



**TEXTO PARA DISCUSSÃO Nº 545**

**MANUFACTURING PLURALISM IN BRAZILIAN ECONOMICS: THE ROLE OF ANPEC  
AS INSTITUTIONAL MEDIATOR AND STABILIZER**

**Ramón García Fernández  
Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak**

**Dezembro de 2016**

## Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

Jaime Arturo Ramírez (Reitor)  
Sandra Regina Goulart Almeida (Vice-reitora)

## Faculdade de Ciências Econômicas

Paula Miranda-Ribeiro (Diretora)  
Lizia de Figueirêdo (Vice-diretora)

## Centro de Desenvolvimento e Planejamento Regional (Cedeplar)

Mônica Viegas Andrade (Diretora)  
Eduardo da Motta e Albuquerque (Vice-Diretor)

José Irineu Rangel Rigotti (Coordenador do  
Programa de Pós-graduação em Demografia)

Marco Flávio da Cunha Resende (Coordenador do  
Programa de Pós-graduação em Economia)

Laura Lídia Rodríguez Wong (Chefe do  
Departamento de Demografia)

Edson Paulo Domingues (Chefe do Departamento  
de Ciências Econômicas)

## Editores da série de Textos para Discussão

Aline Souza Magalhães (Economia)  
Adriana de Miranda-Ribeiro (Demografia)

## Secretaria Geral do Cedeplar

Maristela Dória (Secretária-Geral)  
Simone Basques Sette dos Reis (Editoração)

<http://www.cedeplar.ufmg.br>

## Textos para Discussão

A série de Textos para Discussão divulga resultados preliminares de estudos desenvolvidos no âmbito do Cedeplar, com o objetivo de compartilhar ideias e obter comentários e críticas da comunidade científica antes de seu envio para publicação final. Os Textos para Discussão do Cedeplar começaram a ser publicados em 1974 e têm se destacado pela diversidade de temas e áreas de pesquisa.

### Ficha catalográfica

F363m	García Fernández, Ramon Vicente.
2016	Manufacturing pluralism in brazilian economics: the role of ANPEC as institutional mediator and stabilizer / Ramón García Fernández, Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak. – Belo Horizonte: UFMG/CEDEPLAR, 2016.
	27 p. : il., tabs. - (Texto para discussão, 545)
	ISSN 2318-2377
	Inclui bibliografia.
	1. Pluralismo. 2. Economia - Brail. 3. Sociologia – Aspectos econômicos. I. Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Centro de Desenvolvimento e Planejamento Regional. III. Série.
	CDD: 330

Elaborada pela Biblioteca da FACE/UFMG –  
NMM/103/2016

As opiniões contidas nesta publicação são de exclusiva responsabilidade do(s) autor(es), não exprimindo necessariamente o ponto de vista do Centro de Desenvolvimento e Planejamento Regional (Cedeplar), da Faculdade de Ciências Econômicas ou da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. É permitida a reprodução parcial deste texto e dos dados nele contidos, desde que citada a fonte. Reproduções do texto completo ou para fins comerciais são expressamente proibidas.

*Opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect views of the publishers. The reproduction of parts of this paper of or data therein is allowed if properly cited. Commercial and full text reproductions are strictly forbidden.*

**UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE MINAS GERAIS  
FACULDADE DE CIÊNCIAS ECONÔMICAS  
CENTRO DE DESENVOLVIMENTO E PLANEJAMENTO REGIONAL**

**MANUFACTURING PLURALISM IN BRAZILIAN ECONOMICS: THE ROLE OF ANPEC  
AS INSTITUTIONAL MEDIATOR AND STABILIZER**

**Ramón García Fernández**  
ramon.garcia.fernandez@gmail.com

**Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak**  
suprinyak@cedeplar.ufmg.br

**CEDEPLAR/FACE/UFMG  
BELO HORIZONTE  
2016**

## **SUMÁRIO**

1. INTRODUCTION .....	6
2. PLURALISM IN BRAZILIAN ECONOMICS, NOW AND THEN .....	7
3. AN AGENDA OF MODERNIZATION .....	12
4. ECONOMICS, IDEOLOGY, AND PLURALISM.....	18
5. CONCLUDING REMARKS .....	23
REFERENCES .....	25

## **ABSTRACT**

Brazilian academic economics has been traditionally characterized by its openness to different strands of economic theory. In contrast to the standards prevailing in most of Europe and North America, economics in Brazil can be justly described as pluralistic, with competing schools of thought enjoying relatively secure institutional positions. One of the reasons frequently ascribed for this outcome is the role played by ANPEC, the Brazilian economics association, in mediating conflicts among graduate programs affiliated to different research traditions. A crucial episode in this respect took place in the early 1970s, when the recently born association chose to adopt an inclusive stance towards its membership, welcoming the filiation of the strongly heterodox program at the University of Campinas (Unicamp) even against threats of withdrawal from one of its most prestigious members, the Getúlio Vargas Foundation (FGV). Using a host of primary sources related to the early years of Brazilian academic economics, the paper uncovers the process that led ANPEC, with strong support from the Ford Foundation, to adopt an inclusive and ‘pluralistic’ attitude, and how it related to the political context prevailing in Brazil during the 1970s.

*Key words:* pluralism, ANPEC, FGV, Unicamp, Ford Foundation, sociology of the economics profession.

## **RESUMO**

A economia acadêmica no Brasil é tradicionalmente caracterizada pela sua abertura para diferentes correntes teóricas. Em contraste com os padrões que prevalecem na maior parte da Europa e da América do Norte, a ciência econômica no Brasil pode ser adequadamente descrita como pluralista, com escolas de pensamento rivais usufruindo de posições institucionais relativamente seguras. Uma das razões frequentemente elencadas para explicar esse fenômeno é o papel desempenhado pela ANPEC na mediação de conflitos entre programas de pós-graduação afiliados a diferentes tradições de pesquisa. Um episódio crucial a esse respeito teve lugar no início da década de 1970, quando a recém-criada associação decidiu adotar uma atitude inclusiva em relação a seus membros, aceitando o pedido de filiação do programa fortemente heterodoxo criado na Unicamp mesmo diante da ameaça de retirada de um de seus membros mais prestigiosos, a Fundação Getúlio Vargas. Usando uma série de fontes primárias relacionadas aos primeiros anos da economia acadêmica no Brasil, o artigo desvenda o processo que levou a ANPEC, com o forte apoio da Fundação Ford, a adotar uma atitude inclusiva e ‘pluralista’, mostrando como ele esteve relacionado de perto com o contexto político brasileiro dos anos 1970.

*Palavras-chave:* pluralismo, ANPEC, FGV, Unicamp, Fundação Ford, sociologia da economia profissional.

*Classificação JEL:* B20; A14; A23.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

As commonly regarded by both inside and outside observers, Brazilian economicsexists within a markedly pluralistic academic environment. Scholars dedicated to a wide variety of heterodox theoretical traditions – post-Keynesian, evolutionary, Marxian, institutionalist, Sraffian, among others – occupy tenured positions in several of the country’s most prestigious universities, and in a host of smaller academic centers as well, co-existing in a reasonably peaceful manner with orthodox groups often within the very same institutions. Many of the top economics journals published in Brazil regularly feature papers dealing with non-mainstream topics, and the same pattern may be seen in the most important national event in the area, the ANPEC<sup>1</sup> annual meetings. Such pluralism in theoretical and methodological perspectives also seeps out to economics education, both at the graduate and undergraduate levels. As a compelling illustration, one may adduce the current resolution from the Brazilian Ministry of Education establishing minimum curricular requirements for bachelor programs in economics. In its second article, the resolution reads:

§3º When *laborating* pedagogic projects for bachelor programs in economics, the following requirements should be observed:

[...]

II – methodological pluralism, in consonance with the plural character of economic science, comprising diverse paradigms and currents of thought (*Resolução nº 4, de 13 de julho de 2007, Ministério da Educação, Conselho Nacional de Educação*)

Based on these norms, the Brazilian national exam of higher education (ENADE) typically features questions aimed at assessing student proficiency in different theoretical approaches to a given subject<sup>2</sup>. Contents usually covered include industrial organization, post-Keynesian and Marxian economics, economic history, history of economic thought, and economic methodology. Given the relevance of ENADE results for the prestige of bachelor programs, and its consequent signaling role for prospective students, there is a strong incentive for schools to include these contents in their curricular *structures*.

In a speech given at the ANPEC Annual Meetings in December 2015, the association’s first executive secretary, Paulo Haddad, recounted his experience ahead of ANPEC in the early 1970’s. In his account, he laid particular emphasis on a famous episode from 1973, when the Getúlio Vargas Foundation (FGV) – the most traditional Brazilian graduate school of economics – withdrew from ANPEC as a protest against the acceptance within its ranks of the new graduate program at the University of Campinas (Unicamp), which included several scholars inspired by Marxian theory and the ECLAC (CEPAL) structuralist tradition. In Haddad’s view, by holding its ground and not succumbing to pressure from the Vargas Foundation, ANPEC took a decisive stand in favor of pluralism in Brazilian economics. A similar version of this story has also been told by other contemporary witnesses (Versiani 1997, pp. 239-40). When recently interviewed by the authors, Haddad further reinforced his opinion that ANPEC was crucial in the creation of a pluralistic environment for academic economics in Brazil.

---

<sup>1</sup> Portuguese acronym for National Association of Centers for Post Graduate Economics.

<sup>2</sup> Past exams are available at <http://portal.inep.gov.br/enade/>.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the origins of pluralism in Brazilian economics, and to delve deeper into the role played by ANPEC as the institution in charge of mediating interaction and conflicts among the fledgling Brazilian graduate programs. In order to do so, the argument is divided into three sections, besides this introduction and a few concluding remarks. Section 2 attempts to characterize the pluralistic nature of Brazilian academic economics to the present day. Section 3 then goes back to the moment, in the late 1960's, when graduate training and research in the field were born, as a result of a joint effort by the Brazilian government and international institutions such as USAID and the Ford Foundation. The purpose here will be to catch a glimpse of the kind of economics the agents involved in this process wished to nurture. Finally, section 4 will put the episode involving FGV and Unicamp in the context of Brazilian politics at a time when the country experienced the darkest hours of a military regime, in order to explore its consequences for the attitude espoused by both ANPEC and the Ford Foundation regarding the future development of Brazilian economics.

## **2. PLURALISM IN BRAZILIAN ECONOMICS, NOW AND THEN**

Starting from the premise that there exist different schools of thought in economics, we may uncontroversially state that the intellectual field inhabited by economists is characterized by a plurality of theoretical approaches. Pluralism, on the other hand, refers to something altogether different: it constitutes a normative position, in the sense that “pluralism is a theory or principle that justifies or legitimizes or prescribes the plurality of items of some sort” (Mäki 1997, p.38). According to Hargreaves-Heap (1997), pluralism implies a political commitment to defending a given plurality.

When we speak of the pluralism prevailing in Brazilian academic economics, we refer to the possibility that economists adhering to a plurality of schools of thought in their professional practice, including those known as heterodox economists, can secure positions in the country's most important institutions – especially the universities. In order to establish a reference point, we can allude to the case of leading academic institutions in the US, where the number of people working within a heterodox framework has been constantly falling since World War II<sup>3</sup>. The presence of heterodox economists in US academia has decreased systematically, except within a very restricted set of universities that are not, however, ranked among the top-twenty (or even the top-fifty) of their kind in the country. The (in)famous case, begun in 2003, whereby the Economics Department at the University of Notre Dame was split in two, later leading to the dissolution of its heterodox branch, was allegedly motivated by a desire to improve the ‘quality’ of research in economics<sup>4</sup>. Most heterodox economists, as well as people working in what came to be considered marginal areas, such as the history of thought, are currently employed in liberal arts colleges and other institutions with smaller academic prestige. Moreover, people working on radical economics in high-profile universities normally obtain intellectual shelter in other departments outside economics.

---

<sup>3</sup> This process is described in the volume organized by Mary Morgan and Malcolm Rutherford (1998).

<sup>4</sup> On the origins of this process, see Donovan (2004), who describes how the former Department of Economics was split. Glenn (2009) writes shortly before the heterodox department emerging from the split was closed.

Contrariwise, heterodox economists in Brazil are able to work for some of the country's leading institutions. People who studied in heterodox graduate programs, either in the country or abroad, have managed to occupy important positions in different governments throughout recent history. Academic committees working on the evaluation of research in the field typically comprise a significant percentage of heterodox scholars. Finally, publications in certain heterodox journals are considered as relevant for the assessment of individual and institutional performance as those in the most prestigious mainstream outlets<sup>5</sup>.

One may, of course, refer to very distinct phenomena when using the label 'pluralism' to describe the institutional make-up of a plural academic environment. For one thing, the plurality can be either inter- or intra-institutional. In other words, one may have a situation in which a certain number of institutions embracing, *as a whole*, different theoretical perspectives coexist in the same academic environment, each of them presenting internal uniformity. Or else, we can think of a situation in which people adhering to distinct approaches work side-by-side within the same department. Even though they differ among themselves, it seems warranted to characterize both these scenarios as pluralistic.

Since no two people ever think exactly in the same way, pluralism must obviously relate to major theoretical and/or methodological differences. For instance, at the intra-institutional level, can we say that a department is pluralistic because it hires new classical macroeconomists with different evaluations of a given DSGE model? If this were not enough, would the requirement be fulfilled by hiring a new Keynesian? And at the inter-institutional level, would it suffice to find somewhere a cohesive department doing freshwater style macroeconomics, and somewhere else a department 100% saltwater style? Or would it be necessary to find a certain number of heterodox scholars or departments to characterize a pluralistic situation? We believe the latter to be the case.

Although we believe in the usefulness of the orthodox/heterodox divide as a way of characterizing a major split in the current state of the economics profession, we are aware that this classification has been criticized by authors such as Colander, Holt & Barkley Jr. (2004). Although the concept of 'heterodoxy' has remained mostly unchallenged, the idea of 'orthodoxy' superposes with other related concepts, such as 'mainstream' or 'neoclassical', which are frequently used as synonyms while having significantly different meanings. As Dequech (2007) emphasizes, 'mainstream' is essentially a sociological concept, referring to those seen as the most relevant and prestigious scholars at a given moment. The concept thus indicates that changes in the profession might conceivably lead to corresponding changes in which theories and methods are perceived as the most respectable. In Dequech's perspective, the current mainstream of the profession is formed *in part* by neoclassical economists: "Applying the sociological concept of mainstream economics to the period from the 1990s to the present decade shows that the mainstream is a diverse body of thought, formed by a neoclassical subset as well as other approaches" (Dequech, 2007, p. 285). On the other hand, the use of the term 'neoclassical' as a shortcut for the dominant perspective in contemporary economics has been criticized by Colander (2000), but this position itself later came under harsh criticism (Mirowski, 2013). In light

---

<sup>5</sup> One quick look at *Qualis*, the journal ranking used to evaluate graduate programs in Brazil, may suffice to offer a glimpse of such plurality. At the time of writing, the highest category, A1, included obvious titles such as the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, the *American Economic Review*, the *Journal of Political Economy*, and *Econometrica*, but also less usual choices: the *Journal of Post-Keynesian Economics*, the *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, the *Journal of Economic Methodology* and *History of Political Economy*. No Brazilian journal was ranked at this level.



of this, we will accept the premise that there is a fundamental theoretical split in contemporary economics and, moreover, that the orthodox/heterodox divide is still the one that best captures the overall picture, although notably missing important grey zones.

In order to identify the existence of pluralism in a given academic environment, intra-institutional analysis is rather straightforward. An institution (in our case, usually an economics department) can be considered pluralist if it comprises both heterodox and orthodox economists among its faculty. Since it does not seem reasonable to expect equal proportions for each group, and bearing in mind that some people are very difficult to classify under either heading, an adequate requirement seems to be a minimum representation for the minority group – the presence of an isolated dissident would thus not suffice to characterize pluralism<sup>6</sup>. It should also be kept in mind that size, here, does matter. Ten percent of a department comprising sixty scholars means a group of six people who can have strong interactions, recruit students, and gain momentum. As this number decreases, the stimulus for interaction will likely follow suit: ten percent of a ten-people department could hardly qualify as a plural situation.

To analyze inter-institutional pluralism, we now need to consider three distinct groups of institutions: orthodox, heterodox and pluralist. A given institution may be deemed pluralist if it reaches a minimum ‘threshold of plurality’; the same reasoning can be applied to an academic environment. We define a plural environment as one in which the sum of pluralist institutions and institutions adhering to the minority approach is larger than the number of programs pursuing the majority approach – in this case, we cannot speak of the ‘absolute’ dominance of any one perspective, be it orthodox or heterodox.

We applied this framework to interpret the Brazilian case, but before presenting our results, some clarifications concerning the Brazilian higher education system are in order. Differently from other countries, students in Brazil normally choose their degrees before they are even admitted to a university. In contrast with the US, people do not ‘go to college’ and subsequently choose a ‘major’ or ‘minor’ during their undergraduate years; rather, students are admitted to a specific career, and basically follow a rather fixed curriculum in order to obtain their degrees<sup>7</sup>.

In Brazil, bachelor programs in economics are typically organized by economics departments based in universities. In 2015, according to the Ministry of Education<sup>8</sup>, there were 377 universities offering degrees in economics; however, most of these are private universities or colleges relying on part-time professors, the majority of whom do not have a doctoral degree. Certainly, they do not represent the core of academic economics in Brazil. Bearing this in mind, we decided to focus our analysis exclusively on universities that offer graduate training in economics.

---

<sup>6</sup> To give one example: in a very orthodox Brazilian school, a well-respected economist, trained in engineering as an undergraduate student, and later obtaining a PhD in Economics from the University of Chicago, went through a ‘gestalt-switch’ and became a fierce critic of neoclassical theories. Consequently, throughout the last fifteen years before his retirement, he remained in absolute academic isolation at the institution, serving as the ‘critical spirit’ for his orthodox colleagues. Certainly, his presence would not be enough to characterize that university as pluralist.

<sup>7</sup> Some universities use, or at some moment used, a ‘common curriculum’ for certain careers; for example, in many institutions, students of business, accounting and economics were required to take the same courses during their first year. Besides, some universities are nowadays using a more flexible scheme, allowing the student to choose among a more diverse group of careers in their sophomore or junior years. Nevertheless, these cases are not the standard way of organizing the study of economics in Brazil.

<sup>8</sup> <http://emec.mec.gov.br/>, access on May 25, 2016.

In order to confer degrees, graduate programs in Brazil need to have their functioning authorized by CAPES, an agency of the Ministry of Education. This process places a minimum check on quality – much stronger, in our view, than in the case of undergraduate programs – while also generating valuable records. According to official data<sup>9</sup>, there are currently 51 institutions offering graduate programs in economics in Brazil, at three different levels: Academic Master's Degree (MA), Professional Master's Degree (MP) and Doctoral Degree (PhD). Some institutions offer courses at all three levels, others only at one or two. As the Professional Master's programs are not conceived for people willing to pursue an academic career, we did not include in our analysis the five institutions that only offered programs at that level. The remaining 46 institutions all maintain academic-oriented programs (MA and/or PhD), while some also offer MPs.

We analyzed each of these programs with the purpose of classifying them in one of three categories: orthodox, pluralist, or heterodox. To do this, we examined the faculty attached to each program. Graduate programs need to have a 'permanent faculty' (*corpodocentepermanente*) that normally does not include all department professors, but can also include a limited number of professors from other institutions. We then consulted the CVs of all 'permanent faculty' members, to evaluate if they qualified as either heterodox or orthodox<sup>10</sup>. Data on educational backgrounds, published works, and other information for Brazilian scholars are available at *Plataforma Lattes*, an encompassing database held by the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq).

Since people do not come with labels attached to their foreheads, we obviously had to classify scholars in one of the categories by interpreting the data available on their CVs. As already mentioned, there are grey zones where it may prove very challenging to classify people one way or another, but we tried to include the great majority of scholars in either category – even at the risk of being criticized by unsympathetic readers for pigeonholing the whole profession<sup>11</sup>. Having thus characterized their faculties, we then classified each program using the three categories mentioned above. Initially, we considered using a symmetrical classification: a program with a vast majority or totality of orthodox/heterodox scholars would be classified as orthodox/heterodox, while all the in-betweens would fall in the pluralist category. However, as heterodox programs are much less common worldwide, it seemed appropriate to be somewhat looser on this end of the distribution. We thus chose a criterion whereby a program is classified as 'orthodox' if heterodox scholars represent between 0 and 20% of its faculty; as 'plural', when heterodox scholars comprise between 20% and 60% of its faculty; and as 'heterodox' when more than 60% of its faculty can be thus characterized. Qualitative data such as mandatory courses, topics and methods of research, among others, have helped to improve and refine the overall classification, presented in Table 1.

---

<sup>9</sup><https://sucupira.capes.gov.br/sucupira/public/consultas/coleta/programa/quantitativos/quantitativoIes.jsf?areaAvaliacao=28&areaConhecimento=60300000>, access on May 15, 2016.

<sup>10</sup> Four of the 46 institutions offer each two Master's Programs evaluated by the economics committee (for example, one in "Economic Theory" and another in "Agricultural Economics"). In all of them, both programs followed the same general pattern in terms of the orthodox/plural/heterodox classification. Therefore, we decided to organize our analysis around institutions, not programs. On the other hand, some economic departments offer graduate programs not evaluated by the economics committee (for instance, programs in the "Interdisciplinary Area"). Such programs have been left out of our study. Of course, members of economics departments may belong to programs in areas as different as philosophy, statistics or medicine.

<sup>11</sup> Size is another important problem. Larger programs have around 50 professors, while the smaller ones have just seven or eight. Obviously, doubts about the 'label' to be attributed to each faculty member have a greater impact when analyzing the smaller programs.

The results of our exercise show a very different picture from the one characterizing the economics profession worldwide. Although, even despite our asymmetrical criterion, there are less heterodox than orthodox programs in Brazil, the sum of plural and heterodox programs is considerably larger than the share of orthodox programs. Another interesting feature is that this scenario has remained relatively unchanged for the last forty years or so. In 1973, when just a handful of graduate programs existed, they joined forces to create a national association, ANPEC, with the enthusiastic support of the Ford Foundation<sup>12</sup>. The association, in turn, promoted the creation of new programs, and by 1979 twelve of them were already functioning in Brazil. The expansion subsequently slowed down, and ANPEC decided not to automatically incorporate new programs into its deliberative council, establishing instead a set of quality standards for acceptance that has been the subject of frequent revisions. Despite those barriers to entry, fifteen additional programs have been admitted to the deliberative council since 1988. Some, however, did not manage to get in, and several new programs have been created in the last ten years due to accelerated expansion in the higher education system. The group of graduate programs not currently belonging to ANPEC’s deliberative council now gathers nineteen institutions.

**TABLE 1**  
**Brazilian Graduate Programs in Economics, theoretical orientation**

Institutions	Orthodox	Plural	Heterodox	Total
Traditional ANPEC programs (already existing in 1979)	5	3	4	12
Other ANPEC programs	6	6	3	15
Programs recognized by CAPES but not belonging to ANPEC	6	9	4	19
Total	17	18	11	46

Sources: *Plataforma Sucupira* (Capes) and *Plataforma Lattes* (CNPq), organized by the authors.

As Table 1 shows, however, in all these three groups the picture that emerges is the same: there are more orthodox than heterodox institutions, but the sum of heterodox and plural programs clearly surpasses their orthodox counterparts. This raises an essential question: how could Brazilian economics turn out to be so pluralistic? How did it manage to preserve this character amidst an orthodox tornado that blew off almost all fortresses of heterodoxy throughout the rest of the world? The remainder of this paper will try to offer some clues regarding possible answers.

<sup>12</sup> For an overview of the process leading to the creation of the first Brazilian graduate programs in economics, and subsequently of ANPEC, see Fernández & Suprinyak (2014).

### **3. AN AGENDA OF MODERNIZATION**

The first Brazilian universities only came to be created during the 1920s and 1930s. As far as economics is concerned, scattered courses had been offered in law schools during the 19<sup>th</sup> century, while schools of commerce were also inaugurated with the purpose of offering professional education that bear no relation to the state of economic theory as developed in Europe or the US at the time. The first economics program at the college level was born in 1905 (Castro 2001), having mostly accountants and lawyers as its lecturers – a feature that would characterize training in the field well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The first program offered by a proper university only began in 1945, in what is today the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro.

Although universities did not host noteworthy scholarship in economics during this period, significant quality research was being undertaken elsewhere in Brazil. Many self-educated people who had a practical knowledge of economic affairs worked in the government and the industrial sector. Moreover, intellectuals associated with the Communist Party and other leftist organizations produced highly-regarded work in the Marxian tradition. Among the prominent figures of mid-20<sup>th</sup> century Brazilian economics<sup>13</sup>, one ought to mention at least: Roberto Simonsen (1889-1948), an engineer and businessman who militated in favor of Brazilian industrialization; the Marxist lawyer and historian Caio Prado Junior (1907-1990), author of seminal early works on the economic history of Brazil; Eugenio Gudin (1886-1986), an engineer turned orthodox economist, who represented Brazil at the Bretton Woods conference; and especially Celso Furtado (1920-2004), a lawyer who obtained a Ph.D. in economics at the Sorbonne shortly after the war, and became one of the leading figures in the so-called Latin American structuralist school of economics that gravitated around CEPAL<sup>14</sup>. This eclectic list puts in evidence the plurality of positions adopted by Brazilian intellectuals dedicated to the study of economic topics during those years.

The 1960s witnessed profound transformations in the Brazilian system of higher education, partly resulting from a set of agreements between USAID and the Brazilian Ministry of Education that sought to introduce a more technical and applied bias at all levels of learning (Arapiraca 1979). An important element in this process was a norm issued in 1965 by the Federal Council of Education, establishing a framework for the creation of advanced graduate training programs that required a minimum amount of mandatory course load (Cury 2005). The period coincided with the initial involvement of the Ford Foundation with the social sciences in Brazil, a project in which economics always figured prominently. Ford's initiatives mostly revolved around creating and nurturing high-level academic institutions that could train the human resources and produce the knowledge inputs necessary for designing and implementing public policies tailored for the developmental challenges facing Brazilian society (Fernández & Suprinyak 2014). Given its pivotal role at the time, the Ford Foundation thus exerted significant influence over the normative standards that would subsequently guide the development of academic economics in Brazil.

---

<sup>13</sup> The two standard references for Brazilian economic thought around the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century are Bielschowsky (1988) and Mantega (1985).

<sup>14</sup> In English, ECLA, the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America. In 1984 the name was changed to add “and the Caribbean”, resulting in the current acronym ECLAC.

One of the crucial episodes for establishing such standards was the so-called Itaipava seminar, held in 1966. Dissatisfied with the overall quality of economics education in the country, a group of prominent Brazilian economists ‘invited’ the Ford Foundation to sponsor an intimate gathering where a diagnosis of the situation would be offered, and potential solutions discussed (Widdicombe 1966). Among the present were such notables as Antonio Delfim Netto, Mário Henrique Simonsen, Maria da Conceição Tavares, João Paulo dos Reis Velloso, Isaac Kerstenetzky, and Julian Chacel, many of them coming from different theoretical perspectives. The general tone of the discussion emphasized the outdated contents covered in most courses, and the consequent inadequate training in “modern” economic theory. As Simonsen put it, “the teaching of economics in Brazilian universities is as superabundant in quantity as it is deficient in quality (1966, p. 19). Among the “formative deficiencies” typical of a Brazilian student, he stressed: 1) “lack of basic knowledge in mathematics and statistics”; 2) “difficulties of logical reasoning and incomprehension of the scientific method”, with most graduates “not knowing what a model is nor what it intends to be”; 3) a “disjointed understanding of economic analysis”; 4) and the lack of knowledge regarding the instruments of economic policy used in Brazil (p. 20).

The solution envisaged by the participants involved creating academic programs that could provide what was variously described as “technical training”, “technological instruction”, or a “specialized technical culture”, properly combined with the capacity to “solve the problems of economic development” (Ferreira 1966). Even though there was some discussion regarding the professional profile most adequate for the private sector, the essential concern clearly lay elsewhere: 1) in the training of lecturers that could staff colleges around the country and raise the standards of undergraduate education; and 2) in the preparation of economists that could work in the government agencies responsible for designing developmental policies<sup>15</sup>.

João Paulo dos Reis Velloso, representing the Ministry of Planning’s Office for Applied Economic Research (EPEA)<sup>16</sup>, remarked that the problem should be discussed considering “the mechanism for planning and economic coordination that, notably through an administrative reform, it is intended to introduce in the country” (1966, p. 39). His proposal, therefore, aimed to offer a “quantitative and, notably, a qualitative idea of the technical personnel required for making the federal administrative machinery work with a minimum of efficiency and the necessary faithfulness to the established programs” (p. 40). Such requirements, of course, made it necessary to provide “special training programs for public administration, especially in the field of Economics and Economic Planning” (p. 42)<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> In the reading of Loureiro (1997), the establishment of a field of economists (in the sense of Bourdieu) in Brazil has always been closely related to the places occupied by them within the government apparatus. Before the creation of an academic institutional environment dedicated to the scholarly pursuit of economics, the most prominent Brazilian economists were typically trained on-the-job, in their capacity as members of government agencies in charge of producing relevant data and designing policies. Even after academic economics took root in Brazil, the relationship between scholars and the public sector has remained very strong.

<sup>16</sup> The Office would be converted, in 1969, into the Institute for Applied Economic Research (IPEA), having Velloso as its first president. IPEA remains, to this day, one of the most prominent technocratic agencies in the Brazilian state apparatus.

<sup>17</sup> The focus on ‘modern’, ‘technical’ training in economics that could serve as an intellectually legitimate input for policy-making and government action seems to fit well within the larger historical developments described by Theodore Porter (2006; 2009) and Marion Fourcade (2009).

The participants in that meeting implicitly supported the view that the burden of upgrading the professional skills of Brazilian economists should be shared among several institutions. Advanced graduate training for scholars and high-level bureaucrats was to be offered by the Vargas Foundation's recently-created School of Post-Graduate Economics (EPGE), and by the University of São Paulo's Institute for Economic Research (IPE). In addition, more focused, short-term extension courses would be organized by EPEA's Training Center, by ECLAC, and by the National Council of Economics (CNE). The latter, in fact, had already been offering one such 'revision' course since the 1950s, whose contents were organized around three modules: 1) quantitative methods, comprising mathematics, statistics, econometrics, and operations research; 2) microeconomic theory, covering consumer and firm theory, markets, and "industrial costs"; and 3) macroeconomic theory, under which heading were included national accounting, the theory of income determination and employment, monetary and fiscal policies, international trade, economic programming, and economic development. According to Manoel Orlando Ferreira, who represented the Council at the seminar, "opinions were growingly unanimous in defining a curriculum [similar to the one above] as the nuclear education for the professional economist working in the public sector" (1966, p. 34).

Simonsen also proposed a model curricular structure at the seminar, heavily based on the Master's course that had been inaugurated by the Vargas Foundation earlier that year. After stating that "each graduate program should have a certain flexibility for developing its own curriculum", Simonsen argued that, "for economic reasons, it would not be possible to elaborate programs as flexible as those in North American universities" (1966, p. 26). Some courses would thus have to be mandatory.

**TABLE 2**  
**Mário Henrique Simonsen’s proposal of mandatory courses for Brazilian graduate programs in economics, 1966**

Course offering	Contents to be covered	Reading list
Mathematics	Differential and integral calculus Differential equations and finite difference equations Linear algebra and linear programming	Granville, <i>Differential and Integral Calculus</i> de la Valée Poussin, <i>Cours d’Analyse Infinitesimale</i> Samuelson, Dorfman & Solow, <i>Linear Programming and Economic Analysis</i> Allen, <i>Mathematic Analysis for Economists and Mathematical Economics</i>
Statistics and Econometrics	Elements of probability calculus Frequency distribution Simple and multiple regression analysis Variance analysis Statistical inference Autocorrelation Identification Econometric models Index number theory	Hoel, <i>Introduction to Mathematical Statistics</i> Johnston, <i>Econometrics</i>
Microeconomic Theory	Consumer theory Production theory Partial equilibrium with perfect competition General equilibrium with perfect competition Imperfect competition theory Investment theory	Henderson & Quandt, <i>Microeconomic Theory</i> Friedman, <i>Price Theory</i> Baumol, <i>Operation Analysis and Economic Theory</i> Hicks, <i>Value and Capital</i> Samuelson, Dorfman & Solow, <i>Linear Programming and Economic Analysis</i>
Macroeconomic Theory	National accounting Neoclassical theory of short-run aggregate equilibrium Keynesian theory Inflation theory Growth models	Ackley, <i>Macroeconomic Theory</i> Dernburg & McDougall, <i>Macroeconomics</i> Baumol, <i>Economic Dynamics</i>

Source: Simonsen (1966, p. 27)

To Simonsen, mathematics, statistics and econometrics, microeconomic and macroeconomic theory constituted the “indispensable minimum”. He went as far as describing the contents to be covered, and the reading material to be used in each of these courses, as transcribed in Table 2. Simonsen was particularly concerned with avoiding that people trained in fields such as law or business administration would enter the new graduate programs, and the instrument he devised for such purpose was a rigorous admission exam covering mathematics, statistics, and economic theory. When discussing the possibility of attracting students trained in “related fields”, he mentioned engineers as particularly desirable recruits<sup>18</sup> (p. 24).

<sup>18</sup>Simonsen himself had been trained as a civil engineer.

**TABLE 3**  
**Curricular structure, Brazilian Master's programs in economics, 1966-1972**

Institution	First offering	Mandatory courses	Elective courses
School of Post-Graduate Economics, Getúlio Vargas Foundation (EPGE/FGV)	1966	Mathematics Statistics Econometrics Microeconomic theory Macroeconomic theory General economic theory Economic development Monetary theory and policy International trade	Fiscal policy Economic history History of economic doctrines Economic planning Brazilian economic problems Agricultural economics Industrial economics
Institute of Economic Research, University of São Paulo (IPE/USP)	1966	Mathematics Statistics Econometrics Price theory I & II Macroeconomic theory I & II	Public finance Economic development Human resources Monetary theory Industrial economics Agricultural economics Advanced econometrics Project analysis
Center for Development and Regional Planning, Federal University of Minas Gerais (CEDEPLAR/UFMG)	1968	Mathematics Statistics Econometrics Microeconomic theory Macroeconomic theory Spatial economics Methods of regional analysis	Project analysis Agricultural economics Economics of transportation Research methodology Sociology of development
Integrated Master's Program in Economics and Sociology, Federal University of Pernambuco (PIMES/UFPE)	1968	Mathematics I & II Statistics I & II Microeconomic theory I & II Macroeconomic theory International trade Economic development	Agricultural economics Economic history Economic geography Public finance Regional economics
Center for the Improvement of Economists in the Northeast, Federal University of Ceará (CAEN/UFC)	1972	Mathematics Statistics Econometrics Microeconomic theory I & II Macroeconomic theory I & II	International trade Economic development

Sources: Simonsen (1966); CEDEPLAR/UFMG, curricular structure, Master's Program in Regional Economics, 1970-72; Instituto de Pesquisas Econômicas, Universidade de São Paulo (1971); Baer (1974b); Baer (1975).

Simonsen's proposal eventually became a blueprint for the graduate programs in economics that were created in Brazil, with the support and close monitoring of the Ford Foundation, during the following years. Table 3 summarizes the curricular structure of some of the Master's programs inaugurated around that time. Despite some variation in the available electives, and the eventual addition of specific mandatory courses tailored for each program's specialty, the "indispensable" core of mathematics, statistics, econometrics, microeconomic and macroeconomic theory was a regular feature of all curricula.



The drive towards modernization that took hold of Brazilian economics in the late 1960s, therefore, revolved around cultivating advanced technical skills through a combined solid training in quantitative methods and standard economic theory. The variety of alternative theoretical and analytical approaches that existed in Brazilian economics during the 1940s and 1950s – as described, for instance, in Bielschowsky (1988) – scarcely made any impression either in the plans devised by the leaders of the ‘modernizing’ movement, or in their immediate concrete implementation. If anything, the consensus produced in Itaipava seems to have led to increased homogenization of curricular structures and contents, thus threatening to undermine the pluralistic traits that had characterized the Brazilian intellectual environment up until that moment.

Remarkably, this stands in stark contrast to the situation prevailing years later. A semi-official document produced by ANPEC in 1992, containing the results of a seminar on the teaching of economic theory for graduate students held the previous year, advances a rather more pluralistic stance. Andrade (1992), for instance, emphasized the existence of a remarkable degree of plurality among the different schools, while noting that this feature was not always observable inside each school, especially the smaller ones. In his turn, the orthodox economist Gustavo Franco – who would become president of the Brazilian Central Bank only a few years later – stressed that significant advances had taken place since Itaipava. He commented approvingly on the differences among schools, and referred to a couple of major traditions that divided the landscape: the followers of the North American mainstream, on one hand, and the scholars related to the CEPAL tradition, on the other. Regarding the implications of an academic environment marked by the coexistence of alternative, often conflicting approaches, Franco remarked:

There is a certain amount of interpenetration between those paradigms, which normally do coexist, in a way not entirely free of stress. In a certain way, the existence of these alternative paradigms is natural in the context of the expansion and differentiation of the teaching and research in economics in a ‘peripheral’ country. International and local influences will certainly interact and compete in a kind of ‘structural’ identity crisis that can be very rich and productive in the sense of bestowing its own identity to the practice of the profession in Brazil. Pluralism seems therefore an endogenous feature of the profession in the tropics and we certainly must regard it as something desirable (Franco 1992, p. 56)

How was it, then, that a community of scholars that once promoted a ‘technical’ training for economists, in which people holding rather different *Weltaanschauungen* all seemed to adhere to a homogeneous and non-conflictive view of what constituted economic knowledge, eventually became not only conscious of strong existing theoretical differences, but also proud of the diversity prevailing among its members? The next section sketches an explanation.

#### **4. ECONOMICS, IDEOLOGY, AND PLURALISM**

Given the political context surrounding the Ford Foundation's involvement with economics in Brazil, it eventually became problematic to legitimate such activities exclusively on the grounds of the 'technical' or 'modern' character of the knowledge they helped to produce. Since 1964, Brazil had been living under a military dictatorship, whose repressive and authoritarian nature became ever more apparent as the 1960s wore on. As Ford personnel discussed the relevance of their funded initiatives for policy-related purposes, and for dealing with the developmental problems faced by the country, they gradually became aware of the specific political agendas these projects were serving. While representatives in Brazil remained convinced of the possibility of developing 'policy-relevant' research without submitting to government pressure or control, the New York office expressed major concerns regarding the implications of such programs for both the Foundation's public image, and the values it professed to advance (Suprinyak & Fernández 2015).

The thorny moral dilemmas brought about by its involvement with applied social science research in the context of an increasingly unsavory military regime seem to have made the Ford Foundation particularly sensitive to the political and ideological implications of its activities in Brazil. While throughout the 1960s the emphasis lay on fostering 'policy-relevant' research that could help solve the problems of Brazilian economy and society, during the 1970s Foundation's representatives expressed growing concern with securing the preservation of spaces for the 'free interplay of ideas'. This shift of tone was encapsulated in a 1971 memorandum from Peter Reichard to Stanley Nicholson, head of Ford's Rio de Janeiro office at the time, suggesting a framework for evaluating the trade-offs implied by the social sciences program in Brazil. Drawing on a series of memoranda that had been recently exchanged on the subject, Reichard listed, as one of the positive factors potentially accruing from continued Foundation support, "the survival of a 'critical spirit' or 'some pluralism'" (Reichard 1971).

A symbolic moment in the creation of a new agenda of pluralism took place within the scope of ANPEC, which had been born in the early 1970s partly as an instrument for integrating the activities of Ford's beneficiaries in Brazil at the time (Fernández & Suprinyak 2014). After a sluggish start, the association was restructured and formally established in 1973, and from then onwards rose to become the most prominent institutional forum for Brazilian academic economics. One of the changes introduced at the time determined that ANPEC would not collect, administer, and distribute research funds in the name of its members, as had been originally envisaged. The association, it was argued, "should be, fundamentally, an organ for promoting interchange among the centers dedicated to graduate training in economics" (ANPEC 1973). Commenting on the impressions gathered during his recent visit to Brazil, Arnold Harberger advised the Foundation against insisting otherwise:

I do not [...] think that it would be productive to try to convert the Association into some sort of "central allocator of resources" for the profession. This in effect would convert it into a sort of battleground in which the various centers meet to compete for resources, rather than to collaborate in fostering the interchange of ideas within the profession. I might add that this judgment seems to be shared by members of the leading centers (Harberger 1973)

The perception that ANPEC could become a site of potential conflicts among the various programs proved prescient. The Vargas Foundation, one of the association's most prestigious members, failed to send a representative to the first meeting of the reformed council. Reporting on the results of this meeting, Werner Baer, Ford's program officer for economics in Brazil, mentioned he had discussed the issue in person with ANPEC's executive secretary, Paulo Haddad. The council had decided to approach Carlos Langoni, the absent Vargas representative, regarding "the reason of his absence and his future attitude in collaborating with the Association". "If his attitude is negative", Baer continued, "Haddad and Pastore<sup>19</sup> will speak directly to Mario Simonsen" (Baer 1973a). Such attempts must have been fruitless, for in December 26, 1973, Simonsen wrote a letter to Haddad communicating the Vargas Foundation's decision to withdraw from ANPEC. The reasons mentioned by Simonsen were:

- a) The divergence between the analytical orientation adopted by EPGE [the Vargas Foundation's School of Post Graduate Economics] and the one apprehended from the programs recently promoted by the association;
- b) The new purposes and interests of this school, which prepares itself to create a PhD program;
- c) The criteria that, starting next year, we will use for selecting our students (Simonsen 1973)

Two weeks later, Haddad and Colasuonno replied to Simonsen asking him to reconsider his decision. Even if the Vargas Foundation wished to organize its PhD program independently, and carry out its own admission exam, thus foregoing the unified exam promoted by ANPEC, withdrawal was not the necessary outcome. They also clarified further: "the direction given to the Association results from the consensus of ideas and programs among the directors of the 10 member-centers participating in the council" (Colasuonno & Haddad 1974). Once again, their conciliatory efforts were to no avail, since the root of the problem lay not on points (2) and (3), but rather on point (1). The "programs recently promoted" were a veiled reference to the University of Campinas' Department of Economics and Economic Planning (DEPE), a fledgling graduate program that had been admitted to ANPEC's membership earlier in the year. The Campinas program explicitly promoted heterodox theoretical traditions, in particular Marxism and ECLAC structuralism, and counted among its members with several scholars aligned to the political left, such as João Manoel Cardoso de Mello, Luís Gonzaga Belluzzo, Jorge Miglioli, and Wilson Cano<sup>20</sup>. Two important economists from Rio de Janeiro holding strong links with ECLAC, Maria da Conceição Tavares and Carlos Lessa, would join the program shortly thereafter. As a stronghold for both orthodox economic theory and political conservatism in Brazil, the Vargas Foundation initially resisted, and later reacted against DEPE's admission to the ranks of ANPEC<sup>21</sup>.

---

<sup>19</sup>Afonso Celso Pastore was a prominent young economist from the University of São Paulo (USP), who had succeeded Miguel Colasuonno as director of the Institute for Economic Research, home to USP's graduate program in economics.

<sup>20</sup>Unicamp also hired, around that time, Paulo Baltar, Liana Aureliano, Carlos Alonso, and José Carlos Braga, a group of Brazilian economists that had been living in Chile and returned after Pinochet's coup.

<sup>21</sup>In an interview published in Mantega & Rego (1999, p. 198), João Manuel Cardoso de Mello thus stated: "When we requested our admission to ANPEC, the Getúlio Vargas Foundation at Rio de Janeiro tried to prevent it, using an ideological argument."

The 1973 incident between the University of Campinas and the Vargas Foundation brought into sharp relief how challenging it might become to preserve even ‘some pluralism’ within the current Brazilian political context. Its deeper significance did not escape the Ford Foundation’s attention. In a March 1974 internal memorandum, Ford’s Bruce Bushey thus reported on what he termed “the EPGE question”:

We suspect the original decision was prompted by Carlos Langoni, who dislikes the Association because he fails to dominate it or even to play a predominant role in it. He resents Edmar Bacha’s influence in the Council and the reference to divergence in analytic orientation in Simonsen’s letter, which Langoni probably drafted, apparently accuses the Association of following Bacha’s neo-marxist approach. The accusation is inaccurate (Bushey 1974)

It thus became important to establish this inaccuracy, that is, to make it clear that ANPEC was not introducing a bias in favor of any heterodox approach, but rather safeguarding the conditions necessary for the open, free-spirited discussion of economic issues. Harberger himself had already alerted for the possible arising of ideologically-tinged conflicts among the association’s members:

[...] there seems to be a distinct possibility that strong decisions between the centers may emerge, with significant ideological (and perhaps methodological) overtures. I think the Foundation should use its influence, insofar as possible, to prevent this from occurring. It is much better if extreme views and sharp differences are associated with individuals rather than with centers [...] (Harberger 1973)

The Ford Foundation thus reconstructed the nature of its mission regarding Brazilian economics. The original task of ‘institution-building’ could already be considered as reasonably accomplished; crucial now was to guarantee the conditions for ‘community-building’. ANPEC, of course, was the essential instrument for this purpose, and the architect behind the new strategy seems to have been, once again, Werner Baer. In a lengthy report from 1974, he offered a historical account of the Foundation’s involvement with Brazilian economics, and individual assessments of its four main beneficiaries at the time: the universities of São Paulo and Brasília, CEDEPLAR, and ANPEC. Regarding the general state of the profession, Baer stated that “until recently there existed unbounded faith in neoclassical theory as the best tool for dealing with current problems. Brazilians are only now beginning to form some of the doubts which have been present for a longer period of time in the U.S. and Europe” (Baer 1974a). Baer then reinforced the point by quoting a report from Joel Bergsman: “In spite of the repression of political dissent in Brazil, I find a reasonable diversity of approaches, styles and social preferences underlying research here”. A good example of such departures from traditional standards was offered by the São Paulo program:

---

Totalitarianism was explicit. [...] We could only get accepted because FIPE [USP] took a firm attitude defending democratic pluralism, firmly defended by Affonso Celso Pastore and Miguel Colasuonno”.

A special effort has been made by the staff of IPE to offer courses such as history of economic thought, economic history, and sociology of development, in an attempt to provide economics students with a broader vision. In effect, IPE has made pioneering efforts in breaking out of the traditional mechanistic-type of economics teaching (Baer 1974a)

At CEDEPLAR, likewise, the fact that staff members had undertaken their graduate studies in different schools “assured a healthy diversity in methodological approaches”. All this culminated in the richness and vitality of the initiatives sponsored by ANPEC, about whose prospects Baer stated:

The Association should continue to play an important part in strengthening [member] centers, and, by serving as a clearinghouse for the intellectual output of Brazil’s economists, it should provide an intellectual pluralism which is a basic ingredient of a creative discipline (Baer 1974a)

As Ford’s field officer for the Brazilian economics program, Baer had direct access to sources of information that reflected the changing academic environment. In an April 1975 report on the Pernambuco program (PIMES), he remarked concerning the standards of graduate training:

In addition to giving the standard coverages in the theory courses, it is gratifying to see that an effort is being made to avoid giving a mechanistic and doctrinaire coverage of economic analysis. For instance, besides teaching standard neo-classical capital theory, some attention is also being paid to traditional and current critiques of that theory (e.g., the two Cambridge controversies) (Baer 1975)

Conversations with students at Brasília in 1976 revealed that, despite overall satisfaction, there was some discomfort with the “excessive dose of traditional neo-classical theory they were receiving” (Baer 1976b). A similar diagnosis emerged from the testimony of students at São Paulo:

The major complaint was about the overemphasis on techniques, on neoclassical theory, and not enough time spent on policy problems, economic history and some interdisciplinary seminars. Possibly the complaints of these students are part of a general malaise among the younger members of the Economics profession the world over with the overformalistic paradigm within which they are forced to operate and the increasing distance of this paradigm from many new real life problems. This is a topic that ANPEC should address itself to in order to establish some guidelines for all centers to develop their programs – i.e. add new topics without jettisoning all of established analysis (Baer 1976a)

ANPEC was thus portrayed as ideally placed for promoting diversity and broadening the horizons of Brazilian economics, and its leaders were eager to take on that role. Luis Paulo Rosenberg, who succeeded Haddad as the association’s executive secretary, emphasized the staff exchange program sponsored by ANPEC as one of its crucial initiatives. The program had been devised primarily in order to overcome specific staff deficiencies that plagued especially the less-developed programs. To Rosenberg, however, its real significance lay elsewhere:

[...] more than collaboration among the centers, we seek with this program to eliminate, at its origin, a danger that could compromise integration among the centers: the development of prejudices, related to superficial labels, identifying a center with the “Chicago approach”, another as “leftist” or else with a “Vanderbiltian” approach. We know that each center is an amalgam of influences, constituted by individuals who seek to analyze the problems of teaching in economics and the work of the economist in Brazil in a pragmatic and objective way. Only through academic interaction will such taboos be eliminated from the Brazilian scene, thus creating the conditions for an open and productive dialogue among the various centers (Rosenberg 1976)

The agitated context surrounding the activities of Brazilian economists generated “prejudices” that were as much theoretical as they were political and ideological. Under such conditions, ANPEC proudly undertook to zeal for the possibility of civilized academic conversation.

When the time came to renew its financial support to the association, the Ford Foundation was already completely convinced of the invaluable role played by ANPEC in order to sustain ‘some pluralism’ under the challenging circumstances prevailing in Brazil. In his recommendation for a supplemental grant in 1978, Shepard Forman described ANPEC as “an independent academic association devoted to critical inquiry on national economic issues” (Forman 1978). To Forman, the staff exchange program could “facilitate dialogue and quality control between the centers and help to minimize unproductive, parochial and partisan debates between isolated ‘schools’ of economics”. Additionally, when discussing the active role played by ANPEC in the recent creation of a new graduate program in “public sector” economics at the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, Forman stated:

According to ANPEC’s Executive Secretary, João Sayad, the PUC program offers a serious alternative to the conservative, neo-classical approach of the Fundação Getúlio Vargas. Attempting to mix theoretical and “applied” economics, it is attracting a new breed of students to graduate training in economics in Rio (Forman 1978)

The regular academic events sponsored by the association also offered

an indispensable forum for the free play of ideas on some of Brazil’s most basic economic issues. In point of fact, ANPEC is currently the major source of critical debate in Brazil on the fundamental economic problems of the day. As evidence of the importance of participation in this Association-sponsored dialogue, the Fundação Getúlio Vargas, which withdrew in 1974 partially on ideological grounds, wants to rejoin ANPEC (Forman 1978)

Forman’s assessment was fully subscribed by his colleague James Gardner. After qualifying the results of Ford’s investments in Brazilian economics as “quite spectacular”, he remarked:

More important than this quantitative growth, I think, has been the qualitative strength – and the increasing ideological diversity – of the Brazilian economics community. [...] the

Brazilian economics community is now beginning to diversify beyond what might earlier have been considered a narrower methodological and ideological perspective, to a more open and pluralistic set of perceptions (as variously reflected in the “Chicago orientation” of Pastore and Langoni and the Getúlio Vargas Foundation, or as reflected in the more “critical” perspectives of Malán, Bacha, and Campinas). And the Brazilian economics community is moving beyond a purely academic approach to narrow academic problems to a broader public discussion of economic and public policy issues (Gardner 1978)

Pluralism in Brazilian economics meant accepting methodological and ideological differences in the very same breath, and Gardner had no doubts concerning the importance of ANPEC in making this possible. After restating the Foundation’s interest in “the vitality and quality and ‘openness’ of the Brazilian economics community”, he characterized the association as “the key programmatic manifestation of this interest”. He then briefly described the invaluable services it provided, only to conclude: “If ANPEC didn’t exist we would have to invent it. And we did”.

## **5. CONCLUDING REMARKS**

On a January 1976 meeting of ANPEC’s council, the executive secretary was instructed to maintain contact with the Vargas Foundation’s EPGE in order to indicate the favorable disposition of other members towards its readmission. The association was becoming increasingly invested in its new personality as guardian of the ‘free play of ideas’ in Brazilian economics. In its request for a supplemental grant from Ford in 1978, ANPEC could boast that its annual national meeting “represents today the only forum for debate of economic and political issues of an authentically democratic nature in Brazilian society” (ANPEC 1978). Writing around the same time, Baer stated that the “distinct achievement of ANPEC is that it created a national community of economists” (Baer 1978). The Vargas Foundation program would be finally reintegrated in 1979, thus completing the association’s quest for the creation of an academic environment where pluralism, tolerance, and openness to debate were the structuring values.

This mission, however, was not part of its original design. Created “under the influence of the ideas raised in Itaipava” (Versiani 1997, p. 230), ANPEC was conceived as a means to coordinate institutional efforts geared towards elevating the quality of academic economics in Brazil. In the terms of Itaipava, however, this meant introducing a ‘technical’ and ‘modern’ framework heavily influenced by the standards currently prevailing in North American universities, with a clear bias towards standardization and instrumental neutrality. When the cause of pluralism appeared in Brazilian economics, it did so under the influence of a delicate political atmosphere, which made pluralism, since its very inception, as much an ideological as a theoretical and methodological matter. This may go some way towards explaining how scholars who, today, are associated to radically different approaches – such as Pedro Malan, Edmar Bacha, and the Campinas school – could be grouped together by contemporary observers.

Regardless of its political origins, however, the agenda of pluralism left deep imprints in Brazilian economics, which are strongly felt until the present day. As put by Flávio Versiani, ANPEC’s

executive secretary between 1978-80, “although *lefties* and *Chicago boys* kept attributing such epithets to each other – and eventually even more virulent ones – inside and outside of debates, expressions of intolerance such as took place in 1974 would not be subsequently repeated at ANPEC” (1997, p. 241)<sup>22</sup>. Brazilian economics may have been born ‘spontaneously’ pluralistic, but it became so by conviction during the 1970s. Credit for this outcome is certainly due to the institutions that embraced the agenda: ANPEC and the Ford Foundation. Regarding the latter, the dilemmas associated with supporting social science research in a country ruled by an authoritarian regime seem to have inclined Ford towards activities that seemed to preserve some room for open and critical inquiry. In contrast with the Chilean case, where the training of ‘technical’ economists was all but complete before the military takeover, in Brazil the Ford Foundation could perceive first-hand the risks involved in the enterprise. In addition, Ford’s Brazilian team seems to have nurtured spontaneous sympathies towards theoretical openness and diversity. As evidenced by the case of Werner Baer, one may conjecture that pluralism is also, at least in part, a fruit of the ‘Vanderbiltian’ heritage in Brazilian economics.

---

<sup>22</sup>Versiani attributes these ironic labels to Luis Paulo Rosenberg, ANPEC’s second executive secretary, who is said to have used them in a conference.



## REFERENCES

### DOCUMENTS IN THE FORD FOUNDATION ARCHIVES

- ASSOCIAÇÃO NACIONAL DE CENTROS DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM ECONOMIA (1973). *Relatório da Primeira Reunião do Conselho da Associação Nacional dos Centros de Pós-Graduação em Economia*, February 27, 1973; PA70-606, reel 5493.
- ASSOCIAÇÃO NACIONAL DE CENTROS DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM ECONOMIA (1978). *Pedido de Doação à Fundação Ford*; PA74-620, reel 2970.
- BAER, Werner (1973a). Inter-Office Memorandum, *First Meeting of the New “Conselho da Associação Nacional dos Centros de Pós-Graduação em Economia”*, to Stanley Nicholson, March 8, 1973; PA70-606, reel 5493.
- BAER, Werner (1974a). Inter-Office Memorandum, *Turn-Around Grants for Brazilian Economics: A Background Report*, to Stanley Nicholson, March 11, 1974; PA72-374, reel 6573.
- BAER, Werner (1974b). Inter-Office Memorandum, *Federal University of Ceará, CAEN (64-407A): Recommendation for a second supplemental grant*, to Stanley Nicholson and Robert McLaughlin, May 31, 1974; PA64-407, reel 3638.
- BAER, Werner (1975). Inter-Office Memorandum, *Federal University of Pernambuco, PIMES (770-0138): Recommendation for “A” status for supplement B*, to Robert McLaughlin, April 7, 1975; PA70-138, reel 5389.
- BAER, Werner (1976a). Inter-Office Memorandum, *Visit to IPE, June 21-23, 1976*, to Eduardo Venezian, July 1, 1976; PA65-007, reel 5335.
- BAER, Werner (1976b). Inter-Office Memorandum, *University of Brasília, Economics, 720-0379: Evaluation of 1975 Report*, to Eduardo Venezian, July 20, 1976; PA72-374, reel 6573.
- BAER, Werner (1978). *Letter to James Gardner*, February 6, 1978; PA74-620, reel 2970.
- BUSHEY, Bruce (1974). Inter-Office Memorandum, *The National Association of Graduate Centers in Economics: Annual Reports*, to Stanley Nicholson, March 18, 1974; PA70-606, reel 5493.
- COLASUONNO, Miguel & Paulo HADDAD (1974). *Letter to Mário Henrique Simonsen*, January 9, 1974; PA70-606, reel 5494.
- FORMAN, Shepard (1978). Inter-Office Memorandum, *Request for “A” Status: Association of Brazilian Postgraduate Centers for Teaching and Research in Economics (ANPEC)*, to James Gardner, May 5, 1978; PA74-620, reel 2970.
- GARDNER, James A. (1978). Inter-Office Memorandum, *ANPEC: Request for “A” Status*, to James Himes, May 5, 1978; PA74-620, reel 2970.
- HARBERGER, Arnold (1973). Inter-Office Memorandum, *Impressions, Judgments, Reflections etc., Gathered on my recent trip to Brazil*, to Stanley Nicholson, September 17, 1973; PA65-007, reel 5335.

INSTITUTO DE PESQUISAS ECONÔMICAS, UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO (1971). *Relatório Ford: o curso de mestrado*; PA65-007, reel 5335.

REICHARD, Peter J. (1971). Inter-Office Memorandum, *Social Science in Brazil and the University of Brasília*, to Stanley Nicholson, November 24, 1971; PA72-374, reel 6573.

ROSENBERG, Luis P. (1976). *Letter to Bruce Bushey*, March 23, 1976; PA74-620, reel 2970.

SIMONSEN, Mário H. (1973). *Letter to Paulo Haddad*, December 26, 1973; PA70-606, reel 5494.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

ANDRADE, Joaquim (1992). “Apresentação, Anais do Encontro da ANPEC sobre o Ensino de Teoria Econômica na Pós-Graduação”, *Literatura Econômica*, Número Especial: 45-49.

ARAPIRACA, José O. (1979). *A USAID e a Educação Brasileira: um estudo a partir e uma abordagem crítica da teoria do capital Humano*. (Dissertation, Master’s in Education), Fundação Getúlio Vargas – Rio de Janeiro.

BIELSCHOWSKY, Ricardo (1988). *Pensamento Econômico Brasileiro: o ciclo do desenvolvimentismo*, Rio de Janeiro: IPEA/INPES.

CASTRO, Nivalde J. (2001). *O Economista: a história da profissão no Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro: COFECON/CORECON-RJ/CORECON-SP.

COLANDER, David (2000). “The Death of Neoclassical Economics”, *Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 22 (2): 127-143.

-----, Richard HOLT & Barkley ROSSER Jr. (2004). “The Changing Face of Mainstream Economics”, *Review of Political Economy*, 16 (4): 485-499.

CURY, Carlos R. J. (2005), “Quadragesimo Ano do Parecer CEF Nº 977/65”, *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 30 (3): 7-20.

DEQUECH, David (2007). “Neoclassical, Mainstream, Orthodox and Heterodox Economics”, *Journal of Post-Keynesian Economics*, 30 (2): 279-302.

DONOVAN, Gill (2004) “Economics Split Divides Notre Dame”, *National Catholic Reporter*, April 9. [[http://natcath.org/NCR\\_Online/archives2/2004b/040904/040904c.php](http://natcath.org/NCR_Online/archives2/2004b/040904/040904c.php)], access on May 15, 2016.

FERNÁNDEZ, Ramón G. & SUPRINYAK, Carlos E. (2014). “Creating Academic Economics in Brazil: the Ford Foundation and the beginnings of ANPEC”, *Cedeplar Working Paper no. 514*, Belo Horizonte.

FERREIRA, Manoel O. (1966). “A formação do economista no Brasil”, *Revista Brasileira de Economia*, 20 (4): 31-38.

FOURCADE, Marion (2009). *Economists and Societies: discipline and profession in the United States, Britain, and France, 1890s to 1990s*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

FRANCO, Gustavo (1992). “Tendências dos Programas de Economia no Brasil”, *Literatura Econômica*, Número Especial: 50-57;

- GLENN, David (2009). “Notre Dame Plans to Dissolve the 'Heterodox' Side of Its Split Economics Department”, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 16. [<http://chronicle.com/article/Notre-Dame-to-Dissolve/48460/>], access on May 15, 2016.
- HARGREAVES-HEAP, Shaun (1997). “The Economic Consequences of Pluralism”. In Andrea SALANTI & Ernesto SCREPANTI, eds., *Pluralism in Economics*. Cheltenham (UK) & Brookfield (US): Edward Elgar, p. 282-294.
- LOUREIRO, Maria R. (1997). *Os Economistas no Governo: gestão econômica e democracia*, Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas.
- MÄKI, Uskali (1997). “The One World and the Many Theories”. In Andrea SALANTI & Ernesto SCREPANTI, eds., *Pluralism in Economics*. Cheltenham (UK) & Brookfield (US): Edward Elgar, p. 37-47.
- MANTEGA, Guido (1985). *A Economia Política Brasileira*, São Paulo/Petrópolis: Polis/Vozes.
- & José M. REGO (1999). *Conversas com Economistas Brasileiros II*, São Paulo: Editora 34.
- MIROWSKI, Philip (2013). *Never Let a Serious Crisis Go to Waste: how neoliberalism survived the financial meltdown*, London: Verso.
- MORGAN, Mary & Malcolm RUTHERFORD (eds.) (1998). “From Interwar Pluralism to Postwar Neoclassicism”, *History of Political Economy*, Annual Supplement to volume 30.
- PORTER, Theodore M. (2006). “Speaking Precision to Power: the modern political role of social science”, *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 73 (4): 1273-94.
- PORTER, Theodore M. (2009). “How Science Became Technical”, *Isis*, 100: 292-309.
- SIMONSEN, Mário H. (1966). “O ensino de economia em nível de pós-graduação no Brasil”, *Revista Brasileira de Economia*, 20 (4): 19-30.
- SUPRINYAK, Carlos E. & FERNÁNDEZ, Ramón G. (2015). “Funding Policy Research Under ‘Distasteful Regimes’: the Ford Foundation and the social sciences at the University of Brasília”, *Cedeplar Working Paper no. 520*, Belo Horizonte.
- VELLOSO, João P. R. (1966). “Treinamento informal em Economia e a eficiência do setor governo”, *Revista Brasileira de Economia*, 20 (4): 39-46.
- VERSIANI, Flávio R. (1997). “A Anpec aos 25 Anos: Passado e Futuro”, *Revista ANPEC*, 1: 219-259.
- WIDDICOMBE, Stacey J. (1966). “Introdução sobre o Seminário de Itaipava”, *Revista Brasileira de Economia*, 20 (4): 7-8.