VIII

PATRIMONIAL FUNDING AND DESTABILIZATION OF THE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY THE CAPITAL AGENDA FOR BRAZILIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Janaína Duarte
Kátia Lima Lívia Prestes
Viviane de Queiroz

Introduction

The chapter aims to present a set of reflections carried out by researchers from three public universities: University of Brasilia, Fluminense Federal University and State University of Rio de Janeiro. In these universities, working in the Group of Studies and Research in Education and Social Work/GEPESS/UFF and in the Group of Political-Social Studies /POLITIZZA/UNB and in dialog with the struggles carried out by the trade union movement in defense of the valorization of teaching work and public university, we studied a set of profound changes in higher education conducted by the capital agenda.

In a first moment of the text, we problematize the main structural elements of higher education in a country marked by its capitalist dependence on the world economy. If in capitalism education is born with the functions of forming a labor force, spreading the bourgeois conception of the world and setting itself up as a field of profitable exploitation for capital; in dependent capitalism, such functions assume very specific contours under the leadership of an extremely aggressive and conservative bourgeoisie, as discussed by the late militant intellectual Florestan Fernandes.

In the item "Brazilian higher education in the context post 2016: precarization of training and the working conditions in federal universities" we present as the conception of education as a lucrative field for the capital, historically led by the Brazilian bourgeoisie, was expanded in the first decades of the new century. A process inscribed in the reordering of the accumulation and domination of contemporary capitalism in the central countries and which reaches more aggressive contours in the countries of the capitalistic periphery, due to the contrary nature of the Brazilian State and higher education. The result of this process is expressed in the precariousness of vocational training and working conditions in public universities, particularly federal universities and, also, by stimulating equity funds. The examination of the political and academic significance of these funds is carried out in the last item of the text. Presented by capital as sources of funding for social policies, the funds operate, in fact, the search for profitability carried out by the investment of resources received through donations in the financial market, as well as by the privatization of the patrimony of public institutions of higher education.

The challenges facing those who advocate public and free education today are immense. It is necessary to grasp the new strategies of bourgeois domination and expropriation of the rights granted by workers, such as education, so that together we forge the struggles for public university as a privileged locus of production of critical and creative knowledge in line with the historical demands of the working class.

Public university in dependent capitalism

School education in bourgeois sociability plays a fundamental role in the production and reproduction of capital from the formation of the labor force, the diffusion of the bourgeois conception of the world and as an area of exploitation for the profitability of capital. Based on these considerations, we seek to analyze how these objectives are manifested in dependent capitalism and how they are presented in the conformation of the dependent pattern of higher education, as Fernandes analyzed (1981, 1979).

What makes man a social being is his ability to perform work. Unlike the other animals that carry in their genetics the information necessary to perform their functions, we need to transmit, through some form of communication, the knowledge acquired and accumulated by humanity. The collective actions and their results are not transmitted naturally and to this process of socialization of knowledge and collective making of humanity we call education. We can observe, with this, that education has a direct relationship with what makes man a social being, that is work. Bertoldo (2015) identifies the conception of education in two processes: Education in a restricted sense – including school education, but not only – and education in a broad sense:

> Education in a restricted sense, such as school education (formal) and other forms of education that take place in informal spaces (church, unions, etc.), is that created from social development, to respond to certain needs demanded by men, a particular context of human history. The way it is presented will depend on the specific historical moment of human production. In this sense, education in antiquity is different from the Middle Ages, in the same way that it is presented in modernity and so on. [...] In this sense, education in a broad sense, within the Marxian ontology, can only be apprehended from the work ontological structure. This is because it has its origin in the process of human self-construction, which explains that as long as there is man there will be education, because it only ceases with the extinction of humanity. It is then about taking education in its very essence, so that we can characterize it and identify it from its genesis. This will make the necessary distinction between education in a specific sense and education in a broad sense (Bertoldo, 2015, p. 131).

Starting from the conception of work as an educational principle, Saviani (2003) analyzes the ways to produce and socialize knowledge in different moments of human history. The author points out that, before society divided into classes, there was no separation between work and education, since the educational process occurred in the work itself. In the same sense, Rodrigues (2016) identifies the emergence of formal education or

education in the strict sense associated with the historical scenario of class society. It is from the private appropriation of the land, the main means of production at the time, that the social division of labor arises, generating the separation between work and education, since the class of owners begins to live from the work of others and to control and systematize, according to their conception, knowledge that was collectively constructed in this work process.

Saviani (2003) analyzes that the social division into classes will also generate a division in the educational process, thus creating a separation between the proprietary class, which had an education centered on intellectual activities, philosophic and physical exercises of recreational or military character and the non-property class, carrying out its educational process in the very realization of the work. The author points out that the origin of the schools was based on the education offered to the class owner, which perpetuated the division between work and education. It is in this context that the division arises between those who "think", those who appropriate the collectively acquired knowledge and spread their values as universal, and those who "execute", the majority of the population who is expropriated from the collectively produced riches through their own work.

School education arises, therefore, from demands created by man himself in the historical development and, in certain periods, present different forms, according to the historical and spatial configuration of the classes struggle. Even if school education goes through successive transformations, depending on the historical demands of the modes of production and reproduction,

> [...] duality is not an invention of the educational system and not even the capitalist mode of production. As master Mario Manacorda taught us, the structural duality of education goes through the centuries, from the constitution of class-divided societies, so we cannot naively wait for the overcoming of the structural duality of education within class societies. Consequently, it is not credible that presidential elections eliminate social inequalities arising from class structure (Rodrigues, 2005, p. 265).

In this sense, the school education in capitalism is not exempt from traditions and, in this case, specifically, the contradiction presented is fundamental to understand the economic, political, social and ideological functions of school education in the mode of sociability of capital, since, given the need to expand and develop their productive forces, the ruling classes need to socialize, in some way, part of this knowledge, however, always seeking to improve ways of fragmenting and limiting this process more and more. School education, conceived from this duality proper to class society, is fundamental to the expansion of the capitalism itself. In basic education it seeks to socialize knowledge strictly limited to and compartmentalized to the working class for production, and, in higher education, produces a more specialized workforce, according to the needs of capital, in addition to the formation of contexts of the ruling and research classes that assist in the advancement of sciences to capitalist development (Prestes, 2018).

The role of the State in this process of conducting education policies linked to the need for capital is fundamental. Minto (2006) discusses the relationship between the public and the private from a historical perspective, considering that these conceptions must be

analyzed from each concrete reality. In Brazil, for example, assuming as analytical categories the public/private relationship, where the public refers to what is directly state and the private to what refers to the sectors of the bourgeois classes confuses more than it helps in understanding this dynamic, because, this procedure does not consider the role of the (bourgeois) State as a driver of the policies of interest of the classes of the former, omitting the antagonism between the classes.

Because it has a direct relationship with the production and reproduction of social life, school education accompanies the capitalist development of a region/nation determination, assuming different roles in the historical development, varying according to time and space. It is a contradictory space that also reproduces the tensions and conflicts that arise in the class struggle. It is necessary, therefore, to reflect the particularities of higher education in a dependent capitalist country, such as Brazil.

The unequal and combined dynamics of[1] capitalism addressed by Lenin (2011) and Trotsky (1977) will be recovered in various works by Florester Fernandes for the analysis of the development of capitalism in Brazil. This development took place in the framework of the articulation of the composite pattern of bourgeois domination[2] and the dual pattern of expropriation of the economic surplus[3] as key elements to reflect the role of education in our country.

> [...] Brazil did not live, either as a colony or later, the historical experience of the illustrated university; and the conditions of the slave economy contributed significantly to reduce to a minimum the creative functions of the isolated higher education. On the other hand, the political perspective of the manor did not establish vital connections among higher education, the development of culture and the potentialities of a national and democratic revolution (Fernandes, 1984, p. 32).[4]

[1] The theory of unequal and combined development allows us to grasp the dialectical and contradictory relationship between countries and/or regions circumscribed in capitalist development, so that, contrary to what preaches the ideology of development, the dependent countries are not in a race to develop the central countries, but they play this role in an integrated way with the logic of capital.

[2] Unlike other bourgeois who built their own institutions and achieved hegemony through popular alliances for the dispute of power with previous institutions, the local bourgeoisie did not acquire these mechanisms and emerged in the dependent capitalist reality imposing itself on the political plane, through agreements on the top with oligarchic elites, deliberately excluding most "of those from the bottom". Thus, the oligarchies not only did not lose their power, but were modernizing to suit the needs of capital. To this unity between the local bourgeoisie and the oligarchies, which together with the imperialist bourgeoisie maintains the relationships of domination in power, Fernandes characterized as standard composite of bourgeois domination.

[3] The composite pattern of bourgeois domination and the dual pattern of the economic surplus are the two main categories that help us understand what Fernandes (1981) calls dependent capitalism. For the author, the pattern of imperialist external domination had repercussions mainly on the maintenance of the production of raw materials of primary goods within the already established logic of export-import conditioning and aggravating the archaic economic structures. This element contributed to the national non-integration of dependent countries (in all dimensions), having the transfer of the economic surplus a decisive role for the intensification of this pattern and strengthening the association between the imperialist nations and the local elites that, as shown to us, was formed from particular interests and saw in the subordinate and dependent association a less "risky" means of profit.

[4] School education in Brazil has a very strong mark of oligarchic and elitist education, an axis that also characterizes the process that Fernandes (1981) called as a permanent colonial trait.

School education in Brazil has a very strong mark of oligarchic and elitist education, an axis that also characterizes the process that Fernandes (1981) called as a permanent colonial trait.[5] Although during the historical process changes have occurred in the organization of education, especially in higher education, this structuring character of exclusion of workers from access to education remains, mainly due to the perception of education as privilege and exalted privatism, as identified by Fernandes (1979).

> The Brazilian standard of higher school never laid roots in conceptions, processes or educational values that were vital for the revolution of the modern world, in Europe and the United States. On the contrary, it was attached to a composition of educational or institutional archaic waste with interests of the state or class, which could only have some dynamic meaning in the historical context of the formation of the dependent capitalism in Brazil. Not only was it set up to serve dependency relationships; it supported a typically preserved orientation, which emptied the contribution of higher schools to the cultural transplant of more or less disturbing historical significance (Fernandes, 1979, p. 113).

Throughout his works, Fernandes improved the category of cultural heteronomy, organically linked to the concept of dependent capitalism. Limoeiro-Cardoso (1996) points out that, since his first writings, the author gives a centrality to the cultural dimension in the interpretation of the social-Brazilian economic formation and its limits as a "nation".

> From his theoretical deepening in historical and dialectic materialism and the intensification of the class struggle in the country, Fernandes identifies in his research that in different countries that had a greater "national autonomy", in the sense of cultural development, still maintained their dependent character, this led him to conclude that the cultural heteronomy was not the main obstacle of rupture with the absence, and it was also a consequence of this. If people with their own, rich and complex culture are also in a heteronomic condition, cultural dependence cannot be so central to the dependent condition, even less responsible for it, even though it may be very important (negatively) in the fight against it. With this, culture is not absent from the concerns of Florestan. But it appears more and more thematic as ideology and gives space to more properly economic and political reflections. Consistent with this new perspective, the social classes and their relationships begin to gain prominence and centrality in their analyzes (Limoeiro-Cardoso, 1996, p. 108).

The problem of cultural heteronomy is an important issue to understand the educational challenges in Brazil. Fernandes (1974) reinforces that heteronomy is not only the

[5] "Florestan Fernandes analyzes capitalist accumulation in dependent capitalist countries considering that the absence of an original accumulation strong enough to sustain an autonomous development led to the transition from colonial economies to capitalism by subaltern inclusion in the world economy and by the maintenance of them Political and sociocultural bases of the colonial system associated with the impulse of industrialization and urbanization, thus characterizing the permanent colonial trait or condition in constant process of revitalization" (Lima, 2017, p. 354).

absorption of external ideas and values, but rather the internalization and schematization of these values for the national reality, constituting one of the sides of the bourgeois project of sociability in the dependent capitalism. The very difficult of conducting research that thinks the Brazilian reality in its particularity, but related to the mode of sociability of capital, evidences this heteronomical trait.

> The tendency to seek in Europe or in the US to satisfy all centers of interests and values feeds a process of intellectual and moral alienation of immense proportions. Contrary to what is commonly assumed, the crucial fact is not here in the external origin of thought categories and ways of acting, but in the way of interconnecting them, which takes as a permanent reference point the foreign civilizing nuclei, in which they were produced. This results in a state of fundamental dependence. With this, the process of internal development is entered with evaluations and subjective provisions that directly concur to perpetuate and strengthen the heteronomical condition of Brazilian society (Fernandes, 1974, p. 172).

In Brazil, therefore, universities derived from the Brazilian standard of higher school associated with cultural heteronomy, as Fernandes (1979) analyzed:

> There is, of course, a structural limitation, that is, a limitation that is standardized and general, that appears in all Brazilian higher schools. This forces us to talk about something very complex for this discussion: it is about the Brazilian standard of higher school. [...] The Brazilian high school is constituted s a school of shallow cultural elites that could only (or felt the need to) explore their higher education in very limited directions. As the mass of knowledge came from abroad and society only valued the formation of liberal professionals, higher school became a school of elites, of magisterial and unifunctional education: it was to be a school of dogmatic transmission of knowledge in the areas of technical-professional knowledge, economically, socially and culturally valued by the dominant extracts of castes and ornamental society (Fernandes, 1979, p. 56).

To understand how the dependent pattern of higher education and the cultural heteronomy inherent to dependent capitalism are manifested today are urgent and necessary tasks. Based on the understanding that exalted privacy and the conception of education as a privilege are structural elements of higher education in dependent capitalism, we will seek to identify, next, its current manifestations, in Brazil.

Brazilian higher education in the context post -2016: precarization of training and the working conditions in federal universities

The reordering of the pattern of accumulation and domination of contemporary capitalism in the central countries reaches more aggressive contours in the countries of the

capitalist periphery, mainly from the 2000, through its repercussions on the state, on the conditions and relationships of labor, on the culture, the structure of political and economic power founded on the bourgeoisie sociability. In a country marked by the dependent capitalist insertion in the world economy, the ultra-conservative agenda of capital established in the new century gains quite definite contours.

In the Brazilian context, the neoliberal counter-reforms[6] of the State initiated in the 1990's have advanced, responding to the insatiable demands and demands of capital, from the axes flexibilization, deregulation and privatization. Such scenario has exposed the Brazilian Higher Education Policy to a set of neoliberal counter-reforms guided by the conception of education as a non-exclusive service of the State, to the detriment of the guarantee of the right to education, with emphasis on productivity, in the entrepreneurship of education and in large-scale certification (Lima, 2007), changing the logic of form and working conditions in public universities.

Before the counter-reforms within the scope of higher education policy, some traits are essential and need to be rescued: a) the expansion of privatization, started with the dictatorship,[7] transforming higher education into an area of investment (and profitability) amplified of capital, including post-graduate degree; b) the commitment of the tripod teaching, research and extension, differentiating its achievement with the growth of distance learning, the cuts of public resources in public universities, as well as fragmenting the logic of this triad, which has changed the meaning of the university and suppressing its universalist character; (c) the subordination of the formation and production of knowledge to the market, since university life is organized in the function of capital, through the market, in order to meet its strict interests and demands; and d) the reduction of university autonomy , which gives this a very specific sense,[8] introducing terms such as university quality, university evaluation and university flexibility, as well as incorporating the logic of social organization, to the detriment of the conception of a university institution;[9] e) the precariousness and intensification of teaching work, with the flexibilization of the career, the work overload guided by the business logic of academic activities and the production of knowledge, resulting in developments for the health of this worker

This process will transform the public university from a knowledge translator to an operational university (Chauí, 1999), losing its universal character and being structured by norms and standards entirely alien to knowledge and intellectual formation, thus manifesting the actuality of the dependent pattern of higher education inherent to dependent capitalism, as previously analyzed. Its presupposition is competitiveness and particular strategies, reflecting individualism and individual merit, which contributes to the division of the public

---

[6] According to Lima (2007), the term counter-reform of higher education expresses the profound neoliberal changes that are underway in Brazilian educational policy, unlike reforms that substantially alter the living conditions of workers (even if at the limits of capitalism), they destroy rights and submit education to the level of marketable (and profitable) service, as a niche for the exploitation of capital.

[7] The University Reform of 1968 expanded higher education and university functions, based on a process determined by the naturalization of privatization and repression (Duarte, 2017).

[8] Autonomy here is signifying the institution's business management and predicts that, in order to meet the goals and achieve the indicators imposed by the management contract, the university has "autonomy" to "capture resources" from other sources, making partnerships with private companies (Chauí, 1999).

[9] The institution has society as its principle and its normative and valuative reference; while the organization has only itself as a reference, in a process of competition with others, whose particular objectives are guided by the ideas of effectiveness, management, planning, control (Chauí, 1999).

and private border, which will be expanded from the action of equity funds, as we will analyze later.

In the early years of the new century, it is important to note that the higher education policy is aimed at: 1) public-private partnerships, both in the financing of research and activities of market interest, as well as in the interference in the daily functioning of academic life and in the production of knowledge in universities;[10] 2) the opening of the educational sector higher education for foreign companies and groups, mainly with the stimulation of distance learning and with strategies such as the University for All Program (ProUni) and the Fund for Student Financing of Higher Education (FIES); in detriment to 3) dismantling of the public sector of higher education, with a sharp reduction of public investments, intensification of teaching job, precarization of physical structure, especially by the Program for Restructuring and Expansion of Federal Universities (REUNI),[11] promoting "[...] a planned and systematic deterioration of public universities, further rooting the vast private education system in Brazilian society" (Leher, 2010, p. 371).

As of 2016, the Temer Government,[12] more aggressively, approves Constitutional Amendment 95/2016 that freezes public investments for 20 years in public policies.[13] It follows that public investments in health and education will have, in real terms, the same values as 2017, disregarding the growth of the Brazilian population and the social demands for the expansion of access to health and public education. In addition to freezing the allocation of public funds for public policies, EC 95/2016 freezes the sound adjustments of public officials and the holding of public tenders. Despite the struggles of the working class against its approval, PEC was promulgated, as EC 95, on 12/15/2016.

The privatizing logic that characterizes the dependent pattern of higher education in Brazil will be deepened and expanded in the Michel Temer government (2016/2018). The tripod fiscal adjustment for the payment of interest and amortizations of public debt; reduction of the allocation of public funds for the financing of public policies, among them, higher education, and strengthening of the private sector, via public funds, was the guiding axis of the counter-reform of the State and higher education in that period. In 2017, 39.70% of the General Budget of the Federal Government (OGU) was allocated for the payment of interest and amortizations of the public debt, equivalent to R$ 986,110,833,381.14, that is,

---

[10] As a legal support, the Law of Technological Innovation (10.973/2004), which flexibilizes the boundaries between the public and the private through agreements among universities, research centers and companies, including with "[...] use, by the private sector, of infrastructure, equipment and human resources of public HEIs" (Lima, 2007, p.174); and **Decree No. 7.423/2010 that formalizes the Private Support Foundations and their relationship with federal institutions**, for the capture of private resources aimed at the interests of administration of universities or groups of teachers, or for the hiring of staff without tender, and the collection of courses and projects coordinated by professors.

[11] REUNI, regulated by Presidential Decree 6.096/07, opened vacancies in public universities, but disregarding the situation of federal scrapping and the deficit of professors, explicit being the overload of the already insufficient structure, with precarious bases, and the intensification of work, compromising the quality of teaching and the monitoring of students, with disrespect to the requisitions aimed at the tripod teaching, research and extension.

[12] There are several analyzes for the coup of 2016, however, it is considered that the main one was the rearticulation of the fractions of the local bourgeoisie, of a more conservative nature, in the direction of the more aggressive deepening of the design of the ruling class, culminating with the loss of Dilma's 2nd term and the formalization of Michel Temer's government, without direct election, in fact characterizing a coup in political terms.

[13] In addition to the approval of regressive reforms, such as the Outsourcing Law (Law 13.429/2017) and the Labor Reform (Law 13.467/2017).

almost 1 trillion reais, while 4.10% was directed to education (Auditoria Cidadã da Dívida, 2018)

The current time reveals even more aggressiveness on the capital agenda, particularly for dependent capitalist countries, such as Brazil. According to Leher (2019), the Bolsonaro government is characterized by the denial of everything that is already consolidated in the scientific field, still added to violence and ideological control. Therefore, the current government tends to be against science, art and culture in general (Leher, 2019), to all forms of expression that stimulate critical thinking.

The attack of capital on education gains expression in the Bolsonaro Government Plan (2018/ongoing). The examination of the "Bolsonaro Government Plan – The Path of Prosperity" reveals the central guiding lines of the Higher Education Policy for the period 2019–2022: "Content and teaching method need to be changed. More mathematics, science and Portuguese, WITHOUT DOUTRI- NATION AND EARLY SEXUALIZATION. In addition, the initial priority needs to be basic education and high school/technical" (LIBERAL SOCIAL PARTY, 2018, p. 41, author's emphasis). To this end, it advocates changing the school management; modernizing the content of the disciplines and "purging the ideology of Paulo Freire" (Liberal Social Party, 2018, p. 46) schools and universities. The Government Plan also indicates the following guiding axes of Bolsonaro's actions for higher education:

> Universities need to generate technical advances for Brazil, seeking ways to increase the productivity, wealth and well-being of the population. They should develop new products through partnerships and research with private initiative. Foster entrepreneurship so that the youth leaves college thinking of opening a company [...] Distance education: it should be seen as an important instrument and not vetoed dogmatically (Liberal Social Party, 2018, p. 46).

It is in this context of an ultra-conservative offensive that the Federal Government presents the "Entrepreneurial Program Institutes and Universities. Future-se" indicating to the Federal Institutions the raising of funds from the private sector through investment funds, public-private partnerships and the privatization of the real estate assets of federal universities, whose management will be done, according to the program, by Social Organizations (OS's), of a private nature (UFLA, 2019). The program was divided into three themes: Management, Governance and Entrepreneurship; Research and Innovation; and Internationalization, proposing the signing of a management contract between the Federal Government and each Federal Institution of Higher Education (IFES), concluded with Social Organizations (OS's) already qualified by the Ministry of Education or by other entities, without the need for public call. The said management contract will establish, for a period of four years, performance targets and productivity indicators for the Federal Institutions of Education. To the OS's will be responsible for realizing the process of managing resources related to investments in entrepreneurship, research, development and innovation and acting in the property management of the participating IFES. The Federal Government and/or the IFES will be responsible for allocating budgetary resources and allowing the use of public goods by OS's, thus the real estate assets of the IFES will constitute sources of resources for the program.

In relation to MEC, one may participate as a shareholder of investment funds, (private funds), whose profitability levels will be defined in the statutes of each fund and, also, one can donate real estate to the participants of the management contract. The academic activities of the IFES, in line with OS's, have as main objectives innovation, including parks and technological centers; the improvement of business models and the commercialization of brands and products, fostering the collection of own resources and employability for students of institutions, generating, according to the document presented by MEC, an effective approximation between educational institutions and the private sector.

The creation of a specific purpose society (SPE), in the form of microenterprises, by department or by the IFES for sale, will also be permitted for sale of what the Federal Government considers as educational services, specifically research and innovation, as well as to appoint a part of a good, movable and immovable assets, of a place or event, in exchange for financial compensation.

The program therefore advocates the self-financing or financial autonomy of the IFES (infringing Article 207 of the Federal Constitution of 1988 which deals with the autonomy of financial management), as it is explicitly stated in Article 23, through the following actions: (i) the sale of studies, research, consulting and projects; (ii) the marketing of goods and products with the mark of educational institutions; (iii) the sale of real estate from institutions by sale, improvement and concessions; (iv) financial applications that each institution carries out in dynamics of intellectual property rights of research conducted by professors and students; (vi) collection of enrollment and postgraduate tuition *at* federal universities; (vii) capital gains and income from investments made with their assets; (viii) receipt of amounts due to tax incentive laws and (ix) receipt of income from other sources of funding.

Future-se can only be analyzed articulated to EC 95/2016, because, in a context of absence of public funding for public higher education, aims to deepen a model of financing (private) and management (business), resignifying the political-pedagogical functions of public education, emptying the sense of production and socialization of critical and creative knowledge and the search for solutions to the social problems of a dependent capitalist country, replaced by the sale of educational services and real estate of public institutions, and by investment in the profitable financial market (Lima, 2019).

Given this context, we can affirm that challenges (im)posed for training and work in public universities, especially federal ones, in the post-2016 period:

- **Precariousness of Training:**

a) accelerating the vocational training with distance learning, especially for the growth of private courses, making it difficult for students to access an education that contains research and extension, with incentives to investigative and propositional capacity that escapes the immediate responses indicated by the market;

b) determining market incidence in education, research and knowledge production, as well as compromising the formulation of questions (and the search for answers) that affect the community and that really afflict the working class;

c) tendency to disregard with the theoretical methodological/scientific rigor of the stimulus to immediacy put as reality, disqualifying the fundamental distinction between appearance and essence;

d) training aimed at the immediate supply of necessary labor to the

reproduction of capital, to the detriment of education as a possibility of developing human capacities and thinking society and its problems critically;

e) stimulation of a professional profile that does not appreciate the critical knowledge that ensures the understanding of the complexity of the social reality and the professions inserted in it.

- **Combined dynamics of precariousness and intensification of working conditions in the university:**

a) discredit to the public server, including actions to alter careers and reduce public tenders;

b) overload and intensification of work, in quantity and quality of activities;

c) exacerbation of individualism and competitiveness in daily academic work, affecting professors, administrative technicians and students;

d) illness of the collective of the "academic world" and the difficulty meeting deadlines for completion of academic works (monographs, master dissertations and doctoral theses);

e) production of knowledge more focused on the quantification, in preparation of qualification, that is, stimulation to academic productivism, especially by the research-promoting bodies; and

f) precariousness of objective working conditions (general infrastructure and low wages), both of administrative technicians and professors, led to neglect with investments in the teaching/research/extension tripod.

It is evident that capital advances in its attack on public education, by the materialization of exalted privatitism inherent in the dependent pattern of higher education constitutive of dependent capitalism, as Florestan Fernandes analyzed. Such an attack gains, with the assets funds, a new path. Examining the political and academic significance of these funds is the task we will accomplish next.

Patrimonial fund and precariousness of the federal universities: the capital agenda for Brazilian higher education

Exalted privatism and conception of education as a class privilege has been constituted in two structuring axes of the dependent pattern of higher education in dependent capitalism. In addition to the expansion of private sector action by increasing the number of private institutions, the internal privatization of public institutions and the intensive use of public funds for direct and indirect financing of the private sector of higher education,[14] in the current situation, the capital agenda has sought new strategies of profitability that result in profound destruction of public institutions of education and research. Among these strategies, we highlight equity funds.

Equity funds are set up as private-nature asset sets also known as *endowmentfund*[15] or philanthropic funds – financial structures created by institutions of various kinds. They are made by a sum of resources from donations and inheritances, where the main value is applied in the financial market (investment funds) generating income that are directed to

[14] Cf. Lima (2007), Rodrigues (2007), Sguissardi (2008), Minto (2011), Leher (2018).

[15] According to Fabiani (2012), *endowment* is the original term in English in what was agreed to define, in Brazil, as a heritage fund.

several initiatives in long term. The objectives and strategies for the creation of these funds are given in different ways, according to the typification of the institutions, which may be: a) Family Fundings; b) Independent Funds or Civil Society Organizations (OSC); c) Business Foundations. According to Fontes (2020, p. 20), these private assets of business hegemony (APHs)

> [...] they have more easily access positions in the State, including modifying legislative provisions, and give "state-legal" character to certain elaborations that, focused on private, corporate areas (in the sense of responding to some specific sectors), become imposed on the generalization of such interests, as if they were interest of all.

The author points out that corporate civil society seeks to block, both outside and outside the State, the participation of combative and classist social movements, and it is necessary to think about this activism of dominant sectors – industry, finance, services, agribusiness – in the educational policy[16] associated with equity funds. In the same sense, Neves (2005) analyzes how the new pedagogy of hegemony points out the novelties and continuities of the strategies of capital to (de)educate the workers, having as a common point the theory of human capital in the educational actions to strengthen the bourgeois society project.

These novelties and continuities of the dilemmas of higher education today constitute the offensive actions of capital through the political guidelines of the State – conducted by the reactionary offensive of the Brazilian bourgeoisie, in a new phase of the historical educational duality and the privacy of higher education constitutive of the dependent pattern of higher education inherent to dependent capitalism, as analyzed.

IFES have long been faced with major blockages and orderly cuts that directly affect the conditions of training and work in these institutions. This scenario of reduction of public resources intensifies with the freezing of social spending and the Bolsonaro government, nowadays, presents as an alternative of financing a policy that changes the historical axes that support the public character of the IFES and the social function of public unity in Brazil.

The elaboration of the Future-se program, analyzed previously, was based on the exclusive dialog with the market – the great bourgeoisie through the APHs – to subject the production of knowledge to the interests of capital and not to the needs of the workers. This proposal follows the guidance of international capital organizations, especially the World Bank/BM, based on the US educational system model, such as Harvard University, which have property funds (*endowments*),[17] without considering the particularities of higher education in Brazil.

---

16 Leher (2018) presents the performance of large companies that are among the two hundred largest economic groups active in Brazil and intervene directly in basic, professional and higher education – program their actions through their business entities, the private apparatus of hegemony (APHs).

17 Abroad the *endowments* were the pioneers in impact investments and the financial return to the investment itself. The return on investment takes place through long-term capital in the financial market, with investment potential higher than pension funds, "[...] they have an implicit liability from their conception. *Abroad, endowments* are responsible for investments in infrastructure, forests, alternative investments, private *equity* investments" (Pasqualin, 2019, p. 49).

This is another form of transplantation of the[18] American model for Brazilian universities – in the framework of cultural heteronomy and inherent to the Brazilian standard of higher education in dependent capitalism, as previously discussed. The organic intellectuals of the capital, specifically the BM, seek to justify the creation of equity funds for Brazilian universities, claiming that international experience proves that *endowments* represent an important source of revenue for public institutions, highlighting, as a reference, the Harvard University. However, in addition to being a private institution, public resources (direct and indirect) represent most of their[19] budget – the State finances, but the one who executes and manages public resources is the private initiative.[20]

The debate on equity funds is presented as a priority in Brazil, but the path was already paved for the implementation and strengthening of this type of fund by the government of Dilma Rousseff, with the promulgation of Law number 13.019/2014, known as the new Regulatory Framework of Civil Society Organizations (BROSC) – the equity fund appears for the first time in Brazilian legislation in article 2nd, I, "A" of the said law. In 2010, the APHs platform was announced by a new MROSC and the Government Secretariat of the Presidency of the Republic, from the creation of the Inter-ministerial Working Group (GTI), led, through political articulation with the market-philanthropic entities,[21] the formulation of policies and of its own legislation more favorable to the existence of non-profit entities.

> The I International Seminar of the Regulatory Framework of Civil Society Organizations (MROSC) took place in November 2011, defining the performance of the GTI and the discussion of several issues of the capital agenda, namely *the* Property Funds (*endowments*). According to Lopes (2019), the special session of Gilberto Carvalho (Minister of the General Secretariat of the Presidency of the Republic of the Dilma

[18] The transplantation of the United States model of higher education prevailed from the consented university reform of the business-military dictatorship (Fernandes, 1979). The American higher education system is often pointed out as a model to be followed, especially in the documents of private apparatus of hegemony and highlighted by several organic intellectuals of the capital – the colonized minds – as something to be copied in Brazil. According to Moraes (2015, 2017), there are several higher education systems in the United States, there is no national higher education system, there is no federal university in this country, as in Brazil. Being a decentralized, deeply stateful system – a pyramidal, diversified and hierarchical model. Funding is one of the important elements to demonstrate the differences and similarities between institutions. All higher education in the US is paid by the student, as well as the courses of public institutions, and the debt is very high. There is no public and free system, as in Brazil. Private schools, such as the renowned *Harvard University* and *Massachusetts Institute of Technology* (MIT), receive a large amount of public money. Revenue derived from university private heritage applications and donations made by large millionaires (alumni) cover a small portion of budgets.

[19] According to Harvard University Financial Report (2019), the university's revenue sources rely on public resources directly (federal funding), and indirectly (through tax exemptions from "donors"/shareholders). Available at: https://finance.harvard.edu/files/fad/files/fy19_harvard_financial_report.pdf. Access on: April 01th 2020.

[20] According to Moraes (2015, 2017), since Cologne this occurs in the US higher education system – the donation of public land and the exemption of fees that built the assets and structures of US universities. The author highlights what each sector finances and what each sector performs in terms of research in the US – federal resource finances much of the research. The federal government finances research in industry, universities (public and private), centers and institutes linked to universities. While all the institutions execute more than they finance, the federal government finances more than it executes.

[21] For Fontes (2010), the big bourgeoisie is directly linked to the market entities – philanthropic in Brazil – non-profit entities, but for fattening purposes – for receiving exemptions and tax immunities (public resources for these business entities). In addition, these APHs elaborate the power project for the expansion of capitalism, seeking to disqualify any form of challenge and strengthening the formation of consensus.

> Rousseff government), during this period there was a lot of openness to listen and encouragement from the government for the non-profit entities to present their proposals to the regulatory framework. With this official articulation [...] the General Secretariat began to build bridges with the legislative power in relation to the subject. There was already a bill in the National Congress (PL 4643/2012) for the creation of Property Funds for public universities and IDIS was preparing proposals within a working group. The presentation of a draft bill, prepared by the group, was certainly an aspect that allowed the advancement of the links with the General Secretariat of the Presidency (Lopes, 2019, p. 197).

According to the "Draft Law Proposal – Linked Equity Funds" –[22], the study group was formed with the participation of representatives of 33 civil society organizations, public prosecutor, universities and lawyers, in addition to 57 people and institutions interested in information on the progress of studies. The study group presented proposals for extending *the* creation of *endowments* to PL 4.643/2012 and proposals of the same nature to bill PLS16/2015, which deals with the Senate, as well as presenting technical subsidies and drafting proposals for PL 6775/2016.

The rapporteur of the Committee on Constitution and Justice and Citizenship (CCJ) of the Chamber of Congressmen, Federal Representative Paulo Teixeira (PT-SP), presented PL 4643/2012 and, articulated with the General Secretariat, followed the demand of the study group coordinated by the Institute for the Development of Social Investment (IDIS),[23] as "[...] he incorporated in his report the idea of extending *endowments* beyond public universities. It was the first time that the theme appeared in Congress in order to also contemplate the private non-profit entities" (Lopes, 2019, p 197, our emphasis). According to the author in addition to IDIS, other institutions also began to dedicate themselves to the study on the subject, such as the Group of Institutes, Foundations and Companies (GIFE).[24]

After the fire that destroyed much of the National Museum's collection in Rio de Janeiro in 2018, these organizations managed to placate their proposals for regulation for institutions with a wealth fund as a government policy, after the approval of Provisional Measure (MP) number 851/2018, which aims to regulate the philanthropic Property Funds in Brazil, signed by then President Michel Temer, on September 10th, 2018. Then, Law number 13.800/2019 regulating the constitution of property functions was enacted on January 04th, 2019, by President Jair Bolsonaro. This legal framework meets the demand of organized business that has been claiming this agenda, strengthening public-private partnerships and the new modality of profitable exploitation of higher education. The Property Funds Act is optional[25] – to non-profit entities that already have equity funds the law is not mandatory – as it is important that the public institution demands an exclusive Asset Fund.

---

[22] Linked Property Fund was the name created by the Property Funds Studies Group established by IDIS and Vérios that drafted a proposed Bill "Linked Property Funds". Available at: http://www.secretariadegoverno.gov/arquivos/fundos–patronais. Access on: Nov. 19th 2018.

[23] The main APH of the Equity Funds in Brazil.

[24] GIFE is an organization that is defined as a non-profit that brings together the business sector in Brazil – it is constituted as an APH that acts as a collective intellectual of the bourgeoisie.

[25] Eduardo Pannunzio (2019) states that the equity fund model of Law 13.800/19 is optional, considering the 1988 CF that dedicates wide freedom to associations. Therefore, it does not consider the existing funds founded of several natures.

The Equity Funds of private non-profit institutions were already a practice in Brazil,[26] that is, funds of this type do not arise under the Law of Equity Funds and do not impose limitations on the funds of existing private institutions. The law, however, creates new rules, especially for funds for public institutions. In the Chamber and in the Federal Senate, several bills of law[27] aimed at the creation of equity funds in universities, cultural institutions and conservation units were being drawn up and under way.

On September 09th, 2019, the paper of the newspaper Valor Econômico,[28] points out that MEC, to raise private funding for research, development and innovation in federal universities, aims to bring to Brazil the investments of United States equity funds. The objective, according to this matter is that American managers not only apply but are part of the board of Directors of the Sovereign Knowledge Fund, which will initially have a assets of 4.4 thousand properties, which will be administered by a private law association, no profitable ends. Arnaldo Lima, current Secretary of Higher Education of the Bolsonaro Government, says that the goal is to create a wealth fund of MEC to apply the resources and profitable projects to financial capital. The Secretary told the newspaper Valor Econômico, in the above-mentioned article, that MEC will develop financial products for these agents, that is, the MEC equity fund will establish the assets fund agents of the US universities and submit proposals for projects that meet the interests of these investors.

It is evident, therefore, that, in the proposal of the Federal Government, the resources and guidelines of Brazilian higher education will be defined by the institutions of property funds. The conception that it is up to the public university to be constituted as a profitable business, ensuring the movement of the financial market, not only maintains the dependent pattern of higher education, but also extends the exalted privately held historically in Brazil, imposing, on the class and combative sectors of the working class, the defense of public education and the daily reaffirmation that education is not a commodity.

Final considerations

The reflections presented here, as part of the studies and research that are being carried out in public universities, show that a set of changes is being conducted in the policy of higher education, having as its guiding axis the conception of higher education as a profitable service.

If exalted privatism is a structuring element of the Brazilian standard of higher school, as Fernandes indicates, it is necessary to learn the news of its manifestation today by the articulation of three guiding axes: (i) the use of the public fund for direct and indirect financing of private higher education institutions; (ii) the drastic reduction of public funding to Public institutions, especially federal universities, in the text of EC 95/2016 and the recurring contingencies carried out by the federal government, and (iii) the creation of a legal

[26] Since the early 2000, it has been noticed that there are several equity funds emerging in Brazil and the vast majority have a source of the banking sector (Queiroz, 2020).

[27] PL 4643/2012 of Federal Congress woman Bruna Furlan (PSDB/SP)**;** PL 8694/2017 (PLS 16/2015) the Senator Ana Amélia (PP/RS)**;** PL 8512/2017 (incorporated to PL 6.345/2016) of the Federal Congresswoman Professora Dorinha Seabra Rezende (DEM/TO); PLS 160/2017 of the Senator Elmano Ferrer (PMDB/PI); PL 7.641/2017 of the Congressman Paulo Abi–Ackel (PSDB/MG).

[28] The article by Edna Simon "MEC that implements in the country a common asset fund model in the USA". Available at: https://valor.globo.com/brasil/noticia/2019/09/10/mec–quer– implantar–no–pais–modelo–de–fundo–patrimonial–comum–nos–eua.ghtml. Access on: 04 Oct. 2019.

framework that enables the action of equity funds in public universities, with the argument that they express a viable modality of financing higher education, omitted that such funds constitute, in fact, a new strategy of profitability for capital.

To examine the agenda of capital for higher education, to resist its attacks and to present the project of public and free university, at the service of the workers are, therefore, the guidelines that articulate our studies and our struggles in times of ultra-conservative offensive of capital in crisis.

References

AUDITORIA CIDADÃ DA DÍVIDA. **Os números da Dívida**. Brasília, 2018. Available at: https://auditoriacidada.org.br/wp–content/uploads/ 2018/05/Os–numeros–da–divida–2018.pdf. Access on: Jun. 2th 2019.

BERTOLDO, E. **Trabalho e educação no Brasil:** da centralidade do trabalho à centralidade da política. São Paulo: Instituto Lukács, 2015.

BRASIL. **Law Nº 10.973, of 12/02/2004.** It provides for incentives for innovation and scientific and technological research in the productive environment. Presidência da República. Secretaria Geral. Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. [Subhead for Legal Affairs.] Brasília 2004. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2004–2006/2004/ lei/l10.973.htm. Access on: Jan. 05th of 2021.

BRASIL. **Decreto Nº 6.096, de 24/04/2007.** It establishes the Program to Support Restructuring and Expansion Plans of Federal Universities – REUNI. Presidência da República. [Presidency of the Republic.] Casa Civil. Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. [Subhead for Legal Affairs.] Brasília, 2007. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007– 2010/2007/decreto/d6096.htm. Access on: Jan. 05th of 2021.

BRASIL. **Law Nº 13.429, of 3/31/2017**. It provides for temporary work in urban companies and provides other measures. Presidência da República. [Presidency of the Republic.] Secretaria Geral. Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. [Subhead for Legal Affairs.] Brasília, 2017a. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015–2018/2017/lei/ l13429.htm Acesso em: Jan. 05th of 2021.

BRASIL. **Law Nº 13.467, of 7/13/2017**. It changes the consolidation of the Labor Laws (CLT) to adapt the legislation to new labor relationships. Presidência da República. Secretaria Geral. Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. [Subhead for Legal Affairs.] Brasília, 2017b. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015– 2018/2017/lei/l13467.htm Acesso em: Jan. 05th of 2021.

BRASIL. Presidência da República. [Presidency of the Republic.] Casa Civil. **Constitution of the Federal Republic of Brazil 1988**. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ constituicao/constituicao.htm. Access: 02 jan. 2021.

BRASIL. Presidência da República. [Presidency of the Republic.] Casa Civil. **Constitutional Ammendment nº 95, of December 15th of 2016**. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ ccivil_03/constituicao/emendas/emc/emc95.htm. Access on: 2 jan. 2021.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 13.019, de 31 de julho de 2014.** It establishes the legal regime for voluntary partnerships, involving or not transfers of financial resources, between public administration and civil society organizations, in a mutual cooperation regime, for the achievement of purposes of public interest; it defines guidelines for the policy of promotion and collaboration with civil society organizations; it establishes the term of collaboration and the term of promotion; and amends Laws number 8.429, of June 2nd, 1992, and 9.790, of March 23rd, 1999. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2011–2014/2014/lei/ l13019.htm. Access on: Nov. 17th 2020.

BRASIL. Câmara dos Deputados. **Projeto de Lei PL 4643/2012.** It authorizes the creation of a Property Fund (endowment fund) in federal institutions of higher education. Available at: https://www.camara.leg.br/proposicoesWeb/propmostrarintegra;jsessionid=node01pmtzqgcrhrg21rf0amu0x4jjx9409614.node0?codteor=1035343&filename=PL+4643/2012. Access on: 02 jan. 2021.

BRASIL. Câmara dos Deputados. **Projeto de Lei PL 6775/2016.** It provides for the creation and operation of equity funds linked to public institutions and private institutions of non-profit public interest. Available at: https://www.camara.leg.br/proposicoesWeb/prop_mostrarintegra?codteor=1519319&filename=PL+6775/2016. Access on: 02 jan. 2021.

BRASIL. **Provisional Measure number 851, of September 10th, 2019**. It authorizes the public administration to establish partnership instruments and terms of execution of programs, projects and other purposes of public interest with equity fund management organizations and makes other arrangements. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2015–2018/2018/Mpv/ mpv851.htm. Access on: Nov. 17th, 2020.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 13.800/2019.** It authorizes the public administration to establish partnership instruments and terms of execution of programs, projects and other purposes of public interest with equity fund management organizations. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2019–2022/2019/ lei/L13800.htm. Access on: Nov. 17th, 2020.

CHAUÍ, M. A Universidade Operacional. **Folha Online**, São Paulo, maio 1999. Available at: http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/fol/brasil500/dc_1_3.htm. Access on: April 15th 2015.

DUARTE, J. L. do N. **Trabalho Docente do Assistente Social nas Fede- rais**: contradições e resistências em tempos de intensificação e produtivismo acadêmico. 2017. 467 f. Tese (Doutorado em Serviço Social) – Escola de Serviço Social, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2017.

FABIANI, P. J. O que são fundos patrimoniais. In: KISIL, M.; FABIANI, P. J.; ALVAREZ, R. **Fundos Patrimoniais**: criação e gestão no Brasil. São Paulo: Zeppelini Editorial, 2012.

FERNANDES, F. **Mudanças Sociais no Brasil**. São Paulo: Difel, 1974.

FERNANDES, F. **Universidade brasileira: reforma ou revolução?** 2. ed. São Paulo: Alfa–Omega, 1979.

FERNANDES, F. **Capitalismo Dependente e Classes Sociais na América Latina**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1981.

FERNANDES, F. **A questão da USP**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1984.

FONTES, V. **O Brasil e o capital imperialismo**: teoria e história. Rio de Janeiro: EPSJV, UFRJ, 2010.

FERNANDES, F. Capitalismo filantrópico? – os múltiplos papéis dos APHs empresariais. In: **Marx e Marxismo**. Publicação do Núcleo Interdisciplinar de Estudos sobre Marx e Marxismo – v.8, n.14, jan/jun 2020, p. 15–35. Niterói: Universidade Federal Fluminense, 2020.

IDIS. Proposta de Projeto de Lei – Fundos Patrimoniais Vinculados. Instituto para o Desenvolvimento do Investimento Social – **IDIS.** São Paulo, 2014. Available at: http://www.secretariadegoverno.gov.br/.arquivos/fundos–patronais. Access on: Oct. 20th 2018.

LEHER, R. Educação no governo Lula da Silva: a ruptura que não aconteceu. In: **Os anos Lula***:* contribuição para um balanço crítico 2003–2010. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond, 2010. p. 369–412.

LEHER, R. **Universidade e heteronomia cultural no capitalismo dependente**: um estudo a partir de Florestan Fernandes. Rio de Janeiro: Consequência, 2018.

LEHER, R. Desafios ao trabalho de assistentes sociais na educação em tempos de "escola sem mordaça. In: 16º Congresso Brasileiro de Assistentes Sociais, 2019, Brasília. **Anais** do 16 CBAS. Available at: https://broseguini.bonino.com.- br/ojs/index.php/ CBAS/issue/view/ Access on: 2 jan. 2021.

LENIN, V. **O Imperialismo, etapa superior do capitalismo**. Campinas, SP; FE/Unicamp, 2011.

LIMA, K. **Contrarreforma na Educação Superior**: de FHC a Lula. São Pau- lo: Xamã, 2007.

LIMA, K. Desafio educacional brasileiro e ofensiva ultraconservadora do capital. **Revista Universidade e Sociedade**, Brasília, ano XXIX, out. 2019. p. 8–39. Available at: https://www.andes.org.br/sites/universidade_e_socieda- de. Access on: Jul. 10th 2020.

LIMA, K. Desafios éticos e políticos da luta de classes e o mito da democracia racial em Florestan Fernandes. Revista Katálysis, Florianópolis, v. 20, n. 3, 2017. p. 353–362.

LIMOEIRO–CARDOSO. **Florestan Fernandes**: a criação de uma problemática. 1996. Available at: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_art- text&pid=S0103–40141996000100014. Access on: Mar. 20th 2020.

LOPES, L. de F. Advocacy da Lei de Endowments: diálogo com a Secretaria– Geral da Presidência da República. In: FABIANI, P. J.; HANAI, A.; PASQUALIN, P.; LEVISKY, R. (orgs.). **Fundos Patrimoniais Filantrópicos**: Sustentabilidade para causas e organizações. São Paulo: IDIS – Instituto para o Desenvolvimento do Investimento Social, 2019. p. 195–200.

MINTO, L. W. **A educação da "miséria"**: particularidade capitalista e educação superior no Brasil. 2011.326 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Pós–Graduação da Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2011.

MINTO, L. W. **As reformas do Ensino Superior no Brasil**: o público e o privado em questão. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2006.

MORAES, R. C. **Educação superior nos Estados Unidos**: história e estrutura. 1. ed. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2015.

MORAES, R. C. **Modelos internacionais de educação superior**: Estados Unidos, França e Alemanha. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2017.

NEVES, L. **A nova pedagogia da hegemonia**: estratégias do capital para edu- car o consenso. São Paulo: Xamã, 2005.

PANNUNZIO, E. O modelo da Lei 13.800/19 é obrigatório ou facultativo? In: FABIANI, P. J.; HANIA, A.; PASQUALIN, P.; LEVISKY, R. (orgs.). **Fundos Patrimoniais Filantrópicos**: Sustentabilidade para causas e organizações. São Paulo: IDIS – Instituto para o Desenvolvimento do Investimento Social, 2019. p. 14-51.

PARTIDO SOCIAL LIBERAL/PSL. 2018. **O caminho da prosperidade**. Proposta de plano de governo. Available at: https:// flaviobolsonaro.com/ PLANO_DE_GOVERNO_JAIR_BOLSONARO_2018.pdf. Access on: 30 maio 2019.

PASQUALIN, P. Aspectos jurídicos dos fundos patrimoniais filantrópicos. In: FABIANI, P. J.; HANIA, A.; PASQUALIN, P.; LEVISKY, R. (orgs.). **Fundos Patrimoniais Filantrópicos**: Sustentabilidade para causas e organizações. São Paulo: IDIS – Instituto para o Desenvolvimento do Investimento Social, 2019. p. 14-51.

PRESTES, L. **Para onde caminhamos?** Aspectos estruturantes e conjunturais da crise na Universidade pública brasileira. 2018.170 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Serviço Social e Desenvolvimento Regional) – Escola de Serviço Social, Universidade Federal Fluminense, 2018.

QUEIROZ, V. O fundo patrimonial (*endowmentfund*): a agenda do capital para as universidades brasileiras. **Revista Universidade e Sociedade**, Brasília, ano XXX, n. 65, p. 43–55, 2020. Available at: https://www.andes.org.br/img/midias/e6044942a65bd14 f8e145 ac61c2db303_1581944312.pdf. Access on: Mar. 10th, 2020.

RODRIGUES, J. dos S. Ainda a educação politécnica: o novo decreto da educação profissional e a permanência da dualidade estrutural. **Revista Trabalho, Educação e Saúde**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 3, n. 2, p. 259–282, 2005.

RODRIGUES, J. Ainda a educação politécnica: o novo decreto da educação profissional e a permanência da dualidade estrutural. **Revista Trabalho, Educação e Saúde**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 3 n. 2, 2005. p. 259–282.

RODRIGUES, J. dos S. **Os Empresários e a Educação Superior**. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2007.

RODRIGUES, J. dos S. Por um programa de transição para a educação: em defesa da concep- ção marxista de formação politécnica. **Caminhos da politecnia**: 30 anos da Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio. Rio de Janeiro: EPSJV, 2016.

SAVIANI, D. O choque teórico da politecnia. **Revista Trabalho, educação e saúde (online),** v.1, n.1, p. 131–152, 2003. Available at: http://www.scie lo.br/scielo.php?script= sci_arttext&pid=S1981–77462003000100010. Access on: Mar. 10th 2020.

SGUISSARDI, V. Modelo de expansão da educação superior no Brasil: predomínio privado / mercantil e desafios para a regulação e a formação universitária. **Educação & Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 29, n. 105, p. 991–1022, set/dez, 2008.

TROTSKY, L. **A história da revolução Russa**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1977.

UFLA. **Minuta do Programa Institutos e Universidades Empreendedoras e Inovadoras** – FUTURE–SE. Lavras– MG, 2019. Available at: https:// ufla.br/images/ arquivos/2019/07–julho/Minuta_Programa_ Future–se.pdf. Access on: Aug. 30th, 2019.