



ARTICLE

THE INDUSTRIALIZATION OF INQUIRY

www.rgnmed.com | circles@rgnmed.com

THE PREMISE

The modern research enterprise has become an industry in every structural sense — an apparatus of production, optimization, and throughput. What once resembled a guild of discovery now mirrors a supply chain. Ideas move through the system like commodities: designed, refined, and delivered under pressure to meet output quotas. Laboratories have become factories of “deliverables,” and scientists, line workers in a cognitive assembly line.

This industrial model did not arise by conspiracy but by drift. As public funding tightened and accountability rose, universities adopted corporate logics of efficiency and performance. The scientist became a manager of metrics. Inquiry, once an act of reflection, became an act of compliance.

THE DISTORTION

Industrialization distorts inquiry in predictable ways. The demand for volume fragments attention: large teams produce countless substudies to satisfy contractual milestones. Methodological creativity declines as workflows standardize. The grant proposal replaces the hypothesis as the true object of innovation. Researchers learn to design not for discovery, but for deliverability — for the optics of progress that can be audited, reported, and scaled.

Even language succumbs to bureaucracy. Ideas are described in terms of pipelines, portfolios, and key performance indicators. The lexicon of curiosity is replaced by that of logistics. What cannot be quantified cannot be justified.

THE CONSEQUENCE

Industrialized inquiry produces safe science — technically competent, procedurally correct, and spiritually vacant. Questions that might challenge paradigms are deferred as “too risky.” Senior investigators manage portfolios; junior scientists execute tasks. Curiosity, the irreducible engine of progress, is crowded out by administrative survival. The result is a paradox: we have never produced more research, yet we understand less.

The culture of production turns failure — once the most instructive outcome in science — into a liability. To admit error is to jeopardize funding; to question orthodoxy is to endanger employment. The factory floor tolerates no deviation from the plan.

THE WAY FORWARD

Repairing this industrial architecture requires restoring the craft of science. Institutions must decouple intellectual risk from professional peril, rewarding exploration rather than compliance. Funding mechanisms should privilege depth over breadth and support replication as creative labor, not clerical duty. Above all, research must reclaim its artisan ethos — the deliberate, reflective, human scale of work. Inquiry cannot be mass-produced; its essence lies in attention, not acceleration.

REFERENCES

1. RegenMed (2025). *"Genuine Medical Research Has Lost Its Way."* White Paper, November 2025.
2. Sarewitz, D. (2016). *Saving Science*. The New Atlantis, 49, 4–40.
3. Stephan, P. (2012). *How Economics Shapes Science*. Harvard University Press.
4. Mirowski, P. (2011). *Science-Mart: Privatizing American Science*. Harvard University Press.
5. Edwards, M. A., & Roy, S. (2017). *Academic Research in the 21st Century: Maintaining Scientific Integrity in a Climate of Perverse Incentives and Hypercompetition*. Environmental Engineering Science, 34(1), 51–61.
6. Collini, S. (2012). *What Are Universities For?* Penguin Books.

CONTACT US

RegenMed | www.rgnmed.com
circles@rgnmed.com