

ARTICLE

FUTURE-SE: ELUCIDATING ANOTHER ATTEMPT TO PRIVATIZE BRAZILIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIESLUÍS AUGUSTO LOPES^{1;2}ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3430-2755>¹ Instituto Federal da Bahia (IFBA). Simões Filho, BA, Brasil.² luisaugusto@ifba.edu.br

ABSTRACT: This article aims to establish relationships between the Universities and Entrepreneur and Innovative Institutes Program - Future-se - and various theoretical contributions that have guided the research, the business, and its relations with the Brazilian state throughout the years. It is based on a documental analysis of the proposal submitted to the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies in June 2020, as well as other legislation that supports the project, and is divided into seven parts. After the introduction, an initial analysis is made of the state reform, the Human Capital Theory, and the Information Society. It continues with an examination of Innovation, the Triple Helix model, and Academic Capitalism. Soon after, it focuses on changes in the state and in the individuals and the transformation of the company as a model for society. Then the reform of the state is resumed to demonstrate the managerial mutation that the Brazilian state is undergoing. The penultimate topic details other aspects of Future-se not covered in the previous sections, and at the end goes to the conclusion where some discussions made throughout the text are rescued. For the proposal in this article, we understand that Future-se is not something new, but an attempt to consolidate a growing trend towards the privatization of higher education, with a new specificity, which is the element of financialization.

Keywords: university, future-se, privatization, technology, financialization

FUTURE-SE: ELUCIDANDO MAIS UMA TENTATIVA DE PRIVATIZAÇÃO DAS UNIVERSIDADES PÚBLICAS BRASILEIRAS

RESUMO: Este artigo visa estabelecer relações entre o Programa Universidades e Institutos Empreendedores e Inovadores – Future-se – e diversos aportes teóricos que tem pautado a pesquisa, o empresariado e suas relações com o Estado brasileiro ao longo dos anos. Parte-se de uma análise documental da proposta encaminhada à Câmara dos Deputados em junho de 2020, assim como de outras legislações que dão suporte ao projeto, sendo dividido em sete partes. Após a introdução, faz-se uma análise inicial da reforma do Estado, da Teoria do Capital Humano e da Sociedade da Informação. Prossegue-se com um exame da Inovação, do modelo de Tripla Hélice e do Capitalismo Acadêmico. Logo após, aborda-se mudanças no Estado e no indivíduo e a

transformação da empresa enquanto um modelo para a sociedade. Em seguida, a reforma do Estado é retomada para demonstrar a mutação gerencial que sofre o Estado brasileiro. O penúltimo tópico detalha outros aspectos do Future-se não abordados nas seções anteriores, e, ao fim, parte-se para a conclusão, onde algumas discussões feitas ao longo do texto são resgatadas. Para o proposto neste artigo, entende-se que o Future-se não é algo novo, mas a tentativa de se consolidar uma tendência crescente de privatização do ensino superior com uma nova especificidade, que é o elemento da financeirização.

Palavras-chave: universidade, future-se, privatização, tecnologia, financeirização.

FUTURE-SE: ACLARAR OTRO INTENTO DE PRIVATIZAR LAS UNIVERSIDADES PÚBLICAS BRASILEÑAS

RESUMEN: Este artículo tiene como objetivo establecer las relaciones entre las Universidades y el Programa de Emprendedores e Institutos Innovadores - Future-se - y varias contribuciones teóricas que han guiado la investigación, la empresa y sus relaciones con el Estado brasileño a lo largo de los años. Se basa en un análisis documental de la propuesta presentada a la Cámara de Representantes en junio de 2020, así como en otras leyes que apoyan el proyecto, y se divide en siete partes. Después de la introducción, se hace un análisis inicial de la reforma del Estado, la teoría del capital humano y la sociedad de la información. Continúa con un examen de la Innovación, el modelo de la Triple Hélice y el Capitalismo Académico. Poco después, aborda los cambios en el Estado y en el individuo y la transformación de la empresa como modelo de sociedad. Luego se reanuda la reforma del Estado para demostrar la mutación gerencial que sufre el Estado brasileño. El penúltimo tema detalla otros aspectos del Future-se no tratados en las secciones anteriores, y, al final, va a la conclusión, donde se rescatan algunas discusiones hechas a lo largo del texto. Por la propuesta de este artículo, se entiende que Future-se no es algo nuevo, sino el intento de consolidar una tendencia creciente de privatización de la enseñanza superior, con una nueva especificidad, que es el elemento de la financiarización.

Palabras clave: universidad, future-se, privatización, tecnología, financiarización.

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning, the government of Bolsonaro has performed unsatisfactorily in several areas, in which the educational field deserves to be highlighted. Amid the growing weariness of the then Minister Abraham Weintraub and as a way of not characterizing his management only by negativity, the Ministry of Education (MEC) sought to be more proactive, presenting, on July 17, 2019, the Universities and Entrepreneur and Innovative Institutes Program - Future-se, which aims to increase the financial, managerial and patrimonial autonomy of Universities and Institutes. The proposal was put up for public consultation on the MEC website on the Internet until August 29 of the same year, being the target of criticism. Bermúdez (2019) informs us that more than 40 Universities condemned the project, and five had already formally rejected joining it. According to Ferreira (2019), only 15 of 63 universities and 38 federal institutes were willing to adhere to the government proposal. Despite this rejection, Future-se was again put up for public consultation in January of the following year. Ferreira (2020) tells us that membership had increased to 25 institutions in that month, which still characterizes a strong rejection. The minister announced his resignation in June 2020, however, before leaving, he sent a reduced Future-se proposal to the Chamber of Deputies, which became a Law Project number 3.076/2020 (BRASIL, 2020), in progress in that house. The main changes in the version submitted for prior consultation are the

disappearance of the figure of Social Organizations (SOs) and a more restrained mention of investment funds.

The reading and analysis of the versions of the project show a re-edition of discourses present in other spheres of government and, mainly, in the private sector. It is a rearrangement of once criticized ideas, mixed with some new elements, and presented in a new guise. In short, a reaffirmation of neoliberal policies aimed at reducing the state and privatization. In the words of Dahlet (2014, 2015), it is a discourse riddled with euphemisms, whose meaning refers to “well said [...] which consists of saying things in an attenuated way [...] to avoid the brutality of words [...] thus being able to circumvent or avoid more embarrassing words or formulations” (DAHLET, 2014, p. 126). As a result, the agents of this discourse are eclipsed, as are their responsibilities in the face of crises. Furthermore, various ideological apparatuses of the State, such as the government and the information apparatus, expressed mainly in the media, naturalize and generalize these speeches among social classes, leading to a false understanding that such phenomena are natural and inevitable, and political actions they are nothing more than artifices to minimize the negative impacts of these trends, which are said to be irreversible. The population as a whole, especially the working class, would be left with mere adaptation.

Despite this great disapproval, some of the analyzes carried out so far have different perspectives. We can cite the case of Andifes (National Association of Directors of Federal Institutions of Higher Education) which, at the end of the 176th meeting of its Full Council on July 26, 2019, published the Letter of Vitória, in which the criticisms are addressed more regarding the legal and budgetary aspects of FUTURE-SE (ANDIFES, 2019). More detailed documents, such as the one from the University of Brasília (2019), focus on an analysis of the legal contradictions of the text. In turn, Silva (2020) examined the program from the historical movement of social classes, especially the movement of the Brazilian bourgeoisie, increasingly closer to fascism, which aims to deepen the neoliberal agenda in the country. This article aims to add another perspective to these rich productions. Based on a documentary analysis of the proposal sent to the Chamber of Deputies in June 2020, as well as other legislations that support the project, we sought to relate it to the various theoretical assumptions that underlie it, notably those that support the thinking neoliberal economy and education, and its consequences in the University and the production of technology. After the introduction, it proceeds with an initial analysis of the reform of the State, the Theory of Human Capital and the Information Society, and then the so-called Innovation, the Triple Helix model, and Academic Capitalism are examined. Soon after, the changes in the State and the individual and the transformation of the company as a model for society will be addressed. Then, the reform of the State is resumed to demonstrate the managerial mutation that the Brazilian State undergoes. The last but one topic details other aspects of the Future-se not addressed in the previous sections, and, in the end, we moved to the conclusion, in which some discussions made throughout the text are rescued. For this article, it is understood that Future-se is not something new, but an attempt to consolidate a growing trend towards privatization of higher education with a new specificity, which is the element of financialization.

THEORY OF HUMAN CAPITAL AND THE INFORMATION SOCIETY

Among the program's objectives that deserve to be highlighted, the second is: “to promote and encourage scientific development, research, technological training, and innovation” (BRASIL, 2020, p. 1). Since the Fernando Henrique Cardoso (FHC) government, privatization of higher education has accelerated, and with the same allegations that seek to dismantle the state machine in other sectors: efficiency and cost¹. Private institutions would have a lower cost per

¹ The first major privatization impulse occurred with the University Reform of 1968, when it allowed isolated teaching institutions, among others, to meet a repressed demand of students, not covered by public institutions. Such reforms advance until the 1988 Constitution, and later, in the PSDB governments, where privatization begins a more explicit advance. (CISLAGHI, 2019; FERNANDES, 1979; MARTINS, 2009.)

student and greater flexibility in adapting to supposed market requirements. However, these schools have never been able to match what stands out most in public institutions in Brazil: scientific research. Rabelo (2019) informs us, from the Research in Brazil report, made by the company Clarivate Analytics for the Coordination of Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES- *Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior*), that public universities produce 90% of the country's scientific research, with 60% concentrated in 15 of them. As the privatization attempts failed to remove the importance of public institutions, privatization is now being sought, which starts internally, based on what can be considered as the greatest contribution of these institutions to Brazilian society: scientific research.

However, we wonder why a work activity that does not directly cooperate with the production of value is raised to a position of such greatness in the current context. One of the reasons to be suggested and one of the roots not fully assumed by Future-se is the Theory of Human Capital (THC)². Emerged at the University of Chicago, in the United States, the cradle of neoliberal economic thought, the economist Theodore W. Schultz was one of its greatest exponents. His work reflects a propensity of neoclassical economists to consider that, in addition to the traditional factors of production, capital, and labor, another cause of wealth generation would be what he called human capital. Written in the early 1970s, the author already uses tactics to hide the social relations prevailing in a capitalist society, while at the same time trying to establish supposed equality between the holders of capital and the so-called holders of knowledge. If the criticisms of THC in the educational field are well known, one cannot forget the fact that his mentor does not only consider education in his theoretical scope. In his words, “research will be the main actor, while education will play a supporting role. Research activities are an integral part of the economy” (SCHULTZ, 1973, p. 193). However, he admits that there is a difficulty in measuring their economic contribution. For this reason, he understands that they are a “kind of economic activity because it requires scarce resources and because it produces something of value” (SCHULTZ, 1973, p. 194). The resources would be within the scope of the researchers' activities and in the facilities necessary for their work, and all their efforts would be aimed at the search for “new information” (SCHULTZ, 1973, p. 194). In the end, there would be a researcher's prestige translated into financial gains and benefits for companies and governments. In this last sphere, scientific research would result in development, materialized in the form of inventions, patents, new materials, new products, and a wide spectrum of management and production techniques, which would be manifestations of human capital. Little used to the term development, he considers that the expression technological change would better express this moment, as it would not be allocated to the traditional poles of economic factors – capital and labor – but could replace them.

As a theoretical contribution to his conception of research associated with information, Schutz mentions by name another economist from the University of Chicago, George J. Stigler. In an article published in the *Journal of Political Economics* (STIGLER, 1961), he nominally says that information is a valuable resource because it is about power. To demonstrate his hypothesis, he presents an example of car buyers and sellers, where the buyers seek information on lower prices to purchase their product, in a supposed free market game. This demand results in costs for consumers that can be minimized by advertising, whose primary role would be to provide buyers with adequate information about sellers. Although he does not elaborate on other issues in the article, the author indicates that information can play a fundamental role in the economy in areas such as investments, work, real estate leasing, and asset quality, for example.

This construction goes hand in hand with the formulation of another concept, that of the information society, created by the Austrian-American economist Fritz Machlup. Crawford (1983) demonstrates that the author had an initial interest in studying market imperfections and

² Only in the project's message is there a mention, in topic 21, of producing “social capital and human capital”. Both are within the entrepreneurship axis, and it is noted that both are presented together to try to soften the individualistic emphasis of this topic.

monopolies, analyzing the system for obtaining patents, but followed another approach. As obtaining patents implies research – which is closely related to education – he begins to investigate the weight of these sectors in the US economy. They include the communication and media sectors, the production of telecommunications and information technology equipment, and the so-called information services, such as libraries, legal, financial, health services, etc. He concludes that the added value of knowledge would reach 29% of that country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP), with a growth rate higher than that of other sectors, such as industry and agriculture. He also coined the term “knowledge industry”, in which the university would play a central role.

According to Crawford (1983), based on Machlup's writings, Peter Drucker introduces the concept of Knowledge Society in his 1969 book *The Age of Discontinuity*, a term that is often confused with Information Society. In 1973, the American sociologist Daniel Bell published *The Advent of Post-Industrial Society*, which also highlighted the role of knowledge and information in the new social and economic order that was supposedly being born. These terms are widely spread and popularized since then, especially in the management literature.

Returning to the analysis of the Future-se project, it appears that it is this neoliberal line of thought that guides the proposal. In Item IV of Art. 3 of the project, research is understood as a “creative work undertaken on a systematic basis to increase the stock of knowledge”, and it should aim to “scrutinize new applications” (BRASIL, 2020, p. 2.). Item II of Art. 18 follows the same reasoning when mentioning technological development and innovation as a guideline for research, and actions to promote the “diffusion of knowledge, to consolidate the capacity of the educational institution in the appropriation and negotiation of intangible assets”. Likewise, the internationalization of institutions, exposed in Section XXI of Art. 21, aims at “the multiplication of knowledge and experience acquired abroad.” (BRASIL, 2020, p. 7). These are expressions that, according to Dahlet (2014), make the neoliberal discourse more affable, while pointing to an advance in humanity and ordering what is enunciated to the general public.

Both in the foundations of THC and the Information/Knowledge Society, the absence of terms can reveal something else. The first factor is that Schutz does not consider the historical moment in which he presents his theory. It was formulated in the 1960s, when the Welfare State was in effect, with several gains for the working class. Another factor was the context of the Cold War. Since the Second World War, there was a massive investment in the construction of an industrial structure, aiming to support the military plans, and the involvement of the scientific apparatus was necessary. Terrible inventions, such as the atomic bomb, or great advances, such as penicillin and radar, emerged from this interaction. Another factor is the role of monopoly conglomerates that transformed the results of these researches into products, such as Monsanto, Du Pont, and General Electric.

Precisely because it involves the business sector, there are no considerations about the intricate and opaque relationships between it and the government, which, throughout history, have resulted in a growing concentration and centralization of capital and the formation of large monopolies and oligopolies under complacent eyes of antitrust supervisory bodies. This is the great dissimulation that these neoliberal theories operate: they hide the capital-labor relationship, the class antagonism, and the interests of the bourgeoisie to naturalize a relationship of domination and imprint its world view on society as a whole. By stating that the possession of capital would be equivalent to the possession of information/knowledge, a double movement takes place: first, it seeks to minimize and disguise the historical and social role of private ownership of the means of production, as they would no longer have as much value as the new instrument of power that now appears. Second, it aims to create a sense of democratization of capital ownership, as knowledge would be available to all who were willing to fight for it, regardless of their class, race, or gender status.

In the Brazilian case, other considerations are obscured. The country's position in the international division of labor and the crisis in the pattern of development that prevailed until the 1980s, called the Import Substitution Model (MSI- Modelo de Substituição de Importações) are

not remembered. With the rise of neoliberalism from the 1990s onwards, the country is experiencing growing financialization of the economy, which is reflected in an acute process of deindustrialization, as shown by Bruno (2019). The 2016 coup worsened the whole situation. Faced with this conjuncture, it is necessary to ask what is the role of scientific and technological research. Leher (2010) points out that during the MSI period, and especially during the military dictatorship, the conservative modernization project of the local elites could not do without the university. With the exhaustion of this pattern of development and the beginning of the reprimarization of the economy, the role of scientific and technological research is diminished, since everything starts to be commanded by the sieve of globalized finance, governed by the short-term and high financial returns. The author states that education (and why not research) are now seen as commodities arranged in the so-called free market. Instead of a scientific and technological policy commanded by the State, there is what Dagnino (2011) calls outsourcing of technological action, with protagonists dispersed and fragmented throughout the national territory.

In addition, by reducing research to the search for information that is now measured by its financial value, there is a reduction in the understanding of what research is. It starts with a work of unveiling an object that generates knowledge for something close to the understanding of pure technique in Weber (1978, p. 66): “the means which, with equal quality, certainty, and permanence of the result, are comparatively most ‘economical’ of effort in the attainment of a given end”. If for the German sociologist, the notion of cost is one of the factors that guide technical choices, Future-se adds another objective to the research, which is the applicability of the so-called stock of knowledge, in line with the THC. We can ask: why must knowledge necessarily have an application? If so, who establishes its usefulness? And for whom and what is this application for? Although the program introduces the term society several times, it works as a means of mitigating another word that has great prominence: company.

INNOVATION, TRIPLE HELIX MODEL, AND ACADEMIC CAPITALISM

Another expression in the first axis of the Future-se proposal is innovation. In Item V of Art. 3 of the project, it is defined as the “introduction of novelty or improvement in the productive and social environment that results in new products, services or processes” (BRASIL, 2020, p. 2.). Furthermore, an existing product or service can be the target of new “features”, without forgetting that the expected results must involve “improvements and [...] effective gain in quality or performance” (BRASIL, 2020, p. 2.). From the Weberian contribution, it is understood that the final objective of everything, presented as something from the natural and undoubted field, is gain. In the same vein, scientific research should “promote and encourage [...] scientific and technological training and innovation” (BRASIL, 2020, p. 1.). Likewise, internationalization is conceptualized as the “process of promoting inter-institutional academic-technical-scientific relations, which allows for the creation, implementation, and monitoring of projects and agreements, with a view to innovation.” (BRASIL, 2020, p. 2). The term was added to the name of the Ministry of Science and Technology, Innovations and Communications (MCTI- *Ministério da Ciência e Tecnologia, Inovações e Comunicações*), it should be part of the internal policies of each university and institute, and together they converge to a National System of Science, Technology, and Innovation. When starting with the Marxist framework, the social construction of a fetish that goes by the name of innovation is observed³. Institutions must generate research for innovation, in the same way, people must be enabled to work with innovation, and this must be incorporated and practiced in personal and institutional daily life. However, the term does not act in isolation

³ In this case, alluding to the commodity fetishism described by Marx (2013), that is, the attribution of certain magical characteristics to commodities that tries to hide the capitalist social relations of production, exploitation of the workforce and creation of value for the capitalist.

but is part of a set where expressions such as management and entrepreneurship, among others, form an ideology that must be incorporated into scientific and technological production.

The literature on innovation has the Austrian economist Joseph Alois Schumpeter as its main theoretical source. In one of his main works, *The Theory of Economic Development* (SCHUMPETER, 1997), he seeks to establish a difference between economic growth and development, that is, between a mere addition of data and between effective internal changes in economic life. These occur in sparse periods, in the industrial and commercial scope, in a profound way and establishing a new level in the capitalist system. Its attention is focused on the individual, not on the group or the social context that produces this change. They are called 'entrepreneurs', in contrast to capitalists more accustomed to the possession of money. Stresses that the former go beyond the understanding of businessmen or managers, but are people with "initiative", "authority", "foresight", "intuition", "insight", "energy", and "personality", that is, with a particular behavior driving this change. As a result, all the actions of a given sector will be conducted in the direction indicated by it. The term used to characterize this transformation-inducing impulse is "innovation".

Other factors also stand out in Schumpeterian theory. He does not believe that these people constitute a specific social class since this way of thinking and acting is not something common to all, but specific to a few individuals. Likewise, he does not intend to position them as demiurges, as he does not see them all as geniuses or benefactors who seek the common good. On the contrary, he finds them a bit self-centered, and utilitarian, and that they tend to leave the center stage when some of that strength wears off. Furthermore, the Austrian economist was a supporter of the so-called free market. He was strongly opposed to socialism, as he believed that the creative impulse would be hampered because of the state bureaucratic structure, but not only that. He saw in the large monopolistic conglomerates another obstacle to the development of innovation. However, when relating the fetishized emphasis that innovation assumes nowadays and the cult of this individual who would be the main actor in it, one has to ask what metamorphosis this thought has gone through. We must remember the existence of the Welfare State in the post-war period and a factor that also moved Schumpeterian thinking a little: the continuous growth of large monopoly conglomerates. The symbiosis constituted an intricate game, where governments guaranteed markets to companies and these started to play an increasingly preponderant role in economic and social policies. In the game of expanding markets to other continents or dependent countries, the two performed together. They were government representatives accompanied by their entourage of businessmen who imposed, under the acquiescence of the local elites, their policies, and their companies.

The publication of these theories in the late 1960s and early 1970s coincides with yet another crisis of capitalism looming on the horizon. At that moment, neoliberal thinking begins to rise on the political level and is duly recognized as a major guideline for the conduct of the State from the election of Margaret Thatcher in 1979 in the United Kingdom, and Ronald Reagan in 1980 in the United States, spreading across the globe since then. Their policies were also reflected in universities, with pressure to cut spending and greater efficiency in the use of resources. At that moment, a mutation begins in the old relationship between government, companies, and universities that had established a standard for scientific and technological research until then. The first factor, already discussed, was the advance in business power. Now the government is starting to withdraw from the scene.

Within the same neoliberal theoretical scope, other theoretical contributions begin to emerge. From the mid-1980s onwards, the idea that the production of technology with distinct stagnant spheres (government, companies, and universities) had already been exhausted and now a model was emerging on the horizon where this construct would take place from an intersection of these entities, leading to the creation of a hybrid model. In this way, new terms emerge, such as start-up companies, business incubators, technology parks, etc., and a greater emphasis on entrepreneurship. Another highlight is the transformations that large companies undergo with the

primacy of the financial element. At the same time, ownership of capital is dispersed, while hiding behind new euphemisms: institutional investors, stakeholders, or interested parties, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), stock market, etc. Its internal organization also undergoes a major mutation, since, unlike the vertical and centralized structure - characteristic of the post-war period -, another horizontal structure emerges, where the outsourcing of activities plays a central role, together with the geographical dispersion of operations and extensive computerized control.

Some of the greatest exponents of this new line of thinking are the American sociologist Henry Etzkowitz and the Dutch sociologist Loet Leysdesdorff. Its model, called Triple Helix, became so loose that an international association was created on the subject, which has several “chapters” spread across countries as diverse as Russia, Kazakhstan, Greece, Southeast Asia, and Brazil. Etzkowitz (1984) turns to what he calls entrepreneurial scientists and universities, analyzing cases of business-minded researchers who create patents and, henceforth, increase their income and resources for scientific research. He cites as precursors of this example the collaboration between German universities and companies in the chemical sector, still in the 19th century. Nowadays, these initiatives can generate new ventures from the results of research, the so-called start-ups, which can have a great possibility of growth and even attract the so-called venture capital. Examples are almost always limited to large universities and conglomerates, and even start-ups can end up being taken over. Another possibility suggested by the same author (ETZKOWITZ, 1993) refers to the case of certain regions where there was a joint stimulus for this environment to develop, such as the region of New England, in the northeast of the USA, cradle of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), where, according to him, the university was created to assist the industrial sector in the region. In another direction, the development of the aeronautical sector on the west coast of the country spurred the emergence of the California Institute of Technology.

Later, with his Dutch colleague, he better theorizes the phenomena they observed, naming it Tripe Helix (ETZKOWITZ; LEYDESDORFF, 1995; ETZKOWITZ, 2003), which would be the new foundation for innovation strategies here and elsewhere. This would imply the creation of intersection zones between government, companies, and universities, with teams that would cross the borders of the three entities, and a strong contribution from areas such as research, development, and marketing. From the perspective of reducing the role of the State, this would no longer be a guide for public policies for the sector, but only an inducer, providing institutional and legal security so that the other two parties could relate without further interference. For everything to progress, it would be necessary to create an innovation system, with fluid borders between academia and companies, so that the fruits of scientific research could be converted more easily and quickly into new products and services. But as a *sine qua non* condition, for everything to be fruitful, the economy should also become a Knowledge Economy, which indicates the materialization of the so-called Knowledge Society.

On the side of the State, the rise of financial hegemony within the business sector occurs in line with a shift to the same priority in the governmental apparatus. The neoliberal recipe started from the hypothesis that there should be a downsizing of the public machine and liberation of the economy. In practice, there was a reorientation of actions towards the financial domain, while privatization and deregulation prevailed in the society.

With budget cuts and other neoliberal orientations, what Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) call Academic Capitalism begins to take shape, which, with some reservations, would still induce new ways of producing and sharing knowledge. The theoretical contributions of the so-called Information Society, and a gradual increase in the interaction between government, companies, and universities come to light, the main axis of transformation along the lines that Etzkowitz and Leysdesdorff indicated. However, metamorphosis is not restricted to this area only. Interaction with capital also enters the gates of the academy. According to the first authors, students are now transmuted into consumers of academic products and must be forged to the taste of likely future employers. Likewise, the universe of language and business actions began to permeate universities

with greater force. These are contracts, production goals, results, ubiquitous management, companies, entrepreneurship, shareholding, products, marketing, patents, brands, etc. Other expressions of this domain are manifested in the names of buildings, programs, and courses made to order by companies, areas of the campuses franchised to food and computer companies, etc.; and, perhaps, the greatest consecration of this whole process: the university becomes a brand. This process can be seen in American institutions. There are clothes, accessories, school supplies, and a universe of knick-knacks that bear the university's logo, the production of luxurious catalogs to attract potential students, and participation in various fairs around the world, with the same purpose. In these catalogs, we have the impression of a very pleasant academic life. It should be noted, however, scholarship policies, much more than a subsistence allowance, aim to introduce in the subaltern classes and those displaced from peripheral countries an understanding of the world more suited to the hegemony of central capitalism. When this idyllic world is contrasted with the Brazilian reality of public universities, with budget cuts, lack of professors, difficult access to campuses, insecurity, and a strenuous study routine, it is difficult not to imagine that institutions are better there. But this expression of foreign universities has another strong ideological argument. Everything leads us to believe that the passage through the academy takes place without confrontation of ideas, without contradictions, and major debates. Knowledge appears to be something easily available to anyone who accesses a website and attends classes with renowned professors, who will argue based on “science” and not on “political views”. Here is the biggest seduction of this process.

Throughout the 1990s, led by the World Bank, this neoliberal vision spread across the world. Always critical of free secondary education, several of his documents directed governments to charge tuition fees at public universities. On another front, there should be a wide opening for the offer of courses by private institutions. In Brazil, political pressure did not allow the first attempt to materialize, unlike the second, which had an exponential growth from the same decade of 90, without reflection, however, on the quality. Several actions of Academic Capitalism had already been implemented over the years, however, there is now an attempt to consolidate this process overwhelmingly. In *Future-se*, it is observed that public institutions should become a kind of temple for the consumption of knowledge and its signs. There is talk of “entrepreneurial culture”, “employability”, “modernization of public management”, “efficiency”, “economicity”, “contracts”, “results”, “commercialization”, etc. The message of the project expresses its supposed modernity in supposed agility, “flexibility”, “decentralization”, “generation of wealth”, etc. The Holy Grail to be acquired by interested parties is almost always called patents. Even though the resources are public and the university must be accountable to society as a whole for its actions, it is not to these that patents must be addressed, but to the mystified and reduced form of society that is shown in the project: companies. In addition to this scenario, there is an even greater approximation of Brazilian public institutions to their US counterparts. The sole paragraph of Art.16 (BRASIL, 2020, p. 6-7) provides, among other things, for the commodification of “products or services with the brands of the institutions”. All this would not happen, however, without an intense change being carried out within the State.

CHANGES IN THE STATE AND THE INDIVIDUAL – THE COMPANY AS A MODEL FOR SOCIETY

From a Foucauldian prism, Dardot and Laval (2013, p. 9.) propose that neoliberalism is a form of rationality that “tends to structure and organize not only the action of rulers, but also the conduct of the ruled”, that is, “the rationality of contemporary capitalism”. Their analysis turns to one of the greatest exponents of neoliberalism, the Austrian economist Ludwig von Mises, in which alongside a vehement condemnation of the State, the market and the figure of the entrepreneur stand up as a counterpoint. In this last aspect, there is a great contribution from the aforementioned Peter F. Drucker, who broadens the Schumpeterian view of this individual. He becomes a kind of hero, and just like a redemptive creed, this “spirit” should be disseminated

throughout society, including within governments, since, together with business management, it would result in progress for society as a whole. The two authors emphasize that the Austrian theorist considered the entrepreneurial spirit as a capacity present in all people, but something not perceived, since its stimulus would only occur fully in the market, called by them the “process of self-formation” (DARDOT; LAVAL, 2013, p. 123). Von Mises amplifies Drucker's entrepreneurial missionary spirit and indicates that he must now permeate the media and higher education to demonstrate the moral superiority of capitalism over any other mode of production, while at the same time discouraging pretensions to social change associated with state intervention, which would bring society closer to totalitarianism, according to him. In this context, the French authors will understand entrepreneurship as a way of conduct.

If competition and the market are the ideal horizons for society, the State must also be transmuted to operate according to these dogmas. Dardot and Laval's analysis of Mises points out that the economist saw that government action should be restricted to regulation and evaluation, while at the same time guiding, encouraging, and subjecting to this free competition. Given this situation, another term appears on the horizon, duly suited to the neoliberal ethos: governance. This means that companies and governments must be guided by the same management criteria, materialized in the form of structural adjustments, opening up markets, etc., and the public interest is disguised as the financial interest of large conglomerates. In the same path followed by the companies, manifested in a horizontal structure, the outsourcing of activities and centralization of control also began to guide the new governance. They are Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), associations, myriads of outsourced companies, Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), etc., involved in an intricate network of games of power, control, evaluation, and pressure from the public machine. Covered by a cloak of neutrality, this vision will even seduce the so-called leftist governments, starting with Tony Blair in the United Kingdom, passing through the French socialists, and reaching our Latin American subcontinent.

However, if everything is viewed from the point of view of companies, there is little attention to what happens in this environment and its relations with other segments of society. Pages et al. (1987) make a multidisciplinary analysis on the subject, with contributions from sociology, psychology, and economics, adding Foucauldian and Marxist positions. Investigating the case of the French branch of an American multinational at the end of the 70s, there are several contributions to understanding how what they call a “hypermodern company” is becoming a pattern adopted by large business groups. According to them, it is a system of power, no longer restricted to social groups, but “an economic-political-ideological-psychological system of mediation and concealment of social and psychological contradictions” (PAGÈS et al., 1987, p. 16). The first process is characterized by the interposition of the company figure in the capital-labor conflict, where everything takes on the appearance of an individual conflict with organizational policies. To this end, it offers a generous package of financial rewards and psychological stimuli, coupled with a great restriction and control of professional performance. Contradictions tend to be unconsciously introjected into workers, operating the second aspect of this system, that is, concealment.

As these elements are not static, from the emergence of new situations of confrontation, a constant dynamic is set in motion to dissipate the conflict, promote new psychological stimuli and expand the forms of control. Therefore, the company works as another ideological apparatus, which tends to expand its influence on governments, schools, universities, etc., creating what the authors call “a religion of the company”, converting itself “into a place of production of concepts and values” (PAGÈS et al., 1987, p. 36), which implies an “ideological adherence that galvanizes energies and encourages people to dedicate themselves 'body and soul' to their work” (PAGÈS et al., 1987, p. 75).

In this scenario, great emphasis should be placed on the operation of power and control that is exercised. There are global, regional, and national levels of control. Functions are divided between branches and continents so that the various stages from development to

production of a particular product or service are never concentrated in a single location. The research, in particular, is more restricted to the conglomerates' countries of origin. Laboratories in other countries only operate a few fragmented processes, according to the direction emanating from above. The production follows a similar pace, but without a greater concentration at the headquarters, but also spreading the various stages across dispersed factories so that knowledge about the entire process does not emerge. Control, mainly financial, is rigorous and highly centralized, supported by sophisticated telecommunications and information technology systems. As each branch should not blindly follow everything that is guided by the headquarters, at the risk of not being able to achieve sales and profit targets, a certain degree of autonomy in local decisions is allowed, in a highly daring system, which is constantly changing. Rules are established and changed all the time, but they are not necessarily imposed, because, since the contradictions were introjected, what is expected is a voluntary commitment to them. To this end, one of the most effective mechanisms to create a supposed harmony between all is the translation of everything into financial language, “so that money becomes the universal code”, which ends up “reducing social relations to mercantile relations” (PAGÈS et al., 1987, p. 63). The authors call this process of centralization of control and relative freedom of decisions “controlled autonomy”.

In addition to this line of thought and, equally, under a Foucauldian approach, Gaulejac (2007) sees in the exercise of management a “technology of power” that hides behind an image of rationality, pragmatism, instrumentality, and utilitarianism of social relations. They have prescribed norms, which conceive the world as a mechanical artifact, and a defined purpose, dictated from the outside, supported by supposed mathematical neutrality that would explain everything, or “a set of micro-devices that do not appear as the result of a centralized conception, of a pre-established system of domination” (GAULEJAC, 2007, p. 111). Since there is no room for contradiction and debate, the posture of interpreting only what can be reduced to numbers is adopted, feeding a utopia of dominion over reality. This is why the almost nauseating use of the word 'solution' in advertisements and business manuals is that obstacles should only appear center stage when there is a mathematical answer to them. If in Taylor there is strict surveillance of the bodies from the measurement of time and limitation of movements, this new managerial power works with seduction, through subtle and sophisticated devices of adhesion, recognition, and obedience, which requires from the workers a total involvement of time, space and affections, constituting, in the author's view, a form of “psychic violence”.

Returning to the widespread Triple Helix model, it can be said that, given the power of large corporations and the transformation of the State to neoliberal molds, it is an illusion to believe that academia will remain exempt from this change. The corporate web is not just about subcontractors here and elsewhere. As the practical results of scientific and technological research have become a fundamental part of guaranteeing monopolies through patents and greater profits, the university becomes, in part, an element of this outsourcing chain, aimed at producing technology at a lower cost. This is because there is already public investment in the payment of salaries and maintenance of the facilities, together with a large number of students who, despite being taking the first steps in their learning and handling certain techniques, can be excellent assistants or even protagonists in the scientific production. The immediate logic of corporate finance will understand how a superfluous expense to maintain large laboratories, with many scientists earning good salaries when part of this production can be outsourced and accelerated, given the number of institutions involved. This does not imply, however, the disposal of their laboratories. As seen before, control is a fundamental mechanism in this management model, and losing sight of a fundamental operation for its accumulation is a great risk. The headquarters concentrate part of the research, with actions located in the branches, but now this network is greatly expanded with the involvement of dozens – perhaps hundreds – of renowned universities and researchers focused on their interests. But to ensure that everything goes according to its dictates, the “company religion” needs to be disseminated on these shores to provoke that “ideological adhesion” that drives old and new converts to work hard in this relationship. There is

a set of legal and institutional mechanisms that have a long history in Brazil and that are expressed in the Future-se proposal, and that work in this favor.

THE MANAGEMENT METAMORPHOSIS IN THE BRAZILIAN STATE

The Master Plan for Reform of the State Apparatus (BRASIL, 1995), among other changes adopted, can be considered the landmark of the incorporation of the so-called managerial thinking in the Brazilian public administration. As the neoliberal government of the time had achieved a victory over inflation, after more than a decade of uncontrolledness, attention now turned to the size and efficiency of the public machine, which would be the cause of a large public deficit due to its excessive size and its supposed slowness. There is a set of hostilities directed mainly at the civil service for their supposed privileges and the job stability guaranteed by the law. The new horizons would be flexibility, control of results, and governance, that is, the “ability to efficiently implement public policies” (BRASIL, 1995, p. 11)

Repudiated a lot over the years, her mentor sought to better clarify some points of view. Bresser-Pereira (2017) states that his inspiration came from a movement that took place in the mid-1980s in the United Kingdom, called State Managerial Reform (or new public management, or public management reform), inspired by private companies, but that supposedly would have been associated with neoliberalism because they were created during the government of Margaret Thatcher. As he advocates the neutrality of these techniques, his alibi is that Tony Blair's opposition government continued to follow the same dictates. Another justification presented by the author for the defense of this model is that, even after the rise of center-left governments in Brazil, the managerial model continued to expand in various spheres, such as *Bolsa Família* and Pension Reform; and the Ministry of Education (MEC), with the Reuni program, for the restructuring and expansion of public universities, which required a strategic plan – a language well suited to the private sector. However, the author does not see this movement as a weakening of public action, but just the opposite, since efficiency would result in a strengthening of the so-called welfare state. Since then, other terms have begun to permeate the language of the public sector: managerial culture, results, costs, citizens transformed into clients, management contracts, and, not least, “create psychosocial conditions necessary to strengthen the entrepreneurial spirit of the public service” (BRASIL, 1995, p. 64).

As mentioned at the beginning, Future-se does not mean something new, but the consolidation of a growing trend towards the privatization of higher education. Some specific legislation is mentioned in the text, and in the message sent to Congress, which should be further detailed. The program takes a further step toward implementing the so-called New Legal Framework for Science, Technology, and Innovation (CT&I), a law enacted in the second term of President Dilma Rousseff (BRASIL, 2016). It implements Constitutional Amendment nº 85, of February 26, 2015, whose main highlight is to place innovation as a State policy inserted in the country's Major Charter. The law amends several legal provisions to facilitate the entry of foreign researchers and the hiring of personnel for a fixed period, to make the Federal Teaching Career Plan more flexible, and to make correct decisions to facilitate the importation of goods intended for research. However, about 70% of its text is intended to amend Law 10,973, of December 2, 2004, sanctioned by former President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (BRASIL, 2004), known as the Innovation Law. The entire set of terms associated with the Triple Helix model, THC, information, the exaltation of the company, the Knowledge Society, the fetish of innovation, etc., are there. Business competitiveness here and elsewhere is the ultimate goal, and hybrid organizations, such as incubators, technology parks, etc., are regulated.

However, this hybridization will create two new entities: the Scientific and Technological Innovation Institution (ICT- *Instituição Científica Tecnológica e de Inovação*) and the Technological Innovation Nucleus (NIT- *Núcleo de Inovação Tecnológica*), and expand the spectrum of action of another entity created in the 1990s: the support foundations. ICTs become the name of any public or private body, where research is the purpose described in its constitutive

instruments, as well as the transformation of its results into merchandise. NITs, on the other hand, arise within an ICT or together with another, but without legal distinction. Its major role is the management of the so-called “institutional innovation policy”. The organizational web present in large conglomerates begins to be shaped here. Universities and Institutes are equivalent to ICTs, they have one or more NITs housed inside them, and at the same time they can, according to Item I of §2 of Art. 3 B (BRASIL, 2016.), make agreements with other ICTs and assign real estate and spaces to them or even to companies. This pact also extends to the sharing and use of laboratories and all the tools to develop research, and the participation of professors, who are paid with public money. These agreements may or may not involve financial consideration. The fruits of these works are also within the managerial and financial focus. Patents are intended for entrepreneurs, but there may be the creation of new companies, where the Union can enter with a minimum shareholding in the capital, with a contract that will be signed to leave no doubt as to the financial reward to universities for new technological achievements. Processes and parks are managed, human resources and non-workers must attend the catechism of entrepreneurship, and, if this whole process progresses to the desired success, the use of the capital and credit market, investment funds, and participation is also authorized. Although this framework appears to be broadly free, it also demonstrates a totalitarian character. To ensure that opposition to this model is cooled down among possible critical researchers, the law informs that, once a technology transfer contract is signed, “[...] directors, creators or any other servants, employees or service providers are obliged to pass on the knowledge and information necessary for its implementation, under penalty of administrative, civil and criminal liability [...]” (BRAZIL, 2016, §6, Art. 6).

The 2016 coup, which began a shift towards more radical neoliberalism, continued this privatization process. A decree issued by the Temer government (BRASIL, 2018) adds new details to the legislation in force. The terms are identical to those found in the previous law, but with some additions. Among other things, the customs procedure for the importation of goods and equipment for research is facilitated, tax subsidies are created to stimulate the production of technology and there is greater detail on the participation of public ICTs in investment funds, as well as transfer contracts from technology to companies and their respective forms of remuneration. The rest of society is not considered the target of this transfer, since, as already mentioned, it was eclipsed by the notion of the company.

From the enactment of the so-called Innovation Law, according to Garcia (2019), the creation of innovation centers became compulsory in universities. The National Institute of Intellectual Property (INPI- *Instituto Nacional de Propriedade Intelectual*) enabled them to create the NITs, and the biggest reflection of this process was an increase in the number of patents registered by the academy. Ironically, so much government effort to foster partnerships with corporations does not find much support in them, as “the culture of innovation takes time to take off within companies” (GARCIA, 2019, p. 2). For this reason, the largest patent depositaries at the INPI are universities, and only one multinational private group, Case New Holland (CNH). However, this does not indicate that the corporate culture has cooled down on campuses. The then director of Unicamp's innovation agency, Dr. Newton Frateschi, says that “more important than having the patent deposited is the fact that the university produces patentable things” (GARCIA, 2019, p. 3). At the Federal University of Campina Grande (UFCG), Dr. Nilton Silva complained that they have not been able to transfer technology from patents to companies for three years, partly due to internal university issues. This is why they fail to “receive a few million Brazilian reais in royalties” (GARCIA, 2019, p. 3).

The Formict Report (BRASIL, 2019), confirms these and other data. Most ICTs are universities (44.9%), public (68.5%), housed in the federal instance (67.5%) and with a higher prevalence in the Southeast region (41.2%). Although the legislation points out several options for the implementation of the Triple Helix model, most of the actions implemented are within the scope of the so-called “management of intellectual property and technology transfer”, with 93.2% (BRASIL, 2019, p. 16). As there is no differentiation of data between the two topics, it can be

inferred, from the report published by Garcia (2019), that the second aspect (technology transfer) has a lower weight than the first (intellectual property management). On the other end, the activities of “entrepreneurship, management of incubators and participation in the social capital of companies” reached 50.2% of public and private ICTs, which is considered a low rate by the ministry (BRASIL, 2019, p. 15). Likewise, shared NITs have not been very successful. Only 15.3% of those established in public institutions are in this condition. Another striking aspect is the type of patent registration required, with a predominance of those related to the manufacturing industry and information technology services, showing that there is greater involvement of the areas of engineering and exact sciences in this process. However, the university is not formed only by these fields of knowledge, leaving in abeyance what happens to those areas that do not have, cannot, do not want, or are unable to submit to these dictates, such as the areas of Human Sciences, which, for the most part, do not generate patentable products or services. In the end, the technology transfer contracts were signed by 47 public institutions, only 22.5% of the total of 209, which brought an income of R\$ 374.3 million in 2018. By way of comparison, Moreno (2018) informs that in 2017 the budgeted amount for higher education in Brazil was R\$ 34 billion, a sum that had already been falling since 2015. In other words, the income from technology transfer in public universities was around 1% of the budget foreseen for higher education in 2017, which demonstrates a negligible value to justify an institutional autonomy reduced to the search for external sources of funds.

This managerialism, which enters and shapes the public service, can be understood as a governmental version of the business pattern of the hypermodern company described by Pagès et al. (1987), or as the metamorphosis of public action, according to neoliberal dogmas, considering the theoretical contribution of Dardot and Laval (2016). Newman and Clarke (2012) conceptualize managerialism as an ideology that underpins a profound cultural and political change that took place in the United Kingdom from the 1990s onwards. Together with the extensive privatization of public companies in that country, a change took place in other public actions to operate according to private sector standards, introducing values such as competitiveness, efficiency, excellence, and quality, which came to be placed above the public values once acclaimed, that is, something close to what was proposed for the reform of the State in Brazil. According to the authors, this ideology was implanted from managerialization, that is, a process of transformation that introduced a calculation parameter that should base all public action, and that operates from the figure of the manager, bearer of the will over everything necessary to carry out that same action.

The authors show the effects of this process on British education, which ended up bringing it closer to a business vision, with the weakening of the understanding of education as a public good. Among the consequences are greater exploitation of educators, an expansion of capitalist values, and greater use of utilitarian pedagogical techniques. At the same time, the image of the citizen-client, who purchases services, and the formation of a large business branch focused on the provision of educational services were built. From the 2008 financial crisis, with the neoliberal *ethos* properly installed, the cut of public resources and austerity found acceptance in the thinking of the new managers of the educational business, without provoking further questions, given the naturalization of the market sociability.

In the internal dynamics of institutions, the observations brought by Ball (2004, 2005, 2010) are fruitful. The operation of managerialism takes place through what the author calls performativity, understood as “a technology, a culture and a method of regulation that employs judgments, comparisons and demonstrations as means of control, friction and change” (BALL, 2005, p. 2), that is, a form of power. It is built from the establishment of parameters and indicators, and an apparatus for achieving them that aims to induce workers to enter the competition game, at the same time establishing mechanisms for measuring performance and classifying them. A game of representations is created that exists only for the measurement of the created mechanism, usually related to a number. Managerialism attracts workers to performativity, which, according to the author, is a struggle for visibility. An apparent consensus is produced that tends to hide differences

and divergences while promoting insecurity, as the worker becomes a number, which is the measure of his evaluation and performance.

In British higher education, the author points out that this process is already verified in the processes of submission to funding notices or in the competition for the number of academic publications. However, he also warns that, despite the global scope of these mechanisms, especially through the sponsorship of multilateral organizations such as the World Bank, there is an adaptation of them to local realities. In the Brazilian case, for example, Hypólito (2008, 2011) analyzes the managerial approach to the adoption of quality education programs in the state systems of Minas Gerais and Rio Grande do Sul. Carvalho et al. (2018), studying teaching work in the State of São Paulo, show that the values of managerialism are based on those close to masculinity and that their adoption increases the precariousness of markedly female teaching work. Piolli, Silva, and Heloani (2015) find elements of managerialism in the National Education Plan (PNE- *Plano Nacional de Educação*) for the period 2014-2024 and point to ways of controlling teaching work and increasing illness. Ribeiro and Leda (2016) turn their gaze to the faculty at federal universities, and also demonstrate how competition and individualism result in a process of intensification and precariousness of work also in Brazilian higher education institutions.

This set of studies demonstrates that although the objectives of the Management Reform of the State have not materialized in the figure of the SOs, and they have been obliterated in the Future-se proposal, its guidelines were and continue to be implemented in the Brazilian educational apparatus. It is privatization that starts internally. We note that the program places managerialism on another level. Higher education is now explicitly raised to the condition of supporting increased capital accumulation. In addition to academic productivity goals, such as the publication of works, the production of knowledge for the business sector is added, mainly manifested in the form of patents, all of which are detailed in the project. Furthermore, it opens up the possibility of managerialism reaching a sphere that did not exist until then: the financialization of federal educational institutions. With this, what can be expected is an even greater precariousness of teaching work and new techniques of performativity that will focus on the measurement of marketable knowledge that is produced within the institutions. Furthermore, it is not known what to expect from the areas of Human Sciences in this situation. Allied to neoliberal policies that operate mainly in the economic field, the Bolsonaro government also has a largely conservative area that has hurled insults at the Humanities, for example, that they were disseminators of the so-called cultural Marxism and the so-called gender ideology. Universities, as a whole, were seen as disseminating practices contrary to this conservatism (drug use, abortion, sexual diversity, etc.). Part of these attacks came from Minister Abraham Weintraub. Future-se's proposal tends to cause a deep split in the university as a whole between those who produce marketable knowledge and those who do not, relegating these areas to great ostracism and possible discrimination, as they will not incorporate the new business ethos that points out in the bill.

FUTURE-SE: MINIMUM STATE AND MAXIMUM MARKET

Faithful to the process of the resurgence of neoliberalism in Brazil, Future-se tries to consolidate a trend that has been present for about 25 years in Brazilian public institutions. As in the Bolsonaro government, financial capital starts to have an even greater hegemony than in previous governments, it is symptomatic that it also starts to guide the proposal to an area that is not within its remit⁴. The project's message is signed by the then Minister of Education, Abraham Bragança de Vasconcellos Weintraub; by the Minister of Science, Technology, Innovations, and Communications, Marcos César Pontes, and by none other than the Minister of Economy, Paulo

⁴ Authors such as Andrade (2020), Dweck (2020), Sampaio Jr. (2019) and De Conti (2019), and Gaspar (2018) point out that Bolsonaro government is characterized by an ultra-liberalism, either by associating political violence against resistance to market dominance, or by choosing the Minister of Economy as guarantor with the financial market, whether due to the non-flexibilization of fiscal targets, even during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Roberto Nunes Guedes. While ensuring that there will be no reduction in public investment in institutions, the law intends to create opportunities for them to seek additional sources of funds. The excuse, used since the neoliberal rise in the country, is the budget limitation and the need to “universalize access to essential public services” (BRASIL, 2020b, p. 1). This is contradicted by §2 of Art. 6 of the project, because to those institutions that achieve the contracted results, more budget resources are foreseen as a prize. In the same way, other allegations that have already been used come into play, such as the weight and bureaucracy of the State, which institutions may partially get rid of, and the signal offered to the financial market that there will be no fiscal impacts, as they may reduce gains in the high-interest rates and public debt bonds, so dear to the banks.

In line with other legislation already enacted and attesting to what Dardot and Laval (2016) pointed out, the exaltation of the figure of the entrepreneur as a way of conduct also finds space in Future-se. It is necessary to create an “entrepreneurial culture”, the scientific and technological policy must be focused on entrepreneurial actions, which must also permeate the curricula and training of students. Being at the forefront of what would be an innovative model of education, the employability or ability of someone to get (or stay in) a job would be assured. That is why the word is also used in the project. Gradually, a construction is perceived that places an individual imbued with an ideology that denies, ignores, or does not allow to be influenced by collective actions at the center of actions. This is symptomatic when comparing Item VII of Art. 3 of the project (BRASIL, 2020, p.2)⁵. In the text posted for consultation on the MEC website, the academic community was understood as a “collectivity”, which included professors, students, and administrative technicians. Now it becomes only “that constituted by the faculty, the student body and the technical-administrative body” (BRASIL, 2020, p. 2). This political option is even more explicit when reading Art. 28: “The National Day of the Entrepreneur Student is established, to be celebrated on the first Saturday after Labor Day.” (BRAZIL, 2020, p. 11). This tribute could take place in any other month of the year, but it shows that one of the objectives of the project is to establish a counterpoint and an opposition between the working class that, despite all the mishaps, ascended to higher education in the center-left governments, and the new *ethos* that is intended to be institutionalized in the country. No more capital-labor struggles, no more racial, class, and gender heterogeneity of the proletariat, but a single mold, where all these differences are supposedly annulled in favor of the social construction of a new demiurge, whose success and glory would only be a matter of time, since everything would be in consonance with a so-called natural and unequivocal order of humanity.

However, the financialization element of the academy is not shown fully at first. In article 27, the project mentions “equity funds” that can support Future-se, referring, for this, to Law 13,800 of January 4, 2019 (BRASIL, 2019b, p. 11). It institutes the so-called equity funds that aim to raise and order donations from private individuals and legal entities for various actions, today more limited to public action, such as education, culture, health, environment, security, etc., and also to the production of science and technology. In this specific case, the support foundations created in 1994 with Itamar Franco and changed during the Lula and Dilma governments now have a new and decisive role. According to the sole paragraph of Art.2, they are “equal to the management organizations defined in item II⁶ of the caput of this article, being able to carry out the management of equity funds established by this Law.” (BRAZIL, 2019b, p. 2). By opening this flank to financial capital, there is a new space for its *modus operandi* to approach academia. The decision-making bodies must have professionals familiar with and experienced in the area, and a legal entity registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission (CVM- *Comissão de Valores Mobiliários*) can also be hired to manage the resources. Revenues can come from “exploitation of intellectual property rights” and “sale of goods with the brand of the supported institution” (BRASIL, 2019b, p. 6). Dividends, on the other hand, can be used for investments, research grants, and training, but not payment of ongoing expenses, such as payroll. As it also aims to receive

⁵ Previously, it was item X. In the project sent to the Chamber, it became item VIII.

⁶ The item refers to an endowment fund management organization.

donations, the benefactor should only make a declaration that the donation does not come from irregular activities. It can be held responsible if there is falsehood, but in a country where organized crime is entrenched in several public spheres, even paralyzing investigative bodies, and there is still the possibility of legalizing gambling - known worldwide as a money laundering center - what guarantees that bigger problems will not occur? Furthermore, it is noticeable that the government is creating artifices to get rid of its constitutional obligations and channel more resources to the financial casino. At the same time, as the attention can turn to the dispute for private resources, there is a reduction in pressure to, for example, prevent budget cuts, or mobilize teachers, technicians, and students to improve teaching conditions.

In the end, we will tend to have universities and institutes that conceive of themselves as producers of a nuanced set of goods, expressed in knowledge, a brand and its signs, and, above all, patents. In the same way that modern companies seek to co-opt hearts and minds, entrepreneurial and managerial ideology enters campuses to carry out the same process, producing, as Ball (2004, 2005, 2010) points out, new performativities. As autonomy is restricted in the business world, the guarantee of the achievement of this process within the universities and the consequent reduction of autonomy will be expressed in the figure of contracts. We now have a complex warp with several inspection mechanisms. The MEC enters into agreements with the institutions, all of which are reduced to the status of ICTs, the operationalization takes place with the NITs, and, to sell their main merchandise, new contracts are entered into with companies. Resources come in through the support foundations now raised to the status of endowment funds that, through more contracts with the ICT, are responsible for the application of the accumulated capital. It is a process of horizontalization analogous to what is already happening in conglomerates. It is not too much to note that the axes around which contracts revolve are the results or the merchandise that can come out at the end of this production process. These results are manifested in indicators, meticulously monitored, which can yield benefits for the achievement of objectives if adhesion occurs, and, in the end, as already mentioned, more budgetary resources and even priority in the granting of scholarships by Capes. In this same way, so that the everyday institutional existence continues to be impregnated by the proposed ideology, the figure of governance comes into play along with efficiency, economy, business model, management, evaluation, etc.

If some of these elements had been present for some time in the academy, especially in the areas of exact sciences and engineering, and due to contradictions and struggles, clashes were manifest, but Future-pro's proposal goes further. In Section V of Art.18, when mentioning networks and laboratory centers, one of the objectives is to “involve the entire academic community”, revealing the autocratic character of the project. There is a consonance of the proposal with the character of the Bolsonaro government. As the greatest criticism of their performance came from universities, which are par excellence the place for debate, analysis, and construction of thought, making them similar to companies that operate the same function pointed out by Pagès et al. (1987), that is, camouflage social and psychological contradictions, and go beyond: reduce and neutralize criticism. In a certain sense, there is a reduction of knowledge to a neo-positivist bias, which believes in scientific neutrality, in a utopian idea of infinite progress, and which only considers valid knowledge that can be translated into numbers. It is to carry out scientific and technological research and others that do not aim to generate products, to walk, even more, towards the support of the current power structures, to completely detach from the society in which we are inserted, and, what is worse, to become irrelevant and disposable.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

When analyzing the unsatisfactory trajectory of the MEC during the Bolsonaro government, it is not surprising the massive opposition it has generated so far, given that there is no systematic proposal for the improvement of education in the country, even considering its worldview and society. There is untimeliness that manifests, in general, in hostility to any argument or fact that goes against their phantoms. Unfounded opposition and hatred do not build public

policies in a country marked by deep inequalities, such as Brazil. But this superficial mess hides within it an orientation markedly linked to the most hardened neoliberalism, where, as in Hayek (2010), the market is in the field of moral order. For this reason, the minister of economy has a decisive role in any policy to be adopted, and regardless of what social indicators, other economic approaches, thinkers from other fields of knowledge say, or even a pandemic that devastates the world, the neoliberal agenda of destruction has no truce.

Therefore, the Future-se initiative is not far from that goal. Even with great rejection by the universities and institutes, the proposal was sent to the Chamber of Deputies, as the marketing and financial imperative must overcome any other consideration to the contrary. As there is already a long history of partnerships between sectors of institutions and private companies, alongside legislation that favors the submission of the former to the latter, this state deepens until the business creed can convince the majority of the unwary of its alleged ethics and dignity. Along these lines, a new and worrying aspect is added to the reform of the State: financialization. If initially the so-called non-essential services could be provided by social organizations or delivered to NGOs, what is now ahead is a situation in which the State is even more relieved of its role and opens the door to fundraising through investment found or even the transformation of rights into goods to be sold on the market. This is already happening, for example, in the areas of health and the growing private higher education, but, for example, the commercialization of patent rights, obtained at the expense of public investments and that should benefit society as a whole, indicates an advance in this project.

But so that this is not so explicit, we start with what Dahlet (2014) deciphers: expressions are softened, intentions are hidden and euphemisms are created. Following the reasoning of Pagès et al. (1987), everything seems to be seductive, since it seeks to cover up the picture of uncertainties and contradictions inherent to the experience of life within the capitalist mode of production, and a utopian future is indicated, but considered achievable for being, perhaps, inherent to nature, where the company, its image, and its symbols absorb and clarify the contradictions, at the same time that opportunities and growth are distributed equitably through the so-called entrepreneurial spirit.

However, reality insists on contradicting expectations. In a country that is increasingly deindustrializing and where social inequality and income concentration are the norms, to assume that there is a strong business community in search of technology that can increase its accumulation is to ignore this situation and also how the international division of labor operates, the processes of oligopolization of capital, among other important elements. The lower-than-expected return from institutions with technology transfer attests to this statement. Likewise, the speed at which rights are being destroyed in Brazil confirms that a large part of the national wealth is not supported by the manufacture of cutting-edge products, highly intensive in technology, and whose operation requires few workers, generally with better wages. It relies on informal, outsourced, labor-intensive work, with little or no aggregated state-of-the-art technology, which needs to destroy rights to increase accumulation. The cost of the workforce constitutes a determinant for the adoption or not of new technologies. Why buy sophisticated equipment to perform a task, when you can hire workers at low wages to do similar tasks? In this sense, the devaluation of the workforce in Brazil constitutes a barrier to the advancement of more advanced technologies.

Finally, plurality must be the reference for Brazilian public institutions. Great advances were made in the inclusion of social strata historically excluded from the academy, in the expansion of research topics, as well as in intersectionality. Despite the great contradictions that are always present, there is life in academia beyond the marketable products generated by its laboratories, and this is what reinforces its social and political role. It cannot be forced that areas such as Philosophy, Sociology, Linguistics, Anthropology, or Plastic Arts generate products that can be patented. Similarly, not all fields of the exact or biological sciences have an immediate attraction to capital. What about Cosmology? Will researching the origin, evolution, and structure of the universe contribute to new marketable products? Likewise, the research time cannot be reduced to the short

term of the financial casino. Several studies require years of dedication, personal investment, equipment, and a lot of study for results that are not conclusive because as science advances, new questions arise, certainties disappear and analyzes are refined. For this reason, to keep this spirit alive, it is necessary to renew the strength of our criticism, not succumbing to easily explained proposals, riddled with disingenuous words, on pain of sinking into insignificance.

REFERENCES

ANDIFES. *Andifes – Carta de Vitória*. Associação Nacional dos Dirigentes das Instituições Federais de Ensino Superior. Disponível em: <<https://www.andifes.org.br/?p=65404/>>. Acesso em: 01 jan. 2021.

ANDRADE, Daniel P. Neoliberalismo autoritário no Brasil: Reforma econômica neoliberal e militarização da administração pública. *Sens Public*, Montreal, p. 28, 25 jun. 2020.

BALL, Stephen J. Performatividade, privatização e o pós-Estado do Bem-Estar. *Educação & Sociedade*, v. 25, n. 89, p. 1105–1126, dez. 2004.

BALL, Stephen J. Profissionalismo, gerencialismo e performatividade. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, v. 35, n. 126, p. 539–564, dez. 2005.

BALL, Stephen J. Performatividades e Fabricações na Economia Educacional: rumo a uma sociedade performativa. *Educação & Realidade*, v. 35, n. 2, p. 37–55, ago. 2010.

BERMÚDEZ, Ana C. *Mais de 40 federais criticam Future-se; cinco rejeitam adesão ao projeto*. UOL Educação, São Paulo, 14 ago. 2019. Seção Notícias. Disponível em: <<https://educacao.uol.com.br/noticias/2019/08/14/mais-de-40-federais-criticam-future-se-duas-rejeitam-adesao-ao-projeto.htm>>. Acesso em: 23 jul. 2020.

BRASIL. Ministério da Administração e Reforma do Estado. *Plano Diretor da Reforma do Aparelho do Estado*, Brasília, DF, 1995.

BRASIL. Lei nº 10.973, de 2 de dezembro de 2004. Dispõe sobre incentivos à inovação e à pesquisa científica e tecnológica no ambiente produtivo e dá outras providências. *Diário Oficial da República Federativa do Brasil*, Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 2 dez. 2004. Seção 1, p. 2-4.

BRASIL. Lei nº 13.243, de 11 de janeiro de 2016. Dispõe sobre estímulos ao desenvolvimento científico, à pesquisa, à capacitação científica e tecnológica e à inovação e altera a Lei nº 10.973, de 2 de dezembro de 2004, a Lei nº 6.815, de 19 de agosto de 1980, a Lei nº 8.666, de 21 de junho de 1993, a Lei nº 12.462, de 4 de agosto de 2011, a Lei nº 8.745, de 9 de dezembro de 1993, a Lei nº 8.958, de 20 de dezembro de 1994, a Lei nº 8.010, de 29 de março de 1990, a Lei nº 8.032, de 12 de abril de 1990, e a Lei nº 12.772, de 28 de dezembro de 2012, nos termos da Emenda Constitucional nº 85, de 26 de fevereiro de 2015. *Diário Oficial da República Federativa do Brasil*, Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 12 jan. 2016. Seção 1, p.1-5.

BRASIL. Decreto nº 9.283, de 07 de fevereiro de 2018. Regulamenta a Lei nº 10.973, de 2 de dezembro de 2004, a Lei nº 13.243, de 11 de janeiro de 2016, o art. 24, § 3º, e o art. 32, § 7º, da Lei nº 8.666, de 21 de junho de 1993, o art. 1º da Lei nº 8.010, de 29 de março de 1990, e o art. 2º, caput, inciso I, alínea "g", da Lei nº 8.032, de 12 de abril de 1990, e altera o Decreto nº 6.759,

de 5 de fevereiro de 2009, para estabelecer medidas de incentivo à inovação e à pesquisa científica e tecnológica no ambiente produtivo, com vistas à capacitação tecnológica, ao alcance da autonomia tecnológica e ao desenvolvimento do sistema produtivo nacional e regional. *Diário Oficial da República Federativa do Brasil*, Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 08 fev. 2018. Seção 1, p. 10-20.

BRASIL. Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia, Inovações e Comunicações. *Relatório FORMICT Ano Base 2018: política de propriedade intelectual das instituições científicas, tecnológicas e de inovação do Brasil*, Brasília, DF, 2019.

BRASIL. Lei nº13.800, de 4 de janeiro de 2019. Autoriza a administração pública a firmar instrumentos de parceria e termos de execução de programas, projetos e demais finalidades de interesse público com organizações gestoras de fundos patrimoniais; altera as Leis nºs 9.249 e 9.250 de 26 de dezembro de 1995, 9.532 de 10 de dezembro de 1997 e 12.114 de 9 de dezembro de 2009, e dá outras providências. *Diário Oficial da República Federativa do Brasil*, Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 7 jan. 2019. Seção 1, p. 1-4.

BRASIL. Câmara dos Deputados. *Projeto de Lei PL 3.076/2020*. Institui o Programa Universidades e Institutos Empreendedores e Inovadores – Future-se. Disponível em <<https://www.camara.leg.br/proposicoesWeb/fichadetramitacao?idProposicao=2254321>>. Acesso em: 03 jul. 2020.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *EM nº 00014/2020 MEC MCTIC ME*. MEC. Secretaria Geral. Brasília, abr. 2020. Disponível em: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/Projetos/ExpMotiv/MECON/2020/14-ME.htm>. Acesso em: 19 jun. 2020.

BRESSER-PEREIRA, Luiz C. Reforma gerencial e legitimação do Estado social. *Revista de Administração Pública*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 51, n. 1, p. 147–156, fev. 2017.

BRUNO, Miguel. Financeirização e desenvolvimento no Brasil. *Revista Rumos*, Brasília, n. 303, p. 12-14, jan-fev. 2019.

CARVALHO, Marília P. *et al.* Cuidado e gerencialismo: para onde vai o trabalho das professoras. *Educação em Revista*, v. 34, p. 1-29, 13 dez. 2018.

CISLAGHI, Juliana F. A trajetória histórica do ensino superior no Brasil: expansão e privatização da ditadura aos governos do PT. *SER Social*, v. 21, n. 44, p. 134-151, 10 mar. 2019.

CRAWFORD, Susan. The Origin and Development of a Concept: The Information Society. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, Chicago, vol. 71, no. 4, p. 380-385, oct. 1983.

DAGNINO, Renato *et al.* Racionalidades da interação universidade-empresa na América Latina (1955-1995). In: DAGNINO, Renato; THOMAS, Hernán (org.). *A pesquisa universitária na América Latina e a vinculação universidade-empresa*. Chapecó: ARGOS, Editora da Unochapecó, 2011. p. 37-82.

DAHLET, Patrick. Apagar as divisões, celebrar o consenso: a governança discursiva na era neoliberal. *Todas As Letras*, São Paulo, v. 16, n. 1, p. 125-138, maio 2014.

DAHLET, Patrick. (Re)produzir o inquestionável: nominalização, generalização e naturalização no discurso neoliberal. *EID&A – Revista Eletrônica de Estudos Integrados em Discurso e Argumentação*, Ilhéus, n. 8, p. 206-221, jun. 2015.

DARDOT, Pierre; LAVAL, Christian. *The new way of the world: on neoliberal society*. London: Verso Books, 2013.

DE CONTI, Bruno. A utopia neoliberal na América Latina e os contramovimentos. *Jornal dos Economistas*, Rio de Janeiro, p. 3, dez. 2019.

DWECK, Esther. Regras fiscais para os 99% da população. *Jornal dos Economistas*, Rio de Janeiro, p. 6-7, jul. 2020.

ETZKOWITZ, Henry. Entrepreneurial scientists and entrepreneurial universities in American academic science. *Minerva*, Bielefeld, vol. 21, no. 2-3, p. 198-233, 1984.

ETZKOWITZ, Henry. Enterprises from science: The origins of science-based regional economic development. *Minerva*, Bielefeld, vol. 31, no. 3, p. 326-360, 1993.

ETZKOWITZ, Henry. Innovation in innovation: The Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations. *Social Science Information*, vol. 42, no. 3, p. 293-337, set. 2003.

ETZKOWITZ, Henry; LEYDESDORFF, Loet. The triple helix - university-industry-government relations: a laboratory for knowledge based economy development. *EASST Review*, Maastricht, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 14-19, 1995.

FERNANDES, Florestan. *Universidade brasileira: reforma ou revolução?* 2. ed. São Paulo: Editora Alfa-Ômega, 1979.

FERREIRA, Paula. Três meses após apresentação do Future-se, apenas 15 instituições manifestaram interesse. *O Globo*, Rio de Janeiro, 31 out. 2019. Seção Sociedade. Disponível em: <<https://oglobo.globo.com/sociedade/tres-meses-apos-apresentacao-do-future-se-apenas-15-instituicoes-manifestaram-interesse-1-24053610>>. Acesso em: 23 jul. 2020.

FERREIRA, Paula. Em disputa com o MEC, federais têm baixa adesão ao Future-se e à nova carteirinha estudantil. *O Globo*, Rio de Janeiro, 03 fev. 2020. Seção Sociedade. Disponível em: <<https://oglobo.globo.com/sociedade/educacao/em-disputa-com-mec-federais-tem-baixa-adesao-ao-future-se-a-nova-carteirinha-estudantil-24222398>>. Acesso em: 23 jul. 2020.

GARCIA, Rafael. Núcleos de inovação ajudam universidades a aumentar patentes. Folha de São Paulo, São Paulo, 07 out. 2019. *Seção Ranking Universitário Folha*. Disponível em: <<https://ruf.folha.uol.com.br/2019/noticias/nucleos-de-inovacao-ajudam-universidades-a-aumentar-patentes.shtml>>. Acesso em: 19 jul. 2020.

GASPAR, Malu. O fiador. *Revista Piauí*, n. 144, p. 16-27, set. 2018.

GAULEJAC, Vincent de. *Gestão como doença social: ideologia, poder gerencialista e fragmentação social*. Aparecida: Ideias & Letras, 2007.

HAYEK, Friedrich. *O caminho da servidão*. 6a. ed. São Paulo: Instituto Ludwig von Mises Brasil, 2010.

HYPÓLITO, Álvaro M. Estado gerencial, reestruturação educativa e gestão da educação. *Revista Brasileira de Política e Administração da Educação*, v. 24, n. 1, p. 63-78, abr. 2008.

HYPÓLITO, Álvaro M. Reorganização Gerencialista da Escola e Trabalho Docente. *Educação: Teoria e Prática*, v. 21, n. 38, p. 59-78, 2011.

LEHER, Roberto. Capitalismo dependiente y Educación: propuestas para la problemática universitaria. In: LEHER, Roberto. (org.). *Por una reforma radical de las universidades latinoamericanas*. Ciudad de Buenos Aires: Rosario, Santa Fe, Argentina: CLACSO; Homo Sapiens, 2010. p. 19-93.

MARTINS, Carlos. B. A Reforma Universitária de 1968 e a abertura para o ensino superior privado no Brasil. *Educação & Sociedade*, v. 30, n. 106, p. 15-35, abr. 2009.

MARX, Karl. *O capital: crítica da economia política; livro primeiro – o processo de produção do capital*. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, 2013.

MORENO, Ana C. 90% das universidades federais tiveram perda real no orçamento em cinco anos; verba nacional encolheu 28%. *G1*, Rio de Janeiro, 29 jun. 2018, Seção Educação. Disponível em: <<https://g1.globo.com/educacao/noticia/90-das-universidades-federais-tiveram-perda-real-no-orcamento-em-cinco-anos-verba-nacional-encolheu-28.ghtml>>. Acesso em: 24 jul. 2020

NEWMAN, Janet; CLARKE, John. Gerencialismo. *Educação & Realidade*, v. 37, n. 2, p. 353-381, ago. 2012.

PAGÈS, Max; BONETTI, Michel; GAULEJAC, Vincent; DESCENDRE, Daniel. *O poder das organizações*. São Paulo: Atlas, 1987.

PIOLLI, Evaldo; SILVA, Eduardo P. E; HELOANI, José R. M. Plano Nacional de Educação, autonomia controlada e adoecimento do professor. *Cadernos CEDES*, v. 35, n. 97, p. 589-607, dez. 2015.

RABELO, Nair. Universidades: o que são e para que servem. *Revista Darcy: revista de jornalismo científico e cultural da Universidade de Brasília*, Brasília, n.23, p. 16-20, jul./dez. 2019.

RIBEIRO, Carla V. S.; LEDA, Denisa B. O trabalho docente no enfrentamento do gerencialismo nas universidades federais Brasileiras: repercussões na subjetividade. *Educação em Revista*, v. 32, n. 4, p. 97-117, dez. 2016.

SAMPAIO JR., Plínio A. Acima de tudo e de todos, a tirania do mercado. *Jornal dos Economistas*, Rio de Janeiro, p. 3, jan. 2019.

SCHULTZ, Theodore W. *O Capital humano: investimentos em educação e pesquisa*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1973.

SCHUMPETER, Joseph A. *Teoria do desenvolvimento econômico: uma investigação sobre lucros, capital, crédito, juro e o ciclo econômico*. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1997.

SILVA, Marcelo L. Future-se s.a.: o “programa bolsonarista” para as Instituições Federais de Ensino Superior (IFES). *Germinar: Marxismo e Educação em Debate*, v. 11, n. 3, p. 88-122, 21 abr. 2020.

SLAUGHTER, Sheila; RHOADES, Gary. The Theory of Academic Capitalism. In: SLAUGHTER, Sheila; RHOADES, Gary (Orgs.). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004. p. 11-45

STIGLER, George J. The Economics of Information. *The Journal of Political Economy*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, vol.69, no.3, p.213-225, jun.1961.

UNIVERSIDADE DE BRASÍLIA. *Análise preliminar do Programa Institutos e Universidades Empreendedoras e Inovadoras - FUTURE-SE*. Brasília, 2019.

WEBER, Max. *Economy and Society: an outline of interpretive sociology*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest with this article.

FUNDING

The translation of this article into English was funded by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – CAPES-Brasil.

Submitted: 08/31/2020

Approved: 10/10/2021