The different disciplines which study musics are part of an environment which we know under the name of academia. Between the late 1970s and the early 1980s, the last significant incorporation to that environment took place: that of popular music studies. Even though in each country, institution and individual, the academia acquires a particular mark, it is undeniable that it sanctions common requirements which must be accepted in order to remain under its aegis. Rigorousness, exhaustiveness, criticism, self-criticism, confrontation of ideas, transparent communication, honesty in handling data and interpersonal relationships, and the generation of knowledge useful to society, are some of the requirements which every subject who wants to belong to it has to meet. Beyond the controversies these requirements arouse, there is consensus that they foster healthy and sustainable research and education routines.

However, during the last decades, these routines seem to have been declining before a demand coming from institutions—in which all of us participate—and which is particularly exerted on writing: more and more must be written and published. Under this premise, writing is no longer the corollary of an exercise of data, ideas, concepts and doubts decantation but becomes a light product which, subjugated by the deadline, is born with little or no backing research at all. The result of this demand in an environment which day by day becomes more competitive for young researchers who struggle to add a line to their academic background and obtain a position or scholarship is, paradoxically, opposite to the requirements which that same environment sanctions. Among its consequences we find:

a) a careless type of writing,

b) a repetition of ideas—camouflaged of not—in different articles or presentations by the same author,

c) a superficial use of theories (to a point it questions the real understanding level of them by those who use them),

d) an accumulation of data with little or no interpretation at all,

e) an apathetic attitude about how, in the past, the same discipline has treated the subject approached,

f) a lack of interest in what is happening in related disciplines (even when the subject being dealt with has developments in several of them).
These last two aspects concern exhaustiveness and the possibility of constructing progressive and sustainable knowledge, two objectives which we should never resign. It is not difficult to find papers in which long-standing ideas are presented as new, or others in which concepts with several years of reformulations and criticism are stripped of the multiplicity of voices they store. The demand for more and faster writing and publishing seems to be preventing us from stopping and looking back, and curtails the curiosity for knowing what is happening in neighbouring fields. This vertiginous scenario gives rise to one more paradox: the institutions demand papers with a bigger impact but their fast manufacturing deprives them of interest and, consequently, limits their impact. Although some of these texts may have wide circulation on the Internet because their authors go to great lengths to promote them, they have limited presence in the interchange of ideas. Usually, the review systems manage to stop this situation. But on occasions they fail and encourage this decline, as reviewers acting in scholarship and position contests prefer to prioritize quantity—of published articles—over quality, and/or reward with higher sores those brief papers that have been submitted for review rather than lengthy work such as books.

Often, the attacks of hard sciences against social sciences and the humanities find their foundation on this reality. Finding counterarguments for this type of attacks is a difficult, if not impossible, task. In any case, the best policy is to admit the situation and try to revert this contradictory and disturbing effect of academia. Undoubtedly, this is not the general condition of our disciplines, which together have originated a corpus of work in which criticism, intra and inter disciplinary dialogue, rigorous and exhaustive description, a consistent theoretical-conceptual system and many other achievements abound. However, we should discuss if we want demand to force supply to a point in which the congresses in which we participate are more numerous than the ideas that we have to present in them.