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Introduction: Sociology in Portugal

Abstract: This chapter begins with the presentation of the theoretical approach employed to study the history of sociology in Portugal from 1945 to the present day: genealogical pragmatism. This is followed by a discussion of the chief methodological challenges facing such an endeavour. The chapter concludes with a presentation of the five main analytic dimensions of Carreira da Silva's approach: social agents; ideas; instruments; institutions; and contexts.

At the end of January 1963, the first issue of a new journal in the social sciences called 'Análise Social' ('Social Analysis') appeared in Lisbon. In retrospect, many will interpret this publication as signalling a crucial first step towards the institutionalization of sociology in Portugal. Nineteen-sixty-three is also the year W.E.B. Du Bois died in Accra, Ghana. Exiled from the United States for his leftist political ideas, at the time of his demise Du Bois was, by and large, ignored by the discipline. Today, however, he is rightly considered one of the founders of American sociology, with works such as The Philadelphia Negro (1899), a survey-based depiction of the social conditions of an Afro-American neighborhood, and The Souls of Black Folk (1903), perhaps the most accomplished literary achievement ever penned by a sociologist. Back in the US, 1963 is the publication year of Erving Goffman's Stigma and Howard Becker's Outsiders, but Talcott Parsons' dominance over American sociology was unquestioned. This is not only because of Parsons' work as a social theorist, but also because he was seen 'as an importer' of Weber's ideas about religion and capitalism into the Anglo-Saxon world. Meanwhile, that year in Britain, John H. Goldthorpe and David Lockwood published 'Affluence and the British Class Structure', an article on the consequences of affluence for the working class which would eventually lead to the most celebrated sociological study ever carried out in Britain (Goldthorpe et al., 1968–69). Nineteen-sixty-three is also the heyday of the Frankfurt School of critical theory. This is the year when Adorno published his lecture on 'Culture Industry Reconsidered', Habermas published Theory and Practice, and a few months later Marcuse published One-Dimensional Man. In Paris, Raymond Aron published his Eighteen Lectures on Industrial Society, while Bourdieu began the empirical research on French culture that would eventually lead to his Distinction of 1977. This synoptic view of the international context within which sociology in Portugal took its first steps helps us to put this institutional development into perspective. Sociology in the early 1960s was an academic discipline with a long, varied, and discontinuous tradition in a large number of countries, and Portuguese sociologists imported and adapted this well-established and differentiated discipline to local circumstances and problems.

This book is about sociology in Portugal, understood as a national variety of European sociology. The European tradition can be seen as an institutionalized response to the problem of social order in modern capitalist societies in the nineteenth century. Analysed as a 'social contract' between converging individual interests by Enlightenment theoreticians, nineteenth century sociology opted for analysing the forms and structures that are ultimately responsible for making 'society' possible (Eisenstadt 1968). More recently, R.W. Connell suggests a second rationale for the institutionalization of sociology, namely the systematic comparison between Western metropolises and their colonial territories (1997). In the case of sociology in Portugal, the problem which provided the immediate motivation for its institutionalization sprang not so much from the colonial problem, for political reasons which I will detail in the next chapter, but from a 'social question' typical of developing societies – how to use social scientific knowledge for the improvement of social conditions in Western Europe's poorest country.

From this diversity of founding problems, a number of developmental stages may be discerned. In the case of the global development of sociology as an academic discipline, the following can be identified (on periodization see, for instance, Clark 1972): a pre-academic stage, inaugurated by August Comte's coinage of the term 'sociology' and during which organicist and evolutionist models of society proliferated (1830s–90s); the early academic stage, during which sociology first became institutionalized as an academic discipline in universities in Western Europe and the United States (1890s–1900s); the interwar years, marked by the decline of sociology in Europe and the development of the Chicago School (1920s–30s); the post-war renaissance stage, characterized by the revival and definite consolidation of sociology as an academic discipline in Europe and the United States (1945–68), and the current postmodern global stage, marked by the overcoming of modernist paradigms, by increasing internal differentiation, and an unprecedented global scope (1970s–2010s).

The institutional establishment and consolidation of sociology in Portugal I revisit in this book is closely related to these last two stages. This is for two main reasons. First, there is the collaboration between local sociologists and their international peers in terms of training, funding, conferences, research, and publications. Second, theoretical-methodological developments in the discipline abroad provided the framework within which sociology in Portugal was developed. For instance, as in most other small countries, there is no strand of 'Portuguese social theory', if by that one means a cluster of sociologists integrated by common syllabi, a journal, and a research programme as a means to institutionalize intellectual innovation. Sociological theory in Portugal, as I will show below, has been, by and large, an importation of
ideas from abroad, which were more or less systematically applied to the study of Portuguese society. Individual exceptions, which confirm this diagnosis, include figures such as the Oxford-based Hermínio Martins and critical theorist Boaventura de Sousa Santos.1

This last observation invokes an important terminological distinction I make in this book. I distinguish between 'sociology in Portugal', in the sense of an academic discipline actually practised in Portugal (sometimes by theorists and educators who are not Portuguese) and which is not focused on the study of Portuguese society, and 'sociology of Portugal', in the sense of an epistemic community which defines itself by the sociological, sometimes comparative, study of Portuguese society. In this second sense, one could perhaps speak of a 'Portuguese sociology' as a methodological project whose boundaries are defined by the nation-state called 'Portugal'.2 For reasons I will make clear below, however, I am of the view that such a designation should be reserved for a handful of national sociologies that, for diverse historical and cultural reasons, developed distinctive ways of doing sociology – a case in point is 'German sociology'. In most other cases, Portugal included, it is more rigorous to speak of sociology in that country.

This brings me to the theoretical approach I employ to study sociology in Portugal from 1945 onwards, which is the focus of this book series. Donald N. Levine (1996) has suggested a typology of competing approaches (or narratives) about how sociologists have revisited the discipline's past. These include: a positivist approach, whose chief protagonist is Comte and in which social knowledge progresses as metaphysical speculation gradually but inexorably subsides; a pluralist narrative first developed in the interbellum period which emphasizes the agonistic plurality of competing viewpoints; a synthetic approach in light of which the 'classical' sociological tradition that took shape in turn-of-the-century Western Europe in the writings of seminal figures such as Max Weber and Emile Durkheim converges on a few fundamental sociological principles; a humanist genre, quite popular in the 1960s and 1970s, which suggested the existence of yet another 'classical' tradition, this time dating back to the late eighteenth century, constituted by thinkers who first attempted to examine the consequences of the demise of the ancien régime and concomitant emergence of modern societies, and a contextualist approach, which moves away from the autonomy of the text or ideas to emphasize rather the relevance of social, cultural, ideological, and institutional factors in shaping the meaning of these ideas and texts.

My approach is contextualist in that I conceive of academic disciplines as being partly shaped by external factors, but it is also genealogical and pragmatic. It is genealogical in the sense that, following Nietzsche and the late Foucault (1971, 1982), I see disciplines as institutionalized struggles over meaning. It is pragmatic in that I do not restrict such struggles over meaning to the level of discourse. Rather, I argue that one needs to take the materiality of the processes of meaning-production seriously. Unlike other pragmatic approaches (e.g. Latour 2005), I do not adopt an anti-humanist stance which sees agency as equally distributed among human and non-human entities. Social agents remain at the heart of my approach, understood as socially embedded organisms oriented to solving concrete action problems within certain external frames, such as academic disciplines themselves, for example. Institutions, academic disciplines included, are not purely social constructs, even though they are socially constructed. They possess a distinctive material form. The dialectic between human agency and this material form can be designated as materiality. In this sense, materiality is the pragmatic response to the pitfalls of both materialism and idealism.

For the purposes of this book, there are two important methodological dualisms I wish to supersede. The first is the one that separates 'discipline history' from 'intellectual history' (Collini 1988), that is to say, this dualism distinguishes 'disciplinary history' from the 'history of disciplines' (Novick 1988). The historian of anthropology George Stocking referred to this dualism when he identified the gulf separating 'internal' histories of disciplines that practitioners told themselves, and 'external' histories by those who mined the disciplines for historical insights (Stocking 1965). Literature on the history of sociology in Portugal has been, by and large, dominated by 'internal' historical studies (Cruz 1983; Nunes 1988; Machado 2009), including case studies of sociology journals (Casanova 1996), sociology conferences (Lobo 1996), or sociology departments (Dias 2006). Several developments in recent decades have contributed to make this dichotomy less salient (Geary 2008). On the one hand, 'internal' accounts have benefited enormously from an ever more sophisticated literature on the history of disciplines. As a result, many practitioners' histories now treat concepts such as tradition, conceptual change, and the construction of disciplinary boundaries in a much more reflexive way. Examples include volumes on history (Novick 1988), sociology (Calhoun 2007), economics (Mirowski 2002), and political science (Adcock, Bevir, and Stimson 2007). Sociologists in Portugal have
accompanied this methodological development. ‘External’ histories by practitioners have emphasized the importance of the Catholic Church in the early period of academic formation (Ferreira 2006), critically discussed its late institutionalization (Hespanha 1996), as well as recent tendencies of internationalization (Fortuna 2008). All these studies share a self-conscious attempt to tread the line between discipline history and intellectual history, and their authors have allegiances both to history and to the discipline they seek to investigate.

On the other hand, an increasing number of studies on the nature of discipline formation, the exercise of specialist expertise, and pedagogy have clarified the dynamics behind the creation and reproduction of academic disciplines. Precursors such as Thomas Kuhn (1962), who shed light on the grounds of scientific communal norms, Michael Polanyi (1958), with his work on the ‘tacit knowledge’ required for expert practices, as well as more recent contributors such as Warwick (2003), who have helped clarify the ‘power of pedagogy’ in the creation of scientific communities, have all been central to these developments.

As a result of these changes, an increasing number of scholars work on both sides of the, formerly sharp, divide between internal and external histories of disciplines, and between history and sociology. Illustrating this trend is Andrew Abbott, who has both authored a local history of the Chicago School of sociology (Abbott 1999) and a formal sociology of disciplines (Abbott 2001). Abbott’s sociology of disciplines, however, can be criticized on at least two accounts. First, the fractal models Abbott has imported from mathematics are too rigid to capture the actual distribution of power positions in sociology, however elegant they seem. Rather than recurrent nested dichotomies (agency vs. structure, qualitative vs. quantitative, etc.) that structure natural and social sciences alike, I hypothesize the existence, at least in the case of the latter, of distinctively dialogical, uneven, and culturally relative paths of disciplinary development. Second, rather than endless generational recycling of old ideas (Abbott 2001: 17), with little or no space for genuine conceptual innovation, a fuller appreciation of the national dynamics of discipline formation and development would enable Abbott’s sociology of disciplines to account for historical discontinuities, Foucault’s ‘cyclopean moments’ ([1971] 1991: 77), such as the one spearheaded by social and political revolution in mid-1970s Portugal.

This last observation brings me to the second methodological dualism I wish to overcome. I refer to the kind of periodization – continuist or discontinuist – favoured in one’s account. The first wave of studies in the history of sociology in Portugal, written as first-hand testimonies of their authors’ roles in the creation and consolidation of sociology, emphasized discontinuity. The change of political regime in the mid-1970s is presented as the pivotal historical break which made academic sociology possible in Portugal (e.g. Nunes 1988, Almeida 1991; Fernandes 1996; Pais and Cabral 2006). A more recent wave of studies, however, suggests a broadly continuist narrative (e.g. Pinto 2004; Neto 2013; Garcia et al. 2015). The most systematic study of sociology in Portugal of the continuist ilk is by Frederico Ágoas (2013), who provides an exhaustive Foucauldian genealogy of the origins of Portuguese sociology since the early twentieth century as a disciplinary form of state power. The historical account I present in this book, however, is explicitly discontinuist in that it emphasizes the fundamental difference between pre-1974 and post-1974 sociology in Portugal. The main reason I do so is empirical. None of the continuist studies indicated above has been able to conclusively demonstrate the influence of early intellectual sources on more recent institutional developments. Determined to find an illustrious early Portuguese sociology, sometimes as early as the 1880s (Machado 1962: 2), these studies incur two of the fallacies that Quentin Skinner has long identified as the pitfalls of the history of ideas, that is, the fallacy of ‘anticipation’ and the fallacy of ‘influence’ (1969). Rather than showing a direct causal relationship between the scattered intellectual interventions of the turn of the century and the processes of academic institutionalization of sociology in the late 1960s and early 1970s, they have limited themselves to juxtaposing, as opposed to providing textual evidence that connects, the two. As a result, one of the basic claims I make in this study is that the trajectory of sociology in Portugal is characterized by a fundamental historical discontinuity whose primary cause was a change in the nature of the political regime, that is, the transition to democratic rule than took place in 1974–75 as a result of a leftist military coup.

As noted above, the object of study of this book is an academic discipline. In my view, disciplines are neither the product of the automatic progress of science nor are they ‘natural’ categories. Rather, disciplines are better understood as projects, in the sense of socially constituted authoritative purveyors of explanations and descriptions of segments of reality. Such projects, as we have seen, are fraught with uncertainties and conflicts. They are also, as Foucault rightly emphasizes (1975), disciplining forces that establish authorities, namely, the state, impose on individuals,
producing 'docile bodies' and minds. As such, sociology as an academic discipline does not remain external to the subject. Rather, the process of disciplining leads to the internalization of certain values and principles by all those exposed to it, from practitioners to students and the general public. Political theorist Bernard Yack has distinguished between two different senses of the term 'project' (1997: 116–17). On the one hand, a discipline is a project in the sense of a shared aspiration, a collective idea or blueprint. As we shall see in the next chapter, sociology in Portugal in the 1960s was certainly a project in this sense as it denoted a shared generational commitment towards the betterment of social conditions through social scientific means. On the other hand, Yack points to a second meaning of the term. According to the second meaning, disciplines are also projects in the sense of frameworks which provide the boundaries within which agents operate. This second sense of disciplines as systems of constraints is, of course, close to Foucault's understanding of disciplinary power. Historians of the social sciences have explored this second sense of 'disciplinary project' to emphasize the importance of language as the medium through which meaning is produced, namely those systematically integrated bodies of knowledge Foucault designates as 'discursive formations'. It is my contention that sociology in Portugal, much like other social sciences elsewhere, has become a 'discipline' in this double sense. It has always been, with important variations, both a specialized branch of knowledge and an institutionalized form of regulatory control. One of the research questions I pursue in this book is: What sort of project was the project of disciplinary formation in the case of sociology in Portugal?

In order to answer this question, I employ the pragmatic approach described above, taking into account five analytic dimensions. Following Fleck and Dayé (2015), these dimensions are: social agents, ideas, instruments, institutions, and contexts. Let me now briefly introduce each of these dimensions. Agents are often studied individually, that is, intellectual biographies of leading scholars are widely available, as well as autobiographical accounts (e.g. Elias 1994). Another popular unit of analysis are clusters (Clark and Clark 1971), research groups, schools, departments, and universities (Bulmer 1984; Dahrendorf 1995). An even more general unit are generations (Fleck 2011). In this book, I make use of all these units of analysis to account for human agency in the creation and development of sociology in Portugal. Sometimes I discuss individual scholars (such as Sedas Nunes in the next chapter), while on other occasions my focus will be upon collectives (as in professional association meetings in the third and fourth chapters), and on other occasions still I will weave individual accounts together to bring about a collective understanding of the discipline as a whole (as in the final chapter). Orienting my analysis on these different occasions are the concrete action problems these social agents (individual or collective) are oriented to, for instance, the problem of internationalization that commands attention in the contemporary period. Responding to a problematic often requires collaboration between a relatively large number of practitioners, which in academic hierarchical contexts such as Continental European instances are typically undertaken under the intellectual orientation and academic patronage of a leader. This is (also) why the analytic distinction individual vs. group can somewhat be obfuscating in the study of academic disciplines.

Ideas will be approached as more or less systematic reflections upon the social world, with a materiality of their own, and articulated with an intent that can at times be political. This understanding of ideas can be contrasted with more traditional approaches that tend to analyse them as free-standing unit-ideas (Nisbet 1970) or theories (Coser 1971), and is closer to Lakatos' concept of a research programme (Lakatos 1970) as in a set of propositions (or ideas) around which agents position themselves, often in conflicting ways. I will show that sociology in Portugal has developed around such struggles over the meaning of certain key sets of ideas or research programmes. As such, ideas can be said to possess an unmistakably performative character. It has been through the learning, teaching, application, discussion, and refinement of ideas that sociologists in Portugal have undertaken their social inquiries, taught their students, while acquiring in the process a distinctive disciplinary identity. From this perspective, sociological ideas are to be studied as much as abstract statements with a certain degree of abstraction and generality as tools of inquiry with a specific embodied materiality. In a crucial sense, then, ideas make sociologists. Sociology in Portugal is thus a discursive formation, as Foucault rightly emphasized, but is also much more. It is an institutionalized practice, with a specific materiality, from its outputs in the form of specialized publications to peoples' mores and dress codes.

Instruments, which include specialized libraries, questionnaires, coding handbooks, tape recorders, and cameras, as well as less material instruments such as search strategies, methodologies, and techniques are
yet another analytic dimension of the present study. At first sight, this may seem surprising. Indeed, it is far more common to analyse instruments when one is talking about the natural sciences, that is, telescopes, microscopes, and so on. Yet as works such as Shapin and Schaffer's *Leviathan and the Air-Pump* (1985) have demonstrated, the divide separating the natural sciences from the human and social sciences is much more porous than we are often led to believe. In actual fact, to endorse a certain method of knowledge production (in their study, Hobbes' naturalist philosophy or Boyle's experimental method) is also to accept a social philosophy. In the case of sociology in Portugal, the choice of instruments reveals not only a certain theoretical and epistemological orientation, but also constitutes a sound indicator of the stage of disciplinary development, that is, the distance separating Sedas Nunes' time-consuming manipulation of his mechanical calculator in the late 1960s (Nunes 1988: 26) and the massification of personal computers and statistical software from the 1990s onwards in Portugal marks not only two distinct historical periods, but also signals the consolidation of a more general orientation towards quantitative methodologies and empiricist epistemologies in both teaching and research in Portugal (on the American case, see Platt 1996).

In this book institutions will be studied from a three-fold perspective which emphasizes their simultaneously constraining and enabling (therefore, constitutive) impact upon human agency. First, there are the outlets or physical locations where academic work is conducted, ranging from university departments to academic and professional scientific journals. Second, there are the addressees of the sociological knowledge produced, which can be either other academics or the general public, including state officials, the media, or private contractors. Third, there are the modes of governance which regulate academic politics, which include administrative policies and cultures such as the new public management's audit culture (Strathern 2000). As in most other cases, in the case of sociology in Portugal the state has proved to be a crucial institution, not only by imposing certain modes of governance able to define professional career structures but also by determining groups of public addressees able to dictate research agendas through governmental funding bodies, and providing for the physical installations of sociology departments, research centres, and conference venues (Wagner 1990). A less studied kind of institution is private foundations (Picô 2003: 81–103; Fisher 1993). In the case of Portugal, the philanthropic Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation will be shown to have partially complemented the scarcity of public resources available for work in the human and social sciences since the late 1960s, thus providing, at least to a certain extent, an alternative mode of governance to that promoted by the state.

Contexts, the trademark of externalist studies of science, are the final analytic dimension of my study. In particular, I focus upon two types of context that I deem particularly relevant for my purposes. First, I analyse the context of growing internationalization of the social sciences, including sociology, in recent decades. The blueprint for most studies of the internationalization of the science system is still provided by modernization theories of the 1950s, according to which conceptual innovation tends to follow a pattern of diffusion and isomorphism from a given centre to the periphery: hence the analyses of the theoretical-methodological 'Americanization' of the social sciences (Heilbrun et al. 2008). As I and a colleague have argued elsewhere, however, I am of the view that a 'varieties of modernity' approach that takes its inspiration from S.N. Eisenstadt's multiple modernities paradigm, provides a more robust explanatory instrument (Silva and Vieira 2009). As I will try to demonstrate, whilst there are certainly tendencies towards 'Americanization' in the shaping of sociology in this case, these were always confronted with competing modernizing sources, namely Western European. For a number of different reasons, Marxism and French sociology were always more important sources of modernization in Portugal than American sociology. As a result, rather than a conception of modernity as ideas and institutional forms emanating from a single centre, it seems to be more realistic to assume the existence of a *variety of modernities*, whose impact often gets entangled once they reach developing countries. This seems to be the case in our interdisciplinary age. From research projects that bring together numerous practitioners in different fields to work side-by-side to resolve a given problem, to large international networks of scientists collaborating in postgraduate programmes and research and development initiatives, the scientific landscape today is no longer dominated by academic disciplines (Abbott 2001). In my view, however, one should be careful when dismissing too readily the organizational function performed by disciplines. Ours may no longer be a 'disciplinary age' per se, but the emerging 'postdisciplinary' era certainly does not preclude a central role for this specific institutional form. As I will try to make clear in this book, disciplines still constitute the backbone of scientific practice, and there is no reason to believe they will cease to do so in the future.
This brings me to the second context I will take into account in this study, that is, the nation-state. If in the scientific domain academic disciplines are the modern institutional form, very much the same can be said of the territorial nation-state for the political realm. It should thus not come as a surprise that, while in debates on science we are told that we are now living in a post-disciplinary era, an increasing number of political theorists claim that the nation-state is an institutional form of a bygone era. In this case too, I am sceptical of the tendency to dismiss the centrality of the nation-state as a political institution. Even whilst nowadays member-states in the European Union compete with the European Commission for a leading role in the definition and funding of the research agenda, the fact remains that the Portuguese state has consistently performed a central role in the institutionalization of sociology since its very first stages until today. In particular, the change in the character of the political regime will be shown to have impacted in very profound terms the trajectory of this academic discipline in Portugal. The revolutionary transition from a corporatist right-wing dictatorship to a constitutional democratic regime in the mid-1970s marks a fundamental shift in the history of sociology in Portugal. This analysis of corporatism and of a revolutionary democratic transition complements existing analyses of the impact of the Nazi regime (Coser 1984; Ash and Söllner 1996), communist regimes (Keen and Mucha 1994, 2006), and the Cold War on the development of the social sciences (Abbott and Sparrow 2007; Cohen-Cole 2009; Isaac 2007, 2012; Rohde 2013).

Besides secondary data on the Portuguese professional sociological association’s membership figures and congresses and other institutional indicators, among the materials employed to support my argument in this book are excerpts from interviews with many of the agents involved in the creation and institutionalization of the discipline in Portugal. This constitutes a rare opportunity to include first-person testimonies, which is only possible owing to the relatively recent academic establishment of sociology in Portugal. Most of these interviewees came of age in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The book is structured as follows. In the first chapter ‘The Early Years, 1945–74’, I analyse the conditions of possibility behind the institutionalization of sociology in Portugal, focusing upon how the Grupo de Investigações Sociais (GIS) and its leader, A. Sedas Nunes, responded to the problem of how to create an academic discipline such as sociology under adverse political and economic conditions. This is a period characterized by political repression and censorship, colonial war, mass emigration, and profound social and economic issues. These are also the socio-economic and political lenses through which the impact of the Cold War and ‘Americanization’ was filtered. The following chapter, ‘Sociology Institutionalized, 1975–82’, revolves around the political regime change of 1974–75 and its consequences for sociology in Portugal. An epoch of leftist revolutionary fervour, this is also when the institutionalization of the academic discipline began, with the first sociology undergraduate degrees and university departments officially recognized by the state authorities. The third chapter, ‘Consolidation, 1980s–1990s’, discusses an intermediary phase of institutional development framed by European integration, democratic consolidation, and economic turmoil. This is when the first professional association was created alongside the proliferation of postgraduate programmes, sociology departments, and journals. The fourth chapter, ‘Internationalization, 1995 to the Present Day’, focuses upon the current phase of institutional development. Internationalization is the main problematic of this stage, constituting a challenge to individual and collective ways of teaching, applying for research funding, and publishing findings. The fifth chapter, ‘Sociology’s Voices’, presents excerpts from 16 interviews with Portuguese sociologists who address the successive phases, circumstances, agents, and institutions involved in the development of sociology as an academic discipline. The imaginary conversation that emerges is a fascinating collective discourse addressing the different developmental stages, conflicting theoretical orientations, and multiple thematic specializations that compose contemporary Portuguese sociology. I conclude with some brief remarks on the current situation of austerity after the financial crisis and its implications for universities and sociology in particular.

Notes
1 But see, for instance, Guibentif (2010) and Fernandes (1993, 2008).
2 The notion of ‘methodological nationalism’ was first articulated, of course, by Hermínio Martins (1974: 276f.). On recent re-examinations of this concept, see Wimmer and Schiller (2002), Chernilo (2006). See also Beck (2000).