# 9th WCSA CONFERENCE

## GEGNET:

## *A Complex System Vision on Global Governance and Policy Modelling*

November 3rd to 5th 2020

Presidential Welcome Speech
Prof. Andrea Pitasi

**www.wcsaglobal.org**

Welcome Ladies & Gentlemen,

WCSA is a think tank mainly focused on the complex system approach and epistemology to deal with the key aspects of global governance and policy modeling in a fast and turbulent changing world order

Much about the academy is at our website (www.wcsaglobal.org)

Thus, I will quickly switch to key topics that you will not find there

The Complex System Approach is a transdisciplinary epistemology to add strategic value and scientific strength to the organization, development, innovation and expansion of reliable knowledge for strategic problem setting and problem solving

Knowledge is essentially a matter of how observations are constructed and modeled

Hmmmm… Let's check some concepts from here

# TRANSDISCIPLINARY

## neither inter nor multidisciplinary

## **Why?**


*ANDREA PITASI* *pitasigda@gmail.com*

Metaphorically:

interdisciplinary = A speaks German only, B speaks Chinese only. They are someway interacting but, hopelessly, they do not understand each other.

Then, if an Italian comes along using his hand language, all what happens is that A and B give him their wallets and the Italian guy does not understand why:

He was just asking for a toilet ;-)

Multidisciplinary: everybody speaking in a room at the same time, everybody in a different language and nobody is listening.

SELF REFERENCE means that a observation is shaped according to a systemic observer's set of features: a human eye and a cat's eye do not observe and model the same image although they are observing the same landscape.

AUTOPOIESIS means self reproduction: in biology it is applied to understand blood for example; in society, it relates to the way meaning and traditions cross the ages. The epistemological concept is the same but its operational content (blood/tradition) changes discipline by discipline.

The complex system approach is the grammar and syntax of transdisciplinary research based policy.

Nevertheless, some terms were adopted in non/not yet systemic disciplines just as fashionable sounds but with a totally not scientific meaning.

For example:

- self referential as “egoist”
- self centered as “narcissist” (sigh)
- Complex as “difficult, complicate” (sigh, sigh)

In this case, semantic noise was generated as the semantic terms were separated from its epistemological framework

Ah, maybe you want to know what complexity means… Hold on, not yet!!

The complex system approach came out first of all in biology, sociology and mathematics.

Other disciplines are more and more involved but sometimes they still use the term without the epistemological framework:

political science, economics, urbanism architecture, psychology and sociology are the "second generation" key disciplines

If you take a look, all the second generation disciplines are POLITICAL SCIENCES in their broadest meaning.

That is why global governance and policy modeling has become the key application area of complex system studies.

The power of complex system approach is:

- to provide a second up to N level observation and construction process by drawing distinctions;

- to filter irrelevant noise through the distinctions;

- to unify the key differences with no illusion to integrate everything

You cannot observe and provide meaning to complexity without a coding and selective system with its procedures

Nevertheless, not all systems are viable to manage and govern complexity

The NON-VIABEL SYTEMS are modeled by FOCUSING ON INTEGRATION.

They wish to integrate everything: vertically and horizontally.

The paradox is that in this way non-viable systems just deny complexity: they do not manage or govern it.

Systems focusing on integration are extremely rigid and fragile such as a very non-complex organization.

(Parsons' LIGA Pattern is an exemplary case)

VIABLE SYSTEMS are based on coding and programs TO UNIFY (as unitas multiplex) the key differences which effectively make the difference:

NO ILLUSION OF INTEGRATION: these systems are open to processes and complexity contingent selection which never leads to a permanent reduction of complexity.

From this perspective

**COMPLEXITY** IS

the exceeding **VARIETY** and **DENSITY** of possibilities which requires

**CONTINGENT SELECTIONS**

and

**CONTINOUS EXPANSION**

of variety and density

**BY SELECTING NEGATIVELY** obsolete/superfluous steps, functions and levels


*ANDREA PITASI* *pitasigda@gmail.com*

**Transdisciplinary Research Based Policy Modeling for Global Governance** is a key topic to which **Complex System Epistemology** can be applied with success

The **reduction of obsolete functions** is shaping a multilevel world order with a decreasing amount of levels each of them at higher and higher density and variety which means at the same time complexity reduction of superfluous organizational setting and **complexity expansion** for example, of intangible capitals, world class global and cosmopolitan citizens, etc.

The key challenge to have successful global governance policy modeling is to frame it inside a complex system epistemology.

However, it generates a problem which can be set as follows:

**SYSTEMIC KNOWLEDGE** is open to multiple levels of observation and construction which means a disciplinary vision based on meta observation through different codes.

It is typical of disciplines already featured by multilevel epistemology from internal to meta.

These disciplines are relatively young-born between the Enlightenment and the Post WWII scenarios (political science, sociology, economics, etc.).

Its process and system are focused on a continuous, circular flow from psycho social to micro, meso, macro.

Process and system of these disciplines are focused on a continuous, circular flow from psycho social to micro, meso, macro.

We can call them Kantian disciplines and they are well aware that

*Das Ding an Sich* (the item in itself)

cannot be known and there are many, many observation level between the observer N and the item and that the vision of the observer-item link is complex

The most ancient disciplines (Law and Medicine) coming from the European Middle Ages were pre-Kantian, of course.

Thus, featured by the illusion that an observer might observe and study directly a topic.

It cost many centuries and billon deaths in pandemics and other catastrophes to Medicine to understand that some key challenges to health are invisible to the human eye.

**Remember microscope was initially considered an absurdity**

Since the early 20th century, medicine (with a great help from biology) evolved its epistemology into a multilevel one including the "invisible".

Law studies were not so lucky.

Excellent Law scholars exist, of course but in general the law discipline still has some typical traits of the Middle Ages.

# MIDDLE AGE TRAITS 1

considering a descriptive summary as research.

For example a Handbook in Civil law is not research, it is just an handbook were the discipline basics are summarized for the youngest university students or beginners.

This is the most famous lesson by Jorge da Burgois I in "The Name of the Rose": there is no research, findings either, just sublime recapitulations

# MIDDLE AGE TRAITS 2

Considering professional practice as scientific research and totally ignoring the generalizability principle.

# MIDDLE AGE TRAITS 3

Considering a topic ontologically (an sich, in se) like "Criminal Law in France between 1850 and 1890" as if time, space and topic might be enough to shape a viable observation.

These features are misleading in global governance policy modeling because they generate conflations among observer topic level, paradigm, methodology

For example, creating the illusion that a State is a system in se and that Global Governance can be shaped through negotiations among States

It is like stating that:

As eagles fly since long before airplanes existed,

airplanes were created through an agreement among eagles

The process through which airplanes created was rather different as eagles ignore both that airplanes fly and eagles themselves fly.

Eagles are just eagles and cannot evolve into airplanes.

States are just States and cannot evolve into something different.

I wish this conference can be one more step to develop further **a complex system global governance policy model** beyond the pre- kantian conflations which area rather a severe limit to our evolution as one species living in one planet.

Educate to N level observations is the way to Gegnet, to the **limitless opening to the possible**, and the most effective remedy against the darkest shadows of the Middle Ages

# Have a great Conference time

# Thank You!