

Instituto Superior de Ciências do Trabalho e da Empresa, Lisbon); professor at the Faculty of Letters of Eduardo Mondlane University (Mozambique); areas of interest: Political Anthropology, inequality, hierarchies, family, gender and power relations.

JOSÉ MADUREIRA PINTO

Aged 51, Portuguese; degree in Economics (1968, Faculdade de Economia, Porto University); doctorate in Sociology (1983, Instituto de Ciências Sociais of the University of Lisbon); professor at the Faculty of Economics of Porto University; areas of interest: methodology of social sciences, sociology of work and social class, sociology of symbolic-cultural practices.

WANDERLEY GUILHERME DOS SANTOS

Aged 62, Brazilian; bachelor's degree in Philosophy (1958, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil); doctorate in Political Science (1979, Stanford University, USA); specialised in problems of economic development (Economic Commission for Latin America); professor at the Instituto Universitário in Rio de Janeiro and ex-chairman of the National Association for post-graduates and researchers in the Social Sciences (ANPOCS); areas of interest: social theory, political analysis, parties and elections.

BOAVENTURA DE SOUSA SANTOS

Aged 57, Portuguese; degree in Law (1963, Faculdade de Direito, Coimbra University); master's degree in Social Structures of Development and Development Law (1970, Yale University, USA); doctorate in Sociology of Law (1973, Yale University, USA); professor of Sociology at the Faculty of Economics of Coimbra University; director of the Centro de Documentação 25 de Abril and of the Centro de Estudos Sociais, both of Coimbra University; areas of interest: sociology of law, political sociology, sociology of health, human rights.

AUGUSTO SANTOS SILVA

Aged 41, Portuguese; degree in History (1978, Faculdade de Letras, Porto University); Doctorate in Sociology (1992, Instituto Superior de Ciências do Trabalho e da Empresa, Lisbon); professor at the Faculty of Economics of Porto University; areas of interest: cultural studies, political theory.

OTÁVIO VELHO

Aged 56, Brazilian; bachelor's degree in Sociology (1964, Pontifícia Universidade Católica, Rio de Janeiro); master's degree in Social Anthropology (1970, Museu Nacional, Universidade Federal of Rio de Janeiro); doctorate in Sociology (1973, Manchester University, UK); professor of Social Anthropology at the Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (Museu Nacional); ex-chairman of the National Association for post-graduates and researchers in the Social Sciences (ANPOCS); areas of interest: studies on religion and modernity, peasant populations in border areas and mechanisms of political domination.

INTRODUCTION

TERRA NOSTRA: PRETEXTS FOR LUSOPHONY. CURRENT AND FUTURE CHALLENGES FOR SOCIOLOGY AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Ana Nunes de Almeida

Associação Portuguesa de Sociologia

The *Terra Nostra* Conference, Lisbon, November 1997. A Language as a Region.

With the support of the International Sociological Association, in November 1997 the *Associação Portuguesa de Sociologia* organised in Lisbon one of the conferences which are being held in preparation for the forthcoming World Congress in Montreal in 1998. Basing its reflections on the same subject-matter as the World Congress (challenges, controversies and languages for sociology and the social sciences in the 21st century), the conference decided to adopt a regional criterion for the selection of participants, based on a shared language, Portuguese, rather than geographical proximity.

After English and Spanish, Portuguese, with over 200 million speakers, is the third most spoken European language in the world. Being made up of "bits of Latin, Greek, Asian and African languages", it contains within it a varied range of forms of speech and accents. For us lusophones, this *terra nostra* is a great ocean, containing words which are full of diversity and richness, through which we represent and make our constructs of life - and add value and feeling to it, filling it with our emotions and affections. It is an ocean which contains the history of our past - its meeting-points, its misunderstandings and its rediscoveries. It is an ocean which at the very least touches territories and peoples in Europe, Africa, South America and even in Asia.

Lusophony, which covers a large and diversified space spread over many continents, had a dual role at this conference. As an instrument and as a pretext for the meeting, it offered participants a common filter for their approach to the subjects under discussion; as an object of knowledge in itself, it is a problem area and an opportunity for research for this community of social scientists - who, paradoxically, are not very much used to dealing with an object such as this.

The conference brought together in Lisbon over 3 days some 40 social scientists drawn from the seven countries which make up the CPLP (*Comunidade de Países de Língua Portuguesa* or Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries - Brazil, Portugal, Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde,

Guinea-Bissau and S. Tomé and Príncipe). It had two main *objectives*. To the outside world its objective was to promote internationally the social science research which is produced in the lusophone world, together with the social and cultural facts on which it is based and which it investigates - thus introducing other insights and other empirical reference points in the international field of knowledge. The very fact that the words "lusophony" or "lusophone" do not exist in English, shows how through systematic and lazy omission, these facts and this knowledge have not found their way into the main centres of production of scientific research. But the conference was also aimed at asserting the Portuguese language and having it recognised as a legitimate form of regional communication in the scientific establishment, where the Anglo-American monopoly in terms of language, concepts, ideology and even organisation is so strong that it places us in a position of remote peripheral subordination, where our own outlines are themselves not infrequently drawn from the "genuine" models at the centre.

But for internal purposes, that is for the community of lusophone social scientists, the *Terra Nostra* conference was also an opportunity to get to know each other and to have face to face meetings with African, Brazilian and Portuguese colleagues, all of whom share the same academic activity and a common language in which they carry on their scientific endeavour. In this context, the conference undoubtedly provided the opportunity for us, as a scientific community, to put forward *lusophony* as an object of knowledge, and as a *challenge* and a *problem* for social science at the dawn of the 21st century.

This introduction, although inspired by the content of the papers commissioned for the conference, does not aim to be a summary of them. This publication reproduces those papers in English in their entirety. A reading of these papers is of vital importance in understanding how the inheritance and the challenges for social science in the next century are interpreted from these lusophone locales; and they include carefully selected bibliographies. The papers are organised into four sections: *Societies and Social Facts - the major social problems and challenges for the 21st century*; *Legacies and Language of Lusophone Social Sciences*; *Current Perspectives and the Outlook for the Future of Sociology in the Lusophone Countries*; and *Lusophony and the Field of World Knowledge*.

As a scientific network and organised group of social scientists, however, lusophony is only just starting out. The areas of mutual ignorance and lack of awareness, and the unequal historical development of the consolidation of sociological knowledge in the seven countries in question, remain a powerful obstacle to any attempt at a definitive synthesis which might claim to be a common vision of the legacy and the immediate future of social science in the world in general. It is both prudent and correct to caution that the internal diversity of this universe be respected, and that lusophony should be careful

not to fall into the trap of adopting a simplistic perspective whereby the whole is deduced from one of the parts. I chose therefore to present and discuss, in this Introduction, subject-matters and themes which were part of the group discussion at the conference, providing a common thread which, in my opinion, gives them a coherent and logical sequence. These themes and subjects provide an opportunity to reflect (undoubtedly in an incomplete and individual manner) on:

- the ways in which a new field of sociological research (lusophony) could be constructed and what its potential might be for sociology;
- the recent history of how sociological knowledge in these countries has been built up;
- the nature and type of the community of sociologists who share this linguistic "region";
- and, finally, the use of languages (both local and hegemonic) in social science.

These steps do not envisage restricting the object to a fundamentalist ghetto: to question lusophony was, for all of us, an exercise in getting closer to, and opening up for discussion the major issues which presently await social science in the world at large.

Lusophony as a Problem Area and Field of Research for Social Scientists.

The questioning of the identity of the lusophone community - which in rhetorical and political terms has an institutional form (the CPLP) -, may be a good starting point for drawing up an agenda of relevant social and sociological problems (both within and outside this linguistic "region"). In the final analysis the discussion of the theoretical and practical relevance of a particular problem or of a particular field is one of the core issues for the construction of sociological knowledge, and for defining how visible and how effective it is in society. To state that a particular issue is relevant (either in theoretical or practical terms) is not something which is done as a matter of course, or arbitrarily, or which is done in a neutral manner. It is rather a choice: a choice made from within theoretical paradigms which offer us certain views of reality (and actively preferring these to others, stating that these paradigms are better than others for explaining that reality). It is a choice made within a context of relationships of academic and political power and domination, which postulate and legitimise certain target areas of priority interest (and sideline others areas in the process).

In speaking of peripheral regions and cultures in the globalised world of today, it may therefore be beneficial once again to underline this dimension of sociological knowledge, which has been too much neglected. The fundamental discussion is between a purely academic sociology on the one hand, involving the formal exercise of theory-building in one's study, and an obsessively

empiricist sociology on the other, tied to social demand and taking comfort in providing information to the agencies which finance it. And this dimension may also produce some disturbing effects at the established frontiers of knowledge, and on the way certain objects of scientific research are rendered visible, at the expense of others. Perhaps in this way it might be possible to counter the current diffuse feelings of "crisis" and "scepticism" which not infrequently affect this type of knowledge; and at the same time it might be possible to reinvigorate it by introducing new types of problems and new points of empirical reference.

If globalisation in its various dimensions "defines a common sense of belonging to a common world", unification within this world "is not on a level plane". Against the backdrop of the exchange and traffic of symbols, messages, idols, goods and capital at a planetary level, unequal patterns of inclusion and exclusion, integration and marginalisation, different processes of reconstruction and deconstruction of identity may be played out (whether among groups, classes, generations, regions, nations, etc.). Under a common cover of change, things may be taking place at different speeds, and variable amounts of ground may be covered, subject to different timings and different meanings and tonalities. The case of the lusophone world is a good illustration of the way in which this challenge is relevant: globalisation does not make its effects felt on a *tabula rasa* - but covers many different locales which carry with them their own history and their own specific characteristics.

Objectively, the lusophone world seems to be marked by an impressive range of *internal diversity*. The seven countries which go to make up that world differ in geographical situation and size, in the size and structure of their populations and markets, their natural resources and reserves, in the official statistics which give us the picture of their relative levels of economic and social development. This persistent diversity, on this and other fronts, is a direct challenge to that theory of globalisation which reduces change to a single formula, or which does not address the underlying conditions of inequality and domination. From the point of view of methodology, "diversity can only be productive": diversity is, *par excellence*, the field where comparisons are to be made.

Looking back, the "roads to modernity" which these countries have taken are also a factor in their diversity. Looked at in a historical perspective, Portugal's trajectory within Europe contrasts with the eighteenth-century independence movement of the European colonists who had settled in Brazil, and even more so with the more recent armed struggle against the colonial power in Africa. From the political point of view, all seven states have since the 1970s undergone a process of building and consolidating democratic institutions, either as a result of the overthrow of dictatorial regimes, or as a result of gaining independence. For some (such as Angola and Mozambique) it is now a question of creating the democratic state and rendering it stable,

ensuring a cohesive society; for others (as in the case of Brazil and Portugal), where democracy has reached a stage of consolidation, one of the major challenges is integration within wider, supra-national entities (Mercosul, European Union).

At the same time these seven countries contain very *disparate nations*, with varying degrees of cohesion and fragmentation. While Portugal is a nation which has some of the oldest frontiers in Europe, others, and especially the African countries (for example, as in the case of Cape Verde), are marked by an enormous mixture and crossover of different races and cultures, containing many different ethnic elements and languages. The case of Angola, which is still involved in resolving the aftermath of a long and devastating civil war, is an illustration of extreme national and social fragmentation.

Within the world system, the lusophone world, curiously, emerges as a space which has no centralising pole, "*a space without a centre*"; it contains two semi-peripheral countries (Portugal and Brazil, although the latter is contesting the leadership of Mercosul with Argentina), and five other peripheral countries.

Looking at matters from the *economic point of view*, what we have is a group of countries which is open to competition from other economic areas, namely those revolving around Mercosul, the European Union, Southern Africa, and francophone Africa, and also an area with profound demographic differences. In demographic terms, Portugal has since 1975 embarked at breakneck speed on the road to modernity, combining very low fertility and mortality rates, which are reflected in the progressive ageing of the population. By contrast, the African countries as a whole have not yet overcome the dramatic combination of high birth rates and high mortality rates (which, among both adults and children, is seriously affected by the exponential spread of AIDS); as for Brazil, there is a great variety of demographic patterns.

From the *cultural point of view*, the lusophone world contains elements of European, Christian, African, Moslem and Amerindian culture. These endow this "historical bric-a-brac" with a distinct syncretism and pluralism. Unlike many other metropolitan imperial centres, Portugal was a poor European country, and never had the power to standardise and control (on the basis of its own values) the enormous area over which it spread its fragile supremacy. So this world spread over many continents had as its distinctive features the mixed and the hybrid, the flexibility of its frontiers, and its openness to the circulation of different values and ideas.

However, the issue of disparities and differences between the countries (at the level of the CPLP), should not make us forget the more fundamental issue of the conditions in the world system under which, on the basis of the strategies of development and expansion drawn up at the centre, such disparities emerge, namely the framework of "relationships of domination and dependence, integration and subordination". Nor indeed should we forget to mention the persistence of gross inequalities within nations: in particular those which exist between the sexes, between different classes, different regions,

and different generations. The lack of (particularly economic) resources and skills (and cognitive skills in particular), or at least the uneven distribution of these, can in all probability justifiably be seen as one of the fundamental marks which specifically national and international history have left on these types of regions; and they are in some measure the product of that structure of power relations.

Nevertheless lusophony does have *common binding traits*. The shared language, Portuguese, is one of these. It is a means of communication which carries with it the history of Portuguese maritime expansion in the 15th century. Stories and memories of colonisation and domination, confrontation and war - but also of the meeting of peoples, races, things and cultures, of the intersection of perceptions of one another and of mutual difference. But language is not merely a passive repository of past experience; even today it is a powerful instrument for building that world and for integration within it.

From a secular perspective the lusophone world is a place of *migration*: first of all from Portugal, to Africa and to Brazil; later on, of forced migration as a result of the slave trade from Africa to Europe or to Brazil. Today, with Portugal a member of the EU, the direction of migration has tended to be reversed: large communities of African and Brazilian workers have settled in Portugal. In the context of globalisation, Portugal's level of attractiveness as a destination for migrants is clearly limited, so a shared language has a decisive impact when it comes to deciding on where to go to live and work.

The power of language as an integration factor also extends to the current influence of mass media and TV. In fact it is in this area that the lusophone world has itself experienced the effects of globalisation. In giving wide coverage to common symbolic referents (for example by transmitting Brazilian soap operas, soccer games, by giving wide circulation to images and to sporting idols), the media not only encourage a kind of cross-bred linguistic improvisation. They also bring about changes in day-to-day customs and in the patterns of existence of communities which, in territorial terms, are miles apart. In this way they begin to form a global symbolic world.

With the migrations which took place in the past and which are still taking place in the present, intricate bonds have been established between families spread over three continents. This in turn forms a rich and informal mesh of networks of solidarity and exchange. The process of creolisation, in particular between Portugal and Africa, takes on a number of forms: the professional, political, party and intellectual élites, or the urban populations in Africa, and the Portuguese who remained there after independence, become involved in complex processes of cross-acculturation - and by way of family ties and strategies, these spread to Portugal itself.

The Pretext of Lusophony: Practice and Regulation in the Field of Research Work

With its two dimensions, *diversity* on the one hand and *unity* on the other, lusophony offers the field of sociological knowledge and comparative research an immense wealth of observable facts - each of which no doubt has its own specific characteristics. However, the relevance of those facts (both theoretical and practical) does not shut us in in an isolated lusophone ghetto, rather it opens up ways of communicating and of mutual enrichment with other privileged areas, which have a privileged place in the discipline at a global level. This puts us all on the much-desired road to cumulative knowledge and reminds us of the universal nature of science. Poverty and social inequality, access to citizenship and new forms of exclusion, cognitive or educational resources and forms of illiteracy, national unity and fragmentation or ethnic minorities, productive growth and changes in the environment, new forms of relating to the territory, mass media and values, - all these are relevant subjects for the researcher's agenda - whatever the locale (regional or global) in which they arise.

As an object and issue for the social sciences in the field of knowledge, lusophony remains for the most part under construction. This is a situation which moreover is mirrored in other supra-national environments: experience in the scientific area of building up objects and data banks at a "European" level, or of organising social science research projects in Europe as a whole, is promising, but it is still very recent and has yet to get itself established on a firm footing.

For lusophone sociologists and the way their scientific work is organised, that theoretical and empirical challenge translates into the absolute necessity of taking part in *joint research projects* which, in different continents, will form enduring and solid networks of people and groups with a common interest in creating specific subject-matters. Sociology both at the centre and at the periphery can only gain from this: more and better quality of production at a local level tend to enrich the content and widen the interpretative range of global theories; the increasing visibility of the periphery, based on the intrinsic merit of its scientific output, democratises the international division of intellectual labour. This effort, which in methodological terms translates into the exercise of *comparative analysis*, demands a careful choice of working methods.

Absolute reciprocity between the various parties involved in these joint projects is a pre-condition for starting the work, both in intellectual and ethical terms, as is respect for the unequal extent to which sociology is established in the different countries. There is a risk of recreating within the network of researchers a pattern of academic domination and unequal division of labour - between the centre (in this case represented by Portugal and Brazil) and the

periphery (Africa). The ways in which this perverse form of co-operation can arise are many. A frequent example is that where local labour is used for the job of gathering information in the field, while the privileges of theoretical production and interpretation are reserved for colleagues from the centre (a situation which has obvious implications in unequal salaries). A more sophisticated variant of this is so-called "safari research," which is associated with the idea of the theory franchise: fashionable theoretical models from the centre are exported to the periphery, and subsequently demonstrated to be true by short sharp expeditions in the territory, most often carried out with the help of complacent local guides. In opposition to an approach of this kind, which in fact also occurs in many other non-lusophone areas, we have to assert the principle that there is effectively a whole team taking part in a project of this type, and that the whole team is involved in the selection of research activities, procedures and techniques, as well as in the definition of the various different roles within the project.

Lusophony, as a new field of research, offers us precisely a pretext for reflecting on the desirability of different experiences of sociological work. There are various paths which we can follow to this end. The split between, on the one hand, theory and theoretical output, and, on the other hand, research in the field, has shown itself to be not only unproductive - as a general rule it leads to a certain theoretical rigidity and autism - but also outdated - given that the ways of relating to theory have changed. Where they were more dogmatic, obsessive and closed before, they are now more open and of a hybrid nature. We should make a determined effort to bring together these two dimensions of the production of knowledge in social science, and to reformulate and rebuild the link between methods and techniques of observation (which for several decades have traditionally been the same) and new theories. Another inviting challenge is that of avoiding the setting up of comfortable objects of research, that is those which are confined to traditional methods of observation; for example, we should extend research to those social processes which result directly from applied knowledge.

Finally, the undeniable way in which sociologists in some of these countries have diversified professionally is encouraging. Many graduates in sociology are no longer finding their way exclusively into the academic world. One of the factors which have been instrumental in opening up the social sciences, in the medium term, has been precisely the capacity for dialogue, for exchange and cross-fertilisation between theory and practice both inside and outside academe - and the skill in integrating both of these in theoretical and epistemological work both in research and in education. This is a commitment which denies the absurd dichotomy between first-class sociologists (academics, major producers of theory and creators of knowledge of the discipline) and second-class sociologists (professionals on the ground, those who pass the message on, or are involved in applying that knowledge). The

social science which we practice, whether inside or outside the lusophone world, can only benefit from bringing together the experiences of both.

The Social Sciences in the Lusophone Countries. Activity, Roles and Professional Associations of Sociologists.

Diversity is also a feature of the very development of the social sciences in the different lusophone countries. This is in part the result of the differing social environment in which sociological work is produced from country to country. However, if we look at them from the outside, we can observe similarities between them and lines of continuity with other contexts. On the one hand they emanate from a peripheral region and a peripheral language; in this process what is at stake is the emergence of a form of scientific knowledge which, by reason of the demands it places on its practitioners for respect of a common heritage of standards, processes and intellectual worktools, clearly has a "universalising vocation."

Within the group *Brazil* today has the largest community of social scientists. It is also the community which has been in existence for the greatest length of time. The consolidation of the social sciences took place earlier in Brazil and has therefore now reached a certain level of stability and maturity.

In the 1930s, the active role of a generation of scientists from various different academic backgrounds, and who positioned themselves intellectually close to France, led to the appearance of the first "partial or total syntheses of sociological understanding of Brazil". In the 1970s, and despite the military dictatorship, the regime invested considerably in science; mainly in "hard" science and applied science, but there was some left over for social science as well. A new breath of life was injected into a promising field: the encouragement given to intellectuals to go abroad to study (in France, England and the United States); local programs of post-graduate study were started, with Master's degrees and Doctorates; with a multiplicity of research projects: into native areas (ethnology), issues relating to urban and peasant life, poverty, development-dependency, stratification and class. Later on, the role of theory and the theoretical exposition of the issues, was not forgotten - and in this they produced an interesting new combination of French and English research, as well as their own.

Currently there are academic and research centres in the main Brazilian cities - apart from Rio and S. Paulo, in Brasilia, Porto Alegre, Santa Catarina, Belém, Fortaleza, Recife and Campinas - and degree courses in social science (specialisation only comes with the Master's degree and the doctorate) attract a significant number of students. Outside the universities there are many sociologists involved in applied research programmes, working in dynamic independent research centres financed by non-governmental organisations and International Development Agencies - and putting out

material on subjects as diverse as women, ecology, the native population, aids, violence, street children and poverty.

Both within and outside the universities therefore what we see is a close-knit and numerous community of social scientists, which represent a powerful critical mass. This is reflected in the very dynamic nature of the social science association movement in Brazil.

ANPOCS (*Associação Nacional de Pós-graduação e Pesquisa em Ciências Sociais*), the National Association for Post-Graduates and Research in the Social Sciences, brings together and represents the various research and post-graduate centres which are active in the social science field. Sixty-one institutions "active in the fields of sociology, anthropology and political science" are affiliated to it. Unlike other scientific associations, only institutions are ANPOCS members, not individuals. The following activities are included in its programme: an Annual Meeting, which brings together from the most diverse institutions and regions of the country hundreds of participants, who present and discuss papers and research topics; the organisation of competitions for scholarships and applications for the financing of research; a very active programme of publications, including two scientific reviews, a quarterly newsletter, the annual publication "*Ciências Sociais Hoje*" (Social Science Today), and the two best theses of the year (doctoral and Master's).

Even if *Portuguese sociology* (as a science, discipline or profession) "really started after the revolution of April 1974", there were already in the 1960s, and in the context of a right-wing dictatorship, some small signs of relative acceptance of this new type of knowledge - which had been viewed with suspicion by the established political regime. Thanks to the pioneering endeavours of certain intellectuals, sociological subject-matter was introduced into some university courses (economics and law, for example); and, from 1962 onwards, with the creation of GIS (*Gabinete de Investigações Sociais* - the Social Investigation Unit), in Lisbon, a first research centre was set up. At the same time a new team of researchers was put together and the first Portuguese social science review was published (*Análise Social* - Social Analysis).

This first "informal" generation of sociologists had a number of characteristics in common. The following stand out: they had a cross-disciplinary academic training, acquired initially in Portugal (by means of degrees in "traditional" areas such as letters, law and economics), then later extended in post-graduate or doctoral studies in Europe (above all in France); they had a carefully thought-out commitment to the activity of building and asserting their professional identity, in defending the scientific approach, and the potential and specific characteristics of the new discipline; they made a remarkable effort to acquire sociological knowledge on their own account, which translated into a demanding search after theoretical models and epistemological and methodological reflection; they were remarkably open to

"multi-disciplinarity". The major themes of research at this time were the issues of development, the structure of society, the educational system and ideology.

In 1974, with the advent of democracy, sociology in Portugal entered a phase in which it became part of the "mainstream of European sociology". The pioneering experience of ISCTE (Lisbon, 1974) was followed by degree courses in sociology in the state universities (and more recently in the private universities) of the main cities in the country (Lisbon, Porto, Coimbra, Évora, Braga, Faro, Covilhã, Ponta Delgada). The main centres of teaching and research were formed within these universities, and academic careers (Master's degrees and doctorates) were established. Reviews were published together with translations of the basic works, and scientific meetings were organised; applications for financing and different forms of assessment become part of the routine. And a new, younger generation of sociologists emerged, of which an increasing number of women were a part. From the academic point of view, this generation went through a long period of specialised training in the discipline (which nevertheless retained a strong element of openness towards the social sciences closest to it); at the same time, regular research started to be organised and undertaken into different areas of a society which for a long time had remained unknown. This generation also faced from society, which was itself in the process of modernisation, a sudden demand for sociological knowledge, not only from the government but also from the media. If it was perhaps marked by a certain "withdrawal as far as investment in theoretical work was concerned", it nevertheless maintained a continuity with the preceding generation by refusing to indulge in "paradigmatical exclusivism". The main subject areas of the most recent Congress of Portuguese Sociology (Lisbon, 1996) give a good picture of the main fields of research: the family, marriage and conjugality, gender studies; culture, communication and transformation of knowledge; territories, environment and local and regional development; the State and power, participation and exclusion; structure of production, employment and the professions; education, institutions and players.

Interestingly, as far as the activities of Portuguese sociologists are concerned, the last decade has seen a remarkable movement towards *professional diversification*. The importance of the university as a sector of employment has tended to diminish. By contrast it is a well known fact that there are a much greater number of sociologists now active in public administration, central government (ministries, secretaries of state, government policy observation units, etc.), and regional and local government. Likewise, and as has happened with their Brazilian colleagues, sociologists have acquired increasing visibility in the media.

Some aspects of the much desired opening up of the social sciences certainly involve this relationship with the media and its capacity to reach the public at large - by providing skills and content for a culture of "social reflexivity"; by active involvement in the definition of target problems on the

political agenda; by publicising issues and results of investigations, making the language of science better known to the general public; contributing to a higher appreciation of the profession and thereby clearly drawing more people into it. For these reasons we should pay serious attention to this issue: the role of the media in today's world is highly relevant; and experience shows that the mediafication of sociology (or of those who are its principal players) is not without its risks. There is a great temptation to use sociological knowledge just as a decorative cover for certain pieces of journalism, the structure and content of which have nothing whatsoever to do with it and which sometimes are the complete opposite of the scientific ethic; and there is also a certain perversity in the systematic use of sociologists who, on any pretext, are prepared to please all tastes by offering ready-made "thoughts" on any given issue. This is probably not the best way in which sociology should assert itself in the public mind.

The role of two associations such as the *APS (Associação Portuguesa de Sociologia - Portuguese Sociology Association)* and *APSIOT (Associação dos Profissionais da Sociologia da Indústria, das Organizações e do Trabalho - The Association of Industrial, Organisational and Work Sociology Professionals)* has been crucial in giving dynamism and credibility to Portuguese sociologists.

The APS, created in 1985 and with 1100 registered members, is one of the largest associations affiliated to the *International Sociological Association* (after the USA, Japan, Canada, Finland and Poland). The APS decided not to be a scientific society (which would have been selective in its membership and an exclusive privilege of academics, who would have brought to it their own codes, arguments and entrenched positions). Instead the APS has always been in favour of openness towards the different academic and professional status of sociologists - by respecting the diversity of their roles, encouraging dialogue amongst them in relation to knowledge and experience acquired, and seeking to ensure that they all become part of the heritage of sociological knowledge (in its empirical, methodological, theoretical and disciplinary aspects). Every 4 years the APS organises the Congress of Portuguese Sociology, in which hundreds of colleagues from all sorts of fields take part (from both the universities and outside them). It plays an active role in issuing publications (minutes of academic meetings and seminars, the *Folha Informativa* (Newsletter), and books on professional practice). Sectoral meetings are organised, specifically aimed at colleagues from certain areas (teachers from secondary education or the universities, technical personnel from local government). The APS has approved and published its own *Code of Professional Practice*. As well as being a member of the ISA, the APS is a member of the *European Sociological Association* and has informal contacts with the *Association Internationale des Sociologues de Langue Française*.

APSIOT was started in 1984 and currently has some 250 members with various academic backgrounds: sociologists, managers, psychologists and engineers. It holds a National Meeting every two years and arranges for the

publication of the papers presented, and the debates held, at that meeting. These are papers by specialists in organisation, professional training, design of social-technical systems, the social history of work, syndicalism and information systems. Apart from this type of publication, APSIOT has since 1989 published the review "Organizações e Trabalho" (Organisations and Work) and the "Boletim SIOT" (SIOT Bulletin). Since 1995 it had maintained a set of web pages on the Internet, which are visited annually by thousands of people interested in its various activities.

In the lusophone *African countries* sociology is still a recent and fragile edifice (as a discipline, as a form of knowledge and as a profession), and is strictly conditioned by current political circumstances and vicissitudes. It is in fact difficult to talk of the existence of a "scientific culture", in the broad sense. In a context of extreme material poverty, it is only recently that these countries have begun to acquire the minimum equipment, and the human resources, needed to develop local teaching or research in the social sciences. Even then this has been very uneven as between the different countries.

Portuguese colonisation policy did moreover encourage the beginnings of a colonial science. It was based on ethnography, history, medicine and geography. For the colonial power it was a useful instrument for studying "contact with the races", their specific features, and for "keeping the peace" between them (that is, for keeping them under subjugation). Small studies, reports and monographs were produced at the time by colonial administrators and missionaries. The creation, for example, of the *Instituto de Investigação de Angola* (Angola Research Institute), in 1955 (under the auspices of the *Junta de Investigação do Ultramar* (Overseas Research Board), in Lisbon) illustrates exactly the kind of interest which the metropolitan power had in these matters. But even though these reports provided descriptive information on the habits and customs of the local population, they are very strongly biased: the study of these "wild" and "primitive" peoples rendered it urgent to "civilise" and "evangelise" them.

The armed liberation struggles (which were particularly violent in Guinea, Angola and Mozambique) and the chequered progress involved in political independence (which here and there led to one-party states) brought other challenges to the social sciences. The imposition of official revolutionary (marxist-leninist) ideologies, pointing the way towards socialist societies, implied a selection of priorities and placed limitations on what fields, what subjects and what methods of research could be used.

In this respect the example of *Mozambique* is a good one. In the 1970s intellectuals were asked to provide a bridge between theory and practice, between science and revolutionary ideology, on the basis of the materialist explanation of history, as interpreted by the party, Frelimo. They were asked to rewrite the "actual history of the African populations", breaking with the euro-centric perspective adopted by classical science, and to provide a forum in their field work for "reflective participation" by the groups they were studying, on the

issues of habitat and territorial occupation, rural society, the state of women, poverty, and family forms.

Prolonged contact with the empirical field of study and, in more recent times, the progressive establishment of a liberal-democratic regime, together with its opening up to a form of market economy, have had a remarkable effect on this community. The challenge of a complete rethink, i.e. the critical debate on the contribution of orthodox Marxist party theory on the one hand, and of the classical, centrally-produced social science theories on the other, has brought about a considerable restructuring of concepts, theories and reference paradigms. At the institutional level, and within the Eduardo Mondlane University in Maputo, where the *Centro de Estudos Africanos* (Centre of African Studies) has operated since the 1970s, the opening up of university education to degrees in social science (such as sociology and political science) is a recent accomplishment. Other teaching institutions include courses in sociology and anthropology in their curriculum - both of which are increasingly sought after by students. The recent interest of the present government in sociological knowledge is another encouraging sign: the number of studies of certain areas of the territory and of the Mozambican population has multiplied, as a result of requests from Ministries, non-governmental organisations and delegations of the United Nations.

In *Angola*, a civilian society which is "trapped in bipolarisation", and "not having a culture of tolerance", it is even more difficult to find the intellectual freedom which the social sciences need in order to operate. The aftermath of the civil war, and the entrenched orthodoxy of the official established party line, have left profound scars. There are still today no universities in this area of knowledge, which is viewed with suspicion, nor are there departments dedicated to the teaching of the discipline. At the beginning of 1990s, with the transition to a multi-party system, some tentative new opportunities have arisen: elements of sociology have been introduced into some courses (Architecture, Economics, and in ISCED - *Instituto Superior de Ciências da Educação*, the Higher Institute of Educational Sciences); the *Associação dos Antropólogos e Sociólogos de Angola* (AASA - The Angola Association of Anthropologists and Sociologists) was formed in 1993; and, more recently (in 1995, at ISCED), the teaching of sociology has been included in a degree course in educational sciences. Some cautious efforts have been made to develop research activity, at an individual level and outside any institutional framework, at the request of the United Nations, Ministries, and both Angolan and foreign non-governmental organisations - on street children, food supply and health services.

In the other three countries - *Guinea Bissau*, *Cape Verde* and *S. Tomé and Príncipe* social science is barely established. In the absence of university institutions, the professional role of sociologists in these countries is carried out in research institutes, non-governmental organisations or departments of the state administration.

In *Guinea-Bissau* the creation of INEP (*Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisa* - the National Institute of Studies and Research), in 1984, was a decisive step. This Institute has developed the technique of "direct observation" of social facts and its output is distinguished by a certain "enlightened empiricism". Currently it is working jointly with the Ministry of Education on setting up a university. The absence of an "intellectual environment" and the relative lack of any significant theoretical output signal death for the development of the "critical mind". In spite of all the difficulties INEP is equipped with solid modern infrastructure (a library, information technology and a connection to the Internet).

In *S. Tomé* not only are there no institutes of higher education and learning, but social science has also practically nil visibility. The small local community of sociologists carries out small research projects which are part of general studies commissioned by the state such as the "environmental development plan" and the "struggle against poverty".

Cape Verde is the country which has by far the highest level of sociological output of the smaller lusophone African countries; there is a variety of publications and these come out on a regular basis. In addition there is a chair of sociology at the *Instituto Superior de Educação* (Higher Institute of Education).

There has not been a very widespread flow of information within this very large, but unequal, network of lusophone social scientists. In fact this is not an unusual feature of the field of science, even in cultural regions where the social sciences have been solidly established for a long period of time. While in the lusophone countries it can be explained by the lack of common work routines in a field which is still very young, in the other regions there are undoubtedly other reasons why this should be so. The dominant forms in which academic science is organised, which are nationally based, the establishment of exclusivist "doctrinaire" schools, in particular institutions or those associated with particular individuals, lead in a perverse way to ignorance of sociological output which is taking place just next door. This is a handicap which must be overcome, as much in one region as in the other.

In more recent years contacts between social scientists in the lusophone world have shown a small increase, even though these contacts have been somewhat tentative and have not taken place on a very systematic basis. Since 1990 the Luso-Afro-Brazilian Congress of the Social Sciences has taken place every 4 years, and brings together a very large network of participants; last year (1996) the *Associação Luso-Afro-Brasileira de Ciências Sociais* (Luso-Afro-Brazilian Association of the Social Sciences) was formed in Rio, and has plans to start a review shortly in Maputo. There has been an increase in work exchanges between university researchers and lecturers, above all as between Portugal and Brazil. Some universities have established scientific co-operation agreements, with the objective of educating not only students, but also senior personnel and technicians from public administration (in particular

on the Portugal-Africa axis). But as a dynamic area for scientific co-operation lusophony remains very much a field which is still to be explored.

Language and the Social Sciences

There are 200 million lusophone speakers in the world - "a plain material fact". Portuguese, a pluralistic language, which is "ever more crossbred", is not "a small local language". Nevertheless, like many other languages, it belongs to the group of languages which are peripheral to English, which is the *lingua franca*, the language of international scientific communication. On top of this lusophone speakers are able to understand almost in total the neo-Latin languages, in particular Spanish and Italian.

The mastering of language skills in particular puts the community of lusophone social scientists to the test. Their initiation into the social sciences, and subsequent training, in all three continents, is without exception carried out with abundant and permanent recourse to bibliographical sources in other languages, especially French, English and Spanish. They are "permanently looking outwards", which they are forced into above all by the arbitrary circumstance of the social sciences having become established in these peripheral countries. Undoubtedly the diversity of linguistic sources which they encounter on their intellectual journey encourages a healthy attitude of openness and of "critical assimilation" of many different paradigms, sources of information and writers. This is also no doubt an advantage of being on the periphery. And it is in marked contrast to the often limited and provincial attitude prevailing in some of the output from the centre, particularly in linguistic, cultural and empirical terms.

As a linguistic cause, lusophony is a worthwhile endeavour. But not at any price.

From the outset we set ourselves apart from any notion or idea of a lusophone crusade. The temptation of fundamentalism tends to enclose us in our own essence, described as something unique and perceived as an orthodoxy; all it does is to standardise and simplify us so that we remain rigidly encased in a homogenous unity (which we are not), shut in on ourselves. Now lusophony, built up around the sharing of a common language, historical memories and history in the making, is not a section of flat ground nor is it an isolated world: it acquires its specific features from its internal diversity, from the patterns of cross-breeding and intermingling, or its hybrid character, from its open relationships and from its complicity with other economic, political and cultural contexts.

In the scientific field, "essentialist derivations" are more often than not a form of disguising vulnerability and isolation, a mechanism of backwardness whereby, in a reaction to a perceived threat, we flee from reality. This is typical

of cultures which are under threat, trapped in the dream of a glorious past. "The country of science cannot be a language".

As scientists we are tied to ways of thinking and ways of working which are by their very nature cosmopolitan. In science, and social science is no exception to this rule, work is assessed in accordance with its intrinsic merit, and not by virtue of the language in which it is expressed. What makes science universal and attractive is its ability to state the problem, to choose in a methodical fashion the strategies, the procedures and the tools of observation which will test the validity of those interpretations, and the exchange of information amongst peers - all the basic ground rules governing scientific endeavour. These rules apply whether science be practised in Brazil, Japan, the United States or China.

Having said all this, and in the particular case of the social sciences, the problem of the use of a particular language is *not* totally irrelevant. A language is not just a passive instrument or carrier. Language produces reality: it gives and communicates meaning, but it also creates it; so it is in itself a dimension of society, and therefore one of the possible objects of the science which we practise.

Unlike that which occurs in the hard sciences, our objects speak; they speak about themselves and about the world around them, and in so doing they construct social representations of that world and what it means to them - which we, as sociologists, seek to interpret and understand. If we do not know the language of the speaker, how can we understand the meaning of his actions? How can we speak of social reflexivity?

But the relevance of the use of a local language is also felt at other points in the process of social scientific investigation. A language "represents emotional capital", which in itself is productive in terms of the conditions of life under which science (both of the social kind and other kinds) is produced, and so it is clearly an opportunity to be taken up in the creation of networks and teams of researchers. In the context of the laboratory or the group, work routines, low-level management and operational decisions, informal remarks and interpretative improvisation - all these use the local language in a productive way - and by this means contribute to the creation of knowledge and to progressing it. At the same time, if science is to avoid finding itself in a closed circuit, the local language is of crucial importance in teaching and as a vehicle for dialogue with the general public and society at large.

There is therefore nothing to stop the language of universal communication (which English is today) being used in conjunction with the use of local languages at a regional level. And so, while lusophones have to invest heavily in internal efforts to breathe life and energy into their particular field of scientific research, they must also not neglect the strategy of internationalisation and of making themselves visible to the outside world. This undoubtedly involves the use - and abuse - of the hegemonic language - namely by publishing, in English, in the English-language reviews, and by taking part, in English, in

international meetings and debates. This double wager can only in the end help to progress scientific knowledge. And this book is undoubtedly an effort in that direction.

Four Final Acknowledgements

This introduction owes its content in large measure to the commitment and contributions of many colleagues at the *Terra Nostra* conference. Among them I would like to mention in particular: Alberto Martinelli, Ana Maria Loforte, António Brandão Moniz, António Firmino da Costa, António Teixeira Fernandes, Armindo Vaz de Almeida, Augusto Santos Silva, Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Carlos Cardoso, Cristiana Bastos, Fernando Luís Machado, Guilherme Octaviano, Ilona Kovács, João Arriscado Nunes, João Caraça, João Nzatuzola, João Ferreira de Almeida, João Freire, João Teixeira Lopes, José Madureira Pinto, José Manuel Resende, José Manuel Sobral, José Mariano Gago, José Rodrigues dos Santos, Manuel Carlos Silva, Manuel Villaverde Cabral, Maria Luz Moran, Otávio Velho, Pedro Vasconcelos, Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos.

The Conference Organising Committee worked with commitment and imagination. I am grateful to António Brandão Moniz, Gilberta Rocha and João Ferreira de Almeida for the help and suggestions they provided, and to Margarida Bernardo for her determined and efficient support.

The *Terra Nostra* conference was made possible by the generous financial support of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (Lisbon); the support of the *Junta Nacional de Investigação Científica and Tecnológica* (Ministério da Ciência and Tecnologia, Portugal), and of the *Instituto da Cooperação Portuguesa* (Ministério dos Negócios Estrangeiros, Portugal).

Richard Wall translated the papers by Ana Maria Loforte, Augusto Santos Silva, Carlos Cardoso, João Ferreira de Almeida, José Madureira Pinto and Otávio Velho, as well as this Introduction, from Portuguese into English. I am grateful to him, on behalf of all of us, for his effort and skill.

SECTION ONE SOCIETIES AND SOCIAL FACTS. THE MAJOR SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY