural translation", integrating new discourses and perfecting a "communicational" language, they may contribute to reculture science and technology.

Given the social, demographic, ethnic and intellectual heterogeneity of the international scientific community, it is necessary that this phenomenon of the contemporary world be better understood and assumed as such to take advantage of it and not to ignore or suppress parts of it. It is important to stimulate the growth of social observation and analysis of science. Sociologists provide plausible translations of those endeavours. They have a disciplined capacity to see science in society and can relate its interactions to social and economic progress. Science viewed as a body of expertise is strong enough to be able to manage itself without myths, self-deceptions and unduly defensive attitudes (Chubin 1996). In such frame of mind, science can face up to the public scrutiny and join the debates about its history and sociology without fear and proud of its achievements and promise.

Improving the Social Understanding of Science

Those who have been developing the social understanding of science are acquiring an increasingly visible role as mediators in the relationships between science and society and on occasions come to play significant roles in debates about the social perception of the risks related to science. In a similar way, the results of their work have become an integral part of the intellectual *pool* to which those who seek to quiet down the public's fears resort for advice and guide about the new science-related risks. One of the ironies of the present debate is that the explicit aim of the sociologists and historians of scientific knowledge is in principle endorsed by many of their critics from science: the increase of the social understanding of science. "It is in nobody's long-term interests that such understanding be uncritical: propagating an idealistic or mythologized image of science, as scientists have often done, is in many ways as dangerous as the relativistic image that some (but only some) constructivists seek to impose" (*Nature* 1997, January 30, p.373).

This is therefore a welcome debate. What is at stake for both sides is much. On the one hand, some scientists believe they are fighting to defend the

intellectual and social credibility menaced by the rising irrationalisms (of which at this time the social sciences are accused of being one of its spearheads), of an enterprise that remains crucial for the well being of mankind. They should understand that sociology and history of scientific knowledge do not attempt to compete with natural science in the establishment of scientific facts. On the other hand, many social analysts of science argue forcefully that only a deep understanding of science as a social (and not only intellectual) process will allow us to strengthen the bridge between the worlds of science and politics, which is essential to maintain the social support for science.

Where the social perceptions of science are undermined by poor research and worse interpretation, let the battle continue. But maybe scientists who reflect upon the broader significance of their activity perceive that they are to benefit from the genuine understandings that many social studies of science offer them.

Notes

(1) See for example, Mermin's argument in *Physics Today*, with reference to the book by Collins and Pinch; and Gottfried & Wilson, *Nature*, vol. 386, pp.545-547 when they review Pickering (1984).

(2) For example, Creager (1996).

(3) A recent manifestation are the arguments by Sokal, Weinberg, Bricmont, Gottfried & Wilson, among others, in the ongoing controversy.

(4) Thus, Belgian physicist Bricmont writes shocked that for a good segment of North American *intelligentsia*, science has become a discourse or "narration" among others, which does not give us a more objective worldview than other "myths" (Bricmont, 1997).

Bibliography

- Barnes, B. (1974), *Scientific knowledge and sociological theory*, London: Routledge.
- Barnes, B.; Bloor, D. & Henry, J. (1996), *Scientific knowledge. A Sociological Analysis*, London: Athlone.
- Begley, S. (1997), "The science wars", *Newsweek*, April 21.
- Bloor, D. (1976), *Knowledge and social imagery*, London: Routledge.
- Bricmont, J. (1997), "La vraie signification de l'affaire Sokal", *Le Monde*, January 14th.

- Callon, M. & Latour B. (1986), "Les paradoxes de la modernité", *Prospective et santé*, 36, pp.13-25.
- Chubin, D. E. (1996), "Reculturing science: politics, policy, and promises to keep", *Science and Public Policy*, February, pp.2-12.
- Collins, H. & Pinch, T.I. (1993), *The Golem: what everyone should know about science*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.
- Collins, H. & Pinch, T.I. (1996), "Letter", *Physics Today*, July, pp.11-13.
- Collins, H. & Pinch, T.I. (1997), "Letter", *Physics Today*, January, pp.92-94.
- Collins, H. & Pinch, T.I. (1997), "Letter", *Nature*, vol. 387, June 5, pp.543-544.
- Creager, A. (1996), "Cultivating common ground between laboratory and library in an age of 'culture wars'", Paper presented at the plenary session of the History of Science Society annual meeting, Nov.7, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Dickson, D. (1997), "The 'Sokal affair' takes a transatlantic turn", *Nature*, vol. 385, January 30th, 381.
- Edge, D. (1997), "Letter to Keith Ashman", April 21st.
- Ellis, J. (1997), "Letter", *Nature*, vol. 388, July 3rd, 13.
- Fleck, L. (1979), *The genesis and development of a scientific fact*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (English translation from the German original, 1935).
- Gooding, D.; Pinch, T.I. & Schaffer, S. (eds.) (1989), *The uses of experiment. Studies in the natural sciences*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottfried, K. & Wilson, K.G. (1997a), *Nature*, 386, pp.545-547.
- Gottfried, K. & Wilson, K.G. (1997b), *Nature*, 387, pp.545-546.
- Gregory, F. (1997), "The Poverty of Science Wars", *Newsletter of the History of Science Society*, XXVI, 1.
- Gross, P.R.; Levitt, N. & Lewis, M.W. (eds.) (1996), "The flight from science and reason", *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 775.
- Mermin, N.D. (1996), "The Golemization of Relativity", *Physics Today*, April, 11-13
- Mermin, N.D. (1996), "What's wrong with this sustaining myth?", *Physics Today*, March, 11-13.
- Mermin, N.D. (1996), "Letter", *Physics Today*, July, pp.13-15.

- Mermin, N.D. (1997), "Letter", *Physics Today*, January, pp.94-96.
- Nature (1997), "Science wars and the need for respect and rigour", January 30th, 385, 373.
- Pickering, A. (1984), *Constructing quarks: a sociological history of Particle Physics*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pickering, A. (1995), *The mangle of practice. Time, agency & science*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pickering, A. (1997), *Nature*, 387, 343.
- Ravetz, J.K. (1977), "Criticisms of science", in I. Spiegel-Rösing & D. De Solla Price (eds.), *Science, Technology and Society*, Thousand Oaks (California): Sage, pp.71-89.
- Salomon, J.J. (1997), "L'éclat de rire de Sokal", *Le Monde*, January 31st.
- Snow, C.P. (1949), *The Two Cultures and a Second Look. An Expanded Version of the Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.
- Sokal, A. (1996), "Transgressing the Boundaries. Towards a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity", *Social Text*, 46/47, XIV, 1-2, pp.218-252.
- Sokal, A. (1997), "Pourquoi j'ai écrit ma parodie", *Le Monde*, January 31st.
- Toulmin, S. (1977), "From form to function: philosophy and history of science in the 1950s and now", *Daedalus*, 143-162.
- Weinberg, S. (1996), "Sokal's hoax", *The New York Review of Books*, August 8, 11-15.

CHAPTER 7

SOME DILEMMAS AND CHALLENGES FOR SOCIAL SCIENCES IN BRAZIL

Paulo César Alves (1)
Federal University of Bahia, Brazil

Introduction

Theoreticians and researchers in the social sciences are continuously faced by new challenges and dilemmas. In the end, the eternal youth of these sciences, as Weber suggests, lends them a provisional and contextualized character peculiar to human nature. In this continuous process of construction and superation, a significant array of theoretical and methodological questions can be identified, one of which has recently received significant attention on the part of Brazilian social scientists. It has to do with the logical and structural assumptions of these sciences. The present article will seek to clarify some aspects of metatheoretical concepts that have traditionally predominated in Brazilian academic social analyses. A history of Brazilian social theory will not be attempted here, rather, I will characterize, briefly, some of the principal epistemological categories that have guided Brazilian researchers in their understanding of socio-cultural phenomena.

It is first necessary to loosely define the meaning of the term metatheoretical. Metatheory (theory about theory), can be understood as the language of presuppositions - closely associated with the philosophy of social science - through which a research or theoretical orientation is legitimated and grounded. It "provides us with the means to make sense of a wide range of seemingly disparate theoretical developments." (Ritzer 1990a, p.347). Ritzer further observes:

"We can differentiate between three broad types of metatheorizing: metatheorizing as a prelude to the development of sociological theory (...); metatheorizing in order to achieve a deeper understanding of sociological theory (...); and metatheorizing in order to create an overarching theoretical perspective." (Ritzer 1990, p.18)

Although all three of these distinct types of metatheory are pertinent to the present article, the primary focus here will be the second type, i.e., metatheoretical analysis that involves a deeper understanding of sociological or anthropological theory. In this mode of analysis it is possible to establish two parameters of investigation: a) those concerning intellectual or cognitive

questions *internal* to a theory or group of theories, with the principal object being the identification of its logical and structural assumptions (what is called the analytical perspective); and b) those related to questions *external* to a theory, i.e., institutional or socio-historical contexts, through which the predominance/transformation of dominant interpretive models is explained. Given the limitations of the present article, the primary focus here will be the former. In addition, a brief description of the social context of Brazilian social theory will be valuable in understanding how certain interpretive paradigms rose to hegemonic status.

In Brazil, the predominance of interpretive paradigms of social reality can be roughly divided into "phases." Until the beginning of the nineteenth century such paradigms were almost completely monopolized by clergy (Catholic Church). After political independence in 1822, however, considerable changes occurred. Factors such as incipient industrialization and urbanization generated a climate of relative political (and religious) "liberty" favorable to the development of a complex institutional infrastructure responsible for the flowering of social scientific knowledge at the turn of the century. This knowledge was, in turn, crystallized by the academic world. Three coexisting elements, among others, led the State, in alliance with the national intelligentsia, to invest in developing a system of higher education: elite bureaucrats acquired greater financial and institutional resources; the demand for cultural goods increased; and greater access to the market of intellectual work. The city of Rio de Janeiro, later to be joined by São Paulo, became the major pole of attraction for the provincial intelligentsia. In the twentieth century, São Paulo was principally responsible for the "modernization" of the institutions of education (for more detailed discussions on this topic, see Pecaut 1990; Miceli 1979; Fernandes 1977).

The crystallization of the university project in the 30s, 40s, and 50s included the participation of renowned foreign scientists. Roger Bastide, Radcliffe-Brown, Lévi-Strauss, Jacques Lambert, Charles Wagley, and Donald Pierson, among others, were instrumental in developing the fledgling academic institutions that would later nourish the development of new generations of professionals in the social sciences. Two institutions during this period distinguished themselves on the national scene, the Escola Livre de Sociologia e Política (founded in 1933) and the Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências, e Letras (1934) of the University of São Paulo. The former adopted a pedagogical approach inspired by North American models, while the second had strong European influences. These two "schools" contributed substantially toward the formation of a national way of thinking, an organizational matrix that would mark the character of social science institutions in Brazil.

The university project, born of a marriage of government politics, the Brazilian intellectual elite, and foreign researchers was extremely significant in the development of the social sciences in Brazil. The university project not

only consolidated these sciences, it became primarily responsible for the process of disciplinarization and professionalization of knowledge of the social. While supported by the State as well as by the intelligentsia, the university has determined a specialized concentration in the multiple domains of the social sciences, to the extent that it defines and limits the norms and values of scientific practice. Thus, the university project (as well as research centers) has driven and legitimized the principal interpretative models of social reality. Since in many ways this situation persists to the present, it is possible to say that the path taken by the social sciences in Brazil in the near future, for better or for worse, will depend greatly on the form by which the University (and the Research Centers) will organize and structure this scientific endeavour.

The Theoretical-Methodological Tradition of the Social Sciences in Brazil

This disciplinarization and professionalization of the social sciences by the university project, which gave birth to and legitimized certain paradigms for analyzing social knowledge will form our starting point for examining the intellectual and cognitive aspects of contemporary social theory in Brazil. In the 1990s, however, a number of theoretical and methodological reformulations have been registered, sparking a complex re-evaluation of the previously dominant perspective. An analysis of these changes will form the second part of our discussion.

Our first point of discussion, then, will consider *the* meaning of the analytic perspective. An analytic perspective will be considered to be one that identifies the basis and metatheoretical assumptions implicit in a theory or group of theories; that is, a sort of matrix of knowledge which, although not taking the form of explicit rules and not being verified in the light of empirical evidence, nonetheless conditions or orients a certain body of theory in its totality through suggesting a definite set of problems (and solutions) regarding both the nature of social reality and the way that we understand this reality. According to Morrow, a perspective or metatheory

"is not concerned with explaining social reality in the manner of a substantive theory explaining specific social phenomena; rather it is a form of rational inquiry or argumentation concerned with the theory of theory or theory about theory (...) Metatheory is also just another way for social scientists to talk about the philosophical and methodological assumptions of their work or issues considered in the philosophy of the social sciences" (Morrow 1994, p. 46-47)

One perspective, however, is constituted in an "ideal type" of knowledge that emphasizes certain aspects of the social reality, fertilizing a group of ideas and speculations that serve as guides for distinct theoretical and methodological approaches.

In the history of social theory distinct analytical perspectives can be identified. In relation to the concepts of subject/object, individual/society, two perspectives stand out: one includes theories that can be identified as structural or holistic; the other, those known as comprehensive. American culturalism, functionalism, structuralism, and structural Marxism, while presenting significant theoretical and methodological differences, are examples of the structural perspective; while ethnomethodology, conversational analysis, and symbolic interactionism (in part) are rooted in a comprehensive perspective. In Brazil, the structural perspective has traditionally been the dominant one; thus the present discussion will focus on this way of understanding socio-cultural phenomena.

The structural perspective assumes that the nature of social reality is objective; that is, it is composed of structures of ideas, values, models, or material realities, which underlie social relations. Such structures are not direct attributes of individuals; they lie beyond individual consciousness and establish social frames that constrain the possibilities of social actors. While not accessible to direct or empirical observation, these structures can be "revealed" or "decoded" by scientific concepts, to which is attributed the ability to "penetrate" the reality underlying the concrete events of social life. The idea of structure, in this perspective, is collective, anonymous, abstract, systematic, autonomous, and determinant of social reality. Configured like a system, this idea of structure presupposes a finite set of discrete entities, intrinsically related among themselves, which in turn make up the whole. No entity has independent meaning in itself; each element defines itself with respect to another, either by opposition or by internal relations with other components of the same system. In this view, the world is made up of relationships, differences between its component parts. This paradigm has direct implications for the scientific investigations using it as a theoretical base. The social scientist's principal task becomes to explain, in an almost algebraic way, the "combinatory processes" implicit in a given structure. Consequently, being related to the syntactic invariant latent in manifest meanings, this perspective is not strictly concerned with the semantic universe as the comprehensive perspective would have it (Bruyne et al. 1977, p. 189).

The theories included in this perspective depart from rationalist assumptions as well as empiricist ones. Although they have a common root in the rationalist tradition, there is a distrust of empirical facts that are the immediate results of sensory experience; the empiricist, on the other hand, is suspicious of abstract operations and self-sufficient reason. Such assumptions, however, do not really constitute a contradiction. There are shared principles, such as a common belief in reason—a universal human faculty—as a medium capable of explaining the laws that govern human nature, thus admitting the existence of regulatory principles that explain reality.

The premises of the type of social research that developed in Brazil drew heavily from the structuralist perspective exerted a powerful influence over practitioners in the field. Up until the end of the 1980s few Brazilian social scientists escaped its influence. A quick overview of this tradition reveals that the first social science investigations that emerged were clearly marked by a tendency toward historiographic interpretation. Significant examples include the work of Tavares Bastos, Euclides da Cunha, Nina Rodrigues, Alberto Torres, Oliveira Viana, and Gilberto Freyre. It was not until the end of the 1940s that functionalism began to predominate, a theory that would prove fundamental not only in establishing theoretical principles for interpreting socio-cultural phenomena but also in defining methodological bases of scientific practice. Under the aegis of functionalism, the anthropology that developed in Brazil first incorporated, in different forms, American culturalism as well as the British school of anthropology, in realizing the so-called "studies of communities", represented by the work of Emilio Willems (Cunha: *Tradição e Transição em uma Cultura Rural do Brasil*, 1948), Donald Pierson (Cruz das Almas: *A Brazilian Village*, 1951), Azis Simão and Frank Goldman (Itanhaém: *Estudos sobre o Desenvolvimento Econômico e Social de uma Comunidade Litorânea*, 1958) Alfonso Trujillo Ferrari (Potengi: *Encruzilhada no Vale de São Francisco*, 1960). While subject to severe criticism, functionalism would later continue to influence the empirical-methodological concepts in the fieldwork of Brazilian scientists who subscribed to other theoretical frames of reference.

The decline of functionalism was largely the result of a growing adherence to Marxism and structuralism. The Marxist current became hegemonic in the social sciences in the late 1960s; its influence, however, was stronger in sociological studies than in anthropological ones. In empirically based studies inspired by Marxist historical-structural paradigms, there was a somewhat problematic marriage between the new guiding theory and the methodological formation that came from functionalism. In the case of anthropology, the Marxist penetration produced more of a conflict, due to the absence of symbolic concepts in Marxism, which leans more toward macro-structural problems of social phenomena, principally of capitalist societies (Durham 1986). In anthropology, structuralist paradigms, primarily represented by the thinking of Lévi-Strauss and Louis Dumont, were more influential. But in addition, structuralism, with its formal methodological rigor, faced difficulties in reconciling itself with the functionalist traditions of fieldwork.

The structural tradition, as can be seen, was marked by a strong influence of ideas that originated outside of Brazil. The importation of these ideas reveals, to some degree, the participation of Brazilian scientists in a tradition transcending local culture. But it is important to note the meaning and nature of this type of importation for "peripheral" countries such as Brazil. In the end, as Schwartzman says, "The identity problem is the central feature of the intellectual life in the periphery" (Schwartzman 1985, p. 13).

The absorption of foreign ideas is not simply "imitation". It presupposes that the consumers of cultural products will choose an imported idea over a domestic one. As Ortiz observes,

"A foreign theory is first accepted to the extent that it possesses something in common with other theories already in use" (Ortiz 1985, p. 32)

That theories are not passively consumed is something easily discerned in the history of Brazilian social thought. The sociological and historical studies of the intellectuals of ISEB are paradigmatic examples. These studies, conducted in the late 1950s, had a strong influence on the "social sciences done in Brazil". While preoccupied with questions of "cultural transplantation" "alienation" and "cultural authenticity", these intellectuals nonetheless assimilated Marxism, though this importation was selected and "transformed" in order to serve a nationalist and "*developmentalist*" project. Thus, as Peirano suggests,

"(...) we have our feet planted in our own country; it is here that our identity develops in the day-to-day of political and civic definitions, among patterns of thought that we import as well as among *fashions*. And, in the end, we become 'exiles in our own land'(...)." (Peirano 1995, p.26)

Current Trends

The 'frictions' inherent in the process of importing ideas can generate a disconcerting hybridity. But it would be misleading to say that this has been the tonic of our history. In the process of reconciling different theories, Brazilian social scientists have constructed new syntheses of cultural products. It is, however, important to observe that to a large extent these syntheses traditionally remained limited to the theoretical level of analysis, not in themselves constituting true metatheoretical syntheses. That is, the different conceptual formulations or discursive processes were fundamentally the result of fusions or adaptations that occurred among theories situated within a same perspective of analysis and not among different metatheoretical assumptions.

While it might be possible to point to some Brazilian researchers who have overcome this dominant model of syntactic constructions, this situation only began to develop in a substantial way in the present decade. In recent years a greater space for an array of new (or revitalized) theoretical and methodological approaches and new proposals for synthesis has been legitimized and has taken shape, thus giving rise to a growing metatheoretical examination of dominant interpretive principles in our reality. One significant result of this process is that there is a strong tendency for no single theory or model of synthesis to achieve hegemonic status. It is possible, however, to observe in Brazil strong evidence of rupture, to different degrees, with formerly reified theoretical labels, repudiating dogmatism, of returning to certain

classics of the social sciences which, with rare exceptions, were traditionally relegated to an inferior status.

Taking into due consideration the process and nature of the importation of ideas among Brazilian scientists, a reassessment and realignment of the paths that the social sciences have taken, principally in the Anglo-saxon world can be observed within the Brazilian context. In these countries, the criticisms and discussions generated in the 1960s with regard to the "crisis" experienced by functionalism did not result in a mere substitution of theories. On the contrary, a tendency emerged toward the construction of new paradigmatic models of social interpretation. Since then, no single theory has assumed a hegemonic status such as that held, for example, by the Chicago School in the 20s and 30s, or by functionalism in the 1950s. This change owed itself to a large extent to the fact that the positions critical of functionalism made possible the emergence or reformulation of a group of theories relegated to secondary roles in the American academic panorama, such as Marxism, the theory of rational choice, symbolic interactionism, and phenomenologically based social concepts. Thus, at a moment of relative dismantling of functionalism,⁽²⁾ theories situated within the same structural perspective (such as Marxism), and emanating from other frames of reference provided by the inspiration and problematic of the comprehensive perspective, entered into different processes of confrontation, reformulation, and adaptation. However, the utilization of different scientific languages has engendered a new intellectual atmosphere, bringing social theoreticians to a significant attempt to supersede the dichotomy between the analytic perspectives.

In Brazil this "new intellectual atmosphere" has acquired some peculiar characteristics, only one of which will be examined here: the attempt to open a dialogue with another metatheoretical formulation (comprehensive) has departed *from the assumptions of the structural perspective*. In attempting a brief analysis of this attempt, it is necessary to observe in the first place that by dealing with processes of integration originating from the structural pole, there is a strong tendency to emphasize a certain domain of analysis instead of giving equal weight to the two constructions. In the context of the Brazilian reality, this process has assumed an essential significance: through points of view emanating from the structural perspective, attempts to establish links among different notions about the nature of sociocultural phenomena become possible. Second, the existence of a plurality of dialogues can be noted. There are great differences among Brazilian scientists not only in terms of defining the principal metatheoretical premises that exist in the social sciences but also in conceiving of and appropriating ideas from the theories situated within the comprehensive perspective. Specifically, in a world traditionally dominated by structural analysis, there is always the potential risk that the assumptions of another perspective may be hastily (mis)defined. As there is no consensus in these definitions, certain imprecisions exist in attempting to characterize the

comprehensive perspective as dealt with, in essential terms, with intersubjective phenomena. Thus, the dialogue or attempts at integration at the metatheoretical level depends, to a large degree, on who and what are defined as essential elements of analysis.

Some basic questions, however, are present in different modalities of metatheoretical articulation. Consisting of metatheoretical dialogues—and not simple somatórios or conceptual eclecticism—any process of fusion of theoretical assumptions will need to offer plausible and pertinent answers to questions raised by the different analytical perspectives. The answers to these questions constitute real challenges. In a country with a long tradition of structural analysis, as observed above, it becomes necessary to be able to respond to the questions raised by the comprehensive perspective. Due to a lack of space in the present article, only two of these overarching questions will be addressed.

In the first place there is the question of the "decentering of the subject," to use an expression usually employed by Lacan. The structural perspective embraces an epistemological position which, not having duly distinguished the specificity of the social object, treats it as though it were essentially a physical object, confusing the explanation presented in the analysis of external causes with the very nature of the phenomenon. It does have to do with a "naturalist" position, to use Husserl's term.⁽³⁾ In this concept, the structural perspective, while not necessarily eliminating the individual, places him in a position that is secondary, if not ambiguous. The social actor is seen, before anything else, as a meeting point for social or collective forces that are projected by the "dominant class", by the "culture", and by the "collective unconscious". The subject becomes one thing among many that exist in the world, and since things are conceived of as having objective characteristics, this perspective ends up taking the psychic to a rigid, "objectively valid" determination. In this way, the absence of subjectivity is deeply felt.

The central position of the subject is a fundamental question in the comprehensive perspective, since one of its basic principles is that all social phenomena are always the result of actions, of attitudes, and of convictions. It is unnecessary to add that this postulate, carries with it a set of assumptions as theoretical as they are methodological, which must be taken into consideration in any attempt at integration at the metatheoretical level. For example, in the comprehensive view there is a strong tendency to "localize" interpretive analysis (the guiding principle of hermeneutics) in language, especially oral language. Thus discourse is seen not only in its formal aspect (discursive code) but as discrete acts in which language is performed by the interlocutor, and investigations into the meaning of discourse assume a role similar to that of the enunciative situation, without negating, a priori, the inseparability of these two points of view, which frequently occurs in structural analyses. Another example might be that of the concepts of social practices,

which, in the structural perspective, tend to be deduced from the system, which is itself constructed from representations, emanating from a structure of meanings underlying actions. Bearing in mind that the structural perspective does not duly emphasize the comprehension of the processes of construction of meanings, there is a tendency in this type of analysis to avoid the question of how a certain experience is transformed into something dependent on social meaning and culturally defined by social actors. Organizing or determining practices, representations are usually treated as comprising a closed and anonymous cultural text. The domain of this textual metaphor implies an excessive emphasis on the internal coherence of ideas, values, and practices of determined social groups, resulting in a kind of analysis that offers little opportunity for the treatment of incoherencies, ambiguities, and indecisions that mark the interpretive and interactive processes of the contemporary life of individuals.

In studies of language, the analytical proposals of the structural approach show distinct forms in dealing with the narratives of the actors. If native texts rest on a common lexicon of concepts, they also reveal the effort of their actors to construct coherent meaning from their actions, in a context of continued dialogue with signified others. In this sense, it is necessary to complement/integrate the study of structures or representations upon studying the temporally circumscribed forms by which actors impute and negotiate meanings for their experiences, by which they experience difficulties in sustaining these meanings, and by which they delineate and bring to life projects and strategies in order to re-situate the social world that is given to them. Before anything else, such an enterprise demands the attention of the researchers in temporally transcurring the organization and re-organization of the everyday that marks the experience of the social actor (Alves and Rabelo 1996).

As may be observed, these and other questions bring us to a central point of the present discussion: the construction of "bridges" between structures and individuals, between objectivity and subjectivity, macro and micro theory. It is necessary that, in the dialogic process that may exist between different metatheoretical assumptions, there might be satisfactory answers for dealing with these realities, understood not in dichotomous or dualistic terms, but as dualities within a single reality. Such an overcoming of dualistic approaches restricted to individuals engaged in-interaction or institutional structures requires comprehensive and causal explanations of human action understood as resulting from intentions of conduct, knowledges existing on the part of the actors, and the material and organizational resources available in the socio-cultural environment.

A second question, stemming from the first, has to do with methodological assumptions. It seems evident that in integrating the two analytical perspectives mentioned, a number of methodological questions begin to

assume an essential dimension. The processes of production and analysis of facts that might overcome the "traditional" methodological dichotomies of the social sciences must be better developed. Three of these questions that might be overcome include: comprehension (*Verstehen*) versus explanation, macro vs. microanalysis, qualitative vs. quantitative methods.

The rejection and overcoming of dualisms in social theory—a challenge that in recent years constituted, in the international context, one of the principal concerns of social scientific thought—although, without a doubt, a series of problems at the limits of the disciplinarization and professionalization instituted by the academic world to account for the knowledge of socio-cultural phenomena. In the Brazilian context, it is already possible to verify tendencies that point toward revisions of epistemological divisions traditionally established by our university project. The boundaries between the social disciplines, here including psychology, assumes a more and more tenuous character. This unequal expansion of the horizons of the gaze of the social sciences does not mean, however, the loss of dimensions and specificities of social explanation that have already conquered. On the contrary, it presupposes a process of greater delimitation of disciplinarity or disciplinary identity as a crucial condition for the development of a new analytic perspective for all areas of the social sciences. The realization of this perspective can become one of the basic premises in constituting the interdisciplinarity or even transdisciplinarity of the social sciences. Until what point Brazilian social scientists will confront this challenge is a question that remains to be seen.

Notes

(1) Coordinator of the Graduate Program in Sociology and professor (PhD) of the Department of Sociology, School of Philosophy and Human Sciences of the Federal University of Bahia, Brazil. Researcher in the Nucleus of Studies in Social Sciences and Health (ECSAS). Address: Estrada de São Lázaro, 197, Federação, 40210-730, Salvador, Bahia, Brasil. Tel/Fax 55-071-235-4635/245-4962/237-2767. I would like to thank Dr. Miriam Rabelo for her critical suggestions and Lisa Earl Castillo, who translated the present paper to English.

(2) Relative dismantling, since we cannot declare the "death" of functionalism. A wide range of academics, both American and European, have significantly revitalized many of the premises of this theory.

(3) For Husserl, "What characterizes all forms of extreme and consequent naturalism, which goes out to popular materialism in recent forms of sensualist nominalism and of energetism, is, on the one hand, a naturalization of consciousness; on the other, a naturalization of ideas and, as a result, of all that is ideal and of all absolute norms." (Husserl 1973, p.50)

Bibliography

- Alves, P.C. & Rabelo, M.C. (1996), "O Status Atual das Ciências Sociais em Saúde no Brasil: Alguns dilemas e perspectivas", Salvador, Bahia (XX Encontro Anual da Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação em Ciências Sociais, ANPOCS).
- Durham, E.R. (1986), "A Pesquisa Antropológica com populações Urbanas: Problemas e Perspectivas", in R. Cardoso (ed), *A Aventura Antropológica. Teoria e Pesquisa*, São Paulo: Paz e Terra, pp.17-37
- Fernandes, F. (1977), *A Sociologia no Brasil*, Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Husserl, E. (1973), *La Filosofia como ciencia estricta*, Buenos Aires: Nova.
- Miceli, S. (1979), *Intelectuais e Classe Dirigente no Brasil: 1920-1945*, São Paulo: Difel.
- Morrow, R.A. and D.D.Brown (1994), *Critical Theory and Methodology*, Thousand Oaks (California): Sage.
- Ortiz, R. (1985), *Cultura Brasileira & Identidade Nacional*, São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense.
- Pécaut, D. (1990), *Os Intelectuais e a Política no Brasil*, São Paulo: Editora Ática.
- Peirano, M. (1995), "Desterrados e Exilados: Antropologia no Brasil e na Índia", in R.C. Oliveira & G.R. Ruben (eds.), *Estilos de Antropologia*, Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, pp.13-30.
- Ritzer, G. (1990), "The Current Status of Sociological Theory: The New Syntheses", in G. Ritzer (ed.), *Frontiers of Social Theory: The New Syntheses*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp.1-30.
- Ritzer, G. (1990a), "Micro-Macro Linkage in Sociological Theory: Applying a Metatheoretical Tool", in G. Ritzer (ed.), *Frontiers of Social Theory: The New Syntheses*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp.347-370.
- Schwartzman, S. (1985), "Intellectual life in the periphery", Paper presented at the XI World Congress of Sociology, New Delhi.

CHAPTER 8

THE ROOTS OF BRAZILIAN SOCIOLOGY'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO LATIN AMERICAN SOCIAL THOUGHT

Emir Sader
University of Sao Paulo, Brazil

Two essential themes on which Brazilian social thought has made significant contributions emerge in the extensive selection of texts by Latin American thinkers compiled by Ruy Mauro Marini and Margara Millan at the UNAM's Center for Latin American Studies: the theory of dependency and that of authoritarianism. The names of Caio Prado Jr., Celso Furtado, Ruy Mauro Marini, Theotonio dos Santos, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, and Florestan Fernandes, among others, justly enjoy pride of place.

These names, each author's career, the nature of their works, and the forms they chose in order to play a role in the destiny of their country—and to a certain extent, of their region—are full of meaning. To scan this list is to traverse again, in a particular but significant way, this itinerary of social thought in Brazil, and especially in the second half of the 20th Century when most of the creation of theory in the country has taken place.

Brazil's contribution to the theory of dependency is especially important. Though a school of sociology developed at Sao Paulo in the 1940s—whose chief exponents were Florestan Fernandes and his disciples Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Octavio Ianni—which focused on the relations among classes and races, their work had little impact outside of Brazil. Celso Furtado became a member of the core ECLA team, but his ideas were not much accepted outside the national sphere either. Thereafter, however, Brazil turned into an original source of theory on the subject of dependency.

The other particularity is that these theoretical developments came less from economists than from sociologists: Ruy Mauro Marini, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Theotonio dos Santos, Vania Bambirra.

How can we explore this unique Brazilian contribution to Latin American social thought? In what features of the development of Brazilian social science does the explanation for this phenomenon lie?

The question is a relevant one, since Brazil has made its most significant contributions to Latin American social thought in the theory of dependency, and later in the theology of liberation with such major figures as Leonardo Boff, Clodovis Boff, and Frei Betto, but also including an entire generation of social theologians. These two areas reflect particular aspects of Brazilian history

which influenced the creation of theories that necessarily had to deal with them.

In this article we will go no further than to seek the roots of Brazil's contributions to dependency and authoritarianism theory, but it is also necessary to analyze the building blocks of what was to become liberation theology in Brazil.

The Historiographic Roots

In the preface to a commemorative edition of Sergio Buarque de Holanda's classic "Raízes do Brasil" (Roots of Brazil), Antonio Cândido (Brazil's most outstanding contemporary intellectual, a social scientist who became the country's leading literature scholar) said that his generation had been shaped by three fundamental works: "Casa Grande e Senzala" (The Mansion and the Shanty) by Gilberto Freire, "Formación Económica del Brasil Contemporáneo" (The Economic Origins of Contemporary Brazil) by Caio Prado Jr., and the book for which he wrote the preface in question. The succeeding generations were, above all, developers of the work of Caio Prado Jr., the founder of contemporary critical thought in Brazil.

Caio Prado Jr. was in an important way self-educated. His training came from independent reading of Marx and the Marxist classics as a member—always on the fringe—of the Communist Party. Twice when he was already a professional historian, Caio Prado Jr. tried to get into a university, and twice the doors were shut to him.

Born in Sao Paulo in 1907, he was educated as a lawyer and participated in the social and political mobilizations of the 1920s in Brazil, which led to the "Revolution of 1930" led by Vargas, but Caio Prado Jr. then joined the Communist Party at the same time as Luis Carlos Prestes. His first work analyzing Brazilian history was "Evolución Política de Brazil" (Political Evolution of Brazil), written in 1933. In 1935 he took part in the Communist uprising and went into exile in France, where he worked in solidarity with the refugees of the Spanish Civil War. It was on his return to Brazil in 1939 that the decisive phase of his intellectual production began.

"Formación del Brazil Contemporáneo" (The Origins of Contemporary Brazil) was published in 1942, and was followed by "Historia Económica de Brasil" (Economic History of Brazil) in 1945. At the time of Brazil's return to democracy after the end of the Vargas dictatorship, in 1945, Caio Prado Jr. was elected a Deputy for the Communist Party. But he lost his seat and was imprisoned when the Cold War broke out and the Party was declared illegal.

After founding the journal *Brasiliense* in 1955, he first competed for a post at the University of Sao Paulo's Law Faculty with a thesis titled "Guidelines for a Brazilian Economic Policy". His work was approved but he was denied the job for political reasons. His second attempt was subsequent to the 1964

military coup, in 1970, when he competed for the History of Brazil chair held by Sergio Buarque de Holanda in the University of Sao Paulo's Philosophy Faculty. But the competition was canceled and he was stripped of the post and retired ahead of time by the university authorities.

We have focused so much on Caio Prado Jr. not only for his importance and the way his career was intertwined with his country's history over more than half a decade, but also to call attention to the intellectual experience from which all the key Brazilian social thought of the second half of the century has sprung. Florestan Fernandes said of him: "Caio inaugurated the most advanced form of interpretive history of Brazil." His work explains the contradictory articulation of slavery and the great rural estates in Brazil, and between the precapitalist exploitation of labor and the accumulation by agricultural and commercial capitalism which prevailed throughout the 19th Century and had surprising effects on Brazil's history in the entire 20th Century. Caio Prado Jr. exposed the complex linkages between slavery and colonial life, clearly revealing the latter's mercantile nature, thereby opposing the interpretations favored by the Communist Party and its official historians who talked of a kind of feudalism.

It was on the basis of that approach that Caio Prado Jr. characterized the forms by which capitalist hegemony came to dominate Brazilian society, approaching Lenin's concept of the "Prussian way". Brazil's agricultural structure did not modernize in the classic form because the great rural properties were not suppressed and replaced by small peasant landholdings. On the contrary, he found:

"The situation is different in Brazil, since the base and origin of our agrarian structure does not rest, as in Europe, on a peasant economy, but rather on a great rural exploitation that has prevailed from the start of the country's colonization to our time and adapted to the capitalist system of production through a process still under way and by no means completed (...) of replacement of slave labor by free labor." (Prado Jr. 1979, p. 159).

Later on, when analyzing the political transformations that reflected this particular form of political pact among the elites, Caio Prado Jr. asserted that Brazil's independence —like its transition from monarchy to republic— "is the political superstructure of the colonial Brazil, which when no longer consistent with the state of the productive forces and the country's economic infrastructure, breaks and gives way to more adequate forms" (Prado Jr., 1979, p. 159). For him, then, Brazil's independence was "more a product of a class than of the nation as a whole." That led Carlos Nelson Coutinho to find these analyses close to those of Gramsci, who speaks of "top-down transformations" that bring change but within a larger framework of conservation, achieved through co-optation and transformism.

This motivated Coutinho to conclude:

"The 'top-down' solution to the issue of the unified national state precedes and determines the 'Prussian' solution to agrarian modernization, which conserved the great rural exploitation and political domination by the owners of land and slaves; the 'passive revolution' ...prepared the Prussian outcome of the agrarian structure's adaptation to capitalism in the internal sphere, when the potential for master-slave labor relations became exhausted." (Coutinho 1989).

This paradigm of analysis of the formation of Brazilian society paved the way for the approaches of Celso Furtado, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, and Ruy Mauro Marini, all of whom incorporated Caio Prado's concept of the articulation between the world market's demands and the exploitation of slave labor. It is no coincidence that this current—rather than the one deriving from the Brazilian version of "Soviet Marxism"—was the one from which the most fertile Brazilian theoretical contribution to Latin American social thought emerged.

Foundations of Dependency Theory

If dependency theory emerged as an attempt to overcome the crisis of developmentalism, its two principal currents appear as different interpretations of that crisis. The exhaustion of the formerly very fertile ECLA theories is a historical process with a theoretical correlate. Behind the Brazilian contribution to dependency theory—with the central role played by Celso Furtado, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, and Ruy Mauro Marini—lies the failure of the political initiative taken during the Joao Goulart administration (1961-1964)—in which Furtado was the key economic influence—and the emergence of a new relationship between the capital accumulation process in Brazil and the international market.

"The economic crisis which struck most of the Latin American countries in the early 1960s was simultaneously a crisis of accumulation and one of realization of production" (Marini 1994, p. 135). It made itself felt, for one thing, in an exhaustion of the ability to make imports essential to domestic production, and for another, in restrictions on that production. Both were results of the fact that the industrialization process depended on the old export economy and the structural reform—agrarian reform, fiscal reform, social reform—which might have created a climate more conducive to the industrialization process, did not take place.

This process put Brazil in a privileged position, with a government that brought together Furtado, Darcy Ribeiro, and the Communist Party under the leadership of the politician most directly linked to Getúlio Vargas. That government was also heir to the ECLA analyses, Brazilian nationalism concentrated in the Higher Institute of Brazilian Studies (ISEB), and Cardoso's

Marxist analysis of the lack of interest among Brazilian big business. The alternatives moved in two different directions: an analysis aimed at formulating a national project for change which would include an agrarian reform and a precise limitation of foreign capital's role; and Marini's approach regarding class conciliation between the great industrial bourgeoisie and major landowners against the urban poor and the rising rural population. The failure of the Goulart government's initiative was stressed in both cases.

Dependency theory can be interpreted as a set of interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the import substitution process and its political projection—the hegemonic popular-nationalist models in the region, of which the Goulart government was a clear example. That may explain why Brazil's history has been an enigma which has focused the country's theory production. This is especially the case because, after completing an economic conversion, the military dictatorship succeeded in guiding the Brazilian economy into a period of expansion, which raised new questions as to the opportunities for national development—now in the framework of the internationalization of capital—based on the strengthening of large national capital, State capitalism, and a massive return of capital from a variety of origins which diversified external dependency.

The two leading interpretations of dependency are radically divergent, as shown in the controversy played out in the pages of the *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* (Mexican Journal of Sociology) in articles by Fernando Henrique Cardoso and José Serra, "Las desventuras de la dialéctica de la dependencia" (The limits of the dialectic of dependency) and "Las razones del neodesarrollismo o por qué me ufano de mi burguesía" (The reasons for neodevelopmentalism or why I am proud to be a bourgeois) by Ruy Mauro Marini (*Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, XI, Número Extraordinario (E), pp. 62-71, 1978, UNAM), which cannot be summarized here but are described in a work I have done to bring the debate up to date. They differ in their method, and hence, in the form of articulation of the national and international accumulation processes—that fact in itself generates divergent theoretical and political universes. The understanding of the country's insertion into the capitalist market as simple "external conditioning factors" makes it impossible for Cardoso's approach to rely on any of the many versions of the classic theory of imperialism (Hilferding, Hobson, Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg) and greatly limits its scope. Marini, on the other hand, seeks to update those analyses, toward which key contributions for understanding the worldwide accumulation process in the second half of the 20th Century were also being made by Samir Amin, Wallerstein, Arrighi, Gunder Frank, and Emmanuel.

Dictatorship and Authoritarianism Theory

When we take a step forward and review the contributions to Brazilian social thought on the period of the military dictatorship (1964-1985), the results are less encouraging. When a period of major transformations in the form of organization and exercise of political power, associated with a new and rapid spurt of economic expansion, was coming to a close, the capacity for theoretical understanding was not up to the task.

In discussing the theory produced on the Brazilian state during the military regime, Florestan Fernandes stresses in his "Apontamentos sobre a teoria do autoritarismo" (Notes on the theory of authoritarianism) the ambiguous and multiple meanings of the term authoritarianism, which give rise to a kind of "perverse logic" in the liberals' critique of the "abuses of state power" and the neokantian critique of the "exorbitance of authority" (Florestan Fernandez, "Apontamentos sobre a teoria do autoritarismo", Sao Paulo: Ed. Hucitec, 1982).

Once the rationality attributed to liberalism was accepted, authoritarianism came to occupy the sociopolitical spaces of the irrationality of behavior, with psychosociological—or even outright psychoanalytical—ingredients according to Florestan Fernandes. Nazism and fascism, as well as their simplistic extension in the form of Stalinism, lent themselves to that kind of treatment. The extreme limit of liberalism defined its own pathology.

Florestan attributed an abusive use of the concepts of authoritarian and authoritarianism to "a formidable 'ideological complexity'." Repressive manipulations of the strengthening of State authority are taken as ways to defend democracy. Florestan cites "Totalitarian dictatorship and totalitarianism"—in which Carl J. Friedrich and Zbigniew Brzezinski view the Franco and Salazar dictatorships as technical and instrumental dictatorships for the defense of democracy—as good examples of that approach. By the same token, the Spaniard Juan Linz—who coined the expression authoritarian regimes to characterize the transition of the Franco government, initially considered fascist, toward a state of tolerance of opposition—speaks of authoritarian regimes as equivalent to "strong democracy" or "soft dictatorship".

Florestan concludes that the specific form of obeying the academic division of labor led political scientists to view the State as the exclusive or principal locus of the authoritarian relationship.

The attempt to transform authoritarianism into a systematic theory stems from Juan Linz's analysis of the evolution of the Franco regime. When the original approaches of the 1930s and 1940s—heirs to the Third International's approach—which characterized it as an extension of Italian fascism, were invalidated by the opening of social and even political spaces in the 1950s and 1960s, as well as by the progress of industrial modernization in Spain and the

country's international integration, a theoretical vacuum was created. It was because of the need to transcend the fascism/totalitarianism dichotomy that Linz gained renown for his attempt to give authoritarianism conceptual consistency. But Linz did not consider the Brazilian military dictatorship to be even an incomplete "authoritarian regime"; rather, he called it merely an "authoritarian moment".

However, the conceptual genesis of the theory of authoritarianism is inseparable from the theory of totalitarianism, whose chief exponent in contemporary political science was Hannah Arendt (1978 pp. 395 y ss.). It was her classification of types of government which introduced the distinction among authoritarian, tyrannical, and totalitarian regimes. These regimes are described as forms of organization of power in the center of which there is an empty space, occupied by the leader. A succession of levels is superimposed on him, like the layers of an onion, involving front organizations, professional associations, party members, party bureaucracies, elite formations, police groups, etc.

Tyrannies are defined as egalitarian forms of government where the tyrant governs, but does so in opposition to all; everyone is equally oppressed and stripped of power in the same way. The intermediate structures are destroyed and totality is suspended; the regime is kept in power only by force, applied to the mass of isolated and disorganized individuals.

Power is organized in a pyramidal form in authoritarian regimes. The source of authority is external to the pyramid, and the seat of power is at its top; power and authority radiate downward through the rest of the pyramid. Each consecutive layer has some authority of its own, less than the one above it but more than the one below it, and all the levels are integrated and interrelated in a convergent fashion whose common focal point is the top of the pyramid, the transcendent source of authority. This is the form of governmental authoritarianism that is the most unequal of all because inequality and distinction are its chief structural foundations.

In the application of her theory, Arendt had to cope with the rigidity of her classification, and especially that of the category from which her entire system sprang: totalitarianism. This was the great innovation of her theory, because it broke with the social nature of political regimes and allowed each regime to be defined in terms of specifically political criteria, in the reductive sense of the concept; as such it paved the way for the political science of our century. But when she descended to concrete historical circumstances, Arendt found no regime that corresponded to her definition of totalitarianism. Rigorously, she asserted, only Russia in 1929 and Germany in 1933 met the requirements for the definition; "but", not even Mussolini, however much he abused the expression "totalitarian state" tried to establish a completely totalitarian regime. (Arendt 1978, p. 396)

The footnote which attempts to clarify this exclusion of fascism already reveals the descriptive nature of the theoretical basis for the classification. Says Arendt: "a proof of the non-totalitarian nature of the fascist dictatorship is the surprisingly small number of political crimes and the relatively light sentences that were applied to them." (Arendt 1978, p. 396)

By the same token, the Salazar regime in Portugal and that of Franco in Spain are excluded, and characterized as post-totalitarian dictatorships. Germany—but only if it had won the war—would have experienced totalitarian government. Even the Soviet Union—which was only totalitarian in 1929, due perhaps to the forced collectivization of the land, under the quantitative criterion by which Italian fascism was absolved—would have been transformed into a single-party dictatorship.

Totalitarianism would bring with it a change from a class society to a mass society, and in the undifferentiated organization of the masses lay the great danger of totalitarianism. Arendt notes, "in the areas of traditional Oriental despotism such as India or China, where there is nearly inexhaustible human material to feed the power machine and destruction of men which is total domination, and where in addition the sense of the superfluity of man and the mass has prevailed for centuries in a contempt for human life." (Arendt 1978, p. 396)

While classes are articulated around "specific, limited, and attainable objects", that consciousness is lacking in the masses, which are brought together "by the consciousness of a common interest." Arendt thus defines the term mass by numbers or indifference, or even by a mix of both those characteristics, and by the lack of "a professional organization or union of workers." They comprise "the majority of neutral and politically indifferent people, who never join a party and rarely exercise their right to vote." In their historical career, then, the masses of the 20th Century are the successors to the "rabble of the 19th Century," "because modern leaders do not differ much in their psychology and mentality from the old leaders of the "rabble".

The typology which gives rise to the theories of totalitarianism and authoritarianism is a prisoner of a characteristic which pervades all of Arendt's thought, according to Eric Hobsbawm (1982 pp. 201 & ss.). Commenting on her study of revolutions, this British historian notes "a certain metaphysical and normative tinge to her thought" when she does not focus on historical phenomena as they occurred, "but builds an ideal type herself, defining her field of study on the basis of it and excluding whatever does not fit her specifications." Hobsbawm's empirical rigor is offended by the speed with which Arendt creates typologies and adapts them to a liberal thought which associates "poverty" with "need" and opposes both to "freedom", as well as by her political resolution of social issues such as "terror" and her merely incidental linkage to history.

The family relationship between the theory of totalitarianism and that of authoritarianism is not merely conceptual. Their career is also determined by the international ideological scenario, particularly influenced by the demands of the Cold War. (Tarig Ali, in "Revolution from above," London, Hutchinson, 1988, shows how Arendt's book has a curious genealogy: its first two parts were written in 1945 and 1946, and focus exclusively on the subject of fascism as a "racial imperialism". The essence of Nazism, for Arendt, was antisemitism. The memory of the heroic Soviet resistance to Nazism was still too fresh to allow for an identification of Nazism with communism. But that was mainly because the Cold War had not yet begun. In the 1966 edition of the same book, Arendt has assimilated the two phenomena, which have in common the use of concentration camps and terror, as required by the fashion of North American sovietology in which she actively participated along with Carl Friedrich and Zbigniew Brzezinski in the pages of *Partisan Review*.) The rise of theories on totalitarianism, which put Stalinism and Nazism together in a single category, occurred in the heat of the Cold War, during the 1980s. (See the debate on totalitarianism in North American sovietology, especially in Stephen Cohen, "Rethinking the Soviet experience" and Abott Gleason, "Totalitarianism", *The Russian Review*, Vol. 43, 1984.)

The theory of authoritarianism is an heir to that tradition, which deprives it of historicity and at the same time, of the ability to recognize the unique features of the Latin American military regimes of the 1970s and 1980s. The comparison between the fertility of Cardoso's version of dependency theory and his version of authoritarianism theory is a good example of two different conceptual frameworks. The first, derived from ECLA, puts forward the formulations of economic structuralism but in the context of the dynamic of Latin American societies in the postwar world; that makes it possible to visualize essential features of the evolution of our societies in spite of the limitations indicated above. The second gives us a classification—descriptive, like most—of regime types, which separates political phenomena from their economic and social substratum and thereby empties them of their concrete content.

This set of references probably explains the difference between the theoretical fertility of the 1960s and 1970s and that of subsequent decades in Brazilian social science. Sectoral studies continue to embody enormous analytical capability, but there is a lack of encompassing theories on the most general issues of Brazilian and Latin American society and on international conditions.

It is when the theoretical block provoked by the view adapted from the fiscal adjustment policies—a kind of pauperizing theoretical adjustment—is exhausted that signs of Brazilian critical thought will revive. That could be noted at the last Congress of the Latin American Sociological Association (ALAS), held in Sao Paulo. The rapid transformations through which the

country—both its social structure and the state—is passing pose questions that only a new development of theory can address, if it is to be on a par with the traditions of social thought in Brazil.

Bibliography

- Arendt, H. (1978), *O sistema totalitario*, Lisboa: Publicações Dom Quixote.
- Coutinho, C.N. (1989), "Una via 'nao-clássica' para o capitalismo", in A. D'Incao (comp.), *História e Ideal - Ensaios sobre Caio Prado Junior*, Sao Paulo: Ed. UNESP.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1982), *Trabalhadores*, Sao Paulo: Ed. Paz e Terra.
- Marini, R.M. (1978), "Las razones del neodesarrollismo o por qué me ufano de mi burguesía", *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, Año XL, Vol. XI, Número Extraordinario (E), UNAM, pp. 62-71
- Marini, R.M. (1994), "La crisis del desarrollismo", in R.M. Marini & M. Millán (coord.), *La Teoría Social Latinoamericana*, Vol. II, Mexico, DF: Ediciones El Caballito.
- Prado Jr., C. (1979), *A questao agraria no Brasil*, Sao Paulo: Ed. Brasiliense.

CHAPTER 9

REINVENTING THE CRAFT: THE CHALLENGE OF RESTRUCTURING SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH IN LATIN AMERICA FOR THE NEXT MILLENNIUM

Marcia Rivera

Latin American Council of Social Sciences, CLACSO

There is a growing consensus today that social sciences everywhere need to look at themselves honestly and engage in a profound process of restructuring to be able to meet a multiplicity of challenges. This debate is of particular importance for Latin America, a continent which saw a tremendous expansion of social science research from the fifties to the eighties, and which in the nineties is struggling with a tarnished image of academic production in social sciences, a crisis of paradigms, and the drying out of financial resources to support research. Questioned by many is the failure of traditional disciplines and research methodology to respond to new questions and problems facing the region.

But the challenges to social sciences go beyond that, and they come not only from sectors outside the academic realm, but also from inside. Fundamental issues being raised include questioning of the eurocentrist and rigid construction of disciplinary boundaries, the quest for holistic explanations, the rationality of current institutional settings of social science research and teaching, and the capacity to engage in substantive dialogue with hard sciences where significant new knowledge with major social implications is being generated at a very fast pace.

Evidently, tracing the evolution of social sciences in Latin America would require an important research effort in itself. There have been attempts to reconstruct the process in several countries but there is yet to be produced a comprehensive history of social sciences in the region. In this note I will only be able to scratch the surface of a very complex and differentiated process and will draw mostly on works published by other colleagues, and my own experience at CLACSO.

The Historical Construction of Social Sciences in Latin America

The modern evolution of Latin American and Caribbean social sciences has been directly related to the political instability of the region throughout the twentieth century. The heavy quota of *coups d'états*, military regimes, and dictatorships has had an impact upon social science practice both in terms of

substance - types of research, themes, methodology, and academic activities, and in terms of institutional settings under which programs have been developed. Instability and repression have left a very strong and lasting imprint in the social sciences production in most countries of the region, and many of the dilemmas faced today relate to those processes.

Several Latin American countries have lived a good part of this century under non-democratic regimes where social sciences were suspected of being subversive and were, thus, heavily repressed. Argentina, Chile, Paraguay, Bolivia, and most Central American countries are still struggling to construct or reconstruct university programs which were at some point dismantled. With very few exceptions, social sciences in Latin America have been unable to transit a smooth development and consolidation path. While the different character of political crises in each country and the diverse nature of internal contradictions - ethnic, race, gender, social - and the responses to the crises, makes it very difficult to establish overarching generalizations, one can fairly say that due to the weight of political instability, the problems and challenges faced by social sciences in Latin America today are somewhat different to those of Europe or the United States.

The university system in Latin America is relatively old, particularly in the largest Spanish speaking countries. The first institution for higher education, a religious endeavor, was established by the Spaniards in Santo Domingo as early as 1538. San Marcos, Lima, the University of Mexico, San Felipe, Chile, Sucre, Bolivia, and the University of Cordoba, Argentina, had been all established by the 18th century but subsisted precariously until Independence (Brunner, 1990, pp. 15-20.) Most universities were public and established in important urban centers. Traditional professional degrees were offered - medicine, law, philosophy, and some offered programs related to the demands of the prevalent economy, for example, mining and geology, and later engineering. Whereas political science as a discipline was almost unknown, sociology courses were available in the faculties of law, philosophy or economics at the beginning of the twentieth century. Sociology was considered to be the social science with the largest scope and capability of irrigating other disciplines. This was the university where ideas of nationhood were constructed; it was also an ecumenical space, and a quite elitist one (Krotsch 1993.) Over the years, wider sectors claimed access to higher education and a university degree became an important social conquest. The struggles for open access, free tuition, autonomy, and student participation which led to the Reforma de Córdoba in 1918, rapidly spread through the region and forged the vision and concept of the "national" university, which still prevails. The long history of public universities in Latin America provides an institutional density, tradition and prestige that newer private endeavors lack (Brunner 1990, p. 21.)

The development of a scientific and technological research tradition in Latin America, however, came relatively late, in part because in the post-

Independence period the region's economies were articulated and subordinated to that of Europe and the US, and because the Independence wars generated local conflicts which drained the possibilities of accumulating resources and efforts in favor of a scientific infrastructure. It was in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century that most countries began to take account of the value and need to support scientific research (Oteiza 1992, pp. 11-13.) But social science research, except for history, came even later; half a century later. Few research institutes in the social sciences were established at national universities previous to 1950. The University of Buenos Aires had created the Instituto de Sociología at the University of Buenos Aires in 1940, but it was inactive for many years on account of political repression. Only Mexico and Puerto Rico (both under direct US influence) had respectable institutions in the fifties. UNAM had the Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, Puerto Rico the Social Science Research Center at UPR. The Centro de Investigaciones Sociales, created in 1945 at the University of Puerto Rico, was modeled on U.S. university institutions and most of the research undertaken there was by North American professors who came to the island (a U.S. possession) to do surveys and empirical research exploring "social problems of developing countries". Meanwhile, Brazil created its first university research centers in 1959 and Colombia's national university opened the Sociology program with research on general issues of development and rural studies the same year.

Social science programs in Latin American universities were established with an eurocentrist perspective, present also initially in North American institutions (the development of "Area Studies" in the US has provided a different twist). The neglect to consider the region's history, culture, and social processes as the basis for building new knowledge, has led to a permanent tension between the recognized need for an endogenous perspective and formal programs based on outside ones. The strict disciplinary divisions between social sciences and the separation of history from social sciences, as most European and US universities do, have limited the possibility of constructing knowledge from within.

The tensions are evident everywhere. The thematic and theoretical concern with the socio-economic transformation of national societies dominated the social science production of the mid fifties. But research methods and approaches were permeated with a positivistic perspective. In Argentina, Gino Germani became spokesman of the modernization theory, which looked at development as a quite linear process through which all societies would transit. The problem was to make that transit as smooth as possible. Meanwhile, the closest to an endogenous development theory that the region has experienced was being developed in a U.N. body, CEPAL, outside the university system. The dependency theory was the anchor of Latin American Social Sciences for

many years and is still recognized as the most important theoretical contribution.

The dramatic changes of Latin American societies since have given birth to social and economic processes —fragmentation, diversification, polarization, marginalization— for which the dependency theory had no explanatory power, and no other new paradigm to replace it has emerged. The extraordinary complexity of today's problems escape an explanation from a holistic approach. This has resulted in a growing neglect for theory-building in favor of concrete, well defined, empirical work. For these reasons, some analysts believe that Latin American social sciences today face a veritable crisis, though many are not willing to recognize it (Sonntag 1993, pp. 54-63.)

Construction/Destruction: the Saga of Social Sciences

The national university system which prevailed up to the 1950's and under which social sciences developed yielded to a tremendous expansion of higher education in the years after (Brunner 1990.) The never ending demand for higher education in the region has meant the establishment of hundreds of universities, both public and private. There are more than 2,500 institutions of higher education accounted for today, out of which over 500 are universities. A veritable massification process has occurred, taking its toll on quality, relevance, and management capacity of the higher education institutions, including research.

Social sciences had an important share in this expansion, but it was conditioned by the prevailing political environment: repressive regimes have never liked social sciences, and did not tolerate its smooth development within the national university system, and even in some cases within private institutions. For this reason, since the sixties one finds quite differentiated spaces from where social science research is conducted. Where politically it was tolerated, it generally grew within the university system; in some cases where it was repressed, private non-profit centers were created to continue or generate a research tradition. When political spaces reopened one finds immediate response from the research community. For this reason, in most countries one stills finds a multiplicity of institutional arrangements for social science research. But institutional instability is in the majority of cases their main characteristic. Evidently, this has left a strong imprint on the types of research that was conducted, themes, theoretical perspectives, and forms of dissemination. Reviewing a few cases will help to understand the process.

Argentina, had a very brief period of cultural and academic renovation which was decisive to the establishment of modern, professional sociology. The political space was opened with the downfall of Juan Domingo Perón in 1955. Several institutions with social science research programs were reinstalled or created immediately after: Gino Germani reopened the Instituto

de Sociología of the University of Buenos Aires which had been created in 1940 but had been left dormant throughout the Perón years, and a B.A. degree in sociology was created. The Institute came to be well recognized for its modernization studies and empirical research and a very significant production emerged out of it. Other research institutes established were the Instituto di Tella (1958), Consejo Federal de Inversiones, Consejo Nacional de Desarrollo, and the Instituto de Desarrollo Económico y Social, all of them created in 1960. Two private institutions also opened degree programs in the social sciences in the country: the Catholic University established a career program in sociology and Universidad del Salvador one in sociology and political sciences. Of great significance was that social sciences were recognized as scientific disciplines by the national entity that was to deal with science and technology efforts —Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas (CONYCET), created in 1958. The assistance of North American, European, and other Latin American scholars helped to install empirical research programs within CONYCET and other institutions (Vessuri, 1992.) But this energy lasted shortly.

Again, in 1966 the military coup acted against Argentina's modernizing university project and against the social science institutions that had been created. Many professors at the University of Buenos Aires had to leave the country. The situation of instability persisted, with ups and downs, until 1983, when democracy finally returned to the country. The social science Faculty at the University of Buenos Aires was only reconstructed a few years ago, in 1988, and its social science research institute, now named after Gino Germani, has only been in operation since 1990. The private, non-profit, centers that were created in the course of the seventies with financial support from international cooperation sustained the most important critical research for some fifteen years, but find that surviving today is a most difficult task.

Social sciences in Chile also underwent similar upheavals. Programs established in the fifties in the context of a strong state and democratic parameters were expanding and in a process of being consolidated in the course of the sixties. Most were degree programs with a notorious absence of political science. There were few postgraduate programs in social sciences —only economics at the University of Chile, and those of FLAKES, interdisciplinary and regional in nature. Pinochet's military coup in 1973 brought the intervention of national universities and the dismantling of social science programs, except economics and history, a department with a very conservative approach. Degree programs as well as research institutes were closed; academic and administrative staff people were dismissed, many physically repressed, and massive exile took place (Garretón 1991.) Economics was recognized as the only true social science, and the Chicago school affirmed a great influence that would last throughout the next decade.

Central America also suffered the impact of political repression and instability, and social science programs were not to escape it. The national universities of El Salvador and Guatemala were literally destroyed, both in their material and intellectual existence by dictatorships and military regimes (Torres Rivas 1987.) Their recuperation is still today a project. The only Central American country which did not face repression was Costa Rica, where in fact the University system flourished and social science production there became the *locus* of regional analysis and academic activity.

Though new research being conducted today on Brazil demonstrates that measures to curtail resources to social science research were indeed taken by military regimes, the impact does not seem to have been as great as in other countries of the region. Brazil's military considered higher education and science and technology as national priorities. Thus, the dismantling of social sciences, was not as severe as in other countries, factor which helps explain why today over 57% of all graduates in the social sciences in Latin America come from Brazilian universities (Calderón 1991.)

The Return to Democracy: Unfulfilled Expectations

The transition to democracy initiated in the eighties found most Latin American countries caught up in the debt crisis, with stagnant economies, and lacking the basics of institutional development. The negotiation of agreements for multilateral development funds required implementing hard policies directed at reducing government spending and generating new sources of income, mainly through the selling of state enterprises. The optimism of some sectors about the prospects of structural adjustments clash with the harsh realities of reduced government budgets—particularly for higher education—increased unemployment, growing poverty, and social disintegration.

For these reasons, the process of university reconstruction after the reinstatement of democratic regimes has not been easy. The strict structural adjustment policies have meant severe financial cuts to the educational system, in a period where demand for education has been growing very fast. Research, particularly in the social sciences, receives a low priority in budgets and resource allocation. Between 1980 and 1985 government support to universities in Latin America fell approximately 30%, thus significantly reducing spending per student. Today, average for the region is US\$649.00, whereas Canada spends \$6,000 and most European countries spend between \$4,000-\$5,000.00. Some Latin American countries spend less than \$500 per student. Furthermore, state resources allocated to science and technology in Latin America only average today .05% of GDP, while Japan and other developed countries assign over 3% annually (Tunnerman, 1997, p. 112 / 139.) In this context resources for social science research within state universities have been very limited.

The return to democracy brought along an increased expectation on the part of social scientists of a greater space for social sciences in policy formulation. "Development" and the construction of a "new social order" have been key concerns of social sciences in the region for many years. One cannot forget the contribution of social sciences to the debates and struggles against dictatorships. It was social sciences that provided the intellectual nurturing to social movements and to the political processes of "concertación" (consensus building) in many countries to forge a democratic alternative. Social scientists in Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Brazil, Guatemala, and other countries, also helped in the analysis, and in many cases in the implementation, of transition processes. In some countries social scientists became ministers or important decision makers in the new democratically elected governments.

But dilemmas do exist and the space for real input from academic centers seem to be far more reduced than what originally thought. On the one hand, the rapidly changing demands of a globalized world today seem to be far beyond the capacity of response of traditional scholarship. Governments demand "quick and dirty" research, short term appraisals - the type of work consultancy firms engage in. Only a small fraction of the academic social science community has been able to join other technocrats in policy-making spaces.

Losing the capacity to link research, action through civil society, and policy making may be a great frustration for many social scientists in Latin America, as the history of the "craft" has been one of quite direct articulation between the worlds of academia and politics. The sense of disconnection is also aggravated by the disdain with which many politicians and policy makers treat academics, particularly those linked to national universities which have become obsolete, removed from social initiatives, and massified. Breaking the vicious circle of lack of resources, high enrollment, scant serious research, and obsolescence has proved to be very difficult in most national universities. A profound, coherent, and overarching reform of the university system in Latin America is urgently needed and is a *sine-qua-non* condition for a restructuring of social sciences that will contribute to a recuperation of good scholarship, lost prestige, and effective links with social movements and policy making.

Fragmentation and dispersion is now part of the daily life of a social scientist in the region, who normally has to combine teaching in several places (both public and private institutions) and doing some kind of other job to complete a salary. Faculty appointments are increasingly being made on a part time basis and research resources are not available in most institutions, particularly in private, market oriented ones. Except for Mexico, Brazil, Costa Rica, and Puerto Rico, few scholars can expect to pursue a fully gratifying research career in a university setting in Latin America today. CLACSO's evaluation of the environment under which researchers work in most of Latin America reveals that the standard of living and working conditions for the

majority of researchers has dramatically diminished during the last decade (Rivera 1996.)

The Fragility of Private Research Centers: Key Actors of Social Science Production

Since the late sixties, social scientists found a way of surviving by creating alternative spaces for research and academic exchange. Private non profit research institutes became a strong force of intellectual debate in the region and still account for a very large and diverse production of books, journals, bulletins, courses, seminars, and conferences. The institutional structure of these centers is very different to what normally prevails in a university setting and is not very frequent in Europe or the USA. To begin with, the approach was generally multi or trans-disciplinary in character, i.e., problem-oriented research. With the years, this perspective became a characteristic of an important part of the social science production in the region. Even when research institutes or scholars may identify themselves with a disciplinary perspective, the themes, problems, and particular ways of approaching research -theoretical point of departure, methodology and techniques of study - most often encompass several disciplines. Secondly, one finds that the social science production that emerged from these centers has tended to have a strong historical perspective, as researchers sought to *understand* social and economic processes, incorporating historical research methods in their work. What Professor Wallerstein (1996) is urging from social sciences today, to open up and break disciplinary barriers, was the *raison d' être* of an important part of the Latin American social science production.

Some analysts consider that private research centers have been the leading producers and disseminators of social science and policy research in Latin America since the sixties (Levy 1991). Many of these centers were instrumental in designing and promoting development alternatives to official policies; some eventually became think tanks and were able to assume government responsibilities with the return to democracy or the establishment of more progressive regimes —Bolivia, 1982; Argentina, 1983; Chile, 1990; Brazil, 1995. They have also been a key factor in the process of strengthening civil society and the democratization of the region, as the research they undertake contributes to inform the social agenda. The networks they created and participate in go beyond the national and regional boundaries; a good deal of inter regional exchange has been established by these centers, and only financial constraints has inhibited a greater development of comparative intra and inter-regional research. In summary, besides keeping alive a research tradition and practice, private, non-profit, research centers have also played a major political role in furthering pluralism, an international perspective, and enhancing democracy. Hundreds of private research centers were established

throughout the region in the 1970's and 80's. Many of them gathered under the umbrella of the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO) created by some 60 centers in 1967. Together they developed programs for academic exchange, fellowships, training programs, and publications. As a federation of centers, initially mostly private ones, CLACSO came to play a major role in the defense of academic freedom, university autonomy, human rights of the intellectual community, and even in the survival of many Latin American scholars.

Most of these research centers were established and sustained through the years with financial support from international cooperation, particularly from Canada, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and The Netherlands. France, Germany, and Spain also provided support but to a lesser extent. Some private US foundations, like Ford, were very important supporters of academic think tanks in Chile throughout the Pinochet regime, and been steadily contributing to the development of research capacity in Mexico and Brazil. While outside funding has enabled the development of a research community in the social sciences it has brought in a crucial paradox: whereas research centers were able to grow in autonomy from national governments and were able to protect themselves from state financial manipulation, their dependency on foreign sources has been difficult to overcome.

This has led to many problems which are so intricate and complex that would warrant a much longer discussion. But a few points are worth highlighting. Dependency has sometimes led an institution to yield to the thematic, methodological, or theoretical interests of a grant maker or to research "fashions". And even if funding agencies did not place direct pressure, often centers developed the practice of "smelling" or "understanding" what a funding partner was interested in, so as to define a project in more marketable ways. Thus conceived, research risks becoming a commodity placed in a fierce market, as demands largely exceed funding availability. External dependency has also increased the centers' vulnerability. When grant makers in recent years considered that the political conditions in particular countries had improved to the extent that their presence was no longer needed, they left. And many centers did not survive or had to reduce operations, engage in techno-bureaucratic activities, private consultancy, or service delivery of some kind (Calderón 1992.) The nature of the typical private, non profit, research center has changed quite dramatically and today most perform a quite diversified bag of activities, with scholarly research generally being almost a marginal one. Today, very rarely does a center of this type have full time researchers or assistants on a long-term contract base. Furthermore, documentation and library activities have been severely cut back on account of shortage of funds, and work is usually undertaken on a project by project basis. The evident result is a great institutional instability and fragility

that certainly has had an effect on the type and quality of research that is produced.

Private research centers also face a diminished supply of funds coming from the United Nations system. During the last forty years UNESCO, ECLAC, UNDP, UNICEF, UNRISD, and other UN bodies, developed strong relations with social science research centers in the region and helped to finance projects and programs, including large, comparative, and lengthy ones. The close collaboration between agencies and research centers made possible national and regional studies on democratization, political systems, governability, labor and employment, cultural policies; a truly vast number of research projects. But the financial crisis of the UN system has meant a depletion of funds from this source, contributing to the instability of research centers.

The World Bank and the InterAmerican Development Bank have begun to request work from some private, non profit, research institutes. But for the most part these are limited to short term appraisals on a contract basis for specific inquiries, with certain methods, particular researchers, expected results, and timetables. The relationship is not very different to that established with profit making consultancy firms, except that academic centers often get lower paid contracts. The nature of work requested by these institutions is quite different to what is normally done in an academic setting. And evidently, the Banks choose the centers they wish to work with, according to what they perceive as vision, ideology, and closeness to the Banks' own perspectives. For many centers this new source of funding is a welcome one but is no guarantee of institutional stability.

Counting on local philanthropy is not an alternative either for social science research. To begin with, Latin America does not have a philanthropic tradition such as there is in the United States or Europe. At the most one can find individual or corporate donors for very traditional charity work: orphanages, asylums, hospices, etc. But education, particularly higher, and scientific research have been until recently responsibility of the state. It will still take many years and good tax reforms to be able to stimulate local philanthropy and investment by the private sector for social sciences. For all these reasons, the problem of financing good scholarly work and sustaining research institutions has become a most difficult one for Latin American Social Sciences.

The Challenges of Latin American Social Sciences: Autonomy, Stability and Renovation

As we have attempted to demonstrate, in the last decade the issues of autonomy, stability and sustainability, as well as renovation of social science practice have become absolutely critical. It is very difficult to separate the substantive problems of social science research, including issues of theory

building, transdisciplinarity, dialogue with the hard sciences, policy relevance, from the institutional frameworks from which research is produced. The issues that need to be dealt with today are very complex and difficult to solve. While there is greater production in terms of published works, journals, numbers of academic programs, institutions, and researchers than ever, one can observe unequal growth and quality. The roaring sea of Latin American social sciences today, is generating an enormous amount of information and narrowly defined studies but, sadly enough, there is a scarce contribution to theory building.

The realm of Latin American social sciences has become very complex and intricate, and finding a way to restructure the field and reinvent the craft requires, like the great thinker Gregory Bateson would say, imagination and rigor. Imagination to open up to new questions that need to be asked and taken up by social sciences; to raise them from an endogenous perspective, doing away with models that imposed eurocentrist frameworks of analysis. Imagination to set up new programs within universities that can provide for a more flexible and natural exchange of experiences between academia, policy making and social activism. Imagination to use the new technologies of communications to set up intra and inter-regional transdisciplinary, collaborative, comparative research, to create distance learning programs that can satisfy the growing demand for higher education without compromising quality and relevance, and to disseminate the production of social scientists.

Rigor is needed to set up standards for evaluation of scientific production and accreditation of programs in the social sciences. But mechanisms have to be conceived, designed, and implemented with criteria that is not automatically copied from what is being done in the US or Europe. Rigor is required to establish mechanisms that will ensure accountability and transparency in the use of funds by universities and research centers. Institution building needs to be supported, but success will only be achieved with a rigorous evaluation of the history, planning capacity, scholarship level, quality of scientific production and efficient management of an institution. A process of distillation is required, and it ought to be generated from within the social science community itself.

The agenda for restructuring Latin American social sciences is vast and complex. Substantive issues will not be solved if institutional ones are not tackled and vice-versa. The numerous discussions of where to go and how, that have taken place in the course of the last few years, should now lead to the elaboration of proposals and experiments. For a few years we need to engage in pilot experiences to test out ideas of how to restructure the field and practice of social sciences. Some of the major issues that need to be tackled in the short run are outlined below:

- Engage in a serious intellectual debate about what should change and what should be preserved of our humanistic, literary, scientific, historical and political culture. Rethink with rigor and imagination the construction of disciplines and boundaries and provide flexible mechanisms for crossing what

have been up to know insurmountable barriers, as the most significant advances are made at the crossroads between disciplines and methodologies.

- Find ways to establish a closer relationship between universities and private research centers to design new forms of collaboration and exchange, and to deal with the problem of reproducing the producers of knowledge.
- Give priority to the development of intellectual accumulation instances; for example through the consolidation of regional and inter-regional working groups programs on thematic issues, and the collaborative creation of long term data and information banks.
- Improve and modernize the conditions under which researchers work; support the development of integrated academic electronic networks through which they can engage in fruitful dialogue with peers and have access to a wide variety of services through telecommunications. Design and implement training programs to these ends.
- Engage in serious efforts to design evaluation and accreditation criteria for scientific work in the social sciences, and establish institutional mechanisms for monitoring progress to set goals.
- Design new programs to rationalize the allocation of resources for research; explore joint ventures between public and private sources, and help build corporate and individual philanthropy that can support social science programs.

Bibliography

Advisory Council for Scientific Research in Development Problems (1995), *A Medium Term Perspective on Research for Development*, The Netherlands: Advisory Council for Scientific Research in Development Problems.

Advisory Council for Scientific Research in Development Problems (1995), *Supporting Capacity Building for Research in the South: Recommendations for Dutch Policy*, The Netherlands: Advisory Council for Scientific Research in Development Problems.

Benítez Centeno, R. (1988), *Las ciencias sociales en México*, Mexico, DF: CONACYT/ COMECOSO.

Brunner, J.J. (1990), *Educación superior en América Latina: cambios y desafíos*, Santiago de Chile: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Brunner, J.J. (1993), "Investigación social y decisiones políticas", *Sociedad*, Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, 3, Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA).

Calderón, F. & Provoste, P. (1991), *Autonomía, estabilidad y renovación, los desafíos de las ciencias sociales en América Latina*, Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

- Consejo Venezolano de Ciencias Sociales (1995), "Acta Constitutiva - Estatutos", *Revista Venezolana de Economía y Ciencias Sociales*, 2-3, Caracas.
- Egron-Polak, E.; Lemasson, J.P. & Macdonald, G. (1994), "A New Research Dialogue", *Canadian and Latin American Research Communities*, IDRC, Latin American and Caribbean Regional Office, LACRO Discussion Series, 3.
- García Canclini, N. (1991), "Políticas culturales y relaciones centro-periferia en los 90", *Revista de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*, 491.
- Garretón, M.A. (1991), "La evolución de las ciencias sociales en Chile", *Revista de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*, 491.
- Gómez Campo, V.M. & Pena Borrero, M. (1986), "Problemas contemporáneos de desarrollo educativo", en *Tendencias y problemas de desarrollo y planeación de la educación superior y la modalidad a distancia. Propuesta de modelo de planeación de la oferta de formación*, Bogotá: Proyecto UNESCO-PNUD-ICFES COL/82/027.
- González Casanova (1991) "Los desafíos de las ciencias sociales, hoy", *Revista de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*, 491.
- Hanafi, H. (1991), "La nueva ciencia social; algunas reflexiones", in Lander, Edgardo (ed.), *Modernidad y Universalismo*, Caracas: UNESCO/ Rectorado Universidad Central de Venezuela/ Ed. Nueva Sociedad.
- Harispe, H. (1989), "El rol de la universidad argentina en la capacitación y formación profesional", Ponencia presentada en el Seminario Educación y Capacitación de los Trabajadores, organizado por la UTN y la Fundación Friedrich Ebert, 27-28 noviembre.
- Kazancigil, A. (1991), "Las ciencias sociales en una perspectiva mundial", *Revista de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*, 491.
- Korn, F. (1995), "Ciencias duras y ciencias blandas, ¿un problema de método?", *Sociedad, Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Sociales*, 6, Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA).
- Krotsch, P. (1993), "La universidad argentina en transición: ¿del Estado al mercado?", *Sociedad, Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Sociales*, 3, Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA).
- Lander, E. (1991), "Retos del pensamiento crítico latinoamericano en la década de los noventa", in E. Lander (ed.), *Modernidad y Universalismo*, Caracas: UNESCO/ Rectorado Universidad Central de Venezuela/ Ed. Nueva Sociedad.
- Levy D. (1995), *La educación superior y el estado en Latinoamérica*, Mexico, DF: UNAM/FLACSO.
- Levy D. (1991), *Latin America's Private Research Centers*, Book draft, SUNYAlbany.

- Levy, D.; Lucio, R. & Serrano, M. (1992), *La educación superior. Tendencias y políticas estatales*, Bogotá: Instituto de Estudios políticos y relaciones internacionales, Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Mata Mollejas, L. (1992), "¿Es la economía una ciencia?", *Cuadernos del Cendes*, 20, May-August, Caracas: Universidad Central de Venezuela.
- Pérez Santiago, G. (1990), "La crisis de las ciencias sociales en Puerto Rico", *Homines*, Revista de Ciencias Sociales, XIV, 2, Universidad Interamericana de Puerto Rico.
- Pozas, R. (ed.) (1993), *Las ciencias sociales en los años noventa*, Mexico, DF: Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, UNAM.
- Rivera, M. (1985), "Social Sciences in the Caribbean: From the Theory of the Melting Pot to the Analysis of the Boiling Kettle", *Proceedings, ICCDA Conference on Social Science and Development in Africa*, Dakar, Senegal.
- Rivera, M. (1993), "El Caribe, los movimientos de mujeres y los estudios de género", in Claudia Serrano (ed.), *La investigación sobre la mujer en América Latina*, Dominican Republic: INSTRAW/CLACSO/CIPAF.
- Stolen, K.A. (1992), "State of the Art on Latin American Research", Seminar Report with presentations by Marcia Rivera, Edelberto Torres Rivas and Antonio Arantes, Norway: University of Oslo.
- Taquini, A. et al (1972), *Nuevas universidades para un nuevo país*, Buenos Aires: Editorial Estrada.
- Tedesco, J.C. (1984), "Elementos para un diagnóstico del sistema educativo tradicional en América Latina", in Nassi, Roma, Tedesco, *El sistema educativo en América Latina*, Buenos Aires: Kapeluz.
- Torres Rivas, E. (1987), "Ideas preliminares para establecer un "State of the Arts" de las ciencias sociales en Centroamérica y propuestas alternativas", mimeo, FLACSO: Costa Rica.
- Tunnerman, C. (1997), La educación superior en América Latina y el Caribe en su contexto económico, político y social, in *Hacia una nueva educación superior*, Buenos Aires: UNESCO, CRESALC.
- Universidad de Buenos Aires (1973), *Aportes para la nueva universidad*, Buenos Aires: Secretaría de Planeamiento, UBA.
- Vanossi, J. (1976), *La universidad y sus problemas*, Buenos Aires: Editorial Estrada.
- Vessuri, H. (1992), "Las ciencias sociales en la Argentina, diagnóstico y perspectivas", in E. Oteiza (ed.), *La política de investigación científica y tecnológica argentina. Historia y perspectivas*, Buenos Aires: Centro Editor.

Villegas, A. (1992), *Posgrado y desarrollo en America Latina*, Mexico, DF: Unión de Universidades de America Latina.

Weinberg, G. (1987), "Aspectos del vaciamiento de la universidad argentina durante los regímenes militares recientes", en *Universidad en America Latina*, Mexico, DF: Unión de Universidades de America Latina.

CHAPTER 10

THE FUTURE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Francisco López Segrera
Unesco

The social scientists gathered here today, and the colleagues inside the region and, also, outside the region, which investigate on themes of social sciences are the ones which can better draw the balance and the perspectives of social sciences in Latin America and the Caribbean. Therefore, the construction of the future of these disciplines in Our America will be their responsibility.

I shall concentrate my reflections in synthetical glimpses on UNESCO mission in the development process of social sciences in the region, and, specially, on how to contribute to their future redimensioning. In a Seminar of such a nature, I must mention the permanent support of UNESCO to the Latin American Association of Sociology (ALAS) and to its congresses. It is also necessary to bring out the key role of UNESCO in the foundation and the development of the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO) and its permanent interaction with FLACSO General Secretariat and national headquarters, as well as in the sustained and growing collaboration with the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO), with its Executive Secretary and with its Working Groups. Around FLACSO, CLACSO and ALAS - which have always had UNESCO support - the best of the social sciences in the region has always gathered.

I can say, in synthesis, that networks like FLACSO and CLACSO - or like many others which are more or less directly linked to the development of social sciences in this area: ALAS, SELA, CLAD, IFCU, PROGRAMME BOLIVAR - and the social scientists clustered in these networks and around universities and/or working groups, are the ones which have produced the extraordinary development of the Latin American social sciences - used by other countries of the South as a paradigm - and which guarantee their future, not allowing that their identity vanishes in imported paradigms. The Latin American social sciences reached their full identity in the fifties when FLACSO emerged, and it is a real merit of this network - and of UNESCO - to have contributed to the Latin Americanization of the social sciences, a work which has been strengthened by CLACSO and which, in a Seminar like this one, strengthened itself. Let it say, once and for all, there could exist a crisis of paradigms with relation to CEPAL, or to the School of Dependence era, but there is no identity crisis. However, since the eighties, there is a clear tendency to revert the

valuable purposes to re-think the continent from inside. This tendency, to which we shall refer afterwards, is associated to the paradigms proper to neoliberalism and to postmodernism.

Today, there is among the main Latin American social scientists a consensus related to the diagnosis of the region in our epoch, which is specially related to the fact that, faced to the dangers which spy on the democratic stability -that is to say, a growing poverty and symptoms of daily and silent social outbursts which, according to some people, augur a possible crisis of governability- the social policy must be part of the economic policy (1).

1. Which have been - according to a survey made to some of the main Latin American social scientists at the end of 1995 - the changes and/or phenomenons which have produced the strongest impact in the region during the 80's and the 90's?

Among those they point out, we can find:

a) The uncertainty for the future, the lack of stability (as mentioned in a medullar document by SELA, which proposes in another document a post-adjustment strategy) and the almost total absence of alternative visions for the predominant neoliberal model.

b) The growing globalization (economic, technological, politic, cultural...) parallel to a social exclusion and segregation and to an internal segmentation among regions and countries, which lead to conflicts of various natures and to conventional wars among countries or inside themselves, (as shown by the recent conflict Ecuador-Peru, or the tensions in the frontiers between Venezuela and Colombia) and to internal wars of different kinds, like the ones engaged by the indigenous "minorities" and the drug cartels. The latter is illustrated magistrally in the last book of Gabriel García Márquez, "*Noticia de un Secuestro*".

c) The victory and consolidation of the democracy, parallel to growing poverty and social exclusion which threaten and try to make this kind of democracy not suitable to govern.

d) The growth of the market force, with detriment of the State, which becomes an executor of the neoliberal policies.

e) Outbursts and social revolutions of different kinds (the "*caracazo*" in Venezuela, 1989; attacks to supermarkets and shops in May and June 1989 in Buenos Aires; Santiago del Estero, Argentina, 1993; the blockage of roads in Curanilahue, Chile 1994, protesting against the closing of the charcoal mines; Chiapas, Mexico, occupation of twelve cities in January 1994; crises of the ferrymen, Havana, 1994; occupation of the Embassy of Japan in Lima and the hostage problem, 1996..., accompanied by a growing social disobedience and anonymous acts, brief and bloody, instead of concerted collective actions oriented by a programmatic basis.

f) The predictions of disaster scenarios have a tendency to substitute the utopian visions of the 60's and the 70's.

g) Emergent consensus referred to the seriousness of the crisis.

h) The apparition of a new poverty dimension as a social exclusion (margination of the economy and of the formal society and of the circuit production-distribution-consumption) and not any longer as an "exploitation" *strictu-sensu*. In 1960 Latin America had 114 millions of poor persons; in the decade of the 80 it attained 196 millions of Latin Americans; and in 1997 "in absolute terms, the number of Latin Americans and Caribbean people in a poverty situation went up to 210 millions", the most elevated amount of all times, according to the CEPAL Report, "*The equity gap*", of 6 April 1997, presented at the First Regional Conference on Follow-up of the Social Development Summit (Sao Paulo, Brazil).

i) The increase of the economic violence on excluded people, has its correlate in the growing individual violence that they practice, parallel to the violence performed by the repressive State apparatus and by the private security services.

j) The lack of integration of the social and economic policies.

k) The deficiencia of the in-force impositive policies.

l) The emergence of the "citizen insecurity syndrome", which consist of a general feeling of insecurity, and is a result of the perception of the increase of the anti-social conducts, as well as of the lack of confidence with relation to the institutions which must control these conducts.

m) The growing margination of Latin America in the world economy. In 1990, its participation in the exportations was only of a 3%. In 1960, the region represented nearly the 8% of the world commerce; in the 80s this amount was reduced to less than a 6%, and in 1990, it only attained the 3.3%. During this year, the exportations of a region with 430 millions of inhabitants did not overcome the 130 billions of dollars, a billion less than Holland - with a population of 15 millions - for the same year. This does not contradict the fact that the coefficient of exportations raised up to 14% of the GIP in 1980, to 21% in 1990, and to 24% in 1995. The average growth between 1991 and 1996 was 3.1%, and CEPAL affirmed that in order to attain a "productive transformation with equity", the annual growth rate should not be less than the 6%. Only two countries (Mexico and Brazil), represent the 60% of the regional product and more than half of the exportations. The external Latin American public debt was of US\$420.9 billions in 1988 and of 487 billions in 1993. This means that the region, due to the structural conditions of the debt, to the terms of exchange and the runaway of capitals, transferred and decapitalized itself during the 80's in an approximative amount of 500 billions of dollars.

n) The emergency of "delegative democracies", called in this way by Guillermo O'Donnell, in order to characterize in this manner new forms of political and social clientelism and of leaderships strongly personalized, opposed to the weakness of the institutions. This phenomenon has its correlate in the exacerbation of the traditional supremacy of the executive

power faced to the legislative and judiciary powers and to the "subordinate integration" of large layers of the impoverished population faced to strategies of expansion of the more transnationalized sectors of the capital.

o) The integration processes which could strengthen the economic and/or negotiation capacity of the region faced to other regional blocks, but which could also follow the direction of a subordinate integration, with the result that Latin America will then be a simple appendix of the hemispherical integration.

p) New forms of domination or of liberation thanks to the new communication and information methodologies via Internet and the new telematics networks which tend to substitute the traditional networks.

q) The powerful emergence of multiculturalism, as an expression -among other phenomenons- of the increase of the migration flows.

We shall see now, briefly, the various paradigms of the social sciences in the region since the end of Second World War and up to now.

At the end of the fifties, the future of Latin America was seen through the structural-functionalist paradigms, the traditional Marxism (and through the new version which emerged as a result of the Cuban revolution) and the development vision of CEPAL. If the failure of functionalism was to consider that the classical scheme of the capitalist development of the centre could be reproduced in the periphery -thesis which was validated by the traditional Marxism, which visualized Latin America as a feudal society - and the failure of CEPAL to think that, with the substitution of the importations and a strong State and a strong public sector, results could be obtained; the School of Dependence, in its criticism to the named Latin American dependent capitalism, was not able to give a reflection with practical results on how to construct an alternative model of society. One of the main theorists of this School was the actual President of Brazil, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, who in an appraisal of the last four decades of "El pensamiento socio económico latinoamericano" (The Latin American Socio-Economic Thought) has stressed that: *as thinkers we wanted to 'learn' a reality which we saw as unjust. Now, we shall try to make the change, oriented by feasible utopias*" (2).

The Cepal development thought of Raúl Prebisch has been considered by the dependence theoreticians as a paradigm which, in spite of showing the necessity of modern structural reforms, in praxis was incapable to overcome the reformism. The neoliberal criticism of the development thought concentrated in the excessive State interventionism, the strangling of the private initiative and the assignment of resources in an irrational way.

The main defect of the Dependence Theory was to have not perceived that no system can be independent from the world economy. This interdependent reality does not imply, however, the validity of neoliberalism and its structural adjustment policies - which tend to privilege the function of the market with detriment to the civil society and the State- as a unique valid way, and much

less as the end of history. Specially when we know, now, after more a decade lost in the economic matter, that the structural adjustment has given to the region a strong deterioration of social conditions and a concentration each time bigger of wealth, together with the increase of poverty and social exclusion. If we speak now of Sustainable Human Development (a concept stated by the Brutland Report in 1987), it is because the other *development*, has actually only been a perverse and unbalanced economic development which attempts against man and its environment.

Both theoretical influences which, nowadays, prevail in the Latin American social sciences - the neoliberalism and the postmodernism - hide some dangers. The first tends to the dogmatic reaffirmation of the lineal concepts of universal progress and of the development imagination, and the second one tends to the apotheosis of eurocentrism. The fact that the reports foreseeing the future, during the XXth century, have entered a crisis, does not mean that there is a crisis in any form of thinking towards the future, and much less of the latter. The Report of the "Guberkián Commission for the re-structuration of the social sciences", which contains the contributions of Immanuel Wallerstein who presided such Commission, and of Ilya Prigogine, among other authors, in a fruitful transdisciplinarity, gives us valuable advices on how "Open Social Sciences", though it is obvious that the recommendations, in many aspects, fit better the developed North than the situation we face in our region (3).

The avant-garde idea of the scientific thought, today, in the social and in the natural sciences, seem to coincide in the importance of transdisciplinarity (4). It seems essential to eliminate the artificial and inflexible frontiers, not only among the proper disciplines of social sciences - history, economy, anthropology, law ...- or of natural sciences - physics, mathematics, biotechnology..., - but also between natural and social sciences. This does not imply, at all, to reject the proper specialization of each discipline. The work of authors like Ilya Prigogine, Edgar Morin, I. Wallerstein, Pablo González Casanova and Xavier Gorostiaga, among others, shows us the way. In order to attain this objective, it is necessary to constitute programmes of studies with a transdisciplinary nature, focused on one research problem and theme done, and with the participation of professors invited from other countries. It should be necessary to establish these research programmes of an interdepartmental nature with centres of excellence of the region (cooperation South-South) and outside the region, which would be in the state of art of the disciplines with which the research theme chosen is entered upon.

In number 106 (January-February 1997) of CLACSO Letter, 1996 is shown as "a difficult year for the social sciences institutions in the region". It is stressed that, if "on one side, the actual technological advances in the informatics field open new possibilities for the amelioration of the quality and the impact of the social sciences researches...However we are confronting a real crisis of the institutions which, in the last thirty years have backed the

research... in social sciences in Latin America and the Caribbean". "The result of the adjustment processes impact and the uncomfortable insertion of the region in the processes of economic globalization, as well as the withdrawal of the international cooperation of many countries from the South, is that, nowadays, public and private institutions dedicated to research, and without any earnings, cannot survive without applying to some kind of insertion in the market of the punctual knowledge, it means giving short term consultancies, or giving training and advices in order to survive. The dispersion and the fragmentation, which are a result of these processes, are enormous. Far away is the time when researches looked for a thorough comprehension of a theme: those of a comparative nature, interdisciplinary or at long-term" (5).

The central objective of this Seminar, from the realities stated in the above-mentioned paragraph, is to give new dynamics to the development of social sciences in the region, through the solid union of their main networks, that is to say, ALAS, FLACSO and CLACSO, and UNESCO support to them. It is important to settle down a system of priorities shared by all, which would give a response to the emergencies of Our America, of its civil society and its political classes, in order to establish a **NEW AGENDA OF RESEARCHES IN SOCIAL SCIENCES IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**. If we are not able, all together, to formulate this agenda, the social sciences in the region will lose an identity gained with blood and fire, and we shall be the witnesses not of a "paradigms crisis", but of the re-colonization of our social sciences by paradigms and agendas elaborated according to the interests of the developed North.

In relation to the proposal of a *NEW AGENDA* for the development of social sciences in the region, I should mention that, in April 1997, I recollected criterions of FLACSO and CLACSO in this respect - and of various specialists - which can be resumed as follows:

The creation of the following programmatic areas of work in the Regional Unit of Social and Human Sciences for Latin America and the Caribbean, the headquarters of which are in UNESCO-Caracas office, was suggested:

I. Production of Knowledge and Teaching of Social Sciences

1. To contribute to the consolidation of the Working Groups Programme of CLACSO, which gathers more than 2,000 researchers of the region, clustered around eleven specialized themes, endowed with working instruments through an electronic via and facilities for the diffusion of their work through Internet and other medias.

2. To expand and strengthen UNESCO chairs in social development and culture of peace themes.

3. To undertake, jointly with the Division of information and informatics, an effort for the training of social scientists in the new communication and information technologies.

4. To support the efforts done by CLACSO and FLACSO in order to give access to research resources, like data banks, bibliographies, CD-Roms and pages in WWW, thus giving, in a fast way, working tools to the researchers of the region.

5. To stimulate higher education institutions in order that they carry out the necessary curricula reforms, thus building a bridge between institutions which have attained a high level of excellence and those which want to attain this level.

6. To support the development of pilot programmes on education at a distance, specially those at a post-graduate level.

7. To initiate the preparation of united curricula materials and anthologies of readings for the courses on social sciences, which could be viable through the support of networks like CLACSO and FLACSO.

8. To propitiate a substantive debate among researchers, professors and university authorities on evaluation mechanisms which could be established in the region, like indexing systems of magazines, arbitrage for the selection of articles, and others, which could help to establish criterions of excellence in the research and the teaching.

9. To propitiate a debate on the actual state and the perspectives of social sciences where could participate researchers, directors of centres, public officials of the international system, directors of programmes on science and techniques of governments and public officials of agencies for the development and private foundations, in order to elaborate a consensus which would allow to enter in the new century with new concepts.

10. To support efforts in order to carry out the teaching of social sciences, on other educational levels, the central ideas on tolerance, peace, equitable development, democracy, through the preparation of didactical materials jointly with OREALC, OEI, and other institutions with programmes following this direction.

11. To support programmes in order to strengthen the training of young researchers in areas and critical themes of the social sciences.

II. *Social Sciences and Social Development Policies*

The second axis of discussion was constituted by the examination of the diffusion of knowledge generated by the social sciences, to strengthen the proper academic work, as well as to support the public policies decisions and to strengthen the capacity of action of the civil society. The necessity that UNESCO could support the following activities, was stressed:

1. To undertake a programme of diffusion of best practices supported by a scientific research in the following areas:

- Eradication of poverty
- Measures against corruption
- Social agreement
- Negotiation of conflicts
- Participation of citizens

2. To analyze, carefully, the agreements and commitments of the United Nations Summits, which took place between 1992 and 1996, a task which is necessary in order to help the governments to integrate their social and economic policies. It exist, nowadays, teams of work in the academic society, NGO's of development, which carry out a critical analysis of these documents. It has been suggested to the Regional Unit of Social Sciences that it contributes to the visibility of the analysis mentioned above.

3. To develop new follow-up projects of the Social Summit, for which purpose special resources should be requested from the Development Cooperation Fund at Headquarters, in order to give priority to the three areas agreed upon by the Copenhagen Social Development Summit:

- Social integration
- Productive work
- Poverty

4. To adjust a line of work on social sciences and social transformations which could attend projects in the following themes:

- Multi-culturalism and multi-ethnicity
- The cities as scenarios of social transformation
- Migration and transnationality
- Decentralization, local power and citizens participation
- Setting up of regional blocks
- Technological revolution, social change and daily life
- Drugs traffic and parallel powers
- Equity of class
- Prospective studies
- PYMES
- Youth

III. *Towards a Peace Culture*

The third line of work suggested to the Regional Unit for Social Sciences involves the development of programmes with a view to:

- 1) Contribute to the consolidation of peace, promoting human rights and democracy, tolerance and international comprehension;
- 2) Promote human rights and fight against discrimination;
- 3) Support the consolidation of democratic processes in the region:

4) Contribute to the prevention of conflicts and to the consolidation of peace once the conflicts end.

IV. Cooperation for the Social Development

The Regional Unit for Social Sciences in Latin America and the Caribbean, the headquarters of which are in Caracas, is requested to apply for extra-budgetary funds for their utilization as seed money in the elaboration of technical cooperation projects with public entities, the private sector and the civil society, that could be established in co-operation with bilateral cooperation agencies, organizations of the United Nations System, International financing agencies (IDB, World Bank) and private and public foundations. The regional scientific networks will support the execution of such projects. It is expected that these cooperation projects will be applied to the international, as well as to the regional, sub-regional, and national level.

This NEW AGENDA will allow us, during 1998-1999 biennium, to coordinate UNESCO requirements (in its medium-term plan and its plan of work for 1998-1999, as a result of the requirements of the Member States via the UNESCO National Commissions and Permanent Delegations at UNESCO) with those of the Latin American social scientists *in an extensive scope plan, which will substitute the punctual activities with no real durable impact, by central programmes*. You, ALAS, CLASO and FLACSO, shall decide, at the beginning of the biennium, how to execute the funds assigned by UNESCO to the Regional Unit led by me. You are the ones who must recommend the most adequate consultants and the appropriate places for the best development of the activities. We shall decide, jointly, on how to execute the priorities of this NEW AGENDA, in coordination with UNESCO National Commissions in the different countries, and with UNESCO Regional Offices.

Notes

1. Vid. in No. 139 of *Nueva Sociedad*, "América Latina: la vision de de los cientistas sociales". (Latin America: the vision of the social scientists.)
2. Fernando Henrique Cardoso, "El pensamiento socio económico latinoamericano" (The Latin American socio-economic thought), *Nueva Sociedad*, No. 139, sept-oct. 1995, p. 25.
3. E. Lander - "La herencia sociológica de América Latina y el futuro de las ciencias sociales" (Latin America sociological heritage and the future of social sciences, Venezuela, Colonia Tovar, July 1997). I. Wallerstein, *Abrir las ciencias sociales. Siglo XXI*, (To open the social sciences. XXI century), México 1996. For historical antecedents on the evolution of the social sciences in the region see H. Sonntag, *Duda, certeza, crisis* (Doubt, certainty, crisis.) - UNESCO-Nueva Sociedad, Caracas 1988.

See also from the same author, F. Calderón, A. Quijano and F. Weffort, *¿Nuevos temas, nuevos contenidos?* (New themes, new contents), UNESCO-Nueva Sociedad, Caracas 1989.

H. Sonntag y L. Yero, *Procesos sociales en marcha* (Social processes forward.) UNESCO-Nueva Sociedad, Caracas 1992. See in the International Social Science Review, numbers 139 and 140. Vid. T. Dos Santos, "The Latin American development: past, present and future. A homage to André Gúnder Frank". *Problemas del Desarrollo*, Vol 27, No. 104, January-March 1996, UNAM, Mexico.

4. Ilya Prigogine, *La fin des certitudes* (The end of certainties), Editions Odile Jacob, Paris, 1996; E. Morin, *Terre-Patrie* (Earth-Fatherland), Editions du Seuil, Paris, 1993. E. Morin, *Pour une utopie réaliste* (For a realistic utopia), Arléa, Paris, Nov. 1996.

5. Vid. "Carta de CLACSO", No. 106, Jan.-February 1997, p. 1.

Note: The views contained herewith, in this paper, are expressed on a personal basis and were their author's contribution to the Latin American Regional Seminar.

CHAPTER 11

RESTRUCTURING THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: TOWARD A NEW PARADIGM

Pablo González Casanova
National Autonomous University of Mexico

The current restructuring of concepts in the sciences and humanities poses problems of congruence and rigor which are by no means mere academic exercises. Their inconsistency and the failure to go to the roots or specify their implications is not limited to academic life or concepts; it also has a very serious impact on political action, by preventing a transcendence of well-known patterns even when one momentarily realizes that there is something *new*.

Focusing on *what is new* will not only furnish a better understanding of the world we live in, but also permit a better construction of alternatives and a more effective struggle to achieve objectives. In particular, I refer to the problems mentioned with increasing frequency in the academic and political worlds, while many dominant or emerging forces continue to have the same impact as in the past.

One hears more and more about systems which are partly organized and partly erratic (reflecting the new chaos concept that includes organization). One also hears about complex systems that are largely articulated, with limited linear behaviors and unlinear ones that surround them. And one hears about systems close to equilibrium, which supplant or supersede others that are far from equilibrium—the latter threatened by turbulence and potential bifurcation of tendencies, one of which comes to dominate but not because it was predetermined, and on which no probabilistic predictions can be made, though it is possible to contribute to its path in terms of the construction of alternatives.

The problem lies in that, after asserting that these phenomena are the ones that most help us to describe, predict, explain, and construct the world, we come back without the least embarrassment to positions in which we posit a total opposition of order and chaos, in which we seek neoclassic equilibrium, or in which we think in terms of a predominately disarticulated and unorganized system of structures, wherein we focus on linear perspectives and projects even when we reason "dialectically". This tendency manifests itself in the persistence of upward spirals which return to their starting points, although at continually higher levels.

Accordingly, we do not think in terms of non-linear "evolutionary optimizations", "self-optimizing strategies", "optimization of choices and values

for choosing", or "learning strategies" which include the legacies of the past and allow for effective action in the processes of self-replication and creation.

The techno-scientific transformations that have occurred not only fail to register in their new meanings, but even in their implications for old concepts, tendencies, and structures, which subsist and are redefined in the new sets.

Our traditional ways of thinking are not entirely disqualified; there are realities in which order is set against disorder and vice versa; others that approach equilibrium; many that are found to be disarticulated and unorganized. There are significant linear trends with minimal deviations in their probable behavior; turbulence occurs in the absence of significant bifurcations. What is more, in regard to the dialectic of the dominant system, "the law of the system" discovered by Marx continues to be valid. It is not only an unavoidable historical necessity as a form of accumulation, but also a "lateral restriction" with "undesired" effects which, until there is a will to prevent them (something that does not always happen) appear as "tertiary" and "secondary" effects.

In any event, even if room must be made for the new discoveries and techniques, their presence does not do away with all the "old" knowledge. Both merit our attention and need to be sifted, articulated, and their articulations discovered.

Moreover, all scientific formation processes retain and redefine former concepts, reconstruct them, and circumscribe them. If one seeks formations in the new concepts or realities that will help to understand them, with the new concepts one also restructures and defines the previous ones, and above all, seeks to control the range of their validity and scope. To undertake these tasks with the greatest possible consistency and accuracy is all the more important to the extent that we experience the long-discussed crisis of paradigms.

If by paradigm we mean "a way of expressing and solving problems", today's crisis extends both to the principal paradigms of scientific research and the principal paradigms of political action. To the crisis of structural-functionalism and empiricist philosophy is now added the crises of liberalism, social democracy, communism, revolutionary nationalism, and neoliberalism.

At the same time, the emerging scientific and political paradigms are filled with many diffused and disarticulated concepts. The most positive contributions of "postmodern" philosophy are often expressed separately from the no less important ones stemming from "constructivism", and neither the former nor the latter suffice to *construct the new research paradigm* or as a way to express and solve problems. Nor will they suffice for that purpose until they are articulated among themselves and with an emerging alternative political-social paradigm of universal democracy—a postulate we propose at this time in axiomatic form.

The articulation of paradigms by means of some of their basic elements will link the new systems analysis to classical analysis, including that of the Marxist type. It will in general unite postmodern thought with the underlying modern

thought and actions as well as the concrete situations of the country in which we live and the world in which we think and struggle.

But for that to happen it is necessary to ask what kind of research to favor, among the three that can help us. There is theory-driven research; there is research oriented to the empirical results of previous research and the outcomes of confrontations between theory and practice; and there is research driven by concepts in their confrontation with laboratory experiments and observation, or with those of construction and struggle. In our view, the latter type of research is the most promising and the one best suited to helping us in the factual, discursive, and theoretical restructuring of the postmodern and constructivist philosophies and theories, as well as in the construction of another which will necessarily have to subsume the previous ones (Marxist, Keynesian) though not in a linear, balanced, organized, and articulated way; rather, in the midst of a true "revolution of paradigms".

In any event, the general goal of concept-driven research can have many starting points. One of them is the one that looks for the inheritance, formation, and restructuring of the concepts and categories that Latin America has formulated and reformulated and which comprise its contribution to the social science of the region and the world. To start from that regional-world perspective is to acknowledge our "position" of observation, experimentation, construction, and struggle. It reflects the need to find an epistemological position of its own, which need is now recognized not only in the life sciences but also in the matter sciences, and which is in our case complemented by another important position —the one which puts forward the alternative political-social paradigm of a more democratic, freer, and less unjust world which is now restructuring its scientific and political concepts to achieve its social goals.

The Formation of Sociopolitical Concepts from Latin America

In our examination of the structuring and restructuring of concepts, we will discover conflicting propositions. The method to be used will consist of calling attention to the structurings and restructurings we consider significant for a knowledge oriented toward the construction of a scientific-political paradigm useful to the "general interest" and a non-exclusive universal democracy. That method will keep us from losing our way in debates about theoretical fidelity or infidelity, or in other debates of a "pseudoscientific" bent which conceal their own ideology under the cloak of the end of ideologies.

The aim is to focus on a work of "theoretical accumulation" related to the current restructuring of concepts and their recent formation, based on the theoretical-practical objectives or goals of the alternative paradigm of a universal democracy or "democracy for all". To this "teleonomic" knowledge we will add that of the contexts in which it occurs.

The most significant questions that arise in this respect would appear to be: 1. What are the concepts contributed by the social sciences that continue to be valid today?; 2. What important contributions did they make to theory?; 3. How should they be redefined and circumscribed on the basis of the most recent discoveries about systems and the restructurings which the dominant system has achieved or been able to impose, and which keep the current state of the world system far removed from equilibrium and full of contradictions, whose outcome is unpredictable and leaves a more problematic than "enigmatic", more questionable than questioning, immediate future to the construction of alternatives, fractals, and attractors?

The contributions to the social sciences in the second half of the 20th Century merit special attention, though there are some from previous periods which continue to have a strong presence. The most important are expressed in the following concepts: 1. political independence; 2. order; 3. progress (and development); 4. freedom; 5. revolution; 6. marginalization; 7. center-periphery (and their exchange relations); 8. dependency (with a search for economic, social, and cultural independence or with a defeated nationalism and acceptance of global capitalism); 9. internal colonialism; 10. social and moral revolution; 11. political systems and power systems; 12. informal society and authoritarian formalism, neoliberal informal society; 13. exploitation; 14. the pedagogy of the oppressed and collective pedagogy (reading of texts and of the world); 15. liberation theology (in regard to the faith and the option for the poor); 16. democracy; 17. radical postmodernism and construction of the world (struggle and negotiation, autonomy and networks). Ethnicity and civil society. Construction of power. "Rule by obeying." "Everything for everyone; for us nothing." Dignity.

In some cases the concepts have been formulated to the point of becoming paradigmatic and in general use throughout Latin America and Indoamerica, as well as other regions of the world. In others they came from Europe or North America and were redefined or enriched in Latin America, recording regional experiences which occurred in those continents.

The coming and going of ideas and experiences was never important when it was limited to pure intellectualizing or "Eurocentric" and "Gringo-ized" fashions, and when it did not take concrete forms also including the universal, from the provincial, ethnic, village, or national.

It was always the articulation of Western and continental thought with the life and the social and ethnic movements of "our America" which contributed to the formation and restructuring of concepts that helped to understand and change the global and the local, or the national, spheres. In that way the province to one which belonged changed; the village in which one lived changed; the university at which one taught changed. The change generated by the ethnic groups was slower and more difficult; its contribution to the world as a whole was never even achieved by Mariátegui. It could only be achieved

by the linkage of the "1960s revolutionaries" with the Maya Indians of Mexico, and the revolutionary paradigm change and resistance of the Mayas in the 1990s, reflecting an extremely strong interaction between the two.

The concepts prior to the so-called "professional sociology" were also part of the context. But their reconstructions contain elements of theoretical accumulation which we cannot ignore today. "*Independence*" was originally conceived as "political"; the experience of neocolonialism, which appeared in the formally "independent" countries led to the expression of the need for cultural and economic independence. "Order" was conceived in terms of the legal forms of constitutionalism, which often remained mere forms and goals of an ideal society, while the real order was brutally imposed by warlords and oligarchies, both of which clothed themselves in sacralized symbolic forms. "Progress" was conceived in terms of technology, science, and enterprise, as well as an advance which included the goals of freedom, equality, and fraternity. The dissemination of those values was the subject of practices and myths to which the most outstanding men associated themselves. A culture of "progressive", and later, "developmentalist" falsity led the "common man" to think separately of "the formal country" and "the real country", or about "ideal progress" and "real progress", with combinations of traditional forms of life and more or less concealed colonialist, neocolonialist, imperialist, and globalizing processes. In the historical-political thought about Progress and Development there reappeared and continues to reappear the idea that a process of ascendant change is under way. The importance attributed to education at its different levels, and to the Spanish or national language policy, was one of the most original and influential expressions of the Progress concept. Others were associated with the expansion and real development of British, native, and North American capitalism.

"Freedom", linked to thought and expression, appeared as forced tolerance or as an acknowledged right. It was a concept that was disseminated as a social value much more than in other regions of the world. It took legal forms which turned into frustrated aspirations of most of the movements against oligarchic dictatorships.

The "necessary Revolution" was enriched with the experiences of legal and political movements which achieved nothing, changed nothing. To that universal enrichment was added that of the countries of colonial origin which gradually discovered that "the revolution" could not be only political; it had to be social, cultural, and economic as well. In the vague theory of nationalist revolutions which associated with Marxism-Leninism, Mexico was a pioneer and had worldwide influence. That was also the case of a democratic and pluri-ethnic revolution which postulated the construction of the world from the starting point of civil society.

There is no doubt that the concepts or precepts outlined above are at the heart of the social sciences as they developed in Latin America up to the

present, and in which certain contributions of international scope were made. Many of them help specify phenomena, goals, and means in concrete situations, with critical attitudes, with thought and rethought experiences. These are concepts confirmed or "not disconfirmed" in different situations and periods; circumscribed in different spaces. They are accordingly concepts and bases for conceptual networks which are important to speak with a minimum of rigor and to construct or reconstruct the new concepts or discourse we now use and develop without allowing ourselves to take liberties that would lead us to say whatever we want with frivolous arbitrariness, by custom or expressing supposedly academic pretensions that not only tend to conceal the accumulative nature of the previous concepts but also the necessary structuring of living concepts, resources for structuring thought and action. Bearing these concepts in mind at the end of the 20th Century and the beginning of the 21st Century will help put in their place those who—as sociologists and economists, technoscientists, or conservative philosophers—attempt to impose what they call a truly scientific and contemporary thought that ignores the difficult and rich conceptual construction that has existed and continues to exist in Latin America, part of which is universal and has been adopted in the scientific research performed around the world.

"Marginality" or "marginalism" is a concept formulated by the Argentine Gino Germani. He used it to denote a very important fact in the development of neocapitalism in our countries. To the stratification and social mobility of the "industrial" and "modern" countries, so important in the development of neocapitalism and the mediations which alter the class struggle, is added in the "developmentalist" era and in the countries of the periphery a very useful category for understanding social, cultural, political, and economic phenomena: that of the population excluded from the benefits of development. The mistakes in the interpretation and formulation of that category do not undermine its enormous explanatory potential with undeniable break points between "the participants" and "the marginals".

Another category of worldwide scope and dissemination was the "center-periphery" concept launched by Raúl Prebisch at ECLA and later enriched by Paul Baran for analysis of the world surplus and its distribution. That category made it possible to find a break point both at the worldwide level and within the different regions of the world; today we rightly think and analyze in terms of centers which have peripheries and peripheries which have centers. This category not only takes in the older ones on the gaps between city and country, or empire and colonies, but also the more recent ones on structures and globality relations, their niches and contexts.

Another famous category in worldwide sociology was that of "dependence", formulated by the Brazilian G.H. Cardoso and the Chilean Enzo Faletto. Their chief contribution (and one which subsists today) was to reveal the false theoretical and structural foundations of any nationalism or independence

struggle which ignores the worldwide nature of capitalist development and the structural obstacles that the construction of increasingly just and industrialized nation-states must confront. In the intellectual arena the "dependency" category set off the Third World's crisis of populist nationalism. But neither the conservative and conformist interpretations to which it gave rise nor the more profound ones which appeared to distance themselves under a Marxist-Leninist approach have deprived it of its validity to this day. Its principal meaning—referring to the world system, or capitalist world system, as a set to which we cannot be indifferent if we want to understand and act in the subsets which comprise it—continues to be valid.

"Internal colonialism" is still another category which retains its validity today. Having been systematized in Latin America, it was also applied in many research projects in Africa and Asia, as well as in Australia, the United States, Canada, and the former Soviet Union. In the latter case, it was condemned by those who called themselves descendants of Lenin but once again (since the 1960s) subjected the "nationalities" to relations of exploitation and domination. The explanatory validity of "internal colonialism" in the phenomena of discrimination, racism, parasitism, and expropriation of conquered and reconquered ethnic groups is key to an *alternative* position in favor of ethnic and pluri-ethnic "autonomies". The articulation of the struggles of different peoples for autonomy is especially useful to confront domination and exploitation and to enrich the democratic alternatives at the disposal of the peoples. It helps to specify the struggles in our countries and to pose alternatives for personal, family, and community autonomy which do not only concern the ethnic groups and peoples, but also a great many organizations of governments, companies, and civil society.

In the great movements of the Cuban Revolution and the Chilean Popular Unity coalition, the social scientists and intellectuals made very important contributions on the concepts of revolution and morality, power and politics. The Cuban Revolution broke with the concepts of a Stalinistic determinist Marxism-Leninism and the more conservative positions of dependency theory. The Cuban Revolution established strong links between overcoming conformism, reconciliation with what is possible, and adventurism by putting forward moral and ideological positions that came from Martí, and through political and ideological statements related to the renewed articulation of the groups and masses, foci and mediations, vanguards and bases, which came from Baliño and Mella. The articulations of politics, morality, and the masses allowed them to make use of ideologies, strategies, and tactics with a flexibility that did not lose sight of the general objectives of independence, justice, and freedom. The Cuban "rebels" represented a theoretical-practical opposition to the "foquist" voluntarism which was falsely attributed to Debray and to the determinism of the "modes of production" concept expressed by a superficial academic radicalism. Its most profound propositions opened the path for a

revolution and a resistance conducted with the people, and which addressed the national and social issue as well as the overall structuring of power along with the people.

The Popular Unity movement in Chile was the world's first attempt by an elected government to effectively build a socialist democracy. Its most important conceptual legacy is that it makes it possible to clearly distinguish between political power and State power, the latter not only with its apparatus and its military, ideological, and social foundations, but also with a market controlled by the dominant national and international interests which used it to encourage some policies and discourage others. The concept of "destabilization" or that of "democratic governability" for a government elected by the people on a social justice platform finds elements which cannot be ignored in the Chilean literature of the period. Similar problems arise today for the municipal and local governments that are winning elections in different parts of the world. They are part of a process of transition to the "democracy for all" or the "non-exclusive democracy", about which the theoretical constructions of the past can be very useful, though they need to be considerably enriched.

Another fundamental concept coming out of academia is that of the "informal society" developed by the Mexican-Chilean sociologist Larissa Lomnitz Adler. Based on Russian texts and original sources, Lomnitz Adler reformulated the "real country"- "formal country" dynamic used by 19th Century thinkers such as Justo Sierra, and discovered the dynamic that characterizes the contradictions of any country where the political class says not only that it fights for justice but also that it has achieved justice, and not only expresses that idea in authoritarian or totalitarian form but also engages in corruption and illegal accumulation at the same time. The social justice movements with few resources, great needs, and hierarchical, populist, and clientilistic practices generate an informal and real world, which is carefully and cruelly denied.

To this concept of "informal society" or "informal economy" the Argentine Victor Tockman added another which, with the same terminology, reflects a phenomenon of equal importance in the time of neoliberalism and frequently used by its political representatives. Tockman's "informal economy" refers to a process whereby unemployment and underemployment grow, and situations of marginalization from development turn into those of exclusion for those who had previously achieved rights and security in the sphere of work and services. The praise given to the "informal economy" by certain neoliberal economists and publicists is combined with the use of its internal contradictions as a basis for supporting impoverished businessmen and turning them into intermediaries for subcontracting and controlling impoverished and extremely impoverished informal workers. This concept is also used in a new policy for managing informal populations. Tockman was one of the first to express a critical response to this phenomenon. The impoverishment and de-participation or

"exclusion" of the social sectors and manual workers who had previously found formal work at the minimum wage, social security coverage, free and universal education, etc., appears to be growing to extremes which are uncontrollable or dysfunctional for the "system".

The concept of "exploitation" is fully confirmed today when the "working class's loss of centrality" and the restructuring of the class struggle in industrial society have become undeniable facts. The concept of "exploitation" makes it possible to analyze the expropriation of surplus value through salary, tax, commercial, monetary, and financial channels. What is more, it makes it possible to study historical-political models in which the current exploitation reappears in the context of the central and peripheral system and its subsystems by applying different policies of mediation, repression, and social, cultural, political, and economic exclusion. Polanyi's "distribution principle" with higher, middle, and lower strata; that of "participants" and "marginals", that of "the included" and "the excluded", that of niches and networks with "reservations" and "disaster zones", all help to perfect the modeling of political-social systems and optimize decision making in practical and functional ways for the "law of the system" and exploitation.

In the midst of enormous changes there subsists the social relationship of exploitation in new and old forms through salary and tax channels, free and forced labor. At the same time the transfers of surplus are restructured with the old phenomena of domination, depredation, and parasitism, and there is a reformulation of political, social, and ideological mediations of the traditional culture, mass culture, and focalized culture in combination with the structures of repression and co-optation of individuals and groups.

The analysis of the exploitation-domination relationships contains a potential for a simultaneously structural and political investigation superior to that of "modes of production" and a mere analysis of capitalist accumulation. The latter tend toward a reifying determinism that can only be transcended by the political and structural history of the social relationship of exploitation.

Research into global exploitation or the "globalization of exploitation" today aims to discover what is new in the "world system" dialectic and move ahead from the structuralist models to those which seek to build the structures and the system, its subsystems and contexts.

The future of the exploitation category will probably have to accompany a better-known and more widely accepted one, "domination". In the construction and struggle for a freer, juster, and more democratic world, the conservative resistance by the powers that will be clearly linked to exploitation and domination by the market and the State.

A concept with growing worldwide dissemination is Paulo Freire's concept of the pedagogy of the oppressed. The art of teaching everyone to read, the way to learn to act in the world starting from the position in which one lives, is the most enriching form of universal pedagogy, which *includes* the slaves, the

marginals, and the excluded. Literacy education acquired the character of word-act for the benefit of the majority of humankind with Freire. After Freire has come a development of concepts and techniques for the education of collectivities as collectivities, with "collective knowledge trees" in which "learning-teaching workshops" are organized by the groups themselves. Articulations of the different aspects of knowledge and action are forged in such contexts.

Liberation theology is the maximum effort to desacralize established power and its practice of legitimating itself through the people's beliefs and faith. It demands respect for dogma, but also the "option for the poor" on the part of priests and believers. In the sphere of theology and epistemology it takes a purely scientific approach to the validity and applicability of social theories, including Marxist ones. Though it has been severely persecuted by the top ecclesiastic hierarchies allied to the established powers and dominant interests, liberation theology has also enjoyed strong support from a large number of bishops and priests. It has indirectly influenced the Postconciliar church as a whole, making Catholicism one of the most advanced of the world religions in terms of the defense of ecumenism understood as a plurality of beliefs.

The concept of "democracy for all" is far superior to that of the so-called "popular democracies" and that of the "socialist democracies" which fostered revolutionary nationalism and communism. It combines the peoples' need for participation in decision making with a defense of ideological, cultural, ethical, political, and religious pluralism, as well as a struggle for different forms of autonomy and balance of power among the different regions, cultures, and institutions. Heir to the great tradition of 19th Century liberalism (associated with the national and popular struggles of Juárez and Martí and the anti-imperialist nationalist, socialist, and even communist movements), the concept of a non-exclusive democracy is associated above all with the positions of the "New Left" which arose after the Cuban Revolution, and in particular, the great student and popular movements of 1968. In its most advanced versions it takes in the theoretical and methodological innovations of the so-called "new sciences" with their analysis of self-regulating and complex systems.

The expression of a new historical approach to democracy does more than enrich the critical discovery of the scientific revolution in the second half of the 20th Century. It also opens up a new concept of humanism in which the plural, as *plurality*, is of key importance. It poses the problem of a humanism made up of many humanisms, peoples, and ethnic groups; of many cultures, civilizations, and beliefs. What is more, in its conceptual structuring it would appear to have a decisive influence on what we could call a radical postmodernism which points to a "revolution for the revolution", i.e., the construction of an alternative world "made of many worlds", whose first goal is —already— to change those who want to change the world, bringing them

to cultivate a political-moral respect for their own dignity and that of others which models behavior toward other individuals, institutions, and peoples.

The new movement defends the critical thought of the Guatemalan poet Luis Cardozo y Aragón, who said that "disconnection is reactionary". Almost automatically, though subject to testing, it proclaims the need for a logic of combination and connection, in which "this and also this" supersedes the old dogmatic duality of "this or that".

The change reflects the thought of the peoples in the new scientific revolution. With these elements it formulates the problem of social justice as one of democratic power in the control and construction of society, the market, and the state. Far from returning to the old welfare state model or the explicit assumptions of socialism, it subsumes them and puts more attention than they do on the organization of power in civil society and its components. Though the articulations between this democratic power in civil society and state power are not precise, and still less are those between the democracy for the peoples movements and the systems of accumulation, exploitation, and distribution of surplus, the emphasis on the need for a democracy with power, a power with autonomies, and a politics with dignity make an important contribution which finds one of its most important theoretical-practical sources in the Maya Indian movement in southern Mexico known as the Zapatista Army of National Liberation. Its slogan: "Everything for everyone, nothing for us" is a kind of critique of the clientilistic, corporatist, and populist structures of the past. It makes the struggle against new privileges the key to a power that is not "paternalist", "liberal", "privileged", "self-seeking" or "in league with the exploiters".

In this sphere, a minimum of rigor requires attention to the concepts which reflect an accumulated knowledge and those which go beyond that legacy without turning against it. The rigor to preserve accumulated knowledge is as important as the rigor demanded by the new heuristics (creation of meaning) and the new pedagogy. The necessary linkage affects both the social sciences and the social movements at any time, but especially today given the crisis of the sociopolitical and technoscientific paradigms.

The Heuristics and Pedagogy of the Social Sciences and Social Movements: The Construction of a New Paradigm

The crisis of paradigms, theories, ideologies, and political-social systems does not free us to think with "volubility". The small oppressions of ingenious spirits need to be confronted.

The nihilistic postmodern arguments make it impossible to discover what is truly new in postmodernism. The same thing can be said of the lack of rigor in seeking the meaning of the "new sciences" and their more profound and significant meaning for the historical period in which we live. A large part of

postmodernism—especially the conformist kind—like a large part of the new technoscientific politics, is oriented toward the preservation of particular interests. But a great deal of thought and numerous expressions of postmodernism point to problems and solutions of an alternative paradigm. The technosciences reveal the effective structures and functions of the dominant system. They cannot be ignored, since they alter the dialectic in which we live. They alter humanity as a whole by creating a new history in which organizations have unprecedented importance. Reagan's "new world order" is an "established order" articulated to an "established disorder". New fields are opened up in it for the historical laws of systems far from equilibrium and nonlinear behaviors. At its dominant centers they prepare the self-regulating and "dissipative" mega-organizations which treat the rest of the world as a "context".

The paradigm of an alternative world will not be accomplished without understanding and command of the new global meanings which reflect, express, and encourage postmodernism and the technosciences. The problem will lie in discovering the new meaning of the world to be built from the standpoint of the "general interests" and along with them. It will lie in discovering the new meaning of the history that can be constructed and the role played in it by categories which did not exist or were less important in the past, such as mega-organizations and their "collective technocrats". It will consist of revealing how to redefine the world as a whole and how to redefine it on the basis of the new general meaning of the organization of order and disorder.

The paradigm of an alternative world will investigate and make use of the "deliberate" teleonomies and the "lateral effects" that the dominant system produces and cannot prevent, given the particular interests which constrain it. It will analyze the "contradictions" as other contradictions and as the same ones; it will lie in wait for the negantropies of the dominant system, their possibilities and their limits. Only in that way can it contribute, from the domain of the dominant scientific knowledge and critique, to the creation of an alternative world order.

Concretely, the problem consists of linking scientific and humanistic knowledge—and in the latter, political, moral, and social knowledge as the keys to a heuristics of the "general interest", built up with many "general interests" of whose politics of growing coincidence we are ignorant both within our nations or our region and, naturally, in relation to the worldwide initiatives for an alternative policy, i.e., for the construction of a world comprised of many non-exclusive democracies.

The challenge consists of leaving behind the new metaphysical universals and not being trapped in the atomization of thought on the new and old categories. It is necessary to specify the most significant structurings of a worldwide alternative project which goes beyond the dominant concepts of

"totality" to the extent they do not make a place for "fragmentations" and "exclusions", and still less for the domination relations tied to those of exploitation and parasitism.

The "Global Sciences" which study the ecosystem and "survival systems", as well as measures of "global reach", do not focus on the measures that are *necessary* to solve human problems and which, if applied, would affect the social relations of exploitation and their beneficiaries. The "capitalist world system" concepts are open to these questions. They lead us to pose the problems of destructurings and restructurings, of the "declassifications" and "reclassifications" of social relations in the world system and the subsystems of which it is comprised. They are the source of a fundamental concern which links the heuristics and the politics of uncertainty to the "law of the system" and the struggle for mediations in order to build a freer and less unequal world in relation to differences. But the way in which the general interest approach deals with exploitation (or the many particular exploitations) appears to be mediated by oppression (or the particular oppressions) and by a concept on the basis of which the new paradigm can be articulated: that of democracies with all and for all.

To call —as the Mexican Zapatistas do— for a revolution focused on the organization of civil society "without taking power" —and to conceive this project in the plural form and in civil societies worldwide— opens the way to a set of conflicts and negotiations, of revolutions and evolutions. This in turn makes it necessary to reorganize the concepts that did not exist *before*: the guiding idea of a non-exclusive universal democracy, a democracy united in its diversity. The many problems to which this novel political-epistemological approach points will require knowledge by both specialists and collectivities. They will require the development and dissemination of a new heuristics, in the sense in which Richard Rorty defines it as "abnormal discourse" (which goes beyond ordinary discourse and focuses on the phenomena of creation by searching for "the meaning of what is happening and building this meaning from "unforeseeables") (Rorty, 1979, p. 316.)

The dissemination of that heuristics will necessarily be interactive and intercommunicative, in which a creative and universal dialog will spur the learning and teaching processes, as well as those of discovery and "conversion", with strong and increasingly intense contacts between what has until now been characterized as a culture of specialists and a general culture.

The social sciences, as a heuristics and a pedagogy of small groups and large populations, will have to address the problems of intercommunication as the construction of the core and plural project of the democracies with all and for all, thereby addressing the problems of the "for all" which are so difficult to solve in authoritarian and exclusive societies. But they are heirs to many libertarian struggles with entirely usable symbols and practices of cohesion. What should be taught? To whom? To how many? How? With what and with

whom? With what accent? With what emphasis? With what precision? With what relationship of knowledge and personality, of character, will, hope, dignity? In what ways to put an end to exclusion, to fight for freedom and autonomy? With what command of the relationship among knowledge, power, and duty? With what word-act practices, what discourse-act practices, wherein knowledge, power, and dignity are joined? How and what history is to be recorded? What variations should be achieved between knowledge of the general and knowledge of the specific? How can the nomothetic and the idiomatic, the particular and the general, be brought together? How can we lose our fear of teaching the "higher" scientific and humanistic culture to *everyone*? How can we redefine the general culture and the mobile specializations? How can we achieve the necessary link between the sciences and literature, among politics, history, and action? How can we link intelligence and character under conditions of uncertainty?

The pedagogy of the social sciences and social movements which will model an alternative world will have to destructure and restructure its concepts on: 1. structures; 2. theories; 3. mediations; 4. leaders and negotiations; 5. functions; 6. strategies; 7. alternatives; 8. the variations of the possible and the necessary, of the laws and the historical-systemic needs as obstacles and paths to the construction of an alternative world; and 9. discourse-action for construction. Not only must it pose the problem of generalization in science, but also that of the generalization of science.

As Paulo Cesar Alves (1997), of the University of Bahia has noted: the "traditional" theories are subject to an internal critique that makes it possible to incorporate new theoretical and empirical forms to study how far the loss of centrality of the subject of a historical-social creation implies the composition-recomposition of subject which establish new bridges among themselves and the different strata, among their consciousness and their *objectivities*. In this respect Alves calls attention to some methodological problems that are useful for the drafting of an intertext. Among them is the need to distinguish between the methods corresponding to the "production" processes (*latu sensu*) and those corresponding to the actions in which the "production" or acts of production take place. This distinction becomes all the more necessary to the extent that the new chaos theory confirms the existence of a world in which chaos precedes and succeeds organization and construction in forms which cannot be identified by mere analogy, and which requires in the historical-political world the articulation of the quantitative and qualitative methods and that of instrumental and interactive knowledge in an encounter between the fundamental concepts of the sciences and the humanities which come from structural functionalism and historical materialism —though both have been transcended as systems or paradigms by a reality and a paradigm to which radical constructivism and postmodernism significantly approach but which they do not complete. The new social science paradigm will have to subsume

Marxism-Leninism and structural functionalism, and integrate them with radical postmodernism and the "new sciences". It will do so on the basis of the concrete memories of the peoples, politicians, and intellectuals, but looking forward toward a future of universal democracy which returns the meaning to the words.

The problems and the most useful pedagogy for the construction of an alternative world require a search for the fundamental concepts of the inherited and current theories, with a view to inserting them into a concept that appears to orient understanding and action for a society built of many societies; a democracy for all, of a non-exclusive nature, made up of many differences and sympathies. With utopia and the path, this is the core problem to research and transmit.

Bibliography

Alves, P.C. (1997), "Dilemmas and Challenges in the Social Sciences in Brazil", Lecture, Caracas, July.

Rorty, R. (1979), *La filosofía y el espejo de la naturaleza*, Madrid: Cátedra, 1989.

**XIV^e CONGRÈS
MONDIAL
DE
SOCIOLOGIE**

14th World Congress of Sociology

XIV^o Congreso Mundial de Sociología
