SOCIETY REGISTER 2020 / 4(4): 183-208
ISSN 2544–5502
DOI: 10.14746/sr.2020.4.4.09

ELSEVIER'S SLAVES: THE WASHINGTON CONSENSUS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES?

TADEUSZ KLEMENTEWICZ[1]

[1] University of Warsaw, Faculty of Political Science and International Studies, Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28, 00-927 Warszawa, Poland. ORCID: 0000-0003-2101-5060, Email: tadeuszklementewicz@wp.pl

Captivity—it is putting the form in place of the goal.
C. K. Norwid [translation]

ABSTRACT: This paper investigates the mechanisms of subordinating the system of science and higher education to the needs of boosting capital in the conditions of a new business model characteristic of neoliberal capitalism. The author uses as a theoretical framework of critical studies of science and higher education systems developed in Poland by Krystian Szadkowski based on political economy (Simon Marginson and Gigi Roggero). The weakness of the recently implemented reform of Polish education, the essence of which is making the status of 'scientist' dependent on publication in high-ranking journals belonging to publishing corporations' oligopoly, is that the natural and technical disciplines have been places on an equal evaluation footing with social sciences and humanities. This practice impoverishes the educational and critical functions of humanities, impoverishes the research questions, impoverishes the research methodology, and consequently, their cognitive values. The assessment of the quality of a social researcher's work, to be reliable, should include several other components—the presence of an "invisible university" in international networks (e.g. measured by selected citation indicators), but also problematization and interpretative innovation, as well as an original contribution to the achievements of the discipline. Monographs mainly document this. Qualitative expert assessment is required for evaluation. Therefore, the publication of monographs in reputable Polish and foreign publishing houses should become a showcase of the Polish social researcher, rather than contributing journal papers. In the paper, the author synthesizes his var-

ious analyses of contemporary capitalism and the role that science and the research and development sector play in accumulating capital.
KEYWORDS: knowledge, capital accumulation, turbocapitalism, humanities, parametric evaluation, expert assessment

1. THERE IS NO CAPITAL ACCUMULATION WITHOUT INNOVATION

We are dealing with a wave of four processes (mechanisms) regarding the functioning of modern capitalism. The first is globalization, or the processes of free movement of capital, resulting in production and value chains that encircle virtually the entire globe. The carriers of these processes are transnational companies that have created oligopoly networks in profitable branches of the economy. They follow the logic of profit, especially of maximizing the company's stock market value and reducing the time of capital circulation. Moreover, offshore zones and tax havens were created in their interest, as well as a space for speculation in the raw materials sector (food, oil, precious metals, minerals). They are complemented by speculation in the assets of enterprises (shares, loans), also on the periphery (India, Russia), or by land speculation like in Poland and Ukraine. Globalization took this form as a result of the state's implementation of neoliberal doctrine. Labor arbitration arose, and as a result of deregulation of the financial sector and manipulation of the tax system, considerable disparities in the distribution of income and assets appeared.

The second mechanism is the financialization of the economy and capital accumulation. This is not just a gargantuan expansion of the financial sector. It is also the financial form in which food, inventions, office space appear on the market, and finally the enterprises themselves. Even pensions are involved in the speculation spree.

The third is the progress of technology, the fourth industrial revolution or the second life of machines, this time perhaps controlled by artificial intelligence, not as before—by human beings. This raises uncertainty about the future of capitalism. Optimists are tempted by the vision of active civilization, while pessimists are afraid of a world where people are crammed in the suburbs of large cities without any chance of employment.

The fourth mechanism is the rise of excessive public and private debt, which makes it easier for the financial sector to control the state's economic policy, making slaves out of employees struggling with debt.

These mechanisms are complemented by cultural hegemony—control over ideological apparatuses and means of reproducing ideas and behavioral patterns. Here, the domination of the neoliberal doctrine and the system of institutions that sustain it is complete (bank economists, entrepreneurship studies, behavior control through consumer and mortgage debts, etc.).

In the current phase of the development of the capitalist market economy, the sources of capital accumulation are inventions, product and organizational innovations, the first draft of which is created at universities as a result of academic work. They can be implemented using raw materials, energy, and labour available in the

entire economic space of the world. There is no need to invest in fixed assets, also due to the high variability of products. Corporations prefer to control the market of scientific and technical knowledge in order to receive benefits from intellectual property. Modern-day Fords do not build factories. Today, the production line encircles the globe, the conveyor belt has been replaced by a container, and only the role of the distribution system is ever more significant (see Amazon). Władysław Szymański defines the contemporary economy of incomplete globalization (i.e. economic, not a political one) as "a system based on transnational entrepreneurship networks" (Szymański 2011: 212). Large companies (shell corporations) dominate the globalized economy. Management staff and departments responsible for research and development are located in the headquarters that merely coordinate the global network of suppliers and subcontractors of designed products. A production chain is created, whose first link is located on the Chinese coast, now also in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Central Europe. This applies to products that are admittedly marvels of technology like the iPhone, but their assembly, from parts manufactured separately, is done faster and faster by the skilful hands of trained residents of the province. Factories, or rather assembly plants in which gadgets for information society are created, are owned by local producers, and their margin is small. Establishment of such production and service chains requires computers, telecommunications networks, modern logistics, in particular, containerization of transport and broadening access to, a qualified, and at the same time cheaper, the labour force was needed.

Patents and intellectual property rights are essential in the new business model, and so a pioneer must have two advantages—ample funds and excellent research potential. Business and state expenses for research and development have increased. They range from basic research (discoveries), their technological selection, patents, prototypes, to implementation and production. Expenses for this sphere currently reach 2-3.5% of GDP, with 1/3 of research employees working at universities and 2/3 at enterprises. This leads to an explosion of patents in the field of ICT, biotechnology, nanotechnology, environmental protection, especially in the field of renewable energy. About 200,000 patents are registered each year, of which 1/4 is in the US, followed by Japan (over 20%), Germany, and Korea (nearly 10% each). Higher education provides about 20-30% of patents, and business—70-80%; in Poland quite the opposite.

For example, giants of the ICT industry buy patents from individual companies. These patents relate to wireless connectivity, encryption, touch and voice control, photo processing, etc. Individual companies may own up to several thousand patents. Therefore, the production of patents or at least their possession, prototype design, implementation of production, and promotion of a new product has become a new specialization for large companies. The competitive advantage is then ensured by the size of the potential sales market. The larger the market, the faster the depreciation of expenses and net profit. Thanks to a large market, the scale of production is increasing, and it is important because the costs of implementing technical progress are high. In this situation, market dominance is a way to increase efficiency and competitive advantage—the more customers, the greater the innovation rent and research profitability. That is why powerful global companies are standing in the field of increas-

ing productivity. Oligopolies are created, such as the American GAFA (Google, Apple, Facebook, Amazon) or Chinese BATX (Baidu, Alibaba, Tencent, Xiaomi). In this context, the power of intellectual property of patents is coupled with financial resources, also due to tax optimization. The revenues of the 500 largest mega corporations are approaching 40% of the global GDP. Therefore, they are close to gaining a controlling stake over the global economy, and consequently over the states and universities that are financed by them, and over the future of civilization.[1]

An entrepreneur as an innovator is the organizer and coordinator (orchestrator) of the production and distribution network. This way, next to the market and the state, the network becomes a method of coordinating the global economy. Shell corporations are "real machines for spinning the economic surplus on the global market" (Szymański 2011: 270). A leading company has large liquidity reserves thanks to the innovation rate, high turnover, high margins, market position, and it also has easy access to bank loans and acquires a large part of the surplus generated in the economy. In the product price of such a company, as much as 75% are intangible assets—fees for research, patent, design, marketing strategy, advertising, law firm costs, consulting, public relations, etc. Therefore, the state cannot be unreliable in the protection of intellectual property. This is the essence of a knowledge-based economy. Due to market dominance, the company buys start-ups, merges and takes over competitors. The value of mergers and acquisitions in the world exceeded 4.38 trillion dollars before the financial crisis of 2008. The concentration of capital currently relies on the control and coordination of production as well as trade in high-tech goods (with a few exceptions from the mining or defense industries). Characteristics of capitalism confirm its relevance as a multi-level structure in which the "permanent investment game" takes place (F. Braudel). At the lower level, there are mainly family poverty-businesses in agricultural production, services, construction. The upper level, however, covers spatially extended production and exchange chains, created by large corporations implementing innovative products based on the achievements of natural and technical sciences (Klementewicz 2019: 60-69).

The "game" could go on endlessly if humanity had several planets at its disposal. Economic growth and technological progress have degraded the natural environment (air, ocean, soil pollution), food (antibiotics, chemicals), and climate (carbon dioxide emissions). An outstanding environmental economist Herman Daly laughed at the functional model built on faith in the power of science and technology. Together, they would solve the problem of resource depletion. According to this model, an increase in raw material prices would stimulate the development of new technologies that would, in turn, reduce mining costs.

Consequently, as lower-quality ore, usually a more abundant one, is exploited, prices fall and production increases, and this is called a mining pyramid model. Firstly, technology itself also has its financial and energy costs. Secondly, the increase in the costs of extracting fossil fuels determines all other factors linked to each other. Al-

[1] Milan Babic, Eelke Heemskerk, Jan Fichtner, Who is more powerful – states or corporations?, July 10, 2018 4.14pm, https://theconversation.com/who-is-more-powerful-states-or corporations- 99616

ready at the threshold of industrialization, the co-creator of neoclassical economics and methodologist William S. Jevons noticed: "It is a confusion of ideas to suppose that the economical use of fuel is equivalent to diminished consumption" (Smil 2016: 234). Hence, the paradox derived from his name—cheaper energy, less expensive raw materials, and a reduction in labor costs ultimately lead to a decrease in the product price. The effect of this "progress" is the increase in consumption of a given good or service. As a result, according to the calculations by Vaclav Smil, an outstanding Canadian scholar of Czech origin, the average domestic consumption of per-person contributions to production increased at least four times during the 20th century. The contributions referred to include concrete in houses, metals and plastics in machines, aluminium and plastics in aircraft, and heavy metals, rare earth elements, lithium in electronics, magnets, and batteries. We seem to be slowly entering a new era. It will be a mild agony of economic growth and the search for technological solutions for zero-emission energy. The era in which science and its achievements will again become a common good. Therefore, according to Stanisław Kozyr-Kowalski, science should not follow economic trends, but overtake them, preparing societies for institutional changes and a new development strategy (Kozyr-Kowalski 2005: 52).

2. THE BERMUDA TRIANGLE OF THE EXPLOITATION OF ACADEMIC WORK: GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY AND CORPORATE UNIVERSITIES

Since innovations are the backbone of an effective business, it is not surprising that corporations finance 70% of research and development work. Some corporations benefit from the circulation of knowledge, its dissemination, as well as from the selection of most creative researchers for American universities (brain drain). These, in turn, are corporations selling knowledge to students, hence the role of rankings to highlight the place of the university in the hierarchy of prestige and "research and teaching power." There are around 100 million students to intercept, and not only the university's global ranking, but also the model of "scientific excellence" of the modern researcher is utilized to do it. This formula prefers competition for status between researchers as well as between enterprising universities. This competition, like any other competition on the market or quasi-market, leads to the concentration of prestige and scientific achievements in the centre, and thus in the USA. Scientific excellence understood in this way is intended to ensure, in Marx's language, the subsidization of research work to capital in public higher education sector. Its essence is plundering the public sector, where research results and education based on them have so far been a common good (Szadkowski 2015: 145-174).

The global emergence of university rankings in 2003 was the beginning of subordinating scientific work to corporations. To this end, research (corporate) universities were created, integrated into the market society, which, from the mid-nineteenth century, had become, according to Karl Polanyi, only an addition to the economy. The university transmits in the form of papers, and thus indirectly, to corporations the products of research work arising from public funds—research reports, results of experiments, etc.—every year, the database contains 2.5 million papers. It gets trans-

ferred for further processing in the corporations' research and development departments or to start-ups in science parks created by government agencies, cities or local governments. There, the papers are transformed, as in life sciences, into new technologies, therapies, medicines, gadgets of the ICT industry. Oligopoly consisted of 5-6 publishing corporations plays the role of an "intermediary." In the social sciences and the humanities, these include Reed-Elsevier, Wiley-Blackwell, Sage, Thompson Francis, and Springer. In total, they have an over-60% share in the publication of papers in these fields. Reuters Thompson and Elsevier additionally prepare information on citation in the form of appropriate indexes, e.g. Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) published in the Web of Science database. Their income and profitability exceed the income of industrial corporations; only investment funds have better achievements. Their profit margins rarely fall below 20%; they even reach 40%, e.g. Reed-Elsevier's profit increased from 13 to 25% in the years 2010-2015. To make this possible, American universities' expenditure on their journals grew four times faster than the inflation in 1986-2004 (see Szadkowski 2015a: 150).

Complex research systems are used to direct research to the needs of industry and capital circulation (investments), e.g. in Germany the network of 82 Planck Institutes whose domain is basic research, and the network of 60 Fraunhofer technology centres which are financed half by business and half by state budget (Theil 2012: 25-27). Thanks to this, the whole community assumes the risk of making wrong decisions as to the direction of research and financing of basic research. As always, corporations preponderate—they can socialize the costs of market position by hybridizing what is public and what is private at both global and national levels. The neoliberal Leviathan facilitated the change and was justified by bank economists in the form of neoliberal doctrine and public choice theory. At the core of this theory is the assumption of *homo oeconomicus* (i.e. the specific goal of maximizing utility, especially self-benefit), methodological individualism, and a fierce fight against a "malfunctioning state," bureaucracy "typing winners." In this way, the bureaucracy dares to support the market's harsh verdicts. Although it operates a price mechanism, it is mainly to distribute profits between enterprises. Besides, the economic efficiency criterion imposed on the administration paved the way for new public management. It turned out to be an attempt to commodify another sphere of social life, which was the public services sector. The neoliberal Leviathan first introduced management at universities in accordance with the ideal of evaluation and supervising the state in terms of transparency, accountability, and efficiency. In a word, value for money, hence the large role of social engineering auditing and academic work measurement practices. National bureaucracies governing science and higher education aim to direct researchers and universities to create knowledge that can be commodified or privatized, although at the upper levels of ideas and innovation. The time of academic work has been accelerated—increasing productivity in an even shorter time. The neoliberal Leviathan thus supports its own entrepreneurs in international competition (Korea and China, now also the German government). The new efficiency formula is contracting services, financing them, and finally settling accounts. American universities first provided the models of "good practices" in managing the research and education sector. In a "mother-society," the

state with the industrial-financial-academic conglomerate remains in a successful symbiosis. For instance, MIT is such a hybrid. The implementation of "good practices" was taken care of by the World Bank, OECD, and the European Commission. They define evaluation procedures, comparisons, and benchmarks. Proper implementation of the ideal is done by international bibliometrics experts, as well as specialists in public policy. They resemble imperial eunuchs—judging researchers worthy of financial favors on behalf of principals. They are not able to assess the cognitive values of "evaluated" works themselves; they resemble someone who wishes to evaluate a book without knowing its content. Instead, they leave the main problem of every science aside, which is, after all, a true cognitive practice, i.e., the problem of cognitive values of the knowledge it provides, i.e. its reliable insight into reality.

The process of subjecting science to business has taken the form of a "triple helix model of mutual relations" (L. Leydesdorff, H. Etzkowitz) between the neoliberal Leviathan, corporate university, and industry:

government bureaucracy ==> university ==> knowledge-based economy.

An important link is the relationship between the university and industry. It consists of business incubators, science parks, clusters, research and development departments of corporations.

For example, health protection has become a new field of technological progress based on the achievements of natural science and capital accumulation. First, a significant part of the GDP is allocated to the health sector (from 4.5% in Poland to 17.5% in the USA).[2] Second, it is an amenity that people do not save on—they want to remain young and healthy, and they want to be fit. New opportunities have brought the discoveries of the human genome and various DNA manipulation techniques. The new sensation is the CRISPR technique, which uses the rotation mechanism of bacteria against viruses. To defend against them, the bacterium incorporates a viral DNA fragment into its genetic code. Moreover, this path is used to precisely modify the genetic code of flora, fauna, and people. Therefore, large pharmaceutical companies (Roche, AstraZeneca, Pfitzer), investment funds, and state agencies direct huge funds to biotechnology, personalized medicine, genomics, cryonics or the digitization of healthcare. Application creators from Silicon Valley are trying to buy immortality or at least longevity. They invest millions of dollars in start-ups looking for a panacea drug for cell ageing, arthralgia, poor eyesight, and Alzheimer's disease, just to avoid natural therapy—exercise and a proper diet. Business clusters like Cambridge UK, which consists of 500 companies, employs 15,000 specialists educated at corporate universities, are created. The cluster generates revenues reaching 5 billion dollars. New companies and start-ups are made up of giants of the financial sector: JPMorgan Chase, Berkshire Hathaway. Most significantly, Jeff Bezos's Amazon took over PillPack for 1 billion dollars. This start-up has created a full online pharmacy (from prescription to drug delivery to the patient). Therefore, pharmacies will soon disappear, just like bookstores and small shops. Also, Polish medical schools and hospitals will get something out of

[2] World Health Organization, Public Spending on Health: A Closer Look at Global Trends, 2018, https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/276728/WHO-HIS-HGF-HF-WorkingPaper-18.3-eng.pdf

fashion for bio investment. The government appoints the Medical Research Agency, and clinics receive orders from western giants for clinical trials of late drug implementation and new therapies (Lorezi, Bererebi 2019: 83-92).

In conclusion, the implemented system of evaluating achievements of the humanities is a form of exploitation of scientists, albeit with the enthusiastic support of a narrower circle of beneficiaries and naive zealots. Researchers give away intellectual, copyright, and publishing rights to corporations for free. What is more, researchers and universities often have to pay extra for this turnover. This is a state of affairs utterly incomparable to the situation of artists—admittedly always addicted to and kept by public patronage on a short leash, but nevertheless entitled by definition to royalty. Also important is the fact that the publishing regime imposed by administrative coercion forces researchers where to publish and, appearances to the contrary, what to publish ("what will sell well and what not—in grants and publications"). Therefore, we are dealing here with systemic violation of the autonomy of cognitive processes, of the freedom of science, and of the service of the quality of civil society.

Poland, as a belated newcomer for several centuries, has joined the parade / process of "scientific excellence" and global competitiveness. The state added reform-deformation of higher education and science, at least in the field of the humanities to transform the economy and pensions in accordance with the Washington, DC rules. Hence, a Polish scientist should draw problems for analysis, cognitive styles, and scientific criteria from this reform. However, the results of research exported to the world may have a secondary impact on the center in the form of valuable case studies for comparative research, and even enrich theoretical instruments. It has been done by several Polish humanists (L. Fleck, T. Kotarbiński, F. Znaniecki).

3. NATURAL AND TECHNICAL SCIENCES AND THE HUMANITIES: FUNCTIONS AND CHARACTERISTICS

There is no doubt that internationalization is a condition of cognitive progress in natural and technical sciences. The "scientific excellence" of natural sciences is indeed closely related to internationalization. According to the latest news, "international visibility of research results," "global circulation of knowledge production," and imitation of the American system of grants and corporate universities are present on the "international scientific production" quasi-market. This is where the problem of the specificity of socio-humanistic sciences appears vis-à-vis the natural and applied sciences. Do they have practical (ideological) or theoretical functions that answer the question, how is it now? In the first case, the criterion of their usefulness would be efficiency, in the second—the truth. The practical functions of socio-humanities are also social engineering techniques and technologies of such organization of social life in various dimensions to provide it with the necessary stability and the ability to survive and develop.

Well, science as a type of social practice, as a form of social awareness, and as a genre of knowledge has two basic aspects—content and scope. The first one covers the substantive content of the accumulated knowledge (theorems), the second—the

research area and problem coverage. In general, according to historical epistemology developed by Jerzy Kmita from the Polish Poznan school, the main function of science is to provide prognostic premises, and therefore directives that allow researchers to predict the consequences of undertaken activities, i.e. they determine the effectiveness of human actions against nature and possibly in the social world.

The gathering of practical knowledge takes place in the following order:

nature => scientific knowledge => productive practice => rationality (Kmita 1980).

According to the thesis of historical epistemology, scientific knowledge, and thus the social practice that leads to its creation, are functionally subordinated to the other spheres of social life. Scientific and research activity is determined by non-cognitive factors of historical-pragmatic nature in accordance with the heteronomous model of science development. These will arise in the form of demand for innovation from the economy in the form of technical bottlenecks, orders for the military complex, growing empirical anomalies, inconsistencies in the theoretical apparatus, as well as ideologies, social systems, politics, and the worldview of the current era. They demand better explanations, corrected statements with greater predictive power in a word, of cognitive progress. Thus, science is autonomous in terms of content while becoming increasingly dependent on external factors in terms of scope.

In the field of technical progress, industrial civilization continues to make further qualitative leaps. In the economy, the level of efficiency is determined by scientific derivative technologies that reduce energy and material consumption, facilitating the manipulation of atoms and molecules (nanotechnologies, robotics, teleinformatics, artificial intelligence, optoelectronics, biotechnologies using genomics discoveries, biomedicine, brain-machine interface, material engineering such as carbon nanotubes for computer chips, 3D printing, Internet of things).

In Poland, appearances to the contrary, the current reform of higher education and science is not opening the Polish economy and science to the global market. According to the latest EU ranking, the Polish economy occupies the 25th place in terms of innovation. Whether the lack of innovation is the result of the weakness of Polish science or rather of the structural weaknesses of the Polish economy—of that child of the neoliberal transformation. After three decades of another Polish modernization, there are still no global corporations absorbing innovations. According to the Central Statistical Office of Poland, in 2016-2018 only 26% of industrial enterprises and 21% of service companies were innovatively active. This is the result of deindustrialization and replacement of factories with assembly plants of ready-made parts, as well as the dominance of over 2 million micro-enterprises in the economy. And they are not innovative. In addition, there is a lack of an own arms industry, which has a steering role towards the science and research sector (like the Pentagon in the USA). Currently, the Polish state supports the innovation of other societies by sending scientific discoveries there, at least in its initial form. There is also a lack of laboratory base and a financially rich network of research institutes, as in Germany or the USA.

Meanwhile, in Poland, employment in the research and development sector has decreased by 100,000 employees. So, it is easy to be wise after the event—neither

the neoliberal transformation has shifted the Polish economy to the center, nor the neoliberal pension reform guaranteed their recipients a "vacation under the coconut trees," nor will another neoliberal reform, the reform of science, lead the University of Warsaw to become a competitor of the American Ivy League. Not with these funds, not this laboratory base, not this network for intercepting research results financed from public funds in peripheral countries. However, the requirements cannot exceed the possibilities, but they must be adapted to them.

The humanities are in a different situation because they are more influenced by consciousness and ideational factors, in other words, parts / elements of Popper's Second and Third World. In terms of content, social sciences are less autonomous and sovereign. They contain various "images of the world"—ideological, scientific, and philosophical systems, and images of the world, which are generated by the common consciousness of individual social groups. Thus, the humanities study symbolic culture, preserved in sign systems on the one hand, and on the other, their conscious incarnations—attitudes, stereotypes, memorial sites, historical consciousness, and symbolic imaginarium, etc. All these spheres co-shape human behavior. The regularities that occur between social structures, between the institutional environment and behavior, are used to control people according to the Foucauldian knowledge-power duality principle. It is used, for example, by the government in motivating employees as a "human resource," as well as in advertising, in commercial and political marketing. However, this knowledge is a cognitive deficit.

The main reason for this state of affairs is the lack of connection between the "discoveries" of human sciences (including the impact of ideological or religious discourses) and production technologies, new products, ways of taming and using the powers of nature, etc. The ways of doing so are provided by natural and technical sciences. Consequently, social sciences do not affect the rationality of people in the basic, and thus economic sphere of social life. The business utility of social sciences is of lesser importance. The social sciences' knowledge allows, possibly, to expand the ranks of consumers by shaping the hierarchy of needs, especially symbolic consumption, thanks to which it becomes easier to overcome the barrier of realization of the mass of goods produced; they also allow shaping employees' behavior, especially as voters or consolidating loyalty to the prevailing social order through cultural hegemony. From this point of view, research areas that use models, indicate behavioral conditions, and indicate how to make a profit—neoclassical economics, social choice theory, business psychology and advertising, social policy, electoral sociology, etc. will always be preferred. These disciplines will remain at corporate universities. But they do not contribute much to understanding the complexities of the human psyche and the world that shapes it. Generalizing the characteristics of Florian Znaniecki, the humanities strive to inductively describe the activities of people and the structure of the social systems in which they live, by explaining their causes and functions through the interpretation of meaning.

The functions of social disciplines now boil down, as they did before, to the question of how to serve the gods of this world? And they can be understood as classes, states, national communities, humanity. The rationality of learning about the humanities

and the resulting narratives are dialectical. On the one hand, they represent in the hidden (ideological and political) form particular interests of classes and social states, corporations, nations, on the other they strive for legitimacy borrowed from applied sciences. This fact best explains creative freedom, which is gradually institutionalized in the form of scientific disciplines, essay writing or journalism. A considerable space of public discourse is created, in which individual scientific and philosophical paradigms serve as a "shield and sword" for the rationality of people. And at the same time they are functional towards the interests of classes and large social groups, often even contrary to the ideas, also a common sense of these groups. So, many paradigms contain "areas of vision and blindness," hence the multitude of methodological rules for each paradigm.

I wonder what type of discoveries the reform supporters expect from internationalized humanities. Have there been any significant "discoveries" since the masters of the "art of suspicion"—Marx, Nietzsche or Freud? Well, one can possibly supplement the list with trackers of signs of violence in social life (M. Foucault, G. Deleuze, T. Adorno, L. Althusser). What is more, one can even argue, like Geoffrey Ingham, that "some of those who could qualify on this list have only contributed to the misappropriation and obfuscation of the intellectual heritage of Smith, Marx, Weber, Schumpeter, and Keynes" [translation] (Ingham 2011: 9).

The actual problem of choosing a set of research tools and techniques is to combine two research tasks. First, it consists in the reconstruction of the cultural (semiotic) layer of social reality. It is a sphere of social phenomena and processes, which also include conscious, ideological ("scientific" and simple) ideas about them, also known as the symbolic universe. It is rooted in the history of individual life and work communities—cultural heritage, historical experiences, and systemic specificity. The results of these reconstructions are presented in an appropriate narrative form. Secondly, it involves the reconstruction of the existence outside of the consciousness network of relationships between people, called communities. They determine the possible alternatives for action, as well as its necessity. We reach the unconscious world only indirectly. A thought-out theoretical structure is used for this, which must be encapsulated in indicators of observable phenomena. The researcher serves various socio-demographic and economic data, information from surveys etc. But their cognitive values depend on the theoretical concept that gives them meaning.

A social researcher, therefore, without a laboratory and the possibility of conducting macro-social experiments, works with their head. The success of their work depends on subjective general and factual knowledge, as well as modelling skills—hence the role of the name and a sense of autonomy. That is why authors of contributing papers do not belong to the humanities. Yet, the authors of great analyses and syntheses, such as F. Braudel, M. Foucault, W. Kula, and Th. Pikkety, K. Polanyi, J. Topolski and I. Wallerstein do. It took the latter to write his 1500-page *opus magnum* several years. Nearly 1,700-page work of the English political historian Samuel E. Finer is so valuable for a political scientist; and in the work one can find unique data for studying the function of the state in history (Finer 1997). The imitation of natural science produces an unexpected effect, which is the contradiction between the utilitarian pro-

gramming and selection of publications in the field of applied sciences and the forced reproduction of secondary, sometimes even empty words of "universal" humanities. This threatens with marginalization and even elimination from the international circulation of reflective humanities, seemingly impractical and even useless.

Interesting in this context is the question of where the great humanists come from. All theoretical concepts organizing contemporary research are essentially museums of social thought. The road to greatness leads through diligence and unwavering faith in the validity of ideas, theories, and concepts that are original in the creator's eyes. They must constantly repeat their idea in subsequent books, as well as find its apostles (Hartman 2016). Can writing papers to journals instead of writing monographs help to take a significant position in a linguistically and partially culturally foreign world? The negative answer to the above question leads to the practical conclusion that, above all, the access of outstanding Polish monographs to the global market should be supported. This was the case with the work of Ludwik Fleck, *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*, which only after translating into English won a well-deserved place in the sociology of science. Another example is the 5-volume set of books edited by Przemysław Urbańczyk, entitled *The Past Societies. Polish Lands from the First Evidence of Human Presence to the Early Middle Ages* published by the Polish Institute of Advanced Studies PIASt, financed by the National Humanities Development Program.

Contemporary capitalism without borders has faced challenges whose diagnosis and suggestions for overcoming them should now be completed by catalogs of humanists' research questions. Let me indicate the most important:

ecological crisis and depletion of raw materials, ecological costs of consumerism; energy transformation, change of lifestyle to limit consumerism as a life orientation of contemporaries;

scientific and technical access, reindustrialization, especially robotization, artificial intelligence (the world without a job, its precarization, the problem of basic income);

aging of the population and the problem of safe old age and the related increase in expenditure on the pension fund and health care;

the explosion of inequalities within national societies and disparities between regions of the world (populist movements, waves of immigrants, the problem of unnecessary people of the Global South);

financial crises: financialization of economies, dominance of the financial sector over states (public debt mechanism, invisible parliament of "investors").

Therefore, social sciences not only provide valuable information about man as a social being and the communities he creates. Science—when it comes to the humanities and knowledge about society—is not only measurements, observations, and experiences, not only calculations, but also reflection, theory, focusing on what is problematic or controversial in interpretation. It is universities, not international journals,

that have been a place of pluralistic debate on national strategy, defining the reasons for the state, interpretation of tradition, diagnosis of opportunities and threats in the face of existing development trends of the economy, quality of community ties, examination of human relations with the environment, evolution towards a multi-polar global system, ways of arranging relationships with a neighbor.

In addition, researchers at public universities carry a burden of service towards those who maintain universities through taxes. The minister only administers public funds; they cannot be only a business supporter. In the Polish regressive tax system, these are mainly employee classes. In addition to social and planetary rationality, the social researcher should consciously take into account the emancipation interests of those marginalized, weak, and pushed to the side of public debate. Nevertheless, they can achieve practical goals only because they provide knowledge that is characterized by cognitive values, i.e. it is a reliable insight into the studied reality.

William A. Williams, an American reflective historian and political scientist, indicates four criteria of a reliable social researcher. First, they must get to the bottom of things. This leads to the disclosure of deeply hidden determinants of social life—its economy, political struggle and "game," masked contradictions, and ideological opium. Secondly, they must provide an explanation of the ever-changing institutional matrix of society—new trends and barriers to development. Thirdly, they must present an alternative hierarchy of values than those socially shared, because it is responsible for current causes of stagnation and creates development barriers. Finally, they must show the path of a structural change in the current order, both strategic goals and tactical alternatives to action (Tilman 1974; Williams 2009). As Tony Judt said, a social researcher is to be more of a whistle-blower than a "priest of truths." Paradoxically, capitalism for survival needs not only the "Magic Flute" of scientists naturalizing the System, but also the "Occam's Razor" of researchers critical of their boring theories, hypostases, and recommendations. Otherwise, their uncontrollable tendency to accumulate capital causes havoc in the ecosystem, they cause suffering, affects people's lives and collectivities, ultimately structural crises. As a result of neoliberal turmoil, the science center has just found its place in the backyard of shareholder capitalism, with its guidelines for the privatization of public services, the codification of education and knowledge. And it is a fact, because it reveals the macro-social sources of the evolution of the academic field in the light of the sociology of science and the style of Barry Barnes and David Bloor's strong program of the Edinburgh School. The dynamics was driven by the innovations necessary to multiply capital in the neoliberal business model.

The university cannot install a specific production line of researchers. It will then cease to be a forge of intellectuals with an inquisitive and critical attitude towards social reality. It would then become a culture of "productive" clones according to the criteria of parameters, grades, and grants. The social researcher is not a "puppet" in the hands of the disposer of public funds, a politically correct service provider. From this point of view, Humanities 2.0 can be interpreted as a conscious limitation of the number of researchers and non-natural faculties (i.e. of little use to business or administration) at Polish universities. The results of social research are useful to corpo-

rations for the effectiveness of the cultural industry, controlling consumer behavior and its variation—electoral, forming attitudes towards the System. For administration, for example, the information provided by demographers and social politicians in connection with assessing the effectiveness of public services is valuable. In a word, the taxpayer and the consumer are what counts, not the citizen. Therefore, functions towards the community of life and work related to showing its developmental tendencies, visions of a better organization of society to improve the quality of life or remove the deficiencies of liberal democracy will be eliminated. An interesting contribution to assessing the effectiveness of a reform-deformation of the Polish humanities is the insignificant influence of American (and thus global) citations champions, especially the winners of the Nobel Prize in the field of Economics.

In this country, only six media groups under shareholders' control decide on the content of 90% of what people watch, read, and listen to. The losers in the rat race are wrong—around 30 million uninsured, a few poor jobs may not be enough to live a month without social support.[3] Low unionization and employee protection—short leave, low unemployment benefits, no maternity leave, large pay gap. Hence, one of the highest Gini coefficients, close to 0.5, which means a large diversity of income and assets. Higher education is costly from the lowest levels in the education system. No wonder that 14 times more sons and daughters can afford it whose parents are among the 20% richest citizens than the children of the poorest 20%. And, as a consequence, only 6% of people born in this group manage to break through to the elite—as it is shown in the Brookings Institution research (Zalewski 2019). Therefore, the wealthy class rules. Almost 1% of the population, mainly young African Americans, is also detained in privatized prisons, doing half-free work for a business friend of the prison owner. Privatization includes more and more public services—pensions, intelligence, security services, forest services, water supply systems, garbage disposal, and public transport. That is why the American writer Paul Theroux, traveling in the Deep South, writes that "in terms of power and splendor, America is unmatched in the world, but in terms of neglect it is no different from the world" (Theroux 2017: 533/534). Even the Deep South is no different from the Third World, which the author often emphasizes. One of the reasons for this is the belief that everyone who tries enough will realize the "American dream" of material success ("from rags to riches"). Not surprisingly, according to the Pew Research Center, 41% of Americans believe that the second coming of Jesus "probably" or "with certainty" will take place by 2050.

The economy is dominated by shareholders and speculators, hence the inflated financial sector and capital market. Profit will forgive you anything—even using 15 million liters of water for one unconventional fracturing operation to squeeze gas out of the shale. Even if the society consumes a quarter of the world's energy, "the American way of life is non-negotiable," as President George Bush once said in Rio de

[3] In 2017, 8.8% of people, or 28.5 million, did not have health insurance at any point during the year as measured by the CPS ASEC. The uninsured rate and number of uninsured in 2017 were not statistically different from those in 2016 (8.8 percent or 28.1 million); Edward R. Berchick, Emily Hood, and Jessica C. Barnett, Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2017, September 12, 2018, https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2018/demo/p60-264.html

Janeiro. Restricting the free market in the name of climate change would be a crime against the noblest part of humanity. Meanwhile, EU countries have reduced energy consumption by 2%, greenhouse gas emissions by 22% in 1990-2016, and at the same time increased their GDP by 54%. According to the Center on Poverty and Inequality at Stanford University, the president of a corporation earned 24 times more than their production worker in 1965. Currently, it is 185 times more. That is why the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. According to Angus Deaton, 46.2 million Americans lived in poverty in 2011, while in 1959, it was only 6.7 million (Deaton 2016: 201). In 2015, Americans at the bottom of the social ladder lived at the level of 36% of the official poverty line, which for a family of four constituted an income of 16.5 dollars daily. No wonder that 14% of Americans need food stamps, or about 40 million US residents are supported by food coupons. Half of the employees do not have sufficient income to pay their pension contributions, and two-thirds under 40 do not have any savings for retirement. Meanwhile, the top 10% of the American society had 47% of the total income at their disposal in 2011, with an average of 255,000 dollars per person, while the poorest 20% accounted for 17% of the total income (Deaton 2016: 224). In 2015, the top 20% has an average income 8.3 times greater than 20% of the poorest (4.4 times higher in Germany, only 3.7 times in Denmark).[4]

The country also has its own tax havens in its territory, in which low-income gains and rents disappear. Frustrations are best treated with a multi-shot pistol, which can be purchased at a "Jesus loves you—buy&sell weapons" type of store. The choice of representatives is determined by packets of shares, not by a ballot.

The meaning of these facts is unequivocal—scientific excellence is one thing, and the quality of a society in which science arises is another. They have little in common. Science is used to position the university so that it can attract students from all over the world, not to improve an anarcho-capitalist society.

4. POLITICAL SCIENCE: WHAT CAN BE EXPLAINED AND WHAT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD

Bibliometrists believe that if a thought is not expressed in English and published in an Anglo-Saxon high-ranking journal, it has no cognitive value; it does not matter if it is innovative, true, or initiates a public and scientific debate on some hitherto unnoticed problem. This was the case with publications that opened the eyes of Polish society to the medium development trap. The works are valorized by anonymous, free-working reviewers who fill out the review forms. Bibliometrists themselves do not bother to get to know the "evaluated" achievements. Some even prefer, most easily, to x-ray the biographies, or even the personalities of the researchers evaluated.

Bibliometry, especially in the spirit of Scopus, rewards descriptions or, at most, exploration of details and epiphenomena, e.g. electoral behavior. On the other hand, it is difficult to parameterize the effects of ambitious explanatory (theoretical) reflection, and even more so to investigate and determine hermeneutics, understanding sociolo-

[4] The World Bank, Nearly Half the World Lives on Less than $5.50 a Day, October 17, 2018, https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2018/10/17/nearly-half-the-world-lives-on-lessthan-550-a-day

gy or humanistic political science. This happens, among others, due to disproportions in the communication circuit. A philosopher or theoretician, with the exception of a "scientific celebrity," a currently trendy author, has no chance of winning or even participating in the auction for the number of citations.

The problem arises as to the role of universalization of science, its global circulation and production in the cognitive progress of the humanities. Important questions will arise in this situation—who and for what purpose uses the knowledge gathered by academia? Should it legitimize the existing social order, or rather look for the reasons for its unreliability? This second task is undertaken by critical sciences, without deceiving the recipient that ultramodern research techniques ensure ideological neutrality. They continue the critical and skeptical Enlightenment attitude. Research tasks may concern:

a) own national community (local level);

b) the European community (regional level) or

c) the universal community of life and work (universal level).

What really determines the status and "excellence" of the discipline is the scientific knowledge in the form of theorems and theories collected and systematized by its representatives. The question arises whether the scope and content of the achievements of American political science can only be a model and an oracle for the world due to the position of the country? Without a detailed substantive analysis of the achievements, this question cannot be answered. For example, for someone who is interested in the phenomenon of revolution, they will reach for the work of Theda Stockpol, but not instead of the eminent Polish historian and political scientist Jan Baszkiewicz. "Internationalization" is hampered by the basic fact of human existence. Namely, we are always dealing with a "socioeconomic man institutionally rooted" (Morawski 2001: 34). At the same time, this institutional environment has a historical shape. Therefore, even economists who prefer everyday models (Rodrik 2019), with their analyses of the current state of the national or global economy, are trying to create the basis "for economic and social policy, in which reference to values, norms, and other criteria of social assessment is inevitable" (Wilkin 2005: 13).

In addition, there are aspects of life in political science, which can be studied using statistical techniques (electoral behavior, attitude, analysis of political content, analysis of decision dilemmas). Political scientists studying this aspect are more likely to "internationalize" due to the dominance of the empirical model of social research (in economics, psychology, demography, and partly sociology).

On the other hand, researchers of political history, political systems, political thought, and international relations are in a worse situation. Here, the research and studies have a local and national scope, they are addressed to decision-makers and civil society, because they contain valuable diagnoses, practical suggestions, and launch public debates. In a word, they perform important educational and critical functions from the point of view of the national community. The task of the researcher here is to create a specific map of the global system to indicate the place of their

own national community in the international division of labor and power. It is only on this basis that they can be tempted to reflect on the national strategy or policy of government agencies. Usually, practical reflection based on diagnoses and forecasts ends with postulates, expert opinions, program recommendations, close to visions of better organization of political life. The common wisdom of a politician here is not in the theoretical approach, because it is not true that work and wisdom are getting the nations richer, or that if someone has visions, they should see a doctor. Therefore, it must be assessed separately, both participation in shaping the global good of shared knowledge (participation in the achievements of the "invisible" global university) and participation in the shaping of the national common good—knowledge of political life in a specific country and at a specific time. However, as Jan Hartman writes, "everything in political science eventually returns to the fundamental, and thus philosophical issues" (Hartman 2017: 20). Moreover, "there is no national history, especially modern history, detached from social one" (Mencwel 2019: 21). In this respect, the various subdisciplines of political science have unequal opportunities for international visibility. Let us briefly review their set of research tools and techniques (Klementewicz 2017).

Political history. The works of this subdiscipline use historical sources, official documents, and widely use the procedure of understanding and causal explanation. The political history researchers describe, usually in the form of monographs, often even biographies, the course and effects of a politician's rule or synthesize a specific process. Historical studies are interpreted in these works—they determine the facts, interpret them, and then determine the historical rank or at least embed it in some system of assessments. The set of research tools is universal here, but the circle of interested representatives is rather at national level. At most, thanks to international circulation, the political history studies can be used by other researchers for comparative research. A more systematic approach may take the form of empirical-historical theory of a given type of state or individual process, e.g. the twilight of the significance of the state in the global system, as at present the US. The border between historiography and political science is movable in such a way that the *terminus a quo* of facts directly interesting to the political scientist sometimes goes deep into the past. For example, the peripheral nature of the Polish economy, the type of patriotism characteristic of Poles, a distinctive social ethos, with a lack of civil courage in public life—must be associated with the processes that originated in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. These were in order: refeudalization of Eastern Europe and its place in the division of labor in Europe at the time, nobles' democracy, folklore mentality of the folk classes, nobles' intelligence in the role of the "tribune of the people."

Political systems. This, in turn, is knowledge about the organizational structure of the state apparatus, the party system, and legal and cultural norms. Studies on political systems contain the rules of legal dogmatics. In the work on political systems, the thematic axis is the reconstruction of applicable constitutional and possibly administrative law. In the light of relevant sources of law, these norms determine the competences of state authorities, ways of fighting for the control of the center of political decision by citizens' organizations, as well as the scope of their freedom and civil

rights. Although the effectiveness of legal regulations based on various empirical data is assessed, these works contain a key element that does not appear in other types of narrative of a political scientist. It is the axiological discourse and the rules of legal dogmatics. Important components of political system studies are:

political justifications of the sources of the legal system, legal and political ideologies, factors determining the content of legal norms, in particular *de lege ferenda* postulates;

legal inference rules, conflict of law rules of the legal system, systematization of legal norms; linguistic and non-language interpretative directives of norms from legal provisions (like *ratio legis*), legal inferences.

Dogmatic and legal reflections, problems of interpretation of norms, legal arguments and conclusions assessing the effectiveness of regulations and *de lege ferenda* postulates—they are all of analytical nature. They only occasionally refer to the results of empirical research. The set of research tools is also universal here, although it must take into account the specificity of legal systems. Needless to say, work on a state's political system is primarily relevant to its citizens.

Political ideology. These are forms of culture (awareness) of people participating in politics. So, these will be ideologies, declared party program options, public opinion, national, historical, and class consciousness, stereotypes, myths widespread in a given society. This is where the representative method together with the questionnaire technique and statistics is widely used. Nowadays, studies are being prepared in the form of empirical research reports. There is room here for an explanation of what the source of the idiographic nature of political science is. Mass processes, as important as they are for demographers, sociologists or economists, are, however, a large but secondary area of a political scientist's interests. An inseparable element of political reality are the actions of specific individuals and groups—political leaders in the system of authorities, and in political parties and movements, especially the opposition, trade union activists, freedom and urban movements, representatives of pressure groups, and social authorities. They play the main role on the political scene, which today has shrunk to the size of a television screen. A researcher, wishing to describe the game and fight in the public sphere or assess the role of leaders (biography), must use the historian's set of research tools. Historiographic competence includes, among others, the ability to criticize external and internal sources, mastering the procedures for establishing facts, but also the ability to use non-source knowledge. This is followed by the prominent role of the humanistic interpretation and the procedure of understanding. Therefore, it is counterproductive, even thoughtless, to call political scientists to practice behavioralism as the American rankings' champions do. The leading, most cited authors most often are mainly researchers of electoral behavior, political culture and, in addition, native society. They usually have authored textbooks on surveys and statistics.

Political thought. Analytical work on the history of political thought and current ideological and political options occupy a separate area. Rules for interpreting texts

dominate in these works. Their description is dealt with in philosophical and literary hermeneutics. These studies are sometimes about recreating the system of concepts or worldview of the era, the social group represented by the researched author. Then, an explanation of the origins of ideology functions in the historical drama of group conflicts and their rationalization. The authors of these studies join existing interpretative traditions and propose their interpretations. In this way, one can also analyze the ideology of film or belles-lettres. Polish political science has many authors whose substantive level and writing form are a real ornament of all polish humanities (J. Baszkiewicz, F. Ryszka, G. Seidler, M. Waldenberg).

Philosophy of politics. It deals with the values and norms of political life. At this level, disputes are taking place between supporters of classical liberalism and libertarianism and the advocates of social liberalism, as well as the solidarity and collectivism. It comes here, among others, for establishing—on the basis of ethical and axiological arguments—a catalog of primary goods, analyzing the links between social justice and economic efficiency, or indicating acceptable state actions in the field of redistribution of goods and provision of public services, especially social insurance. For decades, this has been a dispute over a minimal state versus a welfare state. Polish political philosophers in this field provide studies and interpretations in line with the rules in force in "global" science.

Sociotechnics. Its subjects are measures and methods of political action. Several subdisciplines examine the social engineering of governance and influence in a more or less systematic way—political marketing, research on mass communication, sociology of law, research on the language of politics, public discourse, manipulation techniques, the role of non-violent techniques, etc.

Social policy—the state and the economy. Researchers are interested in the issues of economic and non-economic efficiency of public administration activities. The researchers are interested in the role of the state in the economy. That is why several specific policies are attracting their attention. We are talking here especially about monetary, tax, income, business, and development policies, and in particular about social policy. The researcher of the latter makes extensive use of sociography, reports, and diagnostic tests using the representative method.

International relations. The subject of interest of this subdiscipline are the international conditions of the political life of a given society and the process of development and consolidation of the global system, the process of creation of supranational communities, general civilization, duration and evolution of the human population divided into races, nations, and political communities. They were in respectively mini-systems, agricultural empires, nation-states forming a hierarchical whole. Quantitative methods also appear here, especially to measure the power of states.

Political theory. Political science has already been attempted to be illustrated by the use of neoclassical economics in the form of public choice theory. For example, Duncan Black, one of the representatives of the Rochester School, argued that the use of neoclassical economics tools for collective decision mechanisms would lay the foundations for a pure science of politics. Well, it was supposed to work like never before, it turned out as always—everything is to blame for an "inefficient state," espe-

cially when betting on the winners of the game, which should always be market-based and absolutely competitive. It may surprise some, but Polish political science has a theory of its field. This is the result of systematizing efforts initiated by professor Artur Bodnar. Systematic general knowledge about politics consists of several laws of science. They include, in order—the functions of the state, the role of the economy in the face of the political sphere and the role of the state in the economy, the ideological foundations of power, the social entity of public authority, the autonomy of the professional apparatus of power, and the sources of the dynamics of political life (Klementewicz 2017).The multi-faceted political phenomena discussed above lead to specialized strategies for their description and explanation. But since research tools are targeted at specific areas of the political world, they cannot cover the entire research field. Therefore, they have specific cognitive and heuristic values, but at the same time they must be supplemented with other research perspectives (Ollman 2015). The broad pluralistic panorama of modern political science is created by orientations referring to logical empiricism (behavioral approach), institutional and historical approach referring to Marxism, critical school and structural functionalism as well as approaches referring directly to hermeneutics, phenomenology, psychoanalysis, as well as the to naturalistic rhetoric—biopolitics. There are still battles of moderate scientism with the humanities and interpretationism.

However, there is no doubt that a full explanation of an important phenomenon or social process becomes possible only after including knowledge about a man in the broad system of research. And this narrow specialization makes it impossible. That is why "the more limited the subject of research—more and more often a really limited one—the more worthless books and papers can be produced. Even doubtful whether they increase knowledge. It seems that at best they constitute a set of information—facts and their narrow translations" (Czapnik 2012: 80). In this situation, an important challenge for the contemporary researcher is to overcome the division into disciplines. It is only the integral analysis that is carried out over the nineteenth-century discipline divisions that provides the tools of understanding and criticism. To this end, it should combine "issues, research methods, and strategies specific to such sciences as history, political sciences, economics, sociology, anthropology and oriental studies" (Gdula & Nijakowski 2014: 12). Thomas Piketty writes that "one should act pragmatically, mobilize the methods and approaches of historians, sociologists, and political scientists as well as of economists" [translation] (Piketty 2014: 49). A chance arises then for an integral analysis of social processes. In this analysis, various determinants of phenomena—ecological, economic, political, and cultural-consciousness (ideological) ones can be included in the explanatory procedure. Thanks to the integral approach, social sciences better reflect the syndromic nature of social phenomena, including politics. Historical and institutional analyses develop in contradiction to the concept of an abstract, universal economy of free competition, full of information and effective markets, i.e. the dominant trend of neoclassical and neo-institutional economics. Therefore, paradoxically, it is not the cumulative results of studies on the attitudes and behavior of behavioralists and political psychologists that are the most important—as if it resulted from new criteria for evaluating scientific achievements.

5. HOW TO EVALUATE A HUMANIST: BOTH THE POINTS AND THE EXPERTISE

"Not everything that counts can be counted,
and not everything that can be counted counts." A. Einstein

It is very doubtful whether the correct answer to the needs of knowledge integration necessary to understand the current phase of the development of capitalism is the suggested Anglicization of the humanities. It consists in the fact that the Anglo-Saxon center determines the set of problems to study. The language of analysis provides fashionable approaches, and the patterns of good work, i.e. research methodology, reflect the practices of natural sciences. From this universe comes both the preference for papers in major journals and the emphasis on international research teams. To this must be added a grant system. It was originally created so that the entrepreneurial state could support the industry in innovative technology and products (Mazzucato 2016). The Archives of Natural Sciences are research reports describing new findings, but journal articles tend to be secondary literature in the humanities (Suber 2014; Eve 2014). Others, like talented popularizers such as Richard Dawkins and Jared Diamond, synthesize them for the benefit of a wider audience. Here is the weakest link in the projects of Polish science and higher education system reforms (Kwiek 2016). They remind us of the former fascination with the neoliberal transformation of the economy and the introduction of capital pensions.

Following the exact sciences, the fact that the works of scholars and intellectuals in the field of social sciences retain the character of the individual craftsmanship, with its uniqueness and individual characteristics, is ignored. The social researcher is a small producer because they provide their work in the scheme T => P => T`. However, their work is close to art. It requires "creative passion, imagination and sensitivity, the strength of expression, aesthetic values of communication" (Sztompka 2012: 8).

Gilded but empty papers. Can writing papers for journals instead of monographs help to take a significant position in a linguistically and partially culturally foreign world? Only for members of the Polish society the process of modernizing the country, the emergence of a modern nation, and "own" cultural history extended over centuries are engaging. For other recipients, these are only exciting contributions to universal history. On the other hand, the work of Thomas Piketty *Capital in the 21st Century,* on increasing income disparities between 1% of the richest and the rest of humanity has a universal reach. The negative answer to the above question leads to the practical conclusion that, above all, the access of outstanding Polish monographs to the global market should be supported. In addition, he emphasizes the improvement of research conditions so that "expertise" and additional meaningless work will not close a researcher's household budget But what is the role of social sciences in this "responsible development" in a situation where those disciplines that are responsible for educating critical attitudes and developing political awareness of citizens are marginalized; in a situation where at the same time there is a degradation of diplomas, non-instrumental knowledge, not directly subordinated to the needs of business and a corporate career. The economization of the existence of the workforce owner serves the needs of

business, especially when it covers most areas of their life, with family life, sometimes spare time as well. The ideal here is the entrepreneur, whose dynamism is ensured by egocentrism, greed, and consumerism.

On the other hand, as in every discipline, cognitive values and legitimacy of political science is "a derivative of the factual commitment to update in actual scientific research" (Tuchańska 2012: 278). But, unfortunately, neither cognition nor experience can bring certainty of cognition, since it is machined by our minds, nor empirical data, since they do not clearly determine theoretical choices, and even more the unchanging logical-methodological principles.

The status of a researcher should depend in appropriate proportions on the number of points for internationalization of the academic achievements. This, in turn, should be correlated with their expert assessment of "excellence" and cognitive value. Otherwise, the popular essay by Francis Fukuyama about "the end of history" should be valued higher because of the stunning citation index than the lectures of Michel Foucault contained in the books. But the French philosopher is fortunately the leader of influence in the humanities, and in addition he does not owe it to his papers.

Additionally, other forms of participation in the scientific life of the research community should be assessed—not only papers and monographs, but also reviews, polemics, participation in important debates or conferences. Just like it happens in promotion processes. The ideal would be a "compromise balance" between international and national, theoretical and empirical, research and application achievements.

Qualitative assessment should include—the originality of the researcher in the field of systematization of general knowledge, creating new research problems, overcoming the methodological difficulties of the discipline or practical values in the form of expertise, diagnoses, and forecasts regarding the solution of development barriers to the country. And so:

> does their work facilitate the integration of knowledge accumulated by various disciplines and subdisciplines of the humanities, in order to comprehensively explain and understand politics, as well as game and fight in the public sphere? Social phenomena are weaves of various factors and conditions, ranging from ecological, demographic, and economic to political or cultural ones;
>
> do they indicate how to combine various procedures in the research process to show how the selection of a specific alternative for the unit's operation depended on the subject's knowledge of these conditions and professed value systems? It is a fact that structures (natural, economic, institutions, organizational forms, legal regimes, dominant ideas, and ideologies) do not determine human actions, they only limit or facilitate them; they contain the "burden of history; "How does the researcher solve the problem of holism in their own work, and thus distinguishing the social whole, of which the studied phenomenon is part; is he / she able to move from the level of the local community to regional, national and even for some processes to the whole ecumene?
>
> Does the researcher have any idea how to capture historical dynamics, the weave

of continuity / change in spiritual culture, institutional order, national strategy? Qualitatively new forms of social life are emerging in the history of human societies. They change the current determinants of social processes. This fact means that the laws of social sciences, together with the terms used in them, must take into account the developmental aspect of the social world. Their generality consists in taking into account structural differences occurring between all previous types of social phenomena (generality in the historical sense, not in another sense);

Does the practical knowledge provided by the researcher inspire the activities of, e.g. social associations to thus contribute to improving the quality of life of the general public? Contrary to the apparent impression of secondary nature and lack of originality (Warczok & Zarycki 2016), Polish political scientists are developing new and proprietary strategies to solve the indicated research difficulties. Only this achievement must be known first, and then one can proceed to its evaluation, subject to criteria appropriate for the humanities. In particular, reaching the modern "heart of darkness," which is the power of corporations in the global system, requires taking into account three levels of analysis of the social system and at the same time a "three-level model of analysis of the basis of power." The first step is the reconstruction of the explicit level, the second hidden, and the third is the extraction of the deeply hidden, even latent level (Kaczmarek 2003: 136; Ilkowski 2017). At the first level, we have a constitutional order with the ideology of liberal democracy that legitimizes it. Civil society is "marching to its defense." At the second level, there are sources of power, i.e. some historical aspects of classes and social states that find in a given social order the fulfillment of their basic material interests and the concept of a good life. At this level, the oligarchy, the money, and property elite occupy various interchangeable positions in the social system—corporate and bank presidencies, positions in the administration. The deeply hidden dimension, which the author calls in Hegelian premises, is turbocapitalism—the ruthless exploitation of work, nature, and human life for the capital accumulation, ultimately huge excess liquidity that needs to be utilized and recycled in the global system. The system creates functional contradictions that result in various conflicts and antagonisms—inter-class, international, between the economy, and the natural environment. Moreover, in general, they determine the developmental drift in which capitalism without borders is found. In this way, the theoretical foundations of critical political science are codified. The codification is a Polish contribution to universal political science, and it also uses the Polish achievements of socioeconomic structuralism (Tittenbrun 2011). The achievements of Polish political scientists in the field of political theory include the development of the integral explanation procedure (Karwat 2018; Pierzchalski 2016). It solves the structure-action dilemma to facilitate understanding of politics. Its logical foundations were developed by Leszek Nowak (1980), Jerzy Kmita (1973) and Jerzy Topolski (1990), and so it has a native origin. This procedure combines causal, genetic, functional (to reconstruct the conditions of

action) with a humanistic interpretation of the action taken. By referring to the knowledge that the acting subject had about the conditions in which they found himself, as well as on the basis of the professed system of values—it becomes possible to understand why they chose this alternative and not another.

FUNDING: This research received no external funding.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: The author declares no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Czapnik, Sławomir. 2012. „Czterej jeźdźcy apokalipsy polskiej nauki: utowarowienie, technokratyzacja, alienacja, konformizm." Pp. 73-96 in *Wiedza, ideologia, władza. O społecznej funkcji uniwersytetu w społeczeństwie rynkowym*, edited by P. Żuk. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

Deaton, Angus. 2016. *Wielka ucieczka. Zdrowie, bogactwo i źródła nierówności*. Warsaw: PWN.

Finer, Samuel E. 1997. *The History of Government from the Earliest Times*, 3 volumes. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Hartman, Jan. 2016. "Skąd się biorą wielcy ludzie?" *Polityka* 38: n.p. Retrieved September 10, 2020 (https://www.polityka.pl/tygodnikpolityka/kraj/1675490,1,skad-sie-biora-wielcy-ludzie.read).

Hartman, Jan. 2017. *Polityka. Władza i nadzieja*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Agora SA.

Gdula, Maciej & Lech Nijakowski. 2014. „Wprowadzenie." Pp. 5-20 in *Oprogramowanie rzeczywistości społecznej*, edited by M. Gdula & L. Nijakowski. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej.

Ilkowski, Filip. 2017. *Capitalist Imperialism in Contemporary Theoretical Frameworks*. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Warszawa, Wien: Peter Lang GmbH.

Ingham, Geoffrey. 2011. *Kapitalizm*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sic!

Kaczmarek, Bohdan. 2003. „Polityka–problem władzy czy problem własności. Własność jako przesłanka władzy." Pp. 127-152 in *Metafory polityki*, Vol. 2, edited by B. Kaczmarek. Warsaw: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa.

Karwat, Mirosław. 2018. „O niezbędnym dopełnieniu optyki kratycznej w naukach o polityce." Pp. 61-98 in *Nauki o polityce 2.0. Kontrowersje i konfrontacje*, edited by S. Sulowski. Warsaw: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa.Klementewicz, Tadeusz. 2017. *Understanding Politics. Theory, Procedures, Narratives*. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Warszawa, Wien: Peter Lang GmbH.

Klementewicz, Tadeusz. 2019. *Kapitalizm na rozdrożu. Obłęd zysku czy odpowiedzialny rozwój*. Warsaw: Instytut Wydawniczy Książka i Prasa.

Kmita, Jerzy. 1973. "The Methodology of Sciences as a Humanist Discipline." *Dialectics and Humanism* 1(1): 179-189.

Kmita, Jerzy. 1980. *Z problemów epistemologii historycznej*. Warsaw: PWN.

Kozyr-Kowalski, Stanisław. 2005. *Uniwersytet a rynek*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo UAM
Kwiek, Marek et al. 2016. *Projekt założeń do ustawy „Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym”*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo UAM.
Lorenzi, Jean-Herve & Mickael Berrebi. 2019. *Przyszłość naszej wolności. Czy należy rozmontować google`a i kilku innych?* Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
Nowak, Leszek. 1980. *The Structure of Idealization. Towards a Systematic Interpretation of the Marxian Idea of Science*. Dortrecht, Boston, London: Reidel.
Mazzucato, Mariana. 2016. *Przedsiębiorcze państwo. Obalić mit o relacji sektora publicznego i prywatnego*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne Heterodox.
Mencwel, Andrzej. 2019. *Przedwiośnie czy potop? Nowe krytyki postaw polskich.* Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej.
Morawski, Witold. 2001. *Socjologia ekonomiczna*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
Ollman, Bertell. 2015. “What is Political Science? What Should it Be?” *International Critical Thought* 5(3): 362-367. https://doi.org/10.1080/21598282.2015.1065379
Piketty, Thomas. 2015. *Kapitał w XXI wieku.* Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej.
Pierzchalski, Filip. 2017. *Political Leadership in Morphogenetic Perspective*. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Warszawa, Wien: Peter Lang GmbH.
Rodrik, Dani. 2019. *Rządy ekonomii*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
Smil, Vaclav. 2016. *Tworzenie bogatego świata. Perspektywy w ekonomii, przemyśle, środowisku*. Warsaw: PWN.
Suber, Peter. 2014. “Praface.” Pp. ix-xi in *Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts, Controversies and the Future,* edited by M. P. Eve. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sztompka, Piotr. 2012. „Dziesięć tez o socjologii.” *Nauka* 4: 7-15.
Szymański, Władysław. 2011. *Niepewność i niestabilność gospodarcza. Gwałtowny wzrost i co dalej?* Warsaw: Difin.
Theil, Stefan. 2012. „Jak to robią Niemcy?” *Scientific American,* Świat *Nauki* 11: n.p.
Theroux, Paul. 2017. *Głębokie Południe. Cztery pory roku na głuchej prowincji.* Wołowiec: Wydawnictwo Czarne.
Tilman, Rick. 1974. ““Apology and Ambiguity: Adolf Berle on Corporate Power.”” *Journal of Economic Issues* 8(1): 111-126. https://doi.org/10.1080/00213624.1974.11503165
Tittenbrun, Jacek. 2011. *Economy in Society: Economic sociology revisited*. Newcastle upon Tyre: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Topolski, Jerzy. 1990. “Historical explanation in historical materialism.” Pp. 61-84 in *Narration and Explanation. Contributions to the methodology of the Historical Research*, edited by J. Topolski. Amsterdam, Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
Tuchańska, Barbara. 2012. *Dlaczego prawda? Prawda jako wartość w sztuce, nauce i codzienności.* Warsaw: Poltext.
Warczok, Tomasz & Tomasz Zarycki. 2016. *Gra peryferyjna. Polska politologia w globalnym polu nauk społecznych*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
Wilkin, Jerzy. 2005. *Teoria wyboru publicznego. Wstęp do ekonomicznej analizy polityki i*

funkcjonowania sfery publicznej. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.
Williams, William A. 2009. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. New York, London: W.W. Norton.
Zalewski, Tomasz. 2019. „Drabina z powyłamywanymi szczeblami." *Polityka* 3.04-9.04.2019.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Tadeusz Klementewicz is professor of political science at the Faculty of Political Science and International Studies, University of Warsaw, Poland.

ARTICLE HISTORY: Received 2020-08-22 / Accepted 2020-10-25