

# USP's youngest Institute

## STUDY GROUP

IN FEBRUARY 1986, at the beginning of his administration, Dean José Goldemberg began to set, with the academic community of USP, the necessary conditions for establishing the Institute of Advanced Studies- IAS (*Instituto de Estudos Avançados* - IEA). To that end, the first Study Group charged with reflecting upon what this new academic unit could be was set up. The professors invited to participate in the group were Alberto Carvalho da Silva, Luiz Alberto da Rocha Barros, Roberto Leal Lobo e Silva Filho, and Carlos Guilherme Mota.

During the first half of 1986, the Group conducted consultations with the community, analysis of previous proposals and historical surveys of other similar international institutions. When Prof. Roberto Lobo left to take office as assistant dean of USP, the Group began to count on the participation of Prof. Gerhard Malnic, and on July 23, through an ordinance, the members of the Group were formally appointed to work under the coordination of Prof. Carlos Guilherme Mota. In August, summarizing the work carried out by the Study Group, a working document that became the guiding principle of the general philosophy governing the Institute of Advanced Studies at USP was presented to the academic community.

Following several initial activities that defined the operating mechanisms of the Institute, the IEA was officially established on October 29, 1986, through Resolution No. 3269. Its first Board of Directors was comprised of the following faculty members: Carlos Guilherme Mota (director), Gerhard Malnic (deputy director), Alfredo Bosi, Herch Moyses Nussenzweig, José Galizia Tundisi and Paul Israel Singer.

The official duties of the Institute of Advanced Studies at USP include:

I – Conducting research and activities concerning fundamental aspects of scientific thought and culture in general, with an emphasis on interdisciplinarity, aiming to improve and update teaching and research.

II – Promoting conferences, colloquia, programs, seminars and similar activities, seeking to collaborate with other university units and bodies, with a view to encouraging integration between researchers and faculty from USP and other universities, other cultural centers and intellectuals from the country and abroad.

III – Encouraging research and activities that enhance contact between USP researchers, faculty and students and the most significant intellectual currents of our time from both the country and abroad.

IV – Encouraging studies on policies aimed to develop science, technology and culture in general, as well as on the social use of knowledge, taking into

account the best coordination possible between the university and society.

V – Offering internships for a certain period to USP faculty members and researchers and other intellectuals from Brazil and abroad, to carry out activities that result in original works.

VI – Fostering new ideas resulting from conviviality, confrontation and interaction between the various areas of intellectual work.

§ 1º – The IEA shall seek to cover all disciplines of knowledge, including those not listed in the current curricula of USP.

§ 2º – the IEA shall seek to achieve a balance between specialists in Sciences and Humanities in general.

### **Work Proposal**

Why an Institute of Advanced Studies at USP?

### **Fundamentals**

The University of São Paulo, founded in 1934, is facing a challenging situation: How to succeed, with its experience of more than half a century of existence, in establishing a central forum where its members can exchange ideas among themselves, inviting colleagues to cross the borders of their specialties and interact with scientists, thinkers, artists and writers of national and international renown?

USP is the largest educational and research center in the country. It is largely responsible for the scientific and cultural production of the national university network. Bringing together faculties created in the last century, such as the Law School (1827) and the Polytechnic School (1894), the founders of USP benefited from the expertise of institutes, commissions and schools that preceded its foundation, such as the Geographic and Geological Commission (created in 1886, with Orville Derby), the Medicine and Surgery Society, the School of Pharmacy, Dentistry and Obstetrics (this with a project for a school of higher education by Bráulio Gomes), the School of Medicine (1913, which gained momentum from 1931, having become a powerful medical-hospital center), and the Institute of Technological Research (1934, modeled on the Massachusetts Institute of Technology).

The scientific life of those days also benefited from the experiences of the Bacteriological Institute (1983), the Serotherapy Institute (embryo of the Butantan Institute, 1889), the Agronomic Institute of Campinas (1887-1892), the Biological Institute (1924) and since 1891 the Paulista Museum, which developed research and bibliography in the fields of History, Zoology and Ethnography. Since 1933 the School of Sociology and Politics has brought in a number of national and international intellectuals, thus broadening the field of research and theoretical reflection in Social Sciences in Brazil.

Those institutions were the cradle of the modern scientific spirit, open to cutting edge research and reflections that would gain a new dimension with the

founding of USP in 1934, the core of which should be the School of Philosophy, Sciences and Letters, according to the conception of its creators, Julio de Mesquita Filho, Paulo Duarte, Armando de Salles Oliveira and Fernando Azevedo. The primary role of that school, which was central to the organizational chart of the university, would be to stimulate fundamental science from a humanist, liberal, interdisciplinary and - it is worth mentioning - internationalist creative perspective.

To the new university what mattered was to train a new staff, a new elite to upgrade the country by recruiting talents wherever they could be found, sometimes even out of the local oligarchic families. And abroad, the founders of USP succeeded in identifying for the new staff, young university students still relatively unknown, such as the physicist Gleb Wathagin, the anthropologist Lévi-Strauss, the historian Fernand Braudel or the poet Ungaretti. Quality was what really mattered.

After 50 years, USP, located in a troubled city like São Paulo, which has nowhere else to grow, and having experienced adverse national conditions and the vicissitudes of a complex and over-bureaucratized body, finds itself about to resume some aspects of its own history. How to rebuild USP today without *rethinking it*?

USP scholars mobilize to rethink the institution in its multiple roles of research, teach, and produce professionals for the new civil society. In addition, of course, to enhancing the mechanisms to renew its own staff.

Indeed, in view of its current administration, the priority task is to stimulate the creation of new mechanisms for promoting science and scientists, arts and artists, and, ultimately, the very society that wants to recognize itself in this eminently *public* institution. The proposal is to deepen the criticism that will break the bureaucracy established in recent years in the country's largest university. Widespread bureaucracy that has temporarily removed it from the national political-cultural scene.

Therefore, proposing the creation of an IEA that is expected to involve the participation of top-level intellectuals requires more than just observing the path trodden by other institutes of the like. Such as the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, founded in 1930, whose work in some fields of knowledge is remarkable, including for having had among its staff a scientist of the stature of Albert Einstein. It requires also - as proposed by the Institute for Advanced Study in Berlin (1981) - showing to the national university community the importance of promoting scientific discussions supported by cultural criticism beyond the *limitations of disciplines, nations and generations*. In the case of USP, it is worth emphasizing the example of this model, indicating that interdisciplinary collaboration should cross the frontiers of the daily lives of some stagnant schools that isolate themselves from the whole. And reduce the barriers that academic degrees have sometimes raised, instead of stimulating open, critical

and democratic academic interaction.

It is expected that the IEA under development will be capable of incorporating the features of both the very history of the university in which it arises and the city and country where it is located, as well as of overcoming its limitations and meeting its challenges.

Resuming the discussion of the great issues of our time, of cutting edge research and knowledge, of interdisciplinarity, of the possibility of evaluating significant and innovative sectoral productions, and of the *meaning* of the university activity itself is not, however, a task that should be considered separately by a group of enlightened people. It is rather an invitation to reflect upon our time and possible new meanings for intellectual life in the late twentieth century, in a challenging country like Brazil.

In this sense, timely are the caveats of Professor Aziz Ab'Saber from the School of Philosophy, Letters and Human Sciences of this university, who recently remembered that universities in the Third World

are including in their basic design the gigantic task of contributing to break the evil shackles of underdevelopment. Only they - much more than the Church, and now joining forces with the Church and other institutions - have the ability to redirect the attention of society and governments towards the humble and the defenseless [...] The rehabilitated university will play the major role of critical conscience of the Brazilian nation.

In summary, with the creation of the IEA, the current administration of USP intends to meet one of the oldest longings of the academic body and provide an additional instrument for the institution to re-encounter its own history. An endogenous, although internationalist process of critical thinking is therefore encouraged. However, it should be warned from the outset that the *model adopted* - and which should be improved based on suggestions of the academic body of USP - radically excludes the danger of turning the IEA into a university within the university.

The goal is not to devoid the faculties and departments of their substances; on the contrary. Unlike models such as Colégio de México, Collège de France or École Pratique des Hautes Études (outside the university), the USP model of an Institute for Advanced Studies is characterized by establishment of a space for reflection, where advanced studies conducted by masters of national and international renown within the institution are nourished within the institution.

### **The nature of the IEA-USP: its vocation**

It is important to note, also, that the proposed creation of an IEA has been historically supported by the association of professors of the University of São Paulo (ADUSP). In this context, the idea arose in 1979, when amnesty was granted to professors who had been forced into retirement by the Institutional Acts. Among them were several renowned scientists and intellectuals who, away from the university because of the transformations they had experienced during their

compulsory leave of absence, could be more appropriately housed in the Institute.

The idea was aborted, and only during the term of Prof. Jeremias José de Oliveira Filho (FFLCH) a study commission was established, formed by professors Gerhard Malnic (ICB); Luiz Alberto da Rocha Barros (IF); Mario Schenberg (IF); Crodowaldo Pavan (IB); Alexandre Martins Rodrigues (IME); Newton da Costa (EMI); and Alberto Carvalho da Silva (ICB). During the Second USP Congress, the idea was emphatically presented and approved (see *Jornal da Adusp*, No. 9, p.16, Nov. 1984).

### *Premises*

In this regard, the Study Group considering:

The urgent need to increase opportunities for the exchange of ideas among faculty members of USP and to present the results of this exchange to a public not limited to academia.

- a) Cutting edge research implies increased specialization and researchers often lose intellectual contact with their peers in neighboring disciplines and even with their colleagues in their own areas of expertise.
- b) Researchers feel the need to distance themselves from their regular activities once in a while, in order to think about their possible findings in the light of advances in other disciplines, and to examine them in an increasingly broader field of knowledge.
- c) Researchers feel the need to disclose the results of their research through mimeographed or Xeroxed documents of rapid, albeit restricted dissemination, in colloquia and symposia equally restricted and of *provisional* and *speculative* character.
- d) Researchers should have the opportunity, at least three or four times in their professional life, to present a summary of their knowledge in a written article, from a broader and more humanist perspective which, without being too popular can reach a wider audience.
- e) The meeting of researchers from different disciplines in an intellectual environment can be conducive to true interdisciplinarity; in addition, in a country where many renowned intellectuals have no university degrees, the objective is to achieve a form of integration between the academic body of USP and culture producers with different educational backgrounds.
- f) True interdisciplinarity - as we conceive it - should not lead to methodological Confucianism; this interdisciplinarity lies, rather, at the level of epistemological confrontation.
- g) In the field of Humanities or Sciences of Culture, the problem of interdisciplinarity is highly complex, involving issues of a theoretical, political and even aesthetic nature, which cannot be simply resolved, and demands analysis covering fields as diverse as Language, Psychoanaly-

sis, Art, Philosophy and History.

- h) USP has reached, in several research areas, a level of maturity that prompts a sharper dialogue between these areas and other fields of contemporary knowledge.

Proposes:

*General objectives*

The administration of USP should promote the creation of an Institute of Advanced Studies, which can be tentatively defined:

- 1) For its focus on the “cutting edge” issues, problems and investigations of contemporary thought, with a view to the improvement and updating of the academic body of this university by intensifying contacts between these and the most significant and critical intellectual currents of our time.
- 2) For its interdisciplinary character.
- 3) For its concern with scientific, technological and cultural development policies and within their scope, studies will be conducted on the social use of knowledge, with the aim to improve coordination between the university and society.
- 4) For its basic concern to foster collaboration among researchers from different countries and USP faculty, and between these and national and international personalities from the cultural scene.

\* \* \*

The programs implemented in the first years of activity of the IEA are described below.

1986  
Conferences

August 25

Jurist RAYMUNDO FAORO

*"Is there a Brazilian political thought?"*

Host: Antonio Candido de Mello e Souza (Professor Emeritus, FFLCH)

Opening of IEA' activities: President José Goldemberg

September 29

Prof. FLORESTAN FERNANDES

*"Limits of the Bourgeois Revolution in Brazil"*

Host: Octavio Ianni (PUC-SP)

October 15

Prof. JEAN LOUIS KOSZUL (CNRS-France)

*"The genesis of the Bourbaki Group"*

Host: Alexandre Martins Rodrigues (IME-USP)

November 10

Prof. JOSÉ GOLDEMBERG (Dean of USP)

*"A new energy strategy for Brazil"*

Host: Jacques Marcovitch (FEA-USP)

December 11

Prof. ANTONIO GONZALEZ DE LEÓN, UNAM-Mexico)

*"For a new diplomacy in Latin America"*

Host: Carlos Guilherme Mota (FFLCH-USP, director of the IEA)

November 7

Prof. MANUEL RAMÓN MORENO FRAGINALS (Cuba)

*"History and problems of cultural identities"*

Host: Fernando Novais (FFLCH-USP)

November 27

Prof. JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH

*"Arms control and military power"*

Host: Dean José Goldemberg (IF-USP)

Visiting professors in the period

RAYMUNDO FAORO (Jurist, historian and political scientist)

Period: August - December

MANUEL RAMÓN MORENO FRAGINALS (historian, expert in economic history, permanent researcher at the Academy of Sciences of Cuba and professor emeritus at the University of California, Berkeley)

Period: November

1987  
January - December

## Focal Areas

### MOLECULAR BIOLOGY

Coordinator: Prof. Gerhard Malnic (ICB-USP and deputy-director of the IEA)

### ECONOMICS AND POLITICS

Coordinator: Prof. Paul Singer (FEA-USP and member of the IEA Board)

### ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Coordinator: Prof. José Galízia Tundisi (School of Engineering of São Carlos, USP and member of the IEA Board)

### HISTORY OF MENTALITIES

Coordinator: Prof. Carlos Guilherme Mota (FFLCH-USP and Director of the IEA)

## Study Groups

### SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL POLICY

Coordinator: Prof. Erney Camargo (ICB-USP)

### LOGIC AND THEORY OF SCIENCE

Coordinator: Prof. Newton da Costa (FFLCH-USP)

### BIOTECHNOLOGY

Coordinator: Prof. Hernán Chaimovich (IQ-USP)

### THE PSYCHIC IN THE SOCIAL TERRITORY

Coordinator: Prof. Norberto Abreu e Silva Neto (IP-USP)

Mentor: Prof. Bento Prado Júnior (Federal University of São Carlos)

## Working groups

### THE CONSTITUENT AND PUBLIC EDUCATION IN BRAZIL

Coordinator: Prof. Alfredo Bosi (FFLCH-USP and member of the IEA Board)

### USP MUSEUMS AND COLLECTIONS

Coordinator: Prof. Ana Mae Barbosa (ECA-USP and Director of the Museum of Cotemporary Art)

## Visiting professors

Prof. AGUSTÍN CUEVA (Ecuadorian sociologist, political scientist and professor at Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México)

Period: May - June

Prof. RICHARD M. MORSE (historian of ideas and urbanization and director of the Latin American Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center, Washington, D.C.)

Period: June - July

Prof. RUY GALVÃO DE ANDRADA COELHO

(sociologist, anthropologist, former director of FFLCH-USP and professor at the University of Coimbra, Portugal)

Period: July - August



SILVIANO SANTIAGO (writer and professor of Literature and Literary Theory at the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro)

Period: August - October

ALFREDO MARGARIDO (historian and essayist, expert in African History and professor at Sorbonne, Paris)

Period: August - September

MARC FERRO (historian of contemporary culture and politics, and director of École des Hautes Études in Sciences Sociales, Paris)

Period: August - September

JOSÉ PAULO PAES (translator, editor, essayist and literary critic)

Period: August - October

HANS JOACHIM KOELLREUTTER (Musicologist, composer and professor)

Period: September 1987 – July 1988

ATSUYUKI SUZUKI (electrical engineer, mathematician, artificial intelligence expert and professor at the University of Shizuoka, Japan)

Period: November 1987 – January 1988

JOSEPH PEREZ (Historian of mentalities, specialist in the history of the Iberian Peninsula and director of the Maison des Pays Ibériques, Bordeaux, France)

Period: November - December

#### Conferences of the month

March 30

Prof. WILLIAM SAAD HOSSNE (UNESP)

*“Experiments with human beings: problems and frontiers”*

Host: Alberto Carvalho da Silva (President of FAPESP)

April 29

Prof. JOÃO SAYAD (FEA)

*“Brazil: a Third World economy?”*

Host: Jacques Marcovitch (FEA)

June 26

Prof. HANS JOACHIM KOELLREUTTER

*“Fundamentals of a relativist aesthetic of the inaccurate and paradoxical”*

Host: Maestro Olivier Toni

August 6

Prof. BERNARD FELD (MIT)

*“History of nuclear energy, arms race and social responsibility of the scientist”*

Host: Ivan Cunha Nascimento (Director of the Physics Institute, USP)

October 22

Prof. JOSÉ GALIZIA TUNDISI

*“Ecology and development: an analysis and perspective”*

Host: Aziz Ab’Saber (Professor emeritus, FFLCH-USP)

November 18

Prof. LEOPOLDO DE MEIS (UFRJ)

*“Energy in biological systems”*

Host: Walter Colli (director of the Chemistry Institute, USP)

December 2

Prof. JACOB GORENDER

*“Coercion and consensus in politics”*

Host: Prof. Paul Singer (FEA-USP)

#### IEA Board and Advisory Councils (1986-2011)

Carlos Guilherme Mota

Director from 1986 to 1989

Jacques Marcovitch

Director from 1989 to 1993

Umberto G. Cordani

Director from 1993 to 1997

Deputy-director: Alfredo Bosi

Advisory Council:

Carlos Takya

Edison Barbieri

Geraldo Forbes

Fernando Leça

Jorge Forbes

Henrique Fleming

Maria Victória de Mesquita Benevides

Ricardo Hernan Medrano

Renato Helios Migliorini

Rodolfo Hoffmann

Walter Colli

Alfredo Bosi

Director from 1997 to 2001

Deputy-director: Gerhard Malnic

Advisory Council:

Adelci Menezes de Oliveira

Arnaldo Mandel

Dom Paulo Evaristo Arns

Franklin Leopoldo e Silva

Gilberto Dupas

Imre Smon

Marcos Augusto Gripolin Grisotto

Nilson José Machado

Pedro Leite da Silva Dias

Renato Helios Migliorini

Yvonne Primerano Mascarenhas

Gerhard Malnic

Director from 2001 to 2003

Deputy-director: Alfredo Bosi

Advisory Council:

Arnaldo Mandel

Dom Paulo Evaristo Arns

Hernan Chaimovich

Pedro Leite da Silva Dias

Yvonne Primerano Mascarenhas

João Evangelista Steiner

Director from 2003 to 2007

Deputy-director: Alfredo Bosi (until 2005)

Deputy-director: Hernan Chaimovich (2006)

Advisory Council:

Ana Lydia Sawaya

Arnaldo Mandel

Bader Sawaya

Carlos Henrique de Mesquita

Celso Grebogi

César Ades

Dom Paulo Evaristo Arns

Gabriel Cohn

Iberê Caldas

João Fernando Gomes de Oliveira

Luís Nassif

Pedro Leite da Silva Dias

Yvonne Primerano Mascarenhas

César Ades

Director from 2008 to 2012 (January)

Deputy-director: Hernan Chaimovich (until August 2009)

Deputy-director: Luiz Roberto Giorgetti de Britto (since September 2009)

Advisory Council:

Bader Sawaia

Carlos Henrique de Mesquita Euclides Ayres de Castilho Gabriel Cohn

João Fernando Gomes de Oliveira

João Palermo Neto

João Stenghel Morgante

Julio Marcos Filho

Oswaldo Baffa Filho

Renato Janine Ribeiro

Roberto Mendonça Faria

Silvio Salinas