

EDITORIAL

Translated version

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020180401>

MARIA JOSÉ TONELLI
Editor-in-Chief



FELIPE ZAMBALDI
Assistant Editor

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

During these dystopian times in which we are living, it is worth remembering the questions proposed by Rousseau in the eighteenth century: Will science destroy our habits? Will it maintain our virtues? Has science been useful in reducing inequalities? Santos (2008) affirms that we have reached a moment of rupture in the scientific order which asserted its hegemonic rule over scientific development in the last centuries. He believes that the twenty-first century will not distinguish between the natural and human sciences, and that the social sciences will free themselves from positivism, since this is, in effect, “also a totalitarian model” (Santos, 2008, p.11). In this model, the author continues, “to know means to quantify” (Santos, 2008, p.15), but this implies a reduction in complexity, in a mechanistic determinism that does not contemplate the contemporary view that “all natural scientific knowledge is social scientific knowledge” (Santos, 2008, p. 37). In fact, it is impossible to ignore Berger and Luckmann (1974) in their classic text *The Social Construction of Reality*, or Bourdieu (2002), who informs us that science is a social field in dispute like any other, a place of competitive battles between men. We must consider here that Bourdieu’s text precedes the intense feminist debate of the last decades and that we should include women in the power struggles of the various scientific fields. However, this is another conversation. Santos (2008) may dream that the sciences will one day be more social, but what we continue to see today is reason held captive within supposedly scientific principles, and that our cherished scientific rationality may not be so innocent (Rouanet, 1985). As Habermas (1987) argues, technology and science have been transformed into ideologies. However, none of this should discourage us, since this condition only replicates the dogmatic forces that have been present throughout the history of humanity. Rousseau’s questions are still relevant, and perhaps another question to bear in mind is: What science do we perform and for which society?

Following the pluralist approach of the *RAE*, this edition has articles from different areas of study (Marketing, Finance, People Management, Organizational Studies, Entrepreneurship, Operations and Logistics), in addition to the Perspective section, in which Sandro Cabral and Marcelo de Souza Bispo discuss the theme “Challenges in reviewing scientific articles on Administration in Brazil”. Two book reviews conclude this edition, which focus on Martin Lindstrom’s *Buyology: Truth and Lies About Why We Buy*, written by Lucas Rodrigo Santos de Almeida, and *The End of Accounting and the Path Forward for Investors and Managers*, by Baruch Lev and Feng Gu, written by Joyce Mariella Medeiros Cavalcanti, Hudson Fernandes Amaral and Laise Ferraz Correia, in addition to the book recommendations of “Gestão da ciência, tecnologia e inovação” by Bruno Brandão Fischer and “Relação universidade-empresa” by Renato Garcia and Wilson Suzigan.

Happy reading!

Maria José Tonelli¹ | ORCID: 0000-0002-6585-1493

Felipe Zambaldi¹ | ORCID: 0000-0002-5378-6444

¹ Getulio Vargas Foundation,

São Paulo School of Business Administration

São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

REFERENCES

- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1974). *A construção social da realidade*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- Bourdieu, P. (2002). *Campo de poder, campo intelectual: Itinerário de um conceito*. Editorial Montessoro. (Colección Jungla Simbólica.)
- Habermas, J. (1987). *Técnica e ciência como ideologia*. Lisboa, Portugal: Edições 70.
- Rouanet, S. O. (1985). *A razão cativa*. São Paulo, SP: Brasiliense.
- Santos, B. S. (2008). *Um discurso sobre as ciências* (5a ed.). São Paulo, SP: Cortez.