



Education as Commodity: Challenges of Higher Education in Capitalism's Crisis

Estefanni Mairla Alves¹  Ruth Maria de Paula Gonçalves² 

¹ Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie/ Universidade Municipal de São Caetano do Sul

ABSTRACT

Education is an inalienable good of humanity, since its main purpose is the reproduction of the social being. It depends on it to put into operation the human potential of creation and the transfer on its discoveries to later generations. However, such a meaning has been lost in the middle of the capitalist sociability in a structural crisis which, in order to regain its profit margin, seizes and perverts even the most essential human goods, such as education. This article aims to analyze and discuss this process through a bibliographical review that brings back how the higher education, especially the public university, has gone through a long process of ceasing to be entitled as right to become a speculated commodity in the financial market.

ABSTRACT

Education. Commodities. Capitalism. Higher education.

Corresponding to Author

¹Estefanni Mairla Alves

E-mail: estefanni.mairla@uece.br

Universidade Estadual do Ceará, Brasil
CV Lattes

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/3294529721946278>

Submitted: 11 Feb. 2018

Accepted: 20 Dez. 2018

Published: 29 Aug. 2019

 10.20396/riesup.v5i0.8653651

e-location: e019024

ISSN 2446-9424

Checkagem Antiplágio



Distribuído sobre



Educação Como Mercadoria: Desafios da Educação Superior em Meio ao Capitalismo em Crise

RESUMO

A educação é um bem inalienável da humanidade, uma vez que sua principal finalidade é a de reprodução do ser social. A ela cabe colocar em funcionamento a potencialidade humana de criação e repasse das suas descobertas às gerações posteriores. Porém, tal significado tem se perdido em meio à sociabilidade capitalista em crise estrutural, que para recuperar sua margem de lucro apodera-se e perverte mesmo os bens humanos mais essenciais, como a educação. Este artigo tem por objetivo analisar e discutir esse processo por meio de uma revisão bibliográfica que resgata como o ensino superior, em especial a universidade pública, tem passado por um longo processo de deixar de ser direito para se tornar uma mercadoria especulada no mercado financeiro.

PALAVRA-CHAVE

Educação. Comodidade. Capitalismo. Ensino superior.

Educación Como Mercancía: Desafíos de la Educación Superior en Medio al Capitalismo en Crisis

RESUMEN

La educación es un bien inalienable de la humanidad, ya que su principal finalidad es la de reproducción del ser social. A ella cabe poner en funcionamiento la potencialidad humana de creación y repaso de sus descubrimientos a las generaciones posteriores. Sin embargo, tal significado se ha perdido en medio de la sociabilidad capitalista en crisis estructural, que para recuperar su margen de ganancia se apodera y pervierte incluso los bienes humanos más esenciales, como la educación. En este artículo se pretende analizar y discutir este proceso por medio de una revisión bibliográfica que rescata como enseñanza superior, en especial la universidad pública ha pasado por un largo proceso de dejar de ser derecho para convertirse en una mercancía especulada en el mercado financiero.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Educación. Crisis Económica. Capitalismo. Enseñanza superior.

Introduction

We undertake in this text a literature review, outlining arguments to understand one of the great challenges of higher education today, which is to survive as a source of human formation - capable of contributing to the Brazilian scientific, social and cultural improvement - by neoliberal capitalist sociability. We traced this path starting with the discussion about what Mészáros (2002, 2008) produced and developed about the structural crisis of capital, especially in the way education is affected in this process. In order to dialogue with the Hungarian author, we bring other authors (COGGIOLA, 2001, LEHER, 2013, SGUISSARDI, SILVA JÚNIOR, 2009, their collaborators and others) who discuss the repercussions of this crisis not only in education, but mainly in higher education. We deal with the connections between the interest of capital in education as a new way of making a profit and then the university as a means of greater gains for the capitalist system.

It is necessary to think first of the purpose of Education, especially Higher Education. We resort to Lukács (2013) who defines the role of education as a reproducer of the social being - the human being in its completeness, in its continuous capacity for emancipation. That is to say, for this author, education is an inalienable good of humanity, responsible for reproducing the riches of human discoveries and inventions, making each generation, by taking hold of the discoveries of the previous one, make new constructions, providing a growing human emancipation, holder and replicator of its potentialities. However, with the advent and expansion of capitalism many of the naturally human goods were perverted into profit for capital, leaving education to be one of them, having established value and possibility of increasing profit in the stock market. This fact makes education one of the most profitable investments, not because of its potential for human reproduction, but because of its high reproductive capacity, thus losing its main purpose.

Thus, we place the problem of Brazilian higher education in the construction and expansion of the neoliberal state, influenced by the evolution of the globalization of the economy, which began in the civil-military dictatorship and reached its apex in the governments of the 1990s. agencies such as the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). These agents proclaimed changes that adjusted the higher education system to the requirements of the international market, adhering to the fundamentals of competitiveness, flexibility and speculation, reflecting the idea of higher education not as a public good, but a private good, limited to those who for it can pay (FÁVERO; BECHI, 2017).

Thus, the place of education as a right and common good is put in check, since it gradually becomes articulated to the current economic order, thus occupying the place of merchandise, distorting its role, which passes from human emancipation to generate profit for those who manage it. To cope with this situation, it is necessary to clarify and discuss the measures transposed as "social welfare", the role of higher education in our society, questioning whether it has contributed to a more democratic and solidary society, if the "body of knowledge offer an effective contribution to the preservation and flourishing of life, or if,

on the contrary, it becomes an agent of threats and destruction "(SUDBRACK, NOGARO, 2017, p. 428).

Structural Crises of Capital: From the Wealth of Production to the Production of Wealth

We selected two works by the Hungarian philosopher István Mészáros (2002, 2008) to support us in the proposed discussions. The first is the chapter "The production of wealth and the wealth of production" of the author's great work "Beyond Capital". In this work, Mészáros (2002) outlined the main considerations in order to understand the crisis that capital has been experiencing since the 1970s not as a cyclical crisis, but also as a crisis of structure. That is, a crisis that shakes the structures of capitalism and that has brought with it countless consequences for humanity, especially the poorest individuals, since in the attempt to search for stability and in the recovery of gain, capital has been taking over the complex founders of humanity - which leads to transforming rights into commodities.

In this way, we develop reflections about the richness of human production that it has already been and is still capable of producing for the good of mankind. However, it has lost that potential, since it is no longer the purpose of what is produced by man, but the production of wealth that not only limits it but also enslaves it. To conclude, we used some of the reflections that the author put forward in "Education Beyond Capital" (MÉSZÁROS, 2008) to discuss the repercussions that the crisis has had on the education complex and how the metabolism of capital has consumed this human complex, or in merchandise for capital gain.

We began the discussion about the wealth of production and the production of wealth, and what the impacts of it on education. An initial understanding of the structural crisis of capital is needed in order to understand how capital has emerged, has spread and reached its critical point, nowadays. What must first be assimilated is that when one speaks of the structural crisis of capital, it is not a cyclical crisis, as many as the system of capital has already passed, but rather a deep crisis, which for the first time reaches humanity as a whole and which requires, for its maintenance, "fundamental changes in the way social metabolism is controlled" (MÉSZÁROS, 2002, p.7).

The author understands that with the establishment of capitalism there is the institution of a new production process, totally different from those previously experienced. The characteristics of previous productive activities were qualitatively different from the current form of social reproduction, since nowadays it is oriented towards an incessant search for accumulation of capital (MÉSZÁROS, 2002).

From the outset, the capitalist system, for its development, depends on the exploitation to achieve the profit and to develop, becoming a system "that has its expansion oriented and directed by the **accumulation**" (MÉSZÁROS, 2002, p. 11 emphasis added). The exploitation

exerted by the capital is given especially to the worker, the labor, and turns it into a commodity, as described by Mészáros (2002, p.8):

Through the reduction and degradation of human beings to the status of mere "production costs" as the "necessary labor force," capital can treat homogeneous living labor as nothing more than a "marketable commodity," just as any other, subjecting it to the dehumanizing determinations of economic compulsion.

In this perspective, we can observe the face of the exploitation of man by man imposed by capital, because to maintain and reproduce the system is necessary to increase production and this is especially the abuse of the labor force, materialized by the increase of the journey reduction of wages, intensification of the rhythm, among others (DIONÍSIO, 2016). Another factor that becomes important in this metabolism of capital is the accounting of time, described by Mészáros (2008) as a dehumanizing, which obliges the working subjects to submit to the tyranny of "necessary working time", aiming at the increase of production which aims, in turn, to generate more reserve for accumulation, which is the "conversion of surplus value into capital and its (re) transformation into capital" (DIONÍSIO, 2016, p. 103). Hence the need for the exploitation of living labor, as this produces surplus value (MARX, 1982).

We highlight, then, the commodification, which can be considered the major characteristic of capitalist society, since everything can transform (and become) into merchandise, which occurs from the article result of the work of the exploited worker, to the worker himself, once its labor is under the command of the capitalist who owns the means of production (DIONÍSIO, 2016). In addition, other goods are transformed into commodities, such as water, fresh air¹, health, culture, education and so many others that should be undisputed patrimonies of humanity, have won labels and prices. Another aspect fostered by capital - and one of its striking features since its inception - is the production of wealth disconnected from want; it is produced first, then the demand is created, so that human needs will be subordinated to the reproduction of exchange value (MÉSZÁROS, 2002).

We then trace considerations about this peculiarity that capital presented and instituted in society, the differentiation between the production of wealth (one of its principles) and the wealth of production (linked to human need). To begin our discussions, we have salvaged a point in history, a change in the form of production. Ponce (2010) points out that the exchange of goods started the transformation of production, since a part of the products began to be destined for commercial purposes. If before that which was produced was consumed immediately and only what was left would be for trade, it was intentionally changed, generating a trade surplus. From then on, it was determined the separation between the usefulness of things in order to heal the immediate needs and their usefulness for commerce: use-value is separated from the value of exchange, and this was useful so that the production of wealth became the goal of humanity (MÉSZÁROS, 2008).

¹ There are currently two brands (one Canadian and one British) that sell bottled pure air. With one of its main markets being China, whose population suffers from high levels of air pollution.

The separation between the value of use and the exchange value is the starting point for capitalism to transform man into an object, because it makes the production of wealth become the goal of human production. This disjunction between "necessity and the production of wealth, oriented to exchange value, independent of the limits of genuinely human needs" (RABELO; MENDES SEGUNDO, 2004, p.43) is one of the greatest assets to move the gears of capital. This leads to the propagation of the logic that human existential needs do not have to be fulfilled, are deprecated in relation to the need for reproduction and accumulation of capital (RABELO, MENDES SEGUNDO, 2004).

Notably, a reorganization of the division of labor was necessary, since before production aimed at the reproduction of the producer, now has to meet the needs of the market. Under the yoke of capital, the worker can no longer consider the conditions of his production and the reproduction of his property, they are but reflections and results of his own being, for now his production belongs:

[...] a reified "stranger" who confronts producers with their own demands and subjugates them to the material imperatives of their own constitution. Thus, the original relationship between the subject and the object of productive activity is completely subverted, reducing the human being to the dehumanized status of a mere "material condition of production." The "having" dominates the "being" in all spheres of life. At the same time, the real self of productive subjects is destroyed through fragmentation and degradation of labor as they are subjugated to the brutalizing demands of the capitalist labor process. (MÉSZÁROS, 2008, p. 606).

In this way, a more tyrannical face of the capital system is revealed, since the human beings responsible for the production of goods for society have no place in the process of capital, much less are the focus of production, because, as previously revealed, their necessities are not - nor do they intend to be - met by the production required by the system. And this production, which forces itself to continuous growth, has as its premise only the endless multiplication of wealth (MÉSZÁROS, 2008). This makes capital historically a powerful spontaneous regulator of production, and the pattern of success of production that it is able to measure is the degree of adjustment to the imperatives of production subservient to the expansion of utilitarian material wealth (MÉSZÁROS, 2008).

In order to break with this exploitation by capital, there is a need for production to become consciously controlled by producers, and that it aims to meet their needs, since it is not in this way that it controls them by imposing structural imperatives as the premise of social practice. To this end, Marx (1982) and Mészáros (2008, p.614) point out that the way is "**self-realization** through the **wealth of production** (and not through the **production of alienating and reified wealth**) as the purpose of the vital activity of social individuals" (author's italics). This perspective of production offers the viable possibility of escaping the current unrestrained self-reproduction of capital and its destructive consequences, also signifying a possible production of realizing human creative potentialities and the continued reproduction of intellectual and material conditions of social interchange (MÉSZÁROS, 2008).

However, the process of wealth production is widespread in our society, including education and the production of science. The products - university vacancies, diplomas, scientific articles - go through the reification and reductive quantification process. This type of production brings long-term sequelae, particularly in a dehumanized and alienated work function (MÉSZÁROS, 2008). The quantity demanded dictates the whole process of production and time becomes more and more narrow, and the demanding production, at best, the motto of capital: "time is money." Therefore, human beings began to adjust to this productive logic of the capital system, being part of it as important pieces, but its peculiarities and qualities that qualify it as humans are now seen as impediments to the maximum effectiveness of a system that has its laws and forms of legitimation (MÉSZÁROS, 2008).

What is striking in this scenario is the perversion through which the sense of human need passes, for the "human need" of producers is not what counts as "necessity" for capital. The value of use is subordinated to the exchange value, in order to follow the reproduction and the valorization of the system. This makes the worker's access to a certain class and usage values (which may or may not match your needs) limited. In this way, the worker starts to internalize the "needs" presented by the capital imperative, so the use value becomes inseparable from the exchange value, naturalizing the whole process. Thus, the worker himself is tied to the fate of the productive system through the internalization of what he admits to being his own "legitimate" needs. Mészáros (2008, p. 628) warns that "in due time, under the conditions of internalized consumer capitalism, the worker, if he dares to challenge the established order, has in fact much more to lose than his external fetters. "

Therefore, the reorientation of **wealth production** that limits creativity and freedom of human production to the **wealth of production**, which is humanly enriching with an optimum utilization rate, aiming and meeting the real needs of mankind, is the key to a breakup with the reifying system of surplus-value predicted by capital. Obviously, such an upheaval implies profound basic changes in all levels of socioeconomic, cultural and educational production, giving space for the advent of a deeply different and non-hierarchical work organization, both macro and micro, of the constitutive points of the social order. Consequently, we can break the cruel logic of interdependence and the perverse homogenization that is currently present in the division of labor under the command of capital (MÉSZÁROS, 2008).

Reverberations of the Structural Crisis of Capital in Education

Mészáros (2008, p.16) states that: "In the realm of capital, education is itself a commodity." In this sentence he sums up the greater consequence that the capital system has brought to education, an extremely expensive complex for humanity, something that came from the work with the purpose of the human being to pass their cultural patrimony to their offspring and that we see to be consumed of cruel form by the metabolism of this system.

To contextualize our discussion, we will make a brief historical rescue of the role of education during some periods of organization of society, in order to have an understanding of how the role that education has been assuming during the era of capitalism has been changing for a long time, that is, it is not recent. In primitive societies, education was a common good and members of the tribes were educated collectively from daily activities and taking work as one of the main guiding principles of the process. As societies became more complex, they created new roles and assignments, such as administrators and tax collectors, functions that required differentiated "training." From then on, the process of education was gradually ceased to be communal, being sliced and appropriate for each social class, bringing inequality to the educational process ever since. From that point on, the whole process of techniques, beliefs, and formation became the property of higher classes - administrators - who distribute and organize them according to their own interests (DIONÍSIO, 2016).

This shows us that since the dawn of a more complex society there is the privatization of knowledge by the ruling class with a view to maintaining the existing order. From an early age, it was realized that denying knowledge to the masses and articulating strategies to maintain the alienation of most populations culminates in the non-questioning of the status quo, leading to a belief that it cannot be changed (DIONÍSIO, 2016).

One of the earliest institutions to assume public teaching was the Catholic Church in the early Middle Ages, dividing the teaching processes according to the class to which it was to be directed, one form of instruction intended for the training of future monks and another for the teaching of reading and writing restricted to the first group. The purpose of schooling aimed at the plebs was to familiarize this part of the population - which was the majority - with Christian doctrine, and thus to keep it conformed to its position and position in society. It can be seen, then, that in no way was an instruction of the people objectified; instead of instrumentalizing them, was to prevent their access to enlightenment, thus maintaining the majority of society alienated (DIONÍSIO, 2016). Following the historical evolution of humanity, we have come to the changes that the society suffered with the advent of trade and the rise of the bourgeoisie, which naturally reverberated in educational processes. At that moment, the bourgeois class demanded more education and more schools, commerce began to demand another type of education, repelling theological indoctrination. Thus, through the influence of the bourgeoisie that began to demand new forms and processes of instruction, the university worm emerged (DIONÍSIO, 2016).

Universities arise to meet a desire or need of the growing mercantile bourgeoisie. It begins with encounters of men (of possessions) who sought to cultivate a deeper contact with science, and this was expanding on the European continent, generating in the bourgeoisie the will and the notion of the need to expand the intellectual aspect, to the bourgeois lifestyle. The structure that the university organizes at the time is as we know it today, counting on the implantation of admission exams based, in levels, that went from "apprentice to master for the craftsmen or normal citizens and for the young people who wanted to follow the studies. The titration levels were bachelor's, licensed and doctor. This was officially - **the first frankly liberal organization of the Middle Ages** "(PONCE, 2010, p.101, emphasis added). The

institution of the university and its titles granted, paved the way for the bourgeoisie to share advantages that hitherto were restricted to the nobility and the clergy: the children of bourgeois could from that moment onwards take part in the religious orders; the bourgeoisie now appropriated bureaucracy and justice; and the reach of a university degree promoted the bourgeois almost at the level of the nobility (PONCE, 2010).

Therefore, we have reached the beginning of the capitalist system. With the collectivization of production, everything began to flourish very quickly and machines - new "stars" of the production process - imposed the restriction of being usable only by a group of educated workers. This fact began to foster the need for the universalization of education, and the new mode of production forced the working class to have a minimum of knowledge in order to increase production (DIONÍSIO, 2016). The notion of full employment is replaced by employability. In this way, education turns to labor to be absorbed in production, so instrumentalization occupies a differential place between the unemployed and the labor force (DIONÍSIO, 2016).

Hence, the system of capital develops in a universal and globalized way, reaching all societies, reaching its apex and also its structural crisis, which, as already considered, differs from all others by which it has already passed, shake its base and achieve its principles. Then, of course, he relies on countless attempts at survival. It is from the order of capital itself to make use of the appropriation and atrophy of any kind of relation or possibility of inclusion, and in passing through the crisis, this process becomes more and more rapid and pitiless. In view of the peculiarity of the crisis, if it does not only fall on the economy, but slips in other social complexes, capital appropriates education in one of the attempts of its re-emergence.

Education, therefore, which was supposed to be an unquestionable resource for transformation, has become yet another instrument of the stigmata of capitalist society; now it is also instrumental to employment, supplying the restricted information for the operation of productive machinery; the generation and diffusion of certain values that legitimize the interests of the dominant. Thus, Mézáros (2008, p.15) portrays education today as "a part of the process of accumulation of capital and establishment of a consensus that makes possible the reproduction of the unjust class system. Instead of being an instrument of human emancipation, it is now a mechanism for perpetuating and reproducing this system. "

The Hungarian author goes on to claim that the more "advanced" capitalist society is, the more it stands back at a production of reified wealth with an end in itself. It led it to explore the complex of education in its institutions, from elementary schools to universities, especially using privatization and aiming at the continuity of the commodity society (MÉSZÁROS, 2008). Within the discussions already elaborated, it is not at all surprising that capital also appropriated science and the production of knowledge as another crutch of support for the crisis. Returning to the discussion about wealth production, what we perceive today in universities is just that, a reified production of diplomas, the perspective of quantity supplanting quality - especially not only professional training, but also critical thinking - perhaps the most problematic, the alienation of the university public (we can include both

teachers and students), because this is something that should be naturally antagonistic. Thus, we can witness the perversity of capital in transforming the wealth of science production-aimed at shedding light on questions, seeking solutions to problems and social unrest-in producing a wealth of volumes of diplomas sent out, making science bow to the capital.

This leads us to reflect on: what is the use of the educational system - the public in particular - if not to fight against alienation? (MÉSZÁROS, 2008). But sadly, we are faced with the reality that, at present, one of the primary functions of education in our society is to generate as much conformity as is capable, this institutionalized and legally sanctioned (MÉSZÁROS, 2008).

Within the perspective of changing this situation, there is the primordially of overcoming the dehumanizing logic of capital, which prioritizes individualism, profit and competition among members of society. Gramsci (SA apud MÉSZÁROS, 2008) points out that the role of education is to put an end to the separation between "Homo Faber and Homo Sapiens", thus redeeming the primordial sense of education in its relation with work and disposing of human creative possibilities eminently emancipatory education. In this way, we also defend a permanent and continuous education so that it can be defined as such; educational practices. We also prescribe that educational practices provide students and educators with the necessary changes for the rise of a society and that leisure time is also respected, since in these days the ruling classes inflict an education with a view to alienating work, aiming to keep man dominated. For Mészáros (2008), these characteristics define an education beyond capital, that is, an educational process that goes hand in hand with the struggles for a profound transformation of the current hegemonic economic and political model.

In this way, a liberating education is sought, which fights the self-alienation of work, promoting in a conscious and oriented way the joint universalization of work and education. Considering the prominent role of education as a way for the elaboration of strategies to change the objective conditions of reproduction, orienting towards the "**conscious automation**" of the individuals called to concretize the creation of a radically different metabolic social order" (MÉSZÁROS, 2008, p. 68, emphasis added).

The Crises Reaches Higher Education

After having developed some clarifications about the structural crisis of capital and its consequences on the education complex, we seek in this item to expose and discuss in more depth the losses that the crisis has brought, in particular, to higher education, discussing how the crisis comes to the university, bringing damage to the education complex and, as we said before, having to serve the reproduction of the human race, begins to serve the reproduction of capital.

Sguissardi and Silva Júnior (2009) show that the globalization of the economy brings with it the commodification of education, science and technology. This consequence allows flexibility and competition in these areas to develop, which is essential for the economic system. This leads to a questioning between: 1) the role that the university should play in being the critical reason of the historical time and of the society to which it belongs; and 2) the role it takes to assume the administration of education, geared towards the reproduction of sociability productive. With this, the university is transformed and occupies a space relevant to the State.

The rise of the university, as we have already discussed, occurred in the Middle Ages, in the heart of the Catholic Church, at the beginning of the formation of the monks. However, with the rise of the bourgeoisie, it was expanding in order to meet the needs of the society to which it belonged. Over time it has become increasingly secular - even though there are still confessional universities² that also claim to be knowledge producers. In this way, the humanistic vocation, so present when it was founded, is lost at the end of the nineteenth century and the university assumes a place of production of science and professionalization. This occurred in a process that was especially highlighted in US universities (WEBER, 1998, apud SGUISSARDI; SILVA JÚNIOR, 2009). In this way, we highlight the role of the university in the social division of labor, since training the specialist for the purpose of higher education at the time, institutionalized and systematized a production and reproduction of knowledge that further divided the gap between manual and intellectual. Thus, the centrality of intellectual work in the university demonstrated that what was produced was considered of immense value, giving it a prominent place in contemporary capitalism. According to Sguissardi and Silva Júnior (2009, p.12), "there will be no effort for economic development that is successful if the university is not its main engine."

As a result of this need for economic development, especially in the context of the structural crisis, the State has turned to university as one of the lifeline tables for capital, which seeks an operationalization for its amplified reproduction³ (LEHER, 2013). As a result, policies for higher education take new guidelines, mostly in line with what is recommended by the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the World Bank (WB), two bodies that are known to work for the capital and in the quest to overcome its crisis.

Guided by world organizations, the policies that gradually led to a commodification of education in Brazil began during the period of the civil-military dictatorship (1964-1985). In 1968, a university reform was introduced that would profoundly modify the Brazilian university⁴, widening the possibilities for the development of private higher education. For the first time the university's link with the labor market is clear. The reform would be

² We can cite as an example the Pontifical Catholic University (PUC).

³ In the sense of the capacity of the transformation of surplus value into capital, as described by Marx (1982). This means that, in the midst of the structural crisis of capital, the commodity of education is not only capable of generating surplus value, but of its being converted into capital again, thus allowing a broader reproduction of capital.

⁴ We will delve deeper into issues concerning such a reform.

responsible for launching on the market professionals trained according to the needs imposed by the neoliberal economic model - started at that time and booming in the 1990s - through which Brazil transited, leaving a primary economy for the tertiary sector. During this period, scholarships were awarded through the Government Economic Action Program (PAEG), for students to study in private institutions.

Cunha (2007) points out that, in 1973, 39% of public resources spent on higher education consisted of subsidies for private schools, in the second half of the 1970s the private sector reached 50% of total enrollment in higher education, a trend expansion that in the 1990s reaches even greater numbers. These data mark the gateway of investment funds and international corporations that have been subjecting private education to the dynamics of financial capital, supported by public resources (LEHER, 2013).

In the 1990s, the globalization process became a hegemony, marked by a globalized economy that preached individualism and the market above human needs, causing subjection to profit to have serious consequences for human well-being, such as notes Sudbrack and Nogaro (2017). Hence, stock market fluctuations reverberate around the world, and thus all strive for a shift of capital. With this, neoliberal policies⁵ took the most committed attempts to get out of the crisis, this meant economic privatization, overthrow of social achievements, and intensification of exploitation of the proletarian labor force, as expressed by Coggiola (2001, p. 109).

[...] is that the crisis must be paid by the workers, for health, for public education, for the destruction of social achievements in general. In a "global" world, there is a direct connection between the crisis in the Asian Stock Exchanges and the 50% cut in CAPES PET stock exchanges: student exchanges pay for the stock market crisis.

Given this situation at the end of the twentieth century, the World Bank has a direct influence on Brazilian educational policies, orienting the need for an educational reform that guarantees rationality and efficiency to the Brazilian higher education system (CARVALHO, 2006). In the 1980s, when the document entitled "Educational Financing in Developing Countries: An Exploration of Policy Options", the Bank strongly argued that the greatest social return is in the investment in basic education, not higher education (SGUISSARDI, 2005). Another WB document, dated 1994, reiterates the proposal of the previous registry and launches the idea of diversification of higher education, criticizing the Brazilian model based on research universities. The claim is that it is a very expensive and inadequate standard to the needs and resources of the poorest countries, that State investments should focus on basic education, which would provide sufficient instruction for the vast majority of future workers. Passing, thus, higher education to private initiative, so that only those who could pay for it had access (SGUISSARDI, 2005).

⁵ "Neoliberalism" was as it was convened to call the policies of economic privatization and degradation of social achievements implemented in Europe and the United States in the late 1970s, in Latin America post-military dictatorships and in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe "post -communism".

In 1998, a new document from that body was sent to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as a contribution to the World Conference on Higher Education held in Paris. In this document, the WB defends the thesis that higher education would have much more characteristics of a private good than a public good⁶, and it is this thesis that will support the opening of the Brazilian "educational market" to free entrepreneurship (SGUISSARDI, 2008b).

This was followed by a 1999 document from the same institution on the need for diversification of institutions, arguing that the higher education system in peripheral countries should have few research universities, followed by vocational universities of four years and technical training institutes lasting two years. This is supported by the idea that countries such as Brazil should invest in training labor for the market and not in brains for the research⁷, even because they would not have competitiveness in front of the great centers of innovations and creations of patents (OTRANTO, 2006). That is, only the WB was at least 13 years defending the same idea, and every document released reiterates the proposal for the privatization of higher education.

These documents attest to the efforts that the organizations holding world capital have undertaken to appropriate the education, especially higher education, as a means of reproducing capital. The WTO is yet another example of an international organization that strives to profit from educational services by encouraging and pushing its member countries to adopt trade rules in the educational field. The aim is to link education to the service sector, since, according to the WTO, this should be a commodity (OTRANTO, 2006). In fact, in view of these demands, the presidency of the Brazilian Republic declares:

Decree n. 2.306 of August 19th 1997 recognizing higher education as a tradable good, that is, as an object of profit or accumulation; a commodity or an **education-commodity**, of interest to the entrepreneurs of education, which would be completed with their twin pair of interest of all businessmen of the other industrial or commercial branches, the **commodity-education**. (RODRIGUES, 2007, page 5, GRIFOS DO AUTOR).

It is therefore in a context of deep crisis that the privatization of education takes its heaviest form, once it is given that higher education can be turned into a 'business' for capital in crisis, desperate for new fields of profitable exploitation. "(COGGIOLA, 2001, p. 110). The process of privatizations of universities began, from the so-called "white privatization", in which the funding of external resources was delegated to the university, starting with the creation of foundations that would provide support to the institutions in a mixed capital economy, reaching the end from the 1990s to the real attempt to privatize the then University

⁶ Nicholas Barr's 1993 thesis is due to the fact that he considers higher education to be characteristic of competitive conditions due to its limited supply; Excludability: Not everyone has the ability to have access, but it is possible to obtain it through payment and refusal, because it is not something that is required by everyone. According to the author, such characteristics do not respond to those of a strictly public good, but to those of a private good.

⁷ Ivo Tonet (2007) states that once capital is kidnapped by the education complex, it no longer serves human emancipation, and because it is at the base of the capitalist system, both labor exploitation and division in classes, it is extremely feasible to realize this separation between mind and the working hand.

of Tocantins (Unitins), now the Federal University of Tocantins (UFT), the only public university in the state at the time.

Following this situation, a broad opening was made for the development of an education-commodity. Educational services were included in the Free Trade Agreements, which, through the liberalization of markets, could be present in universities around the world, offering courses and trainings of famous institutions in the educational market (LEHER, 2013). What has brought to education, and especially to higher education, a form of management that increases the share of educational companies in the stock market. This management was based on business standards of maximum effectiveness and efficiency with low costs, outsourcing to the maximum to guarantee a growing profit margin (SUDBRACK; NOGARO, 2017).

Thus, large investment funds began to appear in the so-called Brazilian educational market, a phenomenon already present, especially in the United States and Europe (SGUISSARDI, 2008b). It is worth pointing out that foreign groups have been increasingly present in Brazilian higher education institutions, offering their services with international brands and boasting the idea of global employability⁸, since they are present in the five continents. As an example, Inc. Laureate International Universities is currently present in 25 countries, controlling 67 institutions, of which 12 are in Brazil (the country with the largest number of institutions belonging to the group); Whitney and DeVry, both with profiles similar to the previous example. Completing the scenario, we have the major Brazilian educational higher education networks opening their capital for the investment of trading their shares on the São Paulo stock exchange (Bovespa). It is relevant to cite the case of Kroton, who began in the 1970s as a pre-college Pythagoras course, evolving years later into a network of elementary schools, arriving in colleges in the 2000s. In 2007, he opened his capital on the Bovespa under the nickname of Kroton Educational and bought other institutions. In 2016, it became the largest education company in higher education in the world with the purchase of Unopar, Anhanguera and Estácio, accumulating an amount of R\$ 27.2 billion in market value (SCRIVANO, 2016). In order to have a notion, in 2007, these companies came to be worth, in one year in the capital market, the sum of approximately R\$ 1.9 billion (SGUISSARDI, 2008a), less than 10 years later there was an increase in more of 20 times this value.

This fact demonstrates that investing in private higher education companies is profitable, which makes the private networks of Brazilian colleges and universities an "object of desire" for capital, since, as Sguissardi (2008, p. 1006) points out, "Was already to be expected, since a sector that moves 15 billion reais annually would not be excluded from speculative financial market ciranda." What worries in this situation is the fact that the state

⁸ Lima (2009) brings in the text the role that education has assumed against this responsibility of employability, which from education to work, would facilitate the engagement of the subject of the labor market, thus supplanting the situation of lived poverty. Thus, education assumes a role of panacea of all evils, which we know to be a fallacy.

credits and finances institutions that make its their ultimate goal, even if not explicitly. It is observed that through what capital has already demonstrated in other crises, this does not aim at an environmental preservation nor adequate working conditions for workers (we include here the disrespect to the labor laws), do not emphasize by the ethics in the provision of its services, nor for the quality of the products offered, much less they aim at a general good for the society to which they belong. These are just some of the nuances present in the market activities in general: if the educational market is part of this larger, would not it be susceptible to follow the same rules of functioning for profit (SGUISSARDI, 2008)? If we start from the assumption of work as a foundational complex that the metabolism of capital began to explore - and depends on it for its survival - and education as a complex founded on it, we would have an affirmative answer: yes, education is subject to the laws of the market.

All this scenario described in the private sector of higher education demonstrates that entrepreneurs of education seek valuation and control of the commodity-education and demonstrate the strength they have and will tend to exert over the entire educational system of higher education (private and public) so that the inputs that best serve the goals of increase of profit are produced.

Now, if we speak especially of particular institutions, how does this affect the public university? Let us return to what was defended by the documents of the international organizations: to withdraw State investments from public universities and to leave higher education in charge of private universities. We note that this determination opened up the possibilities for a broader dominance of private universities in the higher education system in the last decades, yet they were funded by the government. One of the examples we can cite is:

[...] the University for All Program (ProUni), institutionalized by law n. 11,096, dated January 13, 2005, and the Program to Support Restructuring and Expansion Plans of Federal Universities (Reuni), established by decree no. 6,096, of April 24, 2007; decree n. 7,423, dated December 31, 2010, which regulates partnerships between federal universities and foundations under private law, making it possible to raise private funds to finance scientific and technological research activities. (SILVEIRA; BIANCHETTI, 2016, p.15).

Federal incentives given to private institutions through ProUni consist of exemption from corporate income tax, social contribution on net income, social contribution for social security financing and contribution to the social integration program. It is worth noting that even so, not all students who apply for scholarships are able to receive them in the integral modality, however, they can get funding through the Student Funding Fund (Fies), which means public money going directly to private education funds. Fávero and Bechi (2017) show that the public-private partnership promoted by FIES and ProUni has boosted the development of private higher education institutions (HEIs), both because they have attributed the social function of higher education to a significant part of the population, how to promote their economic growth. The authors report that between 2006 and 2009, the granting of tax exemption only for these educational companies totalized more than R\$1 billion. This also means reducing state investment in the public university. As Otranto (2006) acknowledges, if the public money going to private companies was sent to the public

university, it would allow the expansion of the teaching staff, allowing all courses to work at night, which would imply an increase over four years of almost one million new enrollments at federal universities, instead of the 120,000 grants provided by ProUni.

Another aspect that can be seen in this context is the "white privatization" of public universities, laws such as n° 11.079, of December 30, 2004, which regulates public-private partnerships (PPP), and establishes general norms for bidding and contracting of public-private partnership in the field of public administration, i.e. opening up private-equity firms to "invest" in the public sector, having some benefits in return, and taking some of the state's responsibility for the burden on public institutions, especially universities. In addition, we can cite the "Law of Technological Innovation", n° 10.973, of December 2, 2004, that is the investment of private companies applied directly in the research projects of the universities. Given that the most renowned research programs are in public universities and need money to maintain, private investment is an option, however, the research will be directed to the interests of its sponsor, because, for him, it is about an investment, which constitutes a mechanism of research induction (OTRANTO, 2006).

Thus, as Coggiola (2001, p. 111) observes: "This is the global transformation that the bourgeoisie wants for the university: to cut funds, to select those that will receive the crumbs [...] and to privatize their spaces so that companies profit. "That is, in order to save capitalist businesses, the solution that has been found is to turn universities into a large, profitable business. We therefore recall the speech in which Céline Saint-Pierre (1998 apud SGUISSARDI, 2005, p. 203), president of the Québec Higher Council of Education, at the close of the World Conference for Higher Education, said: "The future of teaching superior in a changing society and its essential role in human development. "She also proclaimed that higher education is a public good, and therefore should not be treated and transformed into a market-oriented knowledge enterprise, for now, as never before, science, knowledge and technology have been so as a commodity to be appropriated by capital through large corporations globalized and guided by the interests of central countries (SGUISSARDI, 2005).

Metamorphosis of the University: Its New Values and the Public x Private Dichotomy

We begin this point in our discussion by presenting considerations about what the role of the university should be and what it has become. The emergence of the Brazilian university was late, as well as other institutions in our society, occurring only in the twentieth century⁹. Although there are colleges scattered throughout the country since the early nineteenth

⁹ In 1912, by forces of social mobilization, arises in Paraná the first university that only survived for three years; in 1920, Decree No. 14.343, dated September 7, 1920, officializes the University of Rio de Janeiro, currently Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (OTRANTO, 2006). It is relevant to point out that in 1918, while in Córdoba, Argentina, the manifesto in defense of the university as a public good and human and social right (FREITAS NETO, 2011) was already in existence in Brazil, it did not even exist.

century, as the university is characterized by the Humboldt model (requires a collegiate dedicated entirely to the university, research, teaching and extension to train not only professionals but also researchers, production of science) has only been made official in Brazil for less than 100 years (LEHER, SILVA, 2014). This particularity of our university is relevant in the sense that already in its emergence has the US university as a "model" to be followed, more pragmatic and focused on professional training.

Let us then reflect on the functions of the university, what they are, or at least what they should be, their goals. Teixeira (1998) points out that there are four basic functions of the university, being them: **professional training**, which aims to prepare professionals for technical, intellectual and scientific careers; the **expansion of the human mind**, provoked by the relationship with knowledge among those who attend university, the initiation in the intellectual life, the extension of the world view, the enlargement of the imagination, finally, the quest to know more; the **development of human knowledge**, since the university, besides cultivating knowledge, transmits it through research, discovering and adding newness to human knowledge, being the disinterested pursuit of knowing its engine; and, finally, the role of **transmitting a common culture**, the identity of the society to which it belongs.

Thus, the university is constituted as a center of knowledge that aims at increasing human knowledge; a preparation for culture that enables the widening of the mind and the maturing of the inventiveness of young people to the adventure of knowledge, a professional training institution and the most democratic means - which for Tonet (2007) is in democracy that creates space so that individuals fully reach their role as citizens, being respected in the exercise of their rights - and more refined for the elaboration and diffusion of the Brazilian common culture (SGUISSARDI, 2008). However, the performance of these functions has taken place in a fragmented, uncertain and sometimes bumpy manner (SGUISSARDI, 2008). Among the "breakdowns" in the four functions mentioned, the last one is in which the Brazilian university most failed, because besides being primarily professional, it is somewhat disinterested in the country, not conquering the place of transmitter of a common national culture. This fact justifies the speech of Sguissardi and Silva Júnior (2009, p. 49), when reporting that "it is not surprising that our scientists discuss foreign problems as professionals and nationals as amateurs."

Having these functions as the principal and exclusive functions to be performed by the university, we can determine the privileged locus that it occupies and, therefore, irreplaceable, since in the university:

It is not just about spreading knowledge. The book also diffuses them. It is not only a question of preserving the human experience. The book also preserves it. It is not only a matter of preparing practitioners or professionals, crafts or arts. Direct learning prepares them, or, in the last case, schools much simpler than universities. It is about maintaining an atmosphere of knowing to prepare the man who serves and develops it. It is a matter of preserving living and undead knowledge, in books or in the empiricism of non-intellectualized practices. It is a matter of formulating intellectually the human experience, always renewed, so that it becomes conscious and progressive. (TEIXEIRA, 1998, p.35).

Thus, we consider the possibility that the university may be losing its function as an institution for the formation of people who contribute to the cultural and social development of the country - one of its deepest characteristics - "to give place to the games of economic interests, accepting that the great determinant is the market, guided by the wings and principles of neoliberalism, thus subtracting its democratizing possibility of knowledge and culture "(SUDBRACK, NOGARO, 2017, p. 425).

In counterpoint, we have the opportunity, within its tripod of teaching, research and extension, to act in the top place of the knowledge society, with many possibilities of transforming social reality, and can promote not only professional training, but also the widening of the whole universe of knowledge, committing itself to give return to the community in general, in the search for solutions of problems that afflict the population (BERNHEIM, CHAÚÍ, 2008). However, as already discussed in the previous topic, it has lost this characteristic - which has not even been its strong point here - because it is increasingly closer to the market, since it has served capital and its reproduction.

The proposals set out by international organizations assume that from this prominent place occupied by the university, she would be able to promote socio-economic reform in the country, which would allow that Brazil fulfilled its secondary role in the international division of labor; that is, in the world economy, the role of Brazilian higher education would be to train qualified human resources to meet the demands of the market, and only (FÁVERO; BECHI, 2017). This is due to the fact that there are no real revolution intentions in education policy, as this would involve changing perceptions and understandings of society, embarking on the path of human emancipation, something that is not the intention of these reformist policies. The necessary changes are made, however, without altering the base. Several documents were released with this proposal as the core, one of them was the Atcon report¹⁰, which for the first time criticizes the financing of higher education by the state and advocates increasing the number of private higher education institutions to the detriment of public (SILVEIRA; BIANCHETTI, 2016). The report points out the organization of the Brazilian university as deformed, especially in terms of administration, didactic-pedagogical organization and, above all, funding. It is defended by Atcon that university autonomy basically consists of financial autonomy, which is considered

As the freedom of the university to select, hire, and dismiss staff; self-organized pedagogically, administratively and financially, with a cost that allows maximum income and less investment of funds within the annual budget, which implies an obligation to seek other sources of funding, other than the State, for its teaching, research and extension activities. (SILVEIRA; BIANCHETTI, 2016, p. 90).

And it is this perspective of autonomy that was spread during the expansion of the Brazilian university during the civil-military dictatorship that commanded the country for 21

¹⁰ Report prepared by the team of Rudolf Atcon, a member of the Agency International Development (AID), a Unesco consultant, originally published in 1961.

years. Measures implemented during this period were not only "successful," but intensified during the neoliberal governments of the 1990s.

Explaining the success of such measures, during the period of the dictatorship in Brazil, the Government Economic Action Program (PAEG) led the process of expansion of universities, however, according to the program proposal, the expansion of enrollments in higher education would not obey to student demand, but to the labor force needs demanded by the market. Economic interests would guide the expansion of Brazilian higher education, so the social claim for the right to higher education was muted, and the expansion of it would meet the aspirations of the technocratic state and local bourgeois leaderships (LEHER, 2013). Among the changes implemented in this period, which still have repercussions, Leher (2013) highlights three: **transferring the university's social function** centered on science and technology to the place of research towards technological innovation; **the growth of light courses**; and the greatest of all: **the expansion of private institutions** through state induction.

This last one reflects that the goal of the dictatorial government of expansion of the university vacancies never had as objective the strengthening and the amplification of the public universities. They opted to follow the dictates of international organizations and prioritized the promotion of the private sector, with tax exemptions for those with children enrolled in private HEIs, a benefit that was extended to the companies themselves - which were still under the cloak of philanthropy in the period. The policy of opening state-subsidized student loans began to serve consumers from families who originally did not have the resources to obtain educational goods, which was one of the main drivers of the extraordinary private expansion that occurred in the period. Such deliberations were justified by the urgency of "democratization" of access to higher education, but without necessarily expanding the public sector, since the existing centers of excellence were sufficient to meet the needs of scientifically trained personnel (LEHER, MOTTA, 2014).

The educational credit program created during the dictatorship - which persisted even after the end of the military government - was transformed in 1999, during the government of Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Fies, maintaining the same characteristics of its predecessor. In the government of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2011), the University for All Program (ProUni) was created and, since 2010, has been made possible by the National Fund for Education Development (FNDE) to annual interest adjustments. This meant the direct entry of public resources into private for-profit institutions (LEHER, 2013).

The university expansion is one of the great brands of the Lula government, as acknowledged by Sguissardi (2008), who found that there was a significant increase in the number of HEIs in the country, between 1994 and 2006, presenting data such as: while in the period public universities grew 13.7%, private ones increased 219.4%; in these 12 years the enrollments in public universities grew 75% compared to 275.2% in private individuals. These are extremely significant numbers, the public university has expanded much less than private, which has grown through state investment. We can affirm that there was a

multiplication of the Federal Institutes of Higher Education (Ifes), considering that up to 2008 more than 12 new federal university campuses were created in Brazil, benefiting metropolitan regions of major cities and interiors of the states. In spite of the aforementioned increase, in a total view of the number of enrollments, the public university has a much smaller number than the private/commercial institutes (SGUISSARDI, 2008).

According to Lima (2006), actions such as ProUni, the technological innovation law, the decree regulating private law foundations within HEIs, the purchase of technology packages for the expansion of distance higher education and the law of public-private partnerships enabled the continued decline in investment in public higher education. In addition to having created a legal basis to ensure direct and constant applications of public funds in the private sector of education, they have broadened the field of business of higher education at national and international levels.

Among the measures cited, authors such as Lima (2006), Fávero and Bechi (2017), Otranto (2006) and Leher (2013) are unanimous in relation to the fact that PPPs and private law foundations within public HEIs are the main responsible for the "white privatization" of Brazilian public universities, a fact that directly affects the autonomy of the university.

It has been battling for the autonomy of universities since before the dictatorial period. Such autonomy was curtailed during the military government and included in the 1988 Constitution, however, although assured by law, it never came to be exercised in fact. The Brazilian public universities are calling for the autonomy of financial and patrimonial management, which concerns the freedom of each public HEI to present and develop its own budget, in accordance with its needs, administering in the way that the resources passed on by the State best suit it. However, the autonomy devised by international organizations - such as the WTO, World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank - and adopted in government policies is financial, instrumental and pragmatic¹¹, understood as the prerogative of the university to capture its own resources in the market (OTRANTO, 2006). This would lead to "financial relief" for the state, which would only undertake to supplement the resources of universities and not be the main provider.

This type of administration with a view to being implemented, in a managerial model, causes great damages both for the university itself, and for the population that makes and intends to be part of it. One of the first affected would be the teachers and staff, who would lose their stability: in the case of the former, it directly affects their profession, both in terms of teaching and research. Be it in the way it conducts these two spheres, since they would be increasingly "watched", leading to a new cycle of ideological persecution, or inducing research aimed at the interests of private foundations, which in turn aim at market demands

¹¹ Lima (2009) presents Dewey as one of the great pragmatist theorists, and who has now been updated on a neo-pragmatism in John Rorty's perspective on Rorty. This is due to the limits of economists' immediacy, with the imposition of productivism, which does not recognize the human being as generic and reduces it to the fabricator and user of instruments.

and not , necessarily, to the social well-being. Unfortunately, the consequences can be even greater and worse, as identified by Adunicamp (2005, p.5):

- 1) the consolidation of the private axis as the vector of higher education provision;
- 2) the naturalization that the (few) young people of the popular classes who will have access to the higher level will receive education of drastically inferior quality;
- 3) the transformation of the university into the organization of services demanded by capital, transformed as technological innovation;
- 4) the conversion of technological education into an arm of business action; and
- 5) the hypertrophy of government and market control (financing and utilitarianism) over the public university, making autonomy and, above all, academic freedom impossible.

These reverberations lead to the dilemma that the public university now faces. It is considered a public state institution, given the legal regime and its maintenance by the State, however, openness to foundations and public-private partnerships causes us to discredit the public university as a public good, since these measures were privatizing it gradually and indirectly. From the moment these new forms of administration and financing take place, direct interference occurs in the processes of autonomy/heteronomy, evaluation, production and transmission of knowledge, aligning and leading all these aspects to the private-commercial perspective. According to Sader (2003, p.3, emphasis added), the de-characterization of the public university as a public good, since "the essence of the public [...] **is the universalization of rights**, the market is 'the commodification' of access to what should be rights: education, health, housing, basic sanitation, leisure, culture. "

Final Considerations

Since the 1970s, Brazilian higher education has gone through a financialization process - a phenomenon deeply aligned with the process of capitalist globalization - which, when faced with a structural crisis, as explained by Mészáros (2002), which seriously undermines its foundation, starts to take over human assets as a way of trying to overcome it. Thus, the market seizes the university environment and imposes its logic of productivity, efficiency and profit, totally going against the essence of higher education, democratization of knowledge and human emancipation (SUDBRACK, NOGARO, 2017).

We emphasize and defend the university as a public good, but to maintain it as such has become more and more a challenge. Especially when we have organs like IMF and BM defending the opposite and pressing governments of countries like Brazil to give it to the market of values, privatizing it. This makes us question whether it is possible for a public good to be produced in private entities. Throughout the discussion undertaken in the article, we seek to demonstrate how impracticable this is, since, as Rodrigues (2007, p. 82) points out, once the public university is deprived of state funding for its maintenance and open to commercialize a "teaching-commodity (diplomas) and knowledge-commodity (patents), the university (public?) will be ready to compete in the market, even competing with the private universities, the resources necessary to remain in existence".

What implies directly in the purpose of higher education, because if there is a payment - in the form of investment - there is the direction of teaching (from research and extension) to the interest of the owner of the budget. The student-client, the delivery of a diploma that would supposedly guarantee their employability, and the owner of the educational company, a profit margin and growth in the stock market. It demonstrates that in this way the core of higher education of critical human formation, of promotion of research and science, and of the cultural and social aggrandizement of the country is lost.

We understand that the university cannot ignore the fact that it functions in a capitalist sociability in crisis, which seeks its salvation in any sphere of human existence. According to Frantz (2013, page 28), this must be attentive to the interests of the market, the impositions of its logic and that through "it builds many of its relations with the economy and politics, especially." So, the community academics need to seize more and more of these discussions and the reverberations that funding programs, such as Fies and laws like that of technological innovation, bring to public higher education. State investment in private HEIs ends up pointing to less investment in the public university and the opposite, private investment in the public institution, promotes the induction - and limitation - of teaching, research and extension thought and executed in this.

Faced with this scenario, we insist on the effort "so that education, culture, science and knowledge are treated as assets to be jointly shared or as public goods" (SUDBRACK, NOGARO, 2017, p. 427). That is, a defense of the role of education as responsible for the reproduction of the social being, of the human in its potentiality and not in the service of the reproduction of profit and surplus value to the capital in crisis. We need, perhaps, to rescue the principles of the Argentine youth movement of Cordoba to the free men of South America, marked by the struggle of Argentine university students who demanded a university as a public good, of free access to citizens and responsibility of the State, proposing again a reform of higher education in order to meet such needs. This would demonstrate a clear and permanent defense of the role of the public university of maintenance and development of intellectual and cultural traditions, also as a priority area of research with a focus on seeking solutions to regional and national problems.

References

ASSOCIAÇÃO DE DOCENTES DA UNICAMP. **Caderno Adunicamp**, Campinas, fev. 2005.

BERNHEIM, Carlos Tünnerman; CHAUÍ, Marilena Souza. **Desafios da universidade na sociedade do conhecimento**: cinco anos depois da conferência mundial sobre educação superior. Brasília: Unesco, 2008.

CARVALHO, Cristina Helena Almeida de. Política para o ensino superior no Brasil (1995-2006): ruptura e continuidade nas relações entre público e privado. *In*: SILVA JÚNIOR, João dos Reis; OLIVEIRA, João Ferreira; MANCEBO, Deise. **Reforma universitária**: dimensões e perspectivas. Campinas: Alínea, 2006. p. 125-140.

COGGIOLA, Osvaldo. **Universidade e ciência na crise global**. São Paulo: Xamã, 2001.

CUNHA, Luiz Antônio. **A universidade reformada: o golpe de 1964 e a modernização do ensino superior**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Unesp, 2007.

DIONÍSIO, Débora Accioly. **Trabalho, educação e conhecimento: da universalização do Ensino superior ao produtivismo acadêmico – o *homo lattés***. 2016. 170 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Programa de Pós-graduação em Educação, Faculdade de Educação, Departamento de Educação, Universidade Estadual do Ceará, Fortaleza, 2016.

FÁVERO, Altair Alberto; BECHI, Diego. O financiamento da educação superior no limiar do século XXI: o caminho da mercantilização da educação. **Revista Internacional de Educação Superior**, Campinas, v. 3, n. 1, 2017. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/riesup/article/view/8650577/16790>. Acesso em: 30 ago. 2018.

FRANTZ, Walter. Reflexões sobre universidade. In: ANDRADE, Elisabete; ANDRIOLI, Liria Angela; FRANTZ, Walter (Org.). **Educação no contexto da globalização: reflexões a partir de diferentes olhares**. Ijuí: UNIJUÍ, 2013. p. 13-31.

FREITAS NETO, José Alves de. A reforma universitária de Córdoba (1918): um manifesto por uma universidade latino-americana. **Ensino Superior Unicamp**, v. 3, 2011. Disponível em: http://www.gr.unicamp.br/ceav/revistaensinosuperior/ed03_junho2011/pdf/10.pdf. Acesso em: 27 set. 2018.

LEHER, Roberto. A universidade reformanda: atualidade para pensar tendências da educação superior 25 anos após sua publicação. **Revista Contemporânea de Educação**, v. 8, n. 16, ago./dez. 2013. Disponível em: <https://revistas.ufrj.br/index.php/rce/article/view/1702/1551>. Acesso em: 12 set. 2018

LEHER, Roberto; MOTTA, Vânia Cardoso. Trabalho docente crítico como dimensão do projeto de universidade. **Germinal**, Salvador, v. 6, n. 1, p. 48-78, jun. 2014. Disponível em: <https://portalseer.ufba.br/index.php/revistagerminal/article/view/12593/8856>. Acesso em: 12 set. 2018.

LEHER, Roberto; SILVA, Simone. A universidade sob céu de chumbo: a heteronomia instituída pela ditadura empresarial-militar. **Universidade e Sociedade**, Brasília, v. 1, n. 54, p. 6-17, ago. 2014. Disponível em: http://noticias.cvrs.fiocruz.br/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Universidade-e-Sociedade-Edicao-54-Agosto_20141.pdf. Acesso em: 12 set. 2018.

LIMA, Kátia Regina de Souza. Financiamento da educação superior brasileira nos anos de neoliberalismo. In: SILVA JÚNIOR, João dos Reis; OLIVEIRA, João Ferreira; MANCEBO, Deise. **Reforma universitária: dimensões e perspectivas**. Campinas: Alínea. 2006. p. 27-42.

LIMA, Marteano Ferreira de. **Trabalho, reprodução social e educação em Lukács**. 2009. 128 f. Dissertação (Mestrado Acadêmico em Educação) – Centro de Educação, Universidade Estadual do Ceará, Fortaleza, 2009.

LUCÁKS, Gyorgy. **Para uma ontologia do ser social**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.

MARX, Karl. Processo de trabalho e processo de valorização. *In*: MARX, Karl. **O capital: crítica da economia política**. Livro 1: O processo de produção do capital. 7. ed. Campinas: Difel Difusão, 1982. v. 1. p. 69-116.

MÉSZÁROS, Istvan. A produção de riqueza e a riqueza da produção. *In*: _____. **Para além do capital: rumo a uma teoria da transição**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2002. p. 605-633.

MÉSZÁROS, Istvan. **Educação para além do capital**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2008.

OTRANTO, Celia Regina. A reforma da educação superior do governo Lula: da inspiração à implantação. *In*: SILVA JÚNIOR, João dos Reis; OLIVEIRA, João Ferreira; MANCEBO, Deise. **Reforma universitária: dimensões e perspectivas**. Campinas: Alínea, 2006. p. 43-58.

PONCE, Aníbal. **Educação e luta de classes**. Tradução de Jose Severo de Camargo Pereira. 12. ed. São Paulo: Cortez; Autores Associados, 2010.

RABELO, Josefa Jackline; MENDES SEGUNDO, Maria das Dores. Análise da crise estrutural do capital à luz de István Mészáros. **Educação em Debate**, Fortaleza, v. 1, n. 47, 2004. Disponível em: http://www.repositorio.ufc.br/bitstream/riufc/15195/1/2004_art_jjrabelo.pdf. Acesso em: 30 ago. 2018.

RODRIGUES, José. **Os empresários e a educação superior**. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2007.

SADER, Emir. Público *versus* mercantil. **Folha de São Paulo**, São Paulo, 19 jun. 2003, p. 3.

SCRIVANO, Roberta. Kroton se firma como maior empresa mundial de ensino superior. **O Globo**, Rio de Janeiro, 1º jul. 2016. Economia. Disponível em: <https://oglobo.globo.com/economia/negocios/kroton-se-firma-como-maior-empresa-mundial-de-ensino-superior-19622666>. Acesso em: 20 de set. de 2018.

SGUISSARDI, Valdemar. Universidade pública estatal: entre o público e o privado/mercantil. **Educação e Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 26, n. 90, p. 191-222, jan./abr. 2005. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/es/v26n90/a09v2690.pdf>. Acesso em: 12 set. 2018.

SGUISSARDI, Valdemar. Modelo de expansão da educação superior no Brasil: predomínio privado/mercantil e desafios para a regulação e a formação universitária. **Educação e Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 29, n. 105, p. 991-1022, set./dez. 2008. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/es/v29n105/v29n105a04.pdf>. Acesso em: 12 set. 2018.

SGUISSARDI, Valdemar; SILVA JÚNIOR, João dos Reis. **Trabalho intensificado nas federais: pós-graduação e produtivismo acadêmico**. São Paulo: Xamã, 2009.

SILVEIRA, Zuleide Simas da; BIANCHETTI, Lucídio. Universidade moderna: dos interesses do Estado-nação às conveniências do mercado. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 21, n. 64, jan./mar. 2016. Disponível em: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1413-24782016000100079&lng=pt&nrm=iso&tlng=en. Acesso em: 12 set. 2018.

SUDBRACK, Edite Maria; NOGARO, Arnoldo. Por uma Universidade para o mercado ou para todos: democracia e emancipação. **Revista Internacional de Educação Superior**, Campinas, v. 3, n. 2, 2017. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/riesup/article/view/8650612/16825>. Acesso em: 30 ago. 2018.

TEIXEIRA, Anísio. **Educação e universidade**. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ, 1998.

TONET, Ivo. Educação e concepções de sociedade. *In*: TONET, Ivo. **Educação contra o capital**. Maceió: Edufal, 2007.