From Sociological Interpretation to Political Science

by
Fernando Barrientos Del Monte
Translated by
Mariana Ortega Breña

From the end of the nineteenth century until well into the 1980s, one spoke of the "political sciences" (in the plural), a concept that included all the disciplines that analyzed political phenomena. "Sociological interpretation" began in the 1960s as a model of social science meant to provide both criticism and direction regarding development policies. Rodolfo Stavenhagen's 1965 "Seven Erroneous Theses about Latin America" is an example of the role played by the political sciences at the time. Given the development of contemporary political science, which seeks dependent and independent variables and mid-range theories and bases its claims on empirical information, the question arises what Latin American political science can (re) learn from the interpretive model employed 50 years ago.

Desde finales del siglo XIX y todavía en los años ochenta del siglo XX se hablaba de "ciencias políticas" (en plural), concepto en el cual se incluían todas aquellas disciplinas que analizaban los fenómenos políticos. La "interpretación sociológica" se erigió en la década de los años sesenta como un modelo de ciencia social que formulaba críticas pero también orientaba políticas de desarrollo. "Siete tesis equivocadas sobre América Latina" (1965) de Rodolfo Stavenhagen es un ejemplo del ejercicio de las ciencias políticas de la época. A la luz del desarrollo de la ciencia política contemporánea, que busca variables dependientes e independientes y teorías de alcance medio y funda sus afirmaciones a partir de información empírica, se trata de responder a la pregunta qué puede (re)aprender la ciencia política latinoamericana del modelo interpretativo de hace cincuenta años.

Keywords: *Sociology, Sociology of science, Political science, Latin America*

What turns a text into a classic? More specifically, under what conditions does an analytical contribution stay relevant with the passage of time? Today more than ever, we understand that the social sciences not only produce knowledge that is valuable in itself because it increases our understanding of societies but serve to legitimize an existing situation and create consciousness about current conditions and the possibilities of transformation (Krotz, 2011: 22). The relationship between "knowledge" and "reality" has occupied human thought since pre-Socratic times, but the dialectic between the development of scientific

Fernando Barrientos Del Monte is a professor and researcher at the Universidad de Guanajuato, the author of *Buscando una identidad: Breve historia de la ciencia política en América Latina* (2014) and *Gestión electoral comparada y confianza en las elecciones en América Latina* (2011), and the editor of the *Revista Mexicana de Análisis Político y Administración Pública*. Mariana Ortega Breña is a freelance translator based in Canberra, Australia.

LATIN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES, Issue 219, Vol. 45 No. 2, March 2018, 51–61
DOI: 10.1177/0094582X17748377

thought and the structural conditions in which it is deployed became a serious concern for the social sciences (specifically, the political sciences) during the second half of the twentieth century. Octavio Ianni (1971: 7) has spoken of the reciprocity between social thinking and social living configurations; this is addressed by Giovanni Sartori (1979) in attempting to locate the development of political science as a product of the relationship between "the state of the organization of knowledge" and the "degree of structural differentiation of the human components." Rodolfo Stavenhagen (1974 [1971]: 207) reached similar conclusions when he pointed out "a historical relationship between colonialism and imperialism as international systems of domination and exploitation, on the one hand, and, on the other, the use of social science in the administration of the empire." At the same time he acknowledged that the contributions made by social sciences to our body of knowledge are independent of their relations to the region's colonialist and imperialist conditions.

The following analysis is grounded in the sociology of science, along the lines of Imre Lakatos's (1982: 66–71) understanding that the theories of modernization, development, and dependency became competing research agendas. Their explanatory horizons were based on a more or less shared "negative heuristic": that Latin America was part of a bipolar system characterized by internal relations of duality in the economic, political, social, and cultural spheres. These kinds of generalizations eventually lumped Latin American nations as a group (DEP, 1984: 19) with or without corresponding data for all cases. Stavenhagen's 1965 "Seven Erroneous Theses about Latin America" is such a homogenizing interpretation and must be understood as a product of a specific moment in intellectual history, a way of engaging with and understanding the social sciences in relation to the social and political context of the time. Reflections on Latin American politics during the second half of the twentieth century involved a methodological eclecticism that combined history, law, economics, anthropology, and sociology as the "political sciences" that provided the framework for political and economic analysis. Today there is greater disciplinary autonomy (albeit not an actual separation) that is perhaps more methodological than ontological. Overarching paradigms, especially Marxism, have been abandoned, and we now find ourselves facing more complex social and economic problems, consequences of globalization and the technological and digital revolution of our times, whose effects demand better and more consistent answers from the social sciences. To what extent can "Seven Theses" and the kind of analysis it represents remain methodologically valid?

THE STARTING POINT

The social sciences of the twenty-first century have developed in a context of internationalization that tends to involve interpretive multidisciplinarity and methodological eclecticism, both of which are stimulated by information and digital technologies. The social sciences examine society in terms of hypotheses and various modes of data collection and interpretation, allowing for the formulation and reformulation of new explanations (Puga, 2008), but these methods are relatively new in the region. The Latin American "social science"

model during the second half of the twentieth century was guided by subjects, theories, and paradigms (cf. González Casanova, 1970) that generated hypotheses and narrative arguments based on a "holistic" reading of social phenomena. It was paradigms, theories, and approaches rather than methods or analytical techniques that determined the questions about social problems. In the twenty-first century a shift occurred: broadly across the social sciences, methodology has become a central concern in explaining social processes. Research agendas have diversified with democracy as one of the central themes (Coppedge, 2012; Mayorga, 2016). However, the scope of the methods and techniques employed has become one of the central independent variables. While discussion of research methods across all the sciences allows for the corroboration of the breadth and the limits of scientific explanations, some currents of the Latin American social sciences seem to prioritize the method over the subject (cf. Munck, 2007). From the 1950s to the 1970s, the general view espoused by the social sciences was that the political and social phenomena of a society were a reflection of socioeconomic conditions and the correlation of productive forces. Collective phenomena were therefore more important than individual actions and not even groups were autonomous, derived as they were from social classes. A significant number of the research agendas of the time focused on the elaboration of concepts within the body of work established by the dominant political and social theories, leading to inductive mid-range interpretations (Munck, 2007: 8–12).

In this context, "Seven Theses" was innovative not so much because it opened new windows onto the interpretation of Latin American reality as because it broke from the mainstream social sciences, whose logical-historical structure often went unquestioned (Zapata, 2012). At a time when theories on modernization and development had fallen into a crisis and dependency theories were booming, the appearance of "Seven Theses" signaled an impasse like the one that dependency theory brought about for development and modernization theories. Stavenhagen's (1967 [1965]) arguments in opposition to the seven theses, which reflected the Latin American scientific and intellectual spirit of the times, can be summarized as follows: First, the "archaic" and "modern" societies in Latin America are two products of a single historical process, and their interrelations are the result of a single global society that includes both. Duality is not the issue; the issue is the relations between these two Latin American worlds (traditional and modern), which generate internal colonialism. Second, the progress of urban and industrial areas in the region takes place at the expense of the traditional and underdeveloped areas. Third, there is no consistent internal market, given the absence of a national and progressive form of capitalism. Fourth, an alliance between the national bourgeoisie and the oligarchies prevails in order to maintain this internal colonialism, which benefits both classes. Fifth, the middle classes in Latin America are neither nationalist, progressive, entrepreneurial, nor dynamic; they fail to develop these characteristics because they are economically and socially dependent on the higher strata of the dominant class and therefore maintain the status quo. Sixth, *mestizaje* (racial mixing) does not constitute an alteration of the social structure, and maintaining the idea of cultural mestizaje as a necessary condition for national integration is a racial prejudice. And seventh, the idea of an

alliance between workers and peasants as part of a common front against the bourgeoisie and imperialism is incorrect because, strictly speaking, their interests are not the same.

Around the same time, Andre Gunder Frank (1967 and 1969) advanced similar arguments, pointing out that underdevelopment did not precede development but the two processes unfolded simultaneously; underdevelopment in Latin America was the result of the same historical process that kept the region a satellite, and the relations between the metropolis and its satellite were reproduced within dependent countries. As a rule, criticisms regarding interpretations of Latin American reality were based on Marxism (see Laclau, 1977). Divergences in positions on development and modernization, however, were rooted in a common epistemological platform inspired by the first theories of "political development" and modernization that emerged in the 1950s and matured during the 1960s in the United States. These perspectives, like those criticized by Stavenhagen, shared concerns but were not the same, having different starting points.

The subject of modernization became pivotal in the social sciences as decolonization deepened in Africa during the 1960s. The concept was influenced, on the one hand, by the ideological positions of those who analyzed it and, on the other, by the uncertainty of its starting and ending points. During those years, Latin America developed a critical attitude regarding European and U.S. scientific production, which in turn prompted attention to a specifically Latin American set of issues (Dos Santos, 1969: 149–150). However, Latin American theories of development (which first promoted "outward" and then "inward" development) reached a crisis point when the effects of industrialization did not meet expectations, giving way to dependency theories. These took shape as a critical response to theories of development and modernization, but viewed from a distance they form part of a set of theories that share epistemological assumptions rather than being counterposed. While dependency is identified as a single theory (there were actually several), Horacio Cerutti and others (Chilcote, 1974; Dos Santos, 2002) insist that it was not really a theory but an *explanation* of a *situation*. Even so, the literature on dependency seemed more like a doctrine—a set of propositions articulated with a certain degree of internal coherence (Cerutti, 2006 [1983]: 185). In short, perspectives on Latin American reality in the second half of the twentieth century were the sum of at least two major paradigms meant to provide broad explanations of regional reality.

"SEVEN THESES" AND THE LATIN AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCES OF ITS TIME

Part of the ongoing relevance of "Seven Theses" lies in the fact that the phenomena and social conditions it interpreted (for example, internal colonialism) remained and even grew exponentially and in its systemic and holistic analysis of the structural relations among multiple closely related social and economic structures. Economic interpretations of Latin American history (or the weight of the economy in the region's historical development) dominated much of the

twentieth century, especially in sociology and anthropology (e.g., Cardoso and Faletto, 1969; Marini, 1970a). The nineteenth century was characterized as "neocolonial," dominated by a landowning oligarchy that, in turn, accommodated the agricultural and mining oligarchies trapped in a relationship of dependency with European trade and capital (Jaguaribe, 1973). Thus, Latin America's entrance into the twentieth century was marked by the search for a path to modernization via industrial development and the middle class's drive toward democracy. The validity or persistence of the "colonial" concept (and, consequently, of derivations such as "neocolonialism" or "internal colonialism," which arose from traditional liberal speech in assuming the survival of "colonial structures") in economic interpretations resignified a kind of economic dependence that survived even after political independence. As pointed out by Charles A. Hale (1993 [1973]), the term "colonial" acquired a strictly Latin American connotation derived from a view of the region as a single historical, cultural, and economic entity. While the nineteenth century in Latin America involved a series of imitations of political and economic structures as a form of identity search, this was accomplished but not fully accepted in the twentieth. This largely explains the "duality" (i.e., internal colonialism, the organic and structural relationship between poles of growth and underdeveloped internal colonies) and the interactions arising from it.

By the 1960s, concerns arose regarding the Latin American social sciences' capacity to understand the political and economic events in the region. Marxism (or in some places Neo-Marxism) was in vogue and was adopted by some academic sectors as the "only system of thought" that brought together "a knowledge method" and a "worldview" (see Flores, 1964). It could be said that the social sciences did not find the politicization of science suspect if it had a direct effect on the subject being studied. As González Pedrero (1961: 85) pointed out, "Ever since Marxism forged the theory of ideologies nobody, in the realm of social sciences, can play at 'objective innocence.' The only sincere and possible kind of objectivity in political science is committed objectivity." At the same time, there was mistrust of "empiricism," which was seen into the 1980s, in the words of Fernando H. Cardoso (1981: 272), as "naive" because "it continues to measure the frequency of interactions or the degree of relative prestige between power groups," blunting social thought's sensitivity to the emergence of new conjunctures and proving inconsistent when trying to explain the dynamics of historical processes.

In this sense, "Seven Theses" was also a critique, a questioning of the kind of social science practiced until then across much of Latin America. According to Zapata (2012), the theses were based on propositions developed by modernization theorists, on the one hand, and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), on the other, and intended to influence public policy. However, the modernization, development, and subsequent dependency theories appear to have developed in a scientific context that remained isolated from theoretical discussions in other parts of the world. At the beginning of the 1970s in the United States, for example, the focus was on a need to develop a less descriptive and more analytical kind of political science while moving from concepts to their quantification (all with due precautions, as pointed out by David Apter in 1965). At the same time in Latin America,

there was discussion of the analytical limits of current interpretations without, however, questioning their epistemological and therefore methodological foundations. Studies of political development in Latin America did not debate theories coming from outside the region, where modernization (economic aspects) and political development (institutional aspects) were part of a single process. Even though political development was the "dependent variable" of other socioeconomic changes, there were other more specific social variables that had much greater impact, among them literacy, mobilization, integration, and political participation. For writers like Huntington and Domínguez (1975), for example, political and economic development revolved around the distribution of power: concentration, expansion, and dissemination. Years earlier, Apter (1965) had pointed out that modernization was based on the combination of values and authority structures. Virtually all proponents of modernization identified democracy as their goal (Pasquino, 1998).

The dimensions addressed in "Seven Theses," as an example of the social science literature of the time, suffer from the absence of politics—its structures, institutions, and actors. Actors (mainly, the social classes) are seen as rational collective subjects with their own identified interests. From this viewpoint, since power relations are subsumed within the economic structure, any mention of politics is wholly unnecessary: it is not autonomous and does not affect the structure. The state is contained within the superstructure (as in classical Marxism), and since relations of production define social development politics becomes a residual element. There is no doubt that the relationship between political and economic development was for several decades and especially between 1950 and 1980 one of the major concerns of the social sciences. In the United States and Europe this concern was addressed by political scientists, who focused on the type of political organization. Latin Americans took off from the opposite starting point: economic development, as a kind of epiphenomenon, was seen as the engine of social progress (Pasquino, 1974: 126). Lack of development was viewed as an unavoidable consequence of U.S.-dominated relations of international exchange. This view would prevail well into the 1980s, as can be seen in the texts compiled by Norbert Lechner (1981) in *Estado y política en América Latina*. When analyzing regime transitions (forms of power enactment) in Latin American states (still understood as tending to be politically homogeneous), the authors barely address forms of government (modes of power distribution), as if these did not impact the structure. Would this way of practicing social science be effective today?

Now, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, some areas of the social sciences show varying degrees of disenchantment with research approaches that are based on socio-anthropological interpretations derived from structural conditions (cf. Krotz, 2011). However, social conditions in Latin America have also changed and need to be studied from new angles. Some of the ideas relevant in the 1960s and 1970s now appear anachronistic. Among the reasons for this are the following global political and economic changes:

1. Neither Latin American peasants nor workers became the revolutionary class. In the countries where they played an important role, the key was the emergence of one-person leaderships that served as catalysts for social

movements or interclass alliances. At the same time, current peasant and urban movements (e.g., students, unions) cannot be described or classified as "revolutionary" in the terms of those years. Movements such as Nicaraguan Sandinismo, the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front in El Salvador, the National Liberation Army in Colombia, and the Zapatistas in Mexico, among others, were composed of various sectors and usually led by people who could hardly be considered peasant or proletarian in origin. While we cannot yet fully assess the outcomes of their presence in regional politics, their strength had most certainly declined by the 1990s: no country completed a transition to socialism, and capitalism was not overthrown. I do not seek to diminish these groups' importance but simply note that the revolutions they attempted did not succeed in that no new regimes were created. In the end, democracy rather than socialism became the goal of all these movements.

2. Currently, development is related to factors that are not necessarily economic: educational level, access to health care, public safety, access to new technologies, human rights, etc. In other words, economic processes related to production processes are not indicators of development; increased industrialization can, in fact, perpetuate inequalities (Deaton, 2015). The development paradigm is not focused on economic and structural factors but oriented toward human development and collective well-being (these have also received due criticism given their still limited and skewed achievements).

3. There are no dual societies (on this Stavenhagen's argument remains valid). Instead we have an amalgam of socioeconomic and cultural strata that coexist in a given territorial space while reproducing internal inequalities. Stavenhagen's interpretive model also foresaw the absence of closed communities. Sectors such as the peasantry or indigenous communities, which were seen as "closed economies" (a view criticized in "Seven Theses") were in fact integrated into regional structures and, through these, participated in the national economic process and the global capitalist system (Stavenhagen, 1968). Neither condition has disappeared; in fact, both have expanded. The concept of "social classes" (in the broader sense of the term) has stretched, a product of economic changes and their impact on the social structure, merging economic distributions and social situations.

4. To a significant extent, nation-states no longer dominate the international context; the dynamics of power are driven by the interactions between political and extrapolitical actors (usually large corporations) that influence the decisions that ultimately affect the societies contained within the territories of nation-states. We have new forms of polity such as the European Union and other processes of regional integration that are superimposed on national interests (Hein, 1994). While the state is still located at the core, political dynamics intersect with a multiplicity of nonstate actors (Castells, 1997; van Dijk, 1999).

5. The capitalist system continues to reproduce in previously unimaginable ways. In the nineteenth century it was thought that exploited classes were a sine qua non for the persistence of capitalist practices. In the twenty-first century this system can do without the exploited and continue to reproduce (Forrester, 1997; Touraine, 1999).

Theories of development and modernization did spur economic policy models such as Argentina's 1955 Prebisch Plan and the model of import-substitution industrialization, which was subsequently dismantled in response to the critique of dependency theories. The 1980s and 1990s saw the appearance of regional policies influenced "from outside" such as the Washington Consensus and structural adjustment policies that replaced those aimed toward "development" and modernization.

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND "HOLISTIC" INTERPRETATIONS

"Seven Theses" criticized a set of ideas and theoretical assumptions from a particular historical period while reflecting the model adopted by the Latin American political sciences at that stage. There was concern regarding the boundaries between the diverse disciplines dedicated to the study of political, power, economic, and social relations and their explanatory scope. The first obstacle, observed by Ruy Mauro Marini (1970b), was the difficulty of establishing the boundary between political sociology and political science. The second was the extent to which Latin America's economic and social conditions allowed for the development of reflective and critical thought regarding the region itself. It was the changes that took place after the war and subsequently under "developmentalism" that strengthened disciplinary confluence in addressing regional problems. The dominant perspective over several decades was that politics could not be understood from the viewpoint of a single social science but required a set of disciplines that converged in the plurality known as the "political sciences." Half a century after the publication of "Seven Theses," we should ask ourselves what Latin American political science can (re) learn from a 50-year old interpretive model. Although Stavenhagen's arguments in that essay were characterized by an underlying vision steeped in Marxism, their relevance lies in their holistic approach, in which national characteristics are blurred by a powerful context of regional/structural trends. While the seven theses can be located within the succession of paradigms ranging from "modernism" to "dependency" (Helguea, 1989: 91 and passim)—that is, as part of a research agenda—they are an example of the regional social scientific thought and practice of the time.

Today, the Latin American social sciences have gained considerable independence from overarching ideological paradigms such as the kind of Marxism that held sway throughout the 1960s. Changes in the international context during the 1990s, especially the fall of the Berlin Wall and the disintegration of the socialist bloc, allowed the political sciences to free themselves from dogmatic interpretations such as Marxism. As José Nun (1965: 267) points out, the latter should have been a theoretical lens with which to capture and reflect a multitude of rays but became a tube that allowed only a certain kind of light through. In this context, the "new" political science (singular), the product of U.S. academic influence on the training of Latin American social scientists, was (re) born. From a critical perspective and with the benefit of hindsight, we can see that a new type of dogmatism, a methodological and specifically quantitative one, has spread. It cannot be described as dominant, but it still produces

intellectual and academic biases similar to those of previous decades (cf. Meilleur, 2005).

The kind of political science currently practiced in Latin America focuses on the particularities (some of them irrelevant) of political (usually institutional) phenomena and on specific, mostly electoral processes. Regional trends receive much less attention, except in the field of international relations. There is no Latin American paradigm or grand theory to orient analytical perspectives. Even though theories of democracy (from J. A. Schumpeter to R. Dahl and A. Downs) and their derivations have become the general framework for studies of sociopolitical reality, political science has concentrated on strictly institutional aspects, paying little or no attention to structural or holistic aspects. In other words, if in the 1960s and 1970s the political sciences analyzed the Latin American regional situation without paying much attention to political institutional issues and with very little empirical evidence for their claims while, at the same time, viewing economic structural aspects as determining the political process, the opposite has been happening during the first decades of the twenty-first century. Few analyses have returned to observing political and social structures as long-term processes. While Latin American integration into the new dynamics of capitalism has been achieved simultaneously with democratization, interpretations are now split among world-systems theorists, political scientists, and economists. Some social sciences have become more autonomous: their analyses have depth and are methodologically consistent. Their interpretive horizons, however, are increasingly narrow and have a limited impact on the development of public policy.

Some explanatory analyses of the development process in Latin America, such as the paradigms of modernization, developmentalism, and dependency—along with their critiques, as outlined in "Seven Theses"—were linked to important intellectual figures with both academic and political weight. These texts became platforms for social organizations and movements and for political parties. Even some governments adopted developmentalist arguments. They were analyses that attempted to formulate policies aimed at the political and social transformation of the continent (Zapata, 1998). Little can be said about the social sciences today aside from the guidelines applied by neoliberal economists during the last two decades of the twentieth century. The social sciences across the region have focused on pointing out our problems but have offered little in the way of solutions.

REFERENCES

Apter, David
1965 *The Politics of Modernization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cardoso, Fernando H.
1981 "Regímenes políticos y cambio social," pp. 272–299 in Norbert Lechner (ed.), *Estado y política en América Latina*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI.

Cardoso, Fernando Henrique and Enzo Faletto
1969 *Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina: Ensayo de interpretación sociológica*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Argentina.

Castells, Manuel
1997 *La era de la información: Economía, sociedad y cultura*. Vol. 1. *La sociedad red*. Madrid: Alianza.

Cerutti Guldberg, Horacio
2006 (1983) *Filosofía de la liberación latinoamericana*. 3d edition. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
Chilcote, Ronald H.
1974 "Dependency: a critical synthesis of the literature." *Latin American Perspectives* 1 (1): 4–29.
Coppedge, Michael
2012 *Democratization and Research Methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Deaton, Angus
2015 *El gran escape: Salud, riqueza y los orígenes de la desigualdad*. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
DEP (Departamento de Estudios Políticos del Centro de Investigacion y Docencia Económicas)
1984 "América Latina: teoría y política de Cuba a El Salvador," pp. 13–31 in Juan Enrique Vega (ed.), *Teoría y política de América Latina*. Mexico City: CIDE.
Dos Santos, Theotonio
1969 "La crisis de la teoría del desarrollo y las relaciones de dependencia en América Latina," pp. 147–187 in Hélio Jaguaribe, Aldo Ferrer, Miguel S. Wionczek, and Theotonio dos Santos (eds.), *La dependencia político-económica de América Latina*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI.
2002 *La teoría de la dependencia: Balance y perspectivas*. Mexico City: Plaza y Janes.
Flores Olea, Víctor
1964 *Política y dialéctica: Introducción a una metodología de las ciencias sociales*. Mexico City: ENCPyS, UNAM.
Forrester, Vivian
1997 *El horror económico*. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
Frank, Andre Gunder
1967 *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Pelican Books.
1969 *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
González Casanova, Pablo
1970 "Los clásicos latinoamericanos y la sociología del desarrollo," pp. 7–37 in Pablo González Casanova et al. (eds.), *Sociología del desarrollo latinoamericano: Una guía para su estudio*. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, UNAM.
González Pedrero, Enrique
1961 *El gran viraje*. Mexico City: Era.
Hale, Charles A.
1993 (1973) "La reconstrucción del proceso político del siglo XIX en Hispanoamérica: un caso para la historia de las ideas." *Cuadernos de Historia de las Ideas*, no. 1, 27–47.
Hein, Wolfgang
1994 "El fin del Estado-Nación y el nuevo orden mundial: las instituciones políticas en perspectiva." *Nueva Sociedad* 132: 82–99.
Helguea, Javier
1989 *Las teorías del desarrollo social en América Latina: Una reconstrucción racional*. Mexico City: Colegio de México.
Huntington, S. P. and J. I. Domínguez
1975 "Political development," pp. 1–114 in Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby (eds.), *Macropolitical Theory*. (*Handbook of Political Science*, Vol. 3.) Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
Ianni, Octavio
1971 *Sociologia da sociologia Latino-americana*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
Jaguaribe, Hélio
1973 *Desarrollo económico y político*. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
Krotz, Esteban
2011 "Las ciencias sociales frente al 'Triángulo de las Bermudas': una hipótesis sobre las transformaciones recientes de la investigación científica y la educación superior en México." *Revista de El Colegio de San Luis* 1 (1): 19–46.
Laclau, Ernesto
1977 *Crítica sobre el origen y naturaleza social de Latinoamérica*. Buenos Aires: Cuervo.
Lakatos, Imre
1982 *La metodología de los programas de investigación científica*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

Lechner, Norbert (ed.).
1981 *Estado y política en América Latina*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI.
Marini, Ruy Mauro
1970a *Subdesarrollo y revolución*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI.
1970b "La sociología política," pp. 158–188 in Pablo González Casanova et al. (eds.), *Sociología del desarrollo latinoamericano: Una guía para su estudio*. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, UNAM.
Mayorga, Fernando (ed.).
2016 *Elecciones y legitimidad democrática en América Latina*. La Paz: Plural.
Meilleur, Maurice J.
2005 "After methodology: toward a profession of political science," pp. 489–508 in Kristen R. Monroe (ed.), *Perestroika!: The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Munck, Gerardo L.
2007 "Introduction: Research agendas and strategies in the study of Latin American politics," pp. 1–21 in *Regimes and Democracy in Latin America: Theories and Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Nun, José
1965 "Los paradigmas de la ciencia política en América Latina: del formalismo al marxismo crítico," pp. 235–290 en Centro Latinoamericano de Pesquisas em Ciências Sociais, *As ciências sociais na America Latina*. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro.
Pasquino, Gianfranco
1974 *Modernización y desarrollo político*. Barcelona: Nova Terra.
1998 "Sviluppo politico," in *Enciclopedia delle Scienze Social*, Vol. 8. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.
Puga, Cristina
2008 "Ciencias sociales: un nuevo momento." *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* 71 (Special): 105–131.
Sartori, Giovanni
1979 *La politica: Logica e metodo in scienze sociali*. Carnago: Sugar Co.
Stavenhagen, Rodolfo
1967 (1965) "Seven erroneous theses about Latin America." *New University Thought* 4 (4): 25–37.
1968 "Clases, colonialismo, y aculturación: ensayo sobre un sistema de relaciones interétnicas en Mesoamérica (La región maya de los altos de Chiapas y Guatemala)," pp. 89–151 in Miguel Othón de Mendizábal et al. (eds.), *Ensayos sobre las clases sociales en México*. Mexico City: Nuestro Tiempo.
1974 (1971) "¿Cómo descolonizar las ciencias sociales?" pp. 207–236 in *Sociología y subdesarrollo*. Mexico City: Nuestro Tiempo.
Touraine, Alain
1999 *¿Cómo salir del liberalismo?* Barcelona: Paidós.
van Dijk, Jan
1999 *The Network Society: Social Aspects of New Media*. London: Sage.
Zapata, Francisco
1998 "Acerca del análisis sociológico del proceso político en América Latina." *Annals of Latin American Studies*, no. 18, 128–149.
2012 "Rodolfo Stavenhagen, 'Siete tesis equivocadas sobre América Latina' (1965)," pp. 327–342 in Carlos Illades and Rodolfo Suárez (eds.), *México como problema: Esbozo de una historia intellectual*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.