Staatsinstitut =

Introducing Staatsinstitut

=

Filip Vukovski

Published on: Apr 13, 2018

DOI: 10.21428/5d3d96c2

License: [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC-BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

TELL LIBRE - Since the many times social use of reason dawned upon us, in situations and embeddings ranging from the most unique, circumstantial excursions into the realm of distributed thought, co-creation and mutual empathy, through the culturally diverse set of experiences labeled as profound, connecting and spiritual, all the way to the many heuristics of everyday social life, there has yet to be discovered, observed or invented, a method or mode of broad collaboration, which is invariant in it's fundamental properties and mechanics while the very group of people that employ this method changes, as groups often do.

Whether such game, mode of behavior, mindset or rule-set could exists in it's ideal form, is most probably a question of metaphysical nature - **could humans connect, instantly?** While the pursuit of virtue and platonic ideals is a noble one, maybe a constructivist approach with clear methodological boundaries is a better fit to explore all of the various "sub-ideal" forms of human collaboration, iterative problem solving, rapid adaptation and decision making. This could then be a worthy problem- and research- space for this new institution, the Staatsinstitut =, to investigate meticulously, creatively and with radical fervor.

Mind you, that this endeavor could not be more complexly intertwined with all the up to now studied aspects of nature and humanity - psychology and anthropology, biology, linguistics, economics and game theory, information theory and physics, computation and complexity, applied mathematics, history and philosophy of ideas, work and practice.

The author believes that this kind of radical reexamination will require radically differing tools and methods of investigation, hypothesizing and conclusion-drawing than previously available, to allow the practitioner to manage the complexity involved. For this reason, amongst many tangential ones, the Staatsinstitut ='s primary deliverable of any scientific value under the traditional norms of scientific merit and excellence, will be a decennially released ontology of political action and prerequisite concepts allowing for explaining individual and collective political action. Equipped with this base tool, an avid social researcher adhering to the guidelines of the Staatsinstitut ='s community, will have access to social modelling and verification tools not much unlike those that are put to use today by logicians, software developers and other discrete mathematicians - the key difference being that such artifacts, if successfully verified, will be *run* by people in the tradition of Brouwer's intuitionism.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \phi \models \bigwedge i, j C[V_i/V] \leftrightarrow C[V_j/V] \\
& \vec{\Delta}, \phi \wedge C[V_1/V] \vdash \hat{S}_1 : \phi', \vec{\Delta}' \\
& \vec{\Delta}', \phi \wedge \neg C[V_1/V] \vdash \hat{S}_2 : \phi'', \vec{\Delta}'' \\
& \vec{\Delta}, \phi \vdash C ? \{\hat{S}_1\} : \{\hat{S}_2\} : \phi' \vee \phi'', \vec{\Delta}''
\end{aligned}$$

Unbeknownst to the author is a method or tool that is able to perfectly record, for some future reviewer, the many details, particularly the interrelationships between entities, that make the complete state of affairs of the world in a given point in time. As time moves on, and change occurs, past states of affairs become as hard to grasp and understand as some potential future states are hard to predict. This fact of the matter is taken into account at the Staatsinstitut =, and it induces our commitment to help those that will come after us.

The first methodological step we take in tackling this predicament of temporal disjointedness is our willingness to scrap all of our results every ten years and start again with no historic baggage. This does not mean that we will destroy data, but that we will be especially skeptical of anyone who mixes past-era results with current research. For those most basic of truths lying in our problem space, we anticipate either rapid rediscovery in the new context of work, potential new discoveries or certain meta-methodological red flags. The author is also convinced that this forced periodic work culture restart will be an efficient catalyst for teaching new generations of researchers, but also a great opportunity for senior researchers to practice their scientific prowess and rigor.

It is almost certain that not all results in one era will be replicated in a subsequent one, meaning that there will always be those brave few who would endeavor to cross and collate disparate ontologies and epistemologies in a fashion considered to be *too meta* even for the ontosocial warriors of the Staatsinstitut = school. Not only that we will welcome such meta-reviewers and analysts but we will also endeavor to make their work easier - however, the specific method we will use to do so was not designed with them in mind, quite on the contrary, it was designed for the common folk.

Of what use would it be to study ways of human collaboration and decision-making without an efficient and robust way of communicating the results of such work to those

that need it most? The whole goal of the Staatsinstitut = is to provide a steady stream of organizational innovation - questions such as “who to hire?”, “how to solve this local community problem?”, “who’s else opinion to consider regarding this decision-problem?”, “how best to communicate new organizational policy?” are examples of real-world problems that we are trying to inch forward in optimizing without losing the empathic focus for the individual. Introducing the non-normative, or descriptive style.

The descriptive style is about making ideas easy to reason about. While we can’t say as much as we would, we can say it the same way to more people. We can talk big by talking relate-ably. Others relate to us when we allow our emotions and concerns to be visible in the way we speak and write. We relate to others by thinking about them and imagining what they must be feeling like, and then feeling that same emotions. While you, the reader, and I the author of this text, may well have different pasts and opinions, making it harder to understand each other, we do have the same emotions. It is time we come to terms with this fact of human nature, and put it at the center of all human matters.

You in?

The Staatsinstitut = is currently formalizing it’s methodology and worldview, here is an outline of our research direction to [unify science, work and love](#).

Wait, but what is the Staatsinstitut =?

Many things and none of them simple.

SI= is firstly a community of contributors, practitioners and supporters of SI=.

Secondly, we could say that SI= is a mathematical object, however nearly none of the serious contemporary mathematicians would agree on this, meaning that we will have to define a much broader notion of mathematics to be able to call SI= an object in that mathematics. This math we will call polymathics - and in this “maths” we can easily talk about people, stories, organizations, innovation, economy, politics, science, religion and work in a rigorous and formal way - at the cost of sacrificing the commonsense notion of mathematics.

Thirdly, by our sheer ambition to broaden mathematics to include, well, most of human activity, we cannot escape admitting that this makes SI= both a philosophy of science and a religion. Yikes!

■ The courage to commit oneself to what may only be a dream - Richard Rorty

Scholastic counterargument

It has been noted at the SI=, and various other fora, through meticulous deliberations, hand-waving and common persuasion, that the SI= must adopt also a scholastic viewpoint. Such strivances are already in effect.