Proposition for a better society

Automation for the provision of the basic needs of society and the possibility for humanity to achieve self-actualisation.

Ty Yiu

2019-08-10

Contents

Abstract

Currently, our world is undoubtedly in multiple crises. From social, political, economic or environmental, it seems as though circumstances are extremely polarised. *Maslow's* hierarchic model of needs and wants for humans states that the actualisation of potential is to be achieved solely after the satisfaction of in the hierarchy underlying needs. Henceforth, the exhaustion of human potential is not the case, for most people in the current state of the world. One could classify this as a crisis, arguing that not exhausting individuals' potential, whether in the classical way productive, creative, innovative, something aught contributing, may be a significant factor towards the decisions made and actions taken, which brought the world to its current state, in multiple crises.

The proposed provision of human basic needs managed by automation aims at raising the hierarchic state of *Maslow's* model that most people find themselves in. As a further consequence, the raise in state of human needs will have effects upon the social, political, economic and environmental state of the world.

Maslow's Theory of Human Motivation states that there are distinct levels in which one can find themselves in, these levels represent the needs that on longs for. As soon as one experiences a change of the state of the level they are in, their needs adapt.

The stages are: *"physiological", "safety", "belonging and love", "esteem",* and *"self-actualization".* The lowest stage, physiological sources need for e.g. water, food, sleep, essential needs to survive. The second stage provides shelter from the elements and predators. The third, the inclusion within society and acceptance. Fourth, the distinction and individuality of one and realisation of such. Which ties in with the last stage, in which prior realised individual skills/talents are fully exhausted in terms of potential.

As these stages rise, arguably there is an increase in two aspects, the time that individuals have available and the productive output due to higher efficiency / effectiveness, which is potential, as the time for that needs to be chosen to be taken.
As an example, as soon as shelter is established within a society, there is a lot less time wasted on precautions and worrying, arguably the better mental state also affects individuals positively. So, that more time can be spent on creating meaningful relationships or better producing food, instead of running from predators and worrying about their lives.

> The goal is to raise humanity up in these stages of Maslow's hierarchy and thus create a better tomorrow.

That thought, of having more time to spend on pressing issues is key.
Another thought that is key, is to realise that pressing issues that do not align with the personal needs of an individual will not be pursued, and thus if one longs for food or shelter, he will give little regard for his surroundings, where as when he'd have everything he'd need, he could contribute towards making the general society better and help others achieve the state he's at.
Such seemingly *altruistic* behaviour seems abnormal, though is and always has been seen as *to be aspired and be strived towards.* Throughout time, in ancient Greece, the character of the philosopher has been seen as *to be strived towards.* Though has the philosopher, in ancient Greece, been made laughter of by many people of middle class, clearly beneath the state a philosopher would find himself. So, a famous anecdote of Thales is how a maid ridiculed him.

> Thales fell plumpe into a ditche over the eares. Wherefore an olde woman that he kepte in his house laughed and sayde to him in derision: O Thales, how shuldest thou have knowlege in hevenly thinges above, and knowest nat what is here benethe under thy feet? (Burnyeat, Levett & Plato. 1990)

The other anecdote famously known is how he responded to the mocking about the necessity of the profession of a philosopher. He is said to have predicted a big olive harvest, on which's prediction he made a lot of money to prove that

his seemingly poor existence is in his will and that a philosopher could in fact earn money, though it is not what is aspired to be done, being a philosopher.

> On the other hand, there is the question of whether the focus on the *hevenly thinges* distracts from pressing issues that reside *benethe under thy feet.* (Burnyeat, Levett & Plato. 1990)

> Or if the focus on the *hevenly thinges* only occurs if there are no pressing issues residing *under thy feet*, when having ascended the hierarchy, as is thus, but merely a temporal distraction, equal to a dream.

The proposition is to make people become *philosophers*, figuratively. When making people philosophers, one ends up with a society of philosophers. Ascend society to a higher stage in *Maslow's hierarchy*, or bring everyone to a common minimum stage. Surely, that is not as diverse, as Plato writes in *"The republic"*, but it doesn't need to be.

Technology and the advancements we have today do not require men working the fields to survive, we can leave that behind as a necessity, though still enjoy these activities for pleasure. The basic human needs will be taken care of by automated systems, similar to as in *the venus project* (The Venus Project, 2019), so that man doesn't have to worry about whether their kids can eat, but about how to solve quantum gravity. As a consequence, provided by the individuals, there will be benefits to society. If one were to find a cure for cancer, all cancer patients can benefit from that cure, not only one person alone.

The alignment of interests of society's and individuals' is the key aspect to consider for undertaking a change as proposed. Furthermore, the interests need identification and verification first, before they can be labelled as selfish or beneficial. The labelling process will need a framework to base the decision on, as *bad & good* aren't objective and exact quantifiable measures. Thus, the aspect of how beneficial is something to the envisioned society, is governed through a dynamic framework that considers multiple cornerstones, so that besides missing context a decision/action can be labelled *good / bad*. The framework aims at removing subjectivity and context, as those are subject to motive and interest, which are planned to be aligned with society's. Thus, a label solely refers to, how a decision/action is, in context of that planned society.

The question of *how* to achieve this ascension in the hierarchy, can be answered using the framework of *five fires of change.*

This framework aids in the transition *"from a state of languishing to one of flourishing" (Class, 2019).* It is a fit for the purpose of transitioning humanity to a higher on the hierarchy laying stage. One can see how these *fires* are inter-connected. Affect each other. Hence, the idea of conjoining their potentials seems close to have.

Empathy

The assumption is, that a human, with more time to spent on upper-level hierarchy stage things, like relationships, status or self-actualisation, will be able to be a more empathetic human.

A more empathetic human would be able to connect more and better with his peers, with more intellectual or enjoyable topics and activities. The reasoning of a human being more empathetic when being in the upper stages of Maslow's hierarchy, could be counter argued with the fact, that someone in desperate need would experience empathy as a tool to satisfy that need. An example could be how one could be imprisoned and by using empathy on their guards, they could increase the chance of getting out and better treatment.
But that empathy differs from the empathy experienced and propagating from someone in the upper stages with no such problems, as the intention and thus the consequential effect upon the *greater* differ distinctively. After all, the needs of the individual should be aligned with the needs of the society. There's the biggest pressing issue, the *viscosity* of society. For any change to happen within the aggregate society, time and drive is required.

Empathy is vital for the survival of the proposed idea, as it is the backbone assumption to have a more empathic human. It is vital, because within the *connections* made to propagate the idea within an existing society, empathy plays an enormous role for the successful propagation. A empathic person would *listen* actively to the proposal, see its benefits and could align their own interests with that proposal's. Empathy is required for the successful propagation of any information exchange via humans.

Kinship

Given the assumption of empathy separately, one can also assume, that the upper stage human is guiding his gaze much greater into the distance, opposite to looking at oneself. This thought, though also indicates that there is a difference within retro-reflection and selfish thinking/planning/action-taking.

The connections that a person would have with other beings, as well as the *more-than-human-world*, would be deeper by a great length. The empathic, emotional, intellectual connections created would differ from those founded on mutual benefit, instead of mutual interest. Where benefit differs from interest, in that interest means being interest in a subject matter.

These inter-human connections would create a much stronger society, which would show to have effects soon. These connections are much stronger nowadays compared to a hundred years ago, given the means of connection, humans can have today, compared to back then. The internet/machines of today and the *digital connections* it creates of course differ from those in skin, though they are valid, necessary and powerful *tools* to be used in making the idea reality.

The connections that can be created are more varied and more plenty and can be stronger themselves than a hundred years ago, which is why this proposal only works post-industrialisation, post-digitalisation et cetera. A society needs connections and a better society should have better connections. Furthermore, a more empathetic person can have a better connection/relationship with another empathetic person, compared to two non-empathetic peers.

Earth

The earth is as we know in crisis and all this is done in mutual interest with the earth and *man's* survival. The upper stage human would be a more caring person, but also for the environment, in general, his surroundings. The environment/surroundings one would find themself in, would matter to their every breath and one would realise that and begin to align his interests with those the environment has.
The interests of a person can be changed easier than those of the planet, those are nearly to all set in stone, the planet doesn't negotiate.

The reality is, that the earth is finite and we require its resources, while it requires us not to kill all life on it. These interests should be aligned. Nowadays, with modern technology and the urgent need for change, this alignment of interests could be pulled of.
Solar, fusion, hydrogen, mostly all fronts of sciences have great opportunities for change and alternatives. These are of course more expensive, but that can be reasoned with. Additionally, the end-goal is, to have a society, that would prefer the choice of more costly, but overall *better* material over cheap and dirty, considering the breach of alignment of interests.
The digital world is a reality, that is infinite in traditional measures to a finite one like earth. This fact could be leveraged to support the lacks of a finite planet. The *intention*/the reason for digitalism would be to support, where the finite planet could be helped using it, while keeping its duty of interconnectedness.

Tools

Tools allow the *Homo Faber* (Man the maker), to be as in *Arnold Gehlen's* Theory of *"Man as an imperfect being"* and create/use tools to bend their environment and nearly every other being on the planet to our will. These tools can vary, they can be guns, hammers, scalpels, fridges, watches. But immaterial *things* can also be tools. These also vary and could be kinship & empathy, hope and fear, love and hate. It should come to attention, that these immaterial tools differ clearly from those materialistic tools in that they address issues that arise in higher stages of Maslow's hierarchy.
Of course, hate arises in primitive cavemen, but again, the intention and realisation of having these emotions and being able to use them as tools are lacking. A gun may be useless when trying to achieve deeper relationships or

self-actualisation as a person, but it may still have value in aiding with getting closer to that goal.

Given the thought of the finite planet, the limits and restraints to the freedom of humans are tight, especially compared to a digital simulation. The tools that we use and have lie within these borders, but more importantly, we lie within as well. Alike being in a bathtub, one cannot reach out for the door, unless standing up. Thus, there are goals out of reach, put there out of reach, by our dependency to the limited world we live in.

Could a less limited world be created?

The tools we have are astoundingly well diverse and greatly tuned towards efficiently and effectively achieving what they are made for. With such amazing tools, it should be possible to create value out of *nothing.*

Theory of Emergence In this theory, the properties of an accumulation/aggregation of parts can differ from those that the constituent parts have on their own.

Similar to the thought of, where is the soul, if all we are made of is atoms. Isn't there something different to the accumulation of atoms that makes a sentient human? (Quanta Magazine, 2019)

Given this theory, It can be seen that things can be created out of nothing. That is the *how* the proposed society will live, based upon *emergence.* The idea is, that automation manages the lower stage hierarchic needs, such as food and therefore makes sure the human doesn't have to worry about that, but can worry about their relationships, connections with other humans or the *more than human world.*

Alike the concept of socialism, there would be a universal provision of some good, given to everyone equally. Though, the concept of capitalism is not scrapped. The conceptual system that a society would be based on, would be a fusion between democratic, socialism and capitalism. The concept of *basic income* (About basic income, 2019), is what the closest real life equivalent looks like. The system would be more equal, fair, have higher living standards et cetera, but most importantly would be made out of humans that worry less about primal things like food on the table or being able to take a shower.

But instead worry more about how to make their neighbourhood community a better place, how to be more successful in the job, wonder if the job is even the correct one considering one's skills, et cetera. *That* would make the human wonder more and more frequently *gaze up to the hevenly thinges.*

Farming can be automated, making food can be automated, the tools for that exist. World hunger can be erased, the tools exist. They just need to be energised from their potential state.

Hope

The question of how these tools can be energised from their potential state and be actively used, is in connection with hope and the other fires. Only with hope can a tool become a means to an end. The hope origins in the moment of the thought of the goal and no later. Henceforth, hope exists when ideas exist.

Hope can be aggregated and much more powerful that way, but still stay potential, because it requires the necessary tools to achieve such hopes.

In fact, all fires in combination act when driving change. It is alike throwing a pebble of a mountain cliff, it will for sure not arrive at the bottom alone, it will tear other stones with it. Analogical for *kinship*, it is sometimes a consequence as well as a reason. One may not someone else in better position to drive change, thus kinship is the source of the change if realised.

Empathy is a natural consequence of human nature and a human doesn't come more empathic then when in hope. Seemingly it can be a tool as well, but empathy also arises naturally in the envisioned society to a greater extent as is, thus another multiplier effect to drive change.

The earth is cradle of creation and place of piece of all our ideas and hopes, even those hoping to be among the stars have to leave the earth first. The fires are as interconnected, as the consequences of society itself.

Society itself seems to consequentially, due to its nature be governed by the *five fires*.

They arise naturally within the interactions and go-alongs of everyday life. Thus, one could say that the framework of *five fires for change* is automatically in place in *some* way, for every society. The framework always acts and reacts, the fires affect each other and become more or less dormant and dominant. They push each other in the background temporarily, like when a crisis tears the connections we have apart with some appalling new shock, just to be grown over the next day or week.

Society is dynamic, like fire and the framework keeps the balance between the flames of the aspects within.

Conclusion

The five fires for change framework has been identified to be deeply embedded within society and can thus perfectly be leveraged for driving change within said society. The goal is said to be moving society to a better, higher state in Maslow's hierarchy of needs, thus the matchmaking of the framework for change and the idea cooperate ideally.

The idea for a better society turns out to require the framework and individuals to become better themselves, so that as a result society becomes better. The five fires provide a concrete framework that can be followed by the individual of such society. Furthermore, it lays out cornerstones, dynamic aspects that can be influenced within a society.

Therefore, the proposal is being achieved on an individual level, it can be promoted and organised/managed alike a movement, though every individual has to apply and consider the fires for themselves. One can only show another the door, not step through it for one.

References

Burnyeat, M. Levett, M.J. & Plato. (1990). The Theaetetus of Plato. Indianapolis: Hackett.

About basic income | BIEN. (2019). Basicincome.org. Retrieved 07 August 2019, from here

Emergence: How Complex Wholes Emerge From Simple Parts | Quanta Magazine. (2019). Quanta Magazine. Retrieved 08 August 2019, from here

The Venus Project. (2019). The Venus Project. Retrieved 08 August 2019, from here

Class. (2019). The Class material