INVITED PAPER

(DE)FETISHIZATION OF ACADEMIC PRODUCTIVITY: CHALLENGES FOR THE WORKER-RESEARCHER

(DES)FETICHIZAÇÃO DO PRODUTIVISMO ACADÊMICO: DESAFIOS PARA O TRABALHADOR-PESQUISADOR

(DES) FETICHIZACIÓN DEL PRODUCTIVISMO ACADÉMICO: RETOS PARA EL TRABAJADOR-INVESTIGADOR

ABSTRACT

Worker-researchers complain that they have to do more than they want or can. They criticize, but stick with it. Analyses of academic productivity hold international and Brazilian organisms (such as CAPES) and the current system responsible; and not without reason. But the results are scant changes and resignation. In this work we examine how, starting in the 19th century, the complex 'social engineering' that commands the world with its overlapping of long-lasting historical processes was structured. The rise of human and social sciences and the commitments they sealed with governments and business men early on is emphasized. The election of Education, Science and Technology as central to promoting economic and social progress reduced the University, predominantly to the role of executor (thinking itself to be autonomous, it is a hostage). While it is capital that needs the knowledge generated by the worker-researchers to reproduce itself, the latter experience the intensification and alienation of their work; such dependence points to the challenge of exercising their power.

KEYWORDS Academic productivity, worker-researcher, economics, human and social sciences, long-lasting history.

Ana Maria Netto Machado laborescrita@gmail.com
Professor at the Education Postgraduate Program – Universidade do Planalto Catarinense – Lages – SC, Brazil

Lucídio Bianchetti lucidio.bianchetti@pq.cnpq.br
Professor at the Center for Education Sciences – Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina – Florianópolis – SC, Brazil

RESUMO O trabalhador-pesquisador reclama fazer mais do que quer ou pode. Critica, porém acata. Análises sobre produtivismo acadêmico responsabilizam, não sem razão, organismos internacionais e nacionais e o sistema vigente. Observam-se, no entanto, mudanças escassas e resignação. Examinamos neste trabalho como se estruturou, a partir do século XIX, a complexa engenharia social que comanda o mundo, com a sobreposição de processos históricos de longa duração e decisivos no Ocidente. Destaca-se o surgimento das ciências humanas e sociais e seus compromissos cedo selados com governos e homens de negócio. A eleição de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia como centrais para promover progresso econômico e social reduziram a Universidade, predominantemente, à executora e refém, não autônoma. Enquanto é o capital que precisa do conhecimento gerado pelos trabalhadores-pesquisadores para reproduzir-se, estes vivenciam a intensificação e alienação do seu trabalho; tal dependência aponta para o desafio de exercer seu poder.

Palavras-chave Produtivismo acadêmico, trabalhador-pesquisador, Economia, ciências humanas e sociais, história de longa duração.

Resumen *El trabajador-investigador protesta de hacer más de lo que quiere o puede. Critica, pero acata. Análisis sobre el productivismo académico responsabilizan, no sin razón, organismos internacionales y nacionales y el sistema vigente. Se observan, sin embargo, pocos cambios y resignación. Examinamos en este trabajo como se ha estructurado, desde el siglo XIX, la complexa ingeniaría social que comanda el mundo, con la imbricación de los procesos históricos de larga duración y decisivos en el Occidente. Se destaca el surgimiento de las ciencias humanas y sociales y sus compromisos a la corta sellados con gobiernos y empresarios. La elección de Educación, Ciencia y Tecnología como claves para promover progreso económico y social han reducido la Universidad, predominantemente, a ejecutora y rehén, no autónoma. Mientras que es el capital que necesita del conocimiento generado por los trabajadores-investigadores para reproducirse, eses han vivenciado la intensificación y alienación de su trabajo; tal dependencia apunta para el reto de ejercer su poder.*

Palabras clave *Productivismo académico, trabajador-investigador, Economía, Ciencias humanas y sociales, historias de larga duración.*

ACADEMIC PRODUCTIVISM UNDER ANALYSIS: WHAT WE ALREADY KNOW SO WELL...

In previous texts, we discussed how we Brazilian researchers involved in postgraduate (PG) courses, are "Hostages of Productivity..." and faced with a "Publish or Die?!" (BBIANCHETTI, MACHADO, 2007) situation. In those studies, we analyzed the context and the impact of PG policy changes on the quality of production and the health of researchers. Sguissardi e Silva Jr. (2009) investigated the conditions of researchers in Federal universities and the effects of so-called "academic productivism"; De Meis and others (2003) addressed health hazards in researcher careers by exploring anthropological elements in his analysis of PG; the ANDES journal, *University and Society* (a. XVII, n 41, Jan./2008: www.andes.org.br), dedicated a special issue to the subject of "Production *versus* Productivism and work precarity," and the ADUSP journal (n. 45, out./2009: www.adusp.org.br), featured an entire session to the question; Duarte Jr. (2010) included a corrosive chapter in his work, designating texts resulting from the productivist induction as "*rotten papers*" (similarly to those causing the recent global financial crisis). We could expand the list of studies on this problem in the past decade to reveal its seriousness and the interest it has aroused.

The inventory of risks includes a long list of symptoms associated with requirements that accumulate to such an extent that even gods possessing ubiquity could not meet them - high blood pressure and cholesterol levels, heart attacks, tendinitis, conflicting demands, imperiously requested presence at several different, distant places at the same time (partly enabled by technology). Memory problems, reports, article assessments for journals, events and selection programs, studies for seminars, lectures, conferences, presentations, classes at undergraduate and PG courses, supervision tasks; traveling, fund seeking; banking, meetings, advisory; writing, reading, data collection for the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Level Personnel (CAPES), the Lattes curriculum system... In other words, unaccounted labor cost, forced work, general degradation. Intellectuals are currently being co-opted by the bureaucratic machine of assessment and promotion (RIQUELME, 2008; JANTSCH, 2010); have we become a mixture of demigods, masochists and bureaucrats?!

"WHY, AFTER ALL, DO WE DO MORE THAN WE WANT AND MORE THAN WE CAN?"

Bourdieu (1976, p. 31) proposed this question more than 20 years ago. Researchers have been seeking to answer it by considering the inventory above from different angles: 1) from the viewpoint of recent history, by studying facts that triggered the configuration of Brazilian universities (especially regarding PG), with a strong criticism of the regulatory procedures adopted by CAPES, ascribing ultimate responsibility to external agents and the compulsory integration into globalization; 2) approaches regarding changes in national (and international) policies on higher education (and science and technology), often discussing the polarization between public *versus* private university, in defense of the former.

In short, academic productivism has been investigated and denounced; it causes discomfort and provokes jokes. Both national and international approaches are say in unison that capitalism is on trial - with more and more adjectives added to it: academic capitalism" (SLAUGHTER e RHOADES, 2004; PARASKEVA, 2009).

How moralistic are these analysis and how justified are they in blaming the government/CAPES, while not being able to understand the "quagmire" of historical , social, institutional and personal elements involved – as legendary Brazilian politician Leonel Brizola would say? Would these explanations lack the heuristic power to promote change? Let us admit that, despite all criticism, adjustment is seen among researchers, complaints have dwindled (some irony with a cathartic effect - like Greek tragedy - is part of everyday life among peers, following the "good morning" of every endless work day). The subject wears out, leaving a humiliating resignation that is carried like another burden of the craft: travail resumes its etymology, *tripallium*. Consolation prizes arise: celebrating Brazil's upward *ranking* in international scientific production; being proud of the discoveries and inventions of Brazilian science in everyday media. Finally, the worker-researcher category has prestige.

Despite the effort to understand/control the determinants of shared reality, we are still chained to the "unthinking, pre-reflective complicity incorporated through selection and classification ways," i.e., the ways "social agents [in this case, researchers] adhere

to the established order," as referred by Valle (2007, p. 127), inspired in Bourdieu. Old antinomies with a paralyzing effect can be clarified from his notion of praxeological knowledge. This notion

> [...] seeks to overcome a classic dilemma of sociological thought, founded on the opposition of two empirical research perspectives considered incompatible: subjectivism, which assumes the possibility of immediate perception of another person's lived existence, and considers such perception as a fairly appropriate form of knowledge of the social world; and objectivism, which assumes a rupture with immediate experience by setting aside the first experience of the social world and clarifying structures and principles - inaccessible to any immediate perception - on which this experience is founded. (VALLE, 2007, p. 120)

Considering these categories, would subjectivism prevail? In order to leave subjectivism and understand what is being experienced, we turned to Eric Hobsbawm, Immanuel Wallerstein, Norbert Elias and Latin American researcher Ariel Langer, authors who analyze the so-called long-term historical processes, large civilizational processes that have been interacting for centuries, thus becoming so complex and entangled that it is difficult to distinguish their intricate elements.

RETURNING TO THE PAST TO UNDERSTAND THE PRESENT

Our aim is to investigate how relationships were built between universities, science, government and economy (industries / businesses), the compromises between some of these spheres at crucial points in history - sometimes large scale events such as the Industrial and French revolutions, as well as other, more limited ones, such as presidential acts - often with no involved group called forth to sanction them or ever becoming aware of them.

As a *leitmotiv* for the discussion, we question a few subjects/concepts dear to the university, such as institutional autonomy and academic freedom (FLICKINGER, 2003; WEBER, 1989), confronting them with notions such as "interest-disinterest" in order to deconstruct academic myths (SCHWARTZMAN, 2008; COMTESPONVILLE, 2005) from the classical tradition that are nothing but common sense, although they remain "untouchable" in academic discourse. Making distinctions, reducing inaccuracies and eliminating conceptual confusion is, within the scope of this study, our aim.

AN ECONOMIC, POLITICAL OR SOCIOCULTURAL PERSPECTIVE? SEEING THE WORLD AND HISTORY FROM ONLY ONE OF THEM... IS INSUFFICIENT!

Wallerstein (2006) undertook to criticize the nineteenth century social science, but he confesses that his criticism was left unfinished, because we have not been able

> [...] to find a way to overcome the most resistant (and misleading) legacy of nineteenth century social science - the division of social analysis into three arenas, three logics, three "levels": economic, political and sociocultural. This trinity is laid in the middle of the path, in granite, blocking our intellectual advance (p. 12).

He continues on the same page: "Maybe it is imperative that the world changes a little more before scholars can theorize about it profitably." This warning to intellectuals gives clues about the ineffectiveness of our explanations of productivism; heavily relying on viewing one of the spheres, they are attached to problems typical of the European classic tradition that were transferred into the reality of a colonized country such as ours used to be/still is, and do not sufficiently connect the three arenas. From each of them, views of one same event can be so different and distant that common points can be difficult to perceive. Segmented and incomplete, such analyses have too weak an effect on the reality they are meant to clarify and transform.

Studies produced within the university have only recently begun to consider movements / tendencies in the business sectors (there are connections, albeit covertly). Making them appear is, according to Bourdieu (1976), a service that sociology can provide to the dominated: unmasking domination mechanisms disguised as "legitimate" instruments.

INTERESTS AS POINTS OF COMPROMISE BETWEEN ECONOMY, POLITICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: WHO IS INTERESTED IN WHOM?

One possible way to reveal unnoticed connections is to historically search how universities became a target to the interests of capital (LANGER, 2008). And in what ways did government agencies (such as CAPES) become mediators and spokespeople of those interests, translating them into demands and transmitting them to the university as requirements or exogenous interference, soon interpreted (within universities) as a confiscation of academic autonomy and freedom?

A fast track about such a complex, overdetermined subject involves risks that we will take in order to: 1) connect sparse elements that help understanding the overwork problem we can barely stand; 2) provoke the community of peers to become conscious of its role, power and the alienation in which we live as a "new" category of workers.

Langer (2008) places the first connection of economy, government, science and universities at the end of World War II, when a new economic order was established and then U.S. President FD Roosevelt requests his scientific research and development office to invest in basic research at universities so that it would "soon spread across the economy in the form of technological applications" (p. 23, translated for this paper). It was the first attempt to an explicitly public plan for a country's scientific system: "the planning of education, science and technology is in the heart of the reproduction planning of capital" (LANGER, 2008, p. 23, translated for this paper). Investments in studies were made throughout the 1960s and 1970s, when concepts, theories and consensus were created (both in the political and academic fields) about the potential of these three dimensions to generate wealth and welfare, and as a strategy for countries / regions to become economically competitive. The kind of relationship that education, science and technology should establish becomes the object of thought. It is worth to enquire: who was thinking about it?

In the following decades, it became a worldwide consensus that education for populations and scientific knowledge (the ability to generate new knowledge and transform it into technological innovation) are essential to national economies, since those are responsible for social and economic development. In this context, the concept of *human capital*, which relates education level rise and income rise, earned Schultz and Becker the Nobel Prize for Economics (1979, 1992 respectively).

According to Langer (2008), in the 1970's, sociology focuses on studying knowledge, and Daniel Bell designs the concept of *post-industrial society*, where science and technology affect and change the structure of society (hence the phrase "knowledge society", made popular by Drucker and Toffler). Gradually, this triad (education, science and technology) starts to be considered a problem of states, which promote it through massive, unprecedented investments. This scenario described by Langer triggers events at the level of governments and intergovernmental forums. The university played a limited role in these processes, although it accounts for much of the execution of their decisions (in education as well as scientific training and production).

WILHE UNIVERSITIES WERE MADE PROTAGONISTS IN GOVERNMENT AGENDAS, PROFESSORS CONTINUED TO DISPENSE EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Since the establishment of the university (in Brazil), this reality has been perceived only by a few intellectuals engaged in various spheres of government (would they be the organic intellectuals of Gramsci?). For professors, the situation was different because the universities were generally disconnected from the problems that the government wanted to solve and for which they conceived / implemented strategies meant to perform the changes planned at global levels of administration.

In 1945, Brazil had only five universities; the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) and CAPES were being created (1951), and their roles were different from current ones. Initially, CAPES, designed and coordinated by Anísio Teixeira, and aimed to "eradicate" non-certified teaching from universities (the country lacked higher education professors; doctorates were obtained abroad and the purpose of PG was not research). Universi-

ties appeared late in Brazil - in the twentieth century (the University of São Paulo was founded in 1934); they focused on the elite and followed the Napoleonic professional training model. Research was the responsibility of institutes rather than universities (MACHADO and ALVES, 2011).

It was not until the organization of the PG system, with the National Plans for PG, during the military regime, that research was introduced in universities as their role. Although the 'teaching, research and extension' set was included in Act 5540/68 (see FÁVERO, 1977), it took decades for it to be incorporated because the teaching tradition was strong in the professional schools that joined to form universities. In Brazil, research and PG histories are different and cannot be confused.

PROFESSORS SURPRISED BY CAPES! FROM TEACHER TRAINERS TO RESEARCHER TRAINERS!

Brazilian universities used to fulfill their role of higher education training for the elites (teaching) when, suddenly, training higher education teachers ceased to be a priority (a goal considered as achieved): Master's and Doctoral programs were now to train researchers (KUENZER, MORAES, 2005) in a managed pace. This concept of university, inspired by the *Humboldtian* model (HUMBOLDT, 1997, MACHADO and MENDES, 2009) was introduced from above, particularly impacting the segment capable of researching and training researchers, causing confusion, resistance, uncritical acceptance and adherence, with little clarity among teachers about its meaning, justification and necessity. The land was not prepared to have these changes implemented by the time they were felt in universities: the mid-1990s. Therefore, PG ranks were summoned to meet new goals that universities had not planned. Control, reward and punishment devices were implemented, turning this induction into a straitjacket. Results were quickly felt in quantitative terms. The spectacular performance in record time, however, with its internationally visible figures (2% of the world's production of *papers*), the pride of educational authorities, has only recently begun to produce results in terms of the applications expected from university research.

WHILE IN EUROPE RESEARCH WAS COLLABORATING WITH INDUSTRY FOR "PROGRESS", IN LATIN AMERICA, THERE WAS LITTLE RSEARCHE, SELDOM CONNECTED WITH EXISTING PROBLEMS...

...whether related to social or business issues. Herrera (*apud* LANGER, 2008, p. 49, translated for this paper) states:

> Indeed, in advanced countries, most of the innovation and development are related to issues directly connected with their national objectives, whether for defense, social progress, prestige and so on. Scientific progress immediately reflects on their industry, agricultural technology and, generally, on continuous increase of production. In Latin America, by contrast, most of the scientific research has little connection with the basic problems of the region. This mismatch between scientific research goals and the needs of society is more relevant as an underdevelopment feature than the shortage of research, and it is too well known to require proof.

This statement is four decades old and it remains valid. The closeness/connection between science (university) and industry (business) has existed in Europe since the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, amid the splendor of the Enlightenment, says Hobsbawm (2010), who steps back in time to extend the explanation of Langer. The later has shown the consensus on the triad education, science and technology to have been built outside universities and brought later into them by governments assisted by international organizations (WB, IMF, WTO, OECD, UNESCO, ECLAC, etc.). Hence the surprise of teachers with the changes transmitted by CAPES in the mid-1990s; these changes were first felt in the control of duration (two years for master's degrees and four doctoral degrees): the factory-like system has been implemented and workers-intellectuals were living in urgency mode (CUNHA; Lauder, 2009).

One pertinent question is: how were governments convinced that the best way to generate economic growth and social welfare was the formula "education associated to the production of scientific knowledge"? Behind the advance of these theses towards worldwide consensus was - and still is - the interest of the

productive sectors (businesses), hidden among noble, humanitarian goals (Paraskeva, 2009), resulting in the commoditization of education and research.

Neither new nor recent, the interest of companies in scientific knowledge is found in the late eighteenth century, when science was already producing for the early industry (Europe) during the Industrial Revolution, as shown Hobsbawm (2010, p. 47):

> The Sciences, not yet split by nineteenth-century academicism into a superior 'pure' and an inferior 'applied' branch, devoted themselves to the solution of productive problems: the most striking advances of the 1780s were those of chemistry, which was by tradition most closely linked to workshop practice and the needs of industry. The Great *Encyclopaedia of Diderot and d´Alambert* was not merely a compendium of progressive social and political thought, but of technological and scientific progress. For indeed, the "Enlightenment", the conviction of the progress of human knowledge, rationality, wealth, civilization and control over nature with which the eighteenth century was deeply imbued, the 'Enlightenment', drew its strength primarily from the evident progress of production, trade and the economic and scientific rationality believed to be associated inevitably with both.

This quote shows the extent to which historical processes interpenetrate into a complex contexture, making it easier to understand how we have come to our current situation. The Enlightenment, which is generally considered as a noble, cultural scholar movement, the Enlightenment, is pervaded by several other processes occurring more or less simultaneously in Europe, resulting in alliances between science and the financial interests of the time, thus unmasking the widespread idea of science as a disinterested pursuit of truth, essentially based on mythical constructs (SCHWARTZMAN, 2008; BOURDIEU, 1976).

As he analyses the conditions that made the Industrial Revolution possible in England, Hobsbawm (2010) affirms that, by that time, "politics were already geared to profit" (p. 64). And even if businessmen's specific demands might

> encounter resistance from other vested interests [...] the agrarians were to erect one last barrier to hold up the advance of the industrialists between 1795 and 1846. On the whole, however, it was accepted that money not only talked, but governed. All the industrialist had to get to be accepted among the governors of society was enough money.

From these considerations, it is not difficult to understand *who* convinced the governments of nations about the strategic role of the triad education, science and technology, and the need, at all costs, to make it work for the interests of market. However, there was an obstacle: it was necessary to convince the intellectuals, who loved knowledge and were capable of analyzing critically, so that the work of those whose education had reached high levels could also be made to serve the market economy. Laden with contradictions, the arguments were developed by linking the idea of economic growth to social welfare, as if the former directly and automatically implied the latter. From the widespread acceptance of this premise, backed by economic theories, the road was open for what the business sector needed: to increase its accumulation chances by accelerating research that generated innovation and increased competitiveness, promising redistribution (Caillé, 2007) and social benefits in a "sure" future. Through scientific management strategies (Vinokur, Sigman, 2010) and under the aegis of "cult of urgency" (AUBERT, 2003), CAPES, conducted by our peers and supported by other funding agencies, has managed to accomplish the "universal" goals whose ultimate command and invisible hand come from afar.

In 2009, the World Conference on Higher Education (CMES2009) was held in Paris (UNESCO). The attendance could see that the protagonists of such international discussions belonged to a circuit different from the academic; such leaders become legitimate (Bourdieu, 1976) by legal devices of democracy meant to ensure that populations have their will represented. The decisions made by ruling staffs in these "legitimate" forums will eventually be implemented locally in the different countries and their micro-regions. The university, in its research segments, has become a hostage of capital, and researchers, the newest category of exploited workers, with no factories, conveyor belts or timecards required.

For many scholars, a closer relationship between universities and companies is problematic (DAGNINO, 2010) and it has been fought / criticized, which has not prevented it from occurring, with the complicity and collaboration of researchers, albeit thwarted. One of the arguments for this restriction is based on that the

university would be forsaking its identity and traditional purpose of "disinterested search for truth," and bowing to the interests of capital, represented particularly by the business sector. This holds true in many aspects, but is also fallacious in others.

THE BIRTH OF SOCIAL SCIENCES - OF HOW THEY GAIN ASCENDANCY OVER GOVERNMENTS TO END AS ACCOMPLICES OF CAPITAL

According to Wallerstein (2006), by 1789, there were only a few universities in Europe - ritually dying entities that were not actual intellectual centers; they were still organized in the traditional four faculties: theology, philosophy, law and medicine. Elias (2006, p. 187) explains that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries:

> the accumulation of knowledge about humans available in society was so small that curiosity about social problems could be satisfied, in many ways, just with the solitary exercise of thought or by applying general ideas about God and the world.

That was a task for philosophers. By the late nineteenth century, however, new chairs were being organized in non-university associations, whether national or international (Wallerstein, 2006), and social science was to become institutionalized within the traditional structure of the European university - an unprecedented social investment. This institutionalization was required because, by this time, the eternity of things hitherto valid was in question (theocentricism *versus* anthropocentrism). After the French Revolution, the power of sovereigns, clergy and ministers to control "the paths of society or even to know where one was going" (ELIAS, 2006, p. 188) was melting away, since social changes were now determined by anonymous forces, not the result of "good" ideas, intentions or plans of rulers anymore.

Those who held the power in traditional societies were no longer considered the ultimate source of laws, which clearly depended on unknown rules: "Implicitly, if not explicitly, the idea of a world governed by autonomous natural laws was a heavy blow on established authority" (Elias, 2006, p. 175). Wallerstein (2006), mentions the acceptance, originated from these events, of what he calls "normal change."

This is where the concept of society as something distinct from the state is born (ELIAS, 2006). If society has laws independent of what rulers establish, it becomes relevant to know these laws in order to rule. This context, where certainties are lost and authorities/powers are fragile, enables social sciences to ascend and become central, since "traditional ways to approach social phenomena prove inadequate," creating "a demand for specialists who could develop a way to describe them in similar ways as those built for the natural events" (ELIAS, 2006, p. 117). Experts advising the development of government programs become a standard practice, whether for progress, as admitted to by Marxists, or to maintain or restore the *status quo*, as intended by the conservatives (Wallerstein, 2006). In this context, political philosophy gives way to economic philosophy and a new division of the intellectual labor is to reflect the triumph of liberal ideology (*ibid.*).

Wallerstein considers three new key institutions in the process of accepting change as normal: 1) ideologies (at that time, conservatism, liberalism and Marxism); 2) the exact sciences; and 3) social movements. Each ideology proposed, somehow, an approach of "normal change":

> Ideology involved the argument that the centerpiece of social process was the careful delimitation of three spheres of activity: those related to the market, those related to the state, and those that were "personal." The last category was primarily residual, meaning all activities not immediately linked to the state or the market. Insofar as it was defined positively, it had to do with activities of "everyday life" - the family, the "community", the "underworld" of "deviant" activities and so forth. (Wallerstein, 2006, p. 28-29).

These three spheres (market, state and "personal") are, respectively, economics, political science and social sciences. We consider this passage fundamental to our discussion on academic productivism, as it provides the key for connecting market mechanisms and the intellectual academic world. Wallerstein then proceeds (2006, p. 29) to expose the complicity between social sciences, state politics and economy:

> The nationally based, empiricist thrust of the new "disciplines" became a way of circumscribing the study of social change that would make it most useful

> for and supportive of state policies, least subversive of the new verities. But it was nonetheless a study of the "real" world based on the assumption that one could not derive such knowledge deductively from metaphysical understandings of an unchanging world. The nineteenth-century acceptance of the normality of change included the idea that change was only normal for the civilized nations, and that it therefore was incumbent on these nations to impose this change on the recalcitrant other world.[...] Social science could play a role here, as a mode of describing unchanging customs, thereby opening the way to understanding how this other world could be brought into "civilization." The study of the "primitive" peoples without writing became the domain of anthropology. The study of "petrified" peoples with writing (China, India, the Arab world) became the domain of Orientalism. For each field, the academic study emphasized the elements that were unchanging but was accompanied by an applied, largely extra-university domain of societal engineering. (WALLERSTEIN, 2006, p. 30.)

This societal engineering is currently perceived to be comprise the above mentioned international bodies, their diagnoses which become prognoses and their "mappings" that are, in fact, prescriptions. Governments of different nations have been giving up their sovereignty by relying on these guidelines to make decisions that separate them from the needs of the peoples they represent. Therefore, these guidelines that surprised the members of PG's, as shown by Langer, were also elaborated by extramural circuits, invisible from within the University.

IN THE FACE OF THESE INCURSIONS, WHAT ALTERNATIVES ARE LEFT TO RESEARCHERS?

Because of its near thousand-year trajectory, the University of the 21st century keeps a structural, problematic ambiguity; it has difficulties to examine its classical tradition influence (pervaded by the worldview inherited from the Church) with the collaboration of contemporary science, separated from philosophical speculation, interested in finding solutions to nature and human survival problems. Both "hearts" beat within the University, and they also fight each other. The co-habitation of the Napoleonic model (professional training originally aimed for the elite, and today's mass education) and the *Humboldtian* model (focused on research) ensures both strands, whose synthesis shows no signs of occurring due their conflicting interests.

The fact is that the university was left out of what was historically foreseen as its role; for example, advising governments (HUMBOLDT, 1997), a role currently played in the form of "societal engineering" (WALLERSTEIN, 2006). What is left to researchers is to integrate the scientific machine task force and to produce, alienated from the exercise of criticism and excluded from the decision-making that controls science, the University, their own daily life and humanity. Academic productivism, embodied in the academic *papers*, was erected into knowledge commodity fetish (RODRIGUES, 2010), and at a *Modern Times* pace; it has made intellectuals stressed, medicated, efficient higher-level workers, beings with no time for their main attribution: analyzing in a rigorously critical way the complexity of ongoing processes (whether natural or social), thus allowing to uncover the underlying logic driving the spectacle of history.

We are far from the mission of the committed intellectual, whose responsibility is to try to "speak the truth and expose lies" (Chomsky, 2006, p. 373), since, marked by history, "the intellectuals tune in with characteristics of each time [...] society expresses a greater or lesser sensitivity on certain values, rating certain needs as primary or secondary, etc."

What are the values and needs that the University can, must and wishes to treat as priorities? What is, after all, the interest of the university? The past "disinterested search" has lost its validity; Schwartzman and Bourdieu showed it to a myth; interests and compromises drive the world.

Frigotto (1994) can help us to show that technical progress and advancement of knowledge arouse interest and serve conflicting purposes, "by confronting, on one side, reproduction necessities of capital and, on the other, the multiple human necessities" (p. 36). Therefore

> [...] it is not a question of denying technical progress, the advancement of knowledge, education and training processes, nor simply focusing on the prospects of resistance or identifying the new demands of business men - a primarily Machiavellian stance, or effectively a humanitarian concern; it is a question

> of struggling concretely for the hegemonic control of technical progress, the advancement of knowledge and skills, and taking them away from the private sphere and the logic of exclusion, and submitting them to the democratic control of the public sphere in order to enhance the satisfaction of human needs.

This statement reveals a strategic misconception (or naiveness) the academic have as they refuse to declare their interest and serve it. By pretending to have no interests at all, researchers and the university became literally hostages of capital. The university-business cooperation for innovation and development in order to build wealth is not in itself malignant.

The question is: to whom do the discoveries and innovations arising from the work of researchers legitimately belong? Devices (policies) are necessary in order to prevent businesses from taking over the labor of intellectuals and drawing surplus value particularly from its results, which defines the incorporation of the university into businesses and mischaracterizes the vocation of the former. After all, economic and social production must not be restricted by ownership nor captive to or the privilege of the powerful in society. If patents on discoveries and innovations were funded by business people, but their *royalties* were guaranteed to the researchers and universities that house them, profits would feed science, rather than add to the accumulation of private capital. What prevents researchers from embracing this fair struggle in favor of mankind?

Would it be the intellectual's duty to speak for the "voiceless," those with little culture, not thereby rightless? This is the political dimension of science (SCHWARTZMAN, 2008) that the researcher should not ignore, given the learning achieved. We are putting back into the agenda the ethical responsibility to fight to restore the autonomy of politics in relation to economy, and to engage in promoting the whole of humanity, which implies rethinking research funding/evaluation agencies (CAPES) with other parameters and frameworks different from the hegemonic ones.

In the present state of things, science is subsumed into the market and its dictates. Researchers, however, have the power, since on the result of their work depends the possibility to increase competitiveness and to expand surplus value, etc. It is worth enquiring what would the result be if intellectuals collectively converged and developed strategies to ensure control over the process and results of their work? Would they and the university remain so heteronomous?

It would be naive to ignore the warning of Mészáros (2006, p. 263): "no society can last without its own education system". If, in the course of historical processes, the capitalist system was able to take over educational and scientific systems, let us not forget Bourdieu's formula: "What history has done, it can undo" (*apud* VALLE, 2007, p. 128). Our present situation has been historically built; therefore, the space for *praxis* (action-reflection) is open: what is our justification not to engage in transforming the degrading ways that took over academic-scientific management (WATERS, 2006), attempting against the dignity of intellectuals and populations?

What is not plausible is "the retreat of intellectuals" (FOLLARI, 2006, p. 348, translated for this paper), who

> are driven by the movement they should be able to describe, explain, and - when necessary - criticize. Instead of systematically driving awareness of the situation in order to take initiative against the historical inertia that is obliterating intellectuals, they have to participate in their own breakdown, and then they emerge incapable of parting with the hegemonic guidelines of the situation created by globalised capitalism.

We can recover the power of researchers and invite them into empowerment, for what are we to expect from the working class – "manual" or "intellectual" labor (Gramsci, 1989) – if we watch such a "*breakdown*" of intellectuals? Berman (1988) returns to Marx to level intellectuals and employees. Marx

> is trying to make us see modern culture as part of modern industry. Art, physical sciences, social theory like Marx's, all modes of production; the bourgeoisie controls the means of production in culture, as in everything else, and anyone who wants to create must work in the orbit of its power. […] Thus they [the intellectuals] can write books, paint pictures, discover physical or historical laws, save lives, only if someone with capital will pay them. But the pressures of bourgeois society are so strong that no one will pay them unless it pays to pay them - that is, unless their works somehow help to 'increase capital'" (BERMAN, 1988, p. 113-14).

This passage suggests determinism. Researchers, however, are in a favorable position to balance forces,

since it is capital that needs them to perpetuate its purposes. And in this case, "them" are us! The theory of alienation applies to our craft. And since it has already been unveiled, it becomes imperative to know it and to overcome the stage of being alienated and having the process and results of our work alienated.

REFERENCES

AUBERT, N. Le culte de l´urgence: la société malade Du temps. Manchecourt: Flammarion, 2003.

BERMAN, M. Tudo que é sólido desmancha no ar: a aventura da modernidade. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1988.

BIANCHETTI, L; MACHADO, A. M. N. "Reféns da produtividade" sobre produção do conhecimento, saúde dos pesquisadores e intensificação do trabalho na pós-graduação. 2007. Trabalho apresentado na XXX Reunião Anual da ANPEd, 2007. Disponível em: http://www.anped.org.br/reunioes/30ra/trabalhos/GT09-3503-Int. pdf. Acesso em: 02.09.2009.

BOURDIEU, P. O campo científico. Traducción de Alfonso Buch, revisada por Pablo Kreimer. Actes de La recherche en sciences sociales. n. 1-2, 1976. Disponível em: http://www.4shared.com/get/WqzWcmTa/O_ Campo_Cientfico__Pierre_Bour.html. Acesso em: 20.01.2011.

CAILLÉ, A. (Direction). La quête de reconnaissance: nouveau phénomène social total. Paris: Éditions La Découverte/M.A.U.S.S., 2007.

CHOMSKY, N. A responsabilidade dos intelectuais. In: CHOMSKY, N. O poder americano e os novos mandarins. Rio de Janeiro & São Paulo: Record, 2006.

COMTE-SPONVILLE, A. O capitalismo é moral? São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2005.

CUNHA, D. M; LAUDARES, J. B. Trabalho: diálogos multidisciplinares. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2009.

DAGNINO, R. Um insumo para uma política de ensino superior em um país capitalista periférico: o que é isso que hoje chamamos de ciência e tecnologia?In: ALMEIDA, M. L. P; MENDES, V. H. (Des)construção da universidade na era do "pós": tensões, desafios e alternativas. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 2010. p. 99-132.

De MEIS, L. e outros. The growing competition in Brazilian science: rites of passage, stress and burnout. Brazilian journal of medical and biological research. Disponível em: http://www.scielo.br/bjmbr. Acesso em: 16.03.2010.

DUARTE JR. J. F. The rotten papers (ou adiós que yo me voy). In: DUARTE JR. J. F. A montanha e o videogame. Escritos sobre educação. Campinas: Papirus, 2010.

ELIAS, N. Escritos & Ensaios. 1: Estado, Processo, Opinião Pública. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2006.

FÁVERO, M. L. A. A Universidade brasileira em busca de sua identidade. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1977.

FLICKINGER, H.G. Em nome da liberdade: elementos da crítica ao liberalismo contemporâneo. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, 2003.

FOLLARI, R. A. La retirada de los intelectuales. Perspectiva. Florianópolis, NUP/CED/UFSC, v. 24, n. 1, p. 341-352, 2006.

FRIGOTTO, G. Educação e formação humana: ajuste neo-conservador e a alternativa democrática. In: GENTILI, P; SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu (Org). Neoliberalismo, qualidade total e educação: visões críticas. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1994. ISSN 0034-7590 ©RAE n São Paulo n v. 51 n n.3 n maio/jun. 2011 n 244-254 w 253 Ana Maria Netto Machado n Lucídio Bianchetti

GRAMSCI, A. Os intelectuais e a organização da cultura. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1989.

HOBSBAWM, E. J. A era das revoluções: 1789-1848. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2010.

HUMBOLDT, W. V. Sobre a organização interna e externa das instituições científicas superiores em Berlim. In: CASPER, G. Um mundo sem universidades? Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ, 1997.

JANTSCH, A. P. Mercadorização, formação, universidade pública e pesquisa crítico-emancipatória: em tempos de realização plena do conceito de capital. In: OLIVEIRA, J. F; CATANI, A. M; SILVA JÚNIOR, J. dos R. (Org). Educação superior no Brasil: tempos de internacionalização. São Paulo: Xamã, 2010. p. 35-78.

KUENZER, A. Z; MORAES, M. C. M. Temas e tramas na pós-graduação em educação. Educação & Sociedade. Campinas, CEDES, v. 26, n. 93, p. 1341-1363, set./ dez./2005.

LANGER, A. El sistema científico y las universidades: revisión de teorias y enfoques en América Latina y Argentina. In: RIQUELME, G. C. (Ed). Las universidades frente a las demandas sociales y productivas – capacidades de los grupos de docência e investigación em la producción y circulación del conocimiento. Tomo 1. Buenos Aires: Miño y D´Avila Srl; Madrid: Miño y D´Avila, 2008. p. 23-74.

MACHADO, A. M. N; ALVES, V. M. As origens da universidade e os modelos ditos clássicos: alguns elementos de ontem e de hoje! In: ALMEIDA, M. L. Políticas e processos educativos. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 2011. No prelo.

MACHADO, A. M. N; MENDES, V. H. Universidades comunitárias do sul do Brasil no cenário e na história da(s) universidade(s): a centralidade do problema da autonomia e os processos de interiorização e universalização da educação superior. In: NUNES, A. K. (Org). Universidade comunitária e avaliação: os quinze anos do PAIUNG. Santa Cruz do Sul: EDUNISC, 2009.

MÉSZÁROS, I. A teoria da alienação em Marx. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, 2006.

PARASKEVA, J. M. (Org). Capitalismo académico. Mangualde, PT: Edições Pedago, 2009.

RIQUELME, G. C. Nota preliminar. In: RIQUELME, G. C. (Ed). Las universidades frente a las demandas sociales y productivas: capacidades de los grupos de docência e investigación em la producción y circulación del conocimiento. Tomo 1. Buenos Aires: Miño y D´Avila Srl; Madrid: Miño y D´Avila, 2008.

SCHWARTZMAN, S. Ciência, universidade e ideologia. Rio de Janeiro: Centro Eldestein de Pesquisas Científicas, 2008.

SGUISSARDI, V; SILVA JR., J. dos R. Trabalho intensificado nas federais. Pós-graduação e produtivismo acadêmico. São Paulo: Xamã, 2009.

SLAUGHTER, S; RHOADES, G. Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: markets, state and higher education. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2004.

TREIN, E; RODRIGUES, J. O mal-estar na academia: produtivismo científico, o fetichismo do conhecimentomercadoria. Caxambu, MG. Trabalho apresentado no GT 9 da ANPEd, Reunião Anual de 2010.

VALLE, I. R. do. A obra do sociólogo Pierre Bourdieu: uma irradiação incontestável. Educação e Pesquisa. São Paulo: USP, v. 33, n. 1, p.117-134, 2007.

VINOKUR, A. Savoirs et pouvoirs: le “grand basculement”? In: VINOKUR, A.; SIGMAN, C. L’enseignement supérieur entre nouvelle gestion publique et crise systémique. Presses de l’ISMEA. Hors Série, n. 4//2010. p. 7-28

WALLERSTEIN, I. Impensar a ciência social: os limites dos paradigmas do século XXI. São Paulo: Ideias & Letras, 2006.

WATERS, L. Inimigos da esperança: publicar, perecer e o eclipse da erudição. São Paulo: UNESP, 2006.

WEBER, M. Sobre a Universidade. Tradução: Lólio Lourenço de Oliveira. São Paulo: Cortez, 1989. 254 w ©RAE n São Paulo n v. 51 n n.3 n maio/ jun. 2011 n 244-254 ISSN 0034-7590.