

The lack of integration between knowledge and the public is crippling our progress.

Stigmergy is a method of collaboration for mass movements, not organizations.

Stigmergy is made up of collaborative actions, not identitarian organizations or people.

In a governance context this means we won't be electing personalities, we will be electing ideas. We won't have representatives for groups of people, we will have concentric circles around ideas.

A SOCIETAL SINGULARITY

Concentric circles relate to sound amplification. In a concentric circle, people or ideas promoted to the center by their peer group receive greatest amplification and findings will be audited, amplified and explained to the general public by outer circles. Concentric circles are not hierarchical as they have no direct control over the actions of anyone. An epistemic community is a knowledge resource only. Authority remains with the entire user group which provides a good incentive for the epistemic community to ensure transparency and knowledge bridges so their ideas are accepted. As in stigmergy, votes in a concentric group are frequently replaced by actions. If an idea receives no amplification, it is just an idea that goes nowhere.

Science will tell us that the population of an isolated community has shrunk 3.5 centimetres in the last century. If they asked the people in the village, they may hear that one man was 5'4" and had 27 children and almost the entire town are now his direct descendants, but in today's structure they rarely ask. Science will tell us that a woman died of a heart attack. Her village could tell us that she died of a broken heart because her son died. Science tells us how, but without the village, we will never understand why. Science today is not asking the village. They are too busy telling everyone that people can't die of a broken heart and sneering at superstitious villagers. As Paul Richards outlines in *Ebola: How a People's Science Helped End an Epidemic*, ebola was not being spread by eating wild meat as the international experts claimed. Villagers noticed it was the people who attended funerals who contracted the disease and adjusted their behaviours more effectively on their own. If the international epistemic community studying ebola had been communicating with the local affinity groups dealing with ebola, they all would have been a lot more effective. Instead of providing a one way flow of near useless information, researchers could have been acting as an integrated epistemic community and a valuable resource.