It is about connections and information flows, we can make that more visible [Lauren].

Process: vision (assess resonance); implementation (making a protocol).

Table of contents

Inter / in-between spaces

Example / metaphor: **oasis**, the ephemeral in-between space. An oasis is a place where desert nomads from many different tribes can gather together, share innovations, form friendships, and trade with one another.
These spaces have a certain ecosystem function, but do not operate as large platforms.
Model a space using https://www.catalist.network / Trove.

Shared experience

Lauren expanded on her idea of creating new kinds of network containers that go beyond the usual domains, such as “open-source technology” or “climate activism,” that are purposely created to increase the flow among groups within a network. When we define our shared wealth as the ability to share innovations quickly across a network, we can measure the amount of activity and connections that are happening within a network and qualify the bridges in between groups. This can be done mathematically, so it can provide us with a quantitative figure besides money to measure. Of course, we don’t just want to design our algorithm for the fast spread of attention-grabbing news….this is the Facebook algorithm and it encourages people to spread shallow and attention-grabbing items. We want to spread deeper innovations and create meaningful connections. How we measure this is not immediately clear, but we could do some experimentation around this.

Lauren developed this line of thinking after her experience of getting together people who spoke at least three languages and getting them to discuss how to translate concepts around different commons groups speaking different languages (what happened was unusual and extraordinary and can be seen here in a condensed form: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eO0336cj_vI). Even though the group was largely heterogeneous with little in common on the surface, there was a remarkable degree of connection among the participants, as they started a freeform discussion in several languages at once, sort of a language cypher. Even though they were in different groups, spoke different languages, and came from different fields, each person there felt a sort of comradery that comes from having the experience of being sort of a cultural nomad. Most of the people there had expanded cultural identities and the ability to relate to all sorts of different people, and that gave them something in common. Lauren realized that in this context, a Wharton graduate whose Jewish family had fled Germany during WWII and had wound up in Latin American before coming to the US actually had a lot in common with a Senegalese man who had spent several years in Italy and in Europe before coming home to his country and setting up a farm in a rural village. On the surface, they have nothing in common except speaking several different languages, but underneath, there was a deep connection that comes from participating partially in many cultures but not being a full member of any. The insight is that we can create collectively intelligent groups comprised of very diverse people if the participants have something deep in common that makes them feel kinship. This way, we can create network hubs of people from many different groups and different domains that actually feel cohesive and make sense.

By creating these groups with a high soul connection, we can increase the overall intelligence of our network and also increase the flow of valuable information and innovations, while also helping people find their network soulmates. In the Harry Potter books, there were four different groups that the students could join: Slytherin, for the highly ambitious; Gryffindor for the brave, Hufflepuff for the kind, and Ravenclaw for the clever. Perhaps we can create groups like this along similar lines. For example, a group of healers, bullshit-detectors, deep innovators, etc.

Beyond Protocols--A new vision for interoperability

The philosophy behind interoperability, until now, was the creation and enforcement of a protocol that allows some kind of uniformity and allows us to interoperate. The problem is, when there are already six protocols that are not widely adopted, and we introduce a 7th “Protocol of protocols” there are now 7 protocols that do not have market dominance, and the effort has simply added to the chaos and confusion. Creating a protocol and enforcing it from the top down is problematic, especially when there is no natural authority to enforce it, as in a decentralized network. We can think differently about interoperability by viewing it as a language--if each group has its own language, we need not choose one of these languages and impose that on the others. Each group then feels slightly colonized. Instead, we can create a sort of pidgin language with words from each group, and create a shared protocol from the bottom up by

taking mutual steps to encourage and dissipate this pidgin language. Speaking in terms of metaphors, we could create a shared dictionary.

Shared data objects: an abstraction that allows people to coordinate their thoughts and actions without a formal anchor, such as a shared ethos for example. Here are some examples:

- A video or paragraph about a group conflict that has arisen (for example, someone has posted a racially charged comment in the chat, detailed specifically). This is just a simple story format that different groups could react to, by discussing how they would deal with that (if at all). This warm data allows us to compare different groups and where they are--emotionally and politically--apples to apples. Once there are enough submissions, we can start to group them into different patterns, to make it easier for future groups to identify the different methodologies and the one they most relate to.
- We could also have a data object (again, a video, a written paragraph) about a person trying to do a particular task, and have different groups respond to the object. Say, for example, a story about an entrepreneur with an idea who is trying to find collaborators. How does this process work within different groups? Or is it totally irrelevant to their group? We could talk about the scenario further, but the important part is that you have multiple groups responding to the same story, so that you can listen to several and start to see which groups you prefer.
- Having the shared data objects allows us to go beyond blah blah and signal to each other more clearly our “vibe.” In an emergent environment, this is important, because we often do not have a common vocabulary to be able to effectively signal each other.

Spaces

- Gitcoin - crowdsourcing and signaling of initiatives
- Trove - define reason of existence - needs architecture.

External links

Wealth Transfer on Sensorica