

Socio-Economy Plans & Growth Features

Rinaldo C. Michellini^{[a],*}

^[a]Mechanical Engineering (DIME), University of GENOVA- Italy, GENOVA, Italy.

*Corresponding author.

Received 15 December 2014; accepted 7 February 2015

Published online 26 March 2015

Abstract

Ecology is the XXI century threat, asking socio.economy changes, for the civilisation continuance. The way out is linked to the men's wherewithal, say, the ability of *rationaly* picking behavioural traits, leading to improved life-quality. The growth sustainability, moreover, is gamble, built on the "cognitive revolution": The *inclusive society* setup merges decision support frames for supply clarity, within "eco-sustainability" goals. Changes, likewise, join "technology innovation", via robot solutions, with "social breakthrough", to open society, by civic (*vs.* political) paths.

Key words: Socio-economy plans; Growth features; Natural order

Michellini, R. C. (2015). Socio-Economy Plans & Growth Features. *Higher Education of Social Science*, 8(3), 1-8. Available from: URL: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/hess/article/view/6594> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/6594>

INTRODUCTION

Wisemen live in lasting paradox: The outer actuality is whispered enjoying extant "information" frames, which act on recognised "matter/energy" reality, making likely inferring the path of what occurs around us. The puzzle entails the very construal: The *dualism* either the *monism* of the perceived surroundings, in view to distinguish appropriate "causal" bonds, expressed by "laws", steering the (material) actuality. The guess agrees with assuming "natural orders", Figure 1, which enjoy *superior* either *inner* causative foundations.

DUALISM: THE UNIVERSE LAWS BELONG TO AN INDEPENDENT UPPER REALITY
 THE TRANSCENDENCE SUGGESTS LOOKING AFTER *GODLIKE* STEERING
MONISM: THE UNIVERSE LAWS ARE MATTER-EMBEDDED INTO THE ACTUALITY
 THE IMMANENCE SHOWS *DETERMINISTIC* PRE-SETTING OF THE REALITY

Figure 1
The Absolute Grounds of the Natural Order

The "natural order" existence harmonises with the scientific feelings, through which we respond to our readings of the external surrounds and the interpersonal dealings. The oxymora, nonetheless, do not stop: the "natural laws" offer causal prospects as if a *theory of everything* has true grounds; the "human laws" are opposed with relational cogency as if their *authenticity* deserves absolute truth. In our "science", "entropy" is certainly acknowledged with truthfulness: decay is proved. Causal frames and "invariants" are provisional or men's invention, without transcendental/immanent truth. In like time, the "civilisation" is acknowledged showing "human progress", i.e., the life-quality improves: the growth is customary option. The guess agrees with supposing "artificial orders", Figure 2, which enjoy manmade *contingent* worth (Baggott, 2013; Close, 2012; Kaku, 2011; Päs, 2014).

OPERATION DUALISM: LIFE AND INTELLIGENCE SINGULARITIES HAPPEN ON EARTH
 THE LIFE ENABLES AGENTIVE PROCESSES, LETTING SELF-REPRODUCTION ISSUES
 THE INTELLIGENCE ADDS RATIONAL STEERING, ADDRESSING TO IMPROVEMENTS
 THE RELATIONAL CONTEXTS ALLOW CHOICES BY DECISION-KEEPING CAPACITIES

Figure 2
The Relative Bases of the Artificial Order

The “information” frames do not have *transcendent* either *immanent* truth; in our construal we may just deal with “knowledge”, i.e., “information”, in-progress created by the “mind”, relating with outer (material) actualities and with in-parallel emergent humans. The *contingency* value is epitomised by *relational*, rather than *causative*, models, exploited by the identified scientific scenarios. In conclusion, the mindful design of life-quality improvements is clever choice, maybe, coached on *divine* inspiration or *automatic* presetting. If such speculation is reliable, the civilisation will go on, without encroaching sustainability burdens. Else, the growth can only be viewed as transient stage; a better picture of the extant universe and linked “natural” or “artificial” orders has to be given (Castellani, 2014; Hawking & Milodininov, 2010; Lincoln, 2012; Wang & Li, 2012).

1. BACKDROP FRAMES

The study of the mankind civilisation shows the earth peculiarities: *biology*, with the copy autonomy of the living beings; *cognition*, with the emulation and reasoning abilities of the men. In our short tip-offs, the idiosyncrasies are linked to the imaginable *strong* anthropic principle, Figure 3, which states that the universe ruling “information” includes exact *natural laws*. These make the men’s mission towards civilisation already assigned. The upshots are absolute truths, because the upper veracity assigns the undertakings, or because the inner determinism accredits the pace wise advancements (Berto, 2010; Newberg, D’Aquila, & Rause, 2001; Plantinga, 2013; Wegner, 2002).

- the men benefit of all the options, to exploit the twin odd life and intelligence wherewithal;
- side corollaries are: the intelligent design oversees the all, to fashion the observers; the observers are necessary, being the goal of the design; the universe repeats to conclude the declared two oddities, as our earth has acknowledged distinctiveness (with or without life/intelligence reiteration).

Figure 3
The Strong Anthropic Principle

The unconditional certainty of the detected *natural laws* is “faith”, with debatable might, at least, if we acknowledge the entropy decay within the same frames. Besides, the derivation of *intelligence* from *life* is not yet proved by causative binds; this addresses to a *weak* anthropic principle, Figure 4, stating that the inner logic could develop along a *relational* path, even if strict causal links cannot be proved (Gazzaniga, 2012; Michelini, 2008; Vallortigara, Girotto, & Pievani, 2008, Zak, 2012; Zak, 2012).

- the mankind is end-result of odd events, though, warranting contingency coherence;
- the recognition of physical models implies matched happenings, because the two restrictions exist: * to make fulfilled self-reproduction life and cognizant intelligence; * to apportion proper sequence and extension of accomplishments, confirming that the two events are already happened.

Figure 4
The Weak Anthropic Principle

The civilisation peculiarities: *biology* and *cognition*, are centred on earth life and man intelligence, rather than on the upper or inner certainties, thought to be already present in the universe. The assertion is equal to say that the civilisation is remarkable accomplishment not because of our “faith” that rigorous *natural laws* exist and we have access to them, but because men exist and share the odd talent to make growth feasible. On that viewpoint, the progress stops to be possible, when *biology* and *cognition* oddities shall not support man-planned transformations, yielding safe and strict value added. The *agrarian* and *industrial* revolutions focused, in the past, biology/genetics and thoroughness/cognizance, to widen gains and riches. Today, the topics converge in the instrumental/anthropoid robot conception and assembly. The change is the removal of on-line operators; the substitution by robotic courses offers chances of expanded processes, if, however, the man-planned transformations satisfy the eco-consistency precepts (Brill, 2015; Ginsborg, 2010; Semmler et al., 2007).

The robot-driven *cognitive* revolution, if the above analysis is correct, is *necessary*, not *sufficient* option. We need to look at technology expansion towards *artificial* life/intelligence contrivances, using *gene*-driven and *meme*-ruled innovations. We shall, however, never forget that we deal via “*operation dualism*”, built on the human knowledge *contingency*. Our forecasts are destitute of *absolute* worth: further pace wise checks are necessary, and the growth will necessarily stop, if the “entropy law” is correct. Yet, robotics, from mere automation solutions, can turn to integrated programmes, making possible the additional developments towards knowledge engineering zings. The statement is, possibly, somehow crazy; still, it does not denote bypassing “entropy law”: The robot-based *cognitive* revolution matures on strictly *contingent* relative logics, if the *weak* anthropic principle is accepted as standard reference (Macbeth, 2014; Ramalho & Angelopoulos, 2011; Siegel, 2012; Targowski & Celinski, 2013).

The assent on the *weak* form takes strength if the practice of the *strong* rituals are reliably conceded. In the past, the anthropic principles deserved to focus cosmology investigations, showing the relevance of the “invariants”, from the gigantic model of the *general relativity*, to the tiny events of the *quantum mechanics*. Lately, the *genome*

disclosure tells that pertinent “information” details pre-exist, and the detected rules are the proper foundation of the *biology* world, already recorded in the *genome*’s book (Marcel, Bermudez, & Eilan, 2001; Taleb, 2012; Zatzman & Islam, 2007).

2. CONTINGENT DECISION SUPPORT

The anthropic principles are useful backdrop to expect the continuance of sustainable growth, based on relatable “information” niceties, processed by human minds. The tangible elements of the progress embed the relationships with the inert/alive surroundings and with the interpersonal dealings. Both entail entropy falloffs. The intangible elements ensue from *creative* additions: the “culture” and “ethics”. The former gives the know-how of technology revolutions; the latter bestows principles for managing “collective orders”, via social breakthroughs. The value-added has combined requisites, involving: the knowledge creation, shaping the “technical capital”; and: the assessment backups, outfitting the “financial capital”. Its *relational* cogency replaces the *causal* linkage of the absolute laws; its outcomes may be depicted by the net theory, using the allied *faint* contexts, to show the usefulness of “principles”, which stimulate improvement, Figure 5, even while only *a posteriori* mind versions are invented and, subsequently, checked on the results (James, 2009; Michelini, 2011; Palombella, 2013; Reeder, 2014).

RELIANCE IN ABSOLUTE PRINCIPLES: THE REALITY ENJOYS APRIORI ENTIRELY PRE-SET MODELS
TRANSCENDENCE: GOD ROUTING BY TRUTHS -IMMANENCE: DETERMININIST FINAL OUTCOMES
RESORT TO CONTINGENT PRINCIPLES:THE MODELS ARE A POSTERIORI MIND INTERPRETATIONS
TANGIBLE AIDS: TECHNOLOGY REVOLUTIONS
-INTANGIBLE AIDS: SOCIAL BREAKTHROUGHS

Figure 5
The Changes, From *Absolute*, to *Contingent* Grounds

The *relational* cogency (in lieu of *causal* bonds) is acknowledged pace wise, when the upshots are there; in addition, the planning requires comparing alternatives, holding the freedom of the on-progress decision-keeping, to adapt the course, with removal of picks, which happen aiming at noxious ploys. That construal imputes the “progress” to the men *relational intelligence*, say, the strange occurrence, creating the “mind”, and organising the related *world* of knowledge, models and theories. The reading encourages resorting to *anthropic principles*, since we recognise the worth of the civilisation, and we conclude that the happenings are actual, with, however, complimentary weights difficult to conceive having *absolute* truth (Dennet, 2013; Padoan & Canonica, 2014; Reyes, 2010; Wooldridge & Mickletwalt, 2014).

In the mankind, those happenings promote the “progress” by:

- social breakthroughs: The added value builds on the “collective order” structuring;
- technology revolutions: The know-how buoys innovative artificial transformations.

The depiction is man centred: The motor of all the happenings starts involving the “human capital”. The “technical” or the “financial” capital arrangement needs *abstract* procedures, before giving independence to the linked worth accumulation. The mental dealings and measures show the autonomy of the creative acts, in particular for the “collective order” settling by grading or adaptive courses, say:

- the *political* track runs top-down, stating structured frames for the assemblies;
- the *civic* path goes bottom-up, leading to fittingness marshalled organisations.

The *political* ways bring to known options: “sovereignty by the grace of God”, or: “nation due to the race homogeneity”. The *civic* decisions explore protean *liberalism* beliefs, scepticism toward authorities, respect of individuals, relativism and contingency, which promote the switching to the “constitutional agreement of the shared collective orders”. The choice has origin in the Enlightenment; it is a scrapbook, assembled out of sketched principles, interleaved with philosophical arguments and snippets of economics. It develops out of the surmise of the *intelligence* singularity, which differentiates the mankind “rational” abilities, on earth, after that the *life* singularity awarded “agentive” manners to current living beings. The *liberalism* does not enjoys absolute truths; it goes through the second singularity, leading to “rationality”, apparently out of the material reality, practiced when we interact with the generic surrounds. This singularity gets in *Illumination*, i.e., it permits understanding the links existing in the Universe and the relations binding the men to *natural* and to *enacted* laws. The Explanation is weird event, with side-effects, yielding, among other cults, to the “Universal Declaration of the Human Rights”: the mankind relational context builds on *inclusive* patterns of the “open society”, avoiding the *exclusive* stages of the “closed society”. Then, *liberalism* includes “altruism” as basic “rationality” wherewithal, when eco-protection becomes compulsory universal constraint (Schöleben, 2011; Viesti & DiVico, 2015; Yeldan, Kose, & Senses, 2009).

3. AWARE SCHEDULING

The “collective order” *political* ways lead to “nation-states” in competition: the efficiency differences are reason of supremacy, backed by top-down structures, which use welfare inner *solidarity* and alien *exclusion* measures. The “closed society” is historically priced achievement, managing identified “communities”, into which hierarchy links (with godlike backing) or conformity bonds (due to racial evenness) are supposed pre-existent. Both are

absolute truths, based on *upper* either *inner* “information”, depending on “transcendent” or “immanent” construal of the surrounds, according to “dualism” or “monism” readings. The Enlightenment has upsetting ties with *upper* either *inner* “information”: God is unjustified credence; inherent causal frames turn freedom into determinism. The “laws” cannot have *upper* or *inner* pre-setting; they originate from the human *intelligence* singularity; they are *relational* construal, due to the *rational* interaction of men, which enjoy the *freedom* of building “culture” and “ethics” and of choosing know-how and rulings. In the sketch, it is better to get rid of the *upper* or *inner* pre-set “information”, replaced by the “human knowledge/morals”, i.e., *creative* information or conjectured laws (Felisini, 2011; Michelini, 2009; Quadrio-Curzio & Fortis, 2005; Thiel, 2014). The *political/civic* options are planning aids (Figure 6).

POLITICAL WAYS: THE REALITY ENJOYS ABSOLUTE LAWS, GIVEN BY APRIORI PRE-SET INFORMATION
PROGRESS PLANNING: EXCLUSIVE RULING OF THE NATION-STATE MICRO/MACRO-ECONOMICS
CIVIC DECISIONS: THE LAWS ARE POSTERIORI BEHAVIOURAL SANCTIONED MIND INTERPRETATIONS
PROGRESS PLANNING: INCLUSIVE RULING OF THE OPEN-SOCIETY RELATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

Figure 6
The Planned Progress Consistency

The “nation-state” choice has alleged immanent marks in *gene* selfishness and social Darwinism. “*Homo homini lupus*” is aphorism of the extant political ways, based on “sovereignty” garbs, whose authenticity has deterministic course, unless it is top-down instructed. The construal (apparently) recovers *absolute* worth, if, however, the devised attires can trust on the “human law” self-determination. The guess is weird, as if “sovereignty” is primordial information quality of the cosmos. If it is just a *posteriori* men’s invention, after communication (*language*) and business (*trade*), we infer that the “closed societies” are “collective order” forms with *provisional* validity. The top-down political ways require thorny implicit conditions:

- lawfulness assumes self-governing “corpus juris”, empowered by total abstraction;
- authenticity adopts sovereign “jurisdiction”, at the country’s replication coverage.

The history offers tricky sample situations: “city-state” age, with empire/church backdrop; “nation-state” setups, with split-sovereign self-sufficiency; etc.; making evident that the current coverages are *conditional* and *contingent* occurrences, hard to manage together with the said required conditions (Antonelli, 2008; Herrero, 2012; Morino, 2011; Westerfield, 2007).

4. BUTTOM-UP MONITORING

The civic paths are imagined leading to “collective orders”, free from the political way conflicts. The law is men’s enacted, according to “utility”, emerging from a *posteriori* checks. The pre-set enclave partition is unknown: Men assembly operates by “inclusive” options, once advantages follow. The tied “open society” is consistent with liberalism, believing that the law has bottom-up authenticity, built because of ensuing civic worth of the cooperation, but not top-down ruled by collective edges, singled out on abstract beliefs, with a *priori* arbitrary reliability. The switch from *absolute* to *contingent* worth, Figure 5, gets rid of inconsistencies on condition to modify the “corpus juris” abstraction and the country’s “jurisdiction” partition (Eichengreen, 2015; Lafley & Martin, 2013; Sun, 2013; Turi, 2012).

The a *posteriori* bottom-up authenticity avails of “Constitutions”, obliging individuals and communities, once recognised their effective usefulness. The *conditional* and *contingent* “utility” has brought, until today, to supremacy and conquest wars. Liberals welcome changes: “growth” does not imply *conservatism*, rather *adaptability*. *Flexibility* allows comparing choices and selecting fittingness, when improvements are valued practical. The ecology is the tomorrow impending challenge. The over-depletion/pollution is standard issue of the extant transformation economy. The resources converted into litter and toxic waste make clear that trends turn downwards. The anthropic principles seem questionable. The *absolute* transcendental dualism and immanent monism portrayals link to matter/information drifts, totally exposed to entropy decay; the *contingency* operation dualism may, possibly, offer *conditional* progress leeway, i.e., “sustainable growth”, which entails the existence of *rational* policies, granting behaviours’ eco-consistency (Doyle, 2015; Ginsborg, 2015; Olsen, Selinger, & Riis, 2009; Salvati, 2009).

NATURAL CAPITAL: THE STOCK OF POTENCIAL WEALTH, EXISTING IN TANGIBLE RESOURCES, PILED-UP ON EARTH OR GOT BY PROCESSING/ REPROCESSING THE EXTANT MATERIAL FONTS
VALUE-CHAIN SYNTHESIS: ARTIFICIAL LIFE/INTELLIGENCE ROBOT-CENTRED TRANSFORMATIONS
SUSTAINABLE CORPORATIONS: “TO DEMATERIALISE”/“TO REMATERIALISE” ECO-MANAGEMENT

Figure 7
The Natural Capital: Main Features

The growth margin depends on the “natural capital” preservation and restoration, Figure 7: The makeover worth requires resource availability and surround safety. The a *posteriori* bottom-up *adaptability* supplies free chances by robot technologies (the *cognitive*

revolution) and by collective order innovation (the *global* breakthrough, via *inclusive* civic paths). The anthropic principles, not to be deceptive, shall empower fitting flexibility, both, with the resort to *technical* discoveries and to *social* deeds. The sustainability plans mix the *biology* and *cognition* oddities, coded in the *genome* book and created by the *relational* mimicry, to derive new material transformations and interpersonal organisations. The trend monitoring assures awareness of the planning feasibility, by *a posteriori* checks: Alertness and contingency go together, until when growth is possible (Easterbrook, 2010; Mingardi, 2012; Preston, 2012; Vigna & Casey, 2015).

5. SUSTAINABILITY PLANS

The *contingency* reading acknowledges that the civilisation is temporary attainment, without absolute reliability and lasting tenure. The cosmos order, aimed at “strong anthropic principle”, is replaced by man proficiency, provided by the “weak” form, limited to *biology* and *cognition* oddities. The “intelligence” adds: “technology innovation”, from contributory insight in the natural orders; and “social breakthrough”, by raise of the collective orders. The latter “intelligence” tracks, Figure 8, at the *contingent* rank, involve “constitutional agreements”, each time, with identified “collective orders”. These cannot encompass people not pinpointed by the specific pacts; the factual procedure leads to “closed society” makeups, defined “nation-states”. The political unions, under fixed governance, oppose to amalgamation, if competition consents discriminating winners and losers. The antagonism is described as “social Darwinism”, hypothesising *gene* selfishness law, marginalising the unfit units (*genes*, individuals, countries) (Abele, Anderl, & Birkofer, 2005; Michelini, 2012; O’Toole, 2010; Tapscott & Williams, 2011).

INTERPERSONAL BONDS: SOCIAL PLUS-VALUE BY VOUNLUNTARY OR REGULATED CATCHES
“RELATIONAL ASSEMBLY”, WHICH FOSTERS THE PEOPLE FRIENDSHIPINTERACTIVITY
“TRADE COMPANY”, WHICH AIMS AT BUSINESS PROJECT COMMERCIAL RUNNING
“SOVEREIGNTY RANK”, WHICH ALLOTS RIGHTS/DUTIES SELF-SUFFICIENT LAWFULNESS

Figure 8
The Extant Collective Order Makeups

A single “constitutional agreement”, involving the entire *global village*, is futuristic option. It reconsiders the listed makeups, on their essential features. The relational capability typifies human communication by *idioms*: Babies need to have parental teaching and training; no other animal enjoys such trait. The business skill is, again,

primordial human feature: *Trade* (not less than language) conveys the intelligence idiosyncrasy from *meme* fruition, adding to *gene* evolution oddities. The sovereignty invention is, also, human feature; otherwise than language and trade, the makeup is mainly thought *derived*, more than *intrinsic* aspect. The top rank, as already noticed, might have *political* ways, replaced by *civic* paths: the “closed society” upshot depends on external condition and the “open society” alternative might, as well, develop (Cable, 2009; Naas & Lysne, 2010; Pardue & Olvera, 2009).

The former “intelligence” tracks, the “technology innovation”, are founded on well-known robotic aids. In the past, technology has boosted food supply (*agriculture*) and widened productivity options (*industry*). The ecology asks guiding the supply chain, limiting scraps and waste, and enabling the recovery by reverse logistics. The robot change *perception*, from now, authorises (Ferris, 2010; Juravsky, 2014; Sorrentino & Pettenati, 2014; Zaring, Coglianesi, & Finkel, 2009):

- *Artificial* intelligence, by which imparting logics and cogent aptitude;
- *Artificial* life, by which emulating operational behaviour’s autonomy.

Robots are computer steered/controlled tools: the former progresses by teleology, using design rules to confer “logical” ability to devices, up to suited levels; the latter avails of anthropomorphism, moving from life “agentive” talent to mimic “rational” decision keeping. The supplemental lines and targets distinguish in:

- Instrumental implements, when the *artificial* intelligence offers the main purposes;
- Anthropoid deployments, when the *artificial* life is the main operative stimulation.

The *artificial* life/intelligence are the substantiation of connected *cognizance* procedures, objectivised by *anthropoid* construal courses to carry on-process exploitation. Robot recovery/remediation prospects depend on eco-driven artificial life/intelligence emulation/simulation issues, compensating and reclaiming the current over-consumption/pollution trends. The innovation is the “cognitive revolution”, i.e., *manmade* implementation and guidance of the *artificial* “life/intelligence” aids (Hallaq, 2014; Konner, 2010; Russell 2014; Sudoh, 2005).

6. BLOW-UP ARRANGEMENTS

The “cognitive revolution”, in current construal, characterises by the “technology innovation”, say, by the outlined robot solutions. In actual facts, the “social breakthrough”, towards the “open society” prospects, is not less crucial. The governance top of the new “collective orders”, Figure 9, has to follow inclusive options.

**INTERPERSONAL BONDS: BEHAVIOURAL MIENS, CONFORMING TO AGREED LEGAL PRECEPTS
RELATIONAL CONNECTIONS, STEERING THE PERSONAL INTERCOURSES TO SHARED OPENNESS
CONTRACTUAL DEALINGS, INVENTING TRADE/BUSINESS ABSTRACT SKILLS AND CONSTRUCTIONS
POLITICAL/CIVIC ARRANGEMENTS, DEVISING LEGALITY/AUTHENTICITY GOVERNANCE FEATURES**

Figure 9
The Collective Order Value Cycle

The changeover will address blow-up procedures, replacing “big state” sovereign rituals, by flexible on-duty deeds, pace wise linked to the (*a posteriori* assessed) reached “utility”, encompassing (Khanna, 2011; Multhead, 2015; Scazzieri, Sen, & Zamagni, 2009):

- Interpersonal bonds, building civic plus-values by “big society” runs;
- Prescribed catches, giving “economic” worth to endorsed contracts;
- Official rules, stating “legal” tenets, under blow-up agreed precepts.

The political cohesion under sovereign nation-states is replaced by the standard of individual/collective “utility”, provided, at the *global* village extension, through *notified* “sustainable corporations”, by (Ingrao & Israel, 1990; Navarra & Bavetta, 2012; Navarra & Bavetta, 2012):

- “Big society” empowering, to organise the fellow-citizens self-reliance;
- “Official agency” authority, enacting the general targets and directives;
- “Certifying body” institution, with monitoring and sanctioning faculty.

The governance *authenticity* is imparted by plebiscite and ruled by regular polls. The business is blow-up endowed by people, conforming eco-protection directives, to enact rescue/restore deeds. Today, many collective order values cycles exist, as if independent top-rank governances are lawful: The split-sovereignty is misleading axiom, confined to “big state” rituals. The few hints are collected to help understanding that it is time reconsidering our day-to-day habits, if the ecology globalisation shall be tackled (Tombs, 2015; Wiles, Bossomayer, & Abbass, 2010; Yergin, 2011).

CONCLUSION

The earth civilisation, even if trifle fact in the universe’s account, is the only cronicle seizing our minds. The man-centred descriptions try to establish *absolute* (vs. *contingent*) foundations, having *transcendence* or *immanence* backing, happy that “faiths” in God or Nature could offer sound explanations. The approach is recapped by the “anthropic principles”, here mentioned, also, in the *weak* reading. This brings in the “faith” in *life* and

intelligence “singularities”: Man centred civilisation bypasses the “cosmos’ information”, resorting to culture and ethics artefacts, from deriving “technology revolutions” and “social breakthroughs” (Laqueur, 2012; Mallaby, 2010; Patti, 2013; Ramalingam, 2014; Zaccaria, 2012).

The memo analyses the progress along the latter “faith”, notably, baring the gaps from socio-political to socio-economic cues. The former invents *legality* from “sovereignty” truisms, mostly, tied to *a priori* merit: It brings to “big state” patterns. The latter extends blow-up relational plots of communication (*language*) or business (*trade*) with *inclusive* ways, possibly, up to the *global village* extension. The ecology threat is, maybe, mitigated or delayed using the socio-economic cues, and the note suggests some pertinent hints.

REFERENCES

- Abele, E., Anderl, R., & Birkofer, H. (2005). *Environmentally-friendly product development: Methods and tools*. Springer, London.
- Antonelli, C. (2008). *The economics of innovation: Critical concepts in economics*. Routledge, New York.
- Baggott, J. (2013). *Farewell to reality: How modern physics has betrayed the search for scientific truth*. Constable, London.
- Berto, F. (2010). *L'esistenza non è logica*. Laterza, Bari.
- Brill, S. (2015). *America's bitter oil: Money, politics, backroom deals and the fight to fix our broken healthcare system*. Random House, New York.
- Cable, V. (2009). *The storm: The world economic crisis and what it means*. Atlantic Books, London.
- Castellani, A. (2014). *Reliability theory and risk analysis*. Aracne (Ed.). Roma.
- Close, F. (2012). *The infinity puzzle: Quantum field theory and the hunt for an orderly universe*. Basic Books, New York.
- Dennet, D. (2013). *Intuition pumps and other tools for thinking*. W.W. Norton, London.
- Doyle, D. (2015). *The cause of all nations: An international history of the American civil war*. Basic Books, New York.
- Easterbrook, G. (2010). *Sonic boom: Globalisation at Mach speed*. Random House, New York.
- Eichengreen, B. (2015). *Hall of mirrors: The great depression the great recession and the uses/misuses of history*. Oxford Uni. Press, New York.
- Felisini, D. (2011). *Inseparabili: Lo stato, il mercato e l'ombra*. Rubbettino Ed., Catanzaro.
- Ferris, T. (2010). *The science of liberty: Democracy, reason and the laws of the nature*. Harper, New York.
- Gazzaniga, M. (2012). *Who's in charge? Free-will and the science of the brain*. Constable & Robinson, London.
- Ginsborg, P. (2010). *Salviamo l'Italia*. Einaudi, Torino.
- Ginsborg, P. (2015). *Family politics: Domestic life, devastation and survival 1900-1930*. Yale Uni. Press, New Haven.
- Hallaq, W. R. (2014). *The impossible state*. Columbia Uni. Press, New York.

- Hawking, S., & Milodininow, L. (2010). *The grand design*. Bantam Books, New York.
- Herrero, L. (2012). *Homo imitans: The art of social infection*. Meeting Minds, Boston.
- Ingrao, B., & Israel, G. (1990). *The invisible hand: Economic equilibrium in the history of science*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- James, H. (2009). *The creation and destruction of value: The globalisation cycle*. Harvard Uni. Press, Cambridge.
- Juravsky, J. (2014). *The language of food*. W. W. Norton, New York.
- Kaku, M. (2011). *Physics of the future: How science will shape human destiny and our daily lives by the year 2100*. Allen Lane, London.
- Khanna, P. (2011). *How to run the world: Charting a course to the next renaissance*. Random House, New York.
- Konner, M. (2010). *The evolution of childhood: Relationships, emotion, mind*. Belknap Press, Harvard Uni. Press, Cambridge.
- Lafley, A. G., & Martin, R. (2013). *Playing to win: How strategy works*. Harvard Business Review Press, Boston.
- Laqueur, W. (2012). *After the fall: The end of the European dream and the decline of a continen*. Dunne Books, New York.
- Lincoln, D. (2012). *Understanding the universe: From quarks to the cosmos*. World Sci. Books, London.
- Macbeth, D. (2014). *Realising season: A narrative of truth and knowing*. Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford.
- Mallaby, S. (2010). *More money than God: Hedge funds and the making of the new elite*. Penguin Press, New York.
- Marcel, A., Bermudez, J. L., & Eilan, N. (Eds.). (2001). *The body and the self*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Michelini, R. C. (2008). *Knowledge entrepreneurship and sustainable growth*. Nova Sci. Pub., New York.
- Michelini, R. C. (2011). *Knowledge society engineering: A sustainable growth pledge*. Nova Science Pub., New York.
- Michelini, R. C., (2009). *Robot age knowledge changeover*. Nova Sci. Pub., New York.
- Michelini, R. C. (2012). *Society progress evolution: Sustainability and responsiveness*. Nova Science Pub., New York.
- Mingardi, A. (2012). *L'intelligenza del denaro*. Marsilio, Venezia.
- Morino, M. (2011). *Leap of reason: Managing to outcomes in an era of scarcity*. Venture Philanthropy Partners, New York.
- Mulrhead, R. (2015). *The promise of party in a polarized age*. Harvard Uni. Press, Cambridge.
- Naas, B., & Lysne, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Financial markets and global recession*. Nova Sci. Pub., New York.
- Navarra, P., & Bavetta, S. (2012). *The economics of freedom: Theory, appraisal and policy implication*. Cambridge Uni. Press, Cambridge.
- Newberg, A., D'Aquili, A., & Rause, V. (2001). *Why God won't go away: Brain science and biology of belief*. Ballantine Books, New York.
- O'Toole, F. (2010). *Enough is enough: How to build a new Republic*. Faber, Belfast.
- Olsen, J.-K. B., Selinger, E., & Riis, S. (2009). *New waves in philosophy of technology*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Padoan, P. C., & Canonica, M. (2014). *La diversità come ricchezza: A che serve l'Europa?* Einaudi, Torino.
- Palombella, G. (2013). *E possibile una legalità globale: Il rule of law e la governance mondiale*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Pardue, G. H., & Olvera, T. K. (Eds.). (2009). *Ecological restoration*. Nova Sci. Pub., New York.
- Päs, H. (2014). *The perfect wave: With neutrinos at the boundary of space and time*. Harvard Uni. Press, Cambridge.
- Patti, A. (2013). *Perché la legalità: Le ragioni di una scelta*. Vita & Pensiero, Roma.
- Plantinga, A. (2013). *Where the conflict realities lies science, religion: a naturalism*. Oxford Uni. Press, New York.
- Preston, R. (2012). *How do we fix this mess? The economic price of having it all and the route to lasting prosperity*. Hodder & Stoughton, London.
- Quadrio-Curzio, A., & Fortis, M. (2005). *Research and technological innovation: The challenge for a new Europe*. Springer, London.
- Ramalho, A., & Angelopoulos, C. (Eds.). (2011). *Cross roads of intellectual property, and other fields of law*. Nova Sci., New York.
- Ramalingam, B. (2014). *Aid on the age chaos: Rethinking international cooperation in a complex world*. Oxford Uni. Press, London.
- Reeder, H. (2014). *Commit to win: How to harness the four elements of commitment to reach your goals*. Hudson Street Press, New York.
- Reyes, A. J. (Ed.). (2010). *Weak falling states: Security threats & US policy*. Nova Sci., New York.
- Russell, G. (2014). *Heirs of forgotten kingdoms: Journey into the disappearing religions of the Middle East*. Basic Books, New York.
- Sadurski, W. (2008). *Equality and legitimacy*. Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford.
- Salvati, M. (2009). *Capitalismo, mercato e democrazia*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Scazzieri, R., Sen, A., & Zamagni, S. (Eds.). (2009). *Markets, money and capital*. Cambridge Uni. Press, London.
- Schöleben, P. (2011). *Integral logistics management: Operations and supply chain management within and across companies*. Auerbach Pub., Boca Raton.
- Semmler, W., Chiarella, C., Hung, H., & Flaschel, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Business fluctuations and long-phased cycles in high order macro-systems*. Nova Sci. Pub., New York.
- Siegel, D. J. (2012). *Pocket guide to interpersonal neurobiology: An integrative handbook of the mind*. Mind Your Brain Inc., New York.
- Sorrentino, F., & Pettenati, M. C. (2014). *Orizzonti di conoscenza*. Firenze Uni. Press, Firenze.
- Sudoh, O. (2005). *Digital economy and social design*. Springer, London.
- Sun, M.-K. (Ed.). (2013). *Advances in cognitive and behavioural sciences*. Nova Sci., New York.

- Taleb, N. N. (2012). *Antifragile: Things that gains from disorder*. Random House, New York.
- Tapscott, D., & Williams, A. D. (2011). *Macro-wikinomics: Rebooting business and the world*. Atlantic Books, London.
- Targowski, A., & Celinski, M. J. (Eds.). (2013). *Spirituality and civilisation sustainability in the 21 century*. Nova Sci., New York.
- Thiel, P. (2014). *Zero to one: Notes on start-ups or how to build the future*. Crown Business, New York.
- Tombs, R. (2015). *The English and their history*. Knopf, New York.
- Turi, G. (2012). *Schiavi in un mondo libero: storia dell'emancipazione dell'età moderna*. Laterza, Bari.
- Vallortigara, G., Giroto, V., & Pievani, T. (2008). *Nati per credere*. Codice Ed., Torino.
- Viesti, G. F., & DiVico, D. (2015). *Cacciavite, robot e tablet: Come far ripartire le imprese*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Vigna, P., & Casey, M. (2015). *The age of cryptocurrency: How bitcoin and digital money are challenging the global economic order*. St. Martin Press, New York.
- Wang, G., & Li, S.-F. (2012). *Introduction to micromechanics and nanomechanics*. Imperial College Press, London.
- Wegner, D. M. (2002). *The illusion of conscious will*. Bradford Books, Cambridge.
- Westerfield, R. E. (Ed.). (2007). *Current issues in globalisation*. Nova Sci. Pub., New York.
- Wiles, J., Bossomayer, T., & Abbass, H. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Recent advances in artificial life*. Imperial College Press, London.
- Wooldridge, A., & Mickletwalt J. (2014). *The fourth revolution: The global race to reinvent the state*. Penguin Books, New York.
- Yeldan, E., Kose, A. H., & Senses, F. (Eds.). (2009). *Neo-liberal globalisation as imperialism: Case studies on reconstruction of the periphery*. Nova Sci. Pub., New York.
- Yergin, D. (2011). *The quest: Energy, security & the remaking of the modern world*. Penguin, London.
- Zaccaria, G. (2012). *La comprensione del diritto*. Laterza, Bari.
- Zak, P. (2012). *The moral molecule: the source of love and prosperity*. Dutton Adults, New York.
- Zaring, D., Coglianese C., & Finkel, A. M. (2009). *Import safety: Governance in the global economy*. Uni. Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Zatzman, G., & Islam, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Economics of intangibles*. Nova Sci. Pub., New York.