

Einstein Meets Magritte 11

Robrecht Vanderbeeken

Frederik Le Roy

Christel Stalpaert

Diederik Aerts

Editors

**Drunk on Capitalism.
An Interdisciplinary
Reflection on Market
Economy, Art and Science**



Springer

Robrecht Vanderbeeken • Frederik Le Roy
Christel Stalpaert • Diederik Aerts
Editors

Drunk on Capitalism.
An Interdisciplinary
Reflection on Market
Economy, Art and Science



 Springer

Editors

Robrecht Vanderbeeken
Faculty of Fine Arts
University College Ghent
Jozef Kluyskensstraat 2
9000 Ghent
Belgium
Robrecht.Vanderbeeken@UGent.be

Frederik Le Roy
Department of Art, Music &
Theatre Sciences
Ghent University
Blandijnberg 2
9000 Ghent
Belgium
Frederik.LeRoy@UGent.be

Christel Stalpaert
Department of Art, Music &
Theatre Sciences
Ghent University
Blandijnberg 2
9000 Ghent
Belgium
christel.stalpaert@ugent.be

Diederik Aerts
Leo Apostel Centre
for Interdisciplinary Studies
Brussels Free University
Krijgskundestraat 33
1160 Bruxelles
Belgium
diraerts@vub.ac.be

ISBN 978-94-007-2081-7 e-ISBN 978-94-007-2082-4

DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-2082-4

Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York

Library of Congress Control Number: 2011939208

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2012

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Drunk on Capitalism. An Interdisciplinary Reflection on Market Economy, Art and Science

EINSTEIN MEETS MAGRITTE: An Interdisciplinary Reflection on Science,
Nature, Art, Human Action and Society

Series Editor

Diederik Aerts, Leo Apostel Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies, Brussels Free
University, Belgium

VOLUME 11

For further volumes:
<http://www.springer.com/series/5914>

Bio's Authors

Robrecht Vanderbeeken obtained his PhD in Philosophy in 2003 at the University Ghent with a dissertation that brought an analysis of the explanation of action from a philosophy of science's perspective. He has published widely in magazines, academic journals and books on subjects ranging from metaphysics to aesthetics. He was a researcher at the theory department of the Jan van Eyck Academie in The Netherlands (2004–2006) and is/was a visiting lecturer at the postgraduate institute Transmedia in Brussels, the higher Institute of fine arts (HISK) in Ghent, Sint-Lucas Art academy in Ghent, the department of performance studies at Ghent University and the School of Social Sciences at Brunel University London. Since 2007 he is a Post-Doctoral Fellow at the Faculty of Fine Arts (KASK) at University College Ghent. He is currently doing research into performance, fine art and the cultural-philosophical implications of technological evolutions.

Heath Bunting is a co-founder of both the Net.art and sport-art movements and is banned for life from entering the USA for his anti GM work. Bunting is also the main co-founder of IRATIONAL.ORG. This community supports independent artists and organisations that need to maintain mission critical information systems. These 'Irrationalists' create work that pushes the boundaries between the corporate realms of business, art and engineering. <http://www.irational.org>

John Dupré is a philosopher of science whose work has focused especially on issues in many areas of biology. He is currently Professor of Philosophy of Science at the University of Exeter and since 2002 he has been Director of the ESRC Centre for Genomics in Society (Egenis). He has formerly held posts at Oxford, Stanford, and Birkbeck College, London. In 2006 he held the Spinoza Visiting Professorship of Philosophy at the University of Amsterdam. His publications include *The Disorder of Things: Metaphysical Foundations of the Disunity of Science* (Harvard 1993); *Human Nature and the Limits of Science* (Oxford 2001); *Humans and Other Animals* (Oxford 2002); and *Darwin's Legacy: What Evolution Means Today* (Oxford 2003).

Hendrik (Rik) Pinxten is professor of anthropology and religious studies at Ghent University since 1980. He was visiting professor at Northwestern University, Ill. and Syracuse university, NY. He also is the president of the Flemish Humanist Federation (HVV). Field of research: epistemology of anthropology, intercultural negotiation, interreligious entente.

Jeroen Van Bouwel is a Postdoctoral Fellow of the Research Foundation (FWO, Belgium) and a member of the Centre for Logic and Philosophy of Science at Ghent University. He is interested in scientific pluralism, social epistemology (e.g., the democratization of science) and philosophy of the social sciences. His articles have appeared in journals such as *Economics and Philosophy*, *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, *Philosophical Explorations*, *Foundations of Science*, *History and Theory* and *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*.

Sigrid Sterckx is professor of medical ethics, bioethics and applied ethics at the Free University Brussels, and ethics and environmental ethics at Ghent University. She made her Ph-D on the ethical justification of current patent-systems in industrialized and developing countries. She published intensively on ethical inquiries.

Dany Nobus is Professor of Psychology and Psychoanalysis at Brunel University, London, where he is also Head of the School of Social Sciences. He is Visiting Professor of Psychiatry at Creighton University Medical School in Omaha NE and Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Massachusetts-Boston. He is the author, most recently, of *Knowing Nothing, Staying Stupid: Elements for a Psychoanalytic Epistemology* (Routledge 2005).

Evi Werkers obtained her degree as Master in Law in 2004 and an advanced degree as Master in Cultural Management in 2005. In November 2005 she started working as a Legal Researcher at the Interdisciplinary Institute for Law and ICT (ICRI – K.U. Leuven – IBBT) where she specializes in copyright and media law. She cooperated in several IBBT-projects with regard to interactive Digital Television (CicK), e-culture (VACF), e-learning (ASCIT) as well as various other projects (eDavid, MONIT, VINN). At the moment she participates in the IWT-SBO project FLEET (FLEmish E-publishing Trends) and the IBBT project CUPID (Cultural Profile Information Database). She wrote and presented several papers on various conferences (ITS Conference 2006, IV International Conference Communication and Reality 2007, International Conference on Automated Production of Cross Media Content for Multi-Channel Distribution 2007), published several articles in Law Journals and wrote several contributions for books. For more information please visit the following link: <http://law.kuleuven.be/icri/people.php?id=100>

Frank Vande Veire teaches philosophy and aesthetics at the Academy of Fine Art in Ghent (KASK). In 1997, he received an important award (The Flemish Cultural Award for Art Critics) particularly for his book: *De geploide voorstelling. Essays over kunst*. Since then, he published a retrospective aesthetical survey: *Als in een donkere spiegel. De kunst in de moderne filosofie* (2002) and a collection of critical philosophical essays: *Neem en eet, dit is je lichaam. Fascinatie en intimidatie in de hedendaagse cultuur* (2005).

Christel Stalpaert is professor at the Department of Performance Studies and Film at the University of Ghent (Belgium). Her main field of study is performing arts at the crossroads of Gilles Deleuze's aesthetics of intensities and Luce Irigaray's corporeal philosophy. She has published several articles in books and academic journals (a.o. *Documenta*, *Ballet-Tanz*, *Arcadia*, *Eighteenth-Century Life*, *Mosaic*, ...) and she is editor of *Documenta*, *Theater Topics* (Amsterdam University Press) and *Studies in Performing Arts and Film*. She recently edited the books Peter Greenaway's *Prospero's Books: Critical Essays* (Academia Press 2000), *Deleuze revisited: Contemporary Performing Arts and the Ruin of Representation* (*Documenta* 2003) and *No Beauty for Me There Where Human Life is Rare: on Jan Lauwers' Theatre Work with Needcompany* (Academia Press and IT&FB 2007).

Isolde Vanhee obtained a PhD in Communication Sciences. From 2001 to 2005, she was a staff member of the Museum of Contemporary Art (SMAK) in Ghent, Belgium. Currently, she is a Lecturer in Film Studies at the Sint-Lucas Visual Arts Institute in Ghent. She wrote a doctoral dissertation about the representation of the family in American gangster films.

Furthermore, she is a member of the Film and Television Studies Working Group of the Department of Communication Sciences at Ghent University. The Working Group concentrates on the role of film, television and other audiovisual media in spreading societal values, tastes and ideology. Other research interests include video art, animation and film title design.

Katerina Gregos is a curator and writer based in Brussels, and founder/director of The People's Cinema. Previously she was the artistic director of Argos – Centre for Art & Media, Brussels and director of the Deste Foundation, Athens. She has organised numerous exhibitions internationally including, most recently, *Contour 2009 – the 4th Biennial of Moving Image in Mechelen, Belgium* entitled "Hidden in Remembrance is the Silent Memory of Our Future". As an independent curator she has also organised several major group exhibitions including: *E V+A 2006 "Give(a)way: On Generosity, Giving, Sharing and Social Exchange"* in Limerick, Ireland; "Regarding Denmark", at the Ileana Tounta Contemporary Art Centre, Athens; "Leaps of Faith: An International Art Project for the Green Line and the City of Nicosia", Cyprus; and "Channel Zero", for the Netherlands Media Art Institute, Amsterdam. Katerina Gregos regularly publishes on art and artists in magazines, books and exhibition catalogues. She is a frequent contributor to *Flash Art* and *Mousse*, among others. She is also a visiting lecturer at HISK, Antwerp.

Christophe Bruno lives and works in Paris. His polymorphic work (installations, performances, conceptual pieces...) has a critical take on network phenomena and globalisation in the field of language and images. He was awarded a prize at the Madrid Contemporary Art Fair with the ARCO new media prize 2007 and at the Prix Ars Electronica 2003. His work has been shown internationally: FIAC Paris, ARCO Madrid, Diva Fair in New-York, Palais de Tokyo in Paris, ArtCologne, MOCA Taipei, Modern Art Museum of the city of Paris, Biennale of Sydney, New Museum of Contemporary Art in New-York, Tirana Biennale of Contemporary Art, HMKV Dortmund, Gallery West in The Hague, Vooruit Arts Center in Gent, Share

Festival in Torino, Transmediale in Berlin, Laboral Cyberspaces in Gijon, galerie Sollertis in Toulouse, ICC in Tokyo, Nuit Blanche de Paris, File Festival in Sao Paulo, Rencontres Paris-Berlin, f.2004@shangai, ReJoyce Festival in Dublin, P0es1s.net in Berlin, Microwave Media Art Festival in Honk-Kong, Read_Me Festival in Dortmund and Aarhus, Vidarte in Mexico City... He divides his time between his artistic activity, curating, teaching, lectures and publications.

Julian Dibbell (New York) is a technology journalist with a particular interest in social systems within online communities. His article "A Rape in Cyberspace" detailed attempts of LambdaMOO, an online community to deal with lawbreaking in its midst. The article was later included in Dibbell's book, *My Tiny Life: Crime and Passion in a Virtual World*. Additionally, Dibbell has chronicled the evolution of online worlds for *Wired Magazine*, and has written about his attempt to make a living playing MMORPGs in the book *Play Money: or, How I Quit My Day Job and Made Millions Trading Virtual Loot*. Dibbell is also a founder of the academic gaming research blog *Terra Nova*. www.juliandibbell.com

Introduction: (Don't) Put Your Money Where Your Mouth Is

Robrecht Vanderbeeken

1 Between the High and the Hangover

The grandiloquent title of this book is of course intended to catch one's attention. This intention is itself a fine illustration of the vigorous marketing that we see all around us today. At the same time, the title perfectly captures the problem posed by this book. While the entire twentieth century was defined by the struggle between ideologies such as fascism, communism and capitalism, since the fall of the Berlin Wall, capitalism is the only reality left standing. These days, capitalism is no longer characterized as an ideology but rather as a *fait accompli* – but then without us really knowing what it actually is. Our attitude with respect to something like the 'free market' is, in effect, fanaticism, confusion, disbelief and discord. In short: delirium. Meanwhile, we are waiting for the so-called 'invisible hand' to smack us across the face in order to sober us up.

For example, in the wake of Francis Fukuyama, a great many supporters of liberalism have announced the end of history, thereby emphasizing that capitalism is here to stay. According to them, we should simply accept the lesson that history teaches us, namely that capitalism is the social model with the best chance of surviving and thus, seen from an evolutionary perspective, is the fittest formula. By analogy with the idea that communism – at least according to the communist scripture – is a historical necessity, today it is capitalism that is all too often seen as a historical fact. Even more, it appears to be a natural order that seems to impose reality upon us. For instance, 'debt' is in the first place semantically associated with financial problems nowadays, not with (religious) guilt. Business logic, expressed in terms of the 'rational consumer', 'progress' and 'profit', has thus come to serve as ontology, even though it was only an instruction manual for the fundamental order of our socio-cultural world. On the other hand, liberal advocates too often forget that capitalism did not necessarily defeat

R. Vanderbeeken (✉)

Rene Van de Puttestraat 7, 9030 Mariakerke, Ghent, Belgium

e-mail: Robrecht@Vanderbeeken.be

communism, but that 'communism', under the specific guise of the Soviet Republic, has collapsed, and consequently the capitalistic West is the only economic superpower left. In other words: it is rather shortsighted to deduce from the implosion of the USSR that the one 'theory' has ultimately triumphed over the other. Or that there were only two possibilities and that now only one remains. A flush of victory such as this is something like a blind high, as if they are stunned, sweet on TINA (There Is No Alternative). However, with the near-fatal market crash of 2008 in mind, we now all know that the threat of catastrophe is all too real – should we still need convincing after all the climate disasters – and that it is imperative that we find an alternative to casino capitalism as soon as possible, before it is really too late.

The seasoned opponents of the capitalistic system also seem to be running around in a drunken state, often with a blurred view of reality and selective memory loss with respect to the past. Because the bankruptcy of the Soviet Union and the unprecedented crimes of their leaders stands in stark contrast to the humane promise that socialism actually wants to be, many former sympathizers rightfully feel they have been duped for believing in the good cause. Unfortunately, their social aspirations are now but so much hot air, as they are still searching for a collective approach that never seems to come. People have nowhere to turn with their sense of commitment and therefore push it to the side. On the other hand, those who wish to continue the fight often seem to have lost their ideological focus insofar as they are content to be spoiled by the pleasures that capitalism affords them. Even if the anesthesia of shopping and the instantaneous pleasure of entertainment cannot tempt them, people are still sometimes tipsy from capitalism because they wrongfully imagine they belong to the upper class simply because they have a pension fund, a home mortgage or some declining stocks. Or because people are not insensitive to the false promise that every individual can become as rich as Bill Gates provided they work hard enough. Consequently, people are no longer able to fundamentally question economic reality. When something goes wrong – such as, for instance, unrestricted stock market speculation – it is no longer seen as a symptom indicative of a structural deficiency, but as an excess that can be corrected with regulation, and thus as a temporary disturbance to our opulent pleasure cruise on our way to a prosperous future.

Finally, for both the proponents as well as the opponents of capitalism, the drunkenness also, and perhaps primarily, comes from the fact that capitalism is a denominator we all use because it seems so clear to everyone, and yet we simultaneously know that it is a very simplistic reduction of a complex, diverse and rapidly evolving economic reality. By way of compensation we occasionally grasp at semantic variations, but these do not seem to temper the ambiguity and its corresponding misunderstandings – on the contrary. To name a few: system of free enterprise, reciprocal trade, laissez faire economy, self-regulating market, the stock market oracle, neo-liberalism, late-capitalism, privatized tyranny, post-fordism, etc. Furthermore, political writings, both for and against, contain numerous apt or even archetypical illustrations of the way in which rhetoric can create phantoms that ultimately threaten to become their own reality. For example, how many anti-capitalistic militants are there who do not assume that 'the capitalist empire' is centrally governed by a lobby of a few 'fat-cat bankers' who clandestinely huddle together and steer the world from their subterranean cockpit? Starting

from the assumption of this kind of anthropomorphic error, they forget that capitalism is actually everywhere and that from the moment we walk into a store as clients, put our money in the bank, or try to fulfill our daily duty at work, we all partake in the ritual. Capitalism, it's us, living our daily live.

In contrast to what the title of the book or this introduction thus far might make one believe, the purpose of this book is not to present an activist-style indictment of capitalism. For this we refer to other actors, such as *Adbusters Magazine*, or to a new generation of born-again communists, such as philosophers Alain Badiou or Slavoj Žižek. On the contrary, what we are in fact aiming at is a little sobering-up from the drunkenness of capitalism. We already know that the situation is critical and that a huge hangover is coming up. In the meantime, in view of the analyses in this book, we attempt to obtain a clear-headed vision of the manner in which the market works upon our culture and in particular on art and science. We have indeed chosen for a very broad theme, and have done so in the hope of mapping out the bigger picture, or at least its diverse complexity. We therefore opted for an inversion of a focused study: beginning from a broad perspective, we try to cast a glance at the horizon. Otherwise stated, this book is both gifted and plagued by the advantages and disadvantages of an interdisciplinary study; in a short space of time, the reader is offered a sample of discussions, problems and standpoints through which one gets a sense of the larger story. The inevitable consequence of this, however, is that many of the storylines raised are broken off too abruptly, are sometimes difficult to relate to one another and, even if they can be, they have to bridge a large distance without an adequate indication of that which lies between. In what follows, this introduction tries to formulate a summary of this overview. In conclusion, this book is the result of much prior discussion, including the two related symposia that preceded this book, namely: *Science for Sale* and *Buy Buy Art*. These symposia took place at the art centre Vooruit in Ghent, Belgium, during a lively art festival that included film, performance, artist talks and a fine arts show – *Art for Sale*. You can find more information, together with the online recordings of the readings at the symposia, at the website www.interface.ugent.be, under 'Activities'.

2 Science for Sale: Abuse, Corporatization and Commerce

This first part brings together six articles written by reputable scientists who, each from their own area of expertise, focus on the many-sided interplay between 'science and money'. Like the scientific researcher in the days of communism was confronted with the fact he or she was always being used ideologically, indoctrinated and recuperated, the scientist in the so-called free western world continually has to deal with the illusion of freedom. Aside from the various threats that the scientific enterprise today must constantly try to resist, and which we will soon discuss, there is for example the simple fact that science in itself is an academic institutional economy that regulates and legitimizes itself, and to which not everyone is simply given free access. Everyone in our contemporary society has the freedom to say what they please, but this does not

mean that anyone is listening. There is something very intolerant lurking within this tolerance. For example, the internet provides an immense forum where every individual can state their opinion in the excess of blogs, discussions and replies. But in this turbulent ocean of information and disinformation, a great many insights that are right on the money simply disappear in the cacophony of a blind mass that continually drowns itself out in all the screaming. In other words, if you want to have an impact on the discussion you need the symbolic capital of an institution, immunity from every accusation of being a fraud, agitator or pseudo-scientist. Considering the fact that we can invoke the academic honors of many international institutions of importance, and above all because a highly regarded publisher such as Springer has given us the opportunity to tell our story, we do not face this problem. Now that we have been given the stage, we of course have to say something. With these six texts we therefore attempt to indicate three general threats the sciences have to deal with, threats that we also must try to resist in the production of this book.

In our contemporary, so-called 'post-wall' age, there has been an enormous increase in the commercialization and corporatization of every aspect of our public and private lives. Consequently, the free market also infiltrates every domain of science. Actually, and primarily for its own continued existence, it is very important for science to enter the political forum and to participate in the discussion concerning this economic transition by means of developing political-economic theories and critiques. But naturally the influence of the market is not limited to being a subject of debate within the political sciences alone. The entire scientific enterprise is subjected to new forms of kinship with the free market on the level of content and organization, as well as the production of knowledge. In itself this need not be bad news. It is, for example, not because scientific research remains exempt from commercial support that the absence of manipulation is guaranteed. On the other hand, it is of course not the case that research carried out by industrial corporations is per definition corrupt. And thus, the combination of science and economy is not a problem *per se*. Problems arise, however, as soon as the authority of science is enlisted in the defense of various interests that have nothing to do with science.

The first significant threat is thus the abuse of the power of the aura of science by the market. In many advertisements, for example, one can find purchasing advice that is based upon on so-called scientific research. For instance, the expression, 'research has shown that... .' accompanies all sorts of marketing strategies like a magical proverb, even if it actually has little to do with the product or the service being advertised. Fortunately there are also many scientists who investigate just this kind of commercial abuse and can thus provide legal evidence in the case of intentional disinformation and falsification. Alas, the chances of being caught, together with the processing speed of ombudsman offices and the short-term memory of the average consumer, is often calculated into a prior risk analysis, and so the damage is long past before it can be corrected. A less evident, and therefore much more dangerous form of abuse, is the recuperation of scientific discourse itself. This often happens in cases of popularization of science. It is not restricted to such cases, of course, but it often comes very clearly to light in this way. In the attempt to make scientific complexity understandable for a general audience, the dangers of oversimplification, wishful thinking and even stubborn dogmatism quickly creep in.

In order to start off with a few observations concerning this problem of abuse, the first part begins with a philosophy of science analysis by John Dupré: "The Inseparability of Science and Values", in which the platitude of so-called objective science is unmasked. Dupré succeeds in showing in a simple and clear way that science is seldom or never free from value judgments, and is therefore exposed to all kinds of abuse. There are perhaps a few particular fields, such as theoretical physics, where the facts do not carry a great deal of value, but that is primarily because the discourse in these fields has little impact on our daily lives – at least directly. Most sciences, which function as an economy of facts, are indeed saturated with all kinds of values, even if that is due to the fact that our language is semantically so complex that normativity is very difficult to exclude, even should we wish to exclude it. Dupré supports his assertions in view of two cases, namely: one concerning the analysis of rape from the perspective of evolutionary psychology; and one about the hidden normative premises in many economic theories. Concerning the latter, after the assessment of the presence of the implicitly value-laden agenda of prevailing economic thought – such as the conclusion that increased production is an obvious goal – , it should not come as a surprise that a great many economic analysts were blindsided by the 2008 stock market crash, or that it was difficult for them to admit afterwards that they actually contributed to the crash. The exceptional thing about Dupré's article is also that it is a reworking of a previously existing text. By noting that it is 'recycled', we want to draw attention to the fact that scientific research always has to be original if it wishes to be considered for publication. From a commercial standpoint this is of course totally understandable. But a side-effect of this is that, because of commercial motivation, the brakes are applied to the need to repeat some established insights, which is often necessary for their true impact to be felt. By choosing for a partial reprint, we immediately open up for discussion two other crucial threats with which science is confronted: the transformation of scientific knowledge into a commodity so that insights become the property of private companies, and the transformation of scientific institutions into corporations whereby, under the guise of making these institutions 'academic', scientists simply become employees who have to make sure that they increase their maximum output should they wish to be promoted.

Beginning with the latter threat: one of the consequences of the 'publish-or-perish' motto that has increasingly found its way into the universities – usually at the expense of education – is that many scientists often emphasize the quantity of publications over the quality; the result is that certain scientific discussions become spread out over so many different texts in books and journals that they make themselves inert and sometimes even redundant. In other words, by advocating professionalism one generates an efficient publication-economy in which productivity is often determined by competition and self-preservation rather than maintaining quality and truth. In order to get a picture of this second threat of corporatization – senior professors becoming publishing managers for their research unit and scientific research turning into a business of academic multinationals – we have included two related texts. In his "Humanities Under Fire?", Rik Pinxten traces the evolution of the scientific community over the last half century and draws our attention to the fact that, with the shift toward the business culture, free research has come under pressure. This can be seen on many levels.

For example, academic institutions have been subjected to an extensive bureaucracy with various selection procedures and control mechanisms such that preference is given only that research which the policy makers decide is useful. Regardless of their internal politics, academic institutions are also increasingly exposed to the power of scientific indexes, such as the famous ISI Index which only measures English-language articles from a select collection of journals, and furthermore is run by a private company, Thomson USA. The more these indexes become the international standard, the more they will also become indexes of promotion, sponsoring and government subsidies. Given the powers that be, Pinxten is rather skeptical about the possibility of guiding this industrialization toward democratic methods. On this point, he is contradicted by Jeroen Van Bouwel who, in his text, "What is there Beyond Mertonian and Dollar Green Science?: Exploring the Contours of Epistemic Democracy", goes in search of a third way between the idealistic idea of independent research – which in his opinion is largely an illusion – and hard core corporatism. Starting with a deconstruction of the Mertonian vision of 'disinterested' research, and somewhat in analogy with the one that John Dupré also makes in his text, Van Bouwel argues that while epistemic and non-epistemic interests still play a role in research, they do not necessarily stand in the way of objective science (i.e. science without forgery and abuse). Starting from this insight, and thus by analogy to the democratizations principles of Philip Kitcher, Van Bouwel presents us with a blueprint for what an epistemic democracy that could protect the scientific institution from the excesses of corporatism might look like. In doing so, he shows us a way to escape from the dilemma. Fingers crossed that it will be utilized.

A third and final threat we address in the first part is the commodification of science. When knowledge can be sold, do people not primarily look for the kind of knowledge that one can sell? When scientists become, so to speak, peer-to-peer, client-oriented traders, there is a risk that scientific practice will become entangled with customer relations. This brings us to the text by Sigrid Sterckx: "Enclosing the Academic Commons – Increasing Knowledge Transfer or Eroding Academic Values?" While John Dupré points to the possibility of the substantial, ideological manipulation of what is called science, Sterckx discusses how scientific research can also come under direct pressure by the simple fact that scientific discoveries can be claimed by means of patents and licenses. With this, the use of knowledge not only becomes an expensive affair that threatens to exclude capital-poor researchers, but can also in principle become simply forbidden. Furthermore, the taxpayer is at risk of paying twice; first for the development of scientific research, and then for the royalties that are included in the prices of the products and processes developed by these universities. Sterckx starts from the sobering assertion that the copyrights for research results have not only significantly increased over the last few years, but also that there has been an increase in 'upstream' patenting; namely, the linking of intellectual property rights to the instruments of research that are required should one wish to undertake research. After a discussion of the impact and dangers of this, she formulates a number of proposals designed to enable people to resist the excesses of patenting. These may be placed within the framework of epistemic democracy, as championed by Van Bouwel, but here as well the question remains whether

academic institutions can muster the will to collectively implement these instructions in their common academic interest.

This places the ball in the scientist's court. In the interest of their own profession and passion, together they themselves will have to muster the will to force through an ethical and socially responsible scientific policy that does not directly concern their expertise and the immediate advantages that are important to them. There is simply no alternative. An uncontrolled commercialisation of science inevitably leads to excesses in terms of misuse, profit seeking, exploitation and perversion that make impossible the normal functioning of the pursuit of science. Succumbing to this pathology would be extremely cynical.

Speaking of pathology, in his contribution, "(E)valuating Words: Money and Gain in the Therapeutic Economy", Dany Nobus offers an entirely different perspective on the relationship between money and science. Nobus' analysis adds a dissonant story to this first part, also focusing our attention on the fact that the logic of money is not just a necessary evil that a scientist has to deal with in order to provide for himself. In fact, the truth is quite the opposite: money often plays an important role both in the practice of science as well as in the so-called 'science wars'; the battle between scientific disciplines or academic departments. In the current mental health economy, for instance, psychoanalysis has been receiving heavy criticism for a good while now. According to Nobus, the problem is not so much the fact that health insurance gives money to treatments that do not necessarily adhere to strict medical discourse in terms of 'accredited, evidence-based practitioners'. The real problem is much simpler: psychoanalysts are under attack from the 'new health economy' because they ask money for what they do. If, like priests, they were to offer their services for free as an act of philanthropic generosity inspired by a fundamental commitment to the well-being of their fellow citizens, no one would likely be bothered by their reluctance to buy into contemporary standards of care. In response to this, Nobus discusses the fact that the economy of money is indeed a crucial aspect of psychoanalytic therapy and thus follows its own particular logic: money monitors the therapeutic transference. Without it, women would never conclude their treatment, believing it to be a matter of love; men would stop because they cannot handle their gratitude. Unlike other sciences, in psychoanalysis, 'trade' is an essential element because money is part of the libidinal economy of the cure. This makes psychoanalysis a 'science of sale'. It is precisely for these reasons that one may think that psychoanalysis is not a science in the strict sense, but rather a pure, albeit subversive therapy. Subversive because, for instance, this therapy undermines the common capitalistic logic of production and consumption insofar as it forces its 'labourers' to question the value of their therapy in their own psychological economy.

With the sixth and final contribution, "Copyright: A Curse or a Blessing?", we conclude the first part with another topic that also brings us a step closer to the next part, "Buy Buy Art". Evi Werkers is a legal researcher who investigates the principle of copyright, and in doing so she focuses on the extent to which this system is still operative in a digital age. Today, primarily because of the rise of the internet, the free use of content, style and images is often seen as self-evident. For many artists who experiment with recycling, re-enactment, mash-ups, etc., it is even a necessity. On the

other hand, copyright law exists in order to protect creativity: with this protection, artists are able to generate income, and ultimately this also stimulates the development of new creations. From a juridical standpoint, the result is an important theoretical exercise designed to conceive of a useful framework in which the artist is protected against both blind piracy as well as industrial commercialisation. With her analysis of so-called 'creative commons', Werkers at the same time illustrates that the regulation of the commoditisation and commercialising of (scientific or artistic) creativity also belongs in the scientific debate and to the very concrete form of juridical decision making. 'Science for sale' is thus not only something of great interest to us all, and to scientists in particular; it is also something that in every respect – its evolutions, causes, problems, solutions – should be the subject of scientific discussion.

3 Buy Buy Art: Contemporary Art and the Play of the Market

Art is an ideal optical instrument with which to view the culture from which it emerges. This is certainly the case for the way in which contemporary art reflects the delirium generated by capitalism today. When we first turn briefly back to the period before the fall of the Berlin wall, it is remarkable to see how clearly the avant-gardes portray the ideological tensions of the cold war. The propaganda in Soviet art simultaneously presented a stereotypical example of what political art is and what it should not be. American art, such as the work of Jackson Pollock and Willem De Kooning, offered an ideological counterbalance to so-called social realism by giving expression to radical freedom. Nevertheless, it is sometimes contended – though this too is also contested – that a great many abstract expressionists received financial support from the CIA. In any case, it was definitely not by pure chance alone that abstract, apparently apolitical art became such a success in the United States. All of those large, elegant canvases and sculptures would likely not have adorned the many entrance halls or stately offices of banks and multinationals were they not absolutely silent and benign concerning the political and the social. The apparently complete renunciation of politics can thus make art very political, and whether by chance or not. The art market started its unprecedented rise after the fall of the Berlin wall, and parallel with the triumph of capitalism in the East and West. This as well is strikingly reflected in the art itself. Andy Warhol's pop art and his playing of the market was beautifully radicalised and perverted by artists such as Jeff Koons, and later by the Young British Artists – the successful brand by speculator Charles Saatchi – or, for instance, by Takasi Murakami. In the summer of 2010, this Japanese visual artist presented a unique exhibition in Versailles. His hyper-decorative, colourful sculptures with Manga dolls and cheerful Hiroshima-Buddha's are wonderfully suited to the majestic halls of this luxurious palace. When viewing it, it is rather difficult to ignore how these artistic crown jewels of our contemporary art elite are a direct extension of the decadent French court lifestyle of the Old Regime. In other words, Versailles is back. Apparently, the class conflict is still being waged – but then not by the proletariat and even less by the middle class because, oddly enough, it thinks it is the propertied class. The capitalists, on the contrary, are organised and are becoming