

[DOI: 10.20472/IAC.2015.016.050](https://doi.org/10.20472/IAC.2015.016.050)

GEORGE MCMILLAN

Aegis Defense Services, United States

AN OVERARCHING MODEL FOR THE MICRO AND MACRO PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Abstract:

This paper introduces the methodology to create a unified theory of the philosophical and social sciences in the behavioral-political-economic-demographic sequence. The two major ideological political-economic philosophies (Hume-Smith and Marx-Engels) are systematized into competing integrated three dimensional behavioral-political-economic models. The paper argues that Hume-Smith's empathy-sympathy behavioral assumptions are a sufficient starting point to create the integrated causal model sought by Tooby and Cosmides. The author then shows that the prerequisite advances in psychology and demographic studies now exist to generate the universal economic theory sought by von Neumann-Morgenstern and the integrated behavioral-economic method of Gintis—a psychological (i.e., behavioral) socio-economic model. By updating Hume-Smith's work with a modern understanding of psychology, as presented by Fromm and others, a new integrated societal model as postulated by Harsanyi can be created that intertwines the social and psychological sciences. The author argues that this fundamentally psychology-based model also can serve as a baseline equation for all social sciences as desired by Kant and Mach, as well as the ahistorical (psychological) philosophic model noted by Husserl, Heidegger, Tillich, and Strauss. The author concludes with a discussion of the necessary next steps to generating a detailed model that fuses these disciplines.

Keywords:

Unified theory

Model of the Micro and Macro Behavioral Sciences

JEL Classification: P50, B12, B31

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Key Components

There are several fundamental steps of determining and completing a unified theory of the philosophical and social sciences represented in a behavioral-political-economic-demographic sequence and baseline equation format that will be presented in this sample paper of a larger body of work in progress.

This proposed system organizes the fields of *evolutionary psychology* and *psychological personality theories* into a coherent model to form the system *constant* and *independent* variable in a manner that is compatible with ordinal ranked *government form categories of Aristotle* in political philosophy as the macro *independent* variable suited to merge with macroeconomic per capita Gross National Product (C+I+G/n-people, i.e. consumer spending + Investment + Government Spending / n-people) based theories as the macro dependant variable with readily available statistical models to serve as an *outcome measure* system.

The per capita GNP based supply and demand and general equilibrium theories already integrate economic production rates of change (numerator) with demographic rates of change (denominator) effectively factoring in the Malthusian problem into social science models, while linking the two fields of economics and demography together conveniently adding two additional fields of study with available statistical models to deepen and complete the overarching model of the three primary (psychology, politics, economics) human studies disciplines common to both the field of philosophy and the empirical social sciences.

1.2 Behavioral Economics and the Hard Modeling of the “Soft” Social Sciences

This method organizes several subject areas of the behavioral sciences to effectively turn the ‘soft-studies’ subject areas of ‘foundational’ philosophy (i.e. metaphysical and psychological assumptions), political philosophy and political theory into a micro-macro behavioral instrument measure linked to general equilibrium theory determinants (gini and multiplier coefficients measuring elite *investment* or *non investment* dichotomies) to raise these fields of study to a strong interval or weak ratio level of modeling while also providing the field of economics with a comprehensive behavioral-political-economic-demographic model.

The method of attaining either a “behavioral economic” theory, or a baseline equation-style model of the philosophical studies, implies linking the three areas of psychology of ‘life-force,’ ‘instinctual drives,’ and ‘deliberative cognition,’ to (a) their mass behavioral aggregate decision processes and (b) the form of elite-mass (rulers versus ruled) relations they engender. Linking the three aspects of human psychology to (a) and (b) accounts for aggregate-level economic and demographic outcomes, which are measurable. Since the modern specialty fields in the social sciences are essentially derivatives of the three subject areas of Foundational, Political, and Economic Philosophy, the lateral integration of disciplines necessary to create a systematic micro-macro behavioral economic model, actually leads to the baseline equation-style model of the human studies sought by Leibniz, Kant and Descartes as described Sabine’s text *A History of Political Theory* (1973) and the text of Strauss and Cropsey *History of Political Philosophy* (1987).

1.3 Two Severe Criticisms Concerning the Social Sciences

As it pertains to the contemporary social sciences, this system of organizing interdisciplinary frameworks achieves the type of model sought by John Harsanyi concerning his severe criticism of the social sciences during the 1960s and 1970s, which was echoed in an even more scathing criticism of the lack of methodological standards used in the social sciences by Tooby and Cosmides in the 1990s.

Harsanyi (1960) stated that there was an “increasing interest in a fundamental theory” or “one basic theory common to all social sciences rather than merely in terms of independent theories particular to the various disciplines.” Harsanyi advocated the need to create an integrated causal model of the social sciences that incorporates “evolutionary theory” and “links personality structure to culture” to merge with the more scientifically developed models from the fields of economic and demography as the means of creating more explanatory models of long-term persistent global trends as they relate to regional effects.

Harsanyi (1966) further argued for “a general analytical theory of social behavior” based on the two core human motivations of “striving for economic gain and social status” (or social acceptance (1969)) where vast amounts of social, political and economic behavior could all be explained from those two strivings common to all people and

cultures. Harsanyi's own striving for a fundamental theory for the social sciences was reiterated in his severe criticism of Talcot Parsons, along with the structural-functionalist and conformist schools of thought, for not abiding by, or adopting, "hypothetico-deductive" models as used in the natural sciences and the fields of economics and behavioral psychology as discussed by Pareto (1916/1935) and Popper (1959/1968) and further described by Homans (1964). Harsanyi's criticism was especially straight forward to the field of sociology which was supposed to be more of an overarching field of study at its' outset as described by Pareto (1916) and Faris (1964).

Echoing the sentiment of Harsanyi decades later, Tooby and Cosmides (1992), writing from the field of evolutionary psychology, also wrote a very severe criticism of the social sciences arguing that not only have the soft social studies failed to adopt stronger social scientific methodologies, but they seem to have abandoned the use of scientific methodology in favor of more subjective analysis since the late 1960s and "should no longer be called sciences at all."

However, with the growing trend toward behavioral economics currently as an outgrowth of psychometric and econometric communities linking psychological decision theory and game theory together since the 1960s, there has been a renewed interest in determining the common principles among micro behavioral (i.e. psychology and its' subfields) and macro behavioral disciplines (e.g. political theory, sociology and economics) and linking key frameworks together.

Gintis made an effort in the last decade with a "Framework for Unification of the Behavioral Sciences" (2006) and *Bounds of Reason: Game Theory and the Unification of the Behavioral Sciences* (2009), has been working to create a core theme (or themes) of the social sciences to form a greater coherency among the disciplines from the fields of evolutionary psychology, economics decision theory, and game theory. Gintis' approach is vastly different than the one presented here (stemming from different academic backgrounds) but the model proposed herein is complementary to his effort as this model was designed to merge with the game theoretic concepts of Harsanyi, et al.

The sum of the intentions of the professors previously mentioned in this section is in effect to: (a) ascertain the central causal themes of the micro and macro behavioral sciences; and (b) develop a core model in a causal chain system to advance interdisciplinary multivariate models; which (c) needs to be a system that is incorporative

of the subfields of psychology, political theory and economics, in order for the model to be scalable and expansive as the means of avoiding the standard criticism of “crude reductionism” by those steadfastly opposed to using stricter methodologies in the social sciences.

The idea behind a unified theoretical model, which can be represented in a simple schematic form, or more complex form that includes more subfields, is to increase the situational awareness of researchers of one field of study of the cause and effect constraints of those working in neighboring fields. The goal is to limit academics from advocating policies that may improve things for a small constituency, but be otherwise disastrous to the whole in the long term. Or in another sense, a model needs to be as explanatory as possible of the long term persistent global trends as the means of being predictive to the effectiveness of regional policies, if only to position individual and group clientele to protect themselves, or their asset, from harm to the extent possible.

2. DEVELOPING THE PRIMARY X, Y, and Z CAUSAL AND TRADE-OFF MEASUREMENT CONTINUUMS

2.1. Analyzing the Hume-Smith and Marx-Engels Behavioral Theories

The initial step of reducing the human studies to one baseline equation-style format is the comparison of the major right versus left behavioral-political-economic-demographic models. This process entails several steps. First, the creation of a Hume-Smith behavioral-political-economic-demographic literature review matrix to compare with a Marx-Engels literature review matrix. It should be noted the Enlightenment Era Philosophers and the German World View Philosophers were the first to delve into overarching psychological, political and economic theories, and many were produced. However, the Hume-Smith team and the Marx-Engels team wrote extensively on *all three* subject matter areas, which offers the most insight at linking the topics of psychology, political, and economic theories together into a singular system.

Secondly the literature review matrices need to be reduced to a behavioral, political and economic set of X, Y, and Z axis continuums that represent the fundamental

tradeoffs of the models so the system can be expressed in a Pareto-style system of equilibriums and optimalities. Since the political and economic models are based on the theorists 'conception of man,' it becomes the micro psychological system in their Foundational Philosophy that integrates the model. Therefore it is the behavioral aspect that assumes the X axis position, and the Y axis becomes the political process continuum that makes the initial micro-to-macro connection, which, in turn, determines the Z axis 'growth versus equity,' or 'growth versus *nongrowth*' dichotomies in economics.

2.2. Examining the Overarching Behavioral-Political-Economic Elements of David Hume and Adam Smith

The axis continuums can be derived by examining the works of Hume and Smith by arranging them in a micro-macro behavioral-political-economic order instead of their publication dates. Literature review matrix of David Hume and Adam Smith is as follows.

2.2.1. *Treatise on Human Nature* (Hume 1739-40) and *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Smith 1759)

2.2.2. *Essays, Moral and Political* (Hume 1741-1742), *Lectures on Jurisprudence* (Smith 1763 published posthumously in 1976)

2.2.3. *Political Discourses* (Hume 1752) *Wealth of Nations* (Smith 1776)

2.3. The Hume-Smith model can be characterized in three dimensional form as:

2.3.1. The X-axis represents the gradation of *empathy/sympathy* versus *non empathy/sympathy* of a society (modal sense) in a continuum. This is the precursor for the corollary continuums of *cooperative* versus *antagonistic* behaviors of psychological personality theories, which then translates into the optimal (proper form) *positive-sum* games versus the suboptimal (perverted form) behavior in *zero-sum* extractive games and/or *negative-sum* (disruptive, spoiler or sabotage mind sets) behaviors that translates the concepts into game theoretic language also.

The logic of this continuum is that it divides the constructive *facilitative* character orientations and the destructive *debilitative* character orientations into a format that links to the macro elements of the system whereby it can ultimately (eventually) be

incorporative of game theoretic principles and mathematics. The constructive facilitative character orientations make small group positive-sum cooperative outcomes possible, where as debilitating extractive zero-sum and negative-sum sabotage character orientations are disruptive and render small group cohesion impossible. The facilitative character orientations (modal sense) engender functional political economies, where as debilitating character orientations (modal sense) engender dysfunctional political economies. From a fundamental *empathy/sympathy* versus *non empathy/sympathy* continuum, a series of supporting corollary continuums can also be derived to both horizontally link the micro and macro behavioral theories together, while paving the way to be incorporative of the subfield frameworks allowing the model to be as simple or as complex as an end user wishes it to be.

2.3.2 The Y-axis continuum represents the method of mass political organization and the level (or trade-off) of mass *antagonism* or *cooperation* engendered by the type of government form and the elite-mass relations tendencies.

Proper Form Dynamics

Hume and Smith based much of their political theories on the Aristotelian government form categories explained in *Politics* where the three value-neutral categories of the “rule of the one,” rule of the few, and “rule of the many” are bifurcated into the proper forms of monarchy, aristocracy and constitutional democracy, and the perverted forms are tyranny, oligarchy and mob rule democracy.

Under this format, the proper forms correlate to the facilitative individuals in society who compete for *resources* and *mates* and for *economic gain* and *social status* freely by encouraging constructive behaviors (encouraging positive sum relationships and showing empathy towards others) via mass scientific education and extension of property rights allowing the productive to manage the fruits of their labor encouraging a meritocratic system that rewards the talented in society allowing the cream to rise to the top.

In a stricter political sense, the goal was to put limitations on government to prevent the disruptive effects of tyranny and despotism from occurring, therefore promoting internal cooperation among large scale domestic economic and political coalitions. Having raw material extraction, industrial manufacturing, distributional and

financial coalitions cooperating with each other in a vertical sense of moving raw materials to the consumer, while each level each enterprise competes against each other in a horizontal sense in the market place, has had the effect of strengthening the more economically cooperative countries against rival nations with the less cooperative and constructively competitive internal dynamics of oligarchic, tyrannical and despotic systems.

The effect of encouraging powerful multilevel industrial and financial coalitions during the Mercantile Era was to promote the ingenuity in metallurgy that produced useful manufacturing items of the day such as water pumps and water mills and large scale factories for civilian products as well as the military hardware of the period. The slight increase in technology increased industrial expansion and economic output and ultimately led to greater geopolitical power as a necessity to protect trade for raw materials and global markets transported on the high seas to meet consumer demand at home.

It should be noted that, the nascent Industrial Era was the time period when gunpowder armies gained vast superiority over edged weapon armies where the force multiplier of firearms filled an age old critical need to protect the agrarian rural areas (which fed the cities) and industrial centers from horseman invaders, especially the ones that plagued Central Asia and Eastern Europe.

However, the expansion of economic wealth domestically necessarily led to greater internal political competition in Western Europe which steadily transformed the monarchies to aristocracies and became constitutional democracies as the number of capital formations (businesses) and wealthy elite increased to create more political coalitions as suffrage expanded due to a more educated middle class with greater political awareness. This effect of this trend was the general dispersion of both economic and political power in a constructive internal dynamic as the preservation of class distinctions increasingly gave way to the maximization of individual development via mass education.

In terms of international geopolitical power, the proper forms of government in the post Industrial Revolution Era, naturally tend toward greater aggregate power in a geopolitical sense as their consumers and factories demand more trade in raw materials and finished goods creating the impetus for greater international trade and manufacturing

items, which creates a greater need for militaries to protect that trade from marauders as Western nations became increasingly linked to, and dependent upon, the raw materials in other parts of the world.

Perverted Form Dynamic

From understanding the proper forms of government, one can see where the perverted forms of government differ motivationally and therefore causally. The perverted forms of Aristotle Six Forms of Government (tyrants, despots, oligarchs and the short lived mob rule democracy) make a priority of *debilitating* their economic rivals (sadistic or non empathetic behavior) as the means of *debilitating* their political rivals. This has the end function of promoting family dynasties through rampant nepotism maximizing the genetic fitness of their own offspring at the expense of increasing collective economic ingenuity and output of the country as a whole (i.e. the non Pareto optimal trade-off), or is a tradeoff that their offspring may be born into more wealth, while living in a very highly unequal class and caste societies. Therefore the dominant motive behind the perverted forms of government is to promote nepotism at the expense of letting the talented, industrious and innovative members of society rise to the top of their professions because ultimately, alternative multilevel industrial and financial coalitions would also promote challengers to the ruling family dynasties over time.

As a result of *debilitated* economic competition, the facilitative aspects of a society disappear (especially as mass scientific education declines) in a modal sense as the zero-sum extractive behaviors and the negative sum sabotage behaviors become the cultural norm over the centuries. The *debilitative* economic rivalry dynamic generates a persistent destructive psychical dynamic that leads to a dysfunctional political economy that has proven to be very difficult to reverse during the 20th Century era of development economics.

Constitutional measures such as protection of property rights, civil rights with due process, freedom of the press and mass scientific education are all diminished as part of the effort to *debilitate* economic rivals as the means of preventing political rivals from ever emerging. These measures aimed at preventing or targeting rivals as they emerge end up debilitating mass economic output and creating the conditions where wealth and power become increasingly concentrated and income inequality rises dramatically as most in society are deprived of the means of economic and social mobility.

Following the debilitating course of action, even though the political power of a tyrant or a despot increases domestically, their geopolitical power diminishes in the world as they lack the domestic economic power to support gunpowder armies (with modern advanced technological force multipliers) and lack foreign trade and positive mass psychological dynamic needed to attain the country's full potential in the world. Even with immense petroleum and mineral wealth, the tyrannical government forms must depend on trading for much of their military needs and remain dependent upon the proper forms for advanced products, which are more often than not, used to equip their militaries more for internal control of the population to prevent rivals from emerging than for external defense.

For these basic internal reasons, the macro economic and political power measures (i.e. gini coefficient and multiplier coefficients) decrease directly due to the *debilitative character orientation dynamic* of the perverted forms of government described in this section. The systematic debilitation of rivals by tyrannical political systems has its roots in the biological drive to secure resources for biological heirs at the expense of everyone else securing resources for themselves and their own heirs. As a result, the debilitating character orientation dynamic seems to indelibly burn the extractive zero-sum and negative-sum sabotage behaviors deep into cultural norms practiced by custom and habit over millennia.

Absent the increase both (a) the aspect of empathy and respect for others, and (b) *the ideal* of everyone producing and consuming found in the state of nature hypothetical histories of Hume and Smith, both elements combine to further the enabling ideals of rewarding hard work, excellence in creativity and fairness that characterize meritocratic institutions based on constructively competitive processes that correspond to positive-sum outcomes among industrial and financial coalitions in a game theoretic sense. Unless this entire string of events occurs, *then* societies tend toward the *debilitative character orientation dynamic* that yields the debilitated political economies instead. ⁱ

With the assistance of more modern post Darwinian evolutionary theory to give additional insight to the government form model of Aristotle, one can see that Aristotle's system merges with the *empathy/sympathy versus non empathy/sympathy* continuum. The *proper forms* show empathy for the populace demonstrated by increased investment and job growth income equality strategies combined with constitutional civil rights

measures to protect the citizenry from government abuses where the effect is geared to produce cooperative game theoretic relationships and prevent the *debilitative tactics* from ever emerging. This is inapposite of the *perverted forms* of government that systematically *debilitate the chance of rivals* from emerging, demonstrating non-empathy (sadism via oppression) by not pursuing investment and job growth income equality strategies and routinely diminishing civil rights protections which have been very often characterized by mass human rights abuses and even killing fields that remain persistent in many areas of the world.

Following the causal chain, or behavioral dynamic, the empathy/sympathy versus non empathy/sympathy dichotomy of Hume-Smith, links to the proper and perverted form categories of Aristotle, leading to a corollary continuum of a *cooperation* versus *antagonism* dichotomy, which all combine to develop a strong parallel to a *facilitative* versus *debilitative* dichotomy, or a *productive* versus *sadomasochistic* character orientation dichotomy of post Freudian psychology. While many more parallel continuum dichotomies can be made to deepen the links between evolutionary theory to personality theory and culture, there is enough here to account for the *behavioral dynamic* that is responsible for either long term *virtuous* and *vicious* cycles of the economic development and endogenous growth theories represented in the Z axis continuum explanation below.

To clarify the purpose of the system introduced in this paper, the field of economics has already known the technological know-how and infrastructural aspects of economic development and growth theories for decades, this model explains the psychical dynamic that either maximizes or minimizes the effectiveness of autarkic economic theories.

2.3.3 The Z-axis represents either *growth* versus *nongrowth* measure, or the *growth* versus *equity* dichotomy in the fundamental per-capita GNP ratio of $C+I+G/n$ people (consumer spending, investment, government spending/n-people, i.e. economic growth rates of change over demographic rates of change), depending how one wishes to apply the model to a topic.

And again, the key to determining a primary continuum is its' parallelism to secondary corollary continuums—the primary continuum must incorporate the secondary corollary continuums of the major subfields otherwise it is not a primary continuum.

Economics is a theory of monetary as well as supply and demand equilibrium factors which are given directionality (it only goes forward from the Stone Age to the Space Age) by technical innovation that increases labor productivity growth and gross domestic product captured in economic development and endogenous growth theories. These economic theories are driven by the psychological and political dynamic factors expressed in sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.

2.4 Literature Review Matrix of Marx and Engels

Similar to the literature review of Hume and Smith, the works presented here are arranged in the behavioral-political-economic order rather than by chronological publication dates.

2.4.1 *The Part Played by Labor in the Transition from Ape to Man* (unpublished draft 1876) and *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (1884)

2.4.2 *The Communist Manifesto* (1848), and *The Conditions of the Working Class in England* (1844)

2.4.3 *Critique of Political Economy* (1859) and *Das Kapital*, (Vol. I 1867)

2.5 The Marx-Engels model can be characterized as:

2.5.1 The X axis represents the level of *destructive self-interest* versus *constructive collective interest* elicited by the introduction of property rights to humankind which is exacerbated in context of a market driven competitive system which Marx and Engels claim to bring about class and gender subjugation. Their corollary continuum is an *altruism* versus *greed* continuum where the level of altruism is supposed to emerge in noncompetitive nonmarket systems once the two sources of subjugation, i.e. property rights and marital rites, are abolished.

Marx-Engels, in this sense, wished to go back to a time prior to religious rituals, which they believe engendered inequity between the sexes and classes. In their hypothesis, it was these cultural norms and antagonisms that led to the zero sum extractive and negative-sum debilitating outcomes if put into game theoretic terms, so

getting rid of property rights, marital rights and market economies would yield a far more altruistic society according to their hypotheses.

2.5.2 The Y axis represents the level of *antagonism versus cooperation* engendered by the government form and the elite-mass relations tendencies, but is derived from Plato's conception of communism and the quest for an enduring state.

In distinction to Hume-Smith, and the majority of political philosophers of the era, Marx based his political theory on Plato's theory of Communism and alternative family conception in *The Republic*, the goal of which is to create an enduring society by eliminating elite rivalries via a government that provides central direction to the political economy and industry, negating the need for property rights and therefore financial investment services. The state, rather than investors and consumers would choose whose technological innovations would be developed, rather than the inventor-consumer-investor feedback loop cycles of market economies.

2.5.3 The Z axis represents the *growth-versus-equity* and *growth-versus-nongrowth* dichotomies.

In distinction to market economies, the Marxist system, derives from a C+G/n people format of the centrally controlled system with no private investment (I). The belief of Marx-Engels was that the government could organize the people more effectively to produce more, i.e. no unemployment means mandatory labor therefore an increase in output. And if more people are working more and producing more, then there should theoretically be more goods and services for everyone to consume more also and therefore raise the living standards for all in society. To Marx and Engels, all of this can be achieved via the improved efficiency of statist direction in lieu of private entrepreneurs which rise and fall with the boom-bust cycles of the market.

2.6 Historical Analysis of the Literature Review Matrix

The behavioral theoretic aspect of the competing Hume-Smith model versus the Marx-Engels model requires an additional explanation due to the uniqueness of the Marx-Engels point of view. The Hume-Smith model assumes competition for resources and mates is natural. The Hume-Smith model consists of a constructive competition made

possible by an increase of empathy and sympathy in society that values upward mobility factors of education and opportunity for all in society. Their model therefore creates the enabling legal, educational and financial systems that advance upward social and economic mobility by continually invigorate multilevel competition by promoting perfect competition in as many sectors as possible.

The Hume Smith model, also strives to prevent the debilitating dynamic from occurring by preventing economic and political leaders from using the legal, educational and financial systems to (a) engage in the destructive forms of competition that run competitors out of business, and (b) use the same systems from preventing rivals from re-emerging. If both (a) and (b) occurred, then leaders could seize upon economic downturns and structural changes in the economy due to the maturing of a certain technological phase to concentrating wealth and power back into the perverted psychical and economic dynamics of the perverted government forms—which have market economies but not “capitalism.”

Capitalism societies, differentiated from mere market systems, is where a vast educational system promotes an abundance of well educated and well trained people for every major sector of the economy to ensure that competing industrial coalitions have access to creative, innovative and competent employees as the means of staying in business.

Leaders that promote this type of constructive competition are said to be acting under ‘enlightened’ self-interest because they are promoting the ‘fairness’ of the ideal of perfect competition and mutually beneficial transactions to create a better society in the long run, as opposed to creating a paradise for their heirs at the expense of everyone else’s heirs. It is important to understand this distinction between the facilitative psychical dynamic, the proper forms of government and capitalism in distinction to the debilitating psychical dynamic, the perverted government forms that have market economies. Capitalism only exists when a combination of enabling factors are present.

If the proper psychical dynamic and proper forms of government exist, then the economy can take advantage of the increase in the division of labor and increased capitalization of society that also yields a boost in GNP. And if the population growth is manageable, the increase in empathy and sympathy in society, reduces antagonism, increases cooperation (modal sense) yielding a higher per capita GNP. Living standards

and relative equity occur simultaneously under these basic success parameters where the economic growth factors found in the numerator of the per capita GNP ratio outpace population growth in the denominator of the ratio.

Marx-Engels

In distinction, the Marx-Engels theory argues that both property rights and matrimonial rites are unnatural 'institutionalized' methods of subjugation of males and females by societal elites solely for economic and sexual exploitation. Therefore, the removal of property rights and matrimonial rites removes these 'unnatural' human conventions restoring society to the state of nature where spouses and children were believed to be held in common in their hypothetical history explained in *The Family* (1884).

Under this condition, the absence of the means of subjugation would restore the natural human tendency toward mate selection freedom and altruism, improving elite-mass relations, boosting human cooperation and increasing per capita GNP. Government control over investment (as opposed to the private sector financial services which siphon off much of the currency from the markets in transaction costs and profit) increases objectivity while decreasing monetary outflows that Marx-Engels believe that the term 'profit' represents. Therefore, Marx-Engels believed that a non market system would promote public welfare, optimization, efficiency, equilibrium and *equity* which is their highest good. The Marx-Engels hypotheses concerning human behavior placed a great faith in government bureaucracies in making things better for the citizens, instead of better for the government actors.

3 EX POST EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS: Examining the Ideologies Of The 20th Century

3.1 Behavioral and Operational Inaccuracies of Marx-Engels

The outcome of the 20th century ideological experiments indicated that the behavioral basis of the Marx-Engels mass organizational political and economic theories was grossly inaccurate where communist regimes notoriously operate as forms of tyranny and despotism as characterized by Aristotle in Book IV of *Politics*. What this paper is stressing is that inaccuracies in the X axis behavioral continuum produce the inaccuracies in the macro-political and macroeconomic continuums. The stifling of the 'fair' competition for resources and mates by the centrally controlled nonmarket system

confused the natural selection drive process of resources and mates which is the manifestation of the twin evolutionary motivations of self-survival and survival of the species. The stifling of the competition for resources and mates also stifled the human motivational energy needed to maintain the positive business cycle over extended periods of time also.

‘People pretended to work,’ and ‘the government pretended to pay them’ as the popular saying goes, but since people didn’t have to compete for resources in this system they didn’t produce them for others to consume either. It is the motivational ‘energy’ that dropped in the ultra controlled heteronymous bureaucratic system as opposed to autonomous free market systems in the West. The goal of empirical models is to isolate unseen forces. The means of accomplishing this is to use a lateral integration of disciplines to isolate motivational, or ‘life-force,’ energies in the system of analysis that this model represents. The objective is to improve the behavioral model at one end of the equation-style format to reduce causal error in economic theory at the other end.

A further analysis in the next section shows how the oversights in the Marx-Engels hypotheses—and the communist experiment in practice—highlighted more shortcomings in communism regarding human behavior, while highlighting some intricate forms of human behavior en masse in the free market system that is taken for granted in the Soviet Union, China and elsewhere. A further analysis helps clarify what occurs in a market system and how communism killed the very aspect of human behavior that makes a political economy functional.

3.2 The Austrian Socialist Calculation Debates and the Operational Absurdity of Marxism

The operational political-economic planning aspect of the Marx-Engels theory was not even considered by Marx and Engels, but was confronted by the Bolshevik Revolution as they implemented the theory in practice. Marx-Engels theory actually rested on the distribution of resources by mathematical linear programming methods of micro economics which is absurdly impracticable in a “billion x billion” matrix of a macro economy. Due to this overlooked assumption, Marx-Engels Communism was based on

an absurd foundation making it one of the worst kinds of political systems engendering the *debilitative* political *favoritism* when it was supposed to engender *facilitative objectivity*. Political distribution of goods and services did not have the 'objective' efficiency that Marx intended. Instead the political process devolved into a system of gross political partisanship, extensive coercion by a secret police with vast numbers of concentration camps for political rivals, where the non market system was ironically supported by the underground economy of black market corruption based on free market principles.

The system not only disproved Plato's theory of government and confirmed Aristotle's, but it offers insight as to how the inventor-consumer-investor feedback loop works in conjunction with geopolitical power as well. The effect of inefficient and non-objective political distribution and government investment was disastrous to technical innovation despite the development of numerous theoretical mathematicians by its educational system—if education alone was the chief ingredient to scientific breakthroughs, the Soviet system would have done much better.

However, the shifting of resources towards new inventions was not practical in this system that was designed to limit production of goods for high-end markets that serve the elite clientele affinities for the latest and most exclusive products. In distinction, in a market system it is the elite clientele who are the consumer preference 'guinea pigs' that routinely transitions products from tactical military to practical civilian use, but in the Soviet system it simply was not present.

To be clear, in a free market system, once the military funds general research for what scientists and engineers believe will be the next greatest technology, it is used to build the military item first where the different designs are tested and the weaker designs are weeded out at the cost of the tax payer, which then sets the stage for the winners ideas to be adapted to the consumer market as the return benefit to the public.

Quite often, this is the stage where the civilian spin-off items are produced as a second generation design based on the superior designs that surfaced during direct military research, development and testing. It is at this juncture that free market investors see which products that the elite clientele prefers and actually consume, which is the signal to invest in the massive large scale manufacturing plants needed to produce the items in the scale required to drop unit prices significantly for consumption by the

masses. It is this whole cycle where high technology products are designed, introduced and transferred into affordable products that occurs automatically in a free market, where the latest inventions of one decade become the common gadgets of the next decade. The centrally planned economies just could not duplicate this cycle.

In practice, neither the Soviet nor the Chinese systems could reverse engineer Western products fast enough to keep up with the natural pace of the inventor-consumer-investor feedback cycle of the West. The Western economies may have government prompting by the desire to have a product that performs a particular function to increase their military security or to gain certain advantages, but the difference is that the West encouraged autonomous competition of a vast number of universities, contractors, vendors and manufacturers to build prototype models for testing which lead to the proper form psychological dynamic expressed in section 2.3.2.

Bureaucrats simply cannot oversee the design and development of highly innovative products that come from a designer's intuition which can only be understood after actual prototypes are built and are used by real humans. Bureaucrats having control over a designer's innovative insight is a laughable proposition as the means of replacing natural competition with the central choreography of the macro economy. The result of bureaucratic decision making of the communist single-party system that throttled competitors from emerging led to a failure to innovate when compared to the West in every major sector. Without an effective technical innovation-market-preference feedback loop to guide investment, the communist bloc countries fell far behind the West in technological gains and labor productivity growth, while underscoring a complicated inventor-consumer investor feedback loop that was taken for granted in the West prior to the Cold War, but was illuminated by it afterward.

3.3 Competition for *Resources* and *Mates*, or *Economic Gain* and *Social Status*

The analysis of the communist system indicates that people still competed for resources and mates exhibiting biologically determined male and female forms of 'competition and jealousy' consistent with the findings of modern narrow evolutionary psychology and Aristotelian Forms of Government categories. More importantly, this is the complete opposite of the Marx-Engels behavioral predictions explicitly stated in *The*

Family. When given a choice the political elites chose a free market (black market of western goods) for themselves to compete for resources and mates, while depriving their natural selection competitors, i.e. the masses, the means of competing fairly with them. Or as Bhagwati says, strict socialism and bureaucracies always end up making it easier “for the people behind the counter instead of in front of the counter.” (2002)

The communist experiment suggests that the behavioral optimization of mass organizational theories runs more along the lines of the Hume-Smith model. The communist system distorted the natural selection drive process on the behavioral and political side of the equation, and the per capita GNP dropped on the outcome measure side of the equation for the multitude of reasons explained. In addition, the analysis determined here is transferable to tyrannical and despotic political systems that characterize the underdeveloped world, meaning that this analysis and method has extensive external validities in the social sciences in analyzing less developed countries.

Furthermore, the investor-consumer-investor feedback loop offers a means of demonstrating many of the longstanding abstract concepts discussed in Strauss and Cropsey's *History of Political Philosophy* (1973), which can be operationalized with this method and analysis. In particular it is Kant's hypothesis that the overarching causal dichotomy of the human studies disciplines is indeed the autonomy-heteronomy distinction in the macro behavioral political sense, which can only be borne out by the Hume-Smith Marx-Engels Cold War comparison where the forms of *autonomous* independent action outperform *heteronomous* central planning choreography of a mass economy.

To use a sports analogy to illustrate the concept, central planning is like having a movie director choreograph each of the 22 players' movements on a football field one player at a time for each play. Obviously this would make each play take several minutes and would look laughably artificial as the choreographer slows everything down to produce the artificial outcomes of their imaginations instead of the natural outcomes that come from the players' intuitive actions.

In contrast to the central choreographer, if each player moves intuitively and autonomously, then they also move simultaneously once the ball is snapped, and each play typically only lasts 10 or 15 seconds. Instead of creating an outcome of a particular person's imagination, the play appearing intense, chaotic and unpredictable as each

player improvises to achieve their objectives in respect to their opponent to either advance the ball on offense, or to chase the ball carrier or cover a receiver if on defense.

Or in another sense of the same analogy, if the game is overly regulated, and the referees call penalties on every slight contact, then the intensity drops as each player becomes so risk averse to take action due to the fear of being penalized, that the players become listless or passive aggressive making the game look artificial in a second sense. In either the case of central choreography, or the over regulation scenario, these two types of heteronomous intervention by a third party external controller destroys the essence of any given activity. The essence of any activity is the intuitive autonomous actions by the players of a game just as it is for the participants in a political economy.

There are more interdisciplinary determinations that can be derived from the Hume-Smith versus Marx-Engels comparison, but the ex post Cold War analysis was a convenient time to introduce Kant's autonomy-heteronomy distinction as it relates to the macro political and economic aspects of the system being proposed due to its importance in making further determinations.

At this point it should also be emphasized that the system being proposed in this paper is laden with the most abstract concepts of each of the relevant areas of philosophy and the fields of psychological, political and economic theory. This is because it is the abstract concepts that represent the behavioral principles that are the most general and explanatory of a very wide range of subfield empirical frameworks within each field of study. The goal of this model is to show the causal themes and linkages represented by the abstract concepts of each field are indeed parallel in meaning and therefore compatibility with one another. As a result, this paper becomes a Rosetta Stone of sorts as it translates the abstract concepts of one field to another to merge both the conceptual ideas and the series of confirmed theories that they refer to. After all, if the goal is to create a seamless series of interdisciplinary models, then the relationship of the abstract concepts of one field have to be translated into each of the neighboring fields of study in the behavioral, political and economic topic areas.

3.4 Clarifying the Metaphysical Psychological and Operational Assumptions of Marx

The process described in the previous section illuminates the main metaphysical-psychological assumptions of the ideological *non*-centrally controlled (autonomous) free-market systems in contradistinction to the centrally controlled (heteronomous) nonmarket (or heavily regulated) classical economic systems founded upon the “labor theory of value.” The ‘three continuum’ method of analysis being presented in this paper made it possible to examine the primary societal ‘problem’ that the Marx-Engels theories were attempting to correct.

Marx and Engels were attempting to reduce class distinctions in the production-consumption, and production-distribution processes, but in actuality, they killed the motivational (psychological) energies underlying the long-term positive business cycle explained in the previous section. The capitalist system is based upon competitors ‘instinctually’ trying to leap-frog their economic competitors in two main ways: (a) *product technology* improvement for *superiority* in military development stages of a product, which typically leads to an element of *exclusivity* at the high-end of the civilian market as the latest product transitions from tactical to practical applications; this leads to (b), the competition to create the large scale manufacturing *process technologies* for the reduction in unit price for either widespread military use, or to increase market share at the middle and low ends of the civilian market, just as metallurgical and electronic gadgets that were purchased by the rich in one decade become available for the masses a decade later.

The West proved to be extremely adept at generating new products and financing their development, where the financial services would transition new products to large scale production and consumption after the best products were decided by high end consumers choosing from competing designs. This inventor-consumer-investor feedback loop process, which coordinates the activities of hundreds of millions of people around the world, occurs automatically in a *noncentrally* controlled political economy, which leads to the “new economies” over several decades. It is this process that inspired Kondratiev’s concept of the long wave cycles which he saw operating in market systems which the Communist systems tried to replicate, but failed miserably in doing so.

However, in failing to replicate the inventor-consumer-investor feedback loop phenomenon, the communist experiment revealed many interesting aspects of human behavior. In theory, Marx was trying to limit the high price of luxury items purchased by the rich because he despised them, and, as a result, the initial target market for innovative products was stifled, consumer preference towards new products was never decided in a manner where real humans could choose for themselves what worked best.

As a result large scale investment was never directed to the wishes of the consumers, but to the wishes of the bureaucrats who are never going to admit that they put all the nations resources behind poor designs, especially since they rule over a captive audience without access to Western goods where the gross inferiority of Eastern goods would be quite noticeable.

Instead the nations' resources were directed to a system of party bosses presiding over a bureaucratic system of sycophants producing shoddy products for a captive audience who were isolated from the world and enslaved by the disastrous sunk cost decisions of the 'infallible' leaders. As a result of this system of errors, the communist political system was a debacle wherever it was instituted despite the abundance of natural resources at hand.

What is important to note is that the misunderstandings in the behavioral aspect of the theory to achieve a 'human ideal' were at variance with the natural selection drives shaped by nature itself over the deep time of the evolutionary process initially described by Darwin and advanced by the field of evolutionary psychology since. In other words people are going to compete for resources and mates, and for economic gain and social status no matter what system they are in, and humans either create a *cooperative game dynamic* or a *zero-sum/negative-sum game theoretic dynamic* following Aristotle's concept of bifurcated forms expressed in 2.3.2.

Doing away with property rights did not have a positive effect expected by the Marx-Engels hypothesis, and doing away with marriage and the concept of the nuclear family never took hold due to the male and female jealousy theories expressed by narrow evolutionary psychology theorists. Marx and Engels may have envisioned the workers' paradise in theory, but in reality, they destroyed the essence of human political and economic activity by arguing so convincingly that a heteronomous centrally planned system could work.

The idea is that human psychological shaping has to be consistent with inherent psychological shaping to create positive growth political and economic cycles as well, the upshot being that mass organizational theories are only as good as their behavioral bases, and in the opinion of the author, this concept is best understood in an integrated behavioral-political-economic feedback loop model where the dynamic processes can be understood as specific components linked in series as a whole.

4 CLARIFYING THE AXIS CONTINUUMS FROM 2.3

4.1 Assessing the Axis Continuums, and Realizing a Double Independent Variable System

At this juncture, it should be mentioned that the motivation of this model was derived from (a) the fall of the 'Iron Curtain' in Eastern Europe that led to the collapse of the Soviet Union; (b) the knowledge that the Enlightenment Era and World View philosophers had already produced the philosophical architecture of a foundational, political and economic model; (c) Aristotle's Six Forms of government was the most complete of the government form frameworks and stood the test of time in one sense, while it readily linked to per capita GNP based economic theories via the two fundamental success-failure determinants of the multiplier coefficient and the gini index, which together measure elite investment and/or elite extraction from society.

The GNP ratio and the two fundamental success-failure determinants relate economic elite investment theories to Aristotle's proper and perverted forms of Government because the Proper Forms of government would naturally invest more into society for the betterment of the whole while the perverted forms restrict investment in favor of family dynasties and nepotism as explained in section 2.3.2. It was this series of realizations led to the conclusion that Aristotle's Six Forms of government is the macro independent variable that links directly to the per capita GNP based economic/demographic theories as the dependent variable and outcome measurement elements of the model.

Coming from the left side of the system, advances in genetic biology that explain hardwired human instinctual drives provided the basis for the value neutral behavioral constant of the two basic motivational drives of the model, i.e. the pursuit of *resources*

and *mates* (gleaned from Professor Bill Robinson at Rutgers) which readily merges with the dual economic motivations of *economic gain* and *social status* (or social acceptance) as advocated by Harsanyi. This series of realizations indicated that the qualitative motivation assumptions of the micro and macro behavioral theories were readily mergeable in conceptual terms.

This meant that the only missing link was the micro independent variable from the field of psychology that would link the value neutral constant twin motivations (pursuit of *resources* and *mates*) to the bifurcated political and economic elements of the system that are already connected. A list of the elements needed for a seamless linking of interdisciplinary frameworks needed for the system is listed below. An inventory makes it easier to see what parts of the system was already decided and which parts of the system were lacking so the investigation could be focused in the right area of the library.

4.2 List of System Components: Haves and Needs

- **Have:** the overarching **Philosophical Architecture** in the foundational-political-economic-demographic order
 - i.e. the Hume-Smith and Marx-Engels works can be analyzed to determine the three dimensional primary tradeoff X,Y and Z continuums
 - the idea that Kant's autonomy-heteronomy distinction in foundational and political philosophy is valid
 - Kant's advocacy of republican forms of government and international political organization is consistent with Aristotle's government forms
 - Kant's abstract causation can be operationalized via the more empirical Hume-Smith model proposed here
- **Have:** the value neutral **System Constant**
 - i.e. the pursuit of *resources* and *mates* are the two cross cultural common instinctual drives motives that stems from biological studies and merges with the pursuit of *economic gain* and *social status* that is common in political and economic theories as well.
- **Need:** initial micro behavioral **Independent Variable**
 - the requirements of the micro behavioral framework need to be:

- in the value neutral constant and bifurcated Proper and Perverted Forms of Behavior in a similar manner as: Aristotle's Six Forms of Government is presented; or the positive and negative dynamics of virtuous versus vicious cycles in economic theory, and the positive-sum versus zero-sum and negative-sum game theoretic outcomes
 - needs to come from post Freudian psychology linking Darwinian instinctual drives with Individual character orientation (e.g. facilitative-debilitative) and link to functional-dysfunctional small group social psychological theories in order to link micro behavioral theories with the macro behavioral theories to minimize gaps in the system.
 - **Solution:** in next section, i.e. this spot was filled with Erich Fromm's biophilous-necrophilous character orientation model and Maddi's (1972) method of modeling and analysis of competing character orientation theories.
 - **Have:** Macro Independent Variable of Aristotle's Six Forms of Government
 - **Have:** Macro Dependent Variable in per Capita GNP Based economic theories
 - In the early stages of the model, the complicated economic theories were boiled down to the two central determinants of the multiplier and gini coefficients and the per capita GNP ratio because:
 - (a) it is the minimal amount of economics needed to merge with Aristotle's framework
 - (b) it was the portal to any of the major economic frameworks
 - (c) it simplified the complex economics theories and mathematics while providing a placeholder, this allowed the author to work on the evolutionary psychology, psychological personality theories, the larger social psychology frameworks, as they connect to the mass organizational elements of the system that are already connected in 2.3.2

- The field of Economics is already very well systematized, the per capita GNP based theories are already very well developed and can be augmented by:
 - Kondratiev Long Wave theories to explain the role of key technological innovations ushering in totally new economies approximately every hundred years or so explaining long term economic phenomena
 - Long Wave Theories encompass the time frames in which:
 - economic supply and demand theories, development theories, general equilibrium theories and endogenous growth theories operate within
 - all per capita GNP based theories automatically link to existing demographic statistical models of the time frame in question
 - This system encompasses the major types of economic theories and is therefore scalable
 - **Have:** Outcome Measure System deriving from off-the-shelf economic and demographic models can be used depending upon the topic the model is applied to.

4.3 Searching for the Independent Variable from Post Freudian Psychological Theories

With this inventory in mind at this phase of this research project, the completion of the system really boiled down to the determination of an *independent variable* to complete the system and do more research to strengthen the connections between fields of study.

There are a few requirements that guide the search. First, the micro behavioral framework from the field of psychology had to match the *value neutral constant* and bifurcated proper and perverted form format of Aristotle. And secondly the independent variable requires an overarching unified theory of personality and character orientation. What is meant by a third stage unified theory of a field or subfield is that each discipline goes through three stages of development from its beginning to mature stages. The first

stage is characterized by researchers describe the single common 'core' element of certain slightly different behaviors where the differences are attributable to a single unique factor that represent 'peripheral' behaviors. For example, if five different 'peripheral' categories of behavior can be explained from a single common 'core' factor, then the schemata would list the common core factor and how it is shaped by the five secondary peripheral factors unique to each category of behavior. It is at this first stage of development where researchers begin to write the smaller core-periphery schemata specific to their small area of a subfield writing about a limited number of subjects.

The second stage of a discipline begins when researchers determine the single common core element among the numerous smaller framework schemata and organizes them into larger schemata, which now incorporate an increasing number of subjects or phenomena. As this stage matures it gradually flows into a third and final stage where theorists begin the process of taking the larger more explanatory schemata and try to determine the common core element of those few larger theories.

At this stage of development, the researchers are in effect looking to create the larger systematic 'general' theories en route to creating a unified theory of their subfield or discipline. It is at this stage that the researchers try to explain all the smaller frameworks from just two primary 'core' human drives that determine the secondary 'peripheral' human drives that in turn explain the very wide range of small scale framework produced in the first two stages. It is this third stage type of theorizing that this model needs. In other words, a unified theory of the primary social sciences must be derived from the unified theories of each discipline that explain its core and peripheral drives and its peripheral behavioral categories or types.

In short, with the understanding of academic competitive behavior understood, as well as the difference between small scale concrete empirical theories and large scale abstract theories, the author was looking for a *third stage* overarching general theoretical model in the field of psychological personality theories which explain the proper and perverted forms of human behavior.

Specifically, the author was looking for a work that has already systematized the theories in post Freudian psychological personality theories to explain the myriad of smaller theories from two competing human motivational drives that add both *direction* (for the person or group) and *tension* (causes oscillation of behavior between differing

needs or desires on Maslow's hierarchy of needs) of human behavior (inside the mind as people satisfy one urge or another, or among members of a group where people compete constructively or destructively), that is presented in a value neutral bifurcated form that was conceptually parallel to the *empathy/sympathy* versus *non empathy/sympathy* dichotomy of Hume-Smith, or the autonomy versus heteronomy distinction of Kant.

4.4 Maddi's Unification of Psychological Personality Theories

With this understanding of how fields of study naturally evolve, Salvatore Maddi's work in *Personality Theories: A Comparative Analysis* (1972) offered the solution. In his opening chapter he describes the *core-periphery* method of modeling which he uses to analyze the major personality theories up to that time period and organize them into a general schematic where he categorizes each type of theory into a group (e.g. conflict models, fulfillment models and consistency models), and analyzes the pros and cons of each type from their respective core assumptions and motivations and their efficacy in explaining peripheral disorders, or in the case of McClelland explain peripheral characteristics of high achievers and over achievers.

In other words, the aim of Maddi's text as he described it in the opening preface, forward and initial chapters was exactly what this model needed to determine the missing micro independent variable. Without this work, the model presented here would not be nearly as complete, or it would have taken much longer.

In Maddi's text, the "core" of personality is the *value neutral constant* used to examine each personality theorists core assumptions and motivations of behavior, where the *periphery* explains the behaviors that are shaped by the environment into each theorists proper and perverted forms of behavior. This meant that Maddi's methodology was consistent with the modeling of Aristotle and the virtuous and vicious cycles of economic theory, or the positive and negative types of game theoretic outcomes. Furthermore, Maddi's overarching distinction of the personality theory analysis was his *activation* (self actualized) versus *nonactivation* (non self actualized, e.g. either controls the behavior of others, or is controlled by another) character orientation dichotomy that is compatible with the basic Hume-Smith dichotomy continuums expressed in section 2.3.

After analyzing the various theories provided by Maddi, and additional follow-up research, Erich Fromm's necrophilous-biophilous character orientation theory developed

in *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* (1973) was chosen as the *micro behavioral independent variable*. This completed the system the initial aspects of the system. Like the other components, an off-the-shelf framework had existed for decades, but the realization required the overarching Hume-Smith versus Marx-Engels comparison and the Cold War ex post analysis of real human behavior to discern the pattern, and select the theories that best predicted and explained that pattern of human behavior.

5 Further Refinements of the Completed System

5.1 Hume-Smith, Maddi and the Affirmation of Kant

Now that the philosophical architecture of the system was decided in the Hume-Smith and Marx-Engels comparison, and each variable position has a core framework that can incorporate its subfield frameworks, then a pattern emerges where more logical deductions and refinements can be made to either the philosophical architecture comprised of the casual axis continuums, or the frameworks which comprise the variable system elements. As refinements are made in one area or element, it leads to further realizations that steadily clarify the overarching patterns revealing stronger connections between the micro and macro behavioral elements where the whole system becomes more precise.

After carefully reading the Maddi's comparative analysis and his synthesis of the various theories in an attempt to create a unified personality theory, and engaging in additional research of reading survey books on the personality theories as a guide to which theories should be read in their entirety, the author realized that Maddi's and Fromm's theories corroborates the Foundational Philosophy of Kant's autonomy-heteronomy distinction in the micro behavioral foundational elements of the system as well. For the sake of brevity, competing philosophical literature review matrices of Kant and Hegel that gave rise to the German Historical School were left out of this sample paper, but we can further insert Kant's contribution here because it leads to further deductions that link to free market economic theory as well.

5.2 The relationship of Empathy, to Personality Theories, which Affirm Kant

Kant's autonomy-heteronomy dichotomy actually supersedes the dichotomy of Hume-Smith in the X axis dichotomy continuum with a much more intricate combination of foundational philosophical and psychological frameworks. If one interfaces the empathy/sympathy –non empathy/sympathy continuum of Hume-Smith with: the conflict model models of Freud, the fulfillment theories of Fromm or Rogers, or the consistency McClelland and Maddi, then the positive effect that an increase in empathy and sympathy has on a society has stronger connection to a positive (cooperative) psychological dynamic.

When greater empathy and sympathy is introduced into the mass educational system of a society, and people become more caring, then people tend to become more cooperative allowing for the needs of others to be met along with the own, which then allows more people in society to satisfy their needs in context of Maslow's hierarchy. In following the simple hypothetical process, the individuals involved are said to gain 'autonomy' insofar as they become adept at satisfying their needs through their own self actualized efforts in conjunction with others doing the same as they attain adult hood and emotional maturity by seeking mutually beneficial cooperative positive-sum relations instead of the zero-sum and negative sums outcomes.

This is true because positive-sum relations minimize antagonisms and conflict in a group setting so the individuals involved can all gain *fulfillment* of their own needs while also gaining psychological *consistency* in terms of a peaceful mind. Psychological fulfillment and consistency are said to occur because the individuals are creating peaceful relationships that are mutually supportive to both self preservation and preservation of the group as a whole vis a vis other groups as explained in section 2.3.2.

The heteronomous and non-empathetic dynamics are the opposite, where the controller (exploiter) satisfies their basic hierarchy of needs at the expense of 'others,' where the 'others' can fulfill neither their basic hierarchy of needs let alone their higher needs. In this case, the controller (sadist or exploiter) may feel *fulfilled* in their basic needs but not their higher needs due to the constant fear of reprisal that are associated with their pursuit of zero-sum extractive outcomes from the controlled (masochist), or persistent engagement in negative-sum sabotage behaviors to prevent the controlled

from leaving and pursuing other options. In this scenario neither the controller or the controlled (exploited) is said to have gained both *fulfillment* and *consistency* because the controller (exploiter) develops the guilty mind and is paranoid for fear of reprisal or abandonment, while the controlled (exploited) does not have their needs met and is angry and either plotting revenge or escape from the relationship.

This simple interrelation of foundational philosophy to post Freudian theories is just as consistent in small group family and social psychology settings as it is with the large polities described in 2.3.2 where the common elements of autonomous and heteronomous relationships can be derived. The common element of *autonomous* micro and macro behavioral systems is the creation of an environment conducive to people freely meeting their needs by the promotion of empathy and sympathy via both educational inputs and the practice of positive sum relations in legal and economics inputs into a polity.

In distinction, the common element of the heteronomous relationships in family, small group and large polities is the presence of a dominating controller who *solipsistically* choreographs the activities of others which tend toward the zero-sum extractive or negative sum debilitating behaviors as the choreographer demands that everyone produces the outcome of his or her fantasy. And if the outcome is not achieved, the coercive punishments increase until that outcome is either achieved, or more likely, the controlled become the listless and lifeless passive aggressive subjects of a script that they want no part in playing, or worse, the sadistic controller choreographs the deaths of the subjects.

The point here is to translate the language of philosophy to the language of modern psychology, and then onto game theoretic and economic theories. Heteronomous solipsistic relations based on compelling a particular outcome of their fantasies as opposed to educating everyone to compete autonomously for themselves according to their own personal attributes and comparative advantages. The choreographed solipsistic relationships associated with the zero-sum and negative-sum punishments increase antagonism, tension and conflict both in the *minds* of the controller and the controlled as the controller is angry that everyone is not acting in accordance with their fantasies, while the controlled want to retaliate against the controller.

The strain of participants manifests itself in the behaviors of the people whether it is in small group settings in psychology, or interest group conflicts in a polity. The point is that if one merges the Hume-Smith model to post Freudian models and game theoretic concepts, one finds that Kant's autonomy-heteronomy distinction is the basic dividing line of micro behavioral personality theories in the sense explained in section 3.3, which leads to an *natural* versus *solipsistic* dichotomy as the *solipsistic* forms represent the dysfunctional forms in psychology, politics, and economics.

In terms of philosophical architecture, where Smith spent most of his time in creating a combined legal and economic theory that gave rise to modern economic theory, Kant was much more motivated by the work of Hume and spent most of his time on the foundational and political aspects of the architecture. Kant freely accepted market economics, property rights and marital rites as all givens. Due to Kant's focus on the foundational philosophy and very long term political projections, Kant produced a more detailed behavioral theory that effected Continental thinking generations later including German behavioral scientists discussed by Maddi.

5.3 Affirmation of Harre

Furthering the findings, and making the linkages between Hume-Smith, Kant and Maddi via the empathy-nonempathy, autonomous-heteronomous and facilitative-debilitative dichotomies, Maddi had in a sense, achieved a goal of Rom Harre in the field of philosophy of psychology. Harre, in several writings had argued that the foundational philosophy of the past could be updated with a more contemporary post Freudian theory as a means of advancing the subfield of the philosophy of psychology which is the branch of philosophy that looks into such matters. The problem faced by Harre, was the formulation of a criteria to select one set of frameworks over another, unless the criteria comes from an undisputed empirical source, any selection would be merely arbitrary, and therefore just a matter of opinion leading to no definitive answer to advance the subfield.

However, the Cold War differences, particularly in the inventor-consumer-investor feedback loop cycle, offered that irrefutable evidence for the selection of the Hume-Smith model over the Marx-Engels architecture models. It affirmed the Aristotelian political model with its clear linkages to per capita GNP based theories and the two determinants of the gini and multiplier coefficients that are the anchors of the variable set system, while

the choice of the micro psychological element came from the behavioral analysis and psychical dynamic of cultural leaders over time either generating functional facilitative or dysfunctional debilitating psychical dynamic ripple effects as briefly explained in section 2.3.2.

For the purpose of this overarching model, there was no better way than to use the capitalism versus communist experiments as the guide since it was tested on real humans and produced very provocative outcomes as communist regimes routinely created police states that slaughtered approximately ten percent of their populations wherever they came into power matching the sadism and solipsism of despots such as Idi Amin or Mobutu Sese Seko.

The harsh sado-masochistic character of communists governments led to the negative psychical dynamics of section 2.3.2 characterized by super narcissistic leaders imbued with the idea of their own solipsistic infallibility presiding over a sadistic police state apparatus lording over a lifeless passive aggressive mass culture who knew that if they competed for resources and mates aggressively that they would be killed in a Marxist system, rather than rewarded in a capitalist system.

Fromm explained this phenomenon quite extensively in *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* where he defines his *autonomous biophilous* versus *heteronomous necrophilous* character orientation dichotomous theory by thoroughly overhauling and merging Freud's two main "libidinous drive" and "death instinct" theories into a unified and well developed psychological fulfillment-frustration theory. When Maddi's framework, which was an attempt to analyze and unify existing personality theories, was placed into the overarching framework of the system presented here, the author realized that Maddi had actually achieved much of Harre's goal, if the findings are either translated into philosophical terms, or the subfield of the philosophy of psychology adopted Maddi's methodology in terms of Kant's foundational philosophical system. Either way, the goal is possible with this system being proposed here.

5.3 Vernon Smith, Invisible Hand, and the Nomos-Physis Distinction

Moving the discussion back to its utility to political and economic theory, once the insight from Maddi and Fromm is used to determine that Kant's *autonomy* versus

heteronomy distinction is correct, then one realizes the Maddy-Fromm-Kant combination adds further insight and corroboration to Adam Smith's concept of the "invisible hand" while bolstering Vernon Smith's idea of the *non-centrally controlled* (objective autonomous) autonomous system produce far superior outcomes to the choreographed *centrally controlled* (solipsistic heteronomous) or overly regulated political economies in the contemporary post Industrial era. Both ideas of Adam Smith and Vernon Smith are extremely pertinent both inside economics as they are in the neighboring fields of study.

It should be said here that the concept of the "invisible hand" of Adam Smith in classical political economy is derivation from the nomos-physis distinction in the classical political philosophy of Ancient Greek University system of Socrates as explained in the Strauss-Cropsey text. The nomos-physis distinction is one of the very long standing hypotheses which can now also be clarified with a big picture model which illuminates big picture patterns.

The Greeks believed that "nomos," i.e. the laws of man, were always inferior to the laws of nature, i.e. "physis", which was supposed to be superior to everything in the universe. Therefore, the Greek university system was designed to determine what the laws of nature were by dividing the University system into the various natural sciences and the philosophical human studies disciplines and subfields, where the field of physics was responsible for discerning the big picture patterns in the natural sciences, while the field of philosophy was supposed to look for the big picture patterns in the human studies disciplines.

The nomos-physis hypothesis can be stated as: the more that human micro and macro organizational systems (differing conceptions of family, polity and economy) followed the laws of nature, then the more likely they would also yield the better outcomes; and conversely stated, the more a systems follows the solipsistic ideals of man (i.e. a tyrant, dictator or despot), then the more likely that the outcomes would be negative by worsening gradations.

Therefore, the fields of psychology, politics and economics were supposed to observe and categorize the pros and cons of various systems practiced in various areas of the known world, and attempt to discern any patterns in the family, polity and economic modes of organization looking for any crosscutting patterns. The idea was that the better small group and mass organizational systems must be more consistent with the laws of

nature indicating that humankind should therefore focus on improving those systems, while the worst ones must follow the laws of man (solipsism) and should be avoided at all costs.

With the Hume-Smith versus Marx-Engels Cold War comparison, and modern technology making productive output results more blatant, the nomos-physis distinction can now be drawn across all three of the primary topics. The solipsistic forms of relations (external heteronomous controller in family or small group relations, or solipsistic centrally planned or centrally directed political economies) are the perverted forms yielding the worst results in both the micro and macro behavioral theories. This is true whether it is the overbearing and/or abusive parents in a family setting; or oppressive fundamentalist religious leader with overzealous sexual mores coerced with extreme punishments; or the sadistic rule of dictators, tyrants or despots that loot and impoverish their countries.

What each level of small group, political, or economic type of human relationships has in common, is the destructive psychical dynamic comes from *solipsism*. This is true whether is it from the solipsistic parents who want to create the ideal child of their dreams, instead of developing the attributes that their child actually has, or the case of solipsistic leaders who envision some type of ideal society that either serves their direct selfish interests, or their romantic vision of an ideal state. It is the solipsism that compels them to choreograph the activities of their entire political and economic systems characterized by choreographed elections and state run media choreographed to indicate that the leaders policies are working and they are adored which becomes the means of artificially masking the reality that the masses would much rather kill them.

In either of these small and large group settings, the solipsism of the controllers creates a system of relationships that continually blocks and thwarts the individuals from integrating the three elements of their psyche: i.e. where element 1, the deliberative cognition (the mind) is developed to direct element 2, the behavior of the body to satisfy element 3, the life force energies, or natural strivings (i.e. pursuit of *resources* and *mates*, or pursuit of *economic gain* and *social status*) of an individual.

So with this overarching model, one can make a series of deductions where the abstract concepts of Kant's autonomy-heteronomy dichotomy can be used to bolster the Hume-Smith model in one sense; link to post Freudian psychological theories and bolster the ideas of Harre in another sense; while indicating a clear pattern for the age old

nomos-physis distinction; while also supporting the concepts of Adam Smith and Vernon Smith in a third sense; while interrelating the micro and macro behavioral studies with game theoretic concepts in a fourth sense.

The point is that there is a seemingly endless series of refinements that can be made with this system where many long standing questions can be either advanced or renewed for more clarified debate once the information can be viewed from the different vantage point that overarching models can provide. The value of an overarching system is to move the information of confirmed empirical frameworks in one field to a neighboring field to answer long standing questions by providing the larger fact pattern that a big picture model provides.

6 CONCLUSION

6.1 Organized non Economic Theories to Merge with Economic Theories

In concluding this sample paper of a larger more detailed work, the system presented here may be long on the philosophical architecture and behavioral aspects, while being short on economics, but it isn't the economic theories that need to be organized. It was the rest of the primary human studies disciplines that needed to be organized in a manner where they can be merged with the already well organized theories of economics.

Indeed the psychological theories touched on in this paper need to be addressed in much greater detail where they can be linked more thoroughly to the political and economic frameworks presented in this initial paper. The author strongly believes that there are many refinements, clarifications, and explanatory scenario categories that can be added to flesh out the skeletal system described here.

However, the main purpose was to make a brief solution to the scathing criticism of the social sciences, written by Tooby and Cosmides in *The Adapted Mind* (1992), concerning how the autarkic social sciences of the current Standard Social Scientific Model (SSSM) are inept at developing general theoretical intradisciplinary frameworks in a manner that can be linked with the general frameworks of neighboring fields of study required to have a "seamless" system of coherent interdisciplinary theories.

Tooby and Cosmides, made it clear that all the natural and biological sciences have already produced models consistent with their neighboring fields and subfields of study, up until the point evolutionary psychology ends, and the social sciences begin with field of social psychology. Tooby and Cosmides believed that the social sciences could indeed be better organized if researchers put their minds to it. Maddi himself even acknowledges that some of his colleagues questioned why he was pursuing a unified theory of personality by when that level of theorizing is not immediately useful in teaching social workers to deal with the everyday problems of a community, or psychologists who advise patients just a few hours per week. But Maddi apparently pursued a unification of psychological theories just to answer some interesting questions while attempting to mature that aspect of the discipline, which he achieved.

Tooby and Cosmides, like Harsanyi did decades earlier, argued that the social sciences are not only chaotic, but many researchers actually resist using scientific methodologies, except for the fields of economics and demography. While demography may just be the counting of people in every country and performing migration studies to the best of their abilities, the field of economics is much more complex. However, by and large economic theorists have taken the time to thoroughly name and define their major factors and describe the competing forces among them that accounts for the oscillating economic cycles and political vicissitudes which are actually the social scientific phenomenon germane to all social sciences.

6.2 Economics, Finance and the Necessity of Predictive Modeling

In moving toward a conclusion, it should be noted that the fields of economics and finance have quite a different reality that has bearing on this discussion. Where many social scientific theorists see no need for abstract theories that explain a wide range of phenomena stemming from two core motivations because their clientele just do not require that level of specificity, whereas the field of economics and finance do have a clientele that demands better and better models.

In economics and finance the goal is to create more explanatory and predictive models to meet the needs of their investor and business clientele who are betting huge sums of money on processes, trends and outcomes where researchers with poorly

constructed models produce poor outcomes and get severely punished by the markets. This payoff and punishment stimulus shapes the type of competition in those fields of study that is lacking in the other social sciences.

The other social sciences just don't require highly sophisticated models so the goal shifts from the explanatory and predictive power of models to become more influential to a wider audience. After all, why would a political scientist care about the nomos-physis distinction or Vernon Smith's lofty idea of the unseen non-central controller when the politician he or she is advising needs resonating political rhetoric to win a coalition of voters in their immediate district? In this respect, the problem of getting researchers in the soft social sciences to make greater use of qualitative hypothetico-deductive methodological theories linked to quantitative statistical measurement systems will simply not go away due to the fact of the differing clientele, with different niche markets with differing political agendas.

However, the researchers in psychometrics and econometrics have been working together via decision theory and game theory since Von Neumann and Morgenstern introduced Theory of Games and Economic Behavior in 1944. The effect of game theory has been the creation of a forum of researchers interested in building more complete models which necessarily has an end goal of linking the major disciplines into an inclusive integrated model.

Since the introduction of game theory (with the closer relationship with psychometrics and economists in decision theory) it can be said that the field of economics has in many ways reached a point of diminishing marginal returns as existing mainstream growth and equilibrium theories are advanced and perfected. The trend recently of behavioral and experimental economics has been to further the interdisciplinary interaction of the evolutionary theory, psychometrics, econometrics, decision and game theory as the means of reaching into neighboring social sciences to adapt more and more suitable interdisciplinary frameworks to merge into the already well systematized field of economics.

The motivation may be merely to generate more explanatory and predictive interdisciplinary multivariate models and answer more interesting questions, but the trend that has been evolving over the past few decades it is the opinion of the author that the interdisciplinary economics research groups might as well just set their sights on

systematizing the primary social science disciplines in their entirety. Except for the curiosity of a few researchers here and there, creating more incorporative models is just is not a priority in the soft social sciences as it is in economics and finance, and it will never be due to the differing clientele.

In closing, this model is consistent with Gintis' effort to search for a method of merging *micro* behavioral human studies fields with the *macro* behavioral fields of study insofar as the next stage of development for his model would be to select more specific frameworks for inclusion, while the next stage of development for this model is to mathematize it with the game theoretic mathematics. Since numerous Universities have interdisciplinary studies programs, the author believes that much progress could be made to advance the ideas of Harsanyi, and create a core model of the micro and macro behavioral studies if just one interdisciplinary program chose to develop and merge the two approaches over time.

ⁱ (even if off-set by petroleum revenues, they lack the educated work force to produce dual use technologies domestically and become dependent upon functional political economies for advanced products).