

Collective knowledge, memory of the common

M. Cañada

A. Orihuela | antonioorihuela@terra.es |

It should be obvious that intelligence is a social product, not just a union of ideas, but above all, of people. It's not difficult to show that language - all forms of language and cultural signs - can only unfold on a social, or collective, horizon. Nobody knows everything, everybody knows something, all knowledge resides in humanity. There is no transcendent reserve of knowledge and knowledge is simply the sum of what we know.

However, the whole of History, we should say, the whole of history as an account of those who dominate over those who are dominated, is also proof of the wilful management of ignorance through processes of exclusion and appropriation of entire areas of knowledge that had previously been shared.

Unfortunately, even social systems can perpetuate themselves on the base of a terrible waste of human experience, skilfulness and richness. In these circumstances it's impossible to think about the development of collective intelligence.¹

Today, the kinds of social knowledge that used to develop as ways of sharing work and knowledge in a co-operative way (that is, in a communal, voluntary and open manner, for the purpose of satisfying shared cultural, economic and social needs and aspirations), have been strengthened by the possibilities of linking individuals and collectives that are generated in a new - virtual - space, which allows work and immaterial goods to flow more easily and with greater reach; work and immaterial materials that are able to provoke

the unexpected, what is not yet known... The problem is that, according to the logic of Capital, the time has also come to apply the law of value to them, and for them to start producing dividends.

Thus, informational capitalism seems to be heading towards a certain form of communism and at the same time stimulating the growth of the legal instruments that will make it impossible, transforming services and information into essential goods subject to private property and market laws (copyright, licenses, patents, canons, etc.) and, as a last resort, the criminal and repressive measures that will ensure compliance.

In this way, while these social co-operation networks are being encouraged, informational capitalism is also trying to figure out how to make ownership of intangible goods possible. In other words, how to make people pay for playing music that can circulate freely on the internet, or how to produce value from social co-operation networks based on enormously complex connections that cannot be measured in simple working time-units.

It's clear that capitalism sees in the *General Intellect* (or general abstract knowledge) what, in reality, it is: the accumulation of fixed capital, generated through processes of co-operation and the creative generation of sociality, which can be made to work within a new matrix consisting of objectified products and programs that are subordinated to profit, the accumulation of personal wealth and the generation of surplus value. In appropriating

it, capitalism completes the old ideal circle of exploitation that becomes a political, bureaucratic, administrative and monetary problem, while the law of value is dissolved because the whole life-time has become production time (Negri, Guattari).

Capital's control and appropriation of collective intelligence implies a new battle over the rights to ownership of knowledge, or to put it another way, over where to cut the «accumulated social knowledge» that we don't pay rights for, from the flows of knowledge production defined by the sections of cognitive work controlled by Capital. In the words of Negri, «the exploitation of the common has become the *locus* of surplus value». And there it reveals its parasitical nature. It lives from social creativity and co-operation, at the same time surrounding itself with intellectual property laws, the appropriation of patents, and all manner of copyright associations such as the SGAE.

The idea is, basically, to privatise something that is abundant in order to make it scarce, to make citizens pay for what they already use. This is no way to protect creation, let alone culture. Rather, it leads to the capitalist appropriation of knowledge, the management of consumption, the use of the cooperative nature of cultural production, and the creation of a legion of artistic singularities doomed to complete labour precarity.

All if this completes the most perverse circle of capitalist ideology, which states that capitalism is the "natural" way of life. Faced with this, we have to reaffirm that collective creation is not the clearest way to hand Capital its profits, but a sign of the most fundamental resistance to it. The redistribution of knowledge based on the premise of free circulation and accessibility contains the old paradigm - the understanding of production and redistribution as a social need and not just another business.

It's up to us to promote and support the possibilities for appropriating the accumulated intelligence of humanity, its abstract richness, and collective creativity. Our ability to co-operate is the perfect weapon against capitalism. Beyond its tangible results, co-operation involves valuing principles that are unconnected to the capitalist system and opposed to it, and that also pre-exist it, such as self-responsibility, participative volunteering, solidarity, social responsibility and commitment to others.

Co-operation in the production, development, distribution and enjoyment of collective knowledge and its abstract richness is, therefore, the basis for sustainable development of communities that make use of it; its members construct and re-construct it continuously, also as the source of an always-deferred project for liberation. Our duty is to let its power and free play spread freely to new collective subjects and new revolutionary representations.

Faced with us, those in power repeatedly declare the market to be a totalitarian stage through which social life flows. But something isn't right, and social criticism is overflowing the retaining lines of pre-programmed spectacle, of a Reality always constructed in playback. Opposing movements are multiplying and making attempts at resistance and fight increasingly unpredictable. The possibilities of producing uncontrolled events are spreading through contagion. Over and over, old flashes of communism re-appear, sparks from a world to come, which is to be constructed from radically different positions and materials. On a pre-election day it appears in front of the ruling party's headquarters, and on another day, self-organising into an Internet loan network, or in occupied social centre. Flashes of communism that are still rare, sporadic, but speak of the revolution to come.

The revolution as a «ceremony of the re-appropriation of the world» (Lyotard) can, indeed, «come from unexpected places and times» (Ripalda). Perhaps it can only come from unexpected places and times.

Communist immanence and actual events promise to come together. As they have at many other times throughout history, before and after Marx. The inconvenient protagonist of this particular combination is incubating in capitalist globalisation, as it did in the workers movement of Marx's time.

It doesn't yet have a name. Some attempts to name it talk of the multitude, others of the precariat, but its features are familiar to us. If Derrida is right, it's the old *stranger*, the eternal exile. He comes singing an anarchist song that speaks of adventures and of exile: «Our land, the whole world / our family, humanity / our law, freedom».

NOTES

1. Even more disturbingly, 'general intellect' has recently been described as 'the intellectual capital of a company', owed to companies by their employees. It is curious to see an attempt to promote these kinds of dynamics, even if it is, of course, for the benefit of the companies, coming from such a fiercely competitive realm, in which the general trend is just the opposite.

Ellington and so many other musicians said so long ago, "It don't mean a thing if it ain't got that swing." As the information age moves into full gear, it would be wise to remember the cautionary tales of shades and shadows; to recall and remix the tale of a bored billionaire living in a dream world in Don DeLillo's *Cosmopolis*, who said:

It was shallow thinking to maintain that numbers and charts were the cold compression of unruly human energies, every sort of yearning and midnight sweat reduced to lucid units in the financial markets. In fact data itself was soulful and glowing, a dynamic aspect of the life process. This was the eloquence of alphabets and numeric systems, now fully realized in electronic form, in the zero-oneness of the world, the digital imperative that defined every breath of the planet's living billions. Here was the heave of the biosphere. Our bodies and oceans were here, knowable and whole.³

Sample away!

Paul D. Miller is a conceptual artist, writer, and musician working in New York City. His written work has appeared in *The Village Voice*, *Artforum*, *Ra-ygun*, and a host of other publications. He is co-publisher of the multicultural magazine *A Gathering of the Tribes*, and has just started the online new media magazine www.21cmagazine.com. Miller is perhaps best known under the moniker of his «constructed persona», *DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid*, whose recent aural efforts have included the cds *Optometry* and *Modern Mantra*, and *Not in Our Name*, a remix collaboration with Saul Williams and Coldcut. His most recent art project is *Errata Erratum*, created for *L.A.'s Museum of Contemporary Art*. This is a Net-based remix of Marcel Duchamp's artworks *errata musical* and *sculpture musical*.

NOTES

1. Theodor W. Adorno, *Essays on Music*, with notes and commentary by Richard Leppert, translated by Susan H. Gillespie and others. University of California Press, 2002
2. Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, translated by Donald Nicholson Smith. Blackwell Publishing, 1974
3. Don DeLillo, *Cosmopolis: A Novel*. Scribner, 2003

Doing business with ideas. Some notes on the privatisation of General Intellect.

Daniel Villar Onrubia | dvo@zemos98.org |

The fact that information and knowledge are the categories that are most widely used to define the specificity of the times in which we live is directly related to a technological revolution that covers all aspects of life, and is developing at a vertiginous rate.

This technological revolution is leading towards «a new form of social organisation in which the generation, processing and transmission of information become the fundamental sources of productivity and power»¹.

The cornerstone that holds together the network-society is the knowledge - ideas and their ability to circulate - that this technology makes possible.

Pierre Lévy points out that from the Neolithic until the industrial revolutions, the principal means of production had been the earth, but since the Industrial Revolution these means of production materialised as machinery and technical infrastructure.

But, «for some decades now, and probably increasingly in the future, the main means of production will be ideas»². Therefore, at this new stage of humanity, it seems apt to identify the means of production as «a series of signs, conditions and skills that arise from work and education»³ rather than a set of tools and equipment such as IT devices and physical networks. We're dealing with the sum knowledge of humanity, which is now more than ever within everybody's reach.

The importance of «the immaterial» in current production structures «tends, due to its quantitative and qualitative reach, to begin questioning once again the categories defined by the capitalist economy, and specially the notions of productivity and property».⁴

To the extent that the ideas of human beings are the means of production in a knowledge economy, we can consider them to be part of the General Intellect, the accumulation of knowledge that has been deposited at the historical level of a society.

As Michael Hardt explains, «Marx uses the term *General Intellect* to refer to the general social knowledge or *Collective Intelligence* of a society at a particular moment in history».⁵

Fixed capital is able to incorporate this *General Intellect* in production in the same way that it uses the «collective power of bodies» to achieve particular objectives, such as for example moving the enormous stones used to build the pyramids.

We can say then, that the forces and means of production overlap and make it difficult to separate them, which in turn influences production relationships. And this is basically due to one of the most significant properties of information, which is summed up in the often-quoted words of Bernard Shaw:

«If you have an apple and I have an apple and we exchange these apples then you and I will

still each have one apple. But if you have an idea and I have an idea and we exchange these ideas, then each of us will have two ideas».

In contrast to industrial capitalism, cognitive capitalism is not characterised by a scarcity of raw materials and means of production, given that these are not destroyed -consumed- in the process.

This involves a radical change in relation to the ownership of the means of production, given that when we are talking about «the earth» or physical tools, ownership is being applied to a finite resource that can easily be divided up, but «the world of ideas is infinite»⁶. The fact that ideas can be transmitted without being lost and used without being destroyed leads us in a single step to talk about economies of «scarcity» and «abundance».

This technological revolution isn't simply raising the possibility of the dematerialisation of the work force and the means of production, which wouldn't necessarily affect the market's normal operating structure. It is also expressed in immaterial goods, which are becoming less dependent on the physical media that up till now had allowed them to be marketed as though they were objects. And it's here that continuity problems really arise for a system that is based on scarcity, and the attempt to force continued scarcity through legislation.

We are now finding that the development of digital technology is dissolving physical media, although there are other physical structures - *hard drives* - that function as containing devices, but these do not have an univocal link with their contents. More interestingly still, these contents then to come together in a single virtual space - cyberspace - that arises from the interconnection between their receptacles.

This is why it is now much easier to guarantee citizen rights to access culture, to knowledge.

Controlling information

Intellectual property rights were created in the 18th century for the purpose of regulating the author's rights over their works. But the court ruling applied to the «physical media» on which knowledge materialised, and not to the ideas themselves.

That is, the concept of property applied to the material support - the book -, which is what, in practice, was sold, rather than to the true fruit of the intellectual work of the writer - the work itself. Using Perry Barlow's famous metaphor, we would then say that intellectual property laws concerned themselves with the «bottles» - physical media - and not the «wine» - ideas -, because: «thus the rights of invention and authorship adhered to activities in the physical world. One didn't get paid for ideas but for the ability to deliver them into reality. For all practical purposes, the value was in the conveyance and not the thought conveyed.»⁷

Faced with this process of disassociation of immaterial work from «physical media», which had traditionally objectified it in the form of goods that could be sold or exchanged, capitalism reacted by toughening intellectual property laws, so that «today the right includes a large collection of restrictions on the freedom of others: It grants the author the exclusive right to copy, the exclusive right to distribute, the exclusive right to perform, and so on».⁸

This toughening of intellectual property laws involves placing harsh restrictions on citizen access to culture, and it has taken the form of «extending the protection period for works, the creation of new intellectual property rights - such as the *sui generis* right,

which protects databases created using pre-existing elements -, limiting legal exceptions - such as the fair use of protected works -, questioning the advantages acquired by users (such as public libraries), or even the possibility of patenting software programs».⁹

In fact, there is even an attempt by the government to conceal the citizen rights that exist in this regard, through confused campaigns with the aim of avoiding piracy, that make many citizens believe that it is illegal to make private copies of records or movies, or download music from the Internet for private use.

All of these measures are making the concept of intellectual property shift from the «bottles» to the «wine», and as «physical media» - which allowed the objectification and sale of knowledge in the same way as material goods are sold - fade away, the idea of property is starting to be applied to the «ideas» in themselves.

Discussing this appropriation of ideas from the private realm, Barlow points out that the fact that today's technology allows information to be transmitted independently of physical media leads to an attempt to own the ideas themselves, rather than their expression, and «just as it is possible to create useful tools that never take on a physical form, we have become used to patenting abstract concepts, sequences of virtual events and mathematical formulas - the least *real* goods imaginable».¹⁰

This situation leads to alarming extremes, like those that would be the equivalent of trying to own the concept *wheel*, extremes that are made concrete in software patents or even particular properties of the human body.¹¹

In this context, corporations act as though ideas arose *ex nihilo*, independently of the

General Intellect that is the basis for most of the knowledge that then gives shape to innovations, inventions and other results arising from creative processes that are concerned with areas from the artistic to the scientific fields.

Measures such as the exponential increase in the time that passes from the moment a work is created until it is in the public domain make Philippe Quéau question whether the ultimate purpose of this intellectual property protection really is the justification of encouraging creativity, in an attempt to ensure that the immaterial work of creators is paid and, thus, to «protect the general interest by ensuring the universal circulation of knowledge and inventions, in exchange for a monopoly of use with consent (for a limited period) for authors».¹²

And the answer is clear, it seems more appropriate to consider that extending usage rights to eighty years after the death of an author does not in any way contribute to encouraging creation, or to finding new talents, but rather to allowing a whole series of middle men to obtain lucrative and lasting benefits from the authors in their catalogues.

The ease of distribution of «culture» offered by new technologies do not involve any disadvantage to creators, given that their role continues to be just as essential; the people that become unnecessary are all those middle men who had done business through distributing this materialised culture on physical media, and those who manage the corresponding copyright.

«A free culture supports and protects creators and innovators. It does this directly by granting intellectual property rights. But it also does it indirectly by limiting the scope of these rights, in order to ensure that creators and innovators who come along later will be

as free as possible from the control of the past. A free culture is not a culture without property, just as a free market is not a market in which everything is free. The opposite of a free culture is a «culture of permission» - a culture in which creators can only create with the permission of those in power, or the creators of the past». ¹³

The only sense in a society providing inventors / creators with a degree of protection is if in exchange the invention/creation ends up favouring that general intellect from which it arose, by becoming part of the public domain that allows its use and appropriation by part of humanity.

The problems of a fierce application of the concept of ownership to the area of thought are not only directly related to restrictions on ways in which citizens can use culture - works that are fruit of immaterial work-, there is another factor that is even more worrying, if possible.

This is the only way in which this legislation is favouring the plundering of the public, human heritage, at the hands of private entities. Because «transnational companies and the institutions of rich countries are patenting everything they can, from the human genome to subtropical plants, perpetrating a true armed robbery on the common property of humanity». ¹⁴

One of the most, if not the most, shocking cases is that of applying patents to living beings, genes and biological substances; perhaps because it affects in quite a direct way the most tangible aspect of the human being, the body, through food and medicine.

«Up until November 2000, patents had been granted, or were in the process of being granted, to over more than 500,000 partial or complete genetic sequences of living organisms. From this total, about 9,000 were

pending or had been granted on 161,195 complete or partial sequences of human genes. The increase in this category of genes is impressive, given that the figure was 126,672 in the previous months, meaning there was an increase of 3,400 or 27% in a single month (*Guardian*, 200). The remaining genes on which patents had been granted or were in the process of being granted were for plants, animals and other organisms». ¹⁵

In the face of this, it is «urgent to revitalise, reinforce and protect the idea of ‘public domain’ from the voracity of private interests at a time when private operators seek to extend their domain of appropriation of information». ¹⁶

On the other hand, to ensure citizen access to culture, we have to ensure the existence of legislation that allows a degree of flexibility, and gives authors the option to allow their works to be copied - without the need for middlemen to manage a canon for compensation -, manipulated and circulated freely by citizens, as long as it is for non-profit purposes - except where the author doesn't mind.

But it is also necessary to rethink the system of paying authors in ways that apply to the new context.

The most interesting way to provide incentives for creation is to do without the middlemen as far as possible, so the author receives profits directly. There are many new models, but everything seems to point to the fact that the most intelligent thing would be to take the focus away from remuneration for the work of authors on sales of material products, although this is also an option that can easily be compatible with the others. These alternatives include payment for artists to develop projects by commission, live performances or describing and explaining creative processes in educational contexts.

To finish off, we would like to bring up the possibility of a basic income as a starting point for guaranteeing the sustainability of immaterial workers.

NOTES

1. Mari Saez, Víctor. *Globalización, Nuevas Tecnologías y Comunicación*. (2002). Madrid. Ediciones de la Torre. p.10
2. Lèvy, Pierre: *L'anneau d'or : intelligence collective et propriété intellectuelle, Multitudes 5 : mai 2001, Mineure: agencements subjectifs posés sur l'Internet*
3. Blondeau, Olivier. *Génesis y subversión del capitalismo informacional*. En VV.AA.: *Capitalismo cognitivo, propiedad intelectual y creación colectiva*. (2004). Madrid. Ed. Traficantes de Sueños. p. 35. <http://traficantes.net/editorial/capitalismo-cognitivo.htm>
4. Blondeau, Olivier. Op.cit. p. 32
5. Negri, Toni y Hardt, Michael. *Sobre el Movimiento Operario Italiano*. En NÓMADAS | Monográficos MA.2 Toni Negri. Revista Crítica de Ciencias Sociales y Jurídicas.
6. Lèvy, Pierre: Op.cit.
7. Lessig, Lawrence. *Free Culture*. p. 87-88. <http://www.free-culture.cc/freeculture.pdf>
8. Perry Barlow, John. *Selling Wine Without Bottles: The Economy of Mind on the Global Net*. http://metabolik.hacklabs.org/alephandria/txt/barlow_economy_of_mind.html
9. Lessig, Lawrence. Op.cit. p.105
10. Quéau, Philippe. *¿A quién pertenecen*

los conocimientos?. Le monde diplomatique, edición española. Enero de 2002.

11. Perry Barlow, John. Op.cit.
12. <http://www.el-mundo.es/navegante/2004/07/07/portada/1089190219.html>
13. Queau, Philippe. Op.cit.
14. Lessig, Lawrence. Op.cit.
15. Queau, Philippe. Op.cit.
16. Khor, Martin. *Intellectual Property, Biodiversity and Sustainable Development*.

SELECTED SOURCES

ALEPHANDRIA: Copyleft Hacktivist Archive v.1.0
http://metabolik.hacklabs.org/alephandria/alephandria_en.html

Free Culture Library COPYFIGHT
<http://www.elastico.net/copyfight/listing.php>



LICENCIA CREATIVE COMMONS

Reconocimiento-NoComercial-SinObraDerivada 2.5 España

Usted es libre de:

- copiar, distribuir y comunicar públicamente la obra

Bajo las condiciones siguientes:



Reconocimiento. Debe reconocer los créditos de la obra de la manera especificada por el autor o el licenciadador.



No comercial. No puede utilizar esta obra para fines comerciales.



Sin obras derivadas. No se puede alterar, transformar o generar una obra derivada a partir de esta obra.

- Al reutilizar o distribuir la obra, tiene que dejar bien claro los términos de la licencia de esta obra.

- alguna de estas condiciones puede no aplicarse si se obtiene el permiso del titular de los derechos de autor.

Los derechos derivados de usos legítimos u otras limitaciones reconocidas por ley no se ven afectados por lo anterior.

© 2005, de la edición Asociación Cultural Comenzemos Empezamos

-Festival zemos98-

© 2005, textos, los autores.

© 2005, traducciones, los traductores.

© 2005, fotografías, los autores.