

Social Sciences in the Periphery

The Emergence and Development of Economics in Uruguay

Adriana Barreiro and Léa Velho

Science is, eminently, a social institution. Science emerges and develops in a particular space. It is based on particular needs and influenced by the characteristics of particular contexts. Science adopts certain institutional forms, and not others, as a result of both the organizational map in which it is located and the evolutionary and political processes that preceded it. Also, it follows paths and orientations in accordance with the factors and priorities that evolve in every specific context. Science, from its problems to its results, is contingent because it integrates the conditions of its own constitution.

The realization of the socially constructed nature of science has rarely prompted detailed consideration of how knowledge production has been differently organized and controlled in different circumstances (cf. Whitley, 1984: 9). This is particularly true for the developing countries. This study tries to fill in this gap. We address the emergence and development of two social sciences dis-

ciplines in a peripheral country: economics and sociology in Uruguay. More specifically we look at the conditions that shaped the choices of research problems, the approaches to study them as well as the results and interpretations considered relevant. We suggest that all those developments, together with the inception of sociology and economics in particular institutions, were greatly affected by the political instability of the country from the 1960's onwards.

The political events steered to the choice of particular research strategies performed alternatively in public institutions or in private research centres. These strategies included, among other things, the nature and the intensity of the relations established between the Uruguayan scientific community and their colleagues in other countries. This research also takes into consideration the dynamics of the local research community, focusing on the latter's commitment to the norms as well as to the scientific production patterns of the re-

search communities in the so-called central countries.

For doing so this study is based on extensive archival research performed in the most significant research centres and institutions in Uruguay and on a number of in-depth semi-structured interviews conducted with key informants. In what follows we will take sociology and economics in turn, separately, after a short section on the different periods of their development.

Economics and Sociology

The complex and lengthy crisis experienced by Uruguay during the late 1960's served as a fertile soil for the development of diverse research trends within the social sciences as well as for the emergence of studies, interpretations, and propositions of increasing importance.

Economics, history, and sociology are the most traditional social sciences disciplines in Uruguay. They are also those with the largest production. History was born early in the Río de la Plata region. It was believed to be a fundamental tool for the new countries to become aware of their roots and thus able to build their national identity. Research activities in economics and sociology emerged later, after the disciplines were able to found a proper institutional setting. Actually, these disciplines did not develop in Uruguay until the 1960's.

The first scientific interpretations of the social and economic processes in Uruguay occurred when deep-rooted academic traditions already existed in other Latin American nations. Common sense attributes this gap to the sustained economic growth and political stability

that Uruguay had enjoyed for more than half a century which discouraged the study of a reality that seemed to be relatively unproblematic. Nevertheless, the end of the populist political model instituted up to the end of the 1950's, as well as the constant economic imbalances and social conflicts occurred during the 1960s, stimulated the emergence of concerns of diverse nature. They promoted the need for a better understanding of the situation, giving rise to the formulation of diagnosis and models of interpretation. The latter cannot be dissociated from the first steps in economic and sociological investigation.

This important thrust in the social sciences first took place at the official sphere – in the ministries and other government organizations. There was a concerted effort to outline an economic plan for the country and studies were needed for the task. During the second half of the 1960's the stimulus was transferred to the university, *locus* in which a critical stand against the prevailing regime evolved.

When the military regime was established in 1973, the social sciences, as well as other means of cultural expression, were persecuted by the state until the end of the regime in 1985. In this context, research activities in the social sciences were kept alive almost exclusively in private research centres. Some of these centres already existed, but the majority of them emerged during the dictatorship, thanks to foreign financial aid provided by non-governmental organizations, philanthropic foundations, and other international agencies.

The private research centres made vital contributions in two important aspects. First, the studies conducted pro-

duced relevant results, which were fundamental to advance research in the social sciences locally. Second, the centres were the only place preparing the new generations of researchers in the social sciences. They hired young university graduates who later pursued their training in these institutions either through formal graduate programs or through work as assistants to senior researchers. The centres even supported a few young researchers to undertake graduate training abroad.

With the return to democracy, the period identified as of “resistance research” was over. In 1986 the private research centres were no longer exceptional places for scientific research. The Universidad de la Republica – the only institution of higher education in the country up to 1984, which concentrates most of the country’s research effort – was eager to resume former activities. An institutional transformation took place, resulting in a tacit association between the private centres and the university. During the first years (1986-88), both types of institution worked in a cooperative spirit and under a division of roles in terms of teaching and research activities, as well as other creative forms of coordinated actions that were facilitated by the fact that they were a community of academics. This community was increasingly organized according to rewards and publication patterns associated with the ones prevailing in the international scientific community.

To explain the emergence and development of economics and sociology in Uruguay; to follow their evolution during the 1960’s, ’70s and ’80s; to deepen the understanding of the factors that encouraged their development and in-

ternal transformations; to analyze the main influences that oriented their activities; and to frame their evolution in the context of their reality and the socio-economic changes occurred during the same period, one must allude to various crucial aspects of the initial construction, later pseudo-deconstruction, and reconstruction (after 1985) of both disciplines.

The Development of Economics

The process of institutionalization of economics as an academic discipline did not start in Uruguay until the 1950’s. Yet, concerns for economic topics as well as the development of certain economic thought are found in several essays at the end of the 19th century. As is the case in other latitudes, a concern for topics of economics in Uruguay has been encouraged in the context of crises and in the need to reflect upon the controversies produced by important changes in economic policy.

Precisely in this sense, Gibbons (1994: 105) points out that

the scientific community and also its analysts have traditionally emphasized the relative autonomy and the functioning of science as a distinct subsystem of society. Largely accepted up to the 1960s, this has been contested ever since. They are clearly not an autonomous subsystem, insulated from the rest of society. Indeed, it is their function to provide an understanding of the world of social experience, and they are valued for the insights and guidance we expect to be able to derive from them. [...] The social sciences, which have developed since the turn of the nineteenth century, share with the humanities a concern for the inner workings of society and the generation of culture and meanings. However,

their viewpoint has generally been more analytic, and their explicit function more oriented towards the construction of practical and technical tools to better understand and manage the increasingly disenchanting world that their descriptions unravel. To maintain their analytic and technical posture, the social sciences have generally tried to maintain a style of reflexivity which links with contextualisation in a consciously detached manner.

In fact, in accordance with the previous passage, the first economic essays were written in Uruguay during the period 1870-1890, which is characterized by profound changes. This period precedes the installation of the populist political model known as *batllismo* which follows the 1929 crisis. After the latter there clearly emerged a need to develop mechanisms for the implementation of anti-crisis policies.

The Growth of Local Importance

Teaching activities in economics at the university predated research by about a decade. The College of Economic Sciences and Administration was created in 1931, but the field of economics did not achieve academic importance until the end of the 1940's. Up to this date, the college trained students only in business administration and accounting.

Professor Carlos Quijano, who joined the Political Economy faculty in 1936, played a fundamental role in preparing a new stage in the development of the discipline, specially after the creation of the Economics Institute in 1951. In addition to his productive work as a professor and a journalist, Quijano always predicted in the widely read local journal *Marcha* the importance of economics to the understanding and transfor-

mation of the Uruguayan society¹. Uruguay became the object of study of political economy at the time when research activities were initiated by the first generations of economists graduated from the college.

The first curriculum in the College of Economic Sciences (1932) included training in scientific research practices. However, it was only after 1944, when the original plan was modified to include new specialization courses and research seminars, that the first studies in economics were effectively undertaken. Also with the Plan of Study of 1944, the first research institutes within the college were created. The Institute of Bank and Monetary Economics and the Institute of Statistics and National Revenue were the precursors of the economic research activities at the local level. In this respect, it is worth pointing out, after Knorr-Cetina (1995: 157), that results become more meaningful through local specifications. These specifications allow for particular advantages and opportunities that, when structured into a scientific object, may make it more successful in the wider context. That is to say that what was originally objectified in order to deepen the academic component in the college, later attained a different character and was reinforced by the creation of the institutes mentioned above.

The configurations in the development of Uruguayan economics during the 1950s had two central landmarks: a fundamental concern for the promotion of academic activities in the field of economics, and the difficulties that resulted from the fact that students preferred to graduate as accountants given the greater job opportunities for this profes-

sion (Barreiro, 1997). In a period of industrial development and state intervention, the process of entrepreneurial modernization and the very execution of the economic policies offered more opportunities for accountants at both the public and private sector. Consequently, professionals graduated from the college were not motivated to pursue academic careers.

In an effort to counteract what was seen by some as an excessive emphasis on the professional training in accounting, the Institute of Economics set its priorities on training researchers during its early years. Courses on research methods, seminars, and round tables were organized to foster debates and exchange ideas, which are characteristic of the academic practice. However, it was only in 1958, seven years after its creation, that the Institute of Economics effectively initiated research activities with the objective of spreading the idea of development and conducting a profound analysis of the reality of the country. In this sense, Barbato (1986: 131) indicates that the publications from that period show the first systematic efforts towards the exploration of the national economic problems, at the same time that they provide evidence of the last stages in the institutional consolidation of the field.

Recognizing Peripheral Specificities

After the resolutions of the Alliance for Progress in 1962, Uruguay as well as other Latin American nations, began to elaborate an economic plan. This event stimulated the development of activities in the discipline and, fundamentally, required that faculty and students of the

Economic Sciences College interacted with foreign specialists given the need to develop a plan with similar characteristics throughout the countries of the region. This gave rise to one of the most influential factors in the development of economics in Uruguay during the 1960s, namely structuralism, a theory in political economy developed by Raúl Prebisch and others at the Economic Commission for Latin America (henceforth ECLA), the regional planning organization.

Structuralism (or dependency theory as it became known) was the first attempt of a theory that took into account the specific circumstances of the periphery, rejecting the simple application of dominant theories originated in the centre. Uruguayan economic researchers integrated this theory and took a stand in reference to it. It is important to note that Enrique Iglesias, *alma mater* of the Uruguayan Inter-Ministry Commission for Economic Development (CIDE), was a researcher himself in the Institute of Economics of the Universidad de la Republica when he was nominated Technical Secretary of ECLA (Barbato, 1986: 133).

The commitment to an in-depth study of the country's economy required an enormous effort in generating statistics. The latter were collected in less than two years, indicating that in some cases scientific analysis is not an end in itself, but rather a means for further political action (van den Daele & Weingart, 1976: 250). The statistical information proved to be of key importance for the later development of research activities in economics in Uruguay.

In this new context the College of Economic Sciences started a new revision of its curriculum during 1966. The hege-

mony of ECLA's dependency theory, the content of several development courses sponsored by the same institution, and CIDE's experience, were all reflected in the spirit of a new Plan of Study. The plan's main objective was to strengthen the importance of the discipline of economics in the college. The revitalization of teaching activities in economics during this period was guided by Israel Wotsever².

Critical Analysis of National Issues

The end of the planning experience and the tensions that began to be felt in Uruguay after 1968 revived the importance of conducting a critical analysis of the national reality. The university was the natural place to carry out this endeavor and to foster the fruitful development of economic science. From 1968 to 1973, the Institute of Economics at the College of Economic Sciences concentrated the research efforts, and the university as a whole became the sounding board for the communication of research results through extra-university diffusion and extension activities. These results and interpretations advanced a way of thinking about the country's reality which was supported by the university and which, given the sociopolitical conditions of the time, found an extraordinary echo in the population.

At that time, a clear consensus was reached around a main group of principles referring to:

- i) the adoption of an approach that would deepen the understanding of the social relations and at the same time explore the historical process from a holistic perspective in order to analyze how and why capitalist transformations occurred and the specific forms

those changes adopted in the Uruguayan reality; ii) a respect for theoretical pluralism in the research practices; iii) the coordination of research activities through the examination of certain main hypotheses focusing on the explanation of the national process; iv) the need to conduct a longitudinal study on the evolution of economic indicators for researchers to be permanently in touch with the national reality, and also to facilitate the diffusion of results from the analyses conducted. (Barbato, 1986: 136).

The urgent need to reflect about the national situation resulted in the publication of *The Economic Process of Uruguay* in 1969, an ambitious study which is still nowadays considered a masterpiece of economics in this country. The production of *The Process* pointed the existence of thematic deficiencies and other needs calling for research. As a result, the Institute of Economics delineated a research agenda for the following years giving priority to the following: the industrialization process in Uruguay; income distribution; financial structure; employment and salaries system; and foreign relations.

Research from 1969 to 1972 was carried out by a university team who shared common ideas and were committed to social change. Inspired by holistic hypothesis and by the belief in the interaction with other social sciences, the activities of this team constituted the beginning of a valuable interdisciplinary experience. In hindsight, however, it is possible to point out goals they were not able to achieve. Because of confrontation between the university and the government, the institute developed a form of resistance, which precluded contact with the public sector and with private firms.

The rejection of anything that could remotely resemble 'cultural dependency' isolated the Institute from foreign academic exchanges depriving it from an important intellectual richness and kept it apart from the debates about the Latin American economic reality. (Barbato, 1986:151).

Thus, by 1968, there had emerged in Uruguay a community of economists who, inspired by ECLA's thinking and the Alliance for Progress, were committed to the national reality. Moreover, such economists were part of research teams integrated by individuals from the most diverse backgrounds and disciplines within the social sciences³.

The Impact of the Military Dictatorship and the Independent Research Centres

The intervention of the university in October 1973, a few months after the installation of the military dictatorship, produced drastic changes in the research conditions. In November, the Institute of Economics was shut down and the teaching activities in the College of Economic Sciences were reformulated according to the ideological repression that, with extreme rigor, affected all academic spheres⁴. As a result, many social sciences professors and researchers left the country either to escape from political persecution or to pursue better research opportunities elsewhere.

The above notwithstanding, the degree to which research activities were maintained during the military regime varied considerably according to scientific fields. Basic and natural scientists outmigrated in a massive way, particularly because they lacked a minimum research infrastructure at the university or in any other local institution (Barreiro

& Velho, 1997). The number of social scientists that left the country from 1972 to 1977 was notoriously smaller. This difference cannot be dissociated from the fact that social scientists found alternative academic places in independent research centres.

In the beginning of the dictatorial period, research activities in economics continued in the following three centres:

- the Latin American Centre on Human Economy (CLAEH), founded in 1960 and organized on an interdisciplinary basis, was strongly oriented to the study of economic policy, health policy, and foreign relations.
- the Centre for Economic Research (CINVE), created in 1974, centred on long term research such as the study of the technological processes of basic production sectors, the export promotion policies and their impact on the industrial sector, the process of industrialization of agriculture, and the formulation of hypotheses about the productive transformation of the Uruguayan economy.
- the Interdisciplinary Centre for Research and Studies for Uruguay's Development (CIEDUR), created in 1977, focused on the study of the rural development structure, financial relations (interest rates, economic growth, capture of financial surplus, the dynamics of the national and regional bank systems, etc.), and topics linked to population studies, employment, income distribution and economic competitiveness.

Research in the independent centres was funded by international financial aid, provided by non-governmental organizations and philanthropic agencies. The Ford Foundation, the Swedish Develop-

ment Research Centre (SAREC), and the German Friedrich Ebert Foundation stand out among the supporters of the centres during the decade 1975-1985. The influence of the funding agencies on the directions of the local social sciences is not clear. However, it is argued that

the study of exchange and the scientific reception through these large cultural agencies, can illustrate a key problem that goes beyond the history of science as a discipline: that of identity in a process of modernization. [...] Identity is constructed, also, in the difference with others. For some time, philanthropic foundations maintained a hierarchical viewpoint of these differences. This perspective promoted a lineal model of scientific development and created an assumption that guided philanthropic policies for a long time: that the donor knows what is best for the recipient. (Cueto, 1991: 914-921)

This was a period characterized by a modernizing pseudo-deconstruction, based on the centres' reorientation of their objectives and research modalities according to the *modus operandi* of "modern science". The latter included a transformation of the researchers' frame of apprehension to the foreign, leaving apart the 'traditionalism' and the fear to subjugate to "cultural dependency". As a result, there was considerable increase in the number of contacts maintained overseas and the linkages established with the Latin American academic community grew significantly stronger. Even though economic researchers had worked in conditions of extreme isolation until 1973, the situation was reverted after 1976 and they started establishing linkages with the Latin American academic sphere. Several factors contributed to this change: the need to find

partners abroad; the foreign funding (that facilitated and promoted the encounter of economists through the organization of meetings and financial support for economists to attend international conferences, and also through opportunities to participate in collaborative research projects at the regional level); the migration of economists to other countries, especially Mexico, because they established numerous contacts abroad; and finally, the need felt by Latin American economists to come closer together, and in that way, foster a better understanding of the economic crisis affecting the whole region.

Once Uruguay regained democratic life, after 1986, research activities conducted within the independent centres weakened. Also, there was a significant reduction in their scientific production in part because their cadres of researchers started working in the university having less time to conduct studies in the centres. Activities were also reduced for financial reasons given that the international organizations and philanthropic agencies dramatically diminished their contributions both in amount and frequency. As we will show below for the case of sociology, after 1987, the private centres joined the university in order to continue the (re)con-struction of the social sciences in Uruguay.

The Development of Sociology

Since 1971 sociology has experienced a series of significant changes in terms of maturation and institutional development in Uruguay. Some authors, however, argue that such changes were somewhat superficial and that many key aspects in the development of the disci-

pline remained untouched. They believe that

sociology still has problems of organization, institutionalization, and consolidation. In this sense, the evolution of the discipline seems to correspond to what recurrently happened around the constitution of science in the Latin American societies. It can be seen as a process similar to 'Sísifo's Myth': a never-ending and always restarted process of construction of science in Latin America. (Filgueira, 1988: 46).

The trajectory followed by sociology demonstrates the repeated efforts of sociologists who gave impulse to the creation of institutions and professional spaces, the frustration (when not the simple elimination) of those efforts, and the new individual and generation attempts from the new groups joining the discipline. The early development of some pioneer sociologists, as well as the later work carried out by the latter's followers, gave rise to a discontinuous process, full of speed-ups and turnarounds carried out at the Universidad de la Republica, the private sphere, and the State.

Following the phases outlined by Filgueira (1988), it is possible to distinguish three large periods in the development of the discipline. First, the foundation period until 1973, when the irruption of the *coup d'état* changed the conditions and characteristics of production of the discipline; second, the period that corresponds to the military regime that expands until 1984 approximately; and finally, the period of transition to democracy and full democracy since 1985.

Early Development: Sociology of Professorship

The first period can also be divided in three main stages: 1) the first is known as the sociology of professorships, 2) the professionalization period, and 3) the stage of consolidation of sociology.

1) "As professorship sociology we understand the foundation stage of the present sociology in Uruguay." (Filgueira, 1988: 47). Similar to the case of other countries of the region, the sociology of professorships is characterized by the emergence of the first faculty groups of sociology integrated to the traditional *curricula* of liberal professions. Certainly Uruguay was not an exception. The process was initially developed in the College of Law and Social Sciences where the first professorship of sociology was created in 1915. The second important constitution only took place in 1952 with the creation of a sociology group associated to the chair of economics in the College of Architecture. The name 'sociology of professorship' corresponds to this period because the discipline did not extend beyond curricular teaching activities. Sociology was one more subject in the global training of another discipline or in a profession that for some reason was considered related.

Considering the instruction and training of the human resources in charge of developing the sociology of professorship, the process is also similar to that of other countries of the region (cf. Vessuri, 1990). Many sociologists who assumed the responsibility of such professorships were professionals trained in other fields, whose knowledge of sociology evolved from a self-taught instruction and spirit. Given its reduced size, a group of pioneers is very easy to identify. Specifically, Dr. Isaac Ganón, Dr.

Aldo Solari who was one of the most important sociology promoters in the College of Law, and Arch. Juan Pablo Terra in the College of Architecture.

A third element to consider in this period, parallel to the groups in the Colleges of Law and Architecture, is the constitution of CLAEH, the already mentioned independent research centre created in 1960. Originated in the activities related to the Team of the Common Wealth lead by Father Lebret, CLAEH had, from the beginning, a strong empirical orientation. For the first time in Uruguay knowledge became available regarding important issues concerning the national reality. Studies about the family in Montevideo and others were conducted during the period. According to the orientation of the centre, these were strongly empirical, descriptive, and sociographic.

A fourth significant event was the creation in 1956 of the Institute of Social Sciences within the College of Law and Social Sciences of the time (at present the Institute is the Department of Sociology of the College of Social Sciences). In the beginning, the Institute of Social Sciences was little more than a continuation of the sociology of professorships. In fact, its presence and capacity in the national scene were reduced because it could not overcome the poor structural conditions provided by the College of Law. For example, when the institute was created, only positions for a director, a few assistants, survey assistants, and drawers were opened. Filgueira sustains that

in fact, we can assert that it was not really a research Institute but a project for a possible future Institute. In terms of research, sociology emerged extraordi-

narily delayed compared to the countries of the region, depending from a professional College and with a series of development problems which made it difficult for the new discipline to reach an important position. (Filgueira, 1988: 51).

Although the problems were numerous, we would like to refer to three particularly serious aspects: a) the thematic dependency, b) the economic dependency of the Institute and the need to share a legitimate space in the College of Law together with other specific Institutes (for example, the Civil Law Institute, the Process Law Institute, etc.), and c) problems inherent to the scientific criterion and the development of sociology as a research discipline.

Sociology arose in a college that did not have (and still does not have) a scientific tradition and where the criteria and demands for research do not result crystal clear as in other scientific sub-communities. Therefore, a group of difficulties and obstacles resulted from the constant tension among criteria, the dynamic, the resources and research times of a discipline that required a different space and understanding capacity from the mother institution.

Professionalization:

Finding an Institutional Space

2) Following the sociology of professorships, around the period 1960-63, the second stage is one of professionalization. It was characterized by the creation of new institutions, the existence of a basic core of sociologists specifically trained and devoted to the discipline, and the emergence of a group of activities previously nonexistent. This stage is revealing of how the development of a

discipline is closely related with social phenomena. This professionalization stage did not take place at the university but evolved around a pole basically constituted by professionals working for the State. During this period a social and economic process took place which led to the questioning of many ideas and conceptions regarding the Uruguayan society. The process of economic stagnation that began in 1955, the declining gross national product, the increasing inflation, the anticipation of social conflicts that would explode during the 1960s, and especially the exhausted import substitution model in which the country was based, all represent a definitive break up with an order and a social organization that did not have conditions to survive.

Until that time social sciences in general, not only sociology, were not enough developed as to respond to the large demand for knowledge, diagnosis and analysis of the specific problems of society. Systematic research and professional academic work was needed in order to leave behind the 'essay style' which had prevailed in social analyses until then. Moreover, as we noted in the case of economics, the peculiar traits of the society did not stimulate social reflection nor the need to generate concrete information up to this time.

In a period of professionalization of sociology things began to look different. In the first place, CIDE was created in 1963 within the government sphere with the purpose of diagnosing and planning the long-term social and economic policy. CIDE produced a profound stimulating effect on economics and sociology. In terms of orientations, research during this stage was strongly

empirical and oriented to explore concrete areas, sectors, and situations of the Uruguayan society.

This stage also corresponds to a heavily eclectic period regarding references, authors, and theoretical frameworks of different origins: American functionalism, French sociology, English sociology, etc. Different themes were explored in a series of studies which, in a sense, reflected the particularities of the Uruguayan society, namely social mobility, the educational system, and the aging process of the population. Other research topics such as marginal populations, demographic explosion, rural-urban migrations, which were prominent in other countries of the region, were noticeably absent in Uruguayan sociology at this time. (Filgueira, 1988: 56-60).

As a final note regarding this phase, we need to highlight the nearly complete lack of relations with the Latin American and the industrialized countries' research and teaching system in sociology. There were no collaborative works during the period, and the exchange of students and professors was almost nonexistent. The foreign training of some scholars started producing results only later, after they finished their studies in the academic centres of the region and returned to the country. This process is only incipient during this period.

The University Takes the Lead

3) The third phase, previous to the *coup d'état* of 1973, took place within the university sphere and include three important developments. Firstly, the constitution of a professional faculty holding permanent positions in the Institute of

Social Sciences. Faculty was selected by an international search committee in a contest of applicants in which their *curriculum vitae* as well as their performance in a test were assessed. Secondly, in several different colleges and schools, sociology professorships were expanded by the beginning of new experiences and, especially, by the creation of basic cores in various majors. Thirdly, in 1967 the Institute of Social Sciences for the first time opened up systematic courses to train sociologists. These courses resulted in the creation, in 1971, of the first Plan of Study for the training of Licentiatees in Sociology at the university.

While sociology was stimulated at the university in this phase, it was dismantled at the government institutions. Most institutions created in the previous period, (those that took place in the Ministry of Education and others), were reduced or even disappeared as a result of the political swings, of the sociopolitical conflicts and the radicalization of society. The functions assigned to the research council (CONICYT) were cut down to a minimum due to the lack of funds. Similarly, the dynamic and innovative role performed by CIDE was substituted by routine practices which had no need of research.

At this point in time, the university had created the basis for a sustained development of sociology and the Institute of Social Sciences unquestionably adopted the leading role. For the first time, there existed a minimum core of professionals working as a tiny "academic community" with capacity to generate innovative ideas and to keep alive the development of the discipline. The creation of the degree of Licentiate in Sociology prompted a new attitude re-

garding publications (translations, reprints of documents, reproduction of books and book chapters, etc.) which resulted in the needed bibliographical support for the sociology majors and the training of researchers. Also, the constitution of sociology professorships in other fields, the creation of the basic core in the College of Medicine and in the College of Engineering, (which would be later expanded to the Colleges of Veterinary and Humanities), gave rise to a demand for teaching activities in sociology resulting in a dynamic element that required resources and qualified professionals. (Filgueira, 1988: 60).

While sociology was growing in importance and getting involved in many university activities, the still small group of sociologists was put under increasing pressure to cope with demand. Up to 1973, there were only 12 sociology Licentiatees, all of them graduated by the end of 1972. A similar number of sociologists had been trained abroad. The figures indicate that the demand actually exceeded the human resources' capacity to respond. This fact constituted a threat to the instruction objectives of Licentiate degree in sociology, and particularly to research activities.

Although the reproduction of bibliographic materials, copies of articles and contemporary sociology books were important during that time, many difficulties existed in order to include national sources into that (basically international) bibliography. This is because local publication was scarce or, in many areas, simply did not exist. The capacity for creation of knowledge in the institutions devoted to sociology was not big enough to support teaching and research activities with works resulting

from previous studies rooted in the interpretation of reality based on original research.

*The Military Dictatorship:
Finding New Institutional Spaces*

The rupture of democracy in Uruguay and the consequent intervention of the university brought up two changes for sociology. One was the closure of all basic courses, many professorships, and most disciplinary activities developed within the university domain. The same happened to CONICYT and other state institutions which were reduced to a minimum expression. With few exceptions, such as the College of Law and the College of Architecture, sociology professorships were definitively shut down while the Institute of Social Sciences was closed and the activities were continued in a new institution named 'Institute of Social Studies'. This new institute was not in the sphere of the College of Law but was directly dependent on the central university offices, the rectorate. In theoretical terms, this Institute would have a very biased performance during the whole dictatorial period.

The other change was the constitution of the independent research centres. These carried out activities in the different social sciences after 1974-75. As we have already mentioned, the creation of CIESU, CINVE, CIEDUR, CLAEH, and CIEP produced a new type of organizational activities that were structurally different from the ones known at the university. In the words of one of the sociologists already active at that time:

The organization and production capacity of these centres is notoriously superior to the one that even the Uni-

versity had previously reached. On one hand, all Centres, without exception developed in one way or another a systematic policy in order to train human resources abroad. Researchers were trained in foreign centres of high academic level such as the Bariloche Foundation, the Latin American College of Social Sciences in Mexico and Ecuador, the Pontificia Universidad Católica in Peru, IUPERJ in Rio de Janeiro, the University of Wisconsin, Stanford University, the University of Chicago, and Yale, in the United States, and the University of Sussex in England. (Filgueira, 1988: 63.)

The sociologists sent abroad were embedded in the scientific *ethos* characteristic of their places of training. On their return to Uruguay they brought with them new attitudes and scientific practices. The latter were adopted in the independent research centres so that credibility criteria, knowledge intensive production, publications, acknowledgments and rewards characteristic from elsewhere began to prevail in the country. These new practices, however, were accompanied by positive experiences whereby the choice of research problems tended to be closely linked to social needs. The research practices of public opinion institutions, marketing firms, and of particular data collections and studies applied to different sectors (carried out by Equipos Consultores and CIID-IDRC, etc.) which then took place were fundamental for the consolidation and professionalization of sociology in the country.

*The Return to Democracy and the
Recovery of University Leadership*

The last stage, initiated with the return to democracy, began to take shape

around 1984. Four major changes occurred as a result of the democratic transition during 1980-1982. The first refers to the reopening of the university, and therefore, to the restoration of a series of institutions, including professorships, which took place after 1985. In second place, while the demand for sociological research was not very important in the private sector, it was very much so in the public sector. The latter led to the emergence of certain divisions or departments within ministries and state organizations. Typically, these were located at the Labor and Social Security Ministry, the Public Health Ministry, and ANTEL (National Administration of Telecommunications), among others. Also the FAS Program (Fondo de Ayuda Social) created in 1987 with funding from the Inter-American Development Bank, within the Presidency of the Republic, opened up a number of posts for sociologists.

The third change in this period was the creation of a considerable number of new private centres for research, extension, and social action. Finally, with the democratic reorganization, a group of sociologists who had left the country for political reasons or personal preferences returned to Uruguay together with a young contingent of sociologists that were trained abroad. The latter were trained under the rules of science organization systems and knowledge creation which were notoriously different from the ones prevailing in Uruguay at the end of the 1980s. This fact led to a sort of crisis of the 'provincial' model and to a significant change in the dynamics of local communities because returning professionals brought with them a theoretical baggage as well as scientific atti-

tudes and practices acquired in their experiences overseas.

An institutional reorganization took place after 1986, which led to the association of the independent research centres with the university. Once the democratic system was re-established, the independent centres (with diminishing funding and research production) and the university (with an increasing production, leaving behind 13 years of work under an 'exception regime') joined efforts and aimed to the revitalization of the academic practice in social sciences. Work agreements were signed between the university and each of the centres individually, leading to a new phase in the reconstruction of social sciences in the country.

During this last decade, many transformations occurred both at the institutional level as well as in the working dynamics of the whole Uruguayan scientific community. The developments involving the basic scientists for example, are particularly interesting because of the institutional arrangements reached within the state sphere and since the constitution of the PEDECIBA (Development Program for the Basic Sciences). A number of events occurred within economics and sociology should be mentioned. The first is the creation of CEIPOS (Research and Postgraduate Centre) in 1987 as a central university institution. This centre aims the training of researchers through the organization of courses of specialization in economics. After the creation of the College of Social Sciences in 1991, the centre was integrated to the College as the Department of Economics. Likewise, in 1992 the new department implemented the first master's program in social sciences

in the country: Master's in International Economics from which 3 students have graduated up to now. Additionally, the Master's in Sociology and the Master's in Political Science offered by the College of Social Sciences at the University of the Republic started 5 years later, in August 1997.

A second significant novelty is the opening in 1989 of the licentiate degree in sociology at the Catholic University Dámaso Antonio Larrañaga. This is the first private university in Uruguay, created in 1984 during the last year of the dictatorship. Initially, it offered law, communication, and psychology courses, but after 1989 when many sociologists who had emigrated returned to the country, it also started offering a bachelor's in sociology. It is also relevant to mention the creation of another private university in July 1997 (Universidad de Montevideo), with a clear orientation in economics and staffed by first level researchers, many of which retired from the Universidad de la Republica.

Research in economics was also considerably strengthened with the creation in 1991 of the College of Social Sciences (FCS) now integrated by the Departments of Political Science, Economics, Sociology, and Social Work as well as by a Multidisciplinary Unit which does not perform teaching activities but conducts research in demography, economic history, and international relations; as well as the creation of the master's degree in sociology at the FCS-University of the Republic in August 1997.

Closing Remarks

Everything seems to indicate that economics and sociology in Uruguay travel

through a new apogee stage after having enjoyed a period of sustained growth during the last seven years. During that period, we have observed a notorious increase in research activities in the social sciences. This growth is characteristic of the dynamic reconstruction phase (1986-1991), the creation of new institutions, and the availability of new funding sources at the public and private sectors. The rapid growth the country has experienced, (according to macroeconomic indicators the annual growth rate has been 4.7%), made it possible to provide for the material conditions necessary for the development of activities in the various sectors.

The scientific community was embedded in that growth. This fact is expressed in the expanding level of research activities made possible by the availability of resources to fund an increasing number of projects and research programs. It also manifests itself through the growing scientific production, the participation of researchers in conferences at regional as well as international level, and in the scientific collaboration with other centres specialized in economics and sociology. The disciplinary subcommunities also found a legitimate place in the public scene as seen by the number of researchers taking part in government.

Most significant, perhaps, than the material conditions for the development of scientific research in Uruguay today is the fact that the return to democracy has put an end to ideological and political restrictions in setting the research agenda. Moreover, it is now possible for professors and students to select their readings according to their needs and preferences in a politically free environ-

ment. It is no longer necessary for the researchers to leave the country in order to be able to participate fully in the intellectual endeavor of their field.

Together, the economic growth and the liberty of expression have considerably impulsed the institutionalization of sociology and economics in the country. Evidence of this is the creation of graduate programs at the master's level in sociology and the emergence of new institutional arrangements in economics to train specialists in the discipline. Both fields aim to encouraging the available capabilities in order to foster a better understanding of the crisis (which is not only economic but one which involves the traditional models) in which the country is immersed, and to respond to the need to reflect about the changes in economic and social policies. That is to say, to the development of a socially constructed science, to the development of two disciplines that integrate the conditions of the context.

Notes

- 1 Evidence of Quijano's commitment to studies in economics is the revised prologue he included in the second edition of his book as well as the column that he frequently wrote in *Marcha* from 1946 to 1963. He was exiled in Mexico when the military took over, where he kept close interaction with his colleagues until his death in 1984.
- 2 A few years later, Wonsever assumed the direction of CONICYT (National Council for Scientific and Technological Research). Wonsever was the President of CONICYT during the period of democratic restoration that started in 1986, and especially, he was the promoter of donations and loans provided by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) during that period. Note that in 1989 Enrique Iglesias was appointed president of BID

after being the first Foreign Relations Ministry of the Uruguayan democratic government from 1986 to 1989.

- 3 The interdisciplinary effort is evident in a series of publications from this period. One is *El Proceso Económico del Uruguay* (The Economic Process of Uruguay), authored, among others, by Raúl Vigorito, Raúl Trajtenberg, Sergio Lichten-sztejn and Alberto Couriel. Other joint academic efforts which resulted in books such as: *El FMI y la Crisis Económica Nacional* (The IMF and the National Economic Crisis) published in 1967 based on the coordinated work of two research teams directed by S. Lichtensztejn and A. Couriel, *La Evolución Económica en 1969 y Perspectivas para el Año Actual* (The Economic Evolution in 1969 and Perspectives for the Current Year) published in 1970 in collaboration of A. Couriel, J. E. Santías, J. J. Pereira, *et al.*, *El Fin de la Estabilización* (The End of Stabilization) published in 1970 authored by A. Couriel, J. E. Santías, J. J. Pereira, *et al.*, *Un Reajuste Conservador* (A Conservative Readjustment) published in 1973 from the work of Raúl Vigorito, Celia Barbato, Luis Macadar, Nicolás Reig, *et al.*
- 4 Most course syllabi related to economics and political economy were specially altered. Professors were not allowed to make any reference to Marxist theory, nor to the formulations derived from the dialectic method and Hegelian logic in their classes. Simultaneously, several authors such as Althusser, Gramsci, Ollman, Terkel, and Venable among others, were literally excluded from social and economic theory courses.

References

- Argenti, G. *et al.*
 1988 *Ciencia y tecnología: un diagnóstico de oportunidades* (Science and technology: a diagnosis of opportunities). Montevideo: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental.
- Barbato, C.
 1986 "Economía" (Economics). Pp. 127–158 in CINVE, *Ciencia y Tecnología en el Uruguay* (Science and Technology in

- Uruguay). Montevideo: Ministerio de Educación y Cultura (Ministry of Education and Culture).
- Barreiro, A.
1997 *La formación de recursos humanos para investigación en el Uruguay* (Training of human resources for research in Uruguay). Montevideo: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental.
- Barreiro, A. & Velho, L.
1997 "The Uruguayan basic scientists' migrations and their academic articulation around the PEDECIBA". *Science, Technology and Society*, 2, 2: 261–284.
- Cueto, M.
1991 "Ciencia y Filantropía en las Américas" (Science and Philanthropy in the Americas). Pp. 913–922 in Ana María Alfonso-Goldfarb & Carlos Maia (eds.), *História da Ciência: O Mapa do Conhecimento* (History of Science: the Map of Knowledge). São Paulo: Edusp.
- Filgueira, C.
No title. Pp. 43–71 in Diego Piñeiro (ed.), *Los trabajos de la Sociología* (The works/production of Sociology). Montevideo: CIESU - Ediciones de la Banda Oriental.
- Gibbons, M. et. al.
1994 *New Production of Knowledge. Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi : Sage Publications.
- Knorr-Cetina, K.
1995 "Laboratory Studies: The Cultural Approach to the Study of Science". Pp. 140–166 in Sheila Jasanoff et. al. (eds.), *Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Universidad de la República, Uruguay (University of the Republic, Uruguay)
1969 *El proceso económico del Uruguay* (The economics process in Uruguay). Montevideo.
- Van den Daele, W. & Weingart, P.
1976 "Resistance and Receptivity of Science to External Direction: the Emergence of New Disciplines under the Impact of Science Policy". Pp. 247–275 in Gerard Lemaine et. al. (eds.), *Perspectives on the Emergence of Scientific Disciplines*. Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris Publications.
- Vessuri, H.
1990 "El Sísifo sureño: Las ciencias sociales en la Argentina" (The Southern Sisyphus: Social Sciences in Argentina). *Quipu*, 7, 2: 149–185.
- Whitley, R.
1984 *The intellectual and social organization of the sciences*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Adriana Barreiro and Léa Velho
Department of Science and
Technology Policy
State University of Campinas/
UNICAMP
Campinas, Brazil