Universities and the Communism of Knowledge as the Core of the World Information Economy

Arthur L. Stinchcombe
Sociology, Northwestern University
Evanston IL 60208 USA
1(847)491 5536;Fax 9907;Home 9186
a-stinch@northwestern.edu

Since I am going to praise universities with inordinate enthusiasm in this paper, as a cautionary measure I will tell you some archaeological evidence of the bureaucratization of World Universities.
The last time I went to a conference at the University of Amsterdam, I was in an auditorium where the seats faced a door which had three signs above it: Uitgang; Geen uitgang; and Nöduitgang. The first means "Exit," the second means "No exit"; the third means "Emergency exit." I would urge on all of you who become university bureaucrats not to leave such strata of deposits that a future Foucault can dig up, to show we were all a part of the conspiracy to bureaucratize the communism of knowledge.

Communism of Science is a Good Business

The argument of this presentation is that the business of a research university is a good business, one of the most lucrative in the industrial world, *because* it is communistic at its core. Teaching and publishing scientific papers are centrally guided by the norm, "from each according to his or her ability, to each according to his or her needs." Whatever else was wrong with Merton's outline of scientific norms, I will argue, his employer, Columbia University, had its central activity guided by the norm of communism. I learned that norm from him while I was at Berkeley, without paying even tuition to Columbia. But what I want to note here is that Merton was very well paid indeed for the activity that educated me to the existence of that norm, as were Paul Lazarsfeld and the other Full Professors at Columbia, and Harriett Zuckerman, from whom I learned more about that norm, was at least paid something. But I partly learned it because it was freely taught by his students Philip Selznick and Seymour Martin Lipset at Berkeley when I was studying there. They were paid well because lots of people wanted their knowledge to be freely available to them, and paid tuitions and taxes and the like to get that knowledge, in concentrated form and attached to certificates, for their children.

Furthermore, compared with other knowledge-industry corporations, universities like Harvard, Columbia, Oxford, Cambridge, Les Grandes Écoles, and the like have lasted for centuries, and are still going strong. In private universities in the United States tuitions have been going up faster than inflation; in state-supported schools likewise people have become willing to pay more in real terms for education in research universities. Even if most of this increase goes into added administration in both cases, rather than into added, or better paid, professors, we could only afford all those

extra administrators if universities were a good business to be in. And it is the communistic part that brings in the money--nobody pays extra so they can get extra administrative service, while if they get a higher degree they pay extra.

Furthermore, as anyone who has paid attention to the career of the founder of the SASE will know, the university business is an international business; Amitai Etzioni's highest degree was awarded by Berkeley, though the empirical work on which it was based was carried out at a leading university in Israel. Among students who are taking independent studies courses, or supervision of Masters or Ph. D. dissertations, from me, one is Argentinean, one who graduated this year with a Ph. D. is Uruguayan, one is Russian, one is Norwegian, one is East Indian, one is Pakistani, and then yes there are a few Americans. Undergraduate education, which really brings in the rent, is not as cosmopolitan but is noticeably more international than the community of Evanston around them. In 1991 over half of all the Ph. D.s in engineering in the United States were earned by foreigners (p. 16 of Suarez-Villa).

Universities were already a world system in the late 19th century when, for example, Longfellow went to German universities to prepare to teach at Harvard, Johns Hopkins imitated German university organization and so radically transformed higher education in the United States, and the Rockefeller Foundation sent people off to Europe to study the organization of medical schools in order to reform American medical education.

So it's a world business, and has been for at least a century and a half, and it is "profitable" in the large sense that people pay more for it than for other kinds of education. But that doesn't show what it is that people need

from it so much that they are willing to pay outrageous prices for it, and how that is compatible with, nay dependent on, the communism of knowledge. We scholars hold our main property in common on a world scale, surely communitarianism of the highest form. But we charge an arm and a leg for easy *and certifiable* access to that communal resource.

At Northwestern where I am retired, a research university of the second rank in the United States, undergraduate tuition is about U.S. $2,000, or about 5,000 Guilders, for what Americans call a “course” (namely about 40 hours of lecturing, plus grading, some tutoring, and comments on papers or laboratory exercises or whatnot). When the courses on the same materials are taught in the local high school (e.g. calculus; first year college physics--mechanics and electricity; first year college chemistry [inorganic reactions]) they cost the taxpayers about $700. So what is the extra $1,300 for?

It is for being taught by researchers or future researchers, and having the same kinds of teachers for the more advanced courses (and of course for having at least one bureaucrat for each professor). So what we have to explain is why teaching in a research university is worth about three times as much as one could get it taught for. The central reason is that the more advanced the subject is, the greater the difference in quality between secondary school teachers and researchers. Beyond the first year or so, then, the secondary school teachers could not teach the subject as well. By the time we get to me teaching you why communal property is good for business, the difference is enormous, if not unequivocally positive. We’ll have to see about that in the rest of this presentation.

Universities as organizations are engaged in certifying the quality of advanced teaching by hiring and promoting people known outside the university for their contributions to science and scholarship. And then they organize and sell that certifiably excellent advanced teaching. So that explains why it is good capitalism. But explaining why it is good capitalism does not yet explain why it has to be communistic at the core, at the actual research bench and teaching preparation that makes up the quality. The remainder of this presentation tries to answer that question. We start with why more fundamental knowledge is developed and taught in universities rather than developed and taught elsewhere, and why fundamental knowledge is central to the international knowledge economy.

Why Fundamental Knowledge is Developed, "Sold," and Taught in Universities

Knowledge is put into easily learnable form by organizations devoted to teaching, so "formalization" of knowledge, putting it together into standardized systems organized so as to make it easy to learn, tends to be developed in schools. Newer and more advanced knowledge is more easily learned if it is generated from a few fundamental principles--this is not necessarily true of the knowledge that constitutes the basis of a craft such as carpentry, or an occupation devoted to persuading people such as politics or advertising, or even of an applied science. This tends to mean that teachers pay more attention to fundamentals, to the generalizable parts and to the organization of knowledge as a whole.

Consequently teachers are most qualified by their training and experience to make advances in fundamentals, and not particularly fitted to improve the crafts or applied professions, and not usually skilled in teaching people to sell false ideas and schemes such as would make them successful advertising and politics. Teachers tend to teach true arithmetic, not how to defraud the tax authorities or the securities market regulators. So they are fitted to advance true arithmetic, not to advance frauds and evasions of standards. You have to learn fraud and fiddles in real life, because whenever there are fundamentals of fraud taught, it can be taught to police, and becomes less valuable.

But fundamental knowledge is also more useful in a wider variety of situations. That is why the patent laws do not allow people to patent laws of nature, because that would stretch patent monopolies over too large an area, and lead to waste of the possibilities. If one supposes that one had to pay a patent royalty to Galileo for every time one used the constancy of gravitation on the surface of the Earth, for example to specify design parameters for buildings and bridges to stand up, patent laws would destroy rather than encourage progress. If one could not learn the law of gravitation freely, one would never become an engineer and know enough to use the innovations that fight gravity, such is welding rather than riveting the steel skeleton of a skyscraper, or even the very idea of a skyscraper. The idea of using steel for the frame of a skyscraper is not patentable either--it is too near to being a law of nature. Then one could not use elevators to overcome the gravity that makes it hard to walk up 42 flights of stairs to one's 43rd or 42nd floor office (43rd in America, 42nd in Europe), because you wouldn't know what size motors to use to drive it.

This in turn means that to be prepared for the applied knowledge, especially the newer parts of it, one needs to learn the fundamental principles of physics, or the fundamentals of the method of sequencing genes and proteins, or of literary creation, or of perspective in painting. But now consider a new fundamental, say a general and fast way of figuring out which genes make which proteins that is the fundamental-science part of the methodology behind much of biotechnology. The question is, how does the professor who teaches it to developers of possible new drugs or new soybeans know that method?

Everyone who has taught any application of the law of gravity to anything will freely tell anyone that he or she didn't develop the law themselves. If one as a geology professor wanted to explain to someone in a class why the lighter igneous rock compounds (e.g. granite) tend to be in the upper levels of the continental crust, while the heavier ones (e.g. basalt) tend to found lower and to be brought to the surface only by volcanoes or by mid-ocean spreading, one did not develop Newton on gravity all over again, and from Newton's principles redevelop the principles of lighter things floating on heavier things, only then apply it to semi-molten rocks and very very long term equilibria. One had learned Newton in secondary school or university, and had used it ever since in teaching. It is a very unusual professor who teaches more than 5 percent new stuff, that he or she has developed alone. And even that 5 percent was developed using the other 95 percent, the rest of the discipline.

One of the key things about using knowledge for teaching is that one has to learn it first, and if one learned about new things that one might teach by paying one's share of what it cost to produce it (the other professor's

salary, for example), one would not figure out how to incorporate it without paying for a lot of stuff one did not use. Further, the tuition that people were willing to pay to get up-to-date sociology, say, would not be going to the university or the professor but to the originators of the fundamental knowledge. Then in turn they wouldn't have developed it because they would be busy trying to figure out how to get enough to teach, and they would have to pay for the other 95% that they were teaching, and that was also the 95% that was required to find the new knowledge.

But how suppose all that capitalizing of fundamental knowledge for teaching took place, the way drug companies are teaching us about the importance of intellectual property for developing new knowledge, and then you taught it to all the students. They could go out and use it without paying for it, perhaps to teach others. So it would be communized by a Robin Hood method, all the students who are taught it treating it as if it was a free good, or at most a good they had already paid for, to use as they pleased henceforth. The whole scheme doesn't work. And it would be a bad scheme if it could work, because it would make the means of production and teaching of new knowledge much scarcer than they need be, and the effect would be pervasive throughout the information economy.

Communism is good for many uses as well. For example, if a computer jock is developing a system to use desktop computers for some safety task where the some aspect of the system has to be absolutely reliable, and has to be immediately correctable so that safety protections could be got running again as quickly as possible if there had been still an error in the system. Then if one builds into the safety system a program like Windows, or any other program without public source code, one does not

know where in that system any unreliability comes from, nor how to correct it.

So one has to use "open source code" operating systems so that one knows where to look and how to change it to make it reliable. It is common industrial practice for the engineering of parts to be used in other machines to be public to the buyer, so that they can arrange maintenance, build diagnosis protocols if the machine of which they are a part develops bugs, and the like. So often the design parameters are public, and drawings are often provided with the machine. Even if you sell the patented machine at a monopoly price, you have to sell most of the knowledge needed to build it in order to let the buyer maintain it.

In fact, one of the chief advantages of the patent system for creating monopolies is that the patents themselves become public information, so that others can use the knowledge within them to build other machines, or chemically related dyes, or whatnot. That is, the system of intellectual property itself is built with a major concession to the communism of knowledge.

At any rate, the result is that we could not sell our university teaching at around three times what other teaching costs, and it would not be useful to students, if fundamental knowledge were not communistic, if teachers couldn't use all the knowledge they had to create their courses, and if buyers couldn't use it afterwards without having to pay royalties on it. So the most valuable, and the most world-systems part, of knowledge is the knowledge that makes us professors rich: communistic knowledge. And it is that communistic but very expensive part that is the fundamental part of the international information economy. The reason I know what "*Geen*

uitgang" means is that the Dutch government invited me, at their expense, to an Institute for Advanced Study, then in Wassenaar, to share my knowledge freely with Dutch colleagues and to learn from them. They may be somewhat dismayed that what I took away from it all is, "No exit," and how to be pompous when I pronounce "*Gouda* cheese."

Socialism for the Rich 1: American Drug Monopolies, Universities, and the Food and Drug Administration

The United States, as most of you know, has been having a boom in which our productivity per working hour is supposed to be increasing, while wages are not increasing so much. Now it turns out that, even with all this improvement, we still aren't productive enough to export as much as we import, and so have a very large trade deficit. We have been in the process of selling off the national wealth abroad, to cover the deficit, so that pretty soon the rest of the world will own what is now the hegemonic capitalist power. Let me tell you we will be glad to do our bit to make our foreign stockholders happy, and will not let unions or socialist parties get in your way in your American colony. We believed in imperialism when it was us doing it; we will therefore be good agents for your imperialism.

However besides our universities, two industries are sufficiently successful so that they make major contributions to reducing that huge deficit: the drug industry and the industry that makes innovative computer and software products. I want to analyze how these two industries are largely the product of American universities, and thus are communal accomplishments to the core. Of course the relations of these industries to

the rest of the world is capitalistic, by which in these cases we mean monopolistic.

The result is that they can charge people abroad much more than those abroad could make the drugs or chips or especially computer programs for, because patent and copyright monopolies turn communal or socialist products into capitalist property. The industries collect massive monopolistic rents from abroad, so our trade balance is not as negative as it would be if we were not overcharging for drugs and software.

So to the drug industry first. A very good case of what is going on is the pricing of HIV or AIDS drugs. The Brasilians, through their government mainly, have managed to produce those drugs at about a tenth the international, that is American, price. The result is that, since the drugs work by reducing the virus load in infected people, the infected people of Brasil do not, by and large, infect others. Not only are HIV patients not developing the AIDS disease and not dying; they are also not passing it on, so the epidemic that other poorer countries have is being turned back in Brasil. If we would let African countries do the same thing, the HIV epidemic there would soon be under control.

The reason the Brasilians can produce a generic form of these drugs is that world technical culture knows how to do it--South Africa or India or Singapore could easily do it as well. The roughly 900% gross profit this means for the American producers is actually mainly the product of American Universities, financed by the National Institutes of Health, and controlled trials of the plan of drug treatment in teaching hospitals connected to American University medical schools.

The reason the development was so quick is partly that American universities trained the R&D people in the drug companies. But it was also that they published the data on the virus and its mechanisms, its genetic structure, its high mutation rate, and so on, in a communistic way. Generally speaking governmentally supported university research, and research at Institutes of the Federal government, immediately published as soon as it was verified, and so developed the basic science on which the clinical achievements of the drug companies were based. Some of the detailed achievements the companies have patented were not actually developed by the owners, but by universities financed by federal research funds.

The big HIV drug achievements then, I would argue, are due to the communist character of the American higher educational system, in respect to the basic knowledge produced. The fact that it is communistic is shown definitively, it seems to me, by the fact that the Brasilian government can do it for a tenth of the price because what they know was produced by American universities, and how to sell it at ten times the production cost was the contribution of the Drug companies.

But let me make a further point about the American Food and Drug Administration, which is the greatest advertising agency in the world. We know that American drugs are effective, not because the drug corporations pump out their advertisements and their samples to medical practitioners. Instead we know they are effective because the FDA certifies that they do good in actual patients in clinical trials. If we ask why Young and Rubicam, or the other great advertising agencies, haven't cottoned onto the enormous advertising value of clinical experiments with control groups, certified by an autonomous scientific authority, you have to put it down to capitalism. If the

advertising business were communal like universities are, it would discover quite quickly that control groups were the best advertisement.

There is a lovely result by a student of Mosteller's, whose name I forget--I'll put my forgetting down to communism of knowledge. The dependent variable is whether or not an article in a medical journal says the treatment is a success. The independent variable is whether or not there was a control group in the trial. And you can guess the result: the best predictor of the success of a therapy in the medical literature is that *there not be a control group*.

In their hearts, the capitalist advertising agencies know this, and take great care not to risk their client's capital by showing definitively that their drug is a fraud. Only socialism, either in the form of government control of certification of quality in the FDA, or in the communism of knowledge in the university, can produce the fantastic advertising value of a clinical trial with a control group. The reason the United States can dominate the world drug market is because it has a socialist advertising agency, and socialism or communism of knowledge produces control groups. I suppose that in a professional school training advertisers, the Harvard Statistics Department results could be used as basic science, to tell budding advertising experts never to have a control group.

Both the production side and the marketing side of the American drug export trade, Americans get their advantages from socialism. (Americans do not get good recreational drugs, because we use our resources to give false information on a large scale, and there is never a good control group for marijuana or cocaine or heroin recreational "treatments.") If we were to nationalize the production part of the drug industry the way we have

nationalized the advertising part, we could sell HIV drugs at the Brazilian price, stop the HIV epidemics in Africa, and kiss our wives because we were proud of what good we had done today.

Socialism for the Rich 2: Why Not Move Stanford Out of Silicon Valley to Where the Faculty Can Afford to Live?

The answer to the question in the heading is that even now, Stanford moving to a place with cheaper real estate would probably undermine Silicon Valley; then Stanford could afford to move back, because real estate would again be reasonable. It's the same principle as the role of art galleries to move into cheap run-down real estate downtown, where low rents mean they can balance their books in a basically unprofitable business. Then the galleries make that part of town a tony place to live, the price of real estate goes up, and then the galleries move out to balance their books again. Communism of knowledge at Stanford is central to the success of Silicon Valley, even if the professors can't really afford to live there.

To make my case that universities are central to early American domination of the computer industry, I have to count Bell Labs as a university, and to some degree to urge that the socialist aspect of the production of knowledge also extends to the Navy's fundamental research support for the development of the world-wide web. The computer and software industry's export success, based on universities, also now characterizes Japan, Taiwan, Korea, Singapore, and Ireland, and even recently India. That rapid spread was due to the large fraction of the knowledge of the industry that was in fact effectively communist, and the

fact that a lot of the students in those parts of Stanford that provided the basis for the physical chemistry and quantum mechanics of silicon and for various kinds of algorithms in software are from the Pacific Rim.

For an example that shows this sharply, the web could not have spread so quickly and so far unless people everywhere could learn how to connect to it, to put up web pages, to write programs that communicate mathematical theorems on it, and the like. “Open” software, like the Unix system pioneered at Bell Labs, and the Java platform-independent (i.e. non-Windows) programming language, is central to that. But some of the communism of knowledge here came about accidentally, by the fact that the proprietary programs are available, with difficulty, to everyone who buys them. Apple could not keep Microsoft from reverse-engineering of the Windows system as an imitation of Apple, though it took a lot longer (and a lot more lines of code per function imitated--the Apple system is much smaller for a slightly superior functioning than is Windows) than similar programming in the open software environment.

Let me briefly sketch a few facts about the fundamental inventions here, to make my pint about the dependence on universities and the communism of knowledge. The first programmable computer was developed at MIT during World War II and immediately after, and was secret. Immediately after the war, the basic knowledge became widely available. The transition to transistors, and so to silicon chips was pioneered at Bell Labs, and three of the researchers at Bell Labs won a Nobel prize with it. It is important to note that you cannot get the Nobel prize in physics for something unless a lot of first rate physicists know all about it--that’s part of the reason that industrial scientists hardly ever get the prize. Bell

Labs was an outfit where publishing results was legitimate, and the way to promotion, just as in a university.

But some of the central people carried this communistic knowledge to Stanford (explaining why Silicon Valley is not in New Jersey), trained students in it, developed firms that used these students. Fortunately one of the main people who developed the firms for developing computing chips, William B. Shockley, was (to put it kindly) one who encouraged the autonomy of his students by making it very unpleasant to be subordinated to him. This caused the lucky accident that the knowledge developed in the firms was quickly communized within the valley, thus communizing the private sector part of the knowledge development.

The open software system was also developed primarily by Bell Labs (with the Unix operating system), and by DARPA, the Navy's fundamental science research operation (with the development of the world wide web system). Much of the development of variations on the Unix system took place in university Computer Science or Electrical Engineering departments, partly because the proprietary systems could not be taught or effectively used in research, so were not good bases for university work.

Thus, while the argument is a bit institutionally murky, with Shockley's bad relations with subordinates having a latent function of communizing knowledge, and with the main university doing the original work of the revolution being a research arm of a private corporation, it seems to me clear that the early communism of knowledge in the computer industry, and Stanford University being in the core of that communistic development in Silicon Valley but being priced out of the real estate market

there, explains another of the United States's few export-competitive industries.

Vanity as a Liberal Pluralist Incentive System: Methodological Individualism for Communitarians

My central argument in this section is that Merton was also right to link authorship and priority, and hence vanity over one's originality and scientific solidity, to the scientific incentive system. If science is the central exemplar in Habermas's defense of honest discourse as the backbone of communally minded liberal pluralism, the central role of vanity over one's accomplishments may be central to the communitarian liberalism. If one wants to come to Amsterdam to cry one's accomplishments from the housetops for the free benefit of one's colleagues, with no other rewards than vanity (because one is retired and universities will not reward one with promotions and salary increases), that shows the power of vanity. But that means that we have to examine how vanity gets tied to the increase of knowledge-capital, of the communistic property of the scientific community.

The hard fact of life here is that, while students will pay for one's knowledge in hard cash, or the government will pay on the students' behalf, your colleagues will at most buy the book. If you have an exceptionally good contract, selling a colleague a $40 dollar book will get you 15% of half of it, or three dollars. And he or she will only buy it if he heard a short version at a conference, and it was helpful to him. But colleagues can be

generous with praise and prestige, if not for more than three dollars. (Colleagues may possibly be less generous even with prestige if you are candidates for the same job.)

When will colleagues reward one for solid originality, freely given in Amsterdam after a very long night in a tourist class seat? I would argue that the general answer is the same as it is for commodities, that they will reward it only if it is useful to him or her. So let me start at the high end of usefulness, the criticism of early drafts by students, criticism sustained until at last they do something unique and go out into the world to earn their own reputations. If one is very lucky they will be more famous one is, so people will actually read the *Festschrift* when one retires. The students may look down on one from the pinnacle of their glory, and say one is a nice little old man, who meant a lot to me way back then.

The thing that makes the whole enterprise communal, then, is that one gets prestige by being useful to others. Our great geniuses, Pierre Bourdieu for example, whose *Distinction* could easily be called the *Das Kapital* of socio-economics, welcomes the opportunity to speak to distinguished large audiences. He doesn't need any more distinction himself, but still seeks it eagerly. He gets that prestige reward by being useful to a great many scholars in a great many disciplines.

Broadly the way university reward systems are organized is that one gets a base salary for being oneself, then one can get infinite rewards in prestige if one actually does anything. And so we all do research, though a simple-minded version of neoclassical economics would predict we would not, once we have tenure, since on the average perhaps a hundred people read it carefully and hey give us a citation--big deal for microeconomics.

And we greatly over-invest in teaching graduate students, who bring us that deepest type of prestige, admiration from those who praise us for helping them to be what they want to be.

The citation is however the standard currency of the vanity market. The actual analysis of an idea or empirical result in the text of a scholarly paper or book is a larger denomination of the same currency. A citation is, first of all, a direct acknowledgement of the communism of scholarly knowledge; it takes the knowledge of the previous citation as part of its own accomplishment, under the new author's name. Second, we regard it as corrupt if it is clearly designed simply to curry favor with a powerful person, that is, if it isn't pure praise for contributing to our common property in scholarly knowledge. Third, it is an acknowledgement that the thing cited is itself knowledge, at least to the extent of being believable enough for the new author to refute.

To put it another way, authorship in university circles *cannot be claimed of a secret*, cannot be claimed unless the knowledge is communistic. One authors knowledge to give it away; otherwise authorship is meaningless. Which leaves only vanity as a reward. That vanity may be capitalizable into tuitions by adding to the prestige of one's university.

My favorite tale on this point comes from a German university chemist working on coal tar dies, in the late 19th and early 20th century when the great research universities were almost all in Germany. This chemist believed that the chemical formulas for the dyes that were giving Germany the undisputed leadership of the dyes market should not be either secret or patentable. He enforced this belief in the communism of knowledge by analyzing the dyes from most of the companies, and publishing all the

formulas in a paper in a chemical journal (this is in Peter Murmann's dissertation on the dominance of the German dye industry in the last part of the 19th and early part of the 20th century). The universities of Germany in those days were the core of German competitiveness in the dye business. But it was central to the university mission, *and to German dominance*, that the chemical knowledge should be communistic, so that many new dyes could be invented with the common knowledge of the old. The chemist then made sure that his reward, besides his generous salary from his government, was only vanity, not a payment for keeping it secret or for a patent on it.

Germany still had more patents per capita than any other large country in 1990, about one and a half times as many as the United States for example (estimated from p. 19. of Suarez-Villa, *Invention and the Rise of Technocapitalism*). No wonder they can export more than they import, while the United States cannot because it is not competitive in enough export industries.

Conclusion

What I claim to have shown is that the dominance of the core capitalist countries in the world information industry is an achievement of their communist parts, not of its capitalism, the communism of knowledge that is maintained principally by their universities. Much of this university communism of knowledge was a German innovation towards the end of the 19th century, but it quickly spread to the United States, which made a great thing of it. The communism of new knowledge is a very individualistic kind of communitarianism. Robert K. Merton was the first to recognize how the

interplay of fame and vanity as a motivational system could support the communism of knowledge, and make modern science possible. That communism is so much superior to capitalism, for the function of advancing knowledge, that it backs the growth of the global information economy. The reason the information that passes in that economy is valuable is that it is true and new, that it is knowledge, not advertising. A lot of the dot.coms that wne broke lately were trying to make money by selling us "information" in the sense of advertising, not knowledge. It is poeic justice that they went broke for bad epistemology. That truth and originality that forms the firm background is the core achievement of the combination of communism of knowledge, and vanity as a motivator compatible with that communism.

And the wonderful thing about it is that it bulls through, like the wooden ships that carried the first global world system, even though they have barnacles that encrust them. Even with "

" on the signs, Amsterdam has created this opportunity for me to try to increase satisfaction of my vanity by making this speech, and has made the content of that speech communistic property of all of you, so that you can knock it down or improve it, as seems wise to you all.