

The art of giving birth to a graduate program in history: on the 20th anniversary of the Graduate Program in the History of the Sciences and Health: interview with Margarida de Souza Neves

An interview with:

**Margarida de Souza
Nevesⁱ**

ⁱ Professor emeritus, Núcleo de Memória/Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro. Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil
orcid.org/0000-0003-2994-5940
msneves@puc-rio.br

Granted to:

Kaori Kodamaⁱⁱ

ⁱⁱ Professor and researcher, Graduate Program in the History of Science and Health (PPGHCS), Casa de Oswaldo Cruz (COC)/Fiocruz. Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil
orcid.org/0000-0002-5327-2689
kaori.kodama@fiocruz.br

**Maria Rachel Fróes da
Fonsecaⁱⁱⁱ**

ⁱⁱⁱ Professor and researcher, PPGHCS, COC/Fiocruz. Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil
orcid.org/0000-0003-0865-2436
rachel.froes@fiocruz.br

Gilberto Hochman^{iv}

^{iv} Professor and researcher, PPGHCS, COC/Fiocruz. Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil
orcid.org/0000-0001-7834-336X
gilberto.hochman@fiocruz.br

Luiz Otávio Ferreira^v

^v Professor and researcher, PPGHCS, COC/Fiocruz. Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil
orcid.org/0000-0002-7512-7343
luiz.ferreira@fiocruz.br

Translated by Tracy Miyake.

Received on 11 Feb. 2022.

Approved on 25 Apr. 2022.

KODAMA, Kaori et al. The art of giving birth to a graduate program in history: on the 20th anniversary of the Graduate Program in the History of the Sciences and Health: interview with Margarida de Souza Neves. *História, Ciências, Saúde – Manguinhos*, Rio de Janeiro, v.29, n.4, out.-dez. 2022. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0104-59702022000400009>.

Abstract

This interview explores the participation of Margarida de Souza Neves, professor emeritus at Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, in the creation of the Graduate Program in the History of the Sciences and Health at Casa de Oswaldo Cruz. To celebrate the twentieth anniversary of this graduate program, professors who have served as coordinators met with Professor Neves to reflect on the meanings of shaping a program in the area of history specializing in research on science and health in Brazil.

Keywords: graduate program in history; history of science and health; memory; Margarida de Souza Neves (1945-).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0104-59702022000400009>



During the afternoon of October 26, 2021, Casa de Oswaldo Cruz (COC) researchers Maria Rachel Fróes da Fonseca, Luiz Otávio Ferreira, Gilberto Hochman, Kaori Kodama, and the filmmaker Cristiana Grumbach met virtually with Margarida de Souza Neves, professor emeritus at Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio). This interview was conducted to mark twenty years since the creation of the Graduate Program in the History of the Sciences and Health (Programa de Pós-graduação em História das Ciências e da Saúde, PPGHCS) at COC, to which Professor Neves made enormous contributions and suggestions and helped shape the proposal for a new course with the Brazilian Coordination for Development of Higher Education Personnel (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior); she also led the first class at PPGHCS on September 14, 2001, soon after the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York. But this interview also was a reunion with professors that include some former students, providing a chance for a virtual meetup in a warm conversation during this long hiatus of the pandemic. On the table alongside Professor Neves were flowers and a plaque honoring her part in the twentieth anniversary of the course. Margarida (or Guida, as she prefers to be called by students and friends) has a long and acclaimed track record as a professor. She received her undergraduate degree from PUC-Rio and a doctorate from the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. She has taught at various universities in Brazil and abroad including the Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF) from 1976 to 1999, the Université Catholique de Louvain in Belgium, the University of Illinois, the Universidade Estadual de Campinas, as well as PUC-Rio, where today she coordinates the Memory Center. On the central topics of memory, culture, and literature (which have marked her teaching career as well as her own research), Guida spoke with former coordinators of the PPGHCS program about its creation and the reality of graduate studies over time, reflecting on the past and the future.



Maria Rachel: Margarida, you played a significant role as a consultant and interlocutor at a very special time during the creation of the PPGHCS, in 2001, reflecting with us in a very important manner about the main objectives, the curriculum structure, and the topics of this program. At that time, what was represented by the plan for a program that focused on combining historical and social studies on science with public health, and how should we consider the creation of a course on the history of science and health in the area of history?

That is a lovely question, but before I respond I'd like to express my thanks, not just for these 20 years of partnership and closeness, but especially for the sweet gesture of sending me these flowers and this plaque today. In fact, I was nothing more than the midwife for the program. There is a beautiful text by Henri Lefebvre (1962) that discusses maieutics, the art and science of bringing about new ideas, but really the program came from you. My participation came about in a very specific way. At the time I was at the National Forum

for Deans of Research and Graduate Studies (Forum Nacional de Pró-reitores de Pesquisa e Pós-graduação, FOPROP), where I was on the board,¹ and we decided that we would provide assistance (without compensation) to university programs with a research profile. And one of these programs that I provided assistance to was yours. The program was beyond mature. But, Maria Rachel, I think your question offers an opening to something beyond simply thinking about the meaning of this program, which was not just launching a line for academic and graduate production recognized at home and abroad, in the history of science and health. It is very important to remember what this meant within Fiocruz itself. Fiocruz has always been known (and this year we are seeing this very specifically) for extraordinary competence, for demanding quality in all fields, for promoting science, and for producing science and scientists – I think this is part of the identity of Fiocruz. And the Graduate Program in the History of the Sciences and Health launched a line [of research] that combined this rigor in health science with rigor in social science. This at certain times may have been more difficult than it should have been, which certainly explains why the program was so mature even from the outset. I can say with certainty that it was this program I know that began its work with an undeniable academic and scientific maturity. I think this is the fundamental meaning: consistency with the institution, response to the need for a dialog between the social sciences and health sciences, biology, and public health. And also rigor in serving the public: it is a right of citizenship to learn about and better explore the memory of what has established itself as one of the pillars of social life. I think the program does an excellent job at this.

Luiz Otávio: Margarida, another important moment as you “practiced the art of midwifery” was your participation in the opening class. You taught this opening class, and by one of these coincidences of history it took place on September 14, 2001, just three days after the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York, and in the class (entitled “History and memory of the sciences and health”) you highlighted the roles of science and techniques in the history of humanity. I think that, in another coincidence, here we are twenty years later, at a time when science and techniques again are important elements, as you just said, not just for the organization of society but also at this time when social life itself has been thrown into jeopardy. So we would like to remember and perhaps resume the discussion from 14 years ago... no, more than that, twenty years ago! I lost count.

I very much remember starting to talk that day, in the first opening class of the program, with a lot of emotion, so much emotion to see the program begin its projects, many emotions as I met many former students and all the friends I have at that institution. But there was also enormous turmoil from what had happened three days earlier. I remember that a lot, I remember starting to talk about that. It was impossible to say what I wanted to without taking into account all that we were experiencing – that gaping wound in the heart of the most powerful country, those horrible scenes of bodies falling out of windows. I remember being very emotional when I started to talk to you, and I don't remember a single thing I said! Memory, as we know, is made of what we remember and also what we forget. It is part of both. Forgetting is not the opposite of memory, forgetting is part of memory. What stayed with

me from that day was the emotion, the various emotions that I was feeling and that we all felt. I remember Nísia [Trindade Lima] hugging me tightly and not saying anything, because she didn't have to. But I don't remember what I said about memory, history, and health, I don't remember any of that. Now, I think that emotion is connected to the indignation that we Brazilians are experiencing today, also with this feeling of powerlessness, this terrible sensation that we are all powerless or that we can't find a path toward any effective action that can reverse this regretful state that all of us in Brazil are experiencing today, and it has a lot to do not only with this constantly incomplete citizenship found in Brazilian society but also with the difficulty we have as academics and scientists in dialog with the public at large. And I think that if any institution was able to get through this barrier of science and oppression during 2020-2021 it was Fiocruz. Certainly, there were others too, but I think Fiocruz's role was not just scientifically relevant, opportune, and necessary, but in its institutional discourse and in the statements by its scientists, in its silences, it was extremely important for me and for everyone. In many situations, what Fiocruz said institutionally and what its scientists said, what Fiocruz did and does, all help us believe there is hope in the future. I think this is very beautiful, and it is important to say this and underscore this right now as the graduate program is completing twenty years. I also think it is important to note this in the memory of the institution, in the memory of science in this country. And it is important to have the courage to say that we are currently at a moment when there are malevolent forces discrediting science and scientists, and it is essential that an institution of Fiocruz's stature give us the dogged hope that one day we will be able to give our children and our grandchildren a better country, and ourselves the certainty that we somehow contributed to this. Fiocruz clearly had an unequalled role at this time, and I thank each of you and the institution as a whole.

Gilberto: Margarida, I'd like to note that I wasn't able to watch you in that opening class. I was actually in Washington and was going to come back to Brazil for it, but I got stuck there when US airspace was closed and I was unable to leave. So I was unable to participate, but I remember my colleagues telling me about it, and this history is also important and is part of our shared trajectory to a certain extent. Thinking about your professional path, you might be one of the historian-professors who has shaped the most people, not only as an advisor, but also as a reader on theses/dissertations defense committees, it is an extraordinary number. What are your reflections on the craft of the historian over these twenty years, what has changed? And how was the history of science and health incorporated into this craft and this process?

First, I think that over these twenty years we have learned to coexist better with fundamental differences in focus and in theoretical and methodological positions, and with approaches to historical knowledge. And we learned to do this better, and in some ways we have lost what Peter Novick (1988) called the noble positivist dream of anchoring the truth in history into some positive ground. I think that over these last twenty years we have learned that unshakable faith in the truth in history that lies in documentation, and in empirical evidence, is in a healthy equilibrium. The empirical evidence is essential. But documents do not speak for themselves, and with documentation it is possible to construct readings

that are not only different but, at times, divergent. So faith in the empirical evidence as the positive ground of history has been somewhat shaken. Similarly, we can say that faith in the method as the solid ground of truth in history has also been shaken to some extent, even by the multiplicity of methodological possibilities used today by historians. And we don't say faith in theory as an anchor of truth in history, that is, we learned that there is no positive truth in history, that truth in history is always a construction *in fieri*, which is always constructing itself, and that history itself is also "historicizable." This, I think, is the great discovery and today is unanimous. Today nobody has to justify this, but for our students, discovering that history also has history is a great discovery.

The history we write, the history we research, the history we teach, that itself is history, and can be the subject of historical investigation. To me, this is the great historical movement of historians over the last twenty years. On the other hand, I believe that specifically from the viewpoint of the history of science and health, one thing that is very interesting (and your work is incontrovertible evidence of this) is that production in the history of science and health is no longer seen as what used to be called special history, a cubbyhole that was completely different from any other kind of history, based on the concept that the history of science, of art, of institutions, and diplomacy are encapsulated histories. You have all contributed a lot, and when I say "you" I mean the [graduate] program that made significant contributions to understanding the history of science and the history of health and diseases as none other than distinct windows to dive deeper into a single, shared history that is the history of culture, of society, which can be entered by different paths but always arrives at the same territory of social relations, of the history of these relationships and of the protagonists of this history of social relationships and society, or, if we prefer, of culture in its broader sense. I don't know if you agree, but I think this is very important.

Maria Rachel: That last bit of what you said makes a very interesting connection with other moments when you were very close to us. Besides this entire process of creating the program, you were very close to our work over these past twenty years, on our path as teachers and researchers at the Casa de Oswaldo Cruz. We recall your various reflections on practicing science, about science and about progress, about peaceful arenas, for example in your work entitled As vitrines do progresso [The showcases of progress] (Neves, 1986), and also very much present in the curatorship of the "Images of progress: scientific instruments and large expositions" exhibition held at the Museum of Astronomy and Related Sciences in 2001 (Mast, 2001). This proximity occurred in the field of the history of medicine, and here we remember your work and research on epilepsy and its diagnostics, with the Hospital Nacional de Alienados as a space, which in fact was the topic of an article published in our journal, História, Ciências, Saúde – Manguinhos (Neves, 2010). Speaking of the journal, it is also worth noting that you played a very important role, with a significant presence throughout these years as an assistant editor. So I'd like you to comment about your proximity to us, and especially about historical research work on these topics.

I'll start at the end. Everyone is very surprised when they find out that my last study, financed by the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development

and the Rio de Janeiro Research Support Foundation, was on Brazilian medical thinking around epilepsy. It has nothing to do with what I did throughout my life, when I worked on other topics, as you recalled, international expositions, the intellectuals considered the modern discoverers of Brazil, or even on the National Guard (Falcon et al., 1981), anyhow, on other research subjects. But I had never worked with medical thinking, and I will tell you why I decided to do that. I was fully aware that I was at the close of my academic career, such that it was for over fifty years. I was going to retire as a professor, and give up research projects, to the great surprise of everyone, but the time came when I said to myself: “Now other people deserve to get a research grant, there should be other researchers who have the same opportunities that I’ve had.” I had had enough of writing reports, and I wanted to stop, but more than anything I needed to make way for the new generation.

Thinking about how to conclude my career as a researcher (although later I discovered that we never stop, ever), I wanted to do something completely different than everything else I had done and where I felt like a novice, something where I knew I had neither the tools nor the familiarity to navigate within the topic and face new problems. In fact I wanted to understand, in working with these scientists from the mid-nineteenth century to 1918 (when the neural network was discovered), how these scientists who wrote dissertations and articles, published books, and were the luminaries of hard science in Brazil let the prejudice that surrounded epilepsy penetrate their scientific practice. How was it possible? These scientists, and even their predecessors going back to antiquity, knew the manifestations of epilepsy, which are unmistakable. Epilepsy was actually the first disease to be described in the history of medicine, back in the time of the Greeks. It’s unmistakable. But while the manifestations were evident, no one had the slightest idea of the etiology of this disease that caused seizures, since this would only be possible after the discovery of the neural network and how neurons functioned. Before that, nobody knew anything beyond the unequivocal manifestations of the syndrome. This did not stop these men from writing, presumptively, and drafting theses, advising theses. In fact, in the science practiced by these physicians from the middle of the nineteenth century through the first decades of the twentieth, science and prejudice (as I called it in my research) were not completely distinct or opposed. Science and prejudice were interwoven. Just read a thesis on epilepsy, the first, which was by Pinheiro Guimarães (1859), in the 1850s, and you would think to yourselves, how can someone write such nonsense about what causes seizures? In the theses I read, the causes of seizures could be, for example, eating asparagus, or drinking something very hot or very cold, playing sports, laughing a lot, dancing, having sex, because in fact, anything that was a source of pleasure seemed to these doctors to cause a seizure.

I was enthralled to see how science and prejudice permeated each other, not just to better understand that era, but to better understand our own era and the science we practice. The science we practice is not immune from the prejudices of our own time, our society, our social group, our personal prejudices. Working on this relationship between science and prejudice at that time made me think critically about the science I practice. And this was a good farewell to the academic world. This conscience that we are historical beings made from the same fragile clay as all of our peers, and that the science we practice is not placed outside of our time or our society. It carries within it everything our age has in terms

of potential, beauty, fairness, but also all the limitations of our time, the prejudices, the inability to see the other and to value difference. That is on the one hand. On the other, I will repeat what I said in my earlier response. I see how, when working on any topic, it is possible to trace the very work we are doing, as if we were to put up vines and swing on these vines from someone else's tree like Tarzan in order to better see our own tree. Every time I went to Fiocruz, I learned a lot about what you do, but also about what I do. I remember one time I went to give a lecture about Santos Dumont. It was a commemoration, and I went to speak about the belief in progress and how Santos Dumont did or did not represent the dream of progress associated with order. I went to talk about this, and the questions and interaction were very good. I don't remember what I said, but I remember what you asked, because the exchanges between specialists and specialties is a very rich path toward deepening what each person does and opening one's eyes to what one isn't doing, what one doesn't know how to do. And this is very good.

Kaori: Margarida, you not only oversaw my training but also many of my colleagues, who also graduated [from other institutions]. The "Guida" we all know had a huge influence on this training, which was even diffused because we all incorporated the things we learned with you to such a great extent. I speak for myself, but I also speak for all of us. I'm thinking of my own trajectory from UFF, latter from PUC, and meeting you again on various occasions as a professional. It is very moving to know you are still here with us and with the inspiration you always bring. Guida, I think we are facing many challenges right now. It's been twenty years and there have been great successes: many advances, from rapid growth, with major effort, let's be clear, but rapid, and I can say that from my first contacts I have followed the academic production of the program as a reference. Back to the present day, I would like to hear a bit about how you see our production, our extremely varied production. I think that today, as you said, the history of science and health is not a cubbyhole or even a large bin, we can say that it is an area that dialogs with many different specialties within the domain of history. But we are, right now, at a very tense time in relation to future prospects for our profession in terms of the funding crisis, while we simultaneously have an unbelievable wealth, which is our extremely diverse student body, and I think PUC has also opened itself up to this. So I would like you to comment a bit on these challenges and on what we can do to keep on moving, and keep on moving together.

Kaori, I would be lying if I said I knew how to keep on moving, in what direction, with what compass, with what map: I don't know. In any case, I think I do know, if I look back on my life as a professor and researcher. I should say, if I look at you, if I look at Maria Rachel, if I look at Nísia, if I look at so many colleagues from your program that at some time or another were my students or were from a panel or who I advised, and so on. I remember, Kaori, that you were my undergraduate student in a Brazil III course, and that you gave an unforgettable seminar on Euclides da Cunha, about *Os sertões*, you may have forgotten this, but I didn't, these tiny scraps of memory – Kaori the undergraduate student, Kaori the graduate student, Kaori in her life, with the most beautiful wedding I've ever been to, Kaori at Fiocruz, Kaori the respected researcher. When I see this, and I can say the same for everyone who is here, this shows me that life surprises us, it shows me that life is stronger than the limitations of

the narrow moment we are living in. And when I see the students I have today as early-career scientific scholars in a research group about memory at PUC-Rio, I see some bright lights in this time of darkness. First, these are students, as you said, represent a very significant change in the student body at PUC. They are students from very different social strata, who represent very different social groups, they are Black students, poor students, students from very poor communities who come from very far away, who come from public schools, who have major financial difficulties, students who cannot study remotely because they don't have the equipment, teachers and students who proposed a plan so that these students could have computers and data chips [for internet access]. So I think that this first light I see, these students and my fellow professors, they show me this desire of ours to be social scientists, this desire that shaped all of us because we want to answer the question that the poet Affonso Romano de Sant'Anna asked: "What kind of country is this?" And we want to answer this question in a way that is not cold and exact. We want to answer this question perhaps with other questions. At this moment, any positive response would be an enormous risk. We are not seeing horizons, let's be honest, we can't see them. Every day we wake up and are bombarded with unbelievable statements, with scandalous attitudes, with tragic realities, and we think: how do we get out of this? How do we get out of this? I think that social scientists have a hard time saying "this in the way out," proposing some incontestable solution, but they can help us think and make thinking a form of resistance. We can help ourselves by knowing that looking for a way out is already the way, and not abandoning the search together with future generations is also a way, the learning of our students is the best way for us, scientists. The knowledge that we are teachers because we want to learn from our students is a way, and little by little we discover beauty in this inhospitable scenario, discovering possibilities for joy where we only see sadness, discovering the strength to live in this morbid scenario, where we cannot stop denouncing what is wrong, but we also cannot let it imprison us. We do not have the right to be held hostage by this evil that attacks us. With the weapons we have, with words, with writing, with resistance, with the exercise of citizenship on the smallest and large scales, we will continue to find a way; in the words of the poet Antonio Machado: "There is no way; the way is made by walking." Let's go, because there are many people with us, many people with us, let's believe it, and believe is an appropriate verb because we don't see, we believe, and those who are coming after us will make a better world, a better country because we did what we could, for better or for worse, we did what we could, let's have faith in the future.

Maria Rachel: I think this interview has been more than a personal statement, it's been a conversation between people who were very close throughout their lives, and this is what is most evident in what Guida is telling us today. And along these lines I want to go back to what we wrote on the card that we sent you with the flowers. Your presence in the symbolic cartography of our identities, of our memory, not only of the institutional program itself but our individual identities, left a very strong mark. I think that much of what you have said today reinforces how this cartography was constructed over these twenty years. I'd like to thank you in the name of everyone here, expressed through the recording of this session, with the flowers and the plaque, to embody what we've said. I'd like to ask for a round of applause for you. Thank you very much.

For all of us, for all of us. You know that a statement of thanks says a lot about who is offering the thanks. So these flowers, this plaque, this meeting, this conversation, this alignment, this life story, since the program's been around for twenty years – Maria Rachel was my student from back when, I can't even tell you... So, they are lives, they are lives lived generously, and I thank you so much. I very much want to be what you see in me, I'm trying, but I still can't. I would really like to be the way you see me. You are very generous, we see the world with our eyes, and your eyes are very generous and very capable of making a better, more beautiful world. Thank you so much.

Everyone: Thank you.

Cristiana: Could I ask her a question before we finish? Guida, the other day I was filming with Nara Azevedo about the move from the COC archive to the Center for Documentation and History in Health (Centro de Documentação e História da Saúde), which is the building that currently houses graduate studies. Nara was saying that 35 years ago, this field of history, of the history of science and health, was still being created. And she said something I thought was very beautiful: "We were being shaped while the field, the field of research, was being shaped." I'm saying this and I'm an outsider, right? But observing, I think that graduate study is a continuation of this process of shaping the field itself. I don't know if I'm stating it correctly, but I want to know what you think about this. Because twenty years is an entire process, but it's a process that emerges at a historic moment that made it possible for this field to also appear. What do you think?

This first thing I think is that you're not an outsider; nobody is outside the field of history, much less the focus of the history of science and health, all you have to do is turn on the TV news on any channel nowadays. Since issues related to science, health, and their relation to social and political life are central, this is yours, just as much as it is mine or anyone else's: you are not outside, and this is the first thing a professor of history should teach. Nobody is outside of history. So that's the first thing, you're not an outsider.

Second, what Nara said applies today, although on a different level. We shaped ourselves as we shaped the field. But the field, unlike a farm field, we don't plow and plant it at certain times, it can always be plowed and planted, so this field is always being shaped, being transformed, into new configurations always and forever. That time Nara referred to was, shall we say, an inaugural moment. But the same statement could be made today, I could say it, this 76-year-old lady can say in all sincerity: I am still shaping myself, while the field of history, particularly the field of cultural history, is being shaped. This new field of knowledge is always the same, and it is always new. So we can use this nice thing Nara said to talk about today. Then we move to the next thing: today, what is being transformed in this field? What are the challenges in the history of science and health today? There is nothing as up-to-date as the challenges in the history of science and health today. With what instruments do we take a critical stance in relation to certain statements that are on a par with the worst kind of fiction, like "the vaccine causes aids?" With what tools of our knowledge do we critically approach this? Naturally, this is not to say how can I prove that the vaccine doesn't cause aids. But how can I develop and debate the meaning of a statement like this one: today, here, now, what does this mean? Not that the scientific suppositions

don't exist. So I can do something that puts that supposed logic in check, which is to deny those assumptions. Scholars know this well: when you negate the assumptions of some logic, the conversation is over. We don't have to scientifically debate nonsense, because these statements have nothing to do with science, there is no scientific basis to them, none at all. It's just barbarity, not only from a scientific point of view but from a human point of view. But what I can do is say, okay then, think about what this thing means, said by the person who said it in the way that they said it. What is our vehicle for indignation? What is our most politically productive position? Is it to pretend we didn't hear it, to not pay any attention? Let's talk about this. We never thought we'd be experiencing what we're experiencing right now, I don't know about you but I never thought that in my lifetime I'd be living in this completely crazy time. For two years I only left the house to go to the doctor's, I left my house exactly three times in two years, which was absolutely unthinkable two years ago. At the same time, this is not the most complicated thing. What is more complicated is what I am obligated to see, to hear, to witness. There are almost 700,000 people dead, nearly 700,000 families experiencing grief without a possibility for real mourning, and this is completely bewildering, and the chances of a better future are slim. So let's give it our all so that the shaping of this field, which will always be shaped and reshaped, has meaning and constructs meaning for today and for those who come after us. The time of memory and the time of history is not the past, it's the present and the future.

Luiz Otávio: I'd like to thank Guida once again for her presence with us. She is present in the shaping of generations of historians, present in the history of our program, and we will always be present, as she says: history is from now on, and she will always be present. Thank you so much, Guida.

I think today we had a lovely exercise about how we constructed ourselves, this conversation of ours was a lovely exercise, a laboratory in constructing ourselves and the meaning of these twenty years we commemorate. The meaning of this twenty-year celebration is the next twenty years, and many more years, I believe.

NOTE

¹ The National Forum for Deans of Research and Graduate Studies was created in 1985 after the first National Meeting of Deans of Research and Graduate Studies in Brazilian Higher Education Institutions to consider research and teaching within the context of redemocratization, formulating needs in the areas of research, innovation, and graduate study.

REFERENCES

FALCON, Francisco et al. *A Guarda Nacional no Rio de Janeiro: 1831-1918*. Rio de Janeiro: Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro/Divisão de Intercâmbio e Edições, 1981.

GUIMARÃES, Francisco Pinheiro. *Algumas palavras sobre a epilepsia*. Rio de Janeiro: Tipografia de D.L. dos Santos, 1859. (Tese apresentada para o concurso a um lugar de

opositor na Seção de Ciências Médicas da Faculdade de Medicina do Rio de Janeiro)

LEFEBVRE, Henri. *Introduction à la modernité: préludes*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1962.

MAST, Museu de Astronomia e Ciências Afins. *Imagens do progresso: os instrumentos científicos e as grandes exposições*. Rio de Janeiro: Mast, 2001.

Disponível em: http://www.mast.br/images/pdf/publicacoes_do_mast/catalogo_exposicao_imagem_do_progresso.pdf. Acesso em: 25 set. 2022.

NEVES, Margarida de Souza. O grande mal no “Cemitério dos Vivos”: diagnósticos de epilepsia no Hospital Nacional de Alienados. *História, Ciências, Saúde – Manguinhos*, v.17, supl.2, p.293-311, 2010.

NEVES, Margarida de Souza. *As vitrines do progresso*. Rio de Janeiro: PUC-Rio; Finep; CNPq, 1986.

NOVICK, Peter. *That noble dream: the “objectivity question” and the American historical profession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

