Since approximately a decade ago, Political Science has been interested in thinking about itself. This self-reflection many times has resulted in labels such as "agonizing", "tragic" or "mortal" (Almond 1999, Held 1991, Ball, 1995; Farr and Seidelman 1996). At the start of the new millennium, discussions on its development and results have increased with Giovanni Sartori's article, "Where is political science going?". The assessment of results carried out by a leading intellectual had a large impact. Both in countries used to periodic evaluations of the "state of the art" of Political Science, and in others, where this article created great interest in reflecting upon the science. Thus, this shrewd criticism by someone with a lasting relationship with the USA, a fervent advocate of a reaction against the old Political Science in the mid-20th century, responsible for the introduction of empiricism, highlighting the centrality of the scientific method in his homeland, shows the inconvenience and dissatisfaction felt with what has become a dominant, specific and exclusive characterization of Political Science. The origin of this sharpness is found in the "behavioral revolution", which occurred in the US during the mid-20th century, spread throughout Europe during the two decades after World War II, and propagated to other countries as predominant political science “culture”.

As regards subject-matter, the atmosphere created by behaviorism was not meticulously followed by new institutionalism. However, both appealed to one same thing. They hid behind science and empirical method to vanish from the discipline all political theory questions about the foundations of a political order, and to avoid reflecting on the sense of politics. The cause of today’s unease, discomfort and dissatisfaction is the narrow meaning of science that has no link to politics, and that was consolidated little by little from the "behaviorist program" and the worshiping of "new institutionalism". But this situation is not identical everywhere. Not every country was anxious or prepared to follow the "behaviorist" calling at first, and of the new institutionalism later. As we will discuss soon after, this is the case of Argentina.

How is this international situation linked to the development of Political Science in Argentina? Can we connect American “historiography” with the local one? Is there a relationship between national and international time schemes, topics and methods? What happened in Argentina with those restricted definitions, in which each program presented itself as "the" way to work in Political Science, underplaying other perspectives?

In contrast with some European countries and with the US, where historiography in Political Science or its study as a discipline are recognized, in Argentina reflection on how knowledge is produced in Political Science is practically nonexistent. The aim of this paper is to start to fill that void. Moreover, debates on the "state of the art" of the discipline are not common. And narratives about the origin and development of the discipline are just
starting to be told. Those that exist had created great disagreement. First, we find those who claim that Political Science can be traced back to the early 19th century. They believe that its origins coincide with an "Argentine political thought" or a "history of political ideas" (Fernández 2002, Kandel 2002). Second, there are those who suggest that the development of its subject matter started towards 1910 in the Revista Argentina de Ciencias Políticas (RACP), directed by Rodolfo Rivarola, discontinued in the late '20s (Roldán 2006). Others consider that the first "generation" of political scientists was the result of a "post-peronista" modernization. This occurs specifically, in the mid-50s, in the city of Buenos Aires and outside the public university (Acuña 2000). Finally, there are those who favor a short history. This is evidenced in the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the Argentine Society of Political Analysis (Sociedad Argentina de Análisis Político-SAAP) in 2002. Here, disputes about the past were avoided, since the new organization was founded when the Argentine Association of Political Science (Asociación Argentina de Ciencia Política) already existed. This institution, led by constitutional law attorneys and specialists in Public Law, was recognized by the International Political Science Association (IPSA), and survived until the '90s. At the celebration, what was highlighted was the foundation of a professional association at the time Political Science was linked to the return and constitutional development of institutions, and when politics was seen from the perspective of representative democracy. Selecting this timeframe for celebrations coincides with two relevant issues for local, regional and international Political Science. First, the selection of the '80s matches the accounts about the recent past of the discipline developed by other Latin American countries (Merino 1999, Amorim Neto y Santos 2005, Sorj 2001, Puryear 1998). These accounts match the bloom of Political Science with the recovery of the democratic ideal as opposed to authoritarian political regimes. In addition, the crisis and/or breakdown of the military order and the challenge of building liberal-democratic institutions match the worldwide revival of the discipline's interest in formal institutions. However, and to hint a thesis that will be developed later on, it is possible to say that in Latin America and particular in Argentina, the interest in studying institutions is less related to issues within the discipline (as, for instance, new institutionalism), and closely connected to the new awakening of the Rule of Law State and the revalorization of liberal-democratic regimes, after high repression and oppression experiences.

This paper's thesis is that there are three main periods in the shaping of Political Science in Argentina during the 20th century. They are related to chronological accounts but they are no sufficient. The first moment which starts in the 1920s, closely relates political sciences with Public Law. And from the mid-20th century it covers the struggle to obtain an identity of its own, different from Law and legal-constitutional formalism. In contrast with developments in other argumentative contexts such as in the USA, this paper rejects the idea that what was done before the mid-20th century is "prehistoric". Law made Political Sciences a discipline. The efforts to be independent from Law and the authority given by a Law degree are realized in the first university course in the country, created in Rosario. The struggle against political, public and constitutional Law continued, when in the mid-80s, it was decided to create a university course at the University of Buenos Aires (UBA). The second decisive moment in the shaping of Political Science as a modern discipline starts towards the end of the 50s, develops as regards subject-matter in the 60s, and shows its potential between the 70s and 80s. The discipline takes its first steps towards
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2This origin is show in Arturo Fernández and Victoria Kandel articles. Other articles suggest different starts.
independence from Public Law and the renewal of constitutionalism that occurred during that part of the century. And later on, it autonomy is shape from the overwhelming march of "scientific sociology". But it distances itself from both trends, towards the end of the 60s when, with the ravaging occurrences that are external to it, the discipline starts to build its own history by analyzing the coup d' état known as “onganiato³”. In this analysis, it clearly upholds polyarchy as a wish for the future. This is a crucial moment because it prefigures the thematic and institutional characteristics that will be predominant for the two following decades. As regards its object of study, locally developed Political Science has distinctive characteristics as a result of its concern with political regimes changes, military rule, the constant presence of Armed Forces in political arena, and possible shape of democratic order as a solution. The renewed political science is linked to the question of the construction of a political-institutional order, and distances itself from the idea of revolution, predominant in other social sciences and in the region. Another characteristic during its thematic, generational and organizational renovation is that it mainly establishes away public universities: at research centers, with the experience of young scientists trained abroad who had not obtained their degrees in either of the two university schools in the country (Rosario from the beginning of the century and Mendoza from the middle). As we will discuss afterward, the last military dictatorship which occurred later on (1976-1983), will play a vital role for Political Science. The third moment, which we are currently undergoing, is characterized by the creation and diversification of institutions: new degree courses at various institutions, periodic publications, book series, research groups, systematic conferences. In addition, there has been a significant increase of educational possibilities, which show the interest that exists in defining expertise fields and concerns within what, until recently, was broadly called "political science". Unlike the previous moment in which Political Science was "reinvented", comparable to a "desert" transformed with innovation and efforts made to translate international models and experiences to local possibilities, the present state is characterized by the routinization of labor. In where the discipline is developed through curriculum vitae regulated work. In where the disciplines restrain it work to the patterns provides by the development of curriculum vitae. This shows that the current Political Science is more withdrawn into each of the institutions that cultivate it, reserved into the individuals that practice it, and interested in shaping a long-lasting more or less standardized vocabulary. But the academic discussions and debates are fragmented, and the discipline is less concerned in being involved in questions that arise from politics as a struggle to build a democratic order, as it was between the 70s and 80s.

Resisting once more the temptation of using standardized and restrictive definitions, we consider that “Argentinean political science” can be defined by the history of its diversity institutionalizations and the reflection upon the debates that arose from its struggle to establish its objects of study and methodology throughout time. These processes have given to the local discipline provisional definitions, rather than universal. Thus, in its origin and development in our country we find local configurations, but which cannot be separated from the political science developed in other geographical and argumentative contexts.

³ It takes this sticky-term from the non-constitutional president Juan Carlos Onganía. His military coup d’état was named by himself “Revolución Argentina” in 1966.
2. From legal-constitutional formalism period to Political Science

Since the first decades of the 20th century, there are discourses, proposals of objects of study, and university institutions where political sciences are made. In the plural form, it subject has no distinction with the one of other social and juridical sciences (e.g. administration, law, sociology, education, history). Among them, Law defines it (public, political, public international law and/or jus gentium). These change in the mid 20th century when social sciences start to look at the USA, resulting in a alteration of point of view. But in the beginning, the European tradition gives it its plural name and its close relationship with Law. Firstly, the discipline is taught in schools and classes of Law. Later on, because its initial definitions are related to Roman Law, where public law deals with the state of public affairs and political and/or civil law, with what regulates community issues within the city. Finally, during the turn of the century and with the emergence of sociology, there is a change in its meaning. Linked to public law, political sciences are thought of as an "action science" and they describe the legal, regulatory and constitutional mechanisms in the configuration of the State (e.g. national and provincial constitutions, institutions for political representation).

As regards its institutionalization, since 1910 we find the RACP, and since 1919 in the National University of Litoral (Universidad Nacional del Litoral), located in Rosario. The latter is a significant laboratory for observation, because it shows its early institutionalization in public universities and the close relationship its degree and PhD courses maintain with Public and International Public Law and/or Jus Gentium. Its association with the legal field is both at the level of course curriculums and institutions, and it will continue well after the mid 20th century (Lesgart y Ramos 2002).

This is evidenced by the various struggles to separate the discipline from Law. Firstly, in 1968 the National University of Rosario (Universidad Nacional de Rosario) is built. The destination for the first university degree courses on politics is the new Faculty of Law (Facultad de Derecho). In this new institutional context, political scientists struggle to obtain administrative autonomy and a different location from what they were given: first, as a subdivision within the School of Law, and then as a School itself. These issues are resolved between 1973 and 1989. Secondly, in 1957 the Argentinean Association of Political Science (Asociación Argentina de Ciencia Política) is created, and it becomes a member of IPSA in 1961. Its president is the lawyer Segundo Linares Quintana. In addition, he was the president of the Latino American Association of Political Science (Asociación Latinoamericana de Ciencia Política), director of the Institute of Constitutional and Political Law (Instituto de Derecho Constitucional y Político) at the Faculty of Law in the University of Buenos Aires (Facultad de Derecho-UBA), Constitutional Law professor at the National University of La Plata (Universidad de La Plata) and the first dean of the degree course on Law, Political and Economic Sciences at the University of Argentinean Social Museum (Universidad del Museo Social Argentino). Towards the mid-20th century and from the point of view of Law, he is the protagonist of argument against work centered
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4 See RACP Nº 1, 1910, Tomos V, and VIII, 1914. In Spain is possible to find the use of the plural form for Political Sciences. There it is institutionalized since XIX century in the Royal Academy of Moral and Political Sciences (Academia Real de Ciencias Morales y Políticas). Also in France it is possible to find the plural use.

5 The Argentinean Review of Political Science has a lot of discussions about Public and International Public Law. Public Law is comprehended as “(...) la constitución del estado y del funcionamiento de los poderes que ella establece” (the State constitution and the functions of the powers that it establish) See RACP: “A propósito del libro de Adolfo Posada”. Tomo VIII, 1914. Pág. 223.
on the letter of the Constitution. This process culminates in the renewal of Constitutional Law, which from then on, would include the examination of the regulations in the constitution and the study of political institutions that were not necessarily included in the text. But the introduction of the institutional aspect did not give greater relevance to political science. On the contrary, Linares Quintana intended to integrate political science and Constitutional Law to create a discipline in which the latter became the fundamental political science. Thirdly, in the mid 1980s several debates arise about the creation of a degree course on Political Science at the UBA (Kandel 2002), given the concerns about institutional and thematic autonomy from Law. From the moment it was promote by rector Francisco Delich, it is highlighted that the discipline should be considered a social science and be separated from schools of law. This is evidenced in various regulations. First, the organization of a committee, that it has the charge of making recommendations to build it. The committee was formed with scholars from various disciplines that had experience in regional institutions for social sciences or political science, working as researchers, teaching, and executive activities. Even though this was an interdisciplinary committee, relevant figures were political scientists by trade and/or experience, such as its president, Carlos Strasser, or the first director of the degree course, Edgardo Catteberg. The reasons for its creations were found in the fundamental role played by the political dimension in the 80s and the work required to consolidate democracy: to link political thought to political consultancy, to educate citizens to be conscientious, to foster an educated public opinion, to reflect on how to strengthen institutions for the new political regime. Lastly, the project sought to separate it, physically and administratively, from the Faculty of Law (Facultad de Derecho). The discipline's belonging to modern social sciences was asserted and the Faculty of Social Sciences (Facultad de Ciencias Sociales) was created as an academic unit that contained new courses.

3. Renew of Political Science: international transformations and local adaptations

Towards de end of the 40s, three events take place that are significant for the international configuration of Political Science as an autonomous discipline, different from what it had been in the past. Some of them will have a correlate in Argentina a decade later.

The first is the arrangement of a standardized-list that emerged from the UNESCO meeting in Paris in 1948. It shows an acknowledgement of the process the discipline was going through in order to gain independence and an attempt to universalize and specify the matters it tackles. The second is the founding of IPSA in 1949. The establishment of an association that in the beginning gathered national associations and later incorporated individual members, shows the need to recognize and strengthen what was already considered a profession. Thus, in 1957 the Argentinian Association of Political Science (Asociación Argentina de Ciencia Política) is founded, and it became a member of IPSA in 1961. The third is that, between 1945 and 1955, especially in Europe, Public and/or Constitutional Law becomes a complementary science for Political Studies. A new path is
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6 The committee includes sociologists, historians, layers with specializations in the constitution or in Political Law, and political scientists. Some names are: Natalio Botana, Mario Dos Santos, Osvaldo Guariglia, Oscar Landi, Mario Justo López, Oscar Ozlack, C. Pérez Llana, Waldo Ansaldi, H. Alvarez Natale, y Roberto Martínez Nogueira.

taken, in which the dogmatic schemes of Law start to lose weight and new emphasis is given to political matters. Political Sociology will take part in this transformation, highlighting the existence of political processes that do not correspond to formal institutions and rules, and of actors whose behavior does not fit what is prescribed by constitutional laws. This tension between Law and Sociology that occurred in Europe coincides with the reaction that occurs in the USA against old formal-legal practice and defines the renewal of the discipline in Argentina.

3.1. Thematic innovations in Argentinean Political Science

Compared to the international process, with its local itinerary beside Law, and to the overwhelming march of "scientific" sociology (Sigal 1991, Terán 1991, Neiburg 1998), the political science practiced in Argentina is an area of knowledge that separates itself belatedly. The 1966 coup d’etat is the one that provides this science with the materials for a topic to study by itself. Institutional breakdowns and political change are the subjects that separate Political Science from other social sciences, and that make it into a modern discipline.

Institutionally, it is now the USA who provides local Political Science with inputs, derived from theories on political development and from the reorganization of comparative politics that takes part in the new object of study. Towards the end of the 50s, the heterogeneous field of study of political development was developed in the USA with several objectives: to interpret the reconstruction of European governments and economies after the Second World War, to study the explosive modernization of Third World countries, to move away from studies centered in formal-legal aspects, and to take apart ideologies from the analyses about Europe and the Third World. Thus, a special interest awoke in the USA for Latin America as an a field of study and a laboratory to observe the politics of modernization. This had an essential role in analyses in and about Latin America on the representation of interests, the study of "interest groups" and/or "pressure groups" (e.g. the Catholic Church, political parties, the role of the military). This provided material to study the role of the military and the Armies Forces as an institution.

At a national level, it is "scientific sociology" developed by Gino Germani in the Institute of Sociology at UBA (Instituto de Sociología-Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires) the one interested in studying what formal and legal vision don’t consider as a problem. Since the mid 1950s, it adapts the vocabulary for theories on modernization to local specificity and concerns itself with the problems derived from modernizing change, examining social processes and actors.

So Sociology provides Political Science with its first topics related to modernization and development, but the latter changes the focus of the studies. In order to achieve a controlled development process, sociologists analyze social problems that arise from the development process (e.g. transformation as a result of industrialization, demographic changes, migrations, social mobility, and urbanization).

However, the first researchers interested in political matters emphasize other points or innovate. They show the difficulties that modernization change creates for the representation of interests that do not fit into the institutions of liberal democracy (e.g. labor unions and their relationship with Peron or “the peronismo”). In addition, they defy the main hypothesis upheld by Germani’s sociology. Said sociologist had proposed that
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8 Germani calls this process as “progreso controlado”.
economic development with significant social modernization could create greater degrees of political democracy. Sociologists assumed a hypothesis by which they proposed that the combination of economical development with significant social or cultural modernization could extent political democracy. But Political Science questions the lineal correlation between social modernization, economic development and political-democratic stability. American researchers’ view that in Third World countries, the modernization and development processes did not necessarily lead to the triumph of capitalism and democratic stability is specified by Guillermo O'Donnell to apply it to the Southern Cone of Latin America with his "pessimistic equation".

The problems that lead to and/or derive from political-institutional breakdown are an innovation that separate Political Science from Law and Sociology. This advance provided Political Science with the processes and actors that were absent in the legal and constitutional model. This paper's hypothesis is that the breakdown of the previous constitutional regimen by the “Argentinean Revolution” (Revolución Argentina) of Juan Carlos Onganía, and the analyses on the military regimes that followed, especially the last military dictatorship, gave the Political Science developed in Argentina a thematic identity. This theme started in the 60s, and is responsible for the modernization of the discipline. Then it went on and was furthered during the following decades. This theoretical and political issue was accompanied by studies on the possible paths to end the dictatorship, which was called democracy.

Locally, we find two inventive cases. O'Donnell's research to obtain his PhD in the USA on the causes that lead to an authoritarian political regime characterized as bureaucratic. His work was published by Editorial Paidós in 1972, and it was entitled Modernización y Autoritarismo. Another case is the compilation of editorial articles published originally in the “Revista Criterio” written by Natalio Botana, Carlos Floria and Rafael Braun. This compilation was entitled El régimen militar 1966-1973, and was published in 1973 by La Bastilla publishing group.

These works differ from one another: in the intentions behind their realization, in the points of view they have regarding the regime they analyze, in the reasons at the back their publication and in the biography of the intellectuals involved. But in both cases there is an interest in thinking, narrating and/or explaining a breakdown at a political level- as regards regime or State- motivated by the coup d' état carried out by Onganía. At the same time, they show some of the characteristics that will prevail in the following decades. Firstly, these works were produced by people who had not taken part in the few courses on Politics that existed in the country. Secondly, they are the ones that carry out academic and/or specialization work abroad, where they discover that there are specialized fields in Social Sciences, especially in Political Science (e.g. in Louvain, Belgium, or in the USA). These experiences are essential in the construction of what could be considered to be a "new generation of intellectuals", who in other countries, read new authors, offer
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10 Guillermo O’Donnell’s’ book was writing as a PhD thesis, directed by David Apter and in Yale University between 1968 and 1971. Firstly, it was published in 1972, in the School of Political Science at the University Del Salvador and CIAP-Di Tella. Secondly, and a year later, in the United States. The book compile by Carlos Floria, Natalio Botana and Rafael Braun, were editorials written for a catholic but laicist review.
10 For example, some of them realized their PhD or specializations in Europe and in Louvain, like Botana or Braun. Others in the United States, like O’Donnell, Strasser or Floria.
innovative subjects and form connections with people who see Political Science as a profession. Between the late 60s and early 70s some meet in the few institutions where Political Science is established in Buenos Aires (e.g. Universidad del Salvador). Or in others that start to show differences in the practice of this new Political Science (e.g. in the Instituto Di Tella the different positions taken in the CIS, CIF or in the CIAP). Thirdly, they stay on the emerging network of non-governmental institutions and/or away from public universities. The non-profit institutions, the one that are born from some defectors (e.g. CISEA and CEDES in 1975), or the institutions arise in the context of the increasing complexity of the State and/or as a result of the regional spread of the development ideas, are protagonists in the establishment of Political Science, and in the matter discussed in these pages, during the mid 1970s.

4. The flourishing of Political Science and Theory: between experiences and expectations

The latest coup d’ état in Argentina is a turning point in national history. In coincidence with those that occurred in the Southern Cone of Latin America, it is possible to consider it as the tempo to examine the relationship between the breakdown of a political regime and the restructuring of Social Sciences. In Argentina, this process occurred in a context of political struggle and dismantling of institutions, including the permanent intervention of public universities, dismissals in the administration or halting of hiring, external or internal exile, and the migration of expert scholars, intellectuals or young people building their careers. Thus, the work of social scientists and intellectuals who were able to keep a more or less public circulation but disapproved of the dictatorship was pushed into places that were built separately from the State, and sometimes they were called “catacomb
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11 In 1966, when the public university was intervened by military government, the Research Center of Public Administration (CIAP) goes to Di Tella Institute of Social Science. The CIAP sheltered young people at the beginning of the academic careers. Later on, and since 1975/6, they founded or take part in spaces in where Political Science and Public Administration has developed, like the Study Center of the State and Society (CEDES) and the Research Center on the State and the Administration (CISEA). For example, Guillermo O’Donnell, Marcelo Cavarozzi, Oscar Ozslak, Horacio Boneo, Jorge Roulet, Dante Caputo. In the opposite, the Social Research Center (CIS) was founded in 1966 by Gino Germani as a center for comparative sociology. In this, as in the Philosophical Research Center (CIF) Natalio Botana take part. In this way, whe can think how political and theories “traditions” are being drawn. In the first side the Political Science and the Public Administration. In the other side that Political Theory interested in ideas and the history of institutions. In the last case and since 1982, its practitioners do not feel interested for included themselves in the Argentinean Society Political Analysis (SAAP). And they still included the National Academy ion Moral and Political Sciences, founded in 1938.

12 A new kind of intellectual, with high specialization, has had appeared. This “expert” keeps distance from an old figure, the “learned” (“docto”). That old kind of intellectual has the capacity to have a public life in the political and the cultural spheres, in where the eloquence of the speeches and the argumentative capacity in public debates and dissertations are very important. Knowledge also is a social distinction. In the opposite, this modern figure of intellectual must be think inside the new context of complexity and the modernization of the National State (Federal Confederation of Investment - CFI, National Council of Economic Development - CONADE), regional organizations (Economic Council for Latin America - CEPAL, Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences - FLACSO, Latin American Council of Social Science - CLACSO). As far as the first mid-century, doctors and lawyers are the professions who can talk about social problems and can served the State. In the opposite, since mid-century are sociologists, engineers and economists the ones qualified for doing this.

universities”. It is true to say that the development of Political Science in Argentina happens in the country, in the region and abroad. And it involves scholars and intellectuals that personally and institutionally forge bonds beyond national borders, regional institutions and research projects with wide geographical bases that are not very well delimited (by exchanging ideas, relations, financial aid).

4.1. Political Science and Comparative Politics

It is not paradoxical to point out that Political Science developed its topics and institutions during the most bloody military dictatorship in the history of the country (1976-1983). The breakdown of the political order was pivotal for the Political Science developed by Argentineans and/or in Argentina, because it was able to be an autonomous discipline. Coup d’ état and debates on conceptualization (e.g. “new authoritarianism” and its adjectives, types of political regimes, bureaucratic-authoritarian State or regime, fascist State) became a research topic related to the type of political change possible.

This analysis was carried out by comparison and contrast. Firstly, by considering the presence, and recurring irruption of the Army Forces in the country’s politics. Secondly, they analyze the emergence of military and/or authoritarian regimes in other countries in the region (Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, and Peru). Thirdly, by comparing the breakdown of democratic regimes in the Southern Cone, with those occurs in other parts of the world. Mediterranean Europe (Spain, Greece and Portugal) become especially relevant for historical, theoretical, and empirical comparisons. It was pertinent both to analyze the dismantling of authoritarian regime and to reflect on the transitions from authoritarian rule. Between the 70s and 80s and for comparative Political Science and Sociology, "transition" became a key-concept and a personal and political experience. It made it possible to think of a progressive and regulated change from authoritarian rule to a political regime expected to be democratic, which was evaluated using the institutions of a polyarchy as described in Dahl's theory.

Political Science flourished in two ways. First, it is renewed with its analysis of military coups and authoritarian rule, a topic which, when dealt with from the point of view of the state or the political regime, was intimately related to possible ways to end it. Thus, the analyses of transitions from authoritarian rule and to democracy were also linked to the broader topic of political change. Secondly, it is renewed by the growing incentive to compare various cases from different geographical regions. This process, which is part of the relocation that the United States creates in Comparative Politics since the end of the 60s, enriches theoretical and political works in Latin American Political Science. This made it possible to think that political situations in each country are not exceptional and to have a shared vocabulary in this discipline that goes beyond national borders, with the drawback of standardizing political situations that are not entirely alike. This is evidenced in the research project of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, entitled: “Los periodos de transición posteriores a los gobiernos autoritarios: Perspectivas para la democracia en América latina y Europa meridional” (Transitions after authoritarian rule: Perspectives for democracy in Latin America and Meridional Europe), the result of collaborative work by CEDES political scientists and a network of scholars from various parts of the world. Guillermo O’Donnell is one of its main promoters and, along with Fernando Henrique Cardoso, summons Latin American, European and North American scientists interested in Latin America and Southern Europe. The center's Latin American program was created in 1977 and in 1979 they start the research that would later be
published in English in 1986 and in Spanish in 1989: Transitions from Authoritarian rule. The aim of the project was to compare various geographical areas where authoritarian situations, military or not, occurred; some of these areas were or had been under a bureaucratic-authoritarian rule. Transition becomes a way to reflect on political change, a process with one objective: political democracy understood as a synonym of polyarchy.

Thus far we find a process of increasing specialization in Political Science and great efforts to differentiate fields of knowledge based on academic criteria, distrust to ideology. This is evidenced in the texts compiled by Guillermo O’Donnell, Phillipe Schmitter and Laurence Whitehead. These, along with other books that resulted from researching authoritarian rule and transitions to democracy, show the debates that occurred within Political Science or Comparative Politics with the aim to find focus points for analysis that would give meaning to the political studies and processes under way. In general terms, these focus points included: whether analysis should be carried out from the point of view of the concept of State or of political regime; whether democracy should be analyzed from a political, social and/or economic dimension. This process culminated in a new-found appreciation for the political dimension and in an emphasis on political regimes, leaving behind the State and the socio-economic question at least until the new millennium.

Two places are relevant to look at the national development of Political Science. In the country CEDES, an institution founded in 1975 devoted to research and to the training a new generations of political scientists. During the dictatorship, it is here that we see Political Science as well as Public Administration becomes established, by the structuring of two areas of work: Political Analysis (Análisis Político) and Bureaucracies and Public Policies (Burocracia y Políticas Públicas), coordinated by Guillermo O’Donnell and Oscar Oszlak respectively. These were replicated by Work Groups in the Latino American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO). Given the increasing difficulties in finding financial aid and settling in public institutions because of political violence and the subsequent military dictatorship, the center is not isolated. The leaders of the institution have a network of relations with people abroad that allows them to circulate throughout various countries, regional or international institutions, absorbing discussions and obtaining financial aid to continue their work in projects and lines of research. In addition, to remedy the impossibility of forging a career in research, they formed a permanent staff of researchers, including new generations as grant holders and encouraging exchange with researchers from other countries. Thus, we clearly see the academic goal for Social Sciences that CEDES had set for itself. Another relevant institution is FLACSO in Buenos Aires, which, after the 1973 coup in Chile, decentralized its organizational structure and opened an office in Argentina. From 1977, the "Programa de Maestría en Ciencias Sociales" (Master Program in Social Science) directed by Carlos Strasser had played an

14 Founded by Elizabeth Jelin, Guillermo O’Donnell, Marcelo Cavarozzi, Oscar Oszlak y Horacio Boneo
15 Political Analysis researches the dismantling and change of the military rule and transition to democracy, the political parties’ role in the military rule, and institutions in transitions and consolidations. The themes are enriched with Marcelo Cavarozzi and the arrival of Liliana de Riz since 1982. The analysis characterizes the political dimension as autonomy, de paths and ways to do politics, political organizations and institutions, authoritarian rule and transition to democracy as a highlight dimension of social action. Bureaucracy and Public Policy studies the State and its administrative dimension, the process of creation and implementation of policies basically in the level of the State, and the birth, expansion and limits of the State, the role of bureaucracy in domination process, and the reform and changes in the State during authoritarian rule and transitions to democracy.
important role in postgraduate education for young graduates who stayed in the country. In it, they had access to new bibliography and experts who had frequent communication with other countries\textsuperscript{16}. With the military rule, it had to redefine its objectives, but the "Programa de Postgrado" was innovative, especially when compared with the old PhD courses in public universities and it collected the efforts of young scholars who carried out their activities in the country's research centers. Like CLACSO, it was founded in 1957 at the initiative of UNESCO as an autonomous, regional and intergovernmental organization, and both were "institutional umbrellas" during the dictatorship\textsuperscript{17}.

4.2. Political Theory

The generically called "authoritarianisms" (present and past) and democracy also inspired questions for Political Philosophy. They were born as theoretically self-referencing questions, politically pivotal for a heterogeneous group of intellectuals (José Aricó, Juan Carlos Portantiero, Emilio de Ipola). Most of them were living in Mexico as political exiles. Coming from different branches of the Left, they created theoretical and political debates that were aimed at discussing controversial topics (armed struggle, socialism, revolution). This process culminated in a new vision on politics, from a democratic, not illiberal, point of view.

Contrary to what happened in Political Science, in this area no explicit program was constructed for the development of the discipline. But the critical situation, personal and political, compelled them to develop sensitive topics about politics. The coup d' état was the immediate experience through which they analyzed their recent past as part of the Left, and which caused them to criticize the way in which politics and change were understood. This is carried out in the context of the defeat of socialist projects which, after Cuba, had been erected around revolution as an idea and praxis. And after the failure of all the experiences that attempts to construct socialist’s political parties in the country. This failure was shown by the presence of military rule and the unfulfilled objective of constructing the socialist society they had imagined. This process was live as a defeat, and impelled the deconstruction of the key-ideas referenced in Socialism and/or Marxism.

From this audacious process, they take the theoretical materials that enriched Political Theory, but the course of action went beyond and influenced the world of politics, creating the atmosphere of ideas of the first constitutional government. The first topic refers to the renewal of Marxism and the construction of a new socialist vocabulary given the theoretical and political revisions, both of which occurred in Mexico, where numerous exiles from other countries met. New relevance is given to the political debates of other Latin Americans, especially Chileans, since Pinochet's breakdown regimen and the violent

\textsuperscript{16} The Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO) has had a highlight role in the development of regional Social Sciences. First, in Santiago de Chile, where it objective was to trained a first regional generation of social scientist through the Sociological School named ELAS (Latin American School of Sociology). Secondly, since '64, with the reception of brasilean emigrates and exiles, that was a signal of the intention to act as an “institutional umbrella”. This role was played with a latinoamericanist profile that promotes a regional autonomous development. FLACSO also promotes the independence of academic institutions, comparing it with the importance that in the same time has had the training of young people in the United States. Since 1975 FLACSO-México acquires a high protagonism.

\textsuperscript{17} "Institutional umbrella" or in Spanish “paraguas institucionales”, is the concept use in Latino American Social Sciences. The translation is difficult, so it can be think like “institutional shields” or “institutional safeguards”.
dismantling of the Unidad Popular (Popular Unity) were experiences that transcended Latin American borders. Great emphasis was given to debates on Latin Euro communism and Italy's experience with the "great historic compromise". A new interpretation of Antonio Gramsci, which traveled between Europe and Latin America, made it possible to find the political dimension to explain politics beyond economic and social determinism. This helped disrupt the idea that revolutionary political change is inevitable and that the State and Politics are mere instruments, since, with Gramsci, there is an analysis of the construction of hegemony, which makes successive transformations possible through a struggle in the cultural field. As seen after the renewal of the classic Marxist topics, democracy is interpreted now as a way to profound socialism. The second topic is that, with the aim to renew politics, these intellectuals turned to theoretical traditions foreign to Marxism. They reinterpreted issues of Political Theory in light of classic works of contractarianism and new contractarianism (from Hobbes to Rawls). They translated and analyzed works that were not well known in the country at the time of the military rule (Carl Schmitt, Max Weber, Michel Foucault). And they went back to the abstract questions of Political Philosophy: the legal limits to political power, the exercise of sovereignty, focusing on how to exercise it, man as holder of inalienable rights. These theoretical works were used for various purposes: to think about democracy as a transition or to revitalize it in light of disappearances, torture and exiles, seeing it as a call for a Rule of Law and a set of minimum conditions that hinder the arbitrary exercise of political power. That is to say, a problem related to the liberal tradition. The third topic is the innovative nature of the ideal of Socialism as an element to profound democracy. To uphold this idea, they debate with a left wing of the Left that after the military rule keeps presenting liberal democracy and revolutionary socialism as incompatible, and renew themselves reading authors from the Second International or long-forgotten socialists and/or Marxists (Mariátegui, Juan B. Justo). Thus, they differentiate themselves from their past in the Left, becoming a "modern Left", "non-orthodox" that pays its dues to conviction-ethics and wants to be responsible with constitutional governmental procedures. With this new repertoire, and seeing Raúl Alfonsín as a politician that could personify some of the aspirations of the beloved democracy, they build a new relationship between intellectuals and government issues, and between scholar knowledge and politics.

4.3. Politics, Democracy and specialized knowledge

We defined the main issues that, in the turn of the decade of the 70s, constitute Political Science and Theory into academic and university fields. And now, we most show their relationship with the world of politics. As a political science or political theory modulation, a significant, meaning-giving topic has emerged, whose background are military rule: democracy. This concept, far from having a univocal sense, takes multiple meanings and is associated with various traditions (polyarchy, liberalism, representative democracy, socialism).

Its introduction to Social Sciences and to the Southern Cone of Latin America occurs during the conference organized by CLACSO in 1978 and in Costa Rica: “Las Condiciones Sociales de la Democracia” (The social conditions for democracy). This event is a turning point symbolically and historically. It is the last political event the sociologist Gino Germani is able to attend. And it is the first academic-scholarly outing for the man who would become the next president of Argentina, Raúl Alfonsín. From then on, democracy fosters new theoretical paths that this organization stimulates through regional
conferences or the issues of the magazine *Crítica y Utopía*. Directed by Francisco Delich, the regional organization, who’s Executive Secretariat was set in Buenos Aires, encourages debates, strengthens exchange activities between scholars and supports its member centers.

As a main guiding idea, democracy flooded academic settings and universities, fostering changes in the curriculum (UNR), colour study programs in various degree courses, fostering the creation of new degree courses and institutions (UBA). But *it went beyond the restricted academic and intellectual world, creating the atmosphere of the years after the founding elections*, delimiting what "ought to be" for institutions, prescribing behavior for actors and driving intellectuals and scholars with diverse background to associate with the Alfonsin administration in multiple ways, as specialists, technical consultants or intellectuals: writing the president's speeches, advising the new administration on key topics, acting as ministers, taking part in public administration.

The intellectuals and scholars' interest in being involved with Alfonsin government, was never again seen in Political Science or Theory, nor in political scientist and theoreticians. A paradigmatic experience that shows intellectual involvement in the "alfonsinista époque" - not restricted to the UCR- are the debates at the *Club de Cultura Socialista* (Socialist Culture Club) and the publications of *La Ciudad Futura* (The Future City), whose immediate precedent can be found in Mexico, in the *Grupo de Discusión Socialista* (Socialist Discussion Group) and in the debates published in *Periódico Controversia* (Controversial Newspaper) In a stronger sense, it is also evidences in the craft of various presidential speeches (e.g. Discurso de Parque Norte/Noth Park Speech), and in the makeup of the president's key-ideas as part of the Foundation called Grupo Esmeralda (Esmerald Group). At CEDES Marcelo Cavarozzi, a central figure in the analysis of authoritarian rule and transitions to democracy, invites intellectuals (e.g. Liliana de Riz, Hilda Sábato) to “almuerzo con los políticos” (lunch with politicians). These meetings fostered the exchange of ideas with a group of young politicians from the less orthodox fields of traditional parties (Civic Radical and Justicialistas) and the Left. Lastly, the CISEA men - institution founded in 1975 from CIAP defectors, like CEDES- serve, in various visible positions, the first constitutional government: as Minister of Education and later as vice-minister of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Jorge Sábato), and/or chancellor (as a Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dante Caputo)18.

In some of these cases, the urgency of politics collides with what was learned academically and it ends up swallowing these intellectuals. But in Argentina the path from the intellectual and academic world, to the world of politics, never leads to an *intellectualization of politics*, as in Chile.

5. Conclusions. Routinized discipline: the creation of institutions, the renew of themes and professional profiles

In contrast with what has been described above, *Political Science and Theory* are currently more involved with their own history. The intense debates that they impulse, related to the analysis and characterization of the Armed Forces and militarys in

18 The center was integrated with: J. Roulet, Dante Caputo, Jorgito Sábato, Jorge Schvarzer, José Moreno, E. Groissman, Osvaldo Guariglia, N. Lavergne (and PEHESA group). There are other examples, like the Institute for Economic and social Development (IDES) that brought other specialists’ and intellectuals, principally those who participated in de Study Program of Economic Theory directed by Adolfo Canitrot. These specialist goes to de Economic and Planning Secretary. The more highlight case is Juan Vital Sourrouille, for long time director of IDES and next Economy Secretary.
institutional life and the various ways to build a democratic political order, *have gone*. Those matters were not the result of the "behavioral revolution", and they arose from the desire to build a political order with free and continuous political participation, going back to a Rule of Law State. The generational and political urge of scholars and intellectuals that led the discipline in the past and still do so in the present is lost. And now, there is no a new generational impulse to revitalize it. In the contrary, there is currently greater concern with *the distinction of disciplines within the university, the institutional organization of educational options* and *scientific work that strictly follows the patterns dictated by curriculum*.

Considering the constant creation of university institutions since the 90s and the permanent increase of young people that choose to study it, we find that today *this discipline that is in fashion*19. And it is also routinely. *Conferences* have been systematized: the SAAP between the Edgardo Catterberg and Arturo Fernández presidencies and the Conferences on Democracy in Rosario. There are *periodic publications* with some history: *Postdata, Estudios Sociales* or *Política y Gobierno*. In other provinces –different from Buenos Aires, the central province-, the profession has been standardized and from some of them come innovative projects carried out throughout time: the collection of Political Science and Philosophy by Homo Sapiens publishers in Rosario, postgraduate and postdoctorate courses by CEA in Córdoba20. But there is less interest in thematic and methodological innovations and less involvement in a sensitive topic: *politics as a struggle to give meaning to the construction, improvement and/or transformation, of the political order*. In all of these senses, the discipline is more alive than ever. But *without the argumentative and political struggles that gave it its impulse between the 60s and 80s and in an adverse political situation, Political Science is in agony*.

With the beginning of the democratic regime, many intellectuals and scholars returned to the universities. In addition, there was a proliferation of universities during the 90s, predominantly in Buenos Aires. This has cause the creation of more political science courses in public and private, secular and religious institutions in Buenos Aires and in other provinces, of both graduate and postgraduate levels. Many are intended as problematic fields or areas for professional development and are less interested in fostering the discipline itself. In this process we see a concentration in separating different fields of knowledge, professional profiles and educational options. Thus, there are *four areas* that defy the existence of a "political science".

*International Relations*, which in some cases use a broader designation: *International Studies*. In the country, the struggles to have institutional autonomy and a separate object of study begin since its early constitution as a degree course in Rosario. At the international level, this struggle was between World War II and the Cold War. Although they briefly refer to their interest in training professionals for the Servicio Exterior de la Nación (State Department), some foster new looks on private businesses, NGO or NPO (Rosario, FLACSO-Buenos Aires, General San Martín and Di Tella)21.

---

19 The paradox is that every day more young people incomes to Political Science university courses. But there is no generational impulse for the discipline. As the history of Political Science in Argentina shows, a new generation was fundamental for it renew in the 60s

20 Espacios importantes de su desarrollo se encuentran en Rosario, en FLACSO-Buenos Aires, San Andrés y Di Tella.
The term Political Studies is centered on Political Theory and Philosophy, central aspects in the modernization of the courses in Rosario. Even though for a long time it was not institutionalized, it is a type of work that is very frequently carried out in the country. And since not long ago, this kind of work and reflection, has received great impulse despite the conquests made by other fields such as public management, government and local development. A growing new field is Development, located mainly at the Escuela de Política y Gobierno (Government and Politics School) and at the General Sarmiento Institutes. These institutions recognize the local, national, regional or international dimension of politics, and the various development and integration strategies that should be produced between actors.

Lastly, Public Policies struggle at the level of meanings and profession against the broad field of “Political Science”. They have multiplied since the 90s and today they are graduate and postgraduate specialties (San Martín, La Matanza, Tres de Febrero, San Andrés, Di Tella, Rosario). What is usually called "management" was a significant input: for the early degree course in Mendoza and the first degree courses in Rosario. But in the latter, management was absorbed by Law and became a field for accountants as management of private companies or public offices. Even now, at the Rosario National University, the field is disputed with the National Faculty of Economic Sciences, the former setting of what we call Political Science. This struggle is also found between some degree courses at new universities, where there usually is no distinction between management of public resources and management of private property, or between the State and a company. As regards the State's pending tasks, such as modernization of its bureaucracy and the design, planning and execution of policies that extend beyond the change of administrations, the develop of management field is necessary. But it is also relevant to pose questions about certain issues that Public Administration creates for Political Science, since the latter can be redefined by pointing out what the former does not. Firstly, because comparing the local sense of Political Science, Public Administration has the intention to “administrate what is given”. Secondly, because if we analyze Public Administration and Political Science, the former presents itself as a discipline that trains "experts" that are not influenced by values. At this point it is important to remember that Political Science in Argentina blossomed as a result of its reflections on political change and by imagining new paths during hard political times. In such a way, political science could be again seen as a conflicted creation of symbolic and institutional frameworks for community life, which would include the every-day life of political institutions. And this process may show the inevitable selection of meanings made when reflecting upon what is public, as was established by the generation that gave Political Science a turn of the screw in the 60s and in the 80s.

All these degree courses differ in the paths they set for professional development. But their main difference is due to the “expert leaders” that coordinate them and the network of contacts they have with the world, which allows them to bring professors from abroad or create programs that give degrees issued by foreign universities (e.g. Politics and Government School at National University of San Martín, Political Science and International Studies Department at University of Di Tella). Others are in contact and cooperate with local governments and actors.

---

22 The work centered in Political Theory and Philosophy, and a more European and less North American name, was institutionalized by Eduardo Rinesi in Buenos Aires.
As we have seen thus far, there has been a development of a wide range of profiles and careers that go beyond that of the intellectuals, the analysis of the current political situation, that of the researcher, or the more classic one of the professor. As was seen before, new careers have appeared: the consultant for government or private companies, the counselor for political actors or the State, and the maker, assessor or executor of various public policies for public or private organizations, and at local, national, regional and international levels. Thus, the discipline molds a professional profile that attempts to distance itself from values in politics. It also aspires to train experts that can be distinguished by their use of the tools provided by science. This interest has advanced so much that the participation of political scientists and public administrators in laboratories of political experiences does not show the amount of creativity that some of them have within the discipline. It would seem that their specific knowledge does not find much opportunity to give meaning to the world of politics, which in Argentina has shown little interest for the world of academic experience. As a result, there are several cases of intellectuals and scholars that join the government as specialists in their area, only to later become candidates in some election or arrange electoral games within the government. But with these tasks they do not renew politics or do not give it the distinctiveness of their specialty. In all of these senses, Political Science and Theory are more alive than ever. But if science does not establish a creative link with politics, it runs the risk of losing what part of the history of this discipline has left as a fresh creative impulse: to offer frameworks that are sensitive to the life of men and women.

And, finally, to discuss current topics centered on the pending task to build a democracy. The treatment of this problem is sometimes carried out following and translating the debates in the discipline that have become international. The undertaking of this issue can be analyzed through two main "classic" themes related to the polis: one is the government of the city (political representation, its crisis or metamorphosis, the quality of the institutions) and the other revolves around the citizens that make up the city (problems related to civic responsibility, transformations and new demands). Both are dealt with theoretically and empirically. Moreover, a theme that includes the two described above is democratic quality, which follows and furthers what in previous decades constituted transitions and consolidations. This, however, is devoid of the impulse given by Comparative Politics, which today presents itself weakly in what is called "comparison at a sub national level". This is an unpaid debt for political science studies in Argentina: to analyze democracy, its institutions, its civic problems, away from the capital city and the capitals of the some of the main provinces, which would result in different diagnoses.

On the topic of the government of the city, the emphasis is put on political parties. Their study has gone from the question of the experience of a system to the question of internal organizational forms, both in the old political parties and in the new ones. There has also been an analysis on the transformation of Parliament as an institution and the role of the political opposition. There are studies centered on the advance of the Executive Power, the personalization of politics and the replacement of legislative activities in administrations that exercise political power through the use of decrees. The analysis of electoral systems and behaviors and the problems of representation (volatility of vote, denationalization of political parties representation), in our country show the aspiration to build an empirical political science, such as was expected by the exponents of behaviorism
and new institutionalism\textsuperscript{23}. As it happened during the first decades of the 20th century, there has been a return to the study of political institutions but not from a formal-legal point of view. And also away from the new institutionalism spirit, which, in this country, has not had the resonance it had internationally. This refers less to the update of perspectives and more to the scarce methodological discussions that Political Science has rendered in Argentina. This also occurred in the past, when, contradicting sociological modernization, the newly-formed political science did not have methodological discussions to establish itself with a specific scientific point of view. In addition this distinguishes it from what happened during the same time period with the so called "behaviorism revolution". It is currently also neglected by Political Theory and Philosophy, which internationally is more than reading the "texts in themselves", and has moved forward towards the reflection on the use and meaning of concepts, necessary also for positivist political science.

On civic responsibility, there is great interest in the various ways in which different social actors participate in the transformation and emergence before, during and after the crisis in 2001. Many times, these studies are carried out from the viewpoint of this moment, analyzing it against the background of the problem of representation. Research has been carried out on the new types of citizenship in the context of democratic complexities. They include a wide range of rights and sometimes use the vocabulary of Political Theory or Philosophy. In some cases, there are original looks that intertwine various dimensions, as in the case of studies on social accountability\textsuperscript{24}.

All of the above draw from the general theme of democratic quality, where interesting new perspectives have been reopened. One of them had been neglected during the late 70s and early 80s: the State.\textsuperscript{25} Another was left behind by the vocabulary of social sciences after the 60s: development, now qualified as sustainable. After being analyzed in relation military rule, the State was neglected during the 80s. And it was replaced by the political regime dimension, or by the wish to strengthen the Rule of Law. Afterwards, it was seen as opposed to the market and from the perspective of the structural and economic reforms of the 90s. A central object of study for Political Science has currently been reintroduced. This object was not absorbed by American studies related to pluralism and polyarchy. And it is now studied theoretically and in relation to democracy and development. Thus, a variable for analysis has been reintroduced after being left out in the recent past, in relation to democracy: social and economic conditions. PNUD’s (United

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}
\item An example, realized with the intention to connect theoretical an empirical work in representative government and representation (political parties, citizenship, electoral systems) is the research directed by Isidoro Cheresky. These research show published outputs, and the generational, national, regional and international exchange. Other cases are: Program in “Electoral and Legislatives Studies” Di Tella University, and Ana Maria Mustapics’ works. Recently the creation of the Program named “Political Institutions’ and Democratic Governability” in FLACSO-Argentina.
\item The concept is a renew of O’Donnells’ Works on accountability. The Project is going on in Di Tella University since 2000 year. It named is “Social accountability strategies in Latin America”, lead by Enrique Peruzzotti y Catalina Smulovitz.
\item The State issue was renew by Political Science and Political Sociology with and since P. Evans, Rueschemeyer, D. y T. Skocpol book: Bringing the State Back in. Since the 90s, it travel to Latin America analysis. In Argentina there are few cases. For example in the University of San Martin the Research Center “State and Democracy in Latin America” directed by O’Donnell. There are recent published books like Iazzetta, Osvaldo: Democracias en busca de Estado. Ensayos sobre América Latina. Homo Sapiens, 2007. About the State and democracy qualities Iazzetta, O’Donnell y Cullell: Democracia, desarrollo humano y ciudadanía. Reflexiones sobre la calidad de la democracia en América Latina. Homo Sapiens, 2005.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Nation Program for Development) 2004 report, entitled “La democracia en América Latina. Hacia una democracia de ciudadanos y ciudadanas” and “Debate conceptual sobre la democracia” (Democracy in Latin America. Democracy for citizenship), is a case in which several of these dimensions are intertwined. This can be considered to be the “state of art” of the regional question.

Finally, in relation to Political Theory, a theme has stood out, brought forth by the current political situation in the region: the debate on the sense and the term *populismo*, which had been left out in the conceptual repertoire of Social Sciences. At present, it is fostered by papers that do not come from the US, which, at an international level, defend the reinterpretation of democracy, linking it to new readings of classic authors (e.g. Carl Schmitt).

After all this vigorous institutional, thematic life, with its research projects and programs, the exchanges and discussions within the discipline are fragmented. Each degree course or department within the university carries out work whose aims are themselves. This situation is very different from what occurred in the 80s. Then, there were fewer institutions that studied this discipline and less people who practiced it, but the forums available were more open to debate. Undoubtedly, the practice of Political Science and Theory has been regularly established. However, these disciplines do not seem very capable of transferring the results of their research, their vocabulary, increasingly standardized and specialized, its predictions to the world of political actors, of every day politics, of organizations outside the discipline. The adrenaline release caused by the urgency of politics does not seem to have touched this time the cubicles, as would have been required by the crisis in 2001, and as it actually happened during the decades when, in the country, the discipline bloomed releasing itself from the claws of Law and the ever advancing and modernizing Scientific Sociology.
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N.G.O. Non-governmental Organizations
N.P.O: Non-profit Organizations
PJ: Justicialista Party
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UBA: University of Buenos Aires
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