

The Radical Constructivism Homepage Papers Archive, edited by Alexander Riegler.  
<http://www.univie.ac.at/constructivism/papers>. Published with the permission of the author. Commercial use and any other copying are prohibited without the express written permission of the copyright holder. **Copyright © Andrea Pitasi 2002** originally titled THE TECHNOLOGICAL CONSTRUCTION OF SELF IN THE GLOCALIZATION AGE, this paper is currently unpublished and was accepted for the conference program of the 2003 as key note speech V of the European Communication Association(ECA, [www.europeancommunicationassociation.de](http://www.europeancommunicationassociation.de)) Munich, March 2003. The CHRP 512 AS brand is also certified and legally protected by Sresa on Andrea Pitasi's behalf.

# The Technological Construction of Self as Individual Pattern of Communication Use

Andrea Pitasi  
[www.andreapitasi.it](http://www.andreapitasi.it)

**Abstract:** This work introduces the epistemological design of CHRP 512 AS which is a technology of self designed to facilitate the individuals to perceive, construct and evolve self referentially their own interpretation, through coding and programming, of the media noise transforming it into meaningful communication. CHRP 512 AS is programmed through nine binary codes which would facilitate individuals to (reframe) noise into communication according to Luhmann's self referential selection of the psychic systems selecting from the outer environment in the age of multimediality, glocality, complexity and functional differentiation. CHRP 512 AS is a technology of self created as an individual pattern of communication use whose power is methodological at the level of self referential standardization of the decisionmaking process through which the psychic system selects and transforms noise into communication. As a technology, it is observer dependent and strategically blind in itself as the aims and goals are not internal to the program (the 512 combinations of the nine binary code agenda setting developed to select and transform noise into communication) but in the individual user's mind according to his/her evolutionary plan and his/her specific combination of his/her multiple intelligences which frame the psychic system's self reference. The theoretical foundations of this work are mainly (although not only) rooted into Niklas Luhmann's system theory, Howard Gardner's multiple intelligence theory and in Georg Simmel's theory of social differentiation.

## Introduction

The key to the understanding of this paper is that, in the scenarios of reflexive modernity as described by Ulrich Beck, concepts like culture and values have entered into fluctuation and have taken on new evolutionary forms which, far from destroying and annihilating the values they have, one could say, placed them in the private, inter-subjective and microsocial sphere with a consequent relativization of the powers and legitimization of market institutions (including those of the third sector of society). At the same time, this has not led simply to the formation of a society of communications information whose fragmentation is not unconditionally diffused as may traditional sociology like to claim. Reflexive modernity is in my opinion the age of individuocratic planning in which all the processes of globalization converge; that is to say, localization, functional differentiation, individualization, individualism and individuation (all processes which I shall discuss later).

The individual in this scenario of modern reflexivity becomes aware that he/she is, at the same time, both a microscopic particle in the universe and also the center point of his/her own world. Evolutionary speaking, this awareness leads him/her, in probabilistic and not deterministic terms,

along the path of individuation, where he/she evolves adapting to his/her own self-reference through a continuous re-elaboration of environmental noise through his/her own codes and programs and functionally at his/her own specific project of life.

In this sense, the reflexive modernity individual is not only the selection from his/her own possibilities of choice but is also involved in a continuous process of, one could say, a do-it-yourself identity without any guide, rigid dogmatic models or superior authorities of any kind. This individual does not ask for any guides, values or cultural models from society; in fact, if anything, this individual is looking for a compass to use to help him find the goal that he/she alone has chosen.

The values of this individual belong to his/her private and inter-subjective sphere (e.g. whether to base marriage on principal fidelity or not does not concern society nor the social system, but is simply an inter-subjective choice made by the couple by means of the open/shut code). So that he/she has no need of cultural/institutional/religious or political models or from the market which are anyway hetero-directed. The reflexive modernity individual is aware, beyond imitation and identification, of which foundation criteria of his/her own personality, favorably influence those who still utilize these banal and simplistic forms of cognitive savings to give meaning to his/her life. Turning to these organizational forms, in fact, runs the risk of becoming (cognitive) chainworkers.

The horizon of reflexive modernity, in my opinion, reveals a radical paradigmatic shift about the social function of knowledge, which is no longer the depository for universal values (or better so called ones), nor is it reduced to mere fragments of contradictory information. For the individual who is aware of his/her own evolutionary specificity and who is able to manage it by him/her self, knowledge is the hedonistic (we shall see later in what sense) construction and function of relative procedures (i.e. never seen as real and absolute). Such procedures are pragmatically viable in their own heuristic valence of cashvalue.

In this prospective, the theory that I am about to develop, is a reflection on the strategic function of knowledge in the age of reflexive modernity and an interpretation of how the individual can avail his/her own self of knowledge in the planning of his/her own self. The main original contribution of this paper is probably the cognitive software program (at the moment, software simply means the metaphoric brainframe) developed by the writer and called CHRP512AS (the meaning of this title will be revealed in the following pages). It makes up one of the possible viable strategic procedures for the individual (seen in Luhmann terms as a psychic system, a system in itself and also a background for the rest of the world and an observer of a world of environments which are powerfully external and foreign) in a world in which is without meaning and generates a deafening and irrelevant noise.

The self-adapting individual of reflexive modernity well knows that nothing meaningful comes from the outside and that the meaning of things is in the mind of the observer. He also knows that the manner in which an observer interprets what he sees is not just subjective but also mostly self-referential and is an operative description that has to overcome Descartes' error as well as Miller's problem (I shall dedicate much more space to both of them later). The individual rebuilds viable procedures for his own self evolution, selecting from the outside environment, not just those noises which can be transformed into information but which have to be formalized into viable procedures.

## **PART 1**

### **Psychic Systems, Technologies of the Self and Lack of the Other.**

If the eye wasn't solar it would never see the sun

J.W. von Goethe

Experience is what you get when you do not get what you want

American proverb

In the scenario of this new century, communications and globalization merge in a complex manner not without risk hereby giving rise to a conflict of identity for the individual between the globalization of telecommunications and standard global procedural-making processes. Communications is one of the principal forms of media through which global markets transcend national rules and norms, but communications is also one of the principal forms of media through which emerging social realities are diffused worldwide. Above all, communications is a strategic medium in the globalization of standards and deontological principles aimed at certifying worldwide quality standards and completing a new ethic normative synthesis under the management banner.

The key to understanding that I would like to offer is that the individual today finds himself/herself at the crossroads between two great global processes : the globalization of telecommunications with its relative over-production, which is becoming more and more fragmentary and contradictory, and the functional differentiation of the legal system. This is no longer regarded as a synthesis of values and social principles but is seen more as a legal formulation of procedures ( deontological/and/or managerial) which are functional for the transparency of processes to obtain legal recognition and acceptance from market institutions and from the thousands of different streams of society. Finding him/herself at these crossroads, the individual experiences huge abstract possibilities and at the same time huge, even more real, risks.

The scope of such intervention is to invite the reader to reflect on how to allow the individual to escape from this loop which has been created. In this way, the individual who receives all this chaotic fragmentary information from the media and institutions, can refuse to accept it as a creditable source of information. The individual can then look to the media and those same institutions, no longer to seek principles, values or information, but only simple procedures on how to select, use and re-organize his/her requirements in life. The ever increasing centralization of media education in the USA is a typical example of this.

In such a scenario, the individual finds him/herself alone in trying to decipher all this excess of disinformation which swamps him/her every day in order to manage his/her growth in a period of increasing instability which is also transitory and uncertain in face of the threat from large private and public non-profit organizations which have identified him/her as the targeted victim in case of problems and failures in the dynamics of individualization which Ulrich Beck (2000) mentions

Today, all of us, -academics, managers and professional men and women - are called to understand, recognize and bear multiple liberties which are very different from the aesthetic words and promises contained in the illustrated book of democracy (Beck 1990: 41).

In this scenario, it is clear that single individuals are more prepared to face the future than social institutions and their representatives (idem: 49). The semantic normative institutional system is often a problem which considers itself to be a solution, which is however, unable to interact with a

citizen who has become the choice of his/her own possibilities (idem: 11) and who, as a result, lives and acts in an uninterrupted plurisation of forms of life.

As Beck writes so clearly: The danger of this new plurality does not lie so much in its supposed opaqueness as in the inability of political parties, trade unions, the Church and associations to manage it. Those who hold positions of responsibility should do something effective and stop condemning individualism whilst recognizing in it the desired and inevitable result in the development of democracy (idem: 47).

In this new scenario, the structures and institutional normative functions change direction towards a culture of serving, listening to and being flexibly transparent towards its citizens (Rovinetti, 2000), who are seen as individuals with their own evolutionary specificity which offers an infinitive range of possibilities. In this way, institutions come to serve the citizen through specific norms, helping him/her to choose their life and offering them a normative orientation which doesn't harm anybody else and at the same time acts as a technology of the self (Foucault, 1986). Institutions, therefore come to play a crucial role in forming, by facilitating, individuals who are well-informed and are fully aware in a policentric network (and also in formative and professional ways). The function of the legal system is to legalize and certify that which exists while attempting to formulate the informal and permitting the black economy to emerge (De Soto, 2001). This would lead to the creation of a system of recognition which would allow a big increase in financial and economic activities which are ethically based and hence the creation of new choice possibilities for the evolutionary individual.

However, one must be aware that certification criteria can only be formulated by professional corporations through lobbying strategies which must be transparent and hence formalized, thus, eliminating the double risks of huge gaps between legal formalities and actual practices while manifesting latent functions of symbolic rules and regulations.

In a more transparent world with clearer criteria of access and non-access, we could reduce the huge waste of human resources caused by self-exclusion which is subjected to misleading information that appears to be clear and correct but isn't.

Returning to the Bavarian sociologist, I feel it is necessary to affirm that the certification of standards is potentially one of the means of expressing the phenomenon known as The individualocracy project of reflexive modernity. This project is in my opinion an embryonic phenomenon which has developed from the above reflexive modernity (Beck, 2001: 9-56) and cannot be reduced to the simple process of individualization (institutionalized individualism) that Beck talks about, although certainly, individualization is a part of the individualocracy project which, in synthesis, is made up of:

- 1) Individuation.
- 2) Individualism.
- 3) Individualization.

All of which I shall discuss later in more detail.

1) Individuation is the social, biological and psychological process by which the individual acquires full knowledge of his/her own evolutionary specificity and self-reference both in spiritual and in more concrete daily terms. In such an evolutionary completeness the individual achieves his/her most profound and real suspension of judgment, as well as relativization from every point of view. He/she acquires a skeptical cynicism which generates the existential condition of the simmelian stranger who lives, through the medium of society, his/her own very personal adventures of their own selective self-reference. This kind of individual is well aware of the fact that he/she can adapt to his/her own self-reference in terms of functional viability and not to the outside environment, which is in itself noumenonic. Through individuation, the individual evolves his/her own strategic project and vision of self-realization as a whole (spiritual, intellectual, affective,

material, etc.) becoming tendentially immune to the big (so-called) persuaders of the outside environment. Such an individual project is a compass thanks to which the individual reaches his/her full self-awareness which leads him/her to relativize his/her own opinion, withholding judgment in a happy playful cynical-skeptical spirit.

2) Individualism; this was the principal inspiration for the American constitution, seen as the right to happiness and self-realization, it lets the individual maximize his potential and instrumental rationality, albeit limited, to achieve in full, his personal project of life. Through a rational form of instrumental individualism, the individual acquires all the economic, organizational, legal and financial know-how necessary to optimize his/her own self-management and to adapt in a strategic and evolutionary manner to his/her own self-reference.

3) Individualization is one of the five epochal phenomenon of western society, and not only this, apart from globalization, the gender revolution, underemployment and global risks, according to Beck (2000). Individualization means institutionalized individualism through a norm which places the individual in the center making him/her responsible, blaming him/her and putting him/her in conditions of increasing precariousness, instability and uncertainty and not only in the workplace. At work, for example, this produces individuals who bear all the risks of the self-employed and all the ties and shortcomings of the employee.

In this way, institutions are also unfortunately less prepared and able to meet global challenges; they too often trust too much in their own possibilities and tie down the individual making him/her responsible for their failures (and not just those of the individual). They don't offer the individual sufficient resources to manage their responsibilities, in fact, they waste their income and specificity raising the transactional costs of social and personal life.

Individualization can be strategically placed in a individualocracy project by adopting tactics which are viable only for the individuals who already have a vision of individuation and a capacity for individualistic self-management. From this point of view, communications on a global scale will offer huge evolutionary opportunities for those individuals who know how to become recipients of those norms of quality certification standards and the legitimization of resources. The others will run the slight risk of becoming part of the cognitive proletarian class if the ethic-normative tie of solidarity is unable to create a humanization of the risk. In such a prospective, in this paper, I would like to propose a form of cognitive software which I have entitled, for reasons which I will explain, CHRP512AS. This software program (I use the term metaphorically) is in fact a procedure, a functional platform (in a world today where platforms, for example could be, the dollar, the English language and Windows) which everybody can use, evolve and implement, depending on their goals and personal plans.

This procedure, as you will see, eases the processes of strategic decision making by reducing psychic noises and cognitive dissonance and helping the growing individuation of the user's psychic system. This reduces the risk that the psychic system becomes a mere functional equivalent in a cognitive perspective (cognitive proletarian). CHRP512AS, as a software program is based on an epistemological and in a heterodoxical manner on radical constructivism, about which one should describe the theoretical and conceptual framework to be able to integrate the conceptual strategies and applied functions of the software program. Therefore I consider it opportune to take a few explanatory steps backwards. The epistemological foundation of Godel's theory of formally undecidable propositions of radical constructivism finds an inestimable source of value in Zen Buddhism, an ocean one could say to immerse oneself in (as I explain later); however, there are also other minor philosophical streams of thought (not so profound perhaps) of radical constructivism, from which one can extract several useful conceptual tools. I can identify three important streams of thought:

- a) Cynicism.
- b) Epicureanism.

c) Skepticism.

I shall briefly and functionally outline the strategic plan that I am evolving.

a) The cynic's ideal of life is living without any goal in life and without having any needs. This style of life coincides with the ideal of freedom, above all, of words and action. The more one eliminates superfluous needs, the more one is free. The path that can lead to freedom and virtue was summarized by Diogenes in two essential concepts of exercise and fatigue which consisted in a lifestyle that was compatible with the strengthening of the body and spirit to meet the toils of nature and suitable for Man to get used to satisfying his desires and even to be able to ignore them. Autarchy, i.e. just having enough; apathy and indifference in the face of everything were considered the basis of a cynic type of lifestyle. Personally, I find cynicism to be one of my fundamental theories regarding one's aims and goals; it helps the evolution of psychic systems towards an authentic if tendential but not absolute objective. If it is enough to become self-sufficient with regard to the resonance and oscillations of the outside world because it generates noise and not sense. Instead. The cynic method causes me some perplexity, in that, in my opinion, the method can latently develop a dark schelerian resentment.

b) At the base of Epicureanism lies the fundamental rule illustrated below. With the term Canons of morality, Epicure wanted to set out the criteria which were necessary and sufficient to lead Man towards the truth. These are the criteria:

1. Sensations: these always grip Man in an infallible manner. Hence they are always all true.
2. Prolepsis: these are mental representations of things, they anticipate experience but only to the point that they are derived from experience. (e.g. names ).
3. Feelings of pleasure & pain: they are necessary to recognize true values and negative values (using logical-ontological and axiological criteria).

If the essence of Man is materialistic, then his well-being will be materialistic. His well-being consists in looking for pleasure and avoiding pain. The epicurean doctrine of pleasure may be expressed in three beliefs:

1. The maximum expression of pleasure is to be free of all pain and to have a state of mind which is free from stress and worry (Ataraxia)
2. The pleasures and pains of the mind should be superior to those of the body.
3. The supreme virtue Phronesis is reason applied to pleasure.

The Epicurean Table of Pleasure:

Kind of Pleasure	Characteristics	Behavior
Natural & Essential	Those related to the conservation of the individual's life	Must always be satisfied
Natural but not essential	These are superfluous variations of the first	Should be controlled
Not natural or essential	Desires for prosperity, honors, power etc.	One should never give in to them

It is therefore necessary to cut back our desires to the first basic nucleus, only by doing this, will one ever achieve happiness and prosperity. To obtain these pleasures, we must cut back in ourselves

and only in this way (Autarky) will we find the greatest riches and happiness. Even if problems seem to claw at Man's existence, they do not constitute, for Epicure, an insurmountable obstacle to his model of happiness and pleasure. The passage of time does not threaten happiness because a limited period of time or an unlimited one can both contain the same amount of pleasure (this is because, pleasure, when it exists, is infinite).

Pain is not a problem either. There are three kinds of pain:

- A slight pain which is easy to bear.
- A strong pain, which although severe, passes quickly.
- A very severe pain, which rapidly leads to death.

Epicure doesn't judge himself by pain, he removes it. The problem of death is not a problem; we must not fear death because when it comes we no longer feel anything; as long as Man lives death doesn't exist, when death comes, Man no longer exists. We should not forget at the same time how Epicure's individualism seems to be completely coherent with his ethic hedonism.

The social and political dimension of man appears to be something unnatural and an intense social and political life can compromise the apathy and be a source of perturbation. This is the basis of the strong warning that Epicurus gives to those who want to become sages: live hidden.

The teachings of Epicurus can be synthesized. As he wanted, in four short forms (the four remedies):

1. Fear of life after death and fear of the gods serve no purpose;
2. fear of death is absurd because death is nothing;
3. pleasure is possible for everybody;
4. pain is fleeting or it is bearable.

The individual who is able to apply these four remedies to himself can acquire peace of the spirit and happiness which nobody or nothing can harm. This is the ideal that the sage, once he has become master of himself, doesn't need to fear anymore.

This is the paradoxical way by which Epicurus wants to tell us that the real sage is imperturbable.

c) Skepticism is a general attitude towards knowledge, where one reflects about the possibility or less of building up coherent and significant visions of the world. The challenge that skepticism makes to men in its era is that happiness and peace of spirit can be achieved by wise men in spite of the collapse of traditional values and without the necessity of offering new ones.

The foundations of skepticism are:

1. Things are indifferent, they are not measurable and they are not discriminatory; as a result, each of our sensations and opinions can be true or false. Pyrrhus therefore denies the existence and the principles of existence and explains everything as a pure appearance.
2. If common sense and reason cannot say what is true and what is false then the only correct attitude that man can have is to suspend judgment (*ad xastos*) without expressing an opinion (*epocha*) or even having an opinion.
3. The sage who assumes this attitude first, achieves the state of *aphasia* (i.e. remaining silent) and then *ataraxia*, which is the state of inner silence.

To summarize, cynicism, epicureanism, skepticism contain significant features common to all them but also clear contradictions. The scope of this paper is not to complete a philosophical reconstruction of the sources or to make a comparison of them. It is more to extract, according to

the self-reference of my point of observation, from these lines of thought, a clearer and more coherent basis to my discourse.

From cynicism, I believe it is strategic to derive the concept of self-sufficiency (autarky) - even if it is relative, mental but not absolute. It is a concept which is also shared with epicureanism.

From epicureanism, I would like to take imperturbability - which is more developed at the level of awareness of banal indifference which can have a touch of lethargy. I also accept the idea of creating a table of pleasures and focalising on those which we consider really crucial even if I consider this as a table which cannot be generalised but just the fruit of the mental and evolutionary constructions of each self-referential psychic system in its own specific way.

From epicureanism I believe in the concept of live secretly but not taken literally. In my opinion the live secretly concept of the self-referential and evolutionary psychic system consists in knowing that one is looking from that feeling of happiness in oneself and not from the noisy outside world and so one remains unaffected by the oscillations and resonances of the outside world. For this reason, suspending judgement on scepticism is a strategic resource to calm and make relative every cognitive claim which goes beyond the construction of one's evolutionary project and the monologue that each system develops from its own project. However, this state of aphasia and ataraxia seems to be just one possibility among many in a wider horizon. In my opinion, the most probable evolutionary possibility which would make a sceptical epoch come true is the imperturbability with which we recognize. The freedom of thought, expression and action in building one's universe of meaning in the shape of a monologue which is fully relative within the horizon of all possible worlds.

However this remains at the same time absolutely strategical for the development of that specific system which derives its information from the outside environment, selecting only the noise - of other monologues - which can be converted through *Walverwandtschaften* (elective affinity) in the growing singleness which German individualism of the early 18<sup>th</sup> century implies, inspired by the thought of Goethe.

In synthesis, cynicism and epicureanism, albeit self-referentially reconstructed, offer conceptual tools to outline in the best possible way the functional norms of the systematic evolution scepticism; on the other hand reveals its full heuristic power by offering an attitude position and a method by which one can follow evolutionary directive paths. Even in the light of presuppositions the operation of observing human sciences appears to have lost every pretension of description or representation of reality. For more than a decade, at least from the time of *The decomposition of sociology* (Horowitz, 1993).

It has been abundantly evident that observation has been intrinsically ideological and biased and uses both qualitative and quantitative tools more or less integrated. On the other hand it would be too simplistic to sound the charge of absolute relativism which is apparently only a contradiction in terms. As I shall point out later, relativism has become crucial nowadays because of its capacity as a self-referential relativizational creator of functional equivalents and possible differences depending on the evolutionary strategies of the specific observer. From this point of view, the observer is a designer who creates, metaphorically speaking, his own software programmes. The concept which develops through these pages is not therefore an analysis, nor an empiric description of reality and certainly not one based on presumed data (which have never really been data).

Less than ever this paper hopes to outline an ethical picture (neither normative nor prescribed) so that we don't even have to proceed at the level of having to exist. The evolutionary challenge posed by this essay, is focused on the range of possibilities that everybody has or might have to live his/her own life, his/her own why. This paper offers 512 possible combinations which create a programme through which we can accomplish selections of sense. At this point, it is perhaps clear to those whom this essay is aimed at: and to every psychic system which can use this self-referential programme, to select the meaning of the multiple contingencies within its horizon. Selection, by which you can more or less make the evolutionary strategy, happen, thereby reducing the cognitive dissonances as much as possible.



This cognitive tool aims at relativizing and reducing the negative influences of the two big cognitive ties which I shall outline and discuss more fully in the following pages:

- a) Descartes's error, on the belief that mind and body are not just separable but are in fact separated.
- b) Miller's problem, as I have defined it has been already present, under other definitions in epistemological debates about neurosciences for the last 30 years. According to the American psychologist George Miller, man is a poor cognitive and communications system which is very efficient in that it has a limited wavelength, a high level of noise, is expensive to run and sleeps 8 hours out of 24 (Miller, 1971: 57).

These two ties place the CERP 512 AS programme on an epistemological and strategic level after man but not against man, in the knowledge that the evolution of our species can be fulfilled, with all due caution, through the re-assembling of the man-machine which will after cognitively, perceptively and bodily be the whole itself of man.

Concept not recognising this factor would lead to the probabilities of getting into self-fulfilling prophecies of metaphysical superstitions of darkness. I believe that the 21<sup>st</sup> century will be a period of great interior spirituality in which I hope that we in the west will be able to learn that what the Zen Buddhists have always known, i.e. He who has contemplated his own nature even for only once can remain, if he wants to, or not remain, if he doesn't want to; he can come and go undisturbed, there is no pain or threat whatsoever. He acts according to the facts, he answers the questions in the required way. He evolves but never changes his nature. This way he achieves the samadhi of imperturbability and freedom and the samadhi of the game that performs miracles. This is called contemplation of one's nature (Hisamatsu, 1993: 44).

Some excellent indications in this direction, that is to say, in the interpretation of Zen orientation in the epistemology of neuroscience, had already appeared at the end of 80s in the last century in the popular scientific books of Fritjof Capra and above all in the now classic *The embodied mind* (Varela, Thompson, Rosch 1992). Zen Buddhism plays a crucial role going beyond Cartesian's error and Miller's problem in that:

- a) it shows the inseparableness of mind and body, the embodiment of thought and the mental character of the action pitilessly demonstrating that Zen Buddhism had already reached a very high level of individual awareness when ancient Greece was still expressing itself culturally in sodomitic symposia.
- b) It shows that feelings, emotions and sensations are physical noises which can't be eliminated by splitting them from mental life.

Such noise however can be softened down to the clearest conscience-making process of one's own, substantially reducing therefore the consequences of Miller's problem. The strategic evolutionary function of the CERP 512 AS programme transcends the specificity of the contents of the selections made. The only functional requirement of the programme is its self-referential autology. The programme functions as a programme and ceases to be if it is used as a theory or ideology.

In the multiplicity of possible alternatives the entity of the individual is his mental life (Simmel, 1998), so that the individual assumes the specificity of the psychic system (Luhmann, 1990) as a psychic system, the individual can ask himself the crucial question: how does a human being transform himself in the subject? (Foucault, 1992) or to put it into Kantian terms: who are we in our reality? (ibidem). The answer from this paper is that we are no longer identities but rather unities of multiple differences of which only a few make the real difference. These differences which make the difference constitute the message of this essay which places itself in the Luhmannian variant of

the horizon of radical constructivism through the paradoxal orthodoxy of heterodoxy (i.e. according to Simmel, 1978). This transforms hereditary money into something else which does not mirror

the life of the departed one as much as it does of those who have received it. The inevitable self-reference of the observer frames (the confines of the horizon in an amusing ironic manner) in an attempt to create and link connections of meanings which are sufficiently adequate to distinguish your own rubbish bag from those of your neighbours even without adequate symbolic generalizations (Luhmann, 1990). The line between *x* and its opposite loses every pretext of ontological foundation or even only of identity according to the old and mostly obsolete criteria of what belongs to who. Symbolic codes like tradition (ideological, religious and common sense), territory (interpreted as homeland), blood (interpreted as phylogeny and biological inheritance) have revealed their relativity and contingency and are today possible fluctuating alternatives. The key to this discussion has its roots in the early thoughts of Simmel (Simmel, 1982, 1985, 1993) and in one of my essays called *A portrait of Georg Simmel as a young man* (Pitasi, 1994) of which these pages represent a rhapsodic, and in some lines, surprising evolution. Surprising, because, compared to then, the study of philosophical cynicism (Onfray, 1992) and of scepticism, above all as interpreted by Sextus Empiricus have enriched the traditional ideas with new thoughts and new implications. Not only the observer must write in all its complexity and spread his own narratives (Marcus, 1993; Geertz, 1987, 1993), but such narratives are quickly taken into consideration but they are looked at sceptically as are the source, the style, the source and the relation between the source and its destination.

These pages, therefore, express a possible narrative from one observer out of many possible ones. It has no more claim to scientific proof or truth than any other writings by other observers (but it has also no lesser claims). The conviction in these pages is above all heuristic in describing a possible strategy of self-reference by which the other one becomes completely irrelevant and different. Later I would like to go onto outline a plan whose function is to describe itself as a self-referential strategic procedure through which an observer can create and develop his own discourse on truth (Foucault, 1972 and more modestly Pitasi, 2001).

The evolutionary leap (Lazlo, 1992) or, if we prefer, the epochal threshold (Luhmann, 1990) of this dissertation is seen in the passage from the technologies of the self founded on models of historical social reproduction to the technologies of the self based on the self-referential processes of construction (for this passage see Foucault, 1992).

Let us look at the criteria of this strategy (see Pitasi for more details, 1994, 2001):

1. Adventure / Non Adventure (Simmel, 1985): for whom life itself becomes an adventure, or actually an island of energy and experiences which don't have any logical or chronological sequence among themselves but only an energy charge which activates or deactivates them depending on their own intensity.
2. Stranger / Non-Stranger: the observer is he who participates in a context but who nonetheless is aware that the context is contingent above all for his own biography.
3. Complexity / Non-Complexity: the variety of possible changes exceeds the number of connective possibilities inside the system so that selectivity becomes necessary.
4. Construction / Non-Construction: the observer knows that he is unable to achieve numerical reality and that he can only achieve the phenomenal reality that his own self-referential specificity can give him.
5. Hedonism / Non-Hedonism: the act of observation eliminates every possible self-referential pathway to suffering and so creates a state of pleasure which is completely without pain.
6. Relativism / Non-Relativism: the observer is aware of his own relativism but at the same time he knows that he is at the center of his own specific world and he recognizes his own micro-sphere, a contingency among other contingencies. The observer knows that his own

reality is contextual but that he cannot model the context but that he can choose one which is closer to his own self-reference.

7. Pragmatism / Non-Pragmatism: the observer is aware that what is possible is implosive without any suitable decisional strategy to decide what cannot be decided (Luhmann, 1999) and that such a decision is based on the functional truth of cash value (James, 1994).
8. Order / Non-Order: just as in the famous metalogue by Bateson (1976), the observer finds himself facing an indefinite horizon of possible states of order and an almost infinite number of possible disorders. The matter is that what is seen as order for the observer, in contingent terms, is statistically a very ordinary improbability so that the observer's Self-reference generates a state of order that is always reversible, contingent and improbable.
9. Self-Conscientiousness / Non-Self-conscientiousness: the observer operates on different levels of functional reality to his own Self-Conscientiousness of his specific combination of multiple intelligence (Gardner, 1997).

These nine sets of criteria, each one of which represents a code 0/1, constitute a network of interdependent selections or possible selections by the observer through bootstrap parameters or through self-nourishing processes with a very high level of internal coherence (Capra, 1995: 79 & 222).

In evolutionary terms, the most functional psychic system (and the observer is a psychic system) is that which self-produces itself in relation to its functional management with the least waste of energy and with the smallest weight of past experiences. In other words, the most functional evolutionary psychic system is that which when faced with two choices (Laszlo, 1992) can make a decision about the undecidable optimizing its own transactional costs - broadly accepted - and reproduce itself through an extension of its confines of systematic sense.

The most functional evolutionary psychic system (in these pages) is the one that reproduces itself at its best following its functional direction. It is thus a system which one could say has had very little experience and one that knows the evolutionary game consists of evolving one's specificity through smallest amount of experience possible.

At the same time, the system is evolutionary aware of its own operative intrinsic characteristics (to borrow a metaphor from Goethe). The systematic evolution derives from a program which is the network of every possible selective combination of the nine codes (0/1) which were previously illustrated. The program within which the system can evolve is composed of from the second to the ninth combination, that is, 512 combinations in total, or if you prefer of 510 combinations including 000000000 and 111111111. The systematic evolution is therefore determined by the type of program peculiar to the self-referential specificity. Such a calculation is not however seen as such by the psychic system which has yet to experience an excess number of variations and needs to select from the 512 possible combinations available both from its own evolutionary strategy and above all its resonant contingencies (Luhmann, 1989). It is particularly excessive in relation to a human life so that the fact that the system cannot choose or select anything outside the 512 combinations of the program which is not seen as a deterministic tie.

In fact, the possible combinations of the program are utilized as excessive complexities of the psychic system which put into action the cognitive saving mechanisms (Paraktanis-Aronson, 1992) to restrict the confines of one's horizon and to model oneself, often in an illusory manner, on the few customary selections. In this way there can be a reintroduction of mechanisms such as tradition, home territory and blood with the aim of canceling the systematic selection process and inserting the automatic pilot on 111111111. In this paradoxical way, a self-technology program played on a self-referential and self-directed construction becomes transformed by the psychic system into a hetero-directed and self-referential technology which is imprinted on the historical social reproduction of traditional cultural models in relation to the phylogenetic education of the psychic system.

The psychic system which goes on automatic pilot is however a contingency, both in relation to its diachronic evolution and in relation to the other psychic systems on the world's horizon even if the tendency to cognitive savings doesn't appear to be such an improbable improbability. How is such a savings possible?

The psychic system constructs its own difference within its own nuclear conscience (Damasio, 2000) which is not, if not by chance, in its own corporeity in that the psychic system does not differentiate itself through the biological system but through the self-referential psychic system itself.

The here and now of the nuclear conscience is in itself and by itself in a rather narrow space from which however the broad conscience evolves or better still the nuclear conscience and the fundamental structure on which one builds a broad conscience (Damasio, 2000).

In a hypothetical fashion and within all the limits of interpretation, I should like to consider the relationship between nuclear conscience and broad conscience through the metaphor of time and the analogy of the relationship between the present and the future. This analogy is rich in heuristic potentiality but it also needs a prudent evolution not to become methodologically a grotesque echo of Lacanian frauds. (Sokal & Bricmont, 1997).

The nuclear conscience is the present, the broad conscience is the evolutionary project present in the future.

The psychic system therefore, is impossible to live in the future and less and less in the past.

At the very most, the psychic system can get, through self-reference its image of the past and the future to complete here and now selections of meaning. From this point of view the future is a horizon that recedes when you try to get near to it (Luhmann, 1999) and the past assumes many multiple forms which, far from establishing a homogeneous and unambiguous narrative flow, split into thousands of little streams of conscience and subjectivity (Simmel, 1987). Not only does History reveal its own scarce ontology but the stories themselves create pieces of a puzzle which can never be completed coherently.

The selections of sense among the 512 possible combinations are activated every now and then by the nuclear conscience in the function of the evolutionary strategy of the psychic system itself. A strategy in itself devoid of any concrete ontical foundation even before an ontological one (ontic and ontological as described by Heidegger, 1977).

This strategy, in substance, is devoid of any real phenomenal reality. It is not known is simply functional on the psychic system which is analogous to the concept of the eighteenth camel in dividing the inheritance between the three sons (von Foerster, 1982). This strategy is functional to avoid deadlocks, implosions and decisions similar to the one of Buridan's Ass.

This strategy is much more functional and clearer in broad conscience (or autobiography) in that the psychic system is aware of its own specific combination of multiple intelligence and how to use it self-referentially in its own evolution.

The strategy is an important self-referential narrative through which the psychic system describes its discourse on truth, for example Stravinski's radical *Entfremdung* from his Russian homeland led to the Russian composer to build his new homeland (*Heimat*) in exterminated horizons of music (Kundera, 1994). There where *Heimat* is divorced from a land, from a geographical entity, does *Heimat* become a state of conscience in itself (*Selbstbewusstsein*).

The psychic system observed in these pages has already made the evolutionary leap. The code and the program its difference are states of conscience. the other one no longer exists. Or better still, the existence (or less) of the other is indifferent in relation to the conscientious evolution of the same psychic system.

The program of the psychic system is substantially a software one whose commands are codified in the nine switches that I have discussed in the previous pages and which I should like to develop in greater depth.

1. Adventure / Non-adventure. It is the code through which describes his metaphor of life. Adventure-life is energy-life, a life inspired by subjective meaning, a life of creative imagination, an open-minded concept of life, while, Non-adventure life is a life of history, a linear life. The observer's choice of selection opens / closes a radically different vision of life.

2. Stranger / Non-Stranger. This is the code where the observer describes himself as the difference between different forms of that which the daily semantics call identity. The multiplex unity places itself between the stranger / non-stranger code and the outsider / non-outsider one. (Merton, 1987). Such equivalence reveals the contingent and reversible character of the differences.

3. Complexity / Non-complexity. The complexity of the world is showing an exponential increase and the formal possibilities are more or less indefinite, yet, in spite of this, the psychic system lives in the operative and procedural horizon of its nuclear conscience. It is not about a social phenomenon of changing oscillations between the public and private sector (Hirschman, 1978) nor about a narcissistic escape by the private citizen from collective disillusion (Lasch, 1983), it is much more simply about an evolutionary ownership of the self-referential closure that unavoidably places the psychic system inside its own horizon. For a doctor, at the end of the 1960s, who had a wife, two small children, a house to buy and practice to establish the 1968 student protests would have passed him by like a background murmur and for a young graduate to be at the end of the 1980s, the fall of the Berlin Wall was probably just a faded and discolored mark. But how is it possible to state all this in a global village in which we have the whole of mankind as our skin? (McLuhan, 1967 & 1989).

Without resorting to repetitive meaningless rhetoric about globalization (the pros and cons) having all of mankind as our skin clearly sets out the code of obtrusiveness and non-obtrusiveness. If, for example, one evening at dinner, we hear on the news, for example about the usual bloody incidents on the Gaza Strip, being thousands of kilometers away the news leaves us pretty indifferent. Of course, we may feel genuinely concerned and feel compassion and understanding for the events but nothing will really prevent us from carrying on eating our food. It would be very different if these incidents or any similar incidents, for example, terrorist attacks were to happen within the horizon of the psychic system of our piazza or our airport. It is here that the obtrusiveness reveals its true power.

For example, in *Il Giornale* of the 16<sup>th</sup> March 1999 on page 18 (the foreign news page) there appeared an article under the heading 'Turkey, the PKK threatens tourists?' which reported a communication from the armed wing of the PKK warning all Western citizens not to visit Turkey for their holidays because of the high risk of getting caught up in terrorist guerrilla attacks. Obviously the real aim of this communication was not to threaten Western tourists but to help bring about a financial and economic collapse for the Ankara government. Obviously a huge number of tourists canceled their holidays to Turkey.

To summarize, the complexity / non-complexity code is therefore structurally tied to that of obtrusiveness / non-obtrusiveness. It is this structural link that transforms the possible into probable and the probable into actual which then allows us to decide the undecidable. The forms of obtrusiveness are varied, multiple and not able to be reduced to common sense banalities like egoism and altruism.

4. Construction / Non-construction. This code functions through mechanisms of perceptive simplification and cognitive savings to activate memory selections according to self-referential norms. In the silence of reality you can hear the murmuring of the possible which becomes probable through the imprinting of elective affinities.

5. Hedonism / Non-hedonism. At program level, what is needed is a simpler operative procedure which will probably not pay justice to the powerful philosophical arguments evoked by the code in question. The selection operation procedurally occurs through the elimination of ambiguity which can let through the parasites of meaning. Each of the following operations may be deemed Hedonistic:

- a) reveal all the previous failed hedonistic solutions;
- b) increment all the possible selections within the confines of one's selected specificity;
- c) evaluate all possible hypothetical links of possibilities in the future;
- d) plan one's desired hedonistic path towards the selected goal moving backwards;
- e) picture and plan the scenario which gives the greatest hedonistic satisfaction;
- f) develop a style of life as it is as if one lived that scenario pictured in e) above,
- g) do not oblige oneself to pursue level of hedonism. Paradoxically the effort would kill off the pleasure;
- h) avoid avoiding suffering. If the absence of pain and suffering could be considered the first step towards achieving pleasure and happiness it is also true that a huge effort to avoid them would create a state of painful primary repression. Avoid suffering as much as possible but without exaggerating and if it does materialize one should be able to understand how to use it strategically;
- i) fix the memory function of positive impulses remembering that the problem of memory (...) is not just the confrontation with the past, but also its relationship with the present because it is only in the present that one remembers and one forgets (Esposito, 2001, V11).

When the observant system selects a meaning through pleasure, happiness and positiveness it does so according to its own self-referency. This procedure is a revised self-referential elaboration of the writings inspired by Giorgio Nardone's (1998) text *Psychosolutions* - that which is on the outside and selected negatively by the procedure is not hedonism.

6. Relativism / Non-relativism. Leaving aside the most extreme simple variant of relativism (derided by Sokal & Bricmont, 2000), that which facilitates the evolutionary strategy of the psychic system within the procedural horizon of its own program is the function of relativization which allows the system to carry out the following operations:

- a) to increase the range of possible selections;
- b) to be aware of one's self-referential ego center in a world which has no top, no center and no hierarchy;
- c) to put oneself into a context, to remove oneself from a context and to put oneself into a different context and depersonalizing the contingencies thus obtaining a criteria of observation which is selected, attentive and removed from time itself.

7. Pragmatism / Non-pragmatism. This code is evolutionary entwined with the previous one in that the pragmatic criteria of the cash value of each operation selection is fundamental to avoid any burlesque-type of error ingrained in most extreme forms of relativism. Obviously, what creates cash value / value is not objective is functional in the observant system.

8: Order / disorder. The observing system considers order a very limited variety of possibilities in comparison with the possibilities the system considers disorder. The awareness of the unlikelyhood of order and that it is a self-referential construction of the observant system facilitates the evolution and the strategic programming of the system which can clearly have compass to manage and select the chaotic and noisy turbulence of the outer environment..

9. Self- Conscience / Non self-conscience. Every psychic system operates on the double horizon of its own nuclear and autobiographical conscience and acquires a relative awareness of multiple intelligence and of the specific combination that describes it.

The multiple intelligence variants of cognitive psychology which have already been identified are:

- a) mathematical logical;
- b) linguistic;
- c) kinesics;
- d) visual;
- e) spatial;
- f) intra-personal;
- g) interpersonal;
- h) musical.

Intelligence f) and g) constitute in substance, emotive intelligence. Intra- personal intelligence is strategic in that if it is adequately developed allows the self-referential function to operate by which the psychic system fully develops the autological program of its own self-reference.

If the psychic system operates on a low level of self-conscience it would still work through self-referential selections but they would probably be heterological and therefore very risky for the psychic system.

At this point the experimental implementation of the program seems to be the natural berth of this essay and the ineluctable beginning to further explorations.

Intelligence f) and g) constitute in substance, emotive intelligence. Intra- personal intelligence is strategic in that if it is adequately developed allows the self-referential function to operate by which the psychic system fully develops the autological program of its own self-reference.

If the psychic system operates on a low level of self-conscience it would still work through self-referential selections but they would probably be heterological and therefore very risky for the psychic system.

At this point the experimental implementation of the program seems to be the natural berth of this essay and the ineluctable beginning to further explorations.

## **PART 2**

### **Memory, knowledge and communication within the psychic system.**

We become metaphysicians every time we make a decision  
concerning questions which have no real answer  
Heinz von Foerster

More than one, do as I do, they write, not to have any identity  
Michel Foucault

Intelligence organizes the world by organizing itself  
Jean Piaget

Memory is a verification of coherence and not an act of preserving the contents (Luhmann, 2000: 85). The form of memory is the remember/forget difference and the function of the memory is the creation of at least one kind of order. Such a creative process chooses selections to construct improbable but possible sets of order out of an infinite variety of disorder which are not only possible but also probable.

After all, as Gregory Bateson magisterially wrote last century there are more ways that you could describe as disorderly than orderly (...) and I know that that it is more probable that one of the many things will happen rather than one of the few ones Considering that there is an infinity of disorderly ways, things will always go in the direction of disorder and confusion (Bateson, 1976: 37-40). Memory, therefore, builds order whose real function lies in their viability. In this way, the psychic system is aware that memory has nothing to do with presumed ontological reality and truth which can't be collected unknowingly.

Memory reveals the joke which is hidden behind the so-called reality of everyday life and common sense (Magnante, 2001): viability creates both recollection and common sense which have nothing to do with deliberately falsified reality or truth.

The evolution of memory occurs through a progressive increase, at times exponential, of a variety of abstract processes and a decrease which is equally progressive and redundant. Memory is a function of a system of reference which observes, operates and selects only from the present because it is only in the present that the remember/forget difference materializes and it is only in the present that one can picture, hypothesize and plan the future (cfr. Esposito, 2001). The remember/forget operation comes to the observer through the criteria and recurring codes of its self-reference and these operative criteria and codes select a whole series of ontological questions which have no answer (the existence of God, the origins of the universe, life after death, whether UFOs exist, justice, happiness in love, etc.). A metaphysical crumb, if we like, comes into play, as an expression of the self-reference of the psychic system which resolves by itself its own micro sphere of meaning and matters which from its point of view are translated into terms of adaptability and functionality and not in terms of noumenic ontological truth.

As Ernst von Glasersfeld (1997: 24) so eloquently writes: for me (...) the most important idea is the concept of being right more than being true and also because as is well known truth and reality cannot be grasped because of the characteristics of the nervous system which translates the signals sent from the sensory cells of the organism to the cerebral cortex, that part of the brain where it is believed that the cognitive processes take place in an invariant manner. (...) There is no justification



therefore in sustaining that we distinguish things because we receive information from what is traditionally known as the outside world. (...). The only approach that seems to have any chance of confronting this problem in the perspective of those processes that we call knowledge is not to refer to an outside reality but to one built by us (idem: 20). Furthermore, we can reach a decision only about questions which basically have no real answers ( von Foerster, 1997: 47) that is to say at least 90% of our decisions in my opinion. Having a political or religious belief (and eventually which one), deciding to marry the person that we love when we only have a vague idea of the possible multiple meanings of love, living with the conviction that you reap what you sow etc., brings us straight to the building of our own very personal and self-referential castle of meanings which becomes our only possible reality. A reality which although suitable is not really true. This reality evolves analogously under our observation but always through criteria of adaptability. And the memory of this psychic system through this evolution puts the difference of the remember/forget code into practice.

Within the program of the verification of an internal evolutionary ordered coherence this is possible because we can choose what we want to become when we have taken up a position in relation to a question which has no real answer (ibidem).

From a procedural point of view, memory processes function through selective operations which only apparently reduce the complexity because on the evolutionary strategic level it is always better to increase the number of choice selections (cfr. von Foerster 1996: 76). The mnemonic procedures of the psychic system place themselves therefore in the epistemological strategic framework of constructivism whose four undecidables are:

1. knowledge is not received passively neither through the senses nor through communication;
2. knowledge is actively accumulated by the knowing subject;
3. the function of knowledge is adaptive, in the biological sense of the term, and it tends towards viability;
4. knowledge is necessary for the organizing of the subject's world of experiences, and not for the discovery of an ontological objective reality (von Glaserfeld, 1998:50).

Memory is a selective self-referential procedure of complexities.

This selective procedure functions in the perspective that complexity needs a strategy (Morin, 1993: 83) and that such a strategy is intrinsically glocal in that it observes a global horizon by selecting in terms of viability those operations which are evolutionary and functional to the observer's self-referential specificity and also in terms of that local knowledge which now dominates post modern scenarios (Gergen, 1991: 226-231). For example, it is highly unlikely that the observer selectively constructs his memory through a passive use of what the mass media transmit as signals also because, as Niklas Luhmann (2000: 15) ironically writes we know enough about the mass media not to trust this source of information. In addition, we have to remember that every closed operative system has to produce their indicators of reality at the level of their own operations: they have no other possibility (idem: 110). Therefore every psychic system only selects from the media that which his operative closure allows him to select and not what the mass media want him to select, if not in a rather improbable way.

The belief that constructivism conceptualizes the existence of systems (psychic, social or biological) which are completely closed in relation to the outside environment and above all the idea that constructivism is based on a delirious form of solipsism which denies the actual existence of existence are two of the criticisms often directed against constructivism by those who know nothing about constructivism at all. Such criticism tells us more about those to make them that about the claims of constructivism.

In these next pages, I shall attempt to throw some light on the heuristic power of constructivism which is also seen in its capacity to re-invent the functions of opening/closing systems.

Such heuristic power - which I clearly see - has been fundamental for me to introduce constructivism (together with the relativism of Baos, hedonism, Diogene Laerzio s cynicism, Sextus Empiricus s skepticism, William James s pragmatism and Clifford Geertz s interpretive anthropology) as part of the most useful tools in my tool box.

For me, constructivism is a most precious tool, it is not a faith, it is not an ideology nor is it a general theory. The observer has all the tools which are necessary in his tool box to elaborate on the pluriversal qualities of his experiences.

I should like to begin by highlighting a psychic system which is evolutionary functional, it follows development lines and cannot be conceptualized in a rigid, static, absolute or dogmatic fashion.

But what is this development?

The development of the individual involves incremental and transformation processes which, through inter action flows between actual aspects of the person and his actual contexts, produce of changes which are relatively long-lasting and which increase or complicate the articulation of the structural and functional traits of the person his interaction with the environment keeping intact at the same time a coherent organization and a single functional structure of the person which cannot be separated (Ford-Lerner, 1995: 69).

This conceptual definition clearly implies that the development occurs through a kind of co-evolution between the system and the environment and that the development relates to the person seen as undividable. This conception of development is an excellent viable resource to demonstrate how unfounded the criticisms recorded earlier are. This conception, however needs some precise terminology:

- a) I prefer to use the expression *psychic system* rather than individual or personal, not because it considers the cognitive sphere to be separated from the bodily and emotional dimension (Descartes's Error) but because I consider the cognitive sphere to be the Kantian synthesis of multiple levels (cognitive, affective, of value and behavioral) of the observer s experience.
- b) The expression *interaction* used by Ford and Lerner should not deceive us. There is no two way dialogue between the system and the environment and there is no system that can survive, let alone, evolve without some form of opening up to the environment.

Ford & Lerner state that, in fact, the successful evolutionary systems are self-built and self-regulating and that selection plays a strategic function in their evolution (Ford-Lerner, 1995: 119, 131-132 & 146).

The two American scholars continue with their argument pointing out that every individual interacts in specific and personal ways with his environment because of the uniqueness of his genotype (idem: 101), in this way Ford and Lerner underline the functional strategy of evolutionary genetic variability : the geneticists (...) have estimated that every human being has the capacity to produce 3000 different eggs or sperms (...) The probability that somebody else - in the past, in the present or in the future - has the same genotype of somebody else ( with the exception of course of monozygotic twins) becomes so minute that it can be discarded (idem: 89).

Genetic variability implies that the development can continue throughout its life but that not all kinds of development can enjoy equal opportunities in relation to its entity of changes (idem: 186).

The context and the environment of the psychic system therefore appears to take second place in relation to the genetic specificity of the psychic system which is generated by several possible combinations between the  $10^{3000}$  different paternal spermatozoon and an egg from the  $10^{3000}$  different maternal eggs. In addition, the psychic system has also a possible specific cognitive DNA or rather its own specific combination of multiple intelligence discussed in previous papers in relation to Howard Gardner s brilliant theory

In a word, with its own specific genotype and relative specific combination of multiple intelligence the psychic system opens up to its environment looking for viable solutions for its own evolution.

The environment cannot in any case interact or communicate with the system, it is rather the system that gathers from the environment (eventually committing evolutionary mistakes) only that which the genotype and relative combination of multiple intelligence allow the system to gather. In this we find the self-constructing, self-regulating and self-producing character of the evolutionary systems (Ford-Lerner, 1995: 119 and 131-132).

The environment is one that is noumenical. The psychic system does not evolve in the environment nor does it interact with the environment.

Properly speaking, the psychic system is closed in the self-reference of its own genotype and specific combination of multiple intelligence and only through this self-reference can it open up to its experience with its own image (cognitive, affective, valued and behavioral) of the environment.

To complicate matters further, fortunately in my opinion, another aspect of evolutionary systems comes into play.

As Mauro Ceruti (2000: 3) so clearly writes serious systems are analytically indeterminable and hence unforeseeable .

Evolutionary psychic systems are naturally serious and unforeseeable.

More than ever, faced with the same environmental stimulus (to use a semantic behavioral expression which I don't share) different systems react (I continue to use the same behavioral semantics to underline its shortcomings) in different and unforeseen ways.

Such unforeseen results, however, contain a worrying vicious circle every position of awareness produces shady areas, and the shade is not just those areas outside the light but even less visible is that which is produced in the very heart of what produces the light. The relationship between the conscious cognitive and the unconscious cognitive is constructed in a recurring and surreal manner and to every position of conscience there is a corresponding new awareness of matrix of a knowledge which has been previously acquired. This production of a new cognitive unconsciousness corresponds to the non visibility of the matrix of the mechanisms which preceded the process of gaining knowledge. Every increase in knowledge corresponds to an increase in ignorance and there are new kinds of knowledge which correspond to new kinds of ignorance (Ceruti, 2000: 46).

Thus the operation of observation is unable to gather a presumed noumenic reality but this observation contains in its own self-reference at least one blind spot in its evolutionary processes.

Ceruti continues underlining the the insensitive constructive circle between the observer and the observed (Ceruti, 2000: 45). The evolutionary schemes of the psychic systems are dynamic, unstable and creators of balancing pushes which never manage to create a static equilibrium.

Picking up from Piaget, Ceruti offers a clear observation of the functions of open/shut binary systems: From a traditional point of view, the adjustment is seen as the reply of the organism to the demands of the environment (...) Now, however, what is regarded as primary for the function of adaptation is maintaining the autonomy of the system expressed in the form of its organizational closure . It is this that selects the most significant stimuli from the environment. And it is this that above all determines which significance to give to these stimuli in view of the changes in the system itself (idem: 76).

Cognitive and communicative processes, even those that function in different ways, have circular and constructive functions in the operative closure norm. The communicative processes by selecting communication/noise following Luhmann directives develop the opening in relation to the self-referential system while the cognitive processes even within all the limits of blind spots and observation tout court are functions of the evolutionary organization of the system itself.

In substance, this new perspective simply shows concepts in a new light, concepts which have already been widely diffused and analyzed such as general theory , multi-dimensional , interdisciplinary and integration .

These concepts - and other which are related to them - do not lose anything in meaning, they indicate functional and viable pathways towards an enlargement and depth of the frameworks and

intrinsic cognitive processes and lead to the observation of the psychic system and its own evolutionary indivisible complexity.

As Ceruti writes, a similar evolutionary leap demands a suitable epistemology which has a polyphonic and rhapsodic multiplicity of forms, strategies, dimensions and constitutive relations of knowledge (Ceruti, 2000: 5).

From this perspective, the ancient quote from Greek philosophy 'Know yourself' doesn't appear to be the words of advice from a wise sage nor the order of a strict authoritarian. 'Know yourself' seems to be more the observation of the link and the possibilities inserted in the evolutionary circle of the operative closure of the psychic system.

## PART 3

### CHRP 512 AS

#### A constructivist strategy for an evolutionary software program

In reconstructing the epistemology of Piaget's matrix through the constructivist heterodox orthodoxy, I shall continue with my objective of developing an experimental epistemology in that it is strategically based on multidisciplinary self-design and in that it is constructively orientated in presenting itself as a multiplex unity, as a complex system and which is highly differentiated in a functional manner towards the building of the mind and viable self designs. It has an epistemological goal in that observes constantly, rebuilding the observations and relative cognitive processes of the observer himself.. In such a perspective, the CHRP512AS program has a formal adaptive function in terms of elimination (or at least the maximum reduction) of the psychic noise of the evolutionary cognitive processes as well as the organizational and decision-making ones of the living system which contains a conscience of conceptual thought at a very high formal operational level. For this reason the CHRP512 AS program is not evolutionary functional for people under the age of 12 because they still haven't developed the concept of formal conceptual thought which can reflect on the subject's conscience.

Therefore, CHRP512AS is a strategic communication program which has an evolutionary function of self-adaptation.

Let us look more closely at these two aspects of the program:

- a) It has an adaptive function, according to Piaget, by intending its use as a preservation and reproduction of the living system which co-evolves by modeling and building its own environment through its own cognitive framework and through action sensor motors in a cognitive process by which the cognitive construction and sensor motors of the environment allow the living system to recognize itself at least as a construction of meaning.
- b) CHRP512AS is an agenda setting which expresses the thematic self-referential functions of the observer and (in a broad sense) who is the designer of the agenda setting itself. In this sense CHRP512AS is a strategic tool of communication seen as a self-facilitating agenda of the process of self-construction through the management with intra-psychic intelligence of the specific combination of the observer's multiple intelligence who models his own agenda on the CHRP512AS program.

This is therefore why people under the age of 12 are not able to use the program: they are not yet able to put into context yet alone conceptualize the relativity of their own conceptualization or even less to relativize their own conceptualization.

As Piaget writes (2000: 2-27) subject A is able to present himself as a subject having a brother B but decisively denies that subject B has a brother because there are only two of them this reasoning is possible up to the age of 4, whilst up to the age of 7, a child is convinced that two glasses in which the water reaches the same level, contain the same quantity of water even if the first glass is three times the size of the second.

Beyond Descartes's Error (that of splitting mind and body) and beyond Miller's Problem (that the embodied action cannot be split from its own cognitive frameworks and vice-versa) which consists in considering man as a means of communication with a low frequency, loud noise and a very high level of entropy and high cost of maintenance.

The cybernetic self which evolves itself through the CHRP512AS program, must not create the mistakes in the complete mentalization ? of the individual against his affective complexity.

Antonio Damasio (1995) had already highlighted Descartes's Error of wanting to split mind and body when they cannot be evolutionarily split.

In these pages, therefore, the intellectual project that we are following is very careful not to fall into this error.

This project, however, it is well aware of Miller's Problem.

Already at the end of the 1960s, the psychologist George Miller had outlined in his shrewdly ironic style that the human being is a system that requires high maintenance and has a low level of functionality, above all as a communication system.

Therefore, mind and body cannot be split but that is not necessarily a merit or a defect.

It is simply a statement which reveals the meaningful and communicative limitation of the human system of high maintenance and low functionality.

There is a third crucial passage, in my opinion, and it is the paradox about Bertrand Russell's barber (the barber shaves all the men in the village who cannot shave themselves. Who shaves the barber?) in the variant that I have developed for this specific project. Or: if the CHRP512AS program makes decisions for all those who cannot make decisions by themselves who decides to let the program decide?

The answer is much easier than that of the paradox of the barber but it strongly reveals the co-evolving subject which cannot be eliminated in the dynamic Man-Machine model (at least in our evolutionary stage).

Descartes's Error, Miller's Problem and the Barber's paradox - in the version cited above - are epistemological fundamentals of the incarnate and inactive action (due to the split between mind and body) which evolves through the method of knowledge and presence.

The difference between man and machine is not to be found at the cognitive level but at the conscience level. The cognitive processes of a machine can evolve along functional directives of unthinkable power.

Challenging the impossible is not to be found in the cognitive evolution of the machine but rather in exploiting its cognitive power without any conscience until it is the human conscience (being aware and being present in Buddhist terms) that makes the evolution strategically functional. Such cognitive power would amply reduce the very high level of psychic noise of cognitive human dynamics, a noise that is clearly recorded by Miller's Problem.

In no case therefore, does the CHRP512AS display unachievable ambitions of elimination and/or obsolescence of the same subject reducing as much as possible psychic noise and cognitive dissonance.

The viable epistemological constructions in methodology and procedure within a strategic evolutionary strategy of reference constitute the most exact and refined cognitive instruments which man possesses - in my opinion correctly - as much as old-fashioned positivistic scientific demands towards nihilist forms of the human mind, forms which are useless to themselves and harmful to the construction of evolutionary strategic systems whose function is to adapt to its own self-reference.

The hermeneutic reconstruction of this re-reading would take me too far away from the path I am laying out, that is the one that leads to the cognitive implementation of the evolutionary CHRP512AS software program and for this hermeneutic reconstruction I should like to point out to the reader the already cited and excellent *The link and the possibility* (Ceruti, 2000: 74-89) which investigates and rewrites with great clarity the evolution of the concept of adaptation.

The global individual who is strategically interested in a evolutionary software like CHRP512AS is able to obtain through self-reference from the environment the viable resources on the horizon.

In his very clear and intelligent, if rather too connotative for a scholar, at least in my opinion, sociological observation on globalization, Ulrich Beck writes asking himself on what is the new power of international companies based? Where does it come from? How does their strategic potential increase? The intervention on the essential structure of modern national companies, which came about in the normal course of things (...) has enabled the companies in the first case to export jobs to where costs and conditions of work are more convenient. In the second place, they can

(thanks to new information techniques that bring everything nearer and closer throughout the world) divide products, services and production by distributing jobs in different places in the world, thus giving simple misleading impressions on the labels of the products which continue to show apparently that they come from one single national source.

In the third place, they can use countries and single places of production instead of others, so that they can run a global government of cows looking for the most convenient fiscal conditions and the most favorable infrastructural conditions; at the same time they can punish those countries they consider to be expensive or hostile to their investments. Finally, they can, in this tangled mess of global production which they have provoked and they control, distinguish autonomously between the place of investment, the place of production, the fiscal address and their registered address and utilize them all by playing one off against the other with the result management (but in my opinion Beck here means the entrepreneurs can live and live in the most beautiful places and pay taxes where they are most convenient for them. All this happens (...) without any questions or debates in Parliament, without any objections, without legislative changes, and in fact without any public debate (Beck, 2001: 15-16).

The reflections of the LMU expert are very precious to me beyond the strong ideological anti-global connotations of the Bavarian sociologist, they underline the four crucial functions which the glocal individual as a strategic entrepreneur himself in front of his eventual business can utilize in a self-referential way:

- a) Export, making it relative inside the evolutionary strategic system of his own self-reference, his own evolutionary project in a greater viable context.
- b) Glocalize - through a multimedia network - the handling and development of his conscience by reducing financial, organizational and contract costs.
- c) Produce in the greater viable context in terms of transaction costs and distribute in the same viable context in terms of propensity to consume.
- d) Develop a multiplex unity of identity, each one functionally differentiated which creates mentally adventurous pathways of the stranger who develops his own cyberself in terms of evolutionary software to manage the multiplex unity of his identity portfolio. Each co-evolutionary identity of the multiplex unity is simply a narrative (Gergen, 2001: 68-70).

The strategic management of the specific multiplex unity of identity of psychic systems is evolutionary endowed with self-organizational entrepreneurship, these systems are aware that each one is due a single meaning, a task that he alone can carry out (Simmel, 2001: 46).

This psychic system is also aware that the adequacy of our methods of thinking and our expressions does not reflect just any structure of a reality that we would have gathered sub specie aeternitatis. It is always an here and now adequacy which is conditioned and constructed by aims and models of the observer as it is by the particular methodological cuts made in the construction of its cognitive universes (Ceruti, 2000: 93).

Therefore: Every relationship with others is thus definitive but only as steps along the path where the I reach myself (Simmel, 2001: 55 56).

The I arrives at himself along the many paths of Glocality whose ever changing horizons of people, mass media technology, financial flows etc., are observed and re-interpreted like construction blocks for imaginary worlds from each one in a different manner (cfr. Beck, 2001: 73-74).

Three crucial secular processes flow in the existential undergrounds of the cyber self-individualism, individualization and individuation.

Let us look at them more analytically in order:

- a) Individualism appears for the first time during the Italian Renaissance period. The first of its two main schools of thought is fully developed in the 18<sup>th</sup> century in terms of enlightened

individualism according to the Kantian matrix where the individual is seen as an single entity in which the fundamental universality of man is revealed. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century the other form of individualism, where the individual is conceived as a single, unique and highly differentiated single specificity, is fully developed. From the 19<sup>th</sup> century, we have, inspired by Goethe's thoughts, it is no longer important to be a single unchangeable determined individual (Simmel, 2001: 55).

The brilliant author of *Social Differentiation* continues: throughout modern times, the individual has been searching for himself, looking for an unambiguous point of stability, which he needs more and more as the theoretical and practical horizon widens ever more and becomes more complicated. It is for this exact reason that it is impossible to find any outside instance of the soul (Simmel, 2001: 55).

Evolution, is essentially a process of adaptation to one's own self-reference, precisely because, to paraphrase Simmel, there is nothing beyond the soul, at least nothing important.

In illustrating the four basic fundamentals of social constructivism, Kenneth Gergen (2001: 47-49) points out that within the horizons of one's own semantics, this unimportant outside part (which in fact only appears in the second point), is notoriously so, while this constructivism had a much more precise co-evolutionary compared to the kind of constructivism which has inspired this dissertation of mine, albeit in a heterodox manner. Gergen writes:

- 1) The terms by which we understand our world and our self are neither required or demanded by what there (Gergen, 2001: 47).  
Here the author of the *Saturated Self* opens up conceptually to the outside world:
- 2) Our modes of description, explanation and or representation are derived from relationship (Gergen, 2001: 48).  
But here he focuses again on the individual:
- 3) As we describe, explain or otherwise represent so we do fashion our future (Gergen, 2001: 48).
- 4) Reflection on our form of understanding is vital to our future well being (Gergen, 2001: 49).

The thoughts of Gergen are useful to reinforce that theoretical vision which states that there is nothing of importance outside of the soul in that the constructivism of the writer from Swarthmore College inserts the modeling of the future as the evolutionary project into the center of the cognitive evolution of the psychic system.

In anthropological terms, nevertheless, the cultural roots of individualism, interpreted as they have been since the 18<sup>th</sup> century, do not belong to the Anglophonic scenario: The individualism of the completely free personality, which is more or less seen as being equal, defines both French and English rationalistic *laissez-faire* (free-thinking), while, the form that looks towards a qualitative and immeasurable singleness is more in keeping with the Germanic ideal (Simmel, 2001: 59).

b) Ulrich Beck's conception of individualization, consists in that global process which institutionalizes the individual as a target - with all the relative advantages and disadvantages- of the strategies and trends in the global market. Individualization, according to Beck, is one of the five principal processes which characterize the world scenario at the dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. According to the author of *Society at Risk*, all five processes have to be managed in an overall and simultaneous manner.

The other four processes are globalization, the gender revolution, unemployment and global risk (Beck, 2000).

Because of the epistemological limits of human knowledge emphasized by the principle of Heisenberg's indeterminism, simultaneous management cannot be observer dependent and relative and the correct prospective in these pages must be that of individualization. In other words globalization is a completely complex and variegated phenomenon which reaches different



individuals in different ways. This phenomenon is in turn reconstructed in many different ways by different people, the gender revolution is taking place not so much in a social way (in terms of belonging to and identifying with) but in an individual evolutionary manner.

My gender is very precious and also functional for me to be able to characterize my uniqueness, as inspired and measured by Goethe's vision, and not just for integrating myself into some community.

Unemployment is an process, which seen in the perspective of individualization concerns all those psychic systems which have evolutionary self-constructed themselves as free and rational individuals according to French and English criteria. Nowadays, they are substantially functionally equivalent in a global market where labor is more and more less strategic (Beck, 2001). They are always subject to the dangers of hire and fire whereas the evolutionary psychic systems which have been built according to Goethe's criteria are not subject to the dangers of functional equivalence but face all the risks of a self-organized system which is endowed with, broadly speaking, entrepreneurial spirit and where the dangers are seen as coming from real situations while the risks are actual blind spots on the cognitive decision-making horizon of the psychic system. Individualism had shown the bifurcation between the construction of the individual seen as an equal and the construction of the individual seen as a specific and unique construction. Individualization chooses a dangerous path of functional equivalence and a risky path of evolutionary self-entrepreneurship. The evolutionary CHRP512AS software program will probably be used by those who choose this second pathway.

c) I see individuation in a completely heterodoxical and original manner.

I consider that individuation as well as being the threshold of self-knowledge, where the psychic system is not only aware of the existence of multiple intelligence but is also aware of the specific combination, is also sufficiently evolved to devise its own strategy to optimize the use of such a combination. Individuation is an evolutionary threshold which can be reached potentially only by those evolutionary psychic systems which we may term Goetheian.

Individualism, individualization and individuation are three crucial aspects albeit in different forms, of the cognitive evolution of the psychic system.

The Individualism which is evolutionary strategic for the psychic system, as I have already illustrated, is the Germanic one and in particular that one based on Goethe, in that only this form of individualism appears to me to be viable in the sense of a tendentially self-planned and self-referential evolution. The process of individuation of the psychic system finds fertile soil in this type of individualism and not only does it become possible but probable.

Within the horizon of Goetheian individualism stretching to individuation, individualization faces the risk of a bumping-effect in relation to the evolutionary self-designing of the psychic system. In other terms, the psychic system evolves differentiating itself more and more from its actual evolutionary context and more and more builds itself along the lines of a simmelian stranger. It remodels its very context or rather changes it modeling itself according to its own self-reference.

Programmed psychic systems in terms of rationalist egalitarian individualism are not evolutionary able to follow the functional directives of individuation and so they adapt to their own self-reference by identifying through their own context based on the narrow logic of Thomas's theory which states that everything that Man considers to be true is actually true (Beck, 2001: 23).

In the semantics of identification, the psychic system is unable to distinguish strategically or in an evolutionary manner the criteria contents of one's self-reference.

In substance, the semantics of these systems which have not really evolved generalizes the criteria of self-reference.

This system expresses itself with expressions like since the world began, things have been like this... , Reality is like this... or the facts are these.... or Life is... ; where this type of system

does not manage to gather its relativity from its own point of view and from its own experience it identifies itself in a context where for the other systems the system which follows the identification directive is merely a functional equivalent.

A similar cognitive dissonance would not be accepted by the psychic system which would identify itself in its own context.

This system identifies itself within a context which does not recognize any other specificity and reduces itself to the functional equivalent.

The more the psychic system identifies itself in its own context the less the system builds itself, and the less the system builds itself the more it becomes a functional equivalent.

This is the implosive loop of normality and common sense.

The individualistic and Goetheian psychic system has thus been saved from the quicksand of imitation, identification, normality and common sense.

But how has this been possible?

The evolutionary leap made by the Goetheian individualistic system is mainly made up of a substantial elimination (or at least of a significant reduction in the creation of rites, myths, legends, ideologies, utopias, dogmas and fantasies (Pratkanis-Aronson, 1997) of all kinds of promised land.

Freed from this social and useless dead weight, symbols become simply the process of the semantic construction of the observant, procedural and operative strategies and the evolutionary tactics of the psychic system itself.

In other words, the symbolic strategy of the psychic system carries out a simple mapping function of the cognitive resources of the psychic system itself facilitating the concept/action connections in terms of viability.

The psychic system thus evolved at this level of self-reference knowledge escapes the identification logic of the symbolic multipliers (Melucci, 1995) so that it does not waste any of its resources in activities which are not strategic in achieving its evolutionary plan.

This evolutionary threshold of the psychic system is clearly defined by two specific characteristics:

- 1) The psychic system is therefore able to observe and reconstruct the horizon of its own experience focusing its meaning through its own self-reference. This involves the system evolving its own epistemology of cognitive strategies and abandoning bit by bit those evolutionary states which are less viable and tendentially re-applicable as follows:

- 1a) The system has abandoned all behaviorist visions of its cognitive strategies.

Not only is the Stimulus/Response (S/R) mechanism not viable but we realize that in the case of the other psychic systems which deem the S/R mechanism to be viable, it is simply an expression of their self-reference and it is not a concrete outside determination. Those who think and act in behaviorist terms do so in a coherent way because they have constructed a behavior model in accordance with Thomas's theorem.

- 1b) These systems do not even consider practicable an epistemology of cognitive strategies based on the idea that outside influences produce effects which are limited both in time and space considering the assimilative function of the receiver. Therefore, the S/A/R model does not seem to be viable either in that although more flexible than the previous model it still does not open the black box of the psychic system.

Moreover, the S/A/R model is also efficient, when in use, since it has been built as a real model by the psychic system which it uses.

Once again Thomas's Theorem demonstrates its real strength.

- 1c) Both of the preceding epistemologies, moreover, reason in terms of single stimuli and single answers to single stimuli with substantial claims which are greater universally in 1a) than in 1b).

The third epistemology of cognitive strategies underlines, a little like in the famous book written by Katz & Lazarsfeld (1962), not only the personal influence in means of mass communications but above all the synchronic presence of multiple stimuli on the horizon of the psychic system. These simultaneous stimuli or those which are temporarily separated often in gaps of seconds or minutes are frequently contradictory and full of cognitive dissonance. In the face of them, the psychic system's bodily sphere of sensory perceptiveness reveals its true importance.

Yet, somehow, the psychic system has to decide, to choose and remember that even deciding not to decide, to choose or not to choose are also decisions and choices to be made.

This form of epistemology has therefore the great merit of being able to shake the very foundations of behaviorism but this epistemology has been much more viable for the psychic system, thanks to the doubts that it has raised, than for the heuristics it proposed.

At this evolutionary level, the psychic system still believes in the so-called outside reality but realizes that the emphasis is not on them but rather on the way the psychic system elaborates, selects and models such stimuli attaching itself to its own specific model of operative, tactical decision-making strategies.

Therefore at this evolutionary point of the second level of epistemological observation of cognitive strategies the question how is it possible to re-elaborate and select such stimuli strategically? remains unanswered both cognitively and conceptually and it evolves in the banal routine of operative procedures.

Even here, what Man calls History often seems to repeat itself: routine, inertia and laziness are three powerful sources of psychic, physical and semantic noises for the systems of Man, so clearly outlined by Miller (1971) as previously discussed.

1d) The psychic system during its evolution becomes aware that its cognitive strategies are expressions of its function of gate keeping or rather its own code of opening/closing.

At this evolutionary threshold behaviorism has already been substantially reduced.

The psychic system begins to realize that it has to observe its actual brain frames and its psycho-technical framework to understand how to develop in the outside environment.

In this particular evolutionary phase therefore the psychic system begins to consider the brain frames as problematic (De Kerchove, 1993), however, it still models itself as if, according to Thomas's theorem, it was in contact with the outside environment.

At this level, the psychic system reasons in an elementary fashion, as if it could get in contact with the other types of systems, understand the gate keeping criteria and open a dialogue while seeking an inter-subjective objectification. This is just pre-Xmas gossip that the system will conceptualize only at the next evolutionary level.

1e) The psychic system knows that it possesses a gate keeping function and a code of opening/closing.

It is also aware that in its evolution, its cognitive strategy demonstrates its clear shortcomings: its relationship and inter-subjectivity are now only a quicksand into which every evolutionary specificity that is not adequately recognized, developed or valued by the system itself, sinks.

At this point in time, the psychic system will probably opt for a cognitive strategy which concentrates on its uses and rewards knowing that this puts it at a crossroads. If the psychic system models its uses and rewards at a simple operative level, it will probably evolve at a self-descriptive level of behavior. If however, the psychic system manages to gather such uses and rewards inside a psychic-technological brainframe (for example CHRP512AS, or another evolutionary viable program) which is at the same time inserted into an epistemological cognitive strategy which is adequately functional, then the uses and rewards will very probably work as gate keeping criteria without becoming strategic priorities and hence maintaining their functional status as means.

A psychic system with such wary strategies, uses and rewards would in fact be subject to all the pitfalls of symbolic multipliers and fantasy illusory risks (Pratkanis-Aronson, 1997).

If the psychic system attributes a strategic function to the uses and rewards turn back, at the start it starts the rounds again, you could say. If however it attributes a mere operative function to its uses and rewards it will probably evolve its own functional guidelines.

1f) At this evolutionary threshold, the psychic system becomes aware that its evolution is only based on the cognitive strategy which centralizes on the construction of the meaning. It also becomes clear that knowledge is simply the observation of one's own psychic knowledge. Eventual relationships with the outside environment are to be considered irrelevant according to Kant: whether there is or not, an outside reality has no importance in that the psychic system can only recognize the intra-psychic organization of its own self-reference. Even the effort involved in denying the existence of a presumed outside reality becomes superfluous.

The cognitive constructions of the meaning and the epistemological observation of the strategies of such constructions become the evolutionary horizon of the psychic system which however still leaves the door open to the outside as I have already outlined when illustrating the second of the four founding pillars of Gergen's constructivism.

The cognitive constructions of the meaning have already become, in this threshold, the heart of the evolutionary strategy but in some way, they have become a little difficult to explain.

Communication is still perceived as a co-evolution with an outside factor which is an indecipherable black box.

1g) The evolution occurs when the psychic system confirms the brainframe for status 1f) but intrapsychic condition manages to gather fully the epistemological and of the communication which then becomes the medium through which the psychic system fully masters its own specific combination of multiple intelligence.

The evolution from 1a) to 1g) is a continuum not a binary code (Wolf, 1985; Bryant-Zillmann, 1994; Brosius, 1995) and it is an evolutionary process of the tendential-probabilistic but not deterministic type. The innumerable possible horizons from which the psychic system has to choose, by cognitively connecting concepts and actions to develop viable constructions makes the evolution of the system rather risky to the point that it places itself at level 1g) as if it were the most normal of improbabilities.

I should like, in conclusion, to discuss in more detail the crucial passage concerning the communicative strategies of the psychic system as far as stage 1g).

I suggest we look at the following continuum:

1j	1b	1c	1d	1e	1f	1g
Behaviorism S-R	Behaviorism S-A-R of limited effects	Multiple and Simultaneous influences	Model of gate keeping	Strategy of uses and operative rewards	Cognitive Constructionism	Radical Constructivism

The levels from 1a) to 1b) are substantially constructed at strategic level based on an anthropology of imitation which is typical of propaganda scenarios. The levels 1c), 1d) and 1e) have been constructed in communicative strategic terms as identification processes of persuasion even if this is seen as gradual flow from 1c) to 1e). 1f) is the entry point towards the facilitation of communicative strategies based on individualistic anthropology and level 1g) is the fulfillment of such an evolution in that the communicative strategy has achieved its own intra-psychic self-directed nature. In other words the continuum from 1a) to 1g) is an evolutionary move from the highest hetero-directivity of behaviorism to the highest self-directivity of constructivism. This is the only evolutionary state where the psychic system is strategically, tactically and operatively free and responsible.

## Epilogue

The CHRP512AS cognitive software program is a functional method for verifying the internal coherence of the decision making processes of the evolutionary strategy of the self-adapting psychic system. A first step consists in examining the visual strategy under the nine binary codes through a self-applied mode. Let us suppose that the self-adapting psychic system considers the configuration 11111111 as viable for its own self-reference. Obviously there are no true or false configurations just simply viable or non-viable ones.

Having established such a strategic configuration, each tactical-operative decision has to choose from the nine codes, each time through self-applied modes, thus obtaining an actual specific configuration, for example, 001110001. Each single configuration derived from tactical-operative decisions is compared with the strategic configuration putting in any eventual cognitive dissonance and any anthropic inertial tendencies which are tied to cognitive saving.

This verification of coherence is necessary therefore to show up any eventual evolutionary contradictions in the system making it as coherent as possible internally and to render explicit every choice and decision in relation to the self-reference of the system itself. In other words, sometimes the tactical-operative demands may require decisions to be taken which are not in line with the strategic vision of the system itself. As a result, the system may wander from its evolutionary strategy but this in itself does not mean it will not function provided that this decision to deviate is recognized and has been thought out. CHRP512AS will function like a procedural criteria as long as the system evolves according to its internal coherence and, whenever it deviates the decision to do so must have been considered and motivated so that the psychic system can through use of this cognitive software program reduce considerably the risk of cognitive short-circuits, which are vicious circles of self-organization and swinging oscillations between contradictory options.

## References

- Bandura, A. (1997) Self efficacy, W.H. Freeman & Co, New York.
- Bateson G. (1976) Verso un'ecologia della mente, Adelphi, Milano.
- Battaglia D.(ed.) (1995) Rhetorics of Self — Making. University of California Press, Berkley.
- Beck U. (1990) I rischi della libertà, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Beck U. (2001) Libertà o capitalismo?, Carocci, Roma.
- Beck U (2000) Manifesto cosmopolitico, Asterios, Trieste.
- Beck U. (2001) Che cosa è la globalizzazione, Carocci, Roma.
- Bottaccioli F. (1996) Psiconeuro immunologia, Red Edizioni, Como.
- Brosius H. B. (1995) Alltagsrationalität und Nachrichtenrezeption, WDV, Opladen.
- Bryant J.; Zillman O. (eds.) (1994) Media effects, Lawrence Erlbaum, New Jersey.
- Burkitt, Ian (1991). Social selves: Theories of the social formation of personality. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Capra F. (1995) Punto di svolta, Feltrinelli, Milano.
- Carroll J. (1980) Sceptical sociology, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Ceruti M. (2000) Il vincolo e la possibilità, Feltrinelli, Milano.
- Chevallier J.J. (1968) Le grandi opere del pensiero politico, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Cionini L. (1999) Dalla prospettiva comportamentale a quella costruttivista, in Codisposti O. Clementel (a cura) Psicologia clinica, Carocci, Roma, op. cit.: 53-71.
- Cionini L. (2001) La psicologia cognitivo-costruttivista in Idem Psicoterapie- modelli a confronto -, Carocci, Roma, II Ed, op. cit.: 111-156.
- Clifford J., Marcus G. (1997) Scrivere le culture. Meltemi, Roma.
- Damasio A. (1995) L'errore di Descartes, Adelphi, Milano.
- Damasio A. (2000) Emozioni e Coscienza, Adelphi, Milano.

- De Kerchove D. (1993) *Brainframes*, Baskerville, Bologna.
- De Soto H. (2001) *Il mistero del capitale*, Garzanti, Milano.
- Deetz S. (eds). (1998) *Discursive Formations, Strategized Subordination and Self-Surveillance*, in: McKinlay A. Starkey K. *Managing Foucault*. Sage, London.
- Erikson E.H. (1980) *Identity and the Life Cycle*., W.W. Norton & Co, London-New York.
- Esposito E. (2001) *La memoria sociale*, Laterza Bari.
- Ford D.H.; Lerner R.M. (1992) *Developmental system Theory*. Sage, London.
- Ford D.H.; Lerner R.M. (1995) *Teoria dei sistemi evolutivi*, Cortina Ed., Milano.
- Foucault M. (1972) *L ordine del discorso*, Einaudi, Torino
- Foucault M. (1977) *Microfisica del potere*. Einaudi, Torino.
- Foucault M. (1986) *Tecnologie del s* , Bollati e Boringhieri, Torino.
- Foucault M. (1992) *Tecnologie del s* . Bollati Boringhieri, Torino.
- Foucault M. (1994) *Poteri e strategie*. Mimesis, Milano.
- Gardner H. (1991) *Aprire le menti*. Feltrinelli, Milano.
- Gardner H. (1994) *La nuova scienza della mente*. Feltrinelli, Milano.
- Gardner H. (1997) *Formae mentis*, Feltrinelli, Milano.
- Gaskin J. (ed) (1995) *The Epicurean Philosophers*, Everyman, London.
- Geertz C. (1987) *Interpretazioni di culture*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Geertz C. (1993) *Antropologia Interpretativa* , Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Gergen K. J. (2001) *An invitation to Social Construction*, Sage, London.
- Gergen K.J. (1991) *The Saturated Self*, Basic Books, New York.
- Gerken G. (1996a) *Multimedia, Das Ende der Information*, Metropolitan Verlag. Duesseldorf.
- Gerken G. (1996b) *Magische Masse*, Metropolitan Verlag, Duesseldorf.
- Gigante M. (1992) *Cinismo ed Epicureismo*, Bibliopolis, Napoli.
- Goleman D. (1996) *Intelligenza Emotiva*. Rizzoli, Milano.
- Gordon C. (1969). *Self-conceptions methodologies*. *The Journal of Nervous & Mental Disease* 148, 1: 328-362.
- Gordon C. *Self-systems: Five current social-psychological approaches*: 193-231.
- Gordon C. *Systemic senses of self*. *Sociological Inquiry* 38, (Spring) 161-178.
- Grossmann . (1999) *Medienrezeption*, WDV, Opladen.
- Harris R. J. (1999) *A Cognitive Psychology of Mass Communication*, Lawrence Erlbaum, London.
- Hasebrink U. (1999) *Beyond Ratings and Shares: Research on Individual Patterns of Media Use in Germany*, in H.B. Brosius - C.Holz Bacha, *German Communication Yearbook*, Hampton Press, Cresskill NJ, pp 101-126
- Heidegger M. (1977) *Essere e tempo*, Utet, Torino.
- Hilts P.T. (1995) *Memory s Ghost*, Touchstone Book, London.
- Hirschman, A.O. (1991) *Retoriche dell intransigenza*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Hirschmann A.O. (1978) *Shifting Involvements*, Prentice Hall, New York.
- Hisamatsu S. (1993) *La pienezza del nulla*, Il Melangolo, Genova.
- James W. (1994) *Pragmatismo*, Il Saggiatore, Milano.
- Jervis G. (1997) *La conquista dell identit* . Feltrinelli, Milano.
- Jung C. J. (1933) *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, Harvesrt Book, San Diego.
- Kreitler S.; Kreitler H. *The Cognitive Foundations of Personality Traits*. Plenum Press, London - New York.
- La Cecla F. (1996) *Il malinteso*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Langbein K.; Fochler R. (1997) *Einfach Genial*, Deuticke Verlag. Vienna-Munich.
- Lasch C. (1983) *La cultura del narcisismo*, Bompiani, Milano.
- Lasch C. (1984). *The minimal self: Psychic survival in troubled times*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Laszlo C.; Laszlo E. (1996) *Navigare nella turbolenza*, Angeli, Milano
- Laszlo E. (1987) *L ipotesi del campo psi*, Lubrina Editore, Bergamo.

- Laszlo E. (1992) *Il pericolo e l'opportunità*, Sperling & Kupfer, Milano.
- Laszlo E. (1998) *Terzo Millennio: la sfida e la visione*, Corbaccio, Milano.
- Lerner & M. Perlmutter (eds.) *Child development in life-span perspective* (pp. 47-65). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Luhmann N. (1983) *Come possibile l'ordine sociale*, La Terza, Bari.
- Luhmann N. (1989) *Comunicazione ecologica*, Angeli, Milano.
- Luhmann N. (1990) *Sistemi Sociali*, il Mulino, Bologna.
- Luhmann N. (1996) *Die Realität der Massenmedien*, WDV, Opladen, 2 Auflage.
- Luhmann N. (2000) *La realtà dei mass media*, Angeli, Milano.
- Luhmann N. et al. (1992) *Teoria della società*, Angeli, Milano.
- Macleod P.D. (1984) *Evoluzione del Cervello e Comportamento Umano*. Einaudi, Torino.
- Magnante P. (2001) *Il mondo dell'ovvio: il concetto di senso comune da Simmel a Pirandello*, Atheneum, Firenze.
- Mahler M. S. et al. (1978) *La nascita psicologica del bambino*. Bollati Boringhieri, Torino.
- Maturana H.; Varela F. (1992) *Macchine ed esseri viventi*, Astrolabio, Roma.
- Mcluhan M. (1990) *Gli strumenti del comunicare*. Il Saggiatore, Milano.
- Mcluhan M.; Powers B. (1991) *Il villaggio globale*. Sugarco, Milano.
- Melucci A. (1995) *Passaggio d'epoca*, Feltrinelli, Milano.
- Merten K. u.a.(Hrsgg) (1994) *Die Wirklichkeit der Medien*, WDV, Opladen.
- Mestrovic, Stjepan G. (1996) *Postemotional society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Meyer, J.W. (1988) *The social construction of the psychology of childhood: Some contemporary processes*. In E.M. Heatherington, R.M.
- Meyrowitz J. (1993) *Oltre il senso del luogo*, Baskerville, Bologna.
- Michelstaedter C. (1996) (1910) *La persuasione e la retorica*. Adelphi, Milano.
- Miller J. (1993) *La passione di Michel Foucault*. Longanesi, Milano.
- Morgan, David L.; Schwalbe, Michael L. (1990) *Mind and self in society: Linking social structure and social cognition*. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 53, 2: 148-164.
- Morin E. (1993) *Introduzione al pensiero complesso*, Sperling & Kupfer, Milano.
- Neisser U., Hyman Jr. I.E. (eds.) (2000) *Memory Observed*, Worth Publishers, New York, 2nd Edition.
- Nietzsche F. (1994) *Come si diventa ciò che si è*. Feltrinelli, Milano.
- Norman D. A. (1989) *La caffettiera del masochista*. Giunti, Firenze.
- Oliverio A. (1997) *L'arte di pensare*. Rizzoli, Milano.
- Onfray M. (1992) *Cinismo, principi per un'etica ludica*, Rizzoli, Milano.
- Ortega y Gasset J. (1996) *L'uomo e la gente*, Armando, Roma.
- Pauwels, L. (1974) *Lettera aperta alla gente felice*, Volpe, Roma.
- Piaget J. (1983) *Biologia e conoscenza*, Einaudi, Torino.
- Piaget J. (1996) *La psicologia*, Laterza, Bari — Roma.
- Piaget J. (1999) *Cos'è la pedagogia*, Newton, Roma.
- Piaget J. (2000) *L'epistemologia genetica*, Laterza, Roma.
- Piaget J. (1975) *La presa di coscienza*, Etas, Milano.
- Piattelli Palmarini, M.(1995) *L'arte di persuadere*, CDE, Milano.
- Pitassi A. (1994) *Ritratto di Georg Simmel da giovane*, in *ReS* nr.13-14, C.E.I.M., Salerno.
- Pitassi A. (1997) *Comunicazione Strategica*. Esculapio, Bologna.
- Pitassi A. (1999) *Il Sesto Stratagemma*. Seam, Roma.
- Pitassi A. (2001) *The communication strategies of the globalized individual in: The Future Trends of communication Strategies*, *World Futures* 6/57, Taylor and Francis, New York.
- Popkin R.H. (2000) *Storia dello scetticismo*, Bruno Mondadori Editore, Milano.
- Pratkanis, A.R.; Aronson, E. (1996) *Psicologia delle comunicazioni di massa. Usi e abusi della persuasione*, Il Mulino, Bologna.

- Riley A.; Burke P.J. (1995) Identities and self-verification in the small group. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 58, 2: 61-73.
- Rocher G. (1975) Talcott Parsons e la sociologia americana, Sansoni, Firenze.
- Rogers and A. Singhal E. (1999) Education - Entertainment, A Communication strategy for Social Change, LEA, London.
- Rosenberg M. (1979) *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rovinetti A (2000) *Diritto di parola*, Il sole 24 Ore, Milano.
- Schulz von Thun F. (1989-1998) *Miteinander reden*, three volumes, Rowohlt Verlag, Hamburg.
- Sextus Empiricus (2000) *Outlines of Scepticism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Simmel G. (1978) *La filosofia del denaro*, Utet, Torino.
- Simmel G. (1982) *La differenziazione sociale*, La Terza, Bari.
- Simmel G. (1985) L'avventura, in: Idem, *La moda ed altri saggi di cultura filosofica*, pp. 15-28. Longanesi, Milano.
- Simmel G. (1987) *La forma della storia*, Ed. 10/7, Salerno.
- Simmel G. (2000) *La legge individuale*, Armando, Roma.
- Simmel G. (2001) *Forme dell'individualismo*, Armando, Roma.
- Simmel G. 1991. Lo straniero, in: S. Tabboni (a cura di), *Vicinanza e lontananza*, pp. 147-154 Angeli, Milano, III edizione.
- Snow D.A.; Phillips C.L. (1981) The changing self-orientations of college students: from institution to impulse. *Social Science Quarterly*, 63, 3:462-476.
- Sokal A.; Bricmont J. (1997) *Imposture intellettuali*, Garzanti Milano.
- Staub de Laszlo V. (1959) *The Basic Writings of C.G. Jung*. The Modern Library, New York.
- Stocking G. W. Jr.(ed) (1989) *A Franz Boas Reader*, Chicago University Press Chicago — London.
- Thompson C.P. et al. (1998) *Autobiographical Memory*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah NJ.
- Thomson C.P. et. al. (1998) *Eyewitness Memory*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah NJ.
- Toffler A. (1992) *Powershift*. Sperling & Kupfer, Milano.
- Touraine A. (1993) *Critica della modernità*. Il Saggiatore, Milano.
- Turner, Ralph H. (1975) Is there a quest for identity? *Sociological Quarterly*, 16 (Spring): 148-161.
- Turner, Ralph H. (1976) The real self: From institution to impulse. *American Journal of Sociology*, 81 (March): 989-1016.
- Turner, Ralph H., & Schutte, Jerald. (1981) The true self method for studying the self-conception. *Symbolic Interaction*, 4, (Spring): 1-20.
- Varela F.J.; Thompson E.; Rosch E. (1992) *La via d' mezzo della conoscenza*, Feltrinelli, Milano.
- Volli U. (1994) *Il libro della comunicazione*, Il Saggiatore, Milano.
- Von Foerster H. (1996) *Attraverso gli occhi dell'altro*, Guerini Ed., Milano.
- Von Foerster H. (1997) *Etica e cibernetica di secondo ordine*, in Watzlawick P. - Nardone G. (a cura) *Terapia breve strategica*, Raffaello Cortina Editore, Milano.
- Von Glasersfeld E. (1997) *Il costruttivismo radicale ovvero la costruzione della conoscenza*, in Watzlawick P. - Nardone G. (a cura) *Terapia breve strategica*, Raffaello Cortina Editore, Milano.
- Von Glasersfeld E. (1998) *Il Costruttivismo Radicale - Una via per conoscere ed apprendere*, 3S, Roma.
- Weinstein D.; Weinstein M. A. (1993) *Postmodernized Simmel*. Routledge, London - New York.
- Wolf M. (1985) *Teorie della comunicazione di massa*, Bompiani, Milano.