THE MATHEMATICAL THEORY OF POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED

> What are the roots that clutch, what branches grow Out of this stony rubbish? Son of man, You cannot say, or guess, for you know only A heap of broken images, where the sun beats, And the dead tree gives no shelter, the cricket no relief, And the dry stone no sound of water. Only There is shadow under this red rock, (Come in under the shadow of this red rock), And I will show you something different from either Your shadow at morning striding behind you Or your shadow at evening rising to meet you; I will show you fear in a handful of dust.
>
> T. S. Eliot, *The Waste Land*, 1922

I will sketch out some ideas here about comparison of political ideologies. Let us define political ideologies broadly, and unrealistically. We will consider political ideologies for the entire human race, rather than tribal or national ideologies because we're interested not in local politics but for global political order.

We define a political ideology as a coherent theory of principles, propositions, and laws whose purpose is to govern the political organisation of the human race.

There are an infinite possible set of political ideologies in theories. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of all political ideologies. For example, we can have political ideologies that seek liberty for people from all interference; or we can have political ideologies that focus on equality of material wealth among all people. I am not interested here in specifying criteria.

Instead I will introduce unknown human nature $\mathcal{N}$ as a set of propositions. We will then introduce $\mathcal{H}$ the set of all human beings. Now we have abstracted human nature such that if $h \in \mathcal{H}$ then necessarily $n(h) = 1$ for all – or almost all – $n \in \mathcal{N}$. This is interpreted as human nature propositions $n \in \mathcal{N}$ evaluate to true for all human beings.

Let $L : \mathcal{H} \to [0,1]$ be the life satifaction of a person. We then consider the function $L_T : \mathcal{H} \times \mathbf{R} \to [0,1]$ which is the life satisfaction at a particular time.

We can then consider two optimisation problems. One is

$$(1) \qquad P_{ls} = \operatorname{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \int_{[0,\infty)} \int_{\mathcal{H}} L_T(h,t)\,dh\,dt$$

And another is a more restricted optimisation. Let

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \{P \in \mathcal{P} : c(P,\mathcal{N}) = 1\}$$

Here $c(P,\mathcal{N})$ is a consistency function.

$$(2) \qquad P_{hn} = \operatorname{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_\backslash} \int_{[0,\infty)} \int_{\mathcal{H}} L_T(h,t)\,dh\,dt$$

1. Interpretation

The interpretation is that the best political ideology can use average life satisfaction of all human beings over their life times either over all political ideologies or restricted to those political ideologies all of whose propositions are consistent with human nature.

Both of these optimisation problems, I submit will produce very different political principles than Democracy and Capitalism or Communism. The extant political ideologies are arbitrary and unprincipled from the viewpoint presented above.

2. Natural Rights Are Not Human Nature But Quite Close

Most global citizens (78%) agree that it is important to have a law that protects human rights in their country, while just 6% disagree, 12% are neutral and 3% don't know [1]

By our criteria, this is close to human nature but it is not 90-95% consensus which would mark it as human nature.

3. Existence of Human Nature

From around 8–7 million years human evolution produced a situation where many of the "lower level" functions had stabilised and were already part our genetic code in common G_c. The precise content of this G_c is filled with mystery. At the same time all civilisations and cultures of the past several thousand years on Earth had attempted to produce principles and laws, philisophies and arts, religions and rituals in one way or another *to fathom G_c* and its potential. Of course this is not what they thought they were doing but it is not wrong to see things in this way.

As a parenthetical note, not long ago, I challenged the concept of Collective Unconscious of Carl Gustav Jung, and this was after more than a decade of interest in his ideas and reading his works. The commonality that is seen to be 'deep' in Jung, of uniting both theories of mythologies and dreams with this concept of Collective Unconscious was an interesting error; it is a great organising principle, but in fact not a good scientific theory. The observed similarity of mythologies of the world is much better explained by G_c.

Now DNA structure in genetic code was discovered in 1953, and the human genome mapped and G_c discovered from 2000. But armed with this knowledge of existence of this G_c we have a great opportunity to revisit and correct all the philisophies, and other knowledge and theories gained in our past and have a new and clearer and superior understanding of Human Nature and this understanding

will allow us to co-create the future on stronger footing in the light of knowledge rather than in the darkness of ignorance about our own nature.

References

[1] https://www.ipsos.com/en/human-rights-2018