
RESEARCH REPORTS AND NOTES

THE RECEPTION OF "SCIENTIFIC SOCIOLOGY" IN CHILE*

Edmundo F. Fuenzalida
Stanford University

At the beginning of the 1950s, Chile prided herself on a century-old tradition of social studies. Beginning with the so-called generation of 1842 and with the support of the University of Chile (established in 1843), some of the most distinguished Chilean minds devoted themselves to the study of Chilean society and its evolution. Hernán Godoy Urzúa (1967) classifies this intellectual production in six groups: social thinking of the nineteenth century, studies belonging to traditional social disciplines, writings on the "social question," novels with social content, modern social essays, and writings with sociological intent.

To the first group belong Francisco Bilbao, José Victorino Lastarria, Jenaro Abasolo, Valentín Letelier, and Rafael Fernández Concha. Lastarria's work entitled "Investigación sobre la influencia social de la conquista y del systema colonial de los españoles en Chile" (1844) stimulated lively discussion among the "intelligentsia" of the new Republic and fostered interest in the study of national history.

*This essay was first presented at the Conference on the Origins and Operations of Educational Systems, organized by the Research Committee on Sociology of Education of the International Sociological Association in Paris in August 1980. The essay is part of a project on Chilean development since 1950 being prepared by the author, Osvaldo Sunkel, and Arturo Valenzuela, with the financial support of the Swedish Agency for Research Cooperation with the Developing Countries (SAREC). Initial support for this project was provided by the Social Sciences Research Council and the Institut für Iberoamerikakunde in Hamburg. Funds were provided by the Volkswagen Foundation and the Institute for Development Studies at the University of Sussex in England.

Among those writing in this field, the prolific Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna perhaps reached the most heterogeneous audience because of the variety of his subjects and his political commitments. At the other extreme was the specialized production of José Toribio Medina, who laid the documentary foundation for much of the history of the colonial period. In spite of the fact that his magnum opus totals sixteen volumes, Diego Barros Arana's *Historia Jeneral de Chile* was read avidly by generations of Chilean students as the most authoritative source for the study of national history up to 1833. Francisco Antonio Encina's twenty-volume *Historia de Chile*, which extended to 1891, was a best seller when published in the late forties. Its success was due in part to the wide circulation of Encina's previous book, *Nuestra inferioridad económica* (1912). This work argued that an antinomy exists between the physical endowment of Chile, which is not particularly favorable to agriculture but adequate for industry, and the aptitudes of the Chilean people, who are good at agricultural activities but not at manufacturing. It sparked a controversy that stimulated the writings of a generation of educators, including Luis Galdames, Enrique Molina, Dario Salas, Amanda Larbarca, and Julio Vega.

The liberal interpretation of Chile's history was followed by Guillermo Feliú Cruz, whereas the Catholic-Hispanic view found a remarkable champion in Jaime Eyzaguirre. The Marxist interpretation was presented by Hernán Ramírez Necochea and Julio César Jobet.

Leaving aside the writings on "the social question" and the novels with social content, certainly the more sociological writings come from the authors of the modern social essays. Encina's essay, already mentioned, belongs to the same period as the essay by Alejandro Venegas called *Sinceridad: Chile íntimo en 1910*. In contrast to the typically superficial celebrations of the first one hundred years of independence, Venegas wrote about the social problems that lay beneath the surface and offered solutions. In the thirties, two new essays continued this line of social criticism: *La eterna crisis chilena* by Carlos Keller, and *Chile desconocido* by Eduardo Frei (the future President of Chile 1964–1970). After the publication of Sergio Vergara's *Decadencia o recuperación* (1945), this kind of intellectual production reached its limits with Jorge Ahumada's *En vez de la miseria* (1958).

Finally, some Chilean authors such as Agustín Venturino, Oscar Alvarez, and Guillermo Viviani published works with specific sociological intent. Others like Samuel Gajardo, Carlos Keller, and Hermes Ahumada cultivated their interest in sociology by writing textbooks for the few courses offered in the professional schools of the university. Godoy Urzúa attempted to characterize these writings as a whole:

. . . [they] emphasize the more concrete and visible aspects of social reality, in particular the social problems of the society, exposed in a straightforward fash-

ion, without theoretical scaffolds. Nearly all of these works have been organized through a personal and direct experience of national reality, acquired during trips or prolonged stays in regions or towns of the inland. . . . They have also seen Chile from abroad, thereby adding this experience to that of the provincial countryside.

Another characteristic that helps explain the first one is the critical and political intent of nearly all of these writings. They aspire more to promote reform than to gain objective and scientifically valid knowledge (Godoy Urzúa 1967, pp. 27–28, author's translation).

In Godoy's opinion, such characteristics reduced the scientific maturity of these works, which remained in a presociological stage. On the other hand, these same characteristics made the works attractive to the common reader, who found in them information and social policy directions that could be easily recognized. The language in which most of these pieces were written was understandable to anyone with secondary-school education. Therefore, if the works did not entirely qualify as contributions to the science of sociology, they helped educate the Chilean citizen at a time when increasing participation in the political process by the middle and the working classes made such education more important than ever before.

The social conditions for the production of this literature had much to do with external characteristics: the authors had been educated in the traditional professions, such as law and pedagogy; they were not full-time social scientists, solely concerned with the advancement of a well-defined body of knowledge and its teaching to a new generation; and they did not earn a living from their efforts at understanding Chilean society, but had to squeeze creative work in around the demands of their livelihood.

Moreover, these writers did not work in an institutional context, but on their own. They lacked the advantage of a specialized public library and had to rely instead on the National Library or on their own private collections. Especially during the Second World War, they had very limited access to works in languages other than Spanish, a situation made worse by the scarcity of imported books. Due to these factors, Chilean intellectuals regarded the work of their predecessors as the main source of ideas and research methods. Therefore, until the mid-fifties, their work continued the local tradition of sociological production or criticized that same tradition within narrow parameters.

THE FIRST MODE OF RECEPTION OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIOLOGY

The beginnings of "scientific sociology" in Chile are linked to the ideas and efforts of one man, Eduardo Hamuy.¹ After studying law and philosophy at the University of Chile, he concluded that this kind of intellectual training did not allow him to learn about the many problems that

affected Chilean society. The sociology taught in the university consisted fundamentally of exposition and commentary on the great European sociologists of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

I was not interested in theoretical subjects because I could learn them on my own, without a teacher. I wanted to learn about the methods of social research that cannot be learned from books. I wanted to know how to conduct social research; I wanted to work with researchers. . . . (Hamuy 1979)

Having discovered the limitations of Chilean sociology, Hamuy decided to go to the United States. With the support of the current rector of the university, Juvenal Hernández, he entered Columbia University. Hamuy decided not to complete all the requirements for a Ph.D. in sociology and took only those courses dealing with research methods. At the same time, he was appointed Visiting Professor at the City College of New York, where he had the opportunity to conduct research on social problems. He personally directed a project on the conditions of Puerto Ricans in New York, which led to a stay in Puerto Rico. Hamuy also studied at the University of Wisconsin in 1950–51 as a research assistant.

After spending two years in the United States and a semester in Puerto Rico, Hamuy returned to Chile in 1951 and began his attempt to establish scientific sociology there with the collaboration of Professors Raúl Samuel and Hernán Godoy Urzúa.

The first years witnessed a struggle on four fronts. First, [it was necessary] to establish an institute with a minimum of facilities. Bernardo Leighton, Minister of Education, provided funds to buy a house, build additional space for the IBM machines, and import these machines. Second, a budget for current expenses was secured. Third, additional funds were obtained to initiate a scholarship program, and several assistants were sent to the U.S. and Western Europe to be trained in sociological research. Fourth, empirical research was carried out in order to demonstrate how research is done and the differences between writing books and articles and doing scientific research. (Hamuy 1979)

An important part of this effort was the organization of a library of scientific sociology. Despite having started practically from scratch, the library of the institute by the late fifties subscribed to 140 specialized journals from the United States, Western Europe, Japan, India, and United Nations agencies. According to several Latin American sociologists who visited the institute at this time, it was the best Latin American library on sociology.

Hamuy described these initial years:

This was a stage in which there was a struggle to create in Chile sociological research, that is to say, scientific sociology, with an empirical basis, as a science of reality, in reaction to the existing speculative tradition. It was not an attempt to introduce the U.S.-style sociology that at the time prevailed in all western countries. But the fact is that the Americans had made major contributions in

methodology: they began working with scales, they invented the polls. Really, they studied reality with a set of instruments that were later adopted universally, including the socialist countries and even the Soviet Union. What was being introduced was a set of scientific instruments that could be used to test any kind of hypotheses deduced from any theory. (Hamuy 1979)

The second stage would begin when research assistants trained abroad would return and start training sociologists in Chile. Professor Hamuy envisioned a school that would not only supply scientific sociologists to Chile, but to all Latin American countries. All could take advantage of the facilities of the institute and of the recently established UN Latin American Center for Demography, located next door. The rationale was that pooling the limited resources of all Latin American countries would make possible a good center for teaching and research. Hamuy took this idea to France, to UNESCO, and to Professor Georges Friedman, one of the most respected French sociologists, and obtained from the latter a promise to send one of his assistants to Santiago every year. Upon his return from France, Hamuy discovered that another attempt at establishing a Latin American center for the social sciences was under way, led by Professor Gustavo Lagos of the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences at the University of Chile. Hamuy joined him in a concerted action.

Thus, by the end of the fifties, Chilean scientific sociology included an Instituto de Investigaciones Sociológicas with its own building and data-processing equipment, the best specialized library in Latin America, and a staff composed of the original team (Professors Hamuy, Samuel, and Godoy) and the returnees from graduate studies abroad (Professors Sepúlveda, Salcedo, Briones, and Ratinoff). At this time, the institute was involved in a major research project on "the educational problems of the people of Chile," as well as several minor projects. This rather impressive outcome was the result of the enthusiastic efforts of a group of young professors of the University of Chile, with no support whatsoever from external sources. All the funds were provided by the university or by the central government. This mode of reception of scientific sociology can be characterized by the following variables: (a) it was centered on the social problems of the country; (b) the United States and Western Europe were used as shopping centers for those instruments of research that were considered useful for the scientific study of social problems, but not for the whole institution of scientific sociology; (c) only a handful of carefully selected students were sent abroad to be trained in the use of those instruments; (d) scientific sociology was defined as applied research; and (e) the direction and the speed of the movement were set by a local charismatic leader, without influence from non-Chilean agencies.

THE SECOND MODE OF RECEPTION OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIOLOGY

The parallel attempt at creating a regional center for the social sciences in Santiago that Professor Hamuy discovered upon his return from France actually had started some years before at two regional international conferences in Costa Rica and Rio de Janeiro and at the Ninth UNESCO General Conference in New Delhi. It had the support of the governments of Brazil and Chile and included the establishment of one teaching institution in Santiago (Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, FLACSO) and one research institution in Rio de Janeiro (Centro Latinoamericano de Investigaciones en Ciencias Sociales, CENTRO) with voluntary financial contribution from all Latin American governments as well as the financial and technical support of UNESCO. The twin institutions had a common Directive Committee composed of outstanding Latin American social scientists, but the implementation of the policies approved by the committee was in the hands of the CENTRO director and the FLACSO Secretary General.

Gustavo Lagos Matus, of the Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales at the University of Chile, had been the moving force in Chile for the establishment of this regional center and was appointed the first Secretary General of FLACSO. Hamuy met Lagos at the request of the rector of the University of Chile, Juan Gómez Millas:

I had very few contacts with Professor Lagos Matus before, but it seemed to me that we could work well together. The organization of FLACSO itself is due to him, but the concrete teaching aspect of the new school was my achievement. I convinced José Medina Echavarría to accept the appointment as Director of the first FLACSO School, the Latin American School of Sociology, and I selected the teaching staff.

On a lot belonging to the Institute of Sociological Research, a new building was erected for FLACSO. A joint research project sponsored by the institute and CENTRO in Rio was launched.

I put aside my idea of creating a purely Chilean school of sociology, thinking that if FLACSO took upon itself the teaching and the institute provided the research, which is the ideal complement of teaching, and with the additional contribution of the UN Latin American Center for Demography, we could create a functional and interesting center. (Hamuy 1979)

At this stage, several factors led to a crisis in the institute that caused the dissolution of the first group of Chilean scientific sociologists and jeopardized collaboration between the Chilean institution and FLACSO. Orlando Sepúlveda, one of the young assistants that Hamuy sent to the United States in the early fifties, and who returned to Chile with a Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin, recalls:

The problem first was a division between the original group [Professors Hamuy, Godoy, and Samuel] and the group of the returning assistants [Danilo Salcedo, Guillermo Briones, and Orlando Sepúlveda]. We rapidly realized that their

knowledge of techniques and procedures in sociology was not solid, that they were no longer the archetypes that had motivated us to quit what we were doing to become sociologists. Besides, we wanted to do research at a certain level and with some degree of autonomy; we did not want to become the technicians at the service of those who held the posts at the institute. Then, the institute was Hamuy himself, the nucleus of all the ideas, everything began and ended in Hamuy. We were only his delegates. (Sepúlveda 1979)

Although he recognizes Hamuy's great contribution to the establishment of scientific sociology in Chile, Sepúlveda maintains that Hamuy was unable to lead the institute into a more advanced stage. "[Hamuy] lacked the ability, the imagination, the wisdom to lead the people he himself had educated. He failed to provide the intellectual leadership without which institutions simply disintegrate" (Sepúlveda 1979). As a result, the institute came apart in 1960. Hamuy left, and so did Godoy Urzúa, Raúl Samuel, Danilo Salcedo, Guillermo Briones, and Luis Ratinoff. The institute was reduced to one-third of its previous staff.

With Hamuy gone, the paths of FLACSO and the Chilean institutions began to diverge. Raúl Samuel was appointed first director of a newly created School of Sociology of the University of Chile and José Medina Echavarría was replaced by Peter Heintz as director of the Latin American School of Sociology of FLACSO.

The *Escuela Latinoamericana de Sociología* (referred to hereafter as ELAS) had been conceived as a regional response to the need for training scientific sociologists to serve as teachers and researchers in the Latin American universities. It was planned as an alternative to graduate studies in sociology in the United States or Western Europe. ELAS could count on three experts provided by UNESCO, a varying number of French sociologists sponsored by the French government, and resources to buy books and subscribe to specialized journals. Students from all Latin American countries could apply for admission provided that they had a university degree in a discipline related to sociology (economics, history, law, education, psychology); scholarships for those accepted were provided by UNESCO, the OAS, and national government agencies.

When Peter Heintz was appointed director of ELAS, the institution had already graduated a first generation of Latin American sociologists. The experience gained in the first period of operation of ELAS was no longer applicable, however, because the crisis at the Instituto de Investigaciones Sociológicas prevented continuation of the close working relationship between the two programs. Heintz had been educated at the University of Zurich in political economy and at the University of Cologne in West Germany in sociology under Rene König. With previous experience as a UNESCO expert in Costa Rica and in ELAS itself as

one of the members of the first group of experts, Heintz decided to try a new approach.

The ELAS program intended to combine intellectual and practical activities in such a way as to conceivably mobilise the positive factors of motivation for sociology existent in the region and, at the same time, as to weaken the ties that continued to bind students to nonscientific sociology. Probably, the most important decision for the attainment of this goal was the delimitation of the problem area on which ELAS was going to concentrate: the social and economic development of the underdeveloped countries of Latin America. Once the problem area was defined, and by this decision having mobilised the strong sources of motivation for sociology existent among the students, ELAS faced the problem of transforming this broad motivation into a specific and constant drive to theoretical and empirical social research. (Heintz and Fuenzalida 1967)

This strategy emerged from the realization that introducing scientific sociology into a social context so different from the one that had originated it would be a very difficult process. It was not advisable, therefore, merely to transplant scientific sociology to Latin American societies; rather, it was judged necessary to analyze the sociology, isolate its component parts, then, design a procedure through which these components could be encouraged to grow in the new social context.

The participation of all members of the staff, including the younger Latin American assistant professors, was also required. Accordingly, an intellectual community emerged under Heintz's leadership that was actively engaged in analyzing scientific sociology and in planning its transfer to Latin America. The students were invited to participate in this undertaking through an explicit redefinition of their role from that of passive recipient of knowledge to associate researcher responsible for a project. What was needed were individuals capable of continuing the task of analysis and planned transfer of scientific sociology once back in their own countries. Therefore, intellectual autonomy, innovative capability, and ability to organize and implement were emphasized as much as familiarity with the technical side of sociological research. Teaching was organized around a nucleus of courses on sociological theory, sociology of development, methodology and statistics, and individual research projects. The other subjects (special sociologies other than sociology of development and demography) were given complementary status.

As the prestige of ELAS grew, new research activities were undertaken by its staff that increased the students' opportunities to get a well-rounded education in scientific sociology. Two major research projects were carried out at ELAS during Heintz's directorship: one, for the Chilean Ministry of Education on opinions and attitudes of the Chilean people toward work and education, was conceived by the staff and coordinated by Eduardo Muñoz, a Chilean graduate of ELAS; the other,

on the process of individual modernization, was directed by Professor Alex Inkeles, a visiting professor from Harvard University.

ELAS had sporadic contacts with the Instituto de Investigaciones Sociológicas or the Escuela de Sociología at the University of Chile during the initial years of implementation of Heintz's strategy. Every two years, new students were admitted, and Chilean graduates took their place among the other Latin American graduates. Also, some of the Chileans who had been educated in the United States and Western Europe during the fifties were invited to teach courses at ELAS (Briones and Ratnoff, for example). By and large, however, the two institutions worked along parallel lines. This situation began to change in 1964–65 as institutional contacts were reestablished with the Escuela de Sociología so that ELAS professors offered courses to its students.

This mode of reception came to an end when ELAS and the University of Chile could not agree on how to share a prospective grant under negotiation with the Ford Foundation. Consequently, Heintz accepted an offer from the University of Zurich to direct its Institute for Sociology and left ELAS in 1965. His successor was the Brazilian sociologist Glaúcio Ary Dillon Soares, who had trained in the United States. He did not share Heintz's ideas and proceeded to reorganize ELAS along the lines of a typical graduate school of a major American university.

This second mode of reception of scientific sociology implemented at ELAS under Heintz can be characterized as follows: (a) it was centered on the discipline of scientific sociology, but was viewed critically as a cultural product to be analyzed and restructured before being imported and used to define the problems of developing societies; (b) the United States and Western Europe provided the teachers, but they were individually chosen for their interest in the transfer of scientific sociology to developing countries and were brought to Chile to become members of an ongoing team; (c) only a few students, chosen from graduates of disciplines akin to scientific sociology, were to be educated as scientific sociologists; (d) scientific sociology was defined as basic research, with emphasis on theory construction; and (e) the direction and speed of the transfer were set by a non-Chilean leader, who belonged to an international organization, UNESCO.

THE THIRD MODE OF RECEPTION OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIOLOGY

When Hernán Godoy Urzúa left the Instituto de Investigaciones Sociológicas at the University of Chile in 1960, he decided to go to the United States to complete his own training in scientific sociology, begun in France in the early fifties. While studying at the University of California

at Berkeley, he received an invitation to join the recently created *Escuela de Sociología* of the *Universidad Católica de Chile* in Santiago.

This new institution had resulted from the activities of a Belgian Jesuit priest, Roger Vekemans, who had arrived in Chile in 1959. Vekemans, a graduate of Louvain University, viewed sociology quite differently from the group created by Professor Hamuy at the National University.

Vekemans's concept was that of establishing a school of sociology and a center of sociological research where people could be trained to think about Chile with a long-term political view to the emergence of a political movement that would implement structural reforms in a democratic way. This was the Kennedy concept for the development of Latin America, and Vekemans was one of its representatives in Latin America. He was very influential both in Chile and the U.S. State Department. (Gyarmati 1979)

To implement this concept, Vekemans first sent two brilliant law students (Raúl Urzúa and José Sulbrandt) to the University of California at Los Angeles for graduate studies in sociology. While they and Professor Godoy were abroad, Vekemans invited a group of young Belgian, Dutch, and French sociologists to come and teach at the *Escuela de Sociología*. He also invited a fellow Jesuit, Joseph Fichter, to create the *Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas*.

Once the Chileans were back in Santiago, Vekemans asked Professor Godoy to replace Fichter at the *Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas*. Godoy and Raúl Urzúa negotiated a major grant with the Ford Foundation for the development of both the school and the center. The grant included visiting professors, a large number of scholarships, aid for the library, and 45,000 dollars for research, a total of 300,000 dollars for a period of five years.

Charged with administering the grant was Gabriel Gyarmati, an engineer who had received a Ph.D. in sociology from Harvard and then joined the *Universidad Católica* in 1974. Professor Gyarmati said of the grant's impact on the new institution:

The visiting professors were a failure because we did not have a clear notion of what it was that we needed. The Ford Foundation used to give us the names of people who had an interest in coming to Chile and, mainly to use the funds available, we took them on board and then started to discuss with them the courses they could offer.

The Chileans who were awarded scholarships went generally to UCLA, where Urzúa and Sulbrandt had studied, and they returned with rigorous minds. They really learned their trade well.

Thanks to the grant, we were able to create a specialized library. With it, we could introduce the system of learning by reading the original articles and books, as in the U.S. universities, instead of textbooks or notes taken during lectures. This was vital because it created a very different style of educating sociologists. The Ford Foundation was exceptionally important in the area of research because with these resources, we were able to undertake long-term

research projects that were well organized, both conceptually and methodologically. (Gyarmati 1979)

Vekemans also obtained the support of the Rockefeller Foundation, which financed the arrival of a Belgian named Armand Mattelart, who together with German-educated Luis Scherz provided a wider perspective on scientific sociology for the students of the school.

Vekemans's activities were by no means limited to the establishment of sociology at the Catholic University. With funds from different (but mainly Western European) sources, he established the Centro para el Desarrollo Económico y Social de América Latina (DESAL), an institute for applied research on the economic and social development of Latin America. The institute, through its research and publications, called the attention of both social scientists and the wider public to the problem of "marginality" that was affecting vast sectors of Chilean society.

The growth of scientific sociology at the Universidad Católica and at DESAL received a big push from the election of Eduardo Frei as President of Chile. The Christian Democratic Party, which promoted structural reforms in a democratic way, came to power and gave final legitimation to scientific sociology. Hernán Godoy Urzúa, looking back on the development of scientific sociology in Chile, recalls:

Scientific sociology began to emerge during the government of Carlos Ibáñez del Campo (1952–58). Its development occurred during the government of Jorge Alessandri Rodríguez (1958–64), which was not much interested in it. But for the Eduardo Frei government (1964–70), sociologists were important. A good percentage of the advisors to the government were sociologists. It created a market for all sociologists, but mostly for those who had graduated from the Catholic University. Those trained at the University of Chile had a difficult life, with the personnel problems, the political struggle, etc. Professors came and went, and finally the school itself was closed for a period. So that those who went to work for the government were mainly the sociologists of the Catholic University, whose training was more akin to the ideology of the government. But in general, the transition to the Frei government was what finally institutionalized scientific sociology in Chile. (Godoy Urzúa 1979)

This third mode of reception can thus be characterized as follows: (a) it was centered on the discipline of scientific sociology as found in the United States and Western Europe. As Gyarmati observed in 1979, "We tried to reproduce Harvard or Berkeley in Chile. It was a mistake, but we could not know it at the time"; (b) the United States and Western Europe provided the entire education of the first group of faculty and the model for the education of the younger generation of Chile; (c) a university undergraduate program in scientific sociology was offered to unlimited numbers of high school graduates; (d) scientific sociology was defined as applied research and consultancy within an overarching ideology of structural changes by democratic means; and (e) the direction and the

speed of the transfer of scientific sociology was heavily influenced by one foreign agency, the Ford Foundation.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE RECEPTION OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIOLOGY

When President Eduardo Frei assumed power in November of 1964, scientific sociology seemed mature enough to share responsibilities with economics in the formulation and implementation of the ambitious economic and social reforms proposed by this government. In fact, several sociologists were summoned to serve in public offices. Nevertheless, despite the brilliant surface of several schools and institutes, both national and international, and the growing public recognition of sociology as a crucial discipline for development planning, Chilean sociology suffered from an invisible weakness.

The original home of scientific sociology in Chile, the Instituto de Investigaciones Sociológicas, had sustained a serious blow with the angry departure of Eduardo Hamuy, its creator, and Hernán Godoy Urzúa. As a consequence of the dissolution of this first group of scientific sociologists, the Escuela de Sociología of the National University found it increasingly difficult to recruit competent sociologists to teach the bright young generation who had been attracted by the achievements of that first group and by the promise of the discipline. The school might have obtained the collaboration of the foreign experts teaching in FLACSO, but relations between the two institutions, never very strong, were further weakened by the dispute about sharing the prospective Ford Foundation grant. When collaboration finally started in earnest, it was too late to take advantage of FLACSO's earlier experiences with scientific sociology because Peter Heintz had been replaced by Glaúcio Ary Dillon Soares, who believed that sociology should be institutionalized in Latin America as in the United States and who promoted the reception of that particular institutional approach for both teaching and research. As a consequence, the students of the school, when taught by professional sociologists, received an orthodox training in the theories, methods, and techniques of U.S. sociology, without benefit of experience in alternative approaches to scientific sociology.

The Escuela de Sociología at the Catholic University was in comparatively better shape than the school at the National University because of its important grant from the Ford Foundation. Its small staff, however, hindered the optimal use of available resources and required the wholesale import of U.S. sociology. By and large, its students also ended up receiving an orthodox sociological education.

With the Instituto de Investigaciones Sociológicas at the National University considerably weakened in staff, and both the national and

the international schools actively reproducing the U.S. model for the social organization of sociology, Chilean scientific sociology began to take a definite shape. This particular approach defined sociology as a full-time occupation centered around the production of research results for the constant expansion of a body of knowledge on human societies and the teaching of that knowledge and its methods of production to the younger generation.

At first sight, this type of sociology seemed to be a useful addition to Chilean cultural institutions, inasmuch as it contained the promise of a deeper understanding of the dynamics of the Chilean society. A more careful scrutiny, however, reveals that this type of organization could not deliver the goods promised.

In order to understand why it could not do so, one must consider what this social organization required from young Chilean sociologists. First, it required that they deal not with any questions of personal interest, but with the questions judged necessary to continue development of the body of knowledge. This body of knowledge had been built on research on the industrialized societies of Western Europe and the United States, and its important questions were created by the dynamics of those societies. Therefore, the young sociologists were pushed to concentrate their attention on these questions independently of their relevance for the sociologists' countries.

Second, it required that the young sociologists tackle the question selected with a well-defined set of methods and techniques that were considered reliable on the basis of previous research done in the industrialized societies. Therefore, these methods and techniques were to be learned and employed in research, again independently of their applicability to the peculiar conditions of peripheral, dependent countries.

The third requirement was that once a piece of research had been completed, it had to be submitted to the guardians of the body of knowledge (the editorial boards of the professional journals) for certification of its quality through publication. At that time, the main professional journals were run by editorial boards composed of European or North American sociologists, or by Latin American sociologists trained in the scientific tradition. Therefore, the young professionals, aware of the conditions, were required to organize their material in the way most conducive to its acceptance by these bodies, which normally made the material less likely to be circulated and understood at home.

The fourth requirement was that a published piece of research receive competent response in the form of reviews, rejoinders, or citations. Because the piece had been conceived, executed, and published in the manner described above, however, it attracted the attention of sociologists of the industrialized countries and not of fellow countrymen.

Whatever the response, it was conceived in terms of the contribution of the piece to the body of knowledge from which it had emerged in the first place.

In summary, this particular way of institutionalizing sociological research pushed the new generation of Chilean sociologists toward the study of questions that were important for the advancement of a body of knowledge originally built through the study of industrialized societies, using very specific methods and techniques, for the purpose of writing pieces acceptable to the referees of the professional journals. The underlying assumption was that the questions deemed important by the guardians of the body of knowledge were also the most important problems that affected Chilean society. Inasmuch as Chile had many of the traits of an urbanized, industrialized society, such an assumption was not totally unfounded, but it allowed sociologists to address minor social questions, provided that they could demonstrate a satisfactory knowledge of the methods and techniques of contemporary social research and of the art of writing papers for publication in professional journals.

Despite this new institution of sociology, some individual sociologists attempted to tackle other questions more relevant to the country. The tension between the institutional standards of "scientific sociology" and the relevance of the published pieces for understanding and solving Chilean social problems appeared even in the work of single individuals over time. This conflict notwithstanding, by the mid-sixties, Chilean sociology had become a peripheral segment of the transnational institution of "scientific sociology."²

At the same time, this institutionalized kind of sociological research had entirely displaced the "ensayismo" of the first part of the twentieth century. Although some of the traditional sociologists managed to survive the onslaught by accepting jobs teaching introductory courses or those on the history of social thought, they were not summoned to help draft reforms or to advise the government or the media, as were the new scientific sociologists. Thus, in theoretical terms, institutionalized sociological research brought about the disintegration of the previous social organization of sociological production.

The new scientific sociology in Chile also contained the seeds of its own destruction. First, it required a constant comparison between what is included in the body of knowledge and what is discovered about social reality using sophisticated techniques of data collection and analysis. After this continual comparing, the best sociologists discovered how much the body of knowledge was influenced by the experience of a few human societies, and how little it had to say with respect to the reality they saw unfolding before their eyes. Second, the new scientific sociology required extracting all the consequences from any discrepancy between the body of knowledge and reality, even if this entailed a reor-

ganization of the entire body of knowledge. Therefore, when the chasm between the learned body of knowledge and the directly experienced social reality was fully recognized by the practitioners, their destructive work could not be stopped. Third, the new scientific sociology tended to isolate practitioners and their students from other activities in society within the walls of an institute or a school of sociology, where there is no way of ignoring the discrepancies between the body of knowledge and reality because the exclusive activity of all its members is research. On the contrary, the normal working of the institution will bring these discrepancies into focus again and again.

Because of these processes, after only a few years of existence, scientific sociology began to be deserted by scores of its practitioners, who commenced a search for a different way of organizing the production of sociological knowledge. In theoretical terms, an attempt began at reintegration, centered around the notion of interdisciplinary research. New centers were established at the major universities (the Centro de Estudios Socioeconómicos at the National University and the Centro de Estudios de la Realidad Nacional at the Catholic University) with the explicit goal of studying Chile, thus beginning a new phase that lies outside the parameters of this essay.

CONCLUSIONS

The preceding study of the reception of scientific sociology in Chile allows some conclusions with respect to the wider process of incorporating countries into transnational capitalism.³ First, the process is set in motion by actors with differing motivations and goals. The young intellectuals at the University of Chile, on both the faculties of Philosophy and Education and of Legal and Social Sciences, were motivated by intellectual curiosity and the desire to acquire abilities that would allow them to understand better the structure of Chilean society and its processes of change. The governments of the Latin American countries that created FLACSO wanted to obtain better administrators who could cope with the problems of rapid, induced social change, and these governments considered sociology to be one of the disciplines that their administrators should master. The foreign institutions that provided scholarships, technical assistance, and books (such as UNESCO, the French government, and the Ford Foundation) had their own goals. There was no grand design or strategy for transplanting this discipline to Chilean soil, except in the case of Peter Heintz, who did have a clear idea of the implications of this transplant and a strategy. Nevertheless, the actions of all the actors, when considered in their totality, produced the effects of transnational integration and disintegration, as has been described.

Second, the effects are no more the result of the action of the

external actors than of the internal ones. Surely, UNESCO, the French government, the Ford Foundation, and other non-Chilean institutions made an important contribution to the process of incorporation. Without the presence in Chile of foreign experts, books, journals, and equipment, scientific sociology could not have developed to the point reached in the mid-sixties. Their presence and their influence, however, were consequences of the efforts of Chilean individuals and institutions to seek foreign support rightly considered vital.

Third, the effects produced by the action of all the actors involved are much more pervasive than any of them had anticipated and sometimes represent an outcome that certainly would have been rejected, had these actors been able to see into the future. Finally, contemporary sociology is a sociocultural mechanism of incorporation because of the way it has been institutionalized world-wide as a full-time research occupation. To the extent that a country accepts this type of institutionalization of sociology, it becomes a new link with the dominant center of transnational capitalism instead of a tool of liberation.

NOTES

1. The expression *scientific sociology* is used here in a merely descriptive way to denote a certain type of sociology developed particularly in the United States after the Second World War. Its most articulate advocates are Robert K. Merton in theory and Paul F. Lazarsfeld in methodology. See Part I of Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949); Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "Evidence and Inference in Social Research," *Daedalus* (Fall 1958):99–130; and Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg, *The Language of Social Research: A Reader in the Methodology of Social Research* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955). In Latin America, the most cogent defence of this type of sociology is that offered by Gino Germani in *La sociología científica* (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1956). The limitations of this type of sociology will not be discussed in this article.
2. The following references include some of the most representative writings of the transnational integration of Chilean sociology by the mid-sixties. It is worth noting that several of the pieces were created in collaboration with European and North American social scientists; nevertheless, the individual production of Chilean sociologists is similar. Also, some of the major works were published in the late sixties and early seventies, when this kind of sociology was already being challenged. Guillermo Briones, "La estructura social y la participación política," *Revista Interamericana de Ciencias Sociales* 2, no. 3:376–404; also published in *Estructura Social de Chile*, ed. Hernán Godoy Urzúa, pp. 476–88 (Santiago: Editorial Universitaria, 1971). Guillermo Briones and José Mejía, *El obrero industrial* (Lima: Instituto de Investigaciones Sociológicas, San Marcos, 1964). Guillermo Briones and F. B. Waisaner, "Aspiraciones educacionales, modernización e integración urbana," *Economía* (Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Económicas de la Universidad de Chile) 24, no. 92, (1966):3–20. Roy Carter and Orlando Sepúlveda, "Occupational Prestige in Santiago de Chile," *The American Behavioral Scientist* 8, no. 1 (Sept. 1964):20–24. Roy Carter and Orlando Sepúlveda, "Some Patterns of Mass Media Use in Santiago de Chile," *Journalism Quarterly* 41, no. 2 (Spring 1964):216–24. Joseph H. Fichter, *Cambio social en Chile. Un estudio de actitudes* (Santiago: CIS, Universidad Católica de Chile, 1962). Alain Girard and Raúl Samuel, *Situación y perspectivas de Chile en septiembre de 1957* (Santiago: Instituto de Sociología, Universidad de Chile, 1958). Hernán Godoy Urzúa, *El oficio de las letras. Estudio sociológico de la vida literaria* (Santiago: Editorial

Universitaria, 1970). Gabriel Gyarmati, *El profesorado secundario. Una planificación sociológica* (Santiago: Instituto de Sociología, Universidad Católica de Chile, 1971). Eduardo Hamuy, Danilo Salcedo, and Orlando Sepúlveda, *El primer satélite artificial: sus efectos en la opinión pública* (Santiago: Editorial Universitaria, 1958). Rudolf Hoffman and Frederic Debuyst, *Chile: una industrialización desordenada* (Santiago: CIS, Universidad Católica de Chile and DESAL, 1966). Henry Landsberger, Manuel Barrera, and Abel Toro, *El pensamiento del dirigente sindical chileno* (Santiago: INSORA, 1964). Armand Mattelart and Manuel Antonio Garretón, *Integración y marginalidad* (Santiago: CIS, Universidad Católica de Chile, 1965). Armand Mattelart and Raúl Urzúa, *La cuenca del Río Maule: estudio sociológico y demográfico* (Santiago: CIS, Universidad Católica de Chile, 1964). Raúl Urzúa, *La demanda campesina* (Santiago: Editorial Nueva Universidad, 1969).

The kind of sociological work that could have been produced by the Institute of Sociology of the University of Chile, if it had not been so seriously crippled by the crisis of 1960, may be deduced from Eduardo Hamuy, *Sociología elemental, alfabetismo y desarrollo económico* (Santiago: Editorial Universitaria, 1960) and *El problema educacional del pueblo de Chile* (Santiago: Editorial del Pacífico, 1961).

On the work of FLACSO under Peter Heintz, see *Anales de FLACSO* 1, no. 1(1964) and Peter Heintz, *Un paradigma sociológico del desarrollo, con especial referencia a América Latina* (Buenos Aires: Editorial del Instituto Torcuato di Tella, 1970).

3. The characterization of the transnational stage of development of capitalism has been presented elsewhere. See, for example, *Transnational Capitalism and National Development*, edited by J. J. Villamil (Brighton, UK: Harvester Press, 1979 and Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1979). This book also discusses the consequences for national societies of their incorporation into transnational capitalism. See Osvaldo Sunkel and Edmundo Fuenzalida, "Transnationalization and Its National Consequences," pp. 67–93.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GODOY URZÚA, HERNÁN

- 1967 "La sociología en Chile." In *Anuario de Sociología de los Pueblos Ibéricos* 2(1967):11–57.
- 1970 "La sociología del intelectual en América Latina." In *El intelectual latinoamericano*, edited by Juan F. Marsal, pp. 107–27. Buenos Aires: Editorial del Instituto.
- 1977 "El desarrollo de la sociología en Chile." *Estudios Sociales* 12(1977):33–56.
- 1979 Interview given as Dean of Social Sciences of the Catholic University of Chile and former Director of the Center for Sociological Research of the Catholic University. In Santiago, Chile, August.

GYARMATI, GABRIEL

- 1974 "Development of the Social Sciences in Chile." *Social Science Organization and Policy*, First Series, pp. 149–84. Paris: UNESCO.
- 1979 Interview given as Professor of Sociology, Catholic University of Chile and former Director of the Center for Sociological Research and of the School of Sociology of that university. In Santiago, Chile, August.

HAMUY, EDUARDO

- 1979 Interview with Eduardo Hamuy Berr, former Director of the Institute for Sociological Research of the University of Chile and of the Center for Socioeconomic Studies of the same university. Santiago, Chile, August.

HEINTZ, PETER AND FUENZALIDA, EDMUNDO

- 1967 "Some Relationships between Scientific Sociology and Society." *Bulletin of the Sociological Institute of the University of Zurich* 1 (1967).

SEPÚLVEDA, ORLANDO

1979 Interview given as Professor of Sociology, University of Chile, and former Director of the Institute for Sociological Research and of the School of Sociology of that university. In Santiago, Chile, August.

URZÚA, RAÚL

1979 Interview given as former Professor of Sociology and Director of the School of Sociology of the Catholic University of Chile. In Santiago, Chile, August.