

# Social Breakthrough to Global Collective Order

Rinaldo C. MICHELINI  
Dime, University of Genova  
Genova, Italy

and

Roberto P. RAZZOLI  
Dime, University of Genova  
Genova, Italy

## ABSTRACT

The paper look at the fancy build-up of our planned constructions, conventionally assessing on-the-go progress. The survey covers the tricky cross-links of <collective orders> and acknowledged <rationality>, viz., reverence and dependence assigned to mind objects expressing culture and ethics. Our relationship with the external world is, then, shortly tacked, because we need some sort of certainty about the <real> consistency of what is perceived, to trust in planned improvements. Afterword, the analysis moves to <intelligence> enabled processes, with especial focus on political cohesion rules, necessary foundation of the organised effectiveness. Last, the conditional framework of the human progress continuance is sketched, mentioning the existing economy globalisation drawbacks, to enlighten the requirements imposed by the impending ecology globalisation. The topics repeat known facts, only, perhaps, assembled by unusual construal.

**Keywords:** Economy Globalisation, Ecology Globalisation, Social Breakthrough, Collective Order, Sustainable Growth.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The human civilisation is difficult to manoeuvre accomplishment, bringing forth prosperity and efficiency by intentional modification of the original natural order of the wilderness. A conventional recognition of the changes moves through <culture> formation, i.e., the man capacity of creating know-how, to transform the surrounding resources into value-added provisions and amenities. A (perhaps) less conformist reading looks at <ethics> construal, i.e., the ability of creating relationships, to establish collective orders and to define principled demeanour. We quote the primeval <social> breakthrough, using the group selection, to arrange sectional political cohesion [1,2,3,4].

<Culture> and <ethics> are *artificial* inventions, not included by the primordial background. They are issue of the man <relational intelligence>. We might accept that they are God's gifts, so the civilisation follows as attainment ruled from above. Remaining on a *posteriori* facts, the oddness is entangled, being in-progress enabled intellectual ends. The quality <artificial> means man planned wherewithal. The world progress is appraised through the enjoyed life-quality, viz., the privileged circumstances built by the men, yielding intentional prosperity and authenticity, relative to the earth original dearth

and wilderness [5,6,7,8].

The deliberate improvements exploit the additive knowledge sharing, by communication and appraisal of the collective mind worlds. The man distinguishes from the other living beings, because of scholarly and empathic training. The affluence and influence build on competence and productivity. The society organises on a series of artificial constructions: business project, indorsed corporation, lawful entrepreneurial cluster, etc., with nation-state ruling, bureaucracy steering and legal institution measures. The government-and-company competitive arrangements need to evolve, slotting in up-dating from technology, administration, economy, management, ecology, etc. sources, all planned contrivances, invented by the man *intellectual* ability [9,10,11,12].

The civilisation is baffling issue, rooted in voluntary measures that men imagine and apply to the surrounds, aiming at improving their life-quality. The survey of how the artificial *mind* worlds prefigure such (actually ascertained) happening, shows, nevertheless, emerging construal ambiguities. The pictures are background of increased concern about the man civilisation continuation. The sustainable growth is impeding threat, produced by the *ecology* globalisation, viz., the alarm on bio-sphere (today mistrusted) reliability. Several reasons exist for fear about future growth, especially, when considering *industrialism*, too much used into undiscerning faith about consumerism. The ecology comes to be sharp intruder in the *economy* prospects, worsening the already actually serious events. The analyses, without hiding the challenge critical character, are heartening. The progress, organised on a *posteriori* rationales, would persist, owing to the discoveries of the man intelligence. The <cognitive revolution> is robot-driven up-turn, offsetting the industrialism over-pollution and over-consumption, by means of the <to de-materialise> and the <to re-materialise> routines.

## 2. PROGRESS AND COLLECTIVE ORDERS

The *artificial* character of the <progress> benefits are conventional, compared to the *natural* wilderness. The judgement entails the set of changes that support thriving life-quality by speculative changeovers. The abstract makeup of mind worlds proposes that *intelligence* is further discontinuity occurring on earth after *life*. With the first break, the <natural selection> promotes <the differential amplification of specific features within a population of items, to enhance the fitness to

the surrounding stimuli). The principle understands the *agentive character* of the life phenomena, saying that the extant traits of the living beings are adaptive: the *gene* evolution develops along with the *genome* information modifications.

The physiology variations (such as immune worth) might exploit *clone growth*, fostering *somatic fitness* at the individual range, by (perhaps) *virome* adjustments.

The second break establishes on neuronal deployment (*fit* for intelligent behaviour); it generates the *mind categories*. The processes are *creative*, bringing forth extension of the *fitness* features. The *knowledge development* ends in culture and ethics objects, which are shared as collective heritage, implemented with *intentional order imprint*. The discontinuity yields such awkward *intelligence* institutions, as trade tenet regulation and political cohesion organisation. No other animal conceived language and trade, money and administration [13,14,15,16].

The *intelligence* institutions are musts of the civilisation beginning and progression; law and market are *artificial* compositions, settled because of recognised *utility*. Their back-up moves from the foundation of *authority*, endowed of accepted *authenticity*. The *king by grace of God* or the *nation by race validity* do not have clear-cut proofs. Dropped transcendental and immanent truthfulness, governments require *a posteriori* legitimacy, with intended *constitutional* settlements. The *order imprint* is *deliberate* change, as the inner cooperation grants synergic advantage. The *artificial* construction requests decisive resort to lawful conduct: responsive authority and civic mindedness [17,18,19,20].

Along with the *modernisation* lines, the parliamentary democracy occurs to be the especially *fit* stage of the recent European nation-states. Education deepens the awareness and sense of ethnic identification, and increases the spirit of political belonging and membership tolerance. The civic life and opinionated grouping are basic features, at odds with the critical determination, issued by personal instruction and strength of mind. The *collective* order choice of the (parliamentary) democracy is just *modernisation* stage, fostered by the western-style society success of the industry age, combining united competition at a fragmented sovereignty span.

Today, the effectiveness range moves towards a continental size, at USA, Russia, China or India consistency. The related *modernisation* required assembling the EU, though, with odd hesitation in sharing prospects, to exploit previous inner chances. The co-existence of cross-border actors and sectional sovereignty is paradox, making the UE ineffective, unless the political cohesion develops into self-contained collective order. The outlined analysis merely deals with economic globalisation constraints. Indeed, the *financial* adequacy is just an element pushing to revise the nation-state size. The growth sustainability brings-in ecologic globalisation restrictions, totally modifying the split-sovereignty course [21,22,23,24].

The ecology constraints are totally new requests. The CO<sub>2</sub> effluence has worldwide effects, and the global warming is acknowledged impending threat. The local (more or less segmented) sovereignty cannot decree charge exemptions or privileged withdrawal conditions. The *unfair* *modernisation* stage, entailing the EU face to economy globalisation

constraints, replicates with critical effects, involving the *global village*, due to ecology globalisation demands. In the time to come, if sustainable growth planning makes sense, the aim of *fair* *political cohesion* clashes against the concept of split-sovereignty, because no one is *certainly* safe, face to the earth *natural capital* management, done elsewhere in bio-sphere. We shall later come back on the question, outlining the (hoped) *cognitive* revolution, adding to the *agricultural* and *industrial* ones, to rebalance the *natural capital* exploitation, consistent with principled tenures. The survey, now, goes on summarising some backdrops, affecting the human life-quality course.

### 3. MANAGING THE TANGIBLES

The progress continuance requires consistency of the wealth creation process, *viz.*, steady regularity of the surroundings, from where withdrawing the indispensable resources. The proposition might appear obvious, and it is pleonastic, if we believe in the science models and in the man ability to be actor of his wellbeing. In reality, we may trust the consensus about (timely accepted) *natural laws*, and we can check the effects of their application. But: is scientists' shared accord sufficient for the *laws* (absolute) truth? The question is often by-passed, as irrelevant. The answers go beyond the survey limited purposes, and we move further according to plain *realism* [25,26,27,28].

The *realists* believe that items exist, because they share the *real* property of the being; the *anti-realists* deem that the concepts that distinguish objects are just mind categories, assigned by the observers (with shared conventions, after educated instruction). The *semantic realism* is equally complex: is the principled truth *universal*, or does it depend on the shared conventions (recognised culture and accepted ethics)? The plain *realism* simplifies the frames, itemising the *reality*, if useful. On those cues, agricultural and industrial revolutions differ on the tied entropy, due to the animate or inanimate tracks. Yet, the latter permits *man-made* creation of prosperity, by *artificial energy*. The conformist source resorts to the earth fossil (and fissile) stocks, piled up during past eras. This way, controlled thermal energy is got, and (partly) transformed into (mechanical and) electrical energy; the process downgrades resources in waste/pollution and (directly/indirectly) raises the world temperature.

The *artificial energy* option progresses, with the burning-up of *non-renewable* means, as the production of the looked-for prosperity implies over-consumption and over-pollution, compared to inborn earth rescue ability. The *renewable* balance limitation means looking at *artificial energy* only, obtained by *alternative* sources: sun radiation, wind/river streams, etc., already enabled at the earth surface. The conversion to *alternative* source options, brings to drastic drop of *artificial energy* availability, at the present state of the art. The sustainable growth requires a novel revolution.

The ground-breaking innovations, with plain *realism*, suitably shall consider [29,30,31,32]:

- computer tools, to help monitoring, checking and appraising the on-the-go resource handling;
- bio-mimicry tools, to diversify and expand applicable life-based paths, with controlled outcomes.

The <realism> aims at inventing artificial agricultural-like procedures, appropriately expanding the biological world in emulation of the primeval farmers, in keeping with industry-like effectiveness, correctly combining artificial energy management. The appraisal of a <real> worth, to be allotted to the *artificial* progress, is a result of the man centred bias, which marks our position face to knowledge and lawfulness. These issues are, perhaps, gobsmacking. We are well aware that our planet is totally negligible at the cosmic scale; the earth life and intelligence are insignificant, when assessed at universe's calibration. Yet, most of us deal with the <nature> laws, classic cosmology or quantum mechanics, as if they were <truth> of a fixed order, out of personal liking. In adjunct, (surely) abstract theories (mathematics, etc.) happen to support models permitting experimental forecasts; our <rationality>, then, feels safe using the <falsification principle> as worthwhile cure-all.

Indeed, the awareness about the successfulness of our mind worlds deserves trust. Even keeping on with factual pragmatism, we are assertive, when preferring anthropic life-quality and rebuffing savagery. Lately, the scientific relies on an <observer> makeup. The investigator is shown looking, e.g., at a chess game; after a while, he understands the rules, and can become player (with useful upshots). The human observer builds <models> and identifies <laws>, empirically assessed by the <falsification principle>. The observation window and acquisition/processing means supply snapshots, with consequent reliability of the inferred forecasts, but dependable on human horizons. In the planning, the handy technology and equipment entail a narrow set of tasks, in line with the detected cause-effect relationships. The position of involved *observers/actors* is restricted to engineer's jobs, with diffident ambition of scientist's speculation. The guesswork is necessary complement for modifying and improving the state of the knowledge, adding new discoveries and letting fall defective frames [33,34,35,36].

When we look behind at past events occurred on earth, two conclusions are evident: all the facts are totally insignificant, in comparison with the universe implications; the man civilisation covers a tiny span of such a trivial framework. We may conclude that the man adventure is <grandiose> from our viewpoint, but, as just above noticed, it very little affects the cosmos. Thereafter, the quarrel about the spotted <laws> moves idle questions, being rather strange that <intelligent> *observers/actors* of peripheral corners could play valuable roles. Thus, the accomplished examination remains localised at man-centred range, and the tied outcomes imply success or failure within anthropic spheres. Accordingly, man civilisation <greatness> is comparative appraisal and, as such, is used to qualify the already available attainments as a proof that (at least, till now) the progress has provided better life-quality, through wider richness and more comfortable habitats. The performed management of the natural resources has been winning challenge, until when the ecology has required monitoring the bio-sphere health.

The monitored upshots have been shocking: the <artificial energy> option cannot grant sustainable growth, if confined into the industrialism we exploit. We find comfort, maybe, in the earth weight irrelevance at the cosmos level. At this point, a different <modernisation> stage has to be forecasted, with fitting technology innovation and appropriate socio-political organisation. The divide has already been identified as <cognitive revolution>: we shall look at <robot age> know-how

and equipment; we shall adopt political cohesion rules at the global village extension. The latter challenge deserves widening the investigation about the human knowledge course.

#### 4. MANAGING THE INTANGIBLES

In our models, usual severance distinguishes the inanimate, from the animate worlds. The latter is ruled by <evolutionism>, steered by <natural selection>. Along that line, an empirical evidence shows the <mind>, in union with the <rational knowledge>; the process is (symbolically) described as *memetic evolution*. If we can be dubious about the <real> existence of the material world, the entire <mind> complex certainly reduces to concepts, with attached <names>. We need, nevertheless, to establish general statements, endowed with acknowledged consent, to make possible a common understanding. Unfortunately, a self-reliant reading is today lacking. Some clues might be devised, putting together <mind> and <conscience>, and trying to figure out where the <rationality> develops [37,38,39,40].

Where does <conscience> start from? The unconscious aggregation of flexible cortical maps might be first step of brain towards to mind, diffused over the whole neuronal nets. The cluster of extraneous (compared with the brain hardware) facts and events assembles what is perceived. As second step, it switches on the brain mechanisms of making out the <qualia>: feeling of pleasure, of pain, of fulfilment, of disappointment, etc.). This is neuronal process, which becomes apparent, third step, when the views add, recognising the self; then, fourth step, the mind establishes, as in progress cognizant sequence of statuses, ending, last step, in the self-conscience. If the individuals communicate and compare their <qualia>, with other people, the <conscience> establishes shared <knowledge>, and the individuals are ready to look to culture and to ethics, i.e., too bring forth (man relational) intelligence [41,42,43,44].

The sketched sequence is rough account: it does not explain the human oddness. It is known that our DNA (*viz.* brain) does not differ too much, from the one of living beings, which never invented spoken/written languages. Indeed, the odd man <intelligence> describes with a set of features:

- the ability to obtain, assemble and categorize the images (*inner model*) of the world;
- the ability to select and order relationships, choosing and fixing *accepted laws*;
- the ability to devise progression forecasts, by *simulation* with the inner model;
- the ability to decide suited *discernment patterns*, consistent with models and laws;
- the ability to acknowledge the learning progress, exploiting conscious *introspection*;
- the ability to check-out theories, through the *co-operative recognition* of scientists.

The set of mind features (*inner model, accepted laws, simulation, discernment patterns, introspection, co-operative recognition*) is hard to conceive on merely <bubble-up> sequences, decomposing complex layouts into mute randomness steps; the upshots cumulate, until when preferential strings start repeating; these become <first choice>, and the <replication> turns out as standard routine (if outer setting does not change). The above features, on the contrary, figure-out <trickle-down> schemes, whether self-consistent

plans allow organising the build-up of knowledge and the cataloguing of behaviours. The entropy principle opposes to the change of randomness into standard routines. Relatedly, <intelligence> generates operation sequences, because of their (invented) consistency. The <trickle-down> standards shape reasoning as if a design project is steering the thinking. The <intelligence> oddness is mostly contained in that mismatch: we cannot predict results, but we organise our actions, as stated by pretended *rational* scopes. The incongruity does not apply to the central processor (of a computer): it does not know mathematics and executes algorithms, without understanding them, but a programmer and an operation system exist, steering the design project.

The mysteriousness of the mind is documented by the *invention* of languages. The happening connects with the archaic <social breakthrough>, to supply messaging means within the groups, to organise cohesion and guard. Most animals communicate by sounds, but, so far, no <bubble-up> way endowed them with speech. In truth, the articulation of noises into words is decipherable if it follows a syntax. The <syntax> is ordering prerogative of all human idioms, exploiting conventional patterns, ruled by <trickle-down> way. The coding is puzzling outcome; the <Babel tower> tale shows that intelligible messages need vigilant lucidity. Besides, several *orderings* have been invented: the Indo-European syntax: subject-verb-complements, has different structure in the Chinese idioms (also the speech timber/tune modulation follows unlike forms). All variants are, of course, consistent with the man anatomy (and brain hardware), and the each other understanding is welcomed, after decoded the established guides.

The <relational intelligence> oddness begins yielding stacy changes with the archaic <social breakthrough>, through resort to <collective order> synergies. The effectiveness is reached by crafty setting: co-operation among fellow citizens; rivalry against foreign assemblies. The trend goes on, until <nation-state> formation and split-sovereignty issues. Successful competition could lead to deceptive upshots, if the society enslaves man to vanity, believing to be all-powerful, as if the achievements are total merit of the country superiority. Upright outcomes follow, if the society teaches the citizen to be *rational*. The latter tuition starts from the man's capacity for <empathy>: his ability to feel what another feels. The *rationality* goes together with the appreciation of the <utility> at the individual and at the communal ranges [45,46,47,48].

Yet, <rationality> requires <empathy squared>: the man's ability to sense what other men feel about him, putting himself in the shoes of other men putting themselves in his shoes. The *civil* education is complete, when a person chooses the *ideal* shoes in which to put himself: i.e., those of a <fair spectator>, who considers our conduct with the same indifference (impartiality), with which we regard that of other people. The <meme evolution> foreshadows <rationality>, stepwise educating the civic mindedness at the right cohesion.

The *judicious* competition is not overwhelming abuse and good dispossession plundering. The nation-state lean utility is meaningful settlement, when defined on impartial agreements, transposing the civic rights of the individuals to like privileges of each country. The course from *gene* selfishness to *group* egoism (and to nation-state self-interest) modifies the public spirit, towards <empathy> and <empathy squared>. So, the *rational* behaviour aims at consistent and stable well-being,

requiring civic-mindedness, as self-centredness is unreliable. The political cohesion edging is, possibly, instrumental settlement: the conscious arrangement of efficient public spirit cannot cross bloody borders, with *gene* selfishness of family clans. It moves to wide governance resolutions, with *country* self-interest, optimised by citizen's loyalty.

The term <empathy> suggests that we enter in the emotional state of another, and we share his feelings. In fact, every human being takes on the role of another, to consider that person's thoughts, behaviour and intentions, in view to decide fitting reactions. The *reading* of others, in order to establish social relations, is <cognitive> activity. The cognition plays vital steps: the emotional sharing of others' feelings is accompanied by a cognitive assessment of the others' actual condition, and followed by an engaged response to attend to their needs and to help up-grading their status. The mood sharing is relational intelligence discernment phase. The empathy illuminates the utility of fair demeanours, because of balanced reciprocity and mutual concern advantages. Hence, the <ethics> dimensions (further to the <culture> ones) are incorporated by the <relational intelligence> outcomes, along with the *meme* evolution (and out of the *gene* selfishness). This is the same of saying that the *group* and *country* divisions are contingent stages, ruled by timely recognised <utility>: the <fair> conduct *convenience* ensues from collective synergy effects, and the *assembly* size is just <provisional> input.

## 5. THE ALTRUISM PASSAGE

The progress has been said to be critically tied to wellbeing that can be enjoyed. The prosperity, however, is *artificial* construction, carried over altering the natural surroundings. The picture involves the exploitation of natural/human resources by value-added transformations: the agricultural and industrial revolutions are well known backing. It implicates, moreover, the deployment of financial/technical resources, concurrently employed, to make effective the value-added accomplishments. For sure, the narrative is man-centred: no civilisation is conceivable otherwise; still, we conventionally refer to four assets: *human*, *natural*, *financial* and *technical*, to express the fact that the improvements require balancing the four sources. The statement is obvious, but often disregarded, with grim drawbacks, when waning the *natural* capital by poisoning and spoil, or when misconstruing the <modernisation> lines, especially, by treacherous affluence-and-influence manipulation [49,50,51,52].

If advancements are man success, shortcomings are man failure. For sure, extant outer conditions alter the headway; still, the planning has responsible performers, which ought to attend as recognised *observers* and reliable *actors*. The statement is equivalent to say that changes to better are viable and that operators need programming the business according to suited rules. To sum-up, the given clues advise assuming:

- the growth adventure of the human species, through <modernisation> steps;
- the consistent availability of <natural capital>, to be transformed in apt riches;
- the wise resort to <human capital>, to help fostering fit socio-political frames.

Our *intellectual* bias adds the <financial> and the <technical> capitals, to offer *rational* evidence to the fancy man

civilisation, by <trickle-down> schemes. The technology innovation role has clear-cut visibility: since remote time, the terms <ars> or <techné> are used to symbolise the intentional *discoveries*, making feasible the <improvement> of the unaffected surroundings.

We have mentioned the languages as human characteristic oddity. The <trade> is not less astonishing: no animal discovered how to organise a market, and to exploit the primary needs within planned <utility> of third operators. The <money>, soon, becomes manifest supplement; the institution of <authenticity> rules is appendage, with the related sovereignty and legitimacy specifications. All measures might look amazing, but it is difficult to imagine factual wellbeing, without those proficient constituents. We conclude that the resources exploitation, with value-added production, is not conceivable out of <authenticity> frames. In our *rational* (cause-effect) schemes, the inference is academic, but cannot be suppressed.

The <collective order> formation is remarkable fact, with the surprising consequence of *social* value-added and *political* organisation, both *artificial* configurations, made-up to improve people wellbeing. It is difficult explaining how the arrangements wrap up. A transcendental or an immanent motivation can be simple way out. The <nation-state> has well-defined <authenticity> due to <king by grace of God> sovereignty, or owing to <race homogeneity> of the citizens. The pictures are well-liked, when eminent leadership is in-force glue, or when direct exchange fosters close cohesion. No pragmatic evidence shows the soundness of one or the other assumption, unless as a result of well-timed value of the provisionally gathered executive assemblies. In our view, no inherent or inborn <collective order> pre-exists; the formation is acquired result, subsequent to decision-making procedures [53,54,55,56].

Today, in fact, we credit the <constitutional> sovereignty, especially, conferred after plebiscite and ruled by (parliamentary) democracy. Accordingly, recent <modernisation> up-turns characterise by a set of quibbles not really entailing ground-breaking changes, more exactly looking after:

- the provisioning profitability, by the resort of advantaged supply chains;
- the country competitiveness, by establishing hierarchical dominances;
- the industrialism effectiveness, by widening throughput and market share.

The industrial revolution avails, as said, of <artificial energy> opportunities; the raw materials are supposed to have withdrawal without limits; the manufacture business positively ends at the point-of-sale; tolerable concern affects the scrape and sewage management. We have clearly pointed out that the ecology entirely modifies the listed postulations. However, the up-turn needs to be imagined, when also the other two rules are no more operative. Continental size of the country is crucial prerequisite of supremacy; buyer's fullness imposes *scope*-manufacture (in lieu of *scale*-supply). Together, these two facts are handled, recognizing the *economy* globalization effects, but the actual issues happen to be doubtful. The millennium sets-up huge suspicions on the firmness of business transactions, based on entwined debts, each one supporting the trustworthiness of the construction, placing out *virtual* wealth (which subsists, on

condition to keep expanding the chain). The indebtedness is invasive ploy of individuals, which enjoy goods, facilities and amenities repaid by future gains; it is standard practice of companies, which organize business projects around venture capitals; it is shrewd resort of governments, which support current welfare to keep occupation continuity. When the circulated *virtual* wealth clashes against too huge obstacles, certain *virtual* amounts disappear, and the related weaker rings of the chain are swindled. The steadiness of the whole is tolerable, if the smashes are limited and randomly distributed.

The wellbeing rooted in <financial> capital manipulations is hot potato, because money held by an economic agent is a claim of wealth of an another (public or private) body. Synergic use fosters growth; virtual abuse, even if ostensibly lawful, exploits Ponzi-like plots, to originate concocted assets, scattered with duplicitous issues. The *economy* globalization radicalizes the shakiness. It allows fictitious recovery by indebted parties, but in-progress transfers wealth to blocs with growing GDP, from the ones, soon moved to recession. The growth is obtained by biasing the advantaged supply chains, modifying the flow of the riches. The picture is construed as <selection> process (social Darwinism), through which shaping nation fittingness. The progress is the result of survival conflicts, with defeats and winners.

The *ecology* globalisation ensues, showing that the earth <natural capital> is limited and that wastes worsen the bio-sphere at global village span. The conflict winners will share contaminated lands: castling is meagre remedy, with no steady prospects. The *planned* (in place of *natural*) <selection> is, possibly, *realistic*, if the winners will successfully enjoy secure progress; this shall double efforts in the fight, as rout entails passing away. Yet, *planned* <selection> is not *rational*, in case of *over-consumption* and *over-pollution*; the obtained <utility> has disputable worth, under way increasing the total of dispossessed people, besides worsening the communal habitat safety [57,58,59,60].

The *rational* scenarios inevitably aim at *sustainability*, viz., at keeping *stable* source provision and *harmless* environment settings. The shady <utility> of damaging the whole habitat (out of, maybe, castled resorts) is perilous, not judicious. The *ecology* globalization unavoidably requires moving, from struggle, to common security. The <competition-to-altruism> alteration is *meme* evolution stage, once understood that the only harmless policy requires sheltering the entire global village. Then, the wise people need to become world-citizens, rejecting the *planned* <selection> practices, undamaging the communal bio-sphere. The <altruism> *rationality* becomes thoughtful choice, on condition to enable growth continuance, upholding man wealth and health. The steps to-come address the <cognitive revolution>, i.e., robot age technologies, devising the two scopes: <to de-materialise>, with enhanced value-added in intangibles; <to re-materialise>, with safety by bio-mimicry reclamation. The bet are left to *artificial* inventions along with the *meme* evolution path.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

The man civilisation is awkward outcome, having man-centred worth, uneasily explained on universe scale. Two oddities occurred in our remote spot: *life*, providing way to local self-sustaining re-ordering processes; *intelligence*, making

conceivable autonomous alterations of the intrinsic trends by planned acts. It is hard to evaluate the oddities, and their appraisal is useless, whether communicated at the human range only. So, the civilisation is to accept as *artificial* incident, with beneficial marks on life-quality until now appreciated, therefore to be extended and protracted. The statement suggests revising the course of man weird ability to enable his observer/actor mission. The paper shortly follows the track, with stress on the deliberate kind of achievements, even when obtained without explicit perception.

The civilisation is identified as apparent consequence of culture and ethics, created by intellectual talents. The joint after-effects bring forth <knowledge> founding, sharing and accrual together with <moral manner> detection, appraisal and enacting. In fact, the civic mindedness is necessary step of the progress, with vital role not less relevant than the know-how. Instruction and education fashion the abstract world of the mind, along with communal learning procedures, yielding <collective orders>, basically tied to the man <relational intelligence>. Thereafter, the human progress is communal accomplishment, in-progress incorporating new features, and unceasingly requiring <modernisation> [61,62,63,64].

The (until now) recorded improvements have affected the earth settings (embodying the exploited <natural capital>, and the participating people (epitomising the concerned <human capital>). Significant changes are obtained managing the earth resources, assumed to belong to mankind, and entirely available to work-out value-added transformations. In truth, this assertion is a bit reckless: we cannot know how <real> is what we perceive, and how <true> is our construal of the outside. The factual assessment of the tangible world has true-life check, through the empirical linking of cause-effect relationships of instant snap-shops. Thus, the knowledge building processes are corollary accomplishment. The examination opposes <bubble-up> to <trickle-down> sequences, with, however, apparent mysteries. The <bubble-up> processes have consistent worth, if an inborn selection mechanism is proved to exist, leading to ordered set-ups, from the pre-existing randomness. Now, we do not know which value the <natural laws> possess, still clear evidence exists for the <entropy> decay, making unbelievable to move the chaos, to regular systems. The <trickle-down> alternative is not less questionable. Its consistency has simple defence, assuming an outer causative origin. If both, the immanent and the transcendental reasons cannot be persuasive at our state of the arts, we shall try to find out plausible ways to acknowledge the organised lay-outs on merely *a posteriori* testimony [65,66,67,68].

The <truth> of the obtained evidence is, of course, restrained. Moreover, the duty is somehow made easier, exploring together <relational intelligence> peculiarity and <man civilisation> strangeness. The analysis has ground to consider: communication, spoken languages plus syntax; trade, individual utility plus organised market; lawfulness, indorsed authority plus authenticity; and so on, always recognising <trickle-down> logic as enabling rational. The *meme* origin of the interpersonal abstract build-ups is accepted, using the term as symbolic description of factual happenings out of the single individual sphere, hence beyond clear-cut *gene* origin [69,70,71,72]. The whole pictures are background of the increased concern about the man civilisation stable continuation. The sustainability of the growth is impeding

threat, produced by the *ecology* globalization, viz., the vibrant alarm about our bio-sphere reliability, today mistrusted, e.g., bearing in mind the climate change trends. In truth, several reasons exist for fear about future growth, especially, if considering the, so named, *advanced* countries, too much used to sink into undiscerning faith about financial instruments. So, the ecology comes to be sharp intruder in the *economy* globalisation prospects, worsening the already actually serious events. The analysis, without hiding the critical character of the challenge, is somehow comforting. The progress, if organised on merely *a posteriori* rationales, will persist, on condition of ground-breaking discoveries of the man intelligence. The <cognitive revolution> is a devised up-turn, offsetting the current industrialism over-pollution and over-consumption, by means of the <to de-materialise> and the <to re-materialise> routines of the robot age technologies.

## 7. REFERENCES

- [01] N. Bhagwati, **In defence of globalisation**, New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004.
- [02] S. Johnson, **Future perfect: the case for progress in a networked age**, London: Allen Lane, 2013.
- [03] V. Tanzi, **Government vs. markets: the changing economic role of the state**, New York: Cambridge Uni. Press, 2011.
- [04] W. Sadurski, **Equality and legitimacy**, Oxford: Oxford Uni. Press, 2008.
- [05] C. Antonelli, **The economics of innovation: critical concepts in economics**, New York: Routledge, 2008.
- [06] R.C. Michelini, **Robot age knowledge changeover**, New York: Nova Sci. Pub., 2009.
- [07] S. Labadi, and C. Long, **Heritage and globalisation**, London: Routledge, 2010.
- [08] N. Stern, **The global deal: climate change and the creation of a new era of progress and prosperity**, London: The Bodley Head, 2009.
- [09] B. Cox, and J. Forshaw, **The quantum universe: everything that can happen does happen**, New York: Capo Press, 2012.
- [10] D. Marquand, **The end of the West: the once and future Europe**, Princeton: Princeton Uni. Press, 2011.
- [11] G. Parker, **Cross-function teams: working with allies, enemies and other strangers**, San Francisco: J. Wiley, 2009.
- [12] V. Wohlgemuth, B. Page, and K. Voight, Eds., **Environmental informatics and industrial eco-protection: concepts, methods and tools**, Aachen: Shaker, 2009.
- [13] H. Hovekamp, **Case institutionalism and the origin of law and economics**, Indiana: Iowa Research Papers, 2010.
- [14] M. Piattelli Palmarini, and J. Fodor, **What Darwin got wrong**, London: Profile Books, 2011.
- [15] R. Sennett, **Together: rituals, pleasures and politics of cooperation**, London: Allen Lane, 2012.
- [16] H. Zhuge, **The knowledge grid: toward cyber-society**, Singapore: World Sci. Pub., 2012.
- [17] F. Fukuyama, **The origin of political orders: from prehuman times to the French Revolution**, New York: Straus & Giroux, 2011.
- [18] P.J. Geary, **The myth of nations: the mediaeval origin of Europe**, Princeton: Princeton Uni. Press, 2002.
- [19] W. Ray, **The logic of culture: authority and identity in the modern era**, Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

- [20] J. Zweig, **Your money and your brain**, New York: Simon & Shuster, 2007.
- [21] E. Abele, R. Anderl, and H. Birkofer, **Environmentally-friendly product development: methods and tools**, London: Springer, 2005.
- [22] J. Marcus, and K. Flannery, **The creation of inequalities: how our prehistoric ancestors set the stage for monarchy, slavery and empire**, London: Harvard Uni. Press, 2012.
- [23] P. Ormerod, **Positive linking: how networks can revolutionise the world**, London: Faber & Faber, 2012.
- [24] G. Zekos, **Economics and law on competition in globalisation**, New York: Nova Sci. Pub., 2008.
- [25] A.L. Barabási, **Bursts: the hidden pattern behind everything we do**, Boston: Dutton Books, 2010.
- [26] A. Clark, Ed., **Super-sizing the mind: embodiment, action and cognitive extension**, New York: Oxford Uni. Press, 2008.
- [27] M. Pigliucci, and G.B. Müller, Eds., **Evolution: the extended synthesis**, Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010.
- [28] J.R. Searle, **Making the social world: the structure of human civilisation**, Oxford: Oxford Uni. Press, 2010.
- [29] J. Haldt, **The righteous mind: why good people are divided by politics and religion**, New York: Pantheon, 2012.
- [30] H. Morton, and I. Alexander, **Aristotle's laptop: the discovery of our informational mind**, London: World Sci. Press, 2012.
- [31] C.K. Phahalad, and M. Krishnan, **The new age of innovation: driving co-created value through global networks**, New York: McGraw Hill, 2008.
- [32] A. Scipione, Ed., **Focus on biomimetics research**, New York: Nova Sci., 2012.
- [33] M. Gazzaniga, **Who's in charge? Free-will and the science of the brain**, London: Constable & Robinson, 2012.
- [34] T. Nagel, **Mind and cosmos: why the materialist Neo-Darwinism conception of nature is almost certainly false**, New York: Oxford Uni. Press, 2012.
- [37] L.J. Rogers, G. Vallortigara, and R.J. Andrew, **Divided brains: the biology and behaviours of brain asymmetry**, New York: Cambridge Uni. Press, 2013.
- [38] G.P. Stamou, **Populations, bio-communities, ecosystems: a review of controversies in ecological thinking**, London: Bentham Books, 2012.
- [39] P.S. Churchland, **Braintrust: what neuroscience tells us about the brain**, Princeton: Princeton Uni. Press, 2011.
- [40] L. Craighero, **Neuroni a specchio**, Bologna: Il Mulino, 2010.
- [41] D.J. Siegel, **The mindful brain: reflection and attainment in cultivation of wellbeing**, New York: Norton, 2007.
- [42] G. Tononi, and G. Edelman, **A universe of consciousness: how matter becomes imagination**, New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- [43] C.D. Frith, **Making up the mind: how the brain creates our mental world**, Oxford: Blackwell Sci. Pub., 2007.
- [44] M. Rowlands, **The science of the mind: from extended mind to embodied phenomenology**, Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010.
- [45] E.O. Wilson, **The social conquest of the earth**, New York: Norton, 2012.
- [46] T.R. Zentall, and B.G. Galef, **Social learning: psychological and biological perspectives**, Hillsdale: Erlbaum, 1988.
- [47] D. Forey, **The economics of knowledge**, Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004.
- [48] M. Gorbis, **The nature of the future: dispatches from the social-structured world**, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2013.
- [49] R.C. Michelini, **Knowledge society engineering: a sustainable growth pledge**, New York: Nova Science Pub., 2011.
- [50] D. Zaring, C. Coglianese, and A.M. Finkel, **Import safety: governance in the global economy**, Philadelphia: Uni. Pennsylvania Press, 2009.
- [51] A. Damasio, **Self comes to mind: constructing the conscious brain**, London: Heinemann, 2011.
- [52] S. Gallager, **How the body shapes the mind**, Oxford: Oxford Uni. Press, 2005.
- [53] E.J. Sternberg, **May brain made me do it? The rise of neuroscience and of the threat to moral responsibility**, New York: Prometheus Books, 2000.
- [54] D.F. Wallace, **Date, time and language: an essay on free will**, New York: Columbia Uni. Press, 2010.
- [55] J.M. Headley, **The Europeanisation of the world: on the origin of the human rights and democracy**, Princeton: Princeton Uni. Press, 2010.
- [56] P. Norris, **Digital divide: civic engagement, information poverty and the internet world wide**, New York: Cambridge Uni. Press, 2001.
- [57] A. Sapir, **Fragmented power: Europe and global economy**, Amsterdam: Brueghel Books, 2008.
- [58] G. Zatzman, and R. Islam, Eds., **Economics of intangibles**, New York: Nova Sci. Pub., 2007.
- [69] J. Kania, M. Kramer, and L. Crutchfield, **Do more than give: the six practices of donors who change the world**, London: Jossey-Bass, 2011.
- [60] R.C. Michelini, **Society progress evolution: sustainability and responsiveness**, New York: Nova Science Pub., 2012.
- [61] R. Thye, and E.J. Lawler, Eds., **Altruism and pro-social behaviour in groups**, Bingley: Emerald Book, 2009.
- [62] J. Whitman, **The fundamentals of global governance**, Basingstoke: MacMillan, 2009.
- [63] C. Boehm, **Moral origins: the evolution of virtue, altruism and shame**, New York: Basic Books, 2012.
- [64] S.S. Cohen, J.B. DeLong, **The end of influence: what happens when other countries have the money**, New York: Basic Books, 2010.
- [65] A. Goti, Ed., **Discrete event simulation**, Rijeka: SCIYO Pub., 2010.
- [66] S. Johnson, **Where good ideas come from: the natural history of innovation**, London: Allan Lane, 2010.
- [67] M. Morino, **Leap of reason: managing to outcomes in an era of scarcity**, New York: Venture Philanthropy Partners, 2011.
- [68] E. Ostrom, and T.K. Ahn, Eds., **Foundation of social capital**, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Pub., 2005.
- [69] D. Rothkopf, **Power Inc.: the epic rivalry between big business and government and the reckoning that lies about**, New York: Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, 2012.
- [70] A. Troccoli, Ed., **Management of weather and climate risk in the energy industry**, London: Springer, 2009.
- [71] A. Dreher, N. Gaston, and P. Martens, **Measuring globalisation, and gauging its consequences**, London: Springer, 2008.
- [72] D. Rodrik, **One economics, many recipes: globalisation institutions**, Princeton: Princeton Uni., 2007.