

***Aurosphere* Number zerØ, a theoretical semi-serious approach
to a socio-political constitution of a new "Community",
increased with genetic principles of systematic Ethics. — [DRAFT].**

J. Jovenal¹, G. Laquidara² — ¹ *J. Jovenal*, (Brown's Café Rua dos Sapateiros, 1100-579; Lisboa - Portugal); ² *Reviewer, Editor X23 Ltd. MIUR Research Archive #60954DHH in Computer Science, Artificial Intelligence, Physics and Cybernetics, Network Science, Non-linear and Complex Systems, Financial Quantitative Modeling, System Dynamics Qualitative Analysis* - (Rome, Salerno, I)

Abstract.

[DRAFT #Ø]. The present theoretical discussion for the establishment of a so called "*New Community in a New Town*" was architectural prototyped on the political writings published between 24~25 May and 13 June 2005¹. Among the others, bio-ethical principles are used. They transfer the typical elements of biological ecosystems, the *exaptation* phenomena, and biological-genetic evolutionary mechanisms and strategies, to the scope of new social networks and human organizations.

In today's review, the original expression of "*Communism*" has been replaced by the new word "*Community*". Although the new "*Community*" concept yet includes the principle of fairness, this theoretical paper sets out only general rules and laws, without identifying practical requirements, to be dealt with in a separate document.

Assumption [25-05-05, 14:10].

*So, I get the bottom part, where before there was
a mine — I decided first.*

*Very clearly, something just very complicated: in
that part it gives life [in experimental practice,
one membership for many] the (Community).*

The teoric one.

Please, get used — it never dies [even if bombed].

The Break-in [25-05-05, 15:33]

Obviously, first you need to bring everything back to the zerØ state: history and memory of the land, social super-family of the seeds, values and prices of elements of the land, roots and brotherhoods lineages, wild grass. However, having Chest² outlined a public mode, and he exposes the project and the state, and he defends him, it is necessary that the entire process of reduction to zerØ, the preparatory phase, the *break-in*, to be performed in a workmanlike manner. And here is the first problem: *who* should break?

Choice zerØ [26-05-05, 09:11]

Yes, we must ask it ourselves, as to till the ground it takes the right tools, who knows how to

¹ "*The Sims - Italy2Dictatur edition*", *Macitynet Off Topic*, 24-05-05

² *Ibidem* 24-05-05, 11:44, ~*Chest* (Registered 09-12-01 - last activity 31-12-07 08:43)

use them, the rules to use them, and the rules to use the rules. So the question #0 "Who should break?" turns to #1. "Which is the system you use to choose who should break?". Let's say that once you overcome this hurdle, the work is all to be done [— *finally*...].

Choice #1 consists in a democratic or technical process? [26-05-05, 11:48]

To choice:

- ~democratically? It is a complex process, usually intermingled: using specific rules [ie. to determine how much time, with what price, with such requirements and by who], which assume that those using respond to the principles applied upstream to downstream. If I choose for all, all have chosen me. This already introduces *the Justice*, suddenly. We wanted to reduce everything to zerØ, and already appears the spectrum of a structure.
- ~technically? Is it chosen on the basis of objective measures, by technical specific merit? The problem is reversed, from the origin to the end: *what* objectives are to be achieved, and *who* is the best one to reach them? It will also be solved for the technicalities, but not if you face related categories to *the Right* or *the Wrong* → **Ethics** → You could not reduce to zerØ *ethically*.

Conviction [01-06-05, 11:58]

Another theory, advanced by Raffaello³, is that of *conviction*.

Persuade everyone that the idea that was thought to that piece of land, instead of the old mine, is the fairest or the most convenient or *similar.or.non-values*, but definitively the one that *everyone wants*.

By the sum of two things: #1. you need a zerØ state, all completely consistent; #2. and it is assumed as a persuasive hypothesis; then it would be an *absolutist persuasion*. This kind of result would automatically be refused: the effects that it would cause would be enough to deny the *conviction theory* to be the instrument to build the *Community* in the *New Town*.

But I must say that, in addition, *conviction theory* must be rejected for the contradiction from which such a *conviction* is based: that there is an original idea, owned by a singular entity which disseminates while defends it, intact as it has it. A resulting *community* built on a theoretical copyrighted principle, moreover so well sold by annihilating every criticism.

No, no way!

The Asynchronous Sharing [03-06-05, 12:29]

Let's move to a more interesting model: the *Asynchronous Sharing*.

The land that will host us certainly has not only needs to be trained. And why considering only the initial needs? Sure, it was said that we aspire to the reduction to zerØ, dismounting each legacies from the past the new land could present — but, let us ask ourselves: would it not be enough to *objectify* the needs releasing them from the judgments? Are there any *absolute necessity* the land would have at its layer zerØ, even after the break-in?

Since the answer is *Yes, there are*, you should pave a path of increasing positive characteristics in the land and its needs: starting from breaking and thinking to *breakers*, then going to more refined preparations, so think to *ploughmen*, then you will have to build even then manufacturers will prepare new schemes, so think to *designers*, and you will have to eat, so *nourishers*, to piss and defecate: *outspreaders*. It is not that it is so difficult if you keep in mind that the life cycle of every community, whatever is origin or state of the art or difficulties, could not stand still; the actions are *dative periphrastic*, carriers of these actions

³ Ibidem, 27-05-05, 06:26, ~Raffaello (Registered 10-02-05 - last activity 06-01-13 16:08)

there will always be. To draw this graph does not undermine at all the tendency to the zero that we need to get now, and it brings not even a single bacterium of the toxicity of today.

So what is the *asynchronous sharing*?

Because we have denied that we proceed by *technical* actions related to a single directive [*singular* in a single person or a single entity], we remain consistent in this figure: the various actors, each for their part, do remain such in the specificity of technique, but [in their own time and for their relevance] they are all *active.points, condominium.accounts* of the same process.

To the process, and *about* the process is defined only the *parity*:

the process will last and be, up to it will last and it will be, for an intrinsic purpose: the process of break will be until you would have been broken, and will end when the break is over.

Assumed that we are in the preliminary phase to reach the new *Community*, and that *Community* [when you will get it] has its own large amount of intrinsic values, even in the singular details of its lifespan, the plan, the graph, the attributes and the model that we are theorizing now exactly remain within the limits of the preparatory overtures we have defined with the *Choices #0, #1: "Who should break?"* and *"Which is the system you use to choose who should break?"*.

%

If the matter is still not clear, or if you are not yet identified the point where the whole system would collapse, it will be useful to begin from a practical thing: *"Who will pay?"*.

"Who do pay the breakers, and all the others?"

In practical facts, they pay for themselves: they repay their hard work with their same effort translated from moment to moment — it's a *p2p bustle*. They also *point to point* translate the infrastructure of the old mine, thus converting to a positive, proactive — thus toward the future — also the processes of degradation of the older systems. They translate into new active strength the work used [double to] *to.build.to.show* to *new.others.to.come* that the work works: They translate their technical expertise, from a recursive and potentially alienating model, in a required node [double to] *to.themselves.to.other.points*, and [nth to] *to.whole.system*, which grows up *to match the task to the parity*.

[I realize that it would not hurt to get in each chapter and treat it, until exhaustion. But since that is not working...]

%

In the sense that this model does not fit with any of the others surrounding, you can no graft in any way; models of this kind are somatic only of themselves, and the examples that before we have shown [the ones we saw translated and repaid the effort through the other points who access and share] are metazoans only inside their own system, they do not germinate and take root elsewhere.

So: a community both *open.closed, neo.patriotic*? Better not.

The Superstring Machine [06-06-05, 21:43]

A more sophisticated and interesting variant of the *Asynchronous Sharing* is given by the so called *Superstring* or *Superstring Machine*.

It is a complex system of management, power generation and service life of each category of a social community, based on the acceleration of the relationship between the subjects of the various divisions. The "*Superstring Machine*" [deliberately] borrows from the previous model the decentralized scheme, but it does not assign ownerships or private interests to the singular identities who carry out activities, so it does not identify any *collective property*. Nor is the association of a shared goal, no ethics of citizenship, any complex equality between peers [*brotherhood*], no. Rather, each vector [each category of activity, each cluster of individuals, each organized class of people] constitutes a *dimension* of the *Superstring Machine*. Which, therefore, is limited to consist only in the *entity.ability* of specific sets of *requirements* that it is able to deal.

So, it follows that:

- # 1. *Machine* covers all the vital needs of the *community*;
- # 2. the accelerated *Machine.Time*, consisting of the intrinsic relationship of the elements of each *Dimension*, and between *Dimensions* each other, creates the condition for which every need is filled in advance; that is, the *Machine* creates the conditions for generation of needs and - with physiological typical velocity of social communities of *humans* - slowly spread, while the *String* has already planned them;
- # 3. the *System.Environment*, as the host of *Community*, harmonically tends to unification, consistent with its own original nature [who is finite], and the quantities of goods and aspirations are not opposed to each other, but also tend to one, coinciding with the *machine.system* [an perfect coincidence between *environment* and *host: aurosphere.into.host*];
- # 4. it generates - at the end of the life cycle born from the Superstring - a *corporate.body*, not mechanical but rather live, organic, political, philosophical, receptive, minute, systemic, which is strong, healthy, fully adhering to the body of the *Community* which expresses it, and that is expressed by it. And that is enriched by this process, and it becomes large: than the "*Asynchronous Sharing*" model, the *Superstring* does not suffer from defects in compatibility with other systems, for which is looking indeed. Since there is not a limit to the number of *Dimensions* of the *String* [except, theoretically, for a remote exhaustion of the largest *space.environment*], nor to the diversification of the identity of each one, which indeed constitutes a further enrichment.

And while the circumscribed and enclosed collective of *p2p* accounts of the "*Asynchronous Sharing*" system is struggling to keep balance, fatigued both by lack of power propagated by the engine, either by excess of strength of each singularity that takes part in, the *Superstring Machine* provides an unique ideal environment, social and not transcendent.

%

Finale numero zero [606 2013]

I look at the old mine, and I step over, for another model.

*I wont say the reason why I'm not choosing the Superstring
[that is already installed into the future of new SimCity, and
its explosion will invest as well the Community I am going to
play, on the piece of land that was assigned to me].*

References.

Cartwright, Dorwin; Harary, Frank: "Structural balance: a generalization of Heider's theory." - Psychological Review, Vol 63(5), 277-293 - Sep 1956

F. Heider, The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations, John Wiley and Sons, New York 1958

F. Harary, R. Z. Norman and D. Cartwright, Structural Models: An Introduction to the Theory of Directed Graphs, John Wiley and Sons, New York 1965

Robert Adelson: "Theories of Cognitive Consistency Theory". Rand McNally - 1968

John H. Schwarz: "Superstring theory" – California Institute of Technology, California 91125, U.S.A. - 1982

AV Getling : "Rayleigh-Bénard convection: structures and dynamics" - 1998

Juan D Delius, Martina Siemann: "Transitive responding in animals and humans: Exaptation rather than adaptation?" - Behavioural Processes, Volume 42, Issues 2–3, Pages 107–137 - Feb 1998

G. GRAEME: "The dynamics of democratization elites, civil society and the transition process" - 2000

Nathan Berkovits: "Super-Poincaré covariant quantization of the superstring" - 2000

De Witt, Douglas Kilgore: "Changing Regimes: Vonda N. McIntyre's Parodic Astrofuturism" - Science Fiction Studies JSTOR - 2000

Arch G. Woodside¹, Jean-Charles Chebat: "Updating Heider's balance theory in consumer behavior: A Jewish couple buys a German car and additional buying–consuming transformation stories" - Article first published online: 9 APR 2001

M. E. J. Newman and M. Girvan, Finding and evaluating community structure in networks, Phys. Rev. E 69 (2004) 026113

MA Vachudova: "Europe undivided: democracy, leverage, and integration after communism" - 2005

H.Gawronski, K. Kulakowski: "A numerical trip to social psychology: long-living states of cognitive dissonance"- Submitted on 28 Nov 2006 (v1), last revised 29 Nov 2006 (this version, v2))

MATTHEW S. MINGUS: "Dotted lines: networks, quantum holism, and the changing nation state" - Public Administration Quarterly, Vol. 29, No. 3/4, pp. 413-444 - 2006

Michael Tofias: "Progressive Ambition as a Process of Adaptation and Exaptation" - University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee, (Draft) - Aug 2006

PD Murphy: "Terraculturation, Political Dissolution, and Myriad Reorientations", in "The Fourth Tamkang International Conference on Ecological Discourse Crisscrossing Word and World: Ecocriticism, Crisis, and Representation" - May 23~24, 2008

Hao Li, Yu Chen, Heng Ji, Smaranda Muresan, Dequan Zheng: "Combining Social Cognitive Theories with Linguistic Features for Multi-genre Sentiment Analysis" - 2012

Dave O'Farrell : "THE POLITICS OF EVOLUTION" - Irish Marxist Review, Vol 1, No 4 - 2012