Hypercitizenship and Development: an Application of the Hipercitizenship Model

Natália Brasil Dib

Ph.D. candidate in Economic and Socio-environmental Law at Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná (PUCPR), Brazil

Abstract

The study of the systems theory is an important instrument for the analysis of the social system and, as a consequence, to the social changes that connectivity and interactions in the social systems emerge from. Society's relations work horizontally and connectedly, regarding interactions and organizations so the emergence of concepts of citizenship that derive from such interactions demand that the theory overcome the structural and reductive method in order to deal with emergence of new phenomena in a systemic and global way. Pitasi's approach of a theoretical apparatus of Luhmannian basis can offer an alternative of study to analyze and describe the social system, as well as it can provide a normative toolkit for the sociology of law, for instance, to help regulate the social relations based on social changes. Understanding the complexity of the system, its resilience potential, its changes due to the disturbances it experiences, among other factors, allows for the analysis of its complexity, and as a consequence, it offers more possibilities to better shape laws and public policies that can fulfill the needs of that system. In this sense, Hypercitizenship emerges as a model taken horizontally and systematically, and it results from the construction of citizenship from four types scientifically analyzed: (i) Beck's cosmopolitan citizen; (ii) scientific citizenship; (iii) entrepreneurial citizenship and (iv) social relations capacity. Adopting this model as a way to manage the complexity of citizenship it is possible to remodeling the law as an instrument of the new shape of Social System.

Keywords: Hypercitizenship, Development, Social System, Systems Theory, Paradigmatic Shift

Riassunto. *Ipercittadinanza e sviluppo: un'applicazione del modello ipercittadino*

Lo studio della teoria dei sistemi è uno strumento importante per l'analisi del sistema sociale e, di conseguenza, per i cambiamenti sociali da cui emergono la connettività e le interazioni stesse. Le relazioni della società interagiscono in modo orizzontale e connesso, riguardo alle interazioni e alle organizzazioni, quindi il concetto di cittadinanza che deriva da tali interazioni richiede che la teoria superi il metodo strutturale e riduttivo al fine di affrontare l'emergere di nuovi fenomeni in modo sistemico e globale. L'approccio di Pitasi di un apparato teorico di base luhmanniana offre un'alternativa di studio per analizzare e descrivere il sistema sociale, oltre a fornire un kit di strumenti normativi per la sociologia del diritto, ad esempio supportare la regolamentazione delle relazioni sociali. Comprendere la complessità del sistema, il suo potenziale di resilienza, i suoi cambiamenti dovuti ai disturbi che sperimenta, consente l'analisi della sua complessità e, di conseguenza, offre più possibilità per modellare meglio le leggi e le politiche pubbliche che possono soddisfare le esigenze di quel sistema. In questo senso, l'ipercittadinanza emerge come un modello adottato in senso orizzontale e sistematico e deriva dall'unione di quattro modelli di cittadinanza analizzati scientificamente: (i) il cittadino cosmopolita di Beck; (ii) cittadinanza scientifica; (iii) cittadinanza imprenditoriale e (iv) capacità di relazioni sociali. Adottando questo modello come modo per gestire la complessità della cittadinanza, è possibile rimodellare la legge come strumento della nuova forma del Sistema Sociale.

Parole chiave: Hipercitizenship, sviluppo, sistema sociale, teoria dei sistemi, cambiamento paradigmatico

1. Introduction

This paper is a result of the analysis of the concepts of development and citizenship, specially using the approach presented by Andrea Pitasi's theory called Hipercitizenship. The aim of this piece of research is to draw attention to territorial barriers and to the

emergence of the global social system, which has been redesigned and shaped for Hypercitizenship. Based on the Systems Theory and on its paradigmatic shift, mainly with Luhmann's theory, Sociology of Law gets new contours. This approach, which focus on the relation between the model of Hipercitizenship theory and Development, was firstly presented in a paper published in a book in which was collected a series of papers about Development an Citizenship after great Andrea Pitasi's lecture in the Doctoral Program in the south of Brazil. Now, after the opportunity to improve some concepts, especially with the opportunity to present the work paper in the 8th WCSA Conference, the theoretical approach was reviewed resulting in this contribution, which aims to provide a possibility to apply the Hipercitizenship approach to analyze development.

2. Paradigm shift in the systems theory – "Systemic Shifts"

An overcoming of the epistemological reductionism, particularly regarding the Newton-Cartesian reason (modern reason, as some prefer to label it), spreads its influences not only on the so-called hard sciences, but also on the soft-sciences. By late twentieth century, such overcoming gained relevance based on the fact that the existing theories did not seem to be able to explain certain emerging properties of the natural systems. Mainly after the theory of chaos, the dissipative systems and the complex adaptive systems, some alternative theoretical models emerged, constituting the method of approach of the complexity of the phenomena presented. These phenomena could no longer be reduced to the analysis of the part in a dissociated and analytical form as established by the Newtonian-Cartesian method (Prigogine, Stenger, 1984, XI), because some fundamental parts of the systems would be excluded. In summary, the above mentioned theories arise as a result of the disruption of the existing methodological proposal.

Among social sciences, markedly in Luhmann's sociology, this phenomenon can be observed through a paradigmatic shift – in the Kuhnian sense (Kuhn, 1998, p. 13). This is especially so in the systems theory of Parsons for the structural proposal of Luhmann's

autopoietic systems, which brought new perspectives for the so-called social system (or social systems). It is no longer identifiable from the notion of an entire hierarchic and coherent, but from its communication flows with a differentiation between system and environment based on function, program and code (Luhmann, 2004, p. 17; Pitasi, 2012, p. 24; Folloni, 2016, p. 36; Folloni and Cabrera, 2015, p. 66).

According to Pitasi, this paradigmatic shift reflected the systems theory in a punctual and outstanding way, changing the theoretical proposal based on the paradigm of «the whole and the part» to the most recent notion of «enormous constellation system» (2012, p. 18; 2013, p. 96; 2014a; Folloni, p. 16). This paradigmatic shift presents four stages as listed by the author: «paradigm 1 – P1», «paradigm 2 – P2», «paradigm 3 – P3» e «paradigm 4 – P4», which represent the «multi-paradigmatic character» (preface, Folloni, 2016, p. 16; Pitasi, 2012, pp. 24, 28) from the systems theory and leading to the Hypercitizenship theory, the theoretical milestone of this piece of work.

The first of one of these stages is represented by what the author calls whole/part paradigm. In P1, systems are referred from their structures, holding some vital functions that characterize them. This is about a conceptual model in which the interactions and the interconnectivity between the parts and the whole as a means of reaction and adaptation can be identified. The focus is on the analysis of relations between the parts in a structural way, able to identify the system. However, this theory was restricted to the notion that systems must be studied according to their structures and vital functions, and that such structures would in fact be able to define the system. Although in this concept there is an interaction between the parts and the whole, Pitasi explains that this was not about the perception of systems as being complex, but only as a step toward the idea of interactivity and holism (Pitasi, 2012, pp. 18, 19).

For this theory, systems should still be understood from their structures, organized according to functions and to certain hierarchy.

The second paradigm (P2) (Pitasi, 2012, p. 21) marks the shift of the proposal of parts/whole to that of system/environment, mainly by the Luhmannian theory (Luhmann, 1995, p. 6) of differentiation between systems and environment. Structure as the

delimitation criterion is overcome in order to identify its function and specific flows of communication from the identification of specific codes and programs (Pitasi, 2012, pp. 21, 24). Luhmann shows the lack of thoroughness that the systems theory based on the part and the whole presents: «but this does not explain how the whole, if composed of its parts, plus something else, can count as a unity on the level of the parts.» (1995, p. 5).

And he highlights the shift, of which Von Bertalanffy was also a protagonist, for the idea of system differentiation, from the reformulation of the theory of the whole and the parts, by using environment for the differentiation of systems. This inaugurates the notion of system/environment (Luhmann, 1995, p. 7). By admitting the complexity of the phenomena and the difficulty that the excess of specialization brought to the systemic analysis of the phenomenon, Bertalanffy proposes a General Systems Theory; this would greatly influence Luhman's proposal (Folloni and Cabrera, 2015, p. 67).

Within this situation, Luhmann (2004, p. 17) identifies an important characteristic of complex systems – the existence of communication flows in the system. These flows do not differentiate from the environment by means of their structure, but by means of the identification of their own function, operated by their code and program, overcoming the methodological proposal of the part as a fundamental element for system differentiation; so through the study of the part it would be possible to predict the consequences and effects of its interactions. As Luhmann states, «in modern systems theory, society performs through its communication» (2004, p. 1).

The third paradigm (P3) is about recognizing the autopoietic capacity of the system. From the studies by Maturana and Varela, Luhmann understands systems as being self-referential and autopoietic. The former concept refers to the programming and to the coding of the system itself. By becoming different from the environment, it refers to itself. In Luhmann's words «only insofar as systems refer to themselves (be this to elements of the same system, to operations of the same system, or to the unity of the same system) in constituting their elements and their elemental operations.» (1995, p. 9).

And the second concept, which is necessarily linked with the first one, determines that the system reacts from its own references. The capacity to react against disturbances/noises

from the environment is identifiable – based on its own instruments, that is, from its own code and program. The system produces itself and it reacts to noises and disturbances, keeping alive (Folloni, 2016, p. 44; Folloni and Cabrera, 2015, pp. 67, 68; Maturana and Varela, 1980, pp. 80, 81).

The shift from paradigm 1 to paradigm 2/3 (unified here for being complementary) reflects the evolution of the systems theory within the context of complexity and social relations to be analyzed and described by Science. As emphasized by Luhmann, the paradigm shift from the whole/part to the idea of self-referential systems (the idea of system/environment) has brought new possibilities to sociology and to the social phenomena that could no longer "fit" the former proposal, incurring the danger of having the reality of the phenomenon to be adequate to the theory, and not the opposite. This allows for a new look over social phenomena, considering its dynamicity. As emphasized by Laszlo and Krippner (1998, p. 9) one can perceive the idea of reduction of systems to their parts turn into the idea of reduction of systems to their dynamicity. That is, «only complexity can reduce complexity» (Luhmann, 1995, p. 26).

As explained by Pitasi, while in P1 the evolutionary and characteristic focus of the system is its interaction from its parts, from the structure of the system; in P2/P3, the basis is the self-referenciality of the system, that is, the identification of the code and the program of the system that is able to make it different from the environment. These characteristics are not supposed to be mistaken with structures or reduction to parts, but to the capacity of internal communication of the system (Pitasi, 2012, pp. 20, 21).

Due this paradigmatic shift, Pitasi formulated what he denominates "Enormous Constellation System" paradigm, which gives rise to a new perspective of social system. For him, the emergence of highly connected and digitalized society demands that social sciences, especially sociology, provide a theoretical model that is able to deal with the complexity of changes and interactions, a shift of the system in which the concepts of fluctuating constellation, reconfigurations, memetic complexity, catalogue, platform, and highly formalized proceduralization are inserted. And he explains that (Pitasi, 2012, pp. 22, 23):

In this sense, systemic sociology is the constellation (Normann, 2002) in which social knowledge is generated and evolves. It is also the constellation that prompts Rogers's complex cycles and accelerates the V in the formula V=R/W. It recombines and reconfigures the boundaries of sense of the social system by activating codes, procedures and programs that select sense (Luhmann, 1990; 1993), considered as a memetic recombinant (Jouxtel, 2010), and enables the system to distinguish between systemic communication (the memetic reconfiguration cycles of V=R/W) and ambient noise.

What we see from Pitasi's explanations is that the paradigm shift of the systems theory is established as a theoretical model that can manage (Folloni, 2016, p. 36) the complexity of social phenomena. Within the sociology of law, this is about a theoretical apparatus that is useful for the regulation of phenomena (Pitasi, 2015, p. 185). The study of the systems theory, and more specifically of P4 proposal brought up by Pitasi, is an important instrument for the analysis of the social system and, as a consequence, to the social changes that connectivity and interactions in the social systems emerge from. Society's relations work horizontally and connective, regarding interactions and organizations, so the emergence of concepts of citizenship that derive from such interactions demand that the theory overcome the structural and reductive method in order to deal with emergence of new phenomena in a systemic and global way.

Pitasi's approach of a theoretical apparatus of Luhmannian basis can offer an alternative of study to analyze and describe the social system, as well as it can provide a normative toolkit for the sociology of law, for instance, to help regulate the social relations based on social changes and even as an important instrument to model public policies.

For Luhmann, social systems are preponderantly defined by their own functions, so we can identify in each of them a code and a specific program that makes it unique and closed, considering that any disturbance of the environment makes it react according to such program and code, thus it can also be characterized as an open system (Luhmann,1995, pp. 34-35; Folloni, 2016, p. 94). One cannot mistake the closeness or autopoiesis of the systems defended by Luhmann with the lack of communicability or impossibility of interference with the environment or with another system. On the contrary, for the notions of system,

environment, self-referentiality and autopoiesis are interconnectePitasi, 2015d and characterize complex systems (Luhmann,1995, p, 35; Folloni and Cabrera, 2015, Folloni, 2016). The system needs the environment in order to be identifiable. This is about the identification of specific characteristics of the system that allows for internal communication and that, based on this toolkit, react to disturbances and create reactions that derive from this program. (Pitasi, 2012, p. 24).

This intention and autopoiesis proposed by Luhmann draw attention to the application of the system and to overcoming the idea that the system must be analyzed from a mostly mechanical and structural perspective of its parts to define its whole (P1 to P4), in a way that only the relations established by the parts would be enough to identify the phenomena. Pitasi proposes a new concept of system based on this referential and conception of social systems as complex systems, which consequently differ from the environment, communicate with it, react to noises and disturbances from their own referential (their codes and programs), making phenomena (that in segregation could not be observed) emerge: «system meant as a high speed, reconfiguration, enormous constellation HSREC.» (Pitasi, 2012, pp. 28, 29). Having this milestone as a point of departure, Andrea Pitasi's position is the emergence of Hypercitizenship as a result of the social changes, and systems theory as a means to react to the new way of life, to the paradigm shift:

This bifurcation implies a potential paradigm shift inside the systemic approach to reframe the conceptual map of global change through a systemic epistemology of the sociology of law and its impact on creating laws which might facilitate and accelerate the technological convergence reshaping a new idea of citizenship, properly Hypercitizenship. (Pitasi, 2012, p. 25).

Understanding the complexity of the system, its resilience potential, its changes due to the disturbances it experiences, among other factors, allows for the analysis of its complexity, and as a consequence, it offers more possibilities to better shape laws and public policies that can fulfill the needs of that system.

3. Emergence of Hypercitizenship

Hypercitizenship emerges as a model taken horizontally and systematically, and it results from the construction of citizenship from four types scientifically analyzed: (i) Beck's cosmopolitan citizen; (ii) scientific citizenship; (iii) entrepreneurial citizenship and (iv) social relations capacity (Pitasi, 2014, pp. 2-3). It is relevant to mention that the use of the expression emergence is on purpose, and it is related with the characteristic that can be observed in complex systems as the «uprising of new coherent structures, patterns and properties over the process of self-organization in complex systems.» (Goldstein, 1998, p.49). This is about properties that appear as a result of interactions and relations of parts or elements of the system that, once analyzed in a dissociative manner, do not manifest. (Folloni, 2016, p. 25; Laszlo and Kripnner, 1998, p. 10). In thPitasi, 2015is way, Hypercitizenship is «the key emergent shape through which the global organized social system is redesigning itself» (Pitasi, 2012, p. 32).

Andrea Pitasi's proposal is that the social system, being globalized, cosmopolitan and organizational, is redefining itself and also redesigning the concept of citizenship based on the notion of "world citizen", one that overcomes the "medieval" criteria of citizenship limited to place of birth and hereditary matters and into the construction of citizenship based on several characteristic milestones of connections that emerge from the global social system. For him, the emergence of citizenship from a multidimensional concept results from the evolution of the social system based on its autopoietic capacity, which should no longer be analyzed and studied by using old methods of social sciences, but by using the most recent theoretical paradigm of systems theory. In this sense, social sciences need to present theoretical models that can diagnose the existing problems and present the most adequate solutions to such problems (Laszlo and Kripnner, 1998, p. 13; Pitasi, 2012, pp. 31-32).

Pitasi explains that there is a bifurcation point (Pitasi, 2012, p. 30; 2013, p. 99; 2014b, p. 9) within the observable social sciences from the notion of Globus, and that based on the existing theoretical toolkit there are two possible paths for citizenship. One of them is thePitasi, 2015 return to old patterns, outlined by the boundaries of the Nation-States,

reiterating the idea that citizenship arises from territorial and hereditary matters, on the opposite way of social changes. The other is Hypercitizenship, which admits the interactions in the Globus and faces the complexity of social systems.

The bigger the variety of systems, (and also the bigger the complexity of the system) the bigger should be the ability of the social scientist to deal with these systems. The paradigm shift that the author points out, especially the shift from the idea of systems/environments/autopoiesis to the idea of enormous constellation system, the author provides paramount considerations for the approach of citizenship. Based on Pitasi's theory, we can admit that within the relations emerging from social changes, citizenship is not restricted to the human being, but also to organizations.

For the author, the development of citizenship within the complex social system depends on the speed that innovations, development of citizenship and technology are incorporated and spread (scientific citizenship) (2012, p. 40).

According to Pitasi, the speed with which knowledge is disseminated, for instance, impacts the relation between possibility of dissemination of such knowledge among people located in more marginal regions (Roger's theory), and the costs of transaction approached by Willianson, specifically as to cognizable economic possibilities of this knowledge (Pitasi 2012, pp. 50, 51, Pitasi and Angrisani, 2013, p. 329). Social changes in the so-called "systemic communication" occur in rather high speed. Citizenship in this system, which is designed from high communication flow, determined by a high level of connectivity and by the growth of knowledge and technology, depends on the reunion of a variety of factors (Pitasi, 2012, p. 34). In this sense, the higher the emergence speed of Hypercitizenship, the bigger the ability to incorporate such social changes, which appears to be higher as the costs of this knowledge are lower.

In order to better elucidate the design of Hypercitizenship, Pitasi explains that it emerges from four different types of citizenship (2012, pp. 32-34; 2014, pp. 3-4).

The first type of citizenship is that of the cosmopolitan citizen. The author extracts this idea from Ulrich Beck's thesis, an author to whom the human condition itself is cosmopolitan (2006, p. 2). Beck ranks some principles of the cosmopolitan citizen, largely

characterized by the breaking of barriers. He explains that cosmopolitanism is the result of a transformation in the globalized world, in which barriers between nations do not limit crises or wars. The cosmopolitan world needs what he calls «cosmopolitan outlook» (Beck, 2006, p. 3). Taking terrorism as an example, the author explains that this has no territorial boundaries. It is a global phenomenon (Beck, 2006, p. 2), and to consider it from territorial theoretical models is a problem, many times a useless one. In this context, there is the need for a paradigmatic shift of the social sciences as assumptions to be able to deal with the complexity of the existing social relations in the systems.

Therefore, Beck explains that one of the principles that cosmopolitanism emerges from is the notion that world crises have already gone over nations' barriers. For instance, an economic crisis that begins in China affects the Brazilian economy, and that is so because indeed the existing connections in the globe demonstrate that there is a network representing the complexity of interactivity in the social system that propagates by means of the high performance of systemic communication.

The economic system holds a function, code and program that determine the way to communicate; it also holds a language, for instance, the standard of a legal tender. These features are not limited by territory; on the contrary, they go beyond the frontiers of the Nation-States. Money exchange is quite a good example of that. In fact, this was the main point of the world economy, as pointed out by Polanyi (2000). It was due to the creation of the gold standard that economic connections initially grew, followed by monetization and the informatics revolution. This confirms even more the concepts of development by Andrea Pitasi, linking it to the ability of levering and involving technological development. The second principle mentioned by Beck refers to knowledge about the cosmopolitan differences – the possibility of identification and limitation of cultural identity issues. This principal also includes the ideas of nationalism, especially by considering the idea of the emergence of a cosmopolitan identity, a global citizen. Such an idea does not overcome a citizen's national identity, but adds to it. The third principle may be outlined by virtual empathy. It involves the existence of cosmopolitan relations exclusively developed in a virtual manner, by means of connection possibilities. It also involves sensibility to issues that we are only

virtually told about, which create a global community, such as humanitarian programs, many of which are maintained with the aid of virtual support. The fourth principle is marked by the impossibility to eliminate frontiers and the attempt to reconstruct old limits. The fifth principle is that of interconnectivity between cultures, identities and nations. It is about the idea that nationalism and provincialism need cosmopolitanism and vice-versa. It is about the systemic idea that the parts and the whole interact and relate with each other.

Besides cosmopolitan citizenship, for a sketch of Hypercitizenship the author highlights the proposal of a scientific citizen. For him, the idea of citizenship, science and technology are linked through the social system, which is supplied by means of the educational system. This is the current means for social mobility and insertion of people in economic and work relations (Pitasi, 2012, p. 3). One cannot conceive the possibility of citizenship without education, as one cannot also imagine life without knowledge and technology. Quite the contrary, social relations are defined more and more through the growth and improvement of science and technology.

The third concept that is required is the social abilities of citizens, the emergence of communities deriving from networks created by citizens, which will actually shape up organizations. This is the ability of creating connections among the world citizens.

Finally, the fourth concept is that of the entrepreneur, that is, the emergence of innovative ideas and of the citizen who undertakes actions based on technology and knowledge.

Considering all that, we can affirm that Hypercitizenship appears as an emerging model based on the social system, the communication flow and the interactivity of the system, which allows for tangible and intangible connections that need to have law as support for the regulation of these new relations, no longer restricted to material and structural matters. For instance, how can law respond to the creation of an international common currency? At the moment, Bitcoin appears as a virtual currency (with no frontiers) that does not depend on a banking institution in order to exist and to serve financial transactions. What is the role of organizations in relation to this new form of money? The theoretical model presented by Pitasi recognizes the existence of new relations as a stimulus for a response from law in order to "maintain expectations" (Luhmann, 2004, pp. 14-15).

4. Hypercitizenship as a model to analyze development

Considering Hypercitizenship as the emerging model over which the global social system has been redesigning itself, development acquires new contours and mainly a leading role. It is believed that one can use the theoretical referential presented to relate Hypercitizenship and development in two ways, thus complementing each other.

The first one is established from the need to promote development as an assumption of Hypercitizenship. Access to conditions to acquire knowledge and technology is an example of that, and it may also be a criterion for evaluation of development (formal education access index), one of the factors that allows for the emergence of Hypercitizenship (scientific citizen). In this sense, it can be affirmed that there is a direct and proportional connection between the potential of leverage of development and the potential of leverage of Hypercitizenship. The bigger the development, the higher the possibility for Hypercitizenship to emerge as a model that derives from the redesign of the social system.

It is in this sense that Pitasi sets the seven platforms of the «global development», which in his point of view must be the focus of elaborated policies, aiming at the intention to maximize Hypercitizenship: the creation of currency standards and evaluation; viability of global communication through satellite; creation and spread of bio-technologies, as well as extraplanetary technologies; creation of platforms of common linguistic communication; the making-up of catalogs of contents and evolution of capitalism (2012, p. 45).

Inclusion of the themes mentioned here in the agenda of States as required for the development of policies that can deal with the emergence of Hypercitizenship is inevitable and paramount so it can be possible for dealing with the complexity of relations and due to the results of new technologies over society (Pitasi, 2012, p. 46).

According to this, the bigger the development of a country, the more it can make for inclusion and emergence of Hypercitizenship possible. This relation leads to the second form of bound between the concepts, which refers to the need for a change in the notion of economic development or even restricted to the territoriality of States.

If leverage of development allows for leverage of Hypercitizenship, this concept also emerges from the changes that arise from the redesign of the global social system. Consequently, there is the need for a theoretical approach that can fulfill the changes mentioned here, overcoming the hierarchical, structural, vertical proposal that has been built since the Industrial Revolution. This is pretty much the sense that Folloni (2014) sets when he is in favor of the need for an interdisciplinary approach to the notion of sustainable development in relation to the complexity of the subject, which requires a break with disciplinary ties of the subject.

Based on this theoretical proposal in which society is becoming more constantly characterized by immaterial connections, and that the social system works within communication flows instead of structural forms (Pitasi, 2012, p. 17), the concept of development should catch up with such changes. Immaterial matters that were formerly dispensable for the notion of development, such as cultural development, emerge as being fundamental for outlining the notion of development, and as a consequence the role of law for promoting and insuring such development also changes in a global scale.

In this sense, it is possible for one to build the idea of development to be taken horizontally. In a similar manner to the concept of Hypercitizenship previously approached, the idea of what we could call Hyperdevelopment also emerges.

For a long time, development was attached to the idea of economic growth (Furtado, 2009), to the determined parameters the world development aimed at, and the influence of the European and North American economic growth. The emergence of industrial capitalism started with the Industrial Revolution (Polanyi, 2000, Furtado, 2009) maximized the economic model that pointed to development from economic parameters at large. For no other reason did the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) work as the main index for measuring the development of a country (Sen, 2000).

Such a proposal ended up segregating the Nation-States as developed and underdeveloped, which according to many people comes from the discourse of American president Truman, who categorized the world in developed and developing countries, as a way to verticalize that concept attached to economic growth (Folloni, 2014).

One of the aspects that drew attention for verticalization and reduction of the notion of development was the harmful socio-environmental result of the uncontrolled economic growth (Beck, 2006a; Harding, 2009; Leff, 2001). In addition, other dimensions of the notion o development were considered to, as the social aspect, the cultural aspect. All of them as a complex approach of development, which could noPitasi, 2015t be reduced to the idea of economic growth.

The *Declaration of Right to Development* (1986) emerges as the result of a process that can be observed since the issuing of the Charter of the United Nations – which gave origin to the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* – in which the concept of development overcame vertical and stuck contours in order to include other perspectives, such as social, economic, cultural, or environmental in a systemic way. Therefore, as well as social changes demonstrated that citizenship gets new contours from the notion of cosmopolitan, entrepreneurial, social and scientific citizenship, it can be considered that development also emerges from the convergence of social development, economic development and cultural development, not considering these as limits to other possibilities.

In this context, the idea of economic growth itself is changed. Csepeli points out, for instance, that there must be a fourth industrial revolution, so that we can understand the needs of production standards in the current world, not only in terms of quantity, but in terms of high connectivity among people. As the author states: «the development of the new economy occurs in a breath-taking speed» (2017, p. 10). And this is only one of the aspects of development to get a new meaning.

Within the perspective brought up for analysis in this piece of work, it can be considered that the social system has evolved as seen from the internal processes that lead it to evolutionary changes and to the unpredicted emergence phenomena (Pitasi, 2012, p. 23). In this sense, the notion of development emerging from connections evolved according to the evolution of the systemic theory of the social system, producing connections that are decisive for its conceptualization.

Development is then defined as a process that is no longer attached to the time linearity of the proposal of economic progress (Capella, 1998, pp. 25-30; Folloni, 2014, p. 68).

Therefore, evolution of the concept of development that must follow the evolution of the social system, in the sense applied by Luhmann, demands a theoretical toolkit that is able to deal with the complexity that derives from such evolution (Luhmann, 1995, pp. 24-26). The shift of paradigm from the part/whole to the paradigm system/environment and more recently to the system of enormous constellation shows that the evolution of the social system implies the recognition of the complexity of the system, in a way that hierarchical, vertical and linear criteria are no longer able to fulfill the above mentioned evolution. This can be observed, for instance, in the *Declaration of Right to Development* by the UN, in 1986, which encompasses a set of complex criteria and the necessary correlation of such criteria, as well as the need for a continuous process for its reach, involving the commitment of all States, and breaking with territorial boundaries.

By making a parallel between the idea of emergence of Hypercitizenship, it is understood that development is inserted as a facilitating process of such a change, which implies a change of the social system itself.

The idea of Modern Science of development can be compared to what the author names "Neofeudal Scenario" of citizenship (Pitasi, 2012; 2014; 2015), the hierarchical proposal of development, supplied in a stratified manner, within the territorial boundaries of the limits of the State. This does not mean supporting the elimination of assessment criteria of development, as it can be observed from the rankings of GDP and HDI, but constructing in a systematic way the idea of development that has been changing according to the interactions that occur in the global social system. It is from the idea of changing the previously formulated paradigm that Pitasi's observation can be inserted

Brazil, Russia, India and China (the so-called BRIC) are not growing at a higher speed than USA or the UE because they are reproducing our economic model to reach our same wealth level; they are reconfiguring the rules of the business-enterprise science-technology game by drawing new theoretical-juridical distinctions and new radical operations. That is why the link between RING Singularity (RS) and Legal System Attractivity (LSA) can, and someway must, be reframed though the paradigm shifts from the "human condition" (HC) to the "post-human" one (PHC), and then to the "hyper-human" one (HHC) as the

convergent technologies dramatically and powerfully reshape the ideas of humanity and mankind. (Pitasi, 2014c, p. 8).

The development proposal that encompasses the complexity of the current society needs to catch up with its cosmopolitan character. What can be seen is a connected and digitalized world, so that verticalization or restriction of the idea of development that works in a way that is restricted to territorial boundaries risks not to keep the same speed of the social changes that occurs in real life. And law is a fundamental instrument to catch up with the complexity of the relations between social systems. It is the job of the scientist of law and the legislator to be conscious about such complexity and to structure law so that it can fulfill the needs of the complexity of the system. It is in this sense that Pitasi defends the point that «law becomes one of the à la carte products to be bought by browsing a global catalogue (Mundus) surfing on a technological global platform (Globus)» (2013, p. 318).

References List

Beck U. (2006a). *La sociedad del riesgo global*. Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno.

Beck U. (2006b). *The cosmopolitan vision*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bonazzi M., Di Simone V., eds. (2015). *Redesigning worldwide connection*s. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Byrne D. (1998). *Complex theory and the social sciences: an introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Capella J.R. (1998). *Os cidadãos servo*s. Porto Alegre: S. A. Fabris.

Casado C.M. (2010). Historia de la teoría del caos contada para escépticos. *Encuentros multidisciplinares*, 34: 1. Retrieved from: http://www.encuentros-multidisciplinares.org/ Revistan%C2%BA34/Carlos%20Madrid%20Casado.pdf (19/09/2019)

Cilliers P. (1998). *Complexity and postmodernism: understanding complex system*s. London and New York: Routledge.

Csepeli G. (2017). Unfinished evolution. In Petroccia S., ed., *Between global and local: citizenship and social change*. Bologna: Esculapio.

Dib N.B., Folloni A., Petroccia S. (2018). *Development As Citizenship Expansion. A systemic approach to the globalizing law system*. Curitiba: Editora Íthala.

Luhmann N. (2004). *Law as a social system*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Luhmann N. (2006). *Social systems.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Folloni A. (2014). A complexidade ideológica, jurídica e política do desenvolvimento sustentável e a necessidade de compreensão interdisciplinar do problema. *Revista Mestrado em Direito* (Unifieo, impresso), 41: 63.

Folloni A. (2016). I*ntrodução à teoria da complexidade*. Curitiba: Juruá.

Folloni A., Cabrera M.G. (2015). *Relações entre o direito e o ambiente social em Niklas Luhmann e Gunther Teubner*. Universitas JUS, Centro Universitario de Brasília, 26, 2: 65. DOI: 10.5102/unijus.v26i2.3461.

Furtado C. (2009). *Desenvolvimento e subdesenvolvimento*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto.

Golstein J. (1999). Emergence as a construct: history and issues. *Journal Emergence*, 1, 1: 49. DOI: 10.1207/s15327000em0101_4.

Harding S. (2008). *Terra viva, ciência, intuição e a evolução de Gaia: para uma nova compreensão da vida em nosso planeta*. São Paulo: Cultrix.

Laszlo A., Krippner S. (1998) Systems theories: their origins, foundations, and development. In J.S. Jordan, ed., *Systems theories and a priori aspects of perception*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science. DOI: 10.1016/S0166-4115(98)80017-4.

Leff H. (2001). *Saber ambiental: sustentabilidade, racionalidade, complexidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes.

Maturana H.R. Varela F.J. (1980). A*utopoiesis and cognition. The Realization of the Living* Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Mitchell M. (2009). C*omplexity: a guided tour*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Petroccia S. (2017). *Between global and local: citizenship and social change*. Bologna: Esculapio.

Pitasi A. (2012). Systemic shifts in sociology. In Pitasi A., Mancini G., eds., *Systemic shifts in sociology*. Saarbrucken: Lambert.

Pitasi A. (2013). A systemic sociological theorem of global evolution. *Revista Direito Econômico Socioambiental*, 4, 1: 92. DOI: 10.7213/rev.dir.econ.socioambienta.04. 001.AO05.

Pitasi A. (2014a). The metaconvergence spiral rethinking sociological working styles systemically. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4, 9: 160. DOI: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v4-i9/1145.

Pitasi A. (2014b). Designing hypercitizenship methodologically. *Revista Direito Econômico Socioambiental*, 5, 1: 2.

Pitasi A. (2014c). *"Hypercitizenship" and the Evolution of a Global Identity*. Communication to XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology (July 13-19, 2014). Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/7371620/Hypercitizenship_and_the_Evolution_of_a_Global_ Identity (27/09/2019).

Pitasi A. (2015). A Systemic Approach to Hypercitizenship. In Bonazzi M., Di Simone V., eds., *Redesigning Worldwide Connections*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Pitasi, A., Angrisani M. (2013). Hypercitizenship and the Evolution of a Global Identity. *Journal of Sociological Research*, 4, 2. DOI: 10.5296/jsr.v4i2.4369.

Polanyi K. (2000). A *grande transformação: as origens de nossa época*. Tradução de Fanny Wrobel. Rio de Janeiro: Compus.

Prigogine I; Stenger I. (1984). *Order out of chaos: man's new dialogue with nature*. New York: Bantam Books.

Sen A. (2000). *Desenvolvimento como liberdade*. Tradução de Laura Teixeira Motta. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

Teubner G. (1993). O *direito como sistema autopoiético*. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.