



Corresponding to Author

¹ Roque Strieder

E-mail: roque.strieder@unoesc.edu.br

Universidade Federal de Alagoas, Brasil
CV Lattes

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/9836803505247235>

Submitted: 04 Oct. 2018

Accepted: 28 Dec. 2018

Published: 09 Feb. 2019

[doi> 10.20396/riesup.v5i0.8653598](https://doi.org/10.20396/riesup.v5i0.8653598)

e-location: e019032

ISSN 2446-9424

Anti-plagiarism Check



Distributed under



Democracy and Education: Challenging the Technician and Utilitarian Logic

Roque Strieder¹ 

¹ Universidade do Oeste de Santa Catarina

ABSTRACT

There are great challenges for Higher Education Institutions threatened by mercantilist logic and mechanisms of instrumentalization. Scenario where academic spaces and humanizing training gradually decrease their pedagogical and formative focus and, replaced by management and skills, lose their intellectual, reflective, creative and humanizing dimension. In many institutions this situation is on the table of debates and discussions as the actions implemented sustain the human mismatch, deepen human indifference and aggravate our dehumanizing present. It is in this enclosure of tensions that we wish to reflect, using other reflections and recent publications to refer to some variables such as democracy, globalization and education. The objective is to problematize the naturalizing and reductionist character of education to processes of qualification for profitable utilitarianism, the rationalistic, domesticating and massifying instrumentation that impoverish the human condition. We understand that any effort that problematizes the globalizing ideal of human formation involves and integrates a complex context of contemporary demands and challenges. Among them, we highlight the challenge of political resistance to this formalizing proposition of the mechanisms of educational logic prioritizing instrumentalization, utilitarianism and the sedimentation of obedience. We acknowledge that, in defense of self-interest, efficiency in mechanisms of acquisition of skills, priority support in science in its technical pragmatic bias restricted to the transmission of information, it is important, through individual and social participation, to create knowledge that improves human understanding, expand the human capacities of coexistence, sharing and human responsibility considering the destiny of each human being.

KEYWORDS

College education. Democracy. Globalization. Human formation

Democracia e Educação: Desafiando a Lógica Tecnicista e Utilitarista

RESUMO

Há grandes desafios para as Instituições de Educação Superior ameaçadas de invasão pela lógica mercantilista e pelos mecanismos da instrumentalização. Cenário onde espaços acadêmicos e de formação humanizadora, gradativamente diminuem seus enfoques pedagógicos e formativos e, substituídos pela gestão e pelas competências, perdem sua dimensão intelectual, reflexiva, criativa e humanizadora. Em muitas instituições essa situação está na mesa dos debates e discussões uma vez que as ações implementadas sustentam o desencontro humano, aprofundam a indiferença humana e agravam nosso presente desumanizador. É nesse invólucro de tensões que desejamos refletir, recorrendo a outras reflexões e publicações recentes para referenciar algumas variáveis como democracia, globalização e educação. O objetivo é problematizar o caráter naturalizante e reducionista da educação à processos de capacitação para o utilitarismo rentável, a instrumentação racionalista, domesticadora e massificadora que empobrecem a condição humana. Entendemos que todo e qualquer esforço que problematiza o ideal globalizador da formação humana, envolve e integra um complexo contexto de demandas e desafios contemporâneos. Dentre eles situamos o desafio de resistência política à essa proposição formalizadora dos mecanismos da lógica educacional priorizando a instrumentalização, o utilitarismo e a sedimentação da obediência. Reconhecemos que, diante da defesa do interesse próprio, da eficiência nos mecanismos de aquisição de competências, do apoio prioritário na ciência em seu viés tecnicista de pragmática restrita à transmissão de informações, importa, via participação individual e social criar conhecimentos que melhorem o entendimento humano, ampliem as capacidades humanas de convivência, compartilhamento e responsabilidade humana diante do destino de cada ser humano.

PALAVRAS CHAVE

Educação superior. Democracia. Globalização. Formação humana.

Democracia y Educación: Desafiando la Lógica Tecnicista y Utilitarista

RESUMEN

Hay grandes desafíos para las Instituciones de Educación Superior amenazadas de invasión por la lógica mercantilista y por los mecanismos de la instrumentalización. Escenario donde espacios académicos y de formación humanizadora, gradualmente disminuyen sus enfoques pedagógicos y formativos y, sustituidos por la gestión y las competencias, pierden su dimensión intelectual, reflexiva, creativa y humanizadora. En muchas instituciones esta situación está en la mesa de los debates y discusiones una vez que las acciones implementadas sostienen el desencaje humano, profundizan la indiferencia humana y agravan nuestro presente deshumanizador. Es en esa envoltura de tensiones que deseamos reflexionar, recurriendo a otras reflexiones y publicaciones recientes para referenciar algunas variables como democracia, globalización y educación. El objetivo es problematizar el carácter naturalizante y reduccionista de la educación a procesos de capacitación para el utilitarismo rentable, la instrumentación racionalista, domesticadora y masificadora que empobrecen la condición humana. Entendemos que todo esfuerzo que problematiza el ideal globalizador de la formación humana, involucra e integra un complejo contexto de demandas y desafíos contemporâneos. Entre ellos situamos el desafío de resistencia política a esa proposición formalizadora de los mecanismos de la lógica educativa priorizando la instrumentalización, el utilitarismo y la sedimentación de la obediencia. Reconocemos que, ante la defensa del interés propio, de la eficiencia en los mecanismos de adquisición de competencias, del apoyo prioritario en la ciencia en su sesgo tecnicista de pragmática restringida a la transmisión de informaciones, importa, a través de la participación individual y social crear conocimientos que mejoren el entendimiento humano, amplíen las capacidades humanas de convivencia, compartir y responsabilidad humana ante el destino de cada ser humano.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Educación universitaria. Democracia. Globalización. Formación humana.

Initial Considerations

The effects of the political, economic and formative deregulations in contemporary times are innumerable, profound and accelerated. All of them, without distinctive gradation, provoke diffuse feelings of perplexity and impotence. The effects of these deregulations are dissonant and asymmetrical, generating generalized conformism manifested by individualism, indifference, and denial of the other.

These effects have basically become the guides of our actions in contemporary times. They can no longer be considered transitory episodes in our everyday domains of existence. They are effects that have reconfigured and distorted the human condition and do us harm because they feed unhappiness, indifference, pain and suffering. We have fed increasing polarization, cultural divergence, economic inequality, lack of care, among others. We lived the experience of aggression, vigilance, control and obedience, while we are fascinated by manipulation through self-denial and denial of others. We are almost unable to live with others. We stretch the abyss of incomprehension which threatens and destroys our inner life, forcing the destruction of basic trust, mutuality and otherness, so dear and even fundamental supports of social coexistence.

What are we doing with the human being, with the human condition? Why and how do we unlearn and cover up the collaborative dynamics that decisively led the process of humanization? Because we abandon or because we bewilder our potential for reflection, our human co-responsibility, formative co-responsibility, for example in Assmann's questioning (2011, p. 127) "how do we become people and what does education have to do with it"?

Or, as Rolf Behncke asks us (Apud Maturana and Varela, 1995, p.14-15) "In what economists, our politicians, social educators, the media are using their time?" How and why do we foment so many alienating processes of formation and of social learning that produce the fierce divergence that emulates in us a hatred "with so much virulence, as to destroy others, even at the cost of our own destruction in the attempt?"

In the face of growing divergences, indifference and disagreements as human beings, education, at any level, but particularly in Higher Education, cannot be summed up in the sterile void of utilitarian manipulations. It is prudent to re-extend the perspective of the understanding of human nature, beyond its instrumentalization, to intellectual spaces that enhance personal and social renewal. At the heart of this prudence and reflective depth can be the possibility of a gradual reversal of the process of human, individual and social disintegration, as well as the potentiation of a social construction that takes up the impulsive bases of mutual collaboration, so present in the long process of humanization.

Rather than firm the logic of technoscience, linked to the immediacy of the results of market and lucrative order, Higher Education, by potentializing the development of conscious reflection can go beyond its reduction to the rational logic of defense of one's own

interests. By persisting in betting and authorizing our differences with the stigmas of divergences, be they cultural, religious, ethnic or other, we also continue to generalize grudges and hatreds which, in turn, require the use of force to exercise control by solidifying submission, subservience and co-optation.

There are great challenges for Higher Education that also, is conceived invaded by the logic of commodification and by the mechanisms of instrumentalization. When in the academic and humanizing training spaces, the pedagogical and formative spaces, replaced and obsessed by the management and the competences, gradually diminish, the institution of Higher Education loses its intellectual, reflective, creative and humanizing dimension. It is true that in many institutions this awareness is on the table of debates, discussions that leads to recognize more and more that some of the actions implemented also sustain human misconduct, deepen human indifference and thus recognize themselves scared to be collaborators of the mechanisms that sustain our dehumanizing present.

It is in this envelope of tensions that we wish to reflect, resorting to other reflections and recent publications to refer to some variables such as democracy and the dubious project / program of globalization of education. Our objective is to problematize the naturalizing and reductionist character of education to the processes of training for profitable utilitarianism, the rationalistic, domesticating and massifying instrumentation that impoverish the human condition. Theme certainly unmentionable in its broad form and that could even flow through a series of other entrances. We understand that every effort and exercise that problematizes the globalizing ideal of human formation involves and integrates a complex context of contemporary demands and challenges. In particular, we place a challenge of political resistance to this proposition, which formalizes the mechanisms of educational logic with prioritization of instrumentalization, utilitarianism, and the sedimentation of obedience and control by undemocratic states of domination. Also, the importance of ethical reconsideration, whether of our own actions or in relation to the actions and the conduct of others.

We recognize that the immeasurable defense of self-interest, efficiency in the mechanisms of acquisition of competences and, rather than being based primarily on science in its technical pragmatic bias restricted to the transmission of information, it is important, through individual and social participation, to create knowledge that improve human understanding, that improve and expand the human capacities of coexistence, sharing and human responsibility for the destiny of each human being.

Democracy and Globalized Formation: Challenges of Higher Education

Words by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, delivered at the Regional Conference on Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (CRES, 2018), in Córdoba, Argentina

It is a difficult time for several reasons, and one of them is that there is not a political attack, but, yes, a depoliticized attack. It is an attack that has two dimensions: budget cuts and the fight against alleged inefficiency or corruption, a

very selective struggle because it is known that public universities are generally very well managed compared to other institutions.

For Santos the blindness of depoliticization ends in co-optation, not in a conscious acceptance of the adoption of pedagogical practices and of knowledge derived from the forms of private administration. In fact, for the author, it is basically this cooptation that allows the dissemination and use of criteria of business and marketing logic as a model for the educational field.

It is important to consider that in each historical epoch certain models, as "regimes of truth", were adopted as hegemonic narratives that guide and determine what can be said about phenomena and objects. These limits to the possibilities of enunciation are what Foucault (1993, p.12) called "regimes of truth". For Foucault, the Cartesian experience of the cogito, which is to find a last and secure foundation for the construction of the knowledge edifice, conceals, today, a more vulgar connotation, present in certain schemes and rules of production of truths no longer reducible to (AGAMBEN, 2009) capable of sustaining the conditions of acceptance of a given regime of truth by the subjects who state it and, linking them to the political game of truth. In the words of Foucault (2014, p.12).

Each society has its regime of truth, its "general policy of truth": that is, the kinds of discourse that it embraces and makes work as true; the mechanisms and instances that allow us to distinguish true statements from false ones, the way one sanctions oneself and others; the techniques and procedures that are valued for the attainment of truth; the statute of those who have the burden of saying what works as true.

We believe it is not surprising that, in contemporary times, our "regime of truth" determines the reduction of education to a process of training for profitable utilitarianism, a kind of usurpation of education by the economy. Nussbaum (2015) points out that this is an attitude of high recklessness, that countries close their educational systems in favor of rationalistic instrumentation, mass domestication and the pragmatism of the office performed as a duty. The 'regime of truth' that entrenches profit-seeking greed and economic reduction while ruling the masses to submit to instructional models favoring profit and economic growth, is also a spokesman for an impoverished conception of the human condition. This "regime of truth" relentlessly relinquishes the qualifications necessary for the survival of human beings, and by making use of the mechanisms of instruction, turns the reflections superficial by uncontrollably curtailing the questioning and creative curiosity.

This same "regime of truth" is also one of the causes of the conservative fossilization of the so-called liberal and representational democracy. A democracy in acute crisis because it no longer finds existential shelter in the feelings and actions of people. This agonizing democracy saw in the political representation an opportunity for patriarchal affirmation and, legalizing appropriation, became the standard of hierarchy, of the dominations of all order, of the instrumental controls through punitive surveillance. Variables that falsified their development, now supported by cooptation and pseudo representativity.

In a historical and cultural way democracy can be considered a wedge that opens a rift in the patriarchal culture. It is fixed in a field of conversation that generates and justifies destructive actions against all those who directly or indirectly deny it with its conduct, or those who do not convert.

Democracy in the Ancient Greek Agora was founded on the principle that it is possible to accept the legitimacy of the other, that is, that human beings can collectively generate common projects of coexistence that recognize the legitimacy of the other in a homogeneous community with participation in equality and freedom. This equality and freedom requires and contemplates restrictions in relation to those considered inferior, the slaves, the farmers and all that, in their daily life, were reduced to actions of satisfaction of necessities of survival. Flickinger (2018, p.1) asserts, "[...] it is only thanks to these restrictions that in ancient Greece it was possible to guarantee the homogeneity of the people as the basis of democracy." Unlike in autocracy, where the predominant mode of regulation of conflict goes through the denial of the other, through violence and coercion, democracy is, as Maturana (2011, p.102) wrote, a system of coexistence "that can only exist through the propositional actions that give rise to it, as a co-inspiration in a human community "by which public agreements are generated between free and equal persons in a process of conversation which, in turn, can only be realized from the acceptance of the other as a free and an equal.

Democracy, according to this conception, is not restricted to the creation and support of free scenarios to compete for power. Scenarios in which a pseudo democracy predominates, which end up sustaining and preserving poverty, systematic abuses, inequalities, privileges and oppression as legitimate forms of living, or incapable of resolving inequalities or of recognizing pluralisms, whether ethnic or ideological or cultural. More emphatically, Maturana (2002, p.78) maintains that democracy "is an ontological conspiracy that arises out of desire", therefore not a rational aspiration, nor its configuration as a necessity "to live together in a country, in circumstances in which the world we bring the hand in the living will be the world we will live together and that will indeed constitute the country."

It is in this controversial framework of democracy that it is striding globalization, as a historical phenomenon and of planetary dimensions. It is not here to bring their peculiarities and characteristics into account, nor to consider the complex web of implications that surround globalization, particularly as regards commercial, productive, economic and financial intertwining. Even so, and as an indication, to affirm that globalization resides economic forces that operate supra and transnationally both to break through and over national frontiers and to rebuild relations between nations. Thus, globalization is not exclusively a phenomenon is an economic phenomenon, but a political-economic phenomenon. For Dale (2004, p. 436) globalization, in the perspective of a globally structured agenda for education "is a set of political-economic devices for the organization of the global economy, driven by the need to maintain the capitalist system, more than any another set of values. "For the author, it is effective in consolidating" three sets of interrelated economic, political, and cultural activities "(DALE, 2004, p. 436).

Globalization is based on trade liberalization, productive transnationalization, financial deregulation, increased productivity at work, deregulation of labor and market laws, and serious threats to the political and territorial destabilization of states, among others.

On the other hand, in the globalized contemporaneity, a cultural and intellectual fabric is based on the creation of theoretical and conceptual dependencies of the northern countries, as Santos and Meneses (2010) point out in "Epistemologies of the South". A plot that increasingly ignores the ways of thinking that cherish singularities in broad contexts of diversity. Globalization becomes a structure through the production of knowledges that are increasingly oriented by and for practice, and whose highest result to be obtained in any human organization is called profit. It is in view of this greater purpose that education becomes synonymous with development, generating convictions that by harming the universalization of the "qualification" of education systems, undoubtedly guarantees social and economic development.

Globalization, and in particular the globalization of education, is demanding a re-signification, a mass education¹, with the purpose, among others, of dissolving a set of singularities. A possible dissolution via curricula for mass schools aiming at increasingly standardized and homogenous levels of instrumentation at a planetary level. This globalization with its standardized models or ideologies forces the creation of homogenizing cultural effects that increasingly undermine national, regional, local and individual interests, needs and traditions. We reinforce it with a reference to Arendt (2009, p.96) when writing

there is a fateful monstrosity in the invisible processes that engendered all the tangible things and all the individual entities visible to us, degrading them to the functions of a global process. [...] The process which makes in itself significant whatever it may carry with it, has thus acquired a monopoly of universality and signification.

In the author's understanding the demands of the economy, demanding instrumental and specialized competence, ends up detracting from training as a human being, because as part of the mechanisms of globalization the rights to education are increasingly instrumented in favor of the logic of capitalism. Thus, the rights to education, its directives, devices and regulations that determine the implementation of these global education mechanisms, and also the right of access or compulsory access are basically, and planetarily fixed. Likewise, they are duly under a state of vigilance as to the fulfillment in the form of office (because imposed and with force of duty to be fulfilled), by institutions created for this purpose, through use of the mechanisms of "evaluation" or, better, quantitative verification, with the use of large-scale² and measurement instruments. And here for there to be no mistaken interpretations of passive and reckless acceptance of these so-called rights, follows Marx's

¹ For a better understanding of the redefinitions of the expressions population, mass and people, see article by Antonio Negri "Towards an ontological definition of the multitude. **Revista Espaço Comum: Mídia, Cultura e Democracia**, Rio de Janeiro, n.19-20, p.15-26, 2004.

² The parameters for this quantification that assess / verify the performance of both learners and educators at international level find shelter in the PISA - Program for International Student Assessment - of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Bologna Process.

(2010, page 48) excerpt from "On the Jewish Question": "The so-called human rights, *droits de l'homme*, unlike the *droits du citoyen*, are nothing more than the rights of the member of bourgeois society, that is, of the selfish man, of man separate from man and community. " That is, human rights, natural and imprescriptible rights such as: equality, freedom, security and property, support an inhuman and unjust social order, based on an abstract human and void of language. A human being void of language because, subject to the rules of bourgeois society, massified and without concrete identity, it has no social class, no history or context, yet it is this empty and abstract subject that serves the interests of a real person and concrete, the bourgeois.

Faced with the controversies and demands of this system of homogenization of the norms of education globalization, as supports of employability for and as a citizen, to the detriment of training as a human being, there is a reference to the Third Regional Conference on Higher Education (CRES 2018), which occurred in Córdoba, Argentina enunciated consensus reaffirming that Higher Education is a public and social good, strategic for guaranteeing the basic human rights and well-being of the Latin American and Caribbean populations.³

It rests on this assertion that Latin American universities are not willing to implement the neoliberal consensus of globalization. It is clearly a declaration of resistance to the resignification of the function of Higher Education, now destined to serve the market, forming competing subjects, technicist professionals, trained to accumulate capital.

Globalized Education: But, What Education?

Tension, debates and reflections on the directions of globalized / globalizing education are still present, broad and complex. Therefore, the limits of what follows as a reflection parameter. Certainly, in these conflicts the questionings and the bets are that education resides in an embryonic space of human formation, that is, the human, properly speaking, does not have to and cannot be left aside.

After all, in eligible to which Education? What is the education enclosure focused on the mercantilist spirit? To what vision of human being, of life and of society? Together with them is an immeasurable range of questions and situations that can help us to think about which human beings, which relational forms, which ways of living we desire, such as perspectives on social behavior, communities of solidarity, experiences of justice and ethics, the presence of self-respect and others, otherness, among others, such as: What country, what

³ More specifically, consensus reaffirms: "Higher Education as a social public good, a universal and human right, and a duty of States, to which access, use and democratization of knowledge is a social, collective and strategic good, essential for guaranteeing basic human rights and indispensable for the good life of our peoples, the construction of a full citizenship, social emancipation and the Latin American and Caribbean regional solidarity."

globalized society, what human beings, what humanity do we want to build through education? Will we persist in developing the limited economicist view of individualism, self-interest, betting on competition and, consequently, the need for the negation of the other? Or, to develop a range of feelings and doings with social purpose, aimed at the common good, a way of giving back to the many others who have already shared something with us⁴? A feeling and doing based on responsibility and a fundamental commitment to contribute to ending poverty, pain and suffering, inequalities, all kinds of abuses and privileges? More specifically in the educational and curricular field of educational institutions: Who is taught what, how is it taught, who teaches⁵ and under what circumstances teaches? How, by whom, and based on what epistemological, theoretical, philosophical and ideological supports, what institutions / organizations and processes define the content to be taught? Who organizes them, who governs them? What democratic bases do they support? What are the possible consequences on people, on social conditions, on the conditions of existence as a human being?

We also understand, along with the definition of educational guidelines for globalized contexts, to understand who they serve, what desires, what human needs to achieve. That is, what specific ways of living and existing, of feeling and doing do we desire on this globalized planet?

But we will be fair and ethical as parents, as educators, as any entity, in evoking the relational and operational matrixes of today's children, adolescents and young people, who will guide them, once adults, in their choices, in their preferences, their tastes and their orientations to and within the scope of their living and living in the tomorrow and as adults?

Well, one way or another, it seems to us that this right is arrogant to us, or we parents, educators and entities appropriate it, then, once having been thought, projected and, hopefully with caution and loose ends, what are the specific knowledge, but also open, necessary for this desired human conduct, this way of living, these feelings and actions to take effect? Which knowledge and which training experiences will be privileged?

Is it the domain of desired daily living, the desired mode of existence, a sort of adjustment of subjectivities to mercantilist, consumerist, and subtle demands under the banner of social inclusion? Which priorities do we understand to be non-negotiable: deep and extensive learning, or fragments with the flavor of a specialist? We want students with profiles for deep reflection, with capacity to think differently, or, via instruction, competent memorizers and subservient repeaters. As institutions, bet on a race for distribution of degrees / diplomas, characterized as institutions for the commercialization of knowledge? As directors

⁴ Maturana (2002: 13) writes: "The difference between preparing to give back to the country what was received from him, working to end poverty, and preparing to compete in the labor market is enormous. [...] the moment a person becomes a student to enter the professional competition, he makes of his student life a process of professional preparation to participate in a realm of interactions that is defined by the negation of the other, under the euphemism: market of free and healthy initiative. "

⁵ In the words of Peter Sloterdijk (2000, 32) [...] In all previous experiences of human education it remained unclear who - or what - educates educators and for what.

and deans, of educational institutions, those who qualify: those who are effectively qualified, or graduate the clients, those who affirm "I paid" and their attendance, even if corrupted, or even ventilate the maximum distribution of diplomas, and these diplomas loaded with "promises" of access to increasingly precarious jobs? A diploma accompanied by the solemn promise to "win in life" to "have a successful life," or diploma because you studied, because you developed intellectual abilities, because besides knowing, you also understand?

From this block of questions, we will develop some reflections focused on three moments, not independent and not the only ones that could be thought:

Globalized education a forceps of commercialization

The utilitarian logic is perverse because it reduces the human condition, human life to an object measurable in commodified values. This logic, even if perverse, finds refuge by referring to the satisfaction of the individualistic, immediate and selfish interests of the human being. In this sense, Yves Lenoir (2016, p. 161) asks: "Can we conceive the human being as a mere element of a set, an isolated actor having for reasons the instrumental interest as the only human and social perspectives of utilitarian relations of the mercantile type?" The author calls into question this reductionist conception of an essentially individualistic human being and points to the importance of considering non-utilitarianism as a possibility, since the human condition is also constituted as a collective being, that is, it exists in a multiverse of relational together and with other human beings.

Certainly, one of the great tragedies today, and in contexts of globalization, is the gradual replacement of the principles of humanism and human formation with the logic of professionalism, that is, forcing the emergence of the unique dimension in the human being: his professional being and his doing professional.

This reduction is intended through a globalized effort to sediment utilitarian conceptions of knowledge, feeding with emphasis the expansion of the individualistic devices of the instructional / formative trajectories in environments where the educators themselves are approached with the logic of the productive world and then submitted to competition rules. This instructional scenario not only invites but encourages students to behave as companies of their own, to bet and preserve the culture of entrepreneurship, to undergo continuous formations, recycling style, of any order and at any time ...

Such an educational way of doing so, means a violent ruin of human educational institutions / organizations, as they increasingly lose their cultural, intellectual and formative references. The insertion in the logic of the market means a deviation from the human and social ends. In the utilitarian logic it becomes a priority to appeal to the principles of efficiency, productivity, competition, flexibilization and deregulation, among others. A shipwreck of the university condition "which has lost its cultural and intellectual references,

only having as a motor and horizon the procedural doing, hiding and excluding the capacity to think, produce and reflect from culture", as Lenoir (2016, p. 162).

Formative organizations feel increasingly atrophied to the narrow horizons of procedural actions, instructional and utilitarian actions, and, in obedience, surrender to the mechanisms of technical competence, giving up and even excluding reflective, questioning, investigative, and creative capacities.

Surrendered by technicians, they no longer care about the wandering of the time of reflection, for what is indicative of loss of time. The time devoted to reflection is a time dedicated to being dazzled by the unknown, not aimed at building bridges, not aimed at curing patients, not at inventing technological devices, nor will it enable desubjectivation and cooptation. The longtime of reflection is dedicated to the understanding of oneself in interaction with the means or domain of existence in order to understand the meaning of the world, society and human being itself; the wandering of the time of reflection makes possible the condition as a being of language that, in conversation and dialogue, transcends the limits of empirical-operational validation, as Goergen (2014) maintains.

In these schools and Institutions of Higher Education, the teachers and the very functioning of the same is given in the business model. Teachers, in breathing the aura of leaders, motivators, and doers of the office, are almost prophets of self-help. It seems that the "mass of teachers" fulfills one of Arendt's prophecies which, in "Truth and Politics" (1998), states that it is common for the masses not to be convinced by the facts, not even by the invented ones, but by the system that promises to embrace them as a part of them.

Directors and deans breathe the air of the administrator and their pedagogical vision is in the process of surrendering by the management paradigm, forming management teams, and now students and teachers are awarded prizes for goals reached, since entrepreneurial thinking has become the moving mechanism of and education systems.

Globalized education: a domestication that dehumanizes

There is a web of dehumanization, specialized in consolidating as natural the way of existence, which makes us live, work and consume, supporting and justifying our illnesses, our tiredness, stress, anxiety, depression, indifference and dissatisfaction of all kinds. They subtly create imaginaries and representations of which all these ills naturally make part of our life, as if they were not historical inventions. It is thus banned, the possibility of "could be different".

Einstein's warning (1981, p.16) should be recalled in stating that

It is not enough to teach a man a specialty. Because it will thus become a usable machine, but not a personality. It must acquire a feeling, a practical sense of what is worth doing, what is beautiful, what is morally right. Otherwise, he will resemble,

with his professional knowledge, more to a learned dog than to a harmoniously developed creature. He must learn to understand the motivations of men, their chimeras, and their anguish to determine exactly their exact place in relation to their neighbors and the community.

Einstein warns about the risk of the loss of subjectivity and deconstruction as a person, through instructional mechanisms of a prioritized content. An instruction that involves transmutation of your being into a "usable machine" of instrumental making, far from the universe of understanding. In this sense, the globalized contemporaneity tends to create an individual with an identity without person - without persona (AGAMBEN, 2010) - because it considers and recognizes the individual, only via biological marks - nude life = *zōé* -, a digital fingerprint, a digit or a code, a photograph, a mere living body in a population nucleus, always passive management, surveillance and administrative control, as Carvalho (2016) points out. Foucault (2008) wrote in "Security, Territory and Population" that, in the biopolitical record⁶, an individual is no longer an individual body. It is, first and foremost, a cipher, a number, a code or, in the limit, a body, a biological mark bearing in mind that "I exist if the Machine recognizes me [...] I am alive if the Machine [...] guarantees that I am alive; I am not forgetting whether the Great Machine registers my numeric or digital data "(AGAMBEN, 2010, p.69).

Life itself became a commodity without quality and without right, in a kind of legal exception. It is through this exception that the rights of citizens are separated, reducing it to mere bare life, as Bartolomé Ruiz (2013) maintains. For the author this separation excludes from the right, life to be controlled in the form of exception. Once the right is suspended, human life is exposed to rape without the right being invoked to protect it. "The figure of the refugees, as well as the millions of clandestine emigrants, is the expression of how the device of exception operates in the control of human life" (BARTHOLOME RUIZ, 2013, p.17). On the one hand, the life, usually brief and suffered for the marginalized, the surplus, the abnormal, the stateless, the redundant⁷, the helpless of all order, the many faceless victims, and even more so as Negri and Hardt (2014) the indebted (the ones who owe money, owe work, owe obedience, owe their vote, owe the time of their life); the mediatized (because impoverished by banality, superficiality and brevity), and still those represented (all those silenced by the path of corruption called democracy, because devoid of intelligence, can be manipulated by mediatic imbecility, separated from power - commanders and commanders) .

⁶ Biopolitics (FOUCAULT, 1999) is a phenomenon that formulates the articulation between the anatomopolitics of the bodies, a characteristic of the disciplinary mechanisms, with a biopolitics of the populations, through mechanisms of regulation and security. A power to be produced from knowledge about life, a kind of massive investment on life and its phenomena, from a metric technology that turns the population into an object of political intervention, an object of management and governmentality. For Foucault, "this technology of power, this biopolitics, will implant mechanisms that have a number of functions very different from the functions that were the disciplinary mechanisms" (2005, p.293).

⁷ In the words of Bauman (2005, p.20) redundant and "to be superfluous, unnecessary, unused. [...] Others do not need you. They can do very well, and even better, without you. There is no self-evident reason for you to exist or any obvious justification for you to claim the right to existence. To be declared redundant means to be dispensed with because it is dispensable. "

On the other hand, the long and comfortable life, but equally innocuous, for the privileged, prisoners in their bunkers, with ferocious dogs, electric fences, surveillance cameras and heavily armed guards, always deprived of privacy and meetings, deprived of conversation, private on the other, prisoners of solitude.

Global education: a silencer of local traditions, singularities and desires

The globalization of education program becomes a forceps for forgetfulness and indifference. Forgetting the victims of inequalities and corruption, stateless persons and victims of violence and human cruelty. To forget is a gradual act of violence that tends to erase history, erase memories. But in a conference given by Bartolomé Ruiz (2018, p.), On the theme "The production of violence and death on a large scale: from biopolitics to tanatopolitics" he stated that

the walls of forgetfulness are built upon the bricks of memory. [...] There is no forgetting for violence. Forgetfulness is the great ally of the mimetic potential of violence. Amnesia is the condition for the perpetuation of violence. Every form of forgetfulness is a way of hiding the force that persists in the one who has practiced violence and who will return.

Still, in creating homogenization imaginaries, the forgetting of the mother tongue is promoted - in name, for example, of universal English - oblivion of culture in the face of the demand for the uniformization of customs and traditions, forgetting the tastes and flavours of foods and traditional desires for the enjoyment of macdonaldization (GENTILI; ALENCAR, 2001). They all constitute instructional programs that close the possibilities for multiple experiences, multiple ways of life, because what matters is mono-experience, monoculture, mono-knowledge (CARVALHO, 2016).

Educational globalization traces the path of the production of oblivion to forge choices of something that is not ours, of what we do not hear, of what we do not see. Local contexts, traditional values, community experiences, cultural diversity, are gradually reduced to their total erasure, their total dissolution, that is, until we lose the house - not only the immigrants lose it - and we lose the mother tongue. It is important to admit, peacefully, that monoexperience dissolves all forms of attachment to what once was a tradition, which enabled local empowerment, which generated networks of community conversations, well-being and community well-being (CARVALHO, 2016).

The production of monoculture, the production of the universalization of experiences, together with the production of mono-knowledge, mono-tastes and the standardization of psycho-affective sentiments are striking evidences in contemporary times. All this serves to erase subjectivities and transform the human being into an object of

technology, measurable and calculable to the exercise of biopower⁸. In the words of Carvalho (2016, p.9)

We are facing a case of production of monoculture of knowledge and affective-perceptive aspects increasingly evident in our contemporaneity. And the monoculture of knowledge is a focus of experience in the production of subjective smoothing, something so necessary for the allocation, distribution, effectiveness and calculability of individuals in population groups.

Much more than mono knowledges and mono experiences, the formation of the human being passes through reflection, through the creation of relationships in open fields, where diversity and uniqueness conceive of legitimacy. An epistemological rupture, as suggested by Santos (2018, s / p)

There is an enormous plurality of knowledge outside the university: rural, urban, popular knowledge of women. Why did the university never take them into account? Why did not the university decolonize? Its contents, its social sciences, its history, are colonialists. In order to defend itself as a public good, the university must make a profound self-criticism against itself. You should leave the arrogant idea that it is the only source of knowledge, open to dialogue with other knowledge. We need to create Epistemologies of the South.

Educating and training involves nurturing attitudes and actions of resistance to the logic of subordination to utilitarian rationality. Resistance to the mechanisms of duty to be fulfilled because imposed arbitrarily by another. It is the resistance against the fulfillment of the profession, carried out in the name of another, that can reactivate the individual responsibility of the teacher and of the educator, allowing him and others the opportunity to experience ethical and democratic attitudes and experiences. This is how consciousness remains intertwined with pedagogical and educational tasks and no longer need to suffer by performing bureaucratic demands and repetitive tasks.

This subversive resistance is encouraging to respect, to respect others, to live socially, knowing open to more fluid relationships, more entangled and rhizomatic. The possibility to open up weighted roads of the dialogue fostering the singular legitimacy, the legitimacy of the other and stimulating collaborations.

Regarding The Referrals

Our objective was to problematize the naturalizing and reductionist character of education to the processes of training for profitable utilitarianism, the rationalistic, domesticating and massifying instrumentation that impoverish the human condition.

⁸ **Biopower** - created by Michel Foucault, the expression indicates the centrality, in the consolidation of power in modernity, of what he calls "body administration" and a calculated management of life (FOUCAULT, 1999). For Foucault, the transformation of human life into the object of sovereign power implied in the reduction of it to the condition of pure biology, a life ready to be administered by the computing devices of power. Biopower is a management that makes life an economically profitable and usable means for the perpetuation of a process of domination

We now understand that any effort that problematizes the ideal of democracy and a globalizing structure for education involves and integrates a complex context of contemporary demands and challenges. Among others, we place the challenge of political resistance to these formalizing propositions through mechanisms of an educational logic prioritizing instrumentalization, utilitarianism and sedimentation of obedience. Reflection leads us to recognize that, given the defense of self-interest, efficiency in the mechanisms of acquisition of skills, priority support in science in its technical pragmatic bias restricted to the transmission of information, it is important, through individual and social participation, to create knowledge that improve human understanding, expand the human capacities of coexistence, sharing and human responsibility before the destiny of each human being.

In this way we affirm that we must have the courage to go beyond the misleading vision that drives us to always have to find the usefulness in everything we do, even with regard to our development and maturation as being, as intellectual and as professional. We are human beings, we are people, that is, beings of relationships long before we are citizens, professionals and consumers.

With regard to democracy and globalization, we align ourselves with Arendt (2002), who not only denounced political risks but elaborated a concept of dignity in politics. The focus of your thinking is on a call / invitation to take responsibility for our political life. Arendt's defense of dignity in politics is a very important parameter for many of us in the face of the current situation of diminishing opportunities for participation, collective action and involvement in authentic discussions with peers. Therefore, we also insist that we must resist the temptation to withdraw from politics by thinking that nothing can be done against ugliness, deception and corruption in political actuality.

Then, in a collective and communitarian way, we can reactivate a pedagogy that has renewed sensitivities to the suffering of others and to the very fragilities intrinsic to the discourse and to the movement of thinking. And we do it, because we understand, together with Adorno (1995: 141), that any educational / formative alternative, of course, "cannot be the modeling of people, because we do not have the right to model people from its exterior, not even persist in the mere transmission of knowledge ready and finished, but in the construction of human beings, involved and enveloping humanity.

That is why we increasingly need an education based on curriculum profiles that together hold wisdom as experience, imagination and rationality, creativity and intellectual rigor, the human dimension and the technological dimension, so that, who knows, next to the moment of graduation, besides the diploma of bachelor or licensee, dares to imply the student with a diploma of good people, a diploma of person, diploma of human being (JULIATTO, 2012).

We conclude by reaffirming with Maturana and Yáñez (2009, p.50):

The future of humanity, it is not boys, girls and young people, but we the adults with whom they live, for they, in turn, will be like adults, appearing or differentiating of ourselves, as we ourselves are adults in our coexistence with them.

Let us not be those who inscribe obstacles to love, let us not prevent those who are born from love, renew the human species. This involves and contains the germ of the importance of ethical reconsideration, whether of our own actions or in relation to the actions and conduct of others.

Referências

- ADORNO, Teodor. **Educação e emancipação**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1995. 190 p. ISBN: 9788577531172.
- AGAMBEN, Giórgio. **Nudez**. Portugal: Relógio D'Água Editores, 2010. 137 p. ISBN: 978-989-641-166-4.
- AGAMBEN, Giórgio. **O que é o contemporâneo?** E outros ensaios. Chapecó: Argos, 2009. 92 p. ISBN: 978-85-7897-005-5.
- ARENDT, Hannah. **A dignidade na política**. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará, 2002. 196 p. ISBN: 9788579470356.
- ARENDT, Hannah. **Entre o passado e o futuro**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2009. 112 p. ISBN: 8527301172.
- ARENDT, Hannah. **Verdade e política**. Portugal: Relógio D'Água Editores, 1998. 60 p. ISBN: 9789727082827.
- ASSMANN, Hugo. **Metáforas novas para reencantar a educação**: epistemologia e didática. Piracicaba: Unimep. 2011. 263 p. ISBN: 9788585541262.
- BARTOLOMÉ RUIZ, Castor. A produção de violência e morte em larga escala: da biopolítica à tanatopolítica. *In*: NOTÍCIAS: os muros do esquecimento são edificados sobre os tijolos da memória. São Leopoldo/RS. 14/05/2018. Disponível em: <http://www.ihu.unisinos.br/78-noticias/578579-os-muros-do-esquecimento-sao-edificados-sobre-os-tijolos-da-memoria>. Acesso em: 8 set. 2018.
- BARTOLOMÉ RUIZ, Castor. O campo como paradigma biopolítico moderno. **Cadernos IHU em formação**, São Leopoldo/RS, v.9, n. 45, p. 15-19, 2013. Disponível em: <http://www.ihuonline.unisinos.br/artigo/4063-castor-ruiz-5>. Acesso em: 10 out. 2018.
- BAUMAN. Zigmund. **Vidas desperdiçadas**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 2005. 170 p. ISBN: 85-7110-873-0.
- CACIABUE, Matías. América Latina en movimiento. *In*: CONFERÊNCIA REGIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO SUPERIOR DA AMÉRICA LATINA E O CARIBE (CRES 2018), 3., 2018,

Córdoba, Argentina.. Tradução Cepat. Disponível em: <http://www.ihu.unisinos.br/582151-a-educacao-superior-em-um-mundo-globalizado>. Acesso em: 27 ago. 2018.

CARVALHO, Alexandre Filordi de. A função-educador na perspectiva da biopolítica e da governamentalidade neoliberal. **Cadernos IHU Ideias**, São Leopoldo/RS , v. 14, n. 244, 2016. Disponível em: <https://dokumentis.com/a-funao-educador-na-perspectiva-da-biopolitica-e-da-governam.html>. Acesso em: 15 set. 2018.

DALE, Roger. Globalização e educação: demonstrando a existência de uma “Cultura Educacional Mundial Comum” ou localizando uma “Agenda Globalmente Estruturada Para a Educação”? **Educação e Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 25, n. 87, p. 423-460, maio/ago. 2004.

EINSTEIN, Albert. **Como vejo o mundo**. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1953. 213 p. ISBN-10: 8520935419.

FLICKINGER, Hans-Georg. A pedagogia – má consciência da democracia representativa? *In*: COLÓQUIO INTERNACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO: DEMOCRACIA EM TEMPO DE CRISES, 6., 2018, Joaçaba, SC. **Anais...** Joaçaba, SC: Unoesc, 2018. p. 1-12.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Verdade e poder**. *In*: FOUCAULT, Michel. *Microfísica do poder*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1993, p. 1-14. 432 p. ISBN: 9788577532964.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Em defesa da sociedade**. Curso no Collège France (1975-1976). São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2005. 396 p. ISBN 85-336-1004-1.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Segurança, território e população**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2008. 572 p. ISBN: 978-85-336-2377-4

FOUCAULT, Michel. **História da sexualidade I: A vontade de saber**. 13. ed. Rio de Janeiro: E. Graal, 1999. 176p. ISBN: 9788577532940.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Microfísica do poder**. 28. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2014. 432 p. ISBN: 9788577532964.

FREITAS, Alexandre Simão de. A formação humana no contexto da consumação metafísica do sujeito: ética da potência de Agamben. **Educação**, Porto Alegre, v. 38, n. 3, p. 415-423, set./dez., 2015. Disponível em: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=84844323012>. Acesso: 30 set. 2018.

GENTILI, Pablo e ALENCAR, Francisco. **Educar na esperança em tempo de desencanto**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2001. 141 p. ISBN-10: 8532626432.

GOERGEN, Pedro. Tecnociência, pensamento e formação na educação superior. **Avaliação**, Sorocaba, SP, v. 19, n. 3, p. 561-584, nov., 2014. Disponível em: <http://submission.scielo.br/index.php/aval/article/view/141219/8928>. Acesso em: 30 jul. 2018

JULIATTO, Clemente Ivo. **Ciência e transcendência: duas lições a aprender**. Curitiba/PR.: Champagnat Editoras PUCPR, 2012. 301 p. ISBN: 9788572922579.

LENOIR, Yves. O utilitarismo de assalto às ciências da educação. **Educar em Revista**, Curitiba, Brasil, n. 61, p. 159-167, jul./set. 2016. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/er/n61/1984-0411-er-61-00159.pdf>. Acesso: 25 ago. 2018.

MARX, Karl. **Sobre a questão judaica**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2010. 144 p. ISBN 978-85-7559-144-4.

MATURANA, Humberto; VARELA, Francisco. **A árvore do conhecimento: as bases biológicas da compreensão humana**. Campinas, SP: Editora Psy II, 1995. 281 p. ISBN: 85.85.480-21-1.

MATURANA, Humberto. **Emoções e linguagens na educação e na política**. Belo Horizonte: Ed. UFMG, 2002. 98 p. ISBN: 85-7041-152-9.

MATURANA, Humberto. YÁÑEZ, Ximena Dávila. **Habitar humano**. São Paulo: Palas Athena, 2009. 272 p. ISBN: 85-72-048-7.

MATURANA, Humberto. VERDEN-ZOLLER, Gerda. **Amar e brincar: fundamentos esquecidos do humano**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Palas Athena, 2011. 264 p. ISBN: 8572420487.

NEGRI, Antonio. e HARDT, Michael. **Declaração: isto não é um manifesto**. São Paulo: N-1 edições, 2014. 144p. ISBN: 978-85-66943-09-2.

NEGRI, Antonio. Para uma definição ontológica da multidão. **Revista Lugar Comum - Estudos de Mídia, Cultura e Democracia**. Rio de Janeiro, n.19-20, p.15-26, 2004.

NUSSBAUM, Martha. **Sem fins lucrativos: por que a democracia precisa das humanidades**. SP.: Martins Fontes, 2015. 153 p. ISBN: 9788578279783.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Souza e MENESES, Maria Paula. **Epistemologias do Sul**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010. 638 p. ISBN 9788524915796.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Souza. Los dolores que quedan son las libertades que faltan. Para continuar y profundizar el Manifiesto de 1918. *In*: CONFERÊNCIA REGIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO SUPERIOR DA AMÉRICA LATINA E O CARIBE (CRES 2018), 3., 2018, Córdoba, Argentina. Disponível em <http://www.ihu.unisinos.br/78-noticias/579979-boaventura-de-sousa-santos-destrincha-o-assedio-neoliberal-as-universidades>. Acesso em: 25 ago. 2018.

SLOTERDIJK, P. **Regras para o parque humano: uma resposta à carta de Heidegger sobre o humanismo**. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 2000, p. 64. ISBN: 9788574480213.