

An Apology of money*

Karl Svozil[†]

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Vienna University of Technology,
Wiedner Hauptstraße 8-10/136, A-1040 Vienna, Austria*

Abstract

General options for monetary systems, in particular the creation of fiat money, as well as its appropriation in various setups is discussed. We identify private banks as the main source of money through monetization. The asset value is inevitably determined by subjective beliefs and fantasies loosely bound by market constraints. One may imagine such a monetary system as being "suspended in belief." Inevitably, the interest levied by banks in return for money created via monetizing debt systematically reallocates resources towards the financial institutions, and away from industrial and manual production, farming and labor. Unfortunately, the alternatives appear to be even more troublesome than the present state of affairs. Any system based on interest-free fiat money creation, in order to avoid hyperinflation through excessive borrowing of "free" debt, has either to rely on unjustifiable privileges or chance. And any system based on commodity money such as the gold or silver standard instead of fiat money creation is heavily depending on the quantity of commodities, and also incapable of waging or defending against war through the effective monetization of future loot or loss.

PACS numbers: 01.75.+m, 05.65.+b

Keywords: money, monetization, value, appropriation

* Contribution to the timesup.org *Data Ecologies Symposium* in Brussels, Belgium, 31st October 2009.

[†]Electronic address: svozil@tuwien.ac.at; URL: <http://tph.tuwien.ac.at/~svozil>

You do look, my son, in a moved sort,
As if you were dismay'd: be cheerful, sir.
Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits, and
Are melted into air, into thin air:
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision, ...
Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
As dreams are made on; and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.
William Shakespeare, in The Tempest

I. RECOLLECTIONS

Money appears to be one of the most amazing and mind-boggling entities which we handle every day: we are conditioned to its existence, yet we may not have the faintest idea of how it is created, how it works, and how it is administered, sustained and maintained. The epistemology of money is confusing and comprises many intertwining layers of narratives; some so trivial they resemble well-told fairy tails of deception [1, 2], some so “deep” they appear to be rooted in metaphysics [3].

My personal interest in money originated in a question my colleague Gerhard Adam was confronting me with as we were sitting at the cafeteria more than ten years ago: “*how is money created?*” At the time of asking some quick fixes were mentioned — Gerhard’s opinion was that all amounted to a zero-sum game, and that there is a gain associated with every loss — and I still remember staring at my half-eaten salad while trying to cope with the shock this simple question had inflicted upon me.

Today, I admit to be more puzzled than ever. As pathetic as it may sound: can we evade the maze created by our conditioning, and build up “higher and deeper” intellectually through loads of (dis)information from the media, contradictory economic theories [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11], ideologies, and influential groups who have a vested interest in one way or another? What are the necessary and sufficient criteria of a proper comprehension of money? Need we, for instance, necessarily become rich through these findings, as economic theories of knowledge suggest? So, is some guy like me, on the brink of poverty, a charlatan, telling fairies to mislead audiences who

would be better off not wasting their time and enjoying themselves with other matters? Frankly, I don't know; all I can ask is a little patience as I attempt to share my thoughts with you.

Descartes noted that if you cannot solve a big problem, then partition it into smaller subproblems which you can solve. Quantum mechanics has taught us through the Kochen-Specker theorem [12] that this method sometimes fails, because the whole needs not be consistently composable from its proper parts. Alas, let us be optimistic, and let us also use two other methods which have been tremendously successive for developing the natural sciences: operationalization and pragmatism.

In what follows, we shall thus subdivide the issues related to maney, and study the creation of money by monetization, then proceed to questions related to levying interest, then deal with value and price, and finally consider the differences between commodity based money and fiat money. The title was chosen because, despite all negative consequences, I can think of no alternative to some form of money, thus in a very general sense I am afraid that I prefer having to deal with money rather than no money at all.

II. MEDIUM OF EXCHANGE

So, let us start with the question of how we could possibly build a monetary system “from the scratch.” More precisely, suppose we were an omnipotent agent trying to organize a society of individuals and institutions allowing ways to co-operate. We could do that, say, in a virtual reality economy.

Obviously, any such configuration should not consist of self-sufficient “monads,” but have scarce entities or *assets* to offer to one another; i.e., these assets present some form of *value* in the mind of other agents or participants. The recognition, negotiation and exchange of these assets take place in some *agora* or *market*, which is a physical as well as a virtual environment.

Somewhat arbitrarily disregarding functions of money as a *measure of economic values* and thus of price, a *unit of account*, a *store of value*, as well as a *measure of debt*, money will be introduced as a *medium of exchange*. Sometimes a direct barter (asset #1) \leftrightarrow (asset #2) between two assets (asset #1) and (asset #2) is inconvenient or impossible, so there has to be an entity which *represents value*, which is henceforth called *exchange money* and denoted by (money): as an intermediary of “generic value” it facilitates an indirect exchange through (asset #1) \leftrightarrow (money) as well as (asset #2) \leftrightarrow (money). The amount of value of an asset expressed in terms or units of

money is called *price*.

There emerge two imminent questions: (i) what is the value of assets, and how are the prices fixed; and (ii) how exactly did the negotiating parties obtain their money? Let us consider the second question first. Quite simply, one can obtain money, say, for a bull. This of course, is only relegating the issue to the customer who offers this money: from where did he obtain the money? Probably he has sold some hay bushels to somebody else in exchange of money. Of course, this indirect barter could go on forever without any clue about how the money was introduced into the system in the first place.

The system should at least contain enough money to allow unimpeded exchange. This also explains why, with the amount of exchanged assets fixed, the faster the exchange happens, the smaller could be the amount of exchange money required.

III. MONETIZATION

So how exactly does money enter the system in the first place? The answer is *monetization*, i.e., the process of converting some asset into some form of money that is generally accepted as a settlement of an exchange or a debt. Obviously, in order to be “generally accepted,” the issuing agency has to be some form of publicly certified *authority*.

Pointedly stated, in an almost “magical” manner, some agency (im)prints something on a sheet of paper or digital account, and in that manner “creates” money out of “thin air.” Henceforth, any such agency will be called *bank*. Examples of banks are central banks issuing central bank money (e.g., coins and bills), private (investment) non-central banks, or funds, creating computerized giro accounts containing digits, or IOU’s (abbreviated form of “I-Owe-You”) on some substratum, mostly on paper. “Trust” & “authority” is very important here; else everybody would print her or his own money. Suppose you were a cashier, then you surely would not take a sheet of blank paper where I just wrote “€ 100” as down payment for a bottle of wine, returning to me some central bank notes as change.

Monetization facilitates the chain of exchanges, as banks pass on the money created to somebody possessing assets, thereby acquiring (rights on) these assets. (Note that in this world, one can merely “obtain” certain more or less limited rights on assets, identified with ownership; nobody, not even the owner, would, for instance, be allowed to break common law on . Only tyrants may have the temporal illusion of absolute ownership; *Habeas Corpus* is a typical example for legal

bounds even to monarchs.) In the view of the asset holder, monetization is the act of “turning in” (rights on) assets, thereby obtaining money: (asset) \rightarrow (money). From the bank’s perspective, the exchange looks like: (money) \rightarrow (asset). In this process, the bank acquires both the asset as well as liabilities (balanced by the ownership of the asset). Examples of monetization are the acquisition of (i) real estate property, (ii) commodities, (iii) shares in a business (iv) future claims of taxes, profits or assets, and (iv) foreign money. *Pro forma*, the insertion of money *via* monetization is just another exchange, taking place between the bank and the holder of the asset; i.e., (money) \leftrightarrow (asset) without any “intermediate” money state; the role of the bank’s asset being played by money.

Now one might argue that the creation and production of these bank assets, i.e., money, at least as long it is believed to be scarce, may be considerably “easier” than the acquisition of other assets, such as real estate property, commodities or industrial complexes. Surely this puts the banks in a privileged position. Another privilege of banks which will be discussed below is the levy of interest.

Quantitatively, according to the U.S. *Bureau of Engraving and Printing*, the production cost of a U.S. “Dollar bill,” i.e., a *Federal Reserve Note* of any denomination, is a few cent; so the ratio between the Note’s production cost and the Note’s denomination is almost zero. The ratio of money created by central bank versus other banks can be estimated by ratios of currency *components*, i.e., various empirical measures, of stock of money M1,M2,M3 with respect to “physical money;” i.e., coins and notes (denoted by M0). This ratio amount to a few percent (M3 is no longer published for the U.S. Dollar), so “most of the money” is created by non-central banks.

IV. INTEREST

Some non-bank agents, such as explorers, invaders, investors or inventors, might require money for future profits. Examples of such non-bank agents are homeowners expecting future salaries, industries expecting the production of future assets, speculators expecting a development of future markets favorable for them, or states waging war on other states in the expectation of victory, allowing the unsolicited exploitation of the opponent’s wealth.

Monetization treats the expectation of future profits quite similarly as assets: a bank can monetize the expectation of future profits by acquiring the right to collecting repayments from the investor in the future. In order to make sense for the investor, these repayments should at least be

counterbalanced by the expected profits. There is a difference between an directly obtained asset and a future asset: whereas the *ownership rights* of assets are immediately transferred to banks in the first, direct monetization case, the banks obtain no immediate control over future backed assets. In more concrete terms: whereas, for example, at direct monetization, the bank can re-sell a monetized real estate property immediately after acquisition, it could only re-sell the rights of future assets in the indirect case. As future profits are necessarily uncertain and subject to possible failures, they are always at risk.

In order to counterbalance their risk and the resulting unwillingness to donate money for uncertain future profits, banks levy interest. Debt, i.e., the obligation to repay in the future, is always associated with interest [6]. Interest is the right to (regularly) collect money from the debtor, in addition to the principal — or to increase the principal as the time of lending increases — at a certain rate.

Note that without credit and debt, the amount of progress can only be sustained linearly with growing assets, as at any given moment it would only be possible to invest money which has already been created, and not also money created *in expectation* of future profits. Alas, if the credit and thus also the debt has no commodity backing, the money creation is principally unbounded, resulting in monetary crises if the future profits are overestimated.

Indeed, despite these unfavorable side effects, the creation of money through the monetization of future profits has been one of the driving forces for the spiral on increase of production of assets [3, 8]. Anybody arguing against monetization of future profits might just as well propose going back to some kind of unrealistic “monetary stone age.”

A. Interest as tax and appropriation

As a result, if all goes well, the banking sector receives a certain amount of “additional” income on an annual base in terms of the interest paid. Where exactly does this money required to pay the interest, in addition to the principal granted, come from? Well, it cannot come from any other source than the banks themselves. As the overall amount of valuable assets competing for money (and *vice versa*) is limited, the effect is a sort of general “taxation” by interest [9], a re-appropriation of assets toward the banks. Even under ideal conditions, this amounts to a geometric progression of both volume of money, assets created, as well as redistribution of wealth in favor of the financial sector.

B. Consequences of no or low interest

In view of the possible imbalances from the accumulation of wealth by the financial sector, attempts have been made by Christian and Islamic communities to abandon interest altogether. Despite the limits of sustainable growth (in terms of the monetary basis), the abandonment of interest causes two undesirable alternatives: (i) either the amount of interest has to be limited “from the outside” by “certain criteria” which effectively introduce privileges: if there is a limited supply of credit, who should receive it? (ii) if there is no limit to the amount of credit available, any agent in the market would find it possible, at least in the extreme case, to “buy up all available assets,” because of the zero cost of borrowing; if there are more than one agents competing in the market, prices will go up *ad infinitum*; effectively causing hyperinflation.

For example, the high demand for real estate properties reflects the particular importance and the relevance of housing to individuals and families. The price of a property seems to be determined by the portion of the household income available for the payment of debt accepted for acquiring that property; i.e., $(\text{interest rate}) \times (\text{price of property}) \leq (\text{available household income})$. As a result, property prices tend to increase on decreasing interest rates. The leverage or ratio of this price increase is determined by the inverse interest rate. In the (absurd) limit, with “free credit” associated with zero interest rate, a single buyer would be able to bid an unlimited price for any given property. By unrealistically assuming those prices will not go up due to competing money, the buyer could acquire all properties available on the market.

C. Inflation and price

Among those “brainwashed” by economic theories, there seems to be a common belief that it is possible to curb the money supply by regulatory measures. Indeed, interest rates of consumer credits and, say, the U.S. *federal funds rate* appear to be correlated. This is usually explained by money volume constraints on the non-central banks, effectively established *via* some regulatory mechanisms: in order to prevent bank runs or an unbounded lending policy, banks usually “cannot” create more money than a certain percentage of some “securities” they hold. This, of course, in view of the recent events connected to the “packaging” and “reselling” of debt by the financial industry in the U.S. and elsewhere, appears to be a fairy tale told, for instance, by various introductory courses in economy (e.g., Ref. [1, 2]).

On the contrary, it is in the legitimate interest of banks to avoid any such constraints, by any “quasi-legal” possibility: It should be always be taken into account that in the present competitive and highly liquid financial market environment, it is impossible for financial institutions to avoid stretching the regulatory bonds to the extreme; otherwise they will be “out of business” soon, overtaken by the competitors which attract their greedy investors.

The amount of outstanding credit of a financial institution is directly proportional to the interest it levies, and consequently to its income. There is, for instance, no immediate reason why a bank should not create money and lend it out for a lower interest rate than the central bank, provided it is not “too much” bound by minimal reserves: even if the interest rate is arbitrary low, as long as it is positive, there is some obtainable gain. Likewise, no customer needs to fail because of defaulting credit: in the extreme case it would even be conceivable to levy no interest at all until such time when the customer can pay again. Indeed, the customer may be “secretly” released entirely from debt; because otherwise all debtors would attempt to default. This, of course, is possible only because the cost of money creation for banks is negligible.

V. VALUE AND PRICE

Price is the amount of value in terms of money; fixed in a market or *agora*, ideally *via* supply and demand. That is, money is the unit of price and indirectly also of value. In a less declamatory but more practical manner, value and prices are derived from fantasies people have about a scarce asset. Suppose I possess a horse, and develop fantasies about romantic rides in the woods; I might get so excited emotionally that my break-even point for selling this horse to somebody else (with similar fantasies) settles at a multitude of the price at which I bought the horse myself. The exchange will go through if I can communicate, establish and realize that kind of fantasy at some market.

Recall, for example, past price rises of some inner city property, or of some sections close to the sea shore or to a lake. These sections have been valued very poorly by the original farmers possessing them; for their utilization of land was not in terms of beauty and recreation, but in terms of harvest.

The “market fantasies” are sometimes authorized by dedicated *rating agencies*; these need not be concerned with regards to a particular value (say, with respect to agricultural utilization), but may take into account the maximal value usage in terms of money; as well as expectations of

future value increases.

As there are various markets with very different fantasies — some of them rather isolated from each other — many fantasies co-exist at any given time in a single economy. The common element of the economy is the money available or created. Since it is dependent on various asset values and prices, which itself are determined by fantasies, this amount of money is a dynamic, volatile quantity. Moreover, the relative appropriation is dynamic: it may, for instance, be possible for one group of assets — say, for example, stocks or other financial assets — to “overtake” other sectors or economic segments — say, for example, labor salaries or property prices. Thereby, a dynamic appropriation of money is obtained. A formalization may be envisaged by constructing a linear vector space; every market segment corresponding to a dimension. A state of the economy is then associated with a vector in this multidimensional state. The dynamics might be modeled by (nonlinear) maps.

If the markets are relatively isolated, these reappropriations may not be perceivable for some time: for instance, a financial *Wall Street* tycoon will not influence the prices of sausages sold on *Wall Street* too much, as he might not be interested in buying a sausage there; and even if he regularly buys sausages for their good taste, he has only use of a very limited number of them. Indeed, the stronger stratified a society, the less will fantasies in one sector will “leak through” and affect prices in other sectors. Nevertheless, in the long run, the different market segments or sectors tend to connect through the monetary base. Thus eventually the fantasies exerted in one of them will “diffuse” into other sectors almost like “osmosis” through small interconnections [11, Section 1(f)]. If, for instance, the same *Wall Street* tycoon attempts to “take over” most sausage stands of *Manhattan*, the very high price he may have to pay for them may indirectly (through the rate of return on investment) affect the street price for sausages there. In reaction, as inflation (in terms of sausage price) goes up, labor costs will increase, contributing to a spiral of inflation.

Finally, let us point out several reasons why the belief that the equilibrium between supply & demand will in general settle at a single particular price, and the idea that there exist equilibriums in economies in general, is an idealistic illusion: As money and its various forms and derivatives is itself marketed, the price of money becomes recursive, self-referential and reflexive; with all consequences known from classical recursion theory [13, 14]; in particular diagonalization. Trade policies and military deployment might enforce prices. The market participant might suffer from an overload of information, accompanied by a lack of reliable criteria or authorities to evaluate the information, or are fed with disinformation. The perpetual flow of spontaneous news and opinions

via the media may make impossible the formation of a “communication equilibrium.” As markets tend to become virtualized, it is not totally unreasonable to suspect that those who control; i.e., possess and pay through ads, the media control the market and public policy. Thus the modern markets are driven by whatever *communication* and *(dis)information* is fed into them. (Hayek used this argument to argue for an open market as opposed to a (centrally) planned economy [15].) The intra-market dynamics might not be sufficiently efficient to settle prices; or there may be no convergence toward a *single* price, but rather price cycles and other more chaotic regimes. The volume creation and annihilation of money and debt by governments, (central) banks, corporations and individuals might not allow a stabile settlement of prices by creating (expectations of) a chaotic regime.

VI. COMMODITY VERSUS FIAT MONEY

With respect to principal types of money, there appear to be at least two major options: (i) commodity based money and (ii) fiat money.

Despite the obvious difference that a commodity based monetary system is tied much stronger to the almost uncontrollable availability and abundance of commodity — culminating in the (economically negligible) “production” of gold from mercury through transmutation [16] and the undesirable dependence of the amount of exchange money on the aggregate amount of the commodity [4] — there exist other drawbacks as well.

In a commodity based money system it is impossible to increase the money supply by the mere expectation of future profits. This, in turn, will strongly cripple commodity based money economies with respect to others, in particular with respect to economic expansion and military defense. From a financial point of view, the amount of military expansion is dominated by the arbitrary but strict limits on the commodities (mostly silver and gold). Thus eventually any such commodity money based economy will fall prey to an economy based on fiat money. This has happened, for instance, due to the expansionist (monetary and military) policy of *NAZI* Germany before 1938, who absorbed the Austrian gold reserves after her occupation.

Thus, for pragmatic reasons, the only remaining alternative appears to be fiat money not directly backed by any commodity. One may argue that the supply (or increase) of fiat money should somehow be linked to the gross domestic product, but this can be abandoned at the outright for many reasons: there is no direct control of fiat money once the system is set “into motion.” Indeed,

the fiat money created by the financial sector, or by the aggregate of property, by far outnumbers any kind of economic indicator even weakly linked to the gross domestic product. So, fiat money can only be backed by the belief in it alone.

VII. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

Some very general options for monetary systems have been enumerated and compared. The creation of present fiat money *via monetization*, as well as its appropriation in various setups has been discussed. We have identified private banks as the main source of money through monetization. Thereby, banks absorb (debt related to) assets of value and in exchange return issue fiat money in the form of quantity information as units of money in giro accounts. The asset value is inevitably determined by subjective beliefs and fantasies loosely bound by market constraints, which may sometimes be certified by rating agencies. One may imagine such a monetary system as being "suspended in free thought;" its continuity, floating and benign evolution being guaranteed by common faith.

Any such system is vulnerable to crises and business cycles. For instance, as asset values are subject to disinformation, fraudulent manipulation or hype in anticipation of future profits or losses, there may be positive and negative feedbacks resulting in price settlements pushing certain equity segments far beyond a stable equilibrium with respect to the rest of the markets.

Inevitably, the interest levied by banks in return for money created via monetizing debt systematically reallocates resources towards the financial institutions, and away from industrial and manual production, farming and labor.

Unfortunately, the alternatives appear to be even more troublesome than the present state of affairs. Any system based on interest-free fiat money creation, in order to avoid hyperinflation through excessive borrowing associated with "free" debt, has either to rely on unjustifiable privileges or chance. And any system based on commodity money such as the gold or silver standard instead of fiat money creation is heavily depending on the quantity of commodities, and also incapable of waging or defending against war through the effective monetization of future loot or loss.

So, what are the political, economic and social options? Ought we, for instance, curb banks in their possibilities to create money? Maybe, but if we overdo, we cripple our economies by penalizing investments. If we do not regulate at all, we stimulate the natural greediness of people,

and foster pyramid scheme type non-sustainable business models which assume ever increasing prices (money supply).

The regulatory fine-tuning requires criteria of performance and reliable theories to forecast market behaviors; unfortunately we do not have any such instruments. But even if such criteria and regulatory instruments exist — which I doubt — there might simply be not any possibility to prevent economic crises and the resulting business cycles. This may be due to the inherent self-referential character of economic processes, which tend to amplify gains and losses through market hysteria, and which are capable of counteracting the very regulatory procedures which are established. This recursion-theoretic feature is called *diagonalization*.

Ought we thus accept occasional monetary crises and the associated business cycles? I am afraid, yes.

Ought we accept imbalances of appropriation and a (geometric) redistribution of wealth towards “the rich,” and in particular towards the banks and other financial institutions, as well as other aggregates commanding ever increasing amounts of money? I am afraid, yes. I am unaware of any measure which could counterbalance the accumulation of wealth, also called the Matthews Effect [17], in the long run.

There are quite serious political connotations to keep in mind: As money is the representation of a particular type of asset value, those who control and create money have equivalent capabilities to deplore economic and political power. It is quite commonly accepted that oligarchies may be “steered” or even dominated by those who have money [18]; to the effect that “money” renders entire governments; or at least corrupts or overthrows them. At some point we might wake up and realize that, facilitated by money, our “democracies” have turned into oligarchies.

To close this brief discussion in a positive mood, let me mention ways to legally get rich along the monetary lines discussed, without relying on inherited wealth: (i) One of the first and foremost opportunities would be to acquire or start up a central bank if some country would allow one to do so; possibly in exchange of a credit line. (ii) A fallback option would be to acquire or start up a non-central bank, or some organization issuing notes which are accepted as some form of exchange payment. (iii) A third option would be to wait until chance singles you out as a beneficiary of the Matthews Effect.

References

- [1] P. A. Samuelson and W. D. Nordhaus, *Economics* (McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, 1948-2004).
- [2] D. Begg, S. Fischer, and R. Dornbusch, *Economics (Eighth Edition)* (McGraw-Hill, London, 2005).
- [3] G. Soros, *The Alchemy of Finance: Reading the Mind of the Market* (John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey, 1987, 1994, 2003).
- [4] J. G. K. Wicksell, *Interest and prices. A study of the causes regulating the value of money* (Macmillan And Company Limited, London, 1936).
<http://www.archive.org/details/interestandprice033322mbp>
- [5] E. Schneider, *Einführung in die Wirtschaftstheorie III. Geld, Kredit, Volkseinkommen und Beschäftigung* (J.C.B.Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1952-1973).
- [6] B. P. Pesek and T. R. Saving, *The Foundations of Money and Banking* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1968).
- [7] K. Brunner, B. Pesek, and R. A. McKee, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* **1** (1969).
- [8] H. C. Binswanger, *Die Wachstumsspirale* (Metropolis-Verlag, Marburg, 2006), 2nd edn.
- [9] B. Champ and S. Freeman, *Modelling Monetary Economies* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2004).
- [10] G. Ingham, *The Nature of Money* (Polity Press, Cambridge, UK, 2004).
- [11] M. Friedman, "Quantity Theory of Money," in *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics. Second Edition*, S. N. Durlauf and L. E. Blume, eds., (2008).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230226203.1374>
- [12] S. Kochen and E. P. Specker, "The Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics," *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics* (now *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*) **17**, 59–87 (1967), reprinted in Ref. [19, pp. 235–263].
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1512/iumj.1968.17.17004>
- [13] H. Rogers, Jr., *Theory of Recursive Functions and Effective Computability* (MacGraw-Hill, New York, 1967).
- [14] P. Odifreddi, *Classical Recursion Theory, Vol. 1* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989).
- [15] F. Hayek, "The Use of Knowledge in Society," *American Economic Review* **XXXV**, 519–530 (1945).
<http://www.virtualschool.edu/mon/Economics/HayekUseOfKnowledge.html>
- [16] R. Sherr, K. T. Bainbridge, and H. H. Anderson, "Transmutation of Mercury by Fast Neutrons," *Phys-*

ical Review **60**, 473–479 (1941).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.60.473>

[17] R. K. Merton, “The Matthew Effect in Science,” *Science* **159**, 56–63 (1968).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.159.3810.56>

[18] C. Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time* (Macmillan, New York, 1966).

[19] E. Specker, *Selecta* (Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1990).