

How Universal is the University?

"Unus" means "one," and "vertere" means "to turn." Universitas denotes a space that permits to turn to any one of its locations from a single location. Spaces that do not possess this feature cannot be epistemic environments. In antiquity, a single perspective was considered possible from where all views could be taken. Consequently, each teacher of a school had to share this perspective. This corresponds to the concept of dike, justice, which developed as the ability to consider all aspects of a case from out of a single constant perspective. Law has kept up this antique concept of universitas, to date. - Teachers who disagreed with the view of the school had to take their leave to found their own institution at a different location. This epistemic location is called "unum", here. A place could not shelter more than one unum, or perspective. Thus, the disciples of Socrates split up into Megarans (center of Greece), Kyrenians (North Africa), and Academians (Athens), and sameways Aristotle moved out of the grove of Akademos outside of Athens to the temple of Lykos within the city.

During the 1300 years that ensued until the first foundation era of the Occidental universities the insight must have have arisen that the residence of ideologies is not causal to thought. If opposing ideas can occupy the same location, then different disciplines can do as well, from which follows that the unum must essentially be transcendental. The latter insight demands, surprisingly, that faculties do combine at one location, because it requires to check whether individual representatives of their respective sciences are in fact transcendently located at that unum. The unity of opinion changed to the unity of the source of any cognition, be it opinion, or knowledge, or truth, or whatever. The auctoritas moved from an historical author to an actual staff of colleagues. The discussion among these replaced the comments that had eternalized the author, before. Access to the staff now depended on the ability to comment the historic author. This twofold qualification, being able to comment, and being able to discuss, requires the employment of two sources of thought simultaneously, namely a historic or eternal one, and an actual or controversial one. Consequently, the unum developed into a separate viewpoint from where both aspects of time were accessible. Thought took its source at God's place, who guaranteed process (concursum), and content (contingency). The unum had migrated from out of polytheistic space into monotheistic time. When Scholasticism came to her end, the ability to employ both aspects of time simultaneously passed away with her. Then, the criterion of acceptance into the staff of peers changed from goal to Julia set, from insights never final to methods infinitely prolonged.

The university had changed from a place where to gather knowledge to an institution where to acquire ability. The conclusion of this change is marked by the Prussian reform of the university of 1810, the idea of unity of research, teaching, and education of which served as a world wide model. Then, after 2300 years of history, the structure of the unum experienced a first time change from a dualistic structure of lectio (instruction) and disputatio (repetition) to a triunite structure of method, authority, and individuality. The time that has elapsed ever since may eventually appear a mere intermediate period. In the wake of World War Two the component of individuality has been re-defined economically, from education to the faculty of making money, a faculty that serves to measure the value of a person. Civilized man has never been able to do without such measures. This redefinition of one component of the unum changes the versitas with consequences for the other two parts of the unum, research and teaching. Again, the source of thought is believed to be located, namely in -isms. This reveals the change of structure of the unum (from 2-fold to 3-fold) as an atavism of antiquity. Romanticism ("education") fathered capitalism, which may show itself to be just one exchangeable constant of a specific variable yet unknown that constitutes one side of the unum.

Common to all concepts of universitas is the conviction that thoughts do not originate in the brain. Neither are they simply discovered in the versitas, but are created in a region somewhere between unum and versitas. If the latter is split into fields of interest, e.g. liberal arts, then the unum is

implicitly declared part of visual perception. If the unum is partitioned into functions, e.g. research, teaching, education, it is implicitly declared part of auditorial perception. An up to date model of universitas needs to integrate previous models. The epistemic environment needs to be accessible in all of its regions from a single, identical location, of transcendental quality, ofcourse. All of the versitas needs to be subjectable to the functions of the unum, which in turn needs to be free against space and time. Enlightenment, e.g., declared the versitas a methodological unity, which enslaved the unum to space and time, subjecting it to sequential and repetitive aspects of both. Reducing the unum to a function of training turns it immanent.

German universities define the versitas by a traditional catalogue of admissible questions that has not changed in 2500 years. Progress is understood as the development of the methods employed to answer them in service of instruction. This canonical constance guarantees the requirement being met for the versitas to be an environment, i.e. that all of the latter can be accessed from out of a single, identical perspective. Permitting new questions to be introduced might lead to the impasse of them being unanswerable from out of the unum. An uneducated person can put more questions than 10 wise men know the answer to. So, people posing questions need to be definable as dumb. Or else the epistemic system would break down. This happening is the moment of despair Socrates leaves his collocutors in. He as well as they were aristocrats and slave owners, but nowadays graduates need to earn their own money.

To define the unum as the location of training prevents the arrival at thoughts, because training is no epistemic function. The dilemma we are up against is on one hand to arrive at thoughts for the sake of progress, on the other hand to maintain the Confucian constitution of the university, i.e. not to augment the canon of questions addressable. The world must be kept at its size by all means. The only way out is to define the unum as a structure. As structure limits what it structures. In this case it protects against new questions. A structure warrants the maximum penetration possible under conditions given. This certifies the quality of the unum (to have no periphery, and its center everywhere). To establish the structure the versitas needs to be comprised in total. If we arrange the recognizable universe into Humanities (**H**), Sciences (**S**), and implicit knowledge, or Arts (**A**), no uncharted white spots seem to remain. H and S have been characterized as idiographic (case studies) and nomothetic (formulating natural laws and constants). Plato inquired already into the nature of implicit knowledge in his dialogues Ion and Theaitetos. One might use terms idiopractic or nomologic to characterize it. It comprises that knowledge that is inherent in executing skills previously acquired or intuitions gained, which applies to the arts, the crafts, and law. The latter arrives at unrelated decisions via a kind-of mathematical system of abstract sentences. This method may be dubbed logothetic: Sentences are linked to sequences according to principles of a semantic logic. The sequence halts at a special sentence of unilateral linking. Law is a turing machine ante rem. Written law is computer program and programming language in one.

The question how to construct an unum from where all 3 areas would be accessible without reserve is a new question, and therefore is not permitted. To put it or to answer it is the task of history, is a topic of alchemy, but is not an issue of research. The latter must be kept defined as the development of methods in the service of instruction by going through canonical catalogues of questions. Instruction is defined as targeted at training, as opposed to being targeted at education. New questions put to researchers produce anxieties, especially in those scientists best apt to answer them. - But, thank God, this is not the end of story, but simply an issue to diplomacy. New questions need to be reduced to familiar ones. A field of computer science are expert systems. Therefore, we redefine the question as the issue to build an agent capable of addressing data banks that differ in semantic content (S, H, A), an unspecific agent, that is. This seemingly calls for expanding methods, and nobody needs to frighten.

E.g., the agent could look for identical symmetries that are implicit in a work of art, let's say a certain movie, and are explicit in physical, e.g. astronomical theories and results. Or, it might

compare the structure Calderon de la Barca, in his plays, imposes on time with structures of certain crystals revealed by x-ray structural analysis. Or, it might exhaust the prophetic potencies of mathematics. A human meaning to study these questions would find no university department to join. Reducing these questions to method development turns them into fundable projects. A goal may scare people who are willing to walk a road, as long as the destiny is unknown. Sure enough, this pragmatism will change the institution of the university. Any project starts with the question: What is required, exactly? Thus, project-oriented research partitions the qualifications of teachers as well as students. A project-bound university offers a place to everyone according to their respective talents.

Adding A to S and H prophecies that man to date has merely been playing with gay pebbles at the beach of an un navigated ocean of knowledge, as Newton summed up his life in the end. Whether this promise will be kept only future can show. The agent will ofcourse change the world. It would be a big blunder, though, to announce that one wants to change the world and to this end means to build that agent. Instead, it is necessary to maintain that one strives to save the world, and to that end needs to build that agent. As Lenin has taught us, progress requires putting the encumbents asleep. Any hope raised must never be hope for the future, but needs to be hope for the past. The agent would be an objective mind. An objective mind performs trials, none of which is at error. And this is what the heart of man, looking back, is yearning for.