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Collaborative Networks.
A possibility to mobilize knowledge from solidarity
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The scriptural exercise that goes through serial publication, in this case, academic-scientific journals, has become a muscle of cognitive capitalism for the generation of wealth, both in indicators for universities and higher education institutions as well as for columnists which, besides, can increase their individual assets. It does not only go through the reading of academics, of course, “the chrematistic logics of the contemporary capitalist system display multiple challenges and contradictions to think about society, knowledge and life” (Arias, 2017, p.305). This, far from being an isolated and in concurrent practice, is today the most common and natural thing in the daily life of researchers, knowledge production centers, and areas of academic-scientific research in the world.

It is not an individual perversion or a collectivized schizophrenia, it is, rather, a science, technology and innovation policy that undermines the possibilities of generating knowledge and co-construction of meanings and public utilities of such, from the necessary times and contexts, since what is written, in most cases, is accelerated by compliance with the indicator and not by the social relevance it has for the human communities which it works with.

This nonsense will continue to occur in our academic realities, present in hallway conversations at universities, and generating debate in networks or research groups and editorials that suffer from the pettiness of politics. Meanwhile, those of us
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who attend the edition of scientific journals understand and suffer from the “high impact” logic publication, which is not necessarily so1, but which has a citation indicator (H Factor) that allows it to be and be in the high spheres of academic publications, today known as JCR and SJR.

And it will not be precisely this publishing house that will change that panorama, not pretending to be so -in addition-, but if it wanted to echo it to propose alternatives that question us and put us in a position of contradictions that help to generate awareness; it is the possibility of consciousness that motivates, moves, and generates change. If we are not aware, we cannot decolonize our ways of thinking, of seeing the world, of living. And it is this emergency that puts in tension the meaning of our academic and scriptural work, that is, what do we research and write for, who does this effort serve? What changes in the world with our theoretical, practical, or conceptual advance?

Working alone is complex, it is time-consuming to generate investigative actions with scarce resources or without experience, in little-recognized institutions or research centers, but also with the pressure to publish the result of this process with “high impact”. This is not an assumption, it is a latent reality, day by day, in most researchers or those who want to be. We can then review matters that allow us to ease academic and personal burdens and that contribute to broadening horizons, to become aware or, at least, to converse with others; the load may be lightened.

In this sense, I propose the conversation (Quijano, 2016) as a transversal axis to recover senses of togetherness that allow us to weave solidarity networks of cooperation for academic and research exercise from our margins and with those who really need it. The fact of coming together to tell our experiences and experiences from the academy, but also from the pre-occupied daily life of writing, opens up paths from our know-how (Aktouf, 2016) to contribute a little more to the solution of specific problems that make visible the public utility of what we do and write.

Aiming to work more collectively, with new initiatives that undertake a difficult path from research and publication, can contribute a little more to understand the different contexts on which we work every day, but which we hardly read appropriately, since we do it from the outside, from disturbing rationality, observing from the sidelines, far from generating complicity with the territories, with the people and with their needs; we do not read about the problems, because we do not know them, we do not listen to anyone, but we do write editorially correct articles that talk about solutions that do not exist in reality.

1 The editorial quality criteria can be varied, such as the evaluation of blind peers, editorial management, among others.
I am sinning, surely, for the excessive criticism of scriptural and research practices, since, surely, there are many of them that are ethically and politically correct with the communities and their contexts, but this desire to publish by publishing scientific articles -a bet also institutional- leaves us breathless to see that there are experiences worthy of being replicated. Therefore, the invitation in this editorial - more like a requiem - is for us to come together, I insist, in conversation and in action to transform close and simple realities, but that requires committed people to think and re-think the society in which they live.

This bet, I hope can reach the written text; a narrative of close experiences that show us networking alternatives to occupy ourselves and not worry about the overwhelming search for H.
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