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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to prepare a complex, reasonably sound, socioeconomic framework of Sustainable Development for the prospective Global Community, along with fading the tenacious modern hegemonic control over the world. To begin with, the present article proposes “rectification of the outrageous hegemonic excesses”, “encouragement of steady human maturation” and “promotion of a viable human future”. According to the present author’s understanding, the hegemonic excesses over centuries have forced the world people at large to suffer from serious insecurity, instability, uncertainty, restlessness and frustration, as well as to emulate aggressiveness, progressiveness and self-righteousness of the hegemonic mentality. Thus, such modern excesses necessary to be rectified by steady maturation of humanity may at least include: “greed-oriented plutocratic, technological and militaristic manipulations”, “aggressive/predatory warfare and market competition”, “self-seeking individual-and-national interests”, “short-run biased irresponsible innovations”. In other words, the present article offers a combination of long-term theoretical, normative, practical frameworks for Sustainable Development that requires a long-term serious support of steadily maturing humanity. Such combined frameworks consist of a hypothetical framework for newly devised theory of “Human Evolution”, a normative framework of “Integral Harmony” – a general social value system amenable to diverse Native Cultures, a general framework of “Long-term Balanced Socioeconomic Development” compatible with Sustainable Development, and a practical/flexible long-term framework of “Integral Lifelong Education”. These mutually-reinforcing frameworks are primarily intended to assist lifelong steady maturation of humanity to rectify the modern hegemonical excesses, as well as to act more effectively for Sustainable Development in the Global Community.
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INTRODUCTION

The United Nations published in 2015 the highly courageous, ambitious and comprehensive Agenda, entitled Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development [UN, 2015]. It includes as many as 17 “comprehensive” Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 169 “specific” Targets. This publication may have, no doubt, attempted to awaken the nonchalant and optimistic people in general to the seriously aggravated human predicament, as well as to encourage further the work of conscientious people in the world. The latter may have long been wishing, aspiring, working for more peaceful, meaningful and comfortable world that humanity deserves. This UN initiative should be applauded as a great feat, regardless of its persuasion would become successful or not. It is, indeed, an awesome challenge to break-through the ever-gathering mental and physical barriers of deeply-inculcated modern/contemporary values and ideologies that justify the on-going plutocracy-driven power structure with insincere governance of high-handed power politics. Such contemporary power structure is called here “Big Market” that refers primarily to the powerful, complex, hegemonical leadership in the contemporary world.

The governance as such may rely heavily on aggressive competition and incessant changes as a means of Big Market’s self-justifying ideologies, including “Might makes right”, “The winner takes all”, “free market competition” and “creative destruction” (among other things). For example, the commonly used economic term, “free market competition” is a rhetorical phrase fabricated with a “good ring” to it. This phrase...
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may have almost always forced the poor and the weak into extremely unfair aggressive/predatory market competition. Another frequently used phrase, “creative destruction”, encourages incessant changes by introducing the fashionable to replace the traditional (including the own holistic Native Culture). Such incessant introduction of the fashionable may be “more profitable” for certain people in the short run but may destroy the “comfortable life” of almost all in the long run. For reasonably “comfortable lifestyle” of humanity, as well as for the long-term oriented Sustainable Development, it is highly important to maintain a reasonably “balanced” co-existence of “the progressive” (new) and “the traditional” (old).

A rapid process of “creative destruction” (meaning “profit-motivated incessant piecemeal innovation”) may have tacitly hidden the motivation of self-enriching and self-empowering Big Market (the contemporary faceless hegemonical power structure). Such short-run incessant and piecemeal innovation for expansion of profit may go directly against the long-term human comfort and Sustainable Development. Such motivation for self-enrichment and self-empowerment may imply the desire that Big Market maintain the global supremacy in market, politics and military preparedness. This selfish motivation inevitably requires incessant and aggressive technological innovations at the cost of both humanity and nature in the long run. Thus, such “hidden motivation” of Big Market may suggest the “hidden disregards” to the well-being of the world people in general as well as to the soundness of the natural environment.

Under the hegemonical governance and manipulation by Big Market, the inevitably biased and reckless activities of Modern Civilization may include “aggressive/antagonistic daily human lifestyles”, “money/material-based inhuman activities”, “short-run oriented, self-seeking and market-controlled human motivations”, “ill-advised/manipulated individualism”, “scientific reductionism for standardization”, “growth-maniacal endless progressivism” (among other things). No doubt, such severe-excessive biases may have imposed on humanity unreasonable burdens, sufferings and miseries. Thus, it is indispensable for the world people in general to question seriously the on-going manipulated lifestyles that ignore the long-run consequences of the short-run biased economic activities. In view of the aggravated human predicament, it is important to understand some historical backgrounds for the conceptualized term “Sustainable Development”.

In a sense, the proposition of “Sustainable Development” may require the world general public to understand it as “the final proposition – an ultimatum” for a reasonably sound survival of humanity. For supporting such proposition, the general public may be encouraged to endeavor earnestly for their personal-and-spiritual maturing, in terms of moral, ethical, cultural, political, intellectual and socioeconomic dimensions. Also, a critical-mind development may be highly important for human maturation to reexamine courageously the on-going social, political, economic and scientific trends, in view of a viable and sound human future. Further, an appropriate global collaboration for such human maturation may require restoration and enrichment of diverse society-specific holistic cultures (abbreviated as “Native Cultures”), together with the respectively sound moral-ethical value systems (abbreviated as “Social Value Systems”). Such respective Social Value Systems in the prospective Global Community must go beyond complementing the hegemonically imposed modern legal systems that cannot understand the highly complex humans worldwide, and help rectify the time-lagged vicious circle between newly immersing criminality and penalty.

For reasonably sound Native Cultures (NCs) and Social Value Systems (SVSs) may reflect some mental-physical complexity of the native residents surrounded by unique geographical-climatic features, local ecosystems, peculiar geopolitics and different varieties of risk factors (among other things). Such NCs and SVSs, suggesting rather than cut-and-dry judgements, may offer variously differentiated recognitions of relational mutuality, empathetic humanity, broad-and-deep perspectives, long-run potentiality and mutuality-empatic lifestyles (among other things). In short, Sustainable Development and the prospective Global Community, requiring long-term, complex and global-local collaborative endeavors, cannot get along with the prevailing combination of hegemonical self-justifying legal system and highly aggressive market value system [Hiwaki, 2022a, 2023].

No doubt, it is a must to have a breakthrough in the hegemonic winner-favoring ruling and aggressively self-justifying greed-oriented
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market competition. Also, in view of the growing environmental hazards worldwide of the reckless Modern Civilization, the short-run aimed profit maximization, in particular, with the customarily ignored/unpaid long-run Social Cost have to be closely examined and urgently rectified in pursuance of Sustainable Development [Hiwaki, 2022b]. For such breakthrough and rectification, it requires the world general public to see through the ongoing winner-favoring deceptive policies, suassions and enforcements of the modern and modernized Governments.

Most likely, such governmental policies and deceptively enticing business advertisements for SDGs, may have undeservingly empowered the plutocratic, profit-driven contemporary power structure (Big Market). All such measures may have enhanced the hegemonical self-justifying one-sided, arrogant, aggressive, extreme views for quick accumulation of wealth-and-power, at the same time, neglecting the consequential long-run local-global Social Cost. Thus, it is indispensable for the world general public to have courage with indomitable determination and effective actions for pursuing Sustainable Development, despite the obstacle of deep-seated core motivational synergism of Modern Civilization (abbreviated as “Modern Core Synergism”), which corresponds to the Market Value System.

The prevailing encouragement of SDGs and Targets by leading governments, multi-national corporations and advertising agencies may mostly lack a holistic viewpoint and long-run framework of the proposed UN Agenda. Such governmental and corporate approaches to the so-called “Sustainable Development” may only to distort and aggravate the human predicament that is already coming to the very limit. In other words, such approaches may distort human lifestyles and endanger life in general, by postponing appropriate and effective actions for the intrinsically globe-wide Sustainable Development.

Thus, in the following discussions, some important historical accounts of Sustainable Development will be taken up first. Secondly, the UN Agenda relevant to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Targets will be briefly introduced. Then, the prevailing modern barriers/obstacles to Sustainable Development will be discussed to emphasize the awesome task of “Transforming Our World”. Thereafter, the present article offers ideas and frameworks, such as Alternative Human Evolution, Integral Harmony, Balanced Socioeconomic Development, and Integral Lifelong Education. Finally, some remarks will be offered to round-up the present discussions. All these discussions for promoting Sustainable Development may clarify the necessity of rectifying contemporary excesses relevant to the reckless Modern Civilization, including aggressive/predatory market competition, short-run-biased economic activities, convenience-chasing lifestyle, insatiable-greed orientation, and on-going marginalization of diverse Native Cultures and Social Value Systems. Such complex discussions will emphasize the utmost importance of human steady maturing in pursuance of Sustainable Development.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND SDGs

In a broad and intrinsic sense, Sustainable Development means an antithesis to the long prevailing “reckless-run” of Modern Civilization. Such antithesis may indicate a softly-placed, unquantifiable “blanket bill”, demanding the long-overdue payment of “ignored/neglected modern debts” to nature and humanity (or, so-called “long-run global Social Cost”). Such “debts” accumulated over modern times may be largely due to the modern hegemonic warfare and short-run market activities, which have compelled the superficial/deceptive “now-orientated” modern thought and conduct. More concretely, the “antithesis” may reveal the long-term “unpaid” globalized Social Cost under the modern supremacy-seeking aggressive technological innovations, industrialization, marketization for inducing and winning the aggressive conflicts and warfare in the process of concentrating wealth and power for the modern hegemonies [Hiwaki, 2022b].

A Brief Background of the Concept “Sustainable Development”

As the furious competition of innovation, industrialization and marketization, in particular, becoming escalated during 1950s-1960s worldwide by the Western industrially advanced nations, many conflicting issues surfaced as regards the on-going industrial development that inflicted visible and tangible damages to the human environment and human health. At that time, the environmental pollution such as water-land-air contamination became visible as well as
human sufferings tangible, many concerned scientists, specialists and researchers began to voice opinions in various academic and business forums. An outstanding international forum was repeatedly offered by the Club of Rome for discussing solution of the pollution issues among conscientious scientists, researchers, politicians and businessmen. The Club of Rome primarily aimed at contributing to solving “the predicament of mankind” that included environmental pollution, nuclear-capacity escalation, population explosion, natural-resource depletion, destruction of traditional values, polarization of income and rapid urbanization, among other things.

In 1972, a well-researched report, *The Limits to Growth* [Meadows et al., 1972], was published from the Club of Rome to awaken people across the world to the serious and complex human predicament. This publication made the Club of Rome well-known and highly esteemed worldwide. In the same year, the United Nations Conference on Human Environment was organized in Stockholm, Sweden, resulting in the *Stockholm Declaration* [UNCHE, 1972]. The *Declaration*, however, placed blame largely on the poor-and-weak: i.e., “In the developing countries most of the environmental problems are caused by under-development” (Item 4). This statement went against the-then widely shared common knowledge that the Western led furious industrialization, modernization and economic globalization at the cost of the developing countries were responsible for most of the environmental and developmental problems of the whole world. Thus, the *Stockholm Declaration* was unpopular among conscientious and well-learned people across the world, as well as scientists and researchers at large.

In 1982, the 2nd UN Conference was held in Nairobi, Kenya, commemorating the 10th anniversary of the 1972 UN Conference in Stockholm, and the *Nairobi Declaration* [UNCHE, 1982] indicated a new recognition of human problems as “the intimate complex interrelationship between environment, development, population and resources” and emphasized that a comprehensive approach to this interrelationship would lead to “environmentally sound and sustainable socio-economic development” (Item 3). As such, the *Nairobi Declaration* sounded generally a fair and balanced statement.

The Declaration’s “Item 9”, however, may have much irritated and angered the Western power structure, for it demanded: “All enterprises, including multinational corporations, should take account of their environmental responsibilities when adopting industrial production methods of technologies, or when exporting to other countries”. In retrospect, the *Nairobi Conference and Declaration* have never been referred to in the following UN Declarations, as if neither of them existed. This may suggest that both the conference and declaration had a low profile or “politically incorrect”, to put it mildly. Perhaps, the UN learned bitterly its powerlessness in relation to the Western power structure and industrial vested-interests.

In December 1983, the-then Secretary General of the United Nations, Jim Mac-Neill, called upon Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland, the previous Prime Minister of Norway, perhaps, due to the unpopular previous two UN Conferences and Declarations for different reasons and, also, because of her outstanding fame and achievements in the field. He asked her to establish and chair a “special independent Commission” (later called “The World Commission on Environment and Development”, “WCED” and/or “Brundtland Commission”). Accepting the extremely challenging task of “a global agenda for change”, despite her already busy schedules, she put together, with furious energy, a highly qualified political and scientific team for a truly independent Commission (consisting of widely different backgrounds of members and a clear majority of members from developing countries).

According to Dr. Brundtland, the Commission was designed to formulate an interdisciplinary, integrated approach to global concerns for common human future. Spending three busy years, working together with the Commission members, travelling, listening, and discussing, *Brundtland Commission* completed its highly reputed report, *Our Common Future* [WCED, 1987] that defined formally the concept of “Sustainable Development” and called for a common endeavor and new norms of behavior at all levels in the interests of all people.

The Commission’s *Our Common Future* with the concept of Sustainable Development served well for the success of the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development (abbreviated...
“UNCED” or “Rio Earth Summit”) held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and offered a principal foundation for the ensuing UN Conferences relevant to Sustainable Development in every ten years, as well as more specific UN Meetings, such as “the 1997 Kyoto Protocol”, “the 2015 Paris Agreement”, and so on. Especially, the profound studies and discussions in the Commission’s *Our Common Future* and the Rio Declaration practically offered almost all the philosophical and moral supports for the UN Agenda of *Transforming Our World* [UN, 2015].

**Changing Definitions of Sustainable Development**

The term “Sustainable Development” addresses, no doubt, to a long-run, complex, worldwide, collaborative socio-politico-economic endeavor that is, unfortunately, highly difficult for the world people in general to aspire for under the contemporary short-run, market-centered, excessively-lenient political stance for economic activities of well-established multinational enterprises. In the prevailing short-run motivated market interpretation of Sustainable Development, there may exist not much difference in the meaning between “economic growth” (short-run) and “economic development” (long-run). This point is highly important, not only in understanding Sustainable Development but also in planning effective actions for Sustainable Development.

According to H. W. Arndt in his book, *Economic Development: The History of an Idea* [Arndt, 1987], the term “development” indicates much more than “growth”. For one thing, he refers to the Stockholm Meeting in September 1969 with Gunnar Myrdal (1974 Nobel Prize recipient in Economics) as chairman, Benjamin Higgins as vice-chairman, and H.W. Singer as rapporteur. The purpose of the Meeting was “to clarify further the role of social factors in development”. Higgins explained the concept “development”, as follows [Hiwaki, 1998]:

“…We assume a collective responsibility to make to development policy and planning”.

Gunnar Myrdal, when he received the 1974 Nobel Prize in Economics, was a Visiting Professor of the Ph.D. Program in Sociology, the City University of New York (CUNY). At his Novel Prize Commemoration Speech to the CUNY audience, he answered simply to the question asked the meaning of “economic development”: *It is a continuous upward shift of all elements of human life*. This complex definition was directly heard by the present author (the-then a Ph.D. candidate in economics) as part of the audience. Although many economic students and researchers in 1940s and 1950s were known to use “economic growth” and “economic development” interchangeably, such complex meaning of “economic development”, like the one quoted above, however, became a standard understanding of economic profession toward the end of 1960s and thereafter. Perhaps, such meaning of “economic development” owes very much to Myrdal’s well-learned definition.

In accordance with such complex meaning, the Brundtland Commission offered its original definition of Sustainable Development, as follows [WCED, 1987]: “Sustainable Development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (p. 8)”. This definition was supplemented by an important explanatory statement of the Commission: “It (Sustainable Development) is not a fixed state of harmony, but rather a process of change in which the exploitation of resources, the direction of investments, the orientations of technological development, and the institutional changes are made consistent with future as well as present needs (p. 9)”. Regarding the strategy for Sustainable Development, the Commission explained: “In its broadest sense, the strategy for sustainable development aims to promote harmony among human beings and between humanity and nature (p. 65)”.

In 2002, an additional clarification was offered to the meaning of Sustainable Development at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), organized by the UN and held in Johannesburg, South Africa. The *Johannesburg Declaration* indicated a collective responsibility of the “three-pillar” simultaneous pursuance at local, national, regional and global levels for Sustainable Development [WSSD, 2002]:

“…”We assume a collective responsibility to
advance and strengthen the interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars of Sustainable Development – economic development, social development and environmental protection – at the local, national, regional and global levels (Article 5)"

More concretely, the UN published *Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, briefly specifying the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [UN, 2015]. Captions of such SDGs are listed for the reader’s convenient reference, as follows:

- Goal 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere
- Goal 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture
- Goal 3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
- Goal 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all
- Goal 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
- Goal 6. Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all
- Goal 7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all
- Goal 8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
- Goal 9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation
- Goal 10. Reduce inequality within and among countries
- Goal 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable
- Goal 12. Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns
- Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
- Goal 14. Conserve and sustainable use of the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development
- Goal 15. Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and holt biodiversity loss
- Goal 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels
- Goal 17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.

**CONTEMPORARY OBSTACLES TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

It may not be farfetched to say that the late pre-modern and early modern conditions within the West European region represented the vortex of hegemony-seeking violence with aggressive behaviors of monarchies, religious organizations, and endlessly expanding greed of adventurous-and-violent merchants. For the region started experiencing the furious socio-politico-economic changes, along with the partially-overlapped, complex processes of Renaissance, Reformation, Enlightenment and Industrial Revolution. The highly volatile, strained and warring relations in the region were compounded with the hegemonic rivalry among the-then powerful nations within the region. Also, such nations were, perhaps, strongly enticed and stimulated by learning availability outside the region of resource-rich territories without strong military capacity. In order to escape the “blind alley” in Europe, some Western Powers, driven by their hegemonic ambition, started looking beyond Europe for obtaining precious metals, natural resources and colonies for their rapid industrialization. Perhaps, such industrialization was considered the way to mass-produce superior weapons, capital goods and export products, all which could contribute to winning the hegemonic competition.

**Modern One-Sided Aggressive Ideologies**

The then on-going socio-politico-economic instabilities, representing the geopolitical reality of Western Europe, gave rise to mutual distrust, animosity, aggressiveness, violence and warfare. In the meantime, as the recurrent aggressive struggles and violent warfare became more-or-less deadlocked, the Western military violence was redirected to the resource-rich and poorly-defended non-European societies/countries. Now, by conquering, plundering, colonizing and exploiting them, as quickly and cheaply as possible, the aggressive Western nations were
amply rewarded over time to reinforce their hegemony-seeking industrialization with the increased supply of abundant natural resources from their acquired colonies.

Along with such self-seeking, violent and aggressive exploitation of rich human-and-material resources after acquisition of expansive territories and colonies, the hegemony-seeking nations attempted tenaciously and thoroughly to destroy the native cultures, values, beliefs and prides of the respectively defeated peoples and societies. Further, the hegemony-seeking nations started imposing their own rules, beliefs and ideologies to compel them to emulate such highly aggressive, cruel and self-righteous Modern Civilization and lifestyles. As a consequence, the human world has become inundated with growing, long-lasting, bottomless, uncontrollable and antagonistic energies that had arisen from bitterness, sadness, misery, rancor, fury, indignation and resentment of the peoples and societies trampled and oppressed.

Most likely, modern ideologies were closely related to motivation-arousing aggressive ideas, such as “free market competition”, “efficient production”, “priority of private property”, “short-run profit maximization”, “division-oriented reductionism”, “individual self-interest” and “national self-interest” (among other things). All these ideas could encourage aggressive/predatory competition for short-run economic growth to amass wealth and power quickly for the purpose of pursuing hegemonic power, without conscience and concern of the long-run accumulation of Social Cost worldwide. (Here, one should not lose sight of the overwhelming silence over the long-run neglected problems, to be discussed in the following Subsection). All such modern ideas/ideologies, mostly favoring the Western industrially advanced nations, have been inculcated tenaciously, popularized worldwide and, often, compelled other societies/peoples to adopt.

In a sense, the book entitled, The Wealth of Nations written by Adam Smith [Smith, 1937/1776], was more than a blessing to the self-justifying modern/contemporary power structures (“Pax Britannica”, “Pax Americana” and “Big Market”). Smith and his followers (so-called “classical economists” heavily influenced by the Enlightenment) emphasized the theoretical concepts, in particular, “laissez-faire”, “individual self-interest”, “invisible hand” and “division of labor”. Before delving further into such theoretical concepts, the present author thinks of a precaution necessary in defense of Adam Smith, a keen-and-broad observer of peoples and societies. For he suggested a special influence “of the own Native Culture” on important economic decision-making. The relevant statement in The Wealth of Nations is, as follows: -

“Every individual is continuously exerting himself to find out the most advantageous employment for whatever capital he can command. It is his own advantage, indeed, and not that of the society, which he has in view. But the study of his own advantage naturally, or rather necessarily leads him to prefer that employment which is most advantageous to the society (p. 241)”.

Once the common property and identity (or, own Native Culture) suffers a severe damage, however, the “Culture-bound mutual trust and centripetal force” may fade away. Then, many individuals may detach themselves from the “Cultural influence” and begin to assume selfish, defensive and/or disorderly attitudes seldom known before. Such attitudes may reflect their “disrespectfulness” to the society and own government. Also, such attitudes may condition the society to suffer from a serious lethargy that entails the individuals’ moral, spiritual and intellectual downfall. In our contemporary world, where diverse Native Cultures have been marginalized or ignored, the above classical concepts (“laissez-faire”, “individual self-interest”, “invisible hand” and “division of labor”), can be intentionally and wrongly reinterpreted, disguised, camouflaged and broadened in meanings with the use of sophistry and rhetoric for the self-justification of modern power structures and accomplice (or, “modern vested-interests”).

The classical concept of “laissez-faire”, to begin with, may have originally meant to “discourage unproductive governmental restrictions and controls” of private economic activities. Such initial meaning may have been expanded to imply “strong encouragement of self-seeking liberty and freedom”, such as “free market competition” (for favoring the rich and strong, in particular) to speed up “technological changes and economic growth”, to force “a quick replacement of the old with the new” and even to marginalize silently “the poor and
weak”. Also, “free trade”, perhaps, has been pursued for expansion of wealth-and-power in favor of the modern advanced enterprises, peoples and societies. Moreover, “no governmental intervention” may justify a stronger motivation of “faceless” Big Market to ruling the world.

Second, the classical concept of “individual self-interest” may have originally meant to encourage the people at large to emancipate themselves from the various shackles of religious-and-secular instructions, bans and loyal practices, as well as to behave a little more for the sake of their respective interests and desires. Over time, the concept may have been reinterpreted, more or less, to encourage “individual selfishness and/or greed”. For such self-interestedness may reinforce economic growth to aggrandize the national wealth and power, as well as to enrich Big Market.

Thirdly, the classical concept of “invisible hand” may have originally meant to suggest a “theoretically wonderous market function” for equilibrating the aggregate demand and supply of various items (“goods and services” and “industrial resources”) without “intentional” management by the market participants. Such abstract concept of “theoretical-virtual market” (not a well-acustomed “market place” in town) was newly introduced by the “classical economics” for the sake of theoretical power of persuasion. The concept, however, may now be used as a tool of encouraging aggressive/predatory “free market competition” that conduces to short-run economic growth, maximization of profits and rapid accumulation of the winner’s wealth-and-power.

Finally, the classical concept of “division of labor” may have originally implied “specialized collaboration of workers” to produce each and all items for increasing quantity and enhancing quality of output. Such concept may have come to suggest a sort of reductionism, meaning “reducing specialized work to “standardized units of cheap-labor” for short-run profit-maximization. Such “division of labor” may simply encourage modern “dry” scientific reductionism to a “lifeless” elementally particle. Furthermore, contemporary “division of labor” has also encouraged “global division of labor”, even suggesting “global division of humanity”, by means of prioritizing the world “cheapest possible labor” for maximization of profit.

An important common feature underling such disseminated ideas/ideologies may be self-justification of “the winner” (“Big Market”, collectively), amassing wealth and power mostly at the sacrifice of “the loser-and-weak” in the world, as well as at the cost of “the voiceless-provider” of natural resources (or, devastating the “global environment”). The winner’s self-justification was obviously inlayed in sophistry and rhetoric, as well as in modern logics, rationales, perspectives, motives and worldviews (among other things). No doubt, it has been important for Big Market to encourage the world people to emulate “the winner” for “short-run” profit maximization.

Indeed, other common features of importance may include the modern ideologies, such as “endless search for efficiency”, “convenience orientation” and “insatiable wants”, which were relevant to another ideology of aggressive/predatory “free market competition” (likened to “fighting in a battle-field”), conducing to rapid accumulation of wealth-and-power for hegemonic preoccupation, at the cost of the future human generations. Such hastiness was symbolized by the “short-run efficient winning” in battle fields with “superior military force”, modelled after the conquests and plunders outside of Europe. The ideologies of “convenience orientation” and “insatiable wants” may have strong relevance to “incessant piecemeal innovations” as well as to “continual short-run economic growth”, both of which lead to “rapid profit making” for “wealth-and-power accumulation”. It is important to add here that reasonable improvement of efficiency and convenience should be profoundly appreciated, when resulting from the steady maturation of humanity, as well as when offering long-run comfort and wellbeing to the world people in general.

The present argument against the contemporary ideologies, such as excessive “short-run efficiency”, “convenience orientation” and “insatiable wants”, is to warn the reader to be keenly aware that Big Market has long compelled peoples and countries across the world to be involved too much in “economic efficiency”, “profit maximization”, “fashion orientation”, “convenience chasing”, “insatiable wants” and “economic growth”, as well as endless “piecemeal innovations” and “incessant model changes”. More generally, such “modern ideological indoctrination” has compelled the world people in general to follow and emulate almost blindly the lifestyle, motivation,
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perspective and worldview of the modern/contemporary power structure.

Such hegemonic phenomenon of contemporary “methodological ideologies” has been, no doubt, destroying the global diversity of Native Cultures, Social Value Systems and decent human lifestyles, which are most necessary for reasonably sound human survival. Thus, hegemonical encouragement of excessively-biased ideological phenomena, as we have already seen, have ironically created both the necessity of Sustainable Development and the prohibitive barrier of Big Market to such important endeavor. Since the excesses have grossly enlarged the long-run unpaid Social Cost (to be explained in the next Subsection), compelling all societies and peoples in the world to suffer increasingly and unbearably.

Short-run Approach and Long-run Unpaid Social Cost

Social Cost: Private Cost and External Cost

The term “Social Cost” is an important economic concept that has been known and discussed by economic profession. For example, Social Cost is defined clearly in the book, entitled Microeconomics (and also Macroeconomics) by Martin Bronfenbrenner, et al.: “Social Cost is the total value of opportunities foregone because of the production and consumption of an item. The total value includes both private cost and external cost” [Bronfenbrenner, et al. 1984]. The “private cost” is often interpreted as indicating mostly short-run cost paid directly by the buyer and seller of the item. The “external cost”, basically-and-largely long-run cost, usually ignored in the “short-run orientation” of production and consumption, and its due payment largely postponed forever (meaning accumulated endlessly as unpaid long-run Social Cost”).

More often than not, Social Cost is only dealt with as short-run phenomenon to confine its analysis at a conceptual level of Microeconomics, on the assumption-and-excuse that “long-run Social Cost” is difficult to assess. This is to pretend or presume conveniently that the “external long-run cost” has not arisen, although nobody can deny/nullify something that actually happened. Such pretension and/or presumption may not only reflect the difficulty of calculating and assorting between paid and unpaid Social Cost, but also reflect the unwillingness of the parties concerned to think of and/or pay such cost (in view of profit-and-utility maximization). In a sense, such treatment suggests that the producers and consumers concerned have nonchalantly assumed that Mother Nature kindly took care of the unpaid Social Cost, or irresponsibly pretended/presumed no such long-run Social Cost existed. This kind of treatment may reflect the nonchalant-optimistic unthinking and irresponsible attitude of humans and human organizations involved.

Such pretension, treatment and irresponsibility, however may have so far implicitly encouraged to exempt or overlook the payment of long-run Social Cost that arose especially from drastic innovative activities, for example, the “testing-and-creating” indiscriminate mass-murder weaponry, not to mention underground businesses, terrorist campaigns, violent conflicts and warfare (among other things). No doubt, such extremely aggressive politico-economic activities in modern times may have produced an extremely heavy short-and-long-run “globe-wide Social Cost” (or “Unaccountable External Cost”) and buried it irresponsibly as the usual practice of the “modern hegemonic force of habit with high-handed power politics” [Hiwaki, 2023]. Such hegemonic force of habit in modern times was initiated by Pax Britannica, solidified by Pax Americana and reinforced by the “faceless” contemporary power structure - Big Market. All such Hegemonic Powers have relied heavily/excessively on plutocracy, technology and military force for manipulating the world people and augmenting the hegemonic wealth-and-power recklessly to give rise to the incalculable/unfathomable External Cost (or, unpaid long-term global Social Cost).

Further, such ideological crimes of pretension and irresponsibility also suggest that almost all the people (producers and consumers in modern times) may have deemed no such “long-run Social Cost” to arise. The presumption behind their producing and consuming attitudes may have suggested that all new innovations and modern new fashion-oriented products could be exempted from long-run Social Cost, owing to the prevailing winner’s ideology, “Might makes right”. This sort of presumption may call to mind the famous (or notorious) saying, often attributed to the prominent British Economist, John Maynard Keynes: “In the long-run, everybody is dead”.
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Pursuing Sustainable Development, however, it is highly important to discourage/prohibit all seemingly irresponsible/hazardous innovations in the short and long runs. Also, it is equally important to find an appropriate method, as soon as possible, to reveal the unpaid Social Cost for repayment/compensation by the major parties responsible, in order to reduce and avoid future damages to humanity and nature. It is highly probable that our modern/contemporary short-run approach to Social Cost may have largely reflected the aggressive military ideology, “The winner takes all”, as well as the short-run oriented, aggressive business mentality, aiming at “profit-maximization/cost-minimization” and “creative-destruction” is, based on excessive “efficiency-orientated cheap-labor” for the quick grasp of wealth and power”. The self-seeking short-run business mentality may also suggest a deep-seated mean mentality of “take money and run”, to avoid/escape uncertain long-run costs, risks and/or blames. The self-seeking mentality may further reflect largely the motive to self-justify by adhering to the “short-run stance” relevant to incessant and piecemeal innovations which may often mean nothing but model-changes, quickly hiding dysfunctions and/or ill-effects of the previously produced items based on the hasty innovative activities. In other words, the self-justifying short-run business stance may have reinforced the “short-run” self-seeking business activities to induce ironically the deepening vicious circle of environmental devastation and self-degeneration of humanity in the long run.

Practically speaking, such unattended long-run External Cost in modern and contemporary times may imply the excessive reliance on the capacity of Mother Nature and/or the willful neglect of endlessly stacking-up complex, hazardous, social and natural environmental damages worldwide. In a sense, due to the difficulty of grasping the accumulated widespread damages to nature, humanity and human societies, Big Market and the accomplice (many modern/contemporary economic advisers, perhaps, lacking both the “long-run” perspective and the “big-picture” imagination) might have willfully ignored such complex unpaid long-run Social Cost. Undoubtedly, the hugely accumulated unpaid long-run Social Cost may have, directly or indirectly, exerted damages to almost all the modern/contemporary Native Cultures, Social Value Systems, humanities and natural environment. Therefore, it may have been assumed much safer for Big Market to be silent about the complex long-run problems and blames, by emphasizing the importance of short-run “economic growth” as well as by feigning total ignorance about long-run Social Cost.

Also, many mainstream neo-classical economists, perhaps, have not wished to reveal the weakness of their academic discipline and/or their scientific inability of dealing persuasively with the long-run, complex, unpaid Social Cost. Or, they have been unwilling to expose their poor knowledge how to cope with theoretical inconsistency between Microeconomics and Macroeconomics. Further, some of them may have wanted to keep pretend nothing serious happening as a result of such long-run unpaid Social Cost, in the hope of getting along with the adamantly short-run inclined Big Market, without rocking the boat. For it is most likely that, knowing such profound weakness of mainstream economics and economists, Big Market may have kept its stance, by loudly insisting on “short-run efficiency”, “incessant innovations”, “growing convenience”, “fashion emphasis”, “profit maximization” and “continuous short-run economic growth”. Most likely, Big Market may have taken advantage of the modern materialistic rationality and reductionistic methodology, which insist on “perfect proof”. It is, perhaps, almost impossible to discuss long-run future events and non-material researches, strictly following the idea of the “perfect proof” or the “perfect counter-proof”. The contemporary recent development of quantum theory, however, is wisely-or-unwisely suggesting: “Nothing happens in the universe unless some observer become conscious of it” [Hiwaki-Hassard, 2019].

Nevertheless, the long-run unpaid Social Cost may have already been accumulated almost beyond the possible repayment/compensation after rampant-and-continuous “short-run oriented” human willful activities worldwide. Most likely, a result of such willfulness is now scorching such human nonchalant neglects for the sake of profit, convenience and insatiable wants. Now, the world people are facing, perhaps, the phenomena called “Boomerang Effects”. Such phenomena may correspond to today’s escalated man-made disasters, due to the human egotistic industrial, economic and military activities for greed and hegemony.

The phenomena “Boomerang effects” in the
present analogy may have, most likely, reflected the contemporary “invisible hand” of the “short-run biased” global market system. In a sense, our extremely unfair “free market competition” has decided almost everything for or against the people at large by such “invisible hand” (or, “balancing power”) [Hiwaki, 2023]. In other words, the contemporary “invisible hand” has invited serious “Boomerang Effects” as a result of our “short-run” oriented, distorted, aggressive, irresponsible, unthinking, immature and, often, brutal human activities worldwide. In other words, such “Boomerang Effects” may consist of disastrous climatic changes, rampant pandemic, increasing means of terrorist activities, politico-economically cornered Russia’s military aggression into Ukraine, the excessive Israel’s indiscriminate retaliation on Hamas in Gaza and, possibly, more serious phenomena to arise.

**Examples of Unpaid Long-run Social Cost**

For the purpose of helping ourselves mature, for example, we can undertake a mental exercise by means of the “well-known” economic terms, “goods” and “services”, and the less-known opposite terms, “bads” and “mal-services”. Goods and services (to be expressed in the following as “G”) are treated as “value-added” when produced newly. They are also recorded as part of the yearly total value-added (called GDP) of the relevant economy/country. The latter terms, “bads” and “mal-services” (to be expressed in the following as “B”), implying negative values (maybe called “value-deducted”), however, are usually not deducted from the relevant GDP. Thus, only G may be considered worthy to mention, because of its positive values in market.

Now, a question is in order: “Do all G offer positive values as recorded in the GDP?” The answer is emphatically “No”. For example, guns when legally produced and sold in market were recorded as “positive value-added”, even though they were used/abused for crimes in the same country during the same fiscal year. The criminal use of guns results in a “negative value B”, but the GDP remain unchanged. In this example, such “negative values B” may accumulate over time as part of unpaid long-run Social Cost.

A much more awesome example may be represented by “aggressive warfare”. For the weaponry produced as G in the past and present times by the presently warring nations may be used against each other to inflict not only physical damages, enormous fatalities of soldiers and other citizens, and lingering serious mental sufferings, as well as devastation of properties and human environment. In view of the global standpoint, all such used G should be recorded as “negative values B”, accompanied with all the other uncompensated human sufferings, material damages and environmental devastation (B). Strictly speaking, all such B should be, at least, approximated as the unpaid long-run global Social Cost, for the sake of assessing the totality of “opportunity cost” (B) inflicted by such warfare. More important, the world general public should know that any warfare is nothing but extremely futile and miserable, as far as the people at large are concerned.

All such damages, losses, mental sufferings and miseries (B) have naturally spread beyond the borders of initial two warring countries, especially when many other countries are drawn into the warfare (such as, WW I and WW II). In order to avoid the recurrence in the future of world war, the world general public, perhaps, need to be emancipated from the aggressiveness based on modern ideologies, as well as from the modern hegemonic force of habit. Also, the world general public need to be awakened to the importance of more natural, humanly steady maturation. A rapidly growing number of matured people in the world will, no doubt, go against warfare more strongly and acquire a stronger power of persuasion to influence the world leadership away from running into warfare. For steadily matured/discrete people know warfare as the most evil, vicious and barbarous human act that robs and destroys everything precious from the present and future humanity.

A primary importance for discouraging the production of “negative values B” worldwide is to encourage steady moderation of the today’s excessive exploitations and uses of natural resources for the seemingly wasteful and reckless contemporary lifestyles. Most likely, such wasteful and reckless lifestyles are closely related to “profit-motivated and supremacy-driven incessant technological innovations”, “aggressive/predatory market competition”, “convenience-chasing insatiable wants”, “excessively extravagant consumption”, “underground illegal businesses”, “a variety of terrorist activities”, “violent conflicts” and “aggressive warfare”. So far, the unaccounted
“negative values B” may have grossly increased worldwide, without reasonable grasp of neither governments nor international agencies. By an escalated accumulation of the unknown and unpaid long-run global Social Cost, we are already undergoing unexpected and ever serious “Boomerang Effects” that may, sooner or later, hold havoc on the world people in general.

The short-run view and approach adopted/practiced “authentically” by the contemporary hegemonic leadership (Big Market) may clearly reflect the winner’s ideology: i.e., “Might makes right”. Thus, such willful modern/contemporary view and approach may have favored the winner at the cost of the loser, often, regardless of the former’s means and tricks used for “winning” in warfare and market. No wonder, such aggressive winners may have, often, made a display of “Might makes right” and “The winner takes all”. Nevertheless, continually accumulated unpaid global Social Cost will not just fade away. Importantly, such huge “unaccounted and unpaid” human debts, if not checked soonest possible, would be “transformed”, sooner or later, into deadly “Boomerang Effects”, such as unexpected complex natural disasters as well as a fatal warfare of human making.

Summary Discussion on Long-run Social Cost

More generally speaking, items produced and consumed in market as well as in warfare are largely dual-character items, representing both G and B. Even an item made exclusively for “positive value G” may eventually turn into “waste or garbage (B)”. Also, almost all positive values G, including energy-oriented resources and products (for example), when consumed, may be transformed into negative value B, depending on the hidden intention of producers, consumers and governments.

Although the terms “bads and mal-services (B)” suggest largely “ill-intended/illegal items, waste and garbage”, even a yearly increment of “B” may cause both short-run and long-run damages to human moral energy, mental-physical health, human integrity, national governance and/or human environments. Such damages may, over time, accumulate more rapidly as unpaid long-run Social Cost of each society and the world, with the spread of anti-social activities, such as a variety of crimes, domestic-international terrorism, mental-and-physical violence and civil-and-international wars, in which victims are mostly uncompensated. When the world is very much disordered by such anti-social activities, the yearly production of “B” worldwide may exceed vastly the total yearly value of “G”. Such important data may not be produced at all, leaving the unknown sum total of long-run unpaid Social Cost, as long as the modern hegemonical force of habit dominates over the world.

If we stick to only the annual accounting of “positive value-added” (GDP) without accounting “negative value-added” (Social Cost), it may continually and grossly distort the relationship between “G” and “B”, as well as between humanity and nature. It is well-known that economic calculations and data may often mislead the people at large. For all the “market-accounted” production and consumption are usually recorded as “G” (positive value-added), without referring to “B” under the contemporary market-centered “positivist” accounting.

At the same time, most of the “non-market” production and consumption are willfully ignored, even though they are humanly and economically important activities. Such activities, including “household-confined” tasks/chores and “non-market” give-and-take, are almost totally ignored in the economic data, as if they were non-existent and valueless. From these examples, we may correctly conjecture that almost all government-produced economic data have been intended for political manipulation of the people at large, by deceptively emphasizing the importance of market system.

Delving further into data manipulation in modern times, most of the superiority-oriented industrial and technological activities have been encouraged, undoubtedly, for production of profit opportunities, wealth-and-power accumulation and self-justification of the “winner-favoring” Big Market. Likewise, data collections of such activities may tell the story that the complex, unpaid, long-run Social Cost has been willfully ignored, overlooked and neglected almost entirely. Perhaps, all such phenomena have been, due to the modern general public deeply inculcated (or “brain-washed”) and overwhelmingly misled by means of the short-run market norm (corresponding to the “Market Value System”), encouraging excessively short-run oriented, change/progress-oriented, aggressive, individualistic, self-seeking and materialistic activities (among other things). For most people might have felt
“nothing wrong” by obtaining “as cheap as possible” the natural resources, goods-and-services and human capital (or mental-intellectual-physical resources). This modern human-inclination may suggest that most people have not been much conscious of their probable exploitations of other human beings (in particular, poor-powerless persons worldwide), as well as of the silent Mother Nature.

**Modern Core Synergism with Short-run Market Norm**

**Modern Core Synergism and Market Value System**

It may not be farfetched to say that modern and modernized people at large have long undergone the inculcation and brainwashing by means of the self-justifying norm and obsession of the modern/contemporary aggressive power structure (“Big Market”) that heavily relies on plutocracy, technology and militarism. Prominent among such mutually-reinforcing norm and obsession may include a variety of modern/contemporary excesses. As already referred to in the above, they are: short-run orientation, free market competition, insatiable wants, accumulation of wealth-and-power, supremacy-oriented technological development, endless search for efficiency, privatization of property, promotion of short-run convenience, encouragement of aggressive spirits, individualized self-seeking activities, market-based profit maximization, hegemony-oriented violence, and disdainfulness of the loser/victim (among other things).

Based on such representative examples, the core motivational synergism in Modern Civilization -“Modern Core Synergism” (the present author’s conceptual term referring to modern dogmas) is taken up in this section as a major obstruction to Sustainable Development. Also, the Modern Core Synergism (MCS) has given rise to the “Market Value System (implying a framework of mutually-reinforcing modern “methodological ideologies”). The greater part of MCS was based largely on the pre-modern adventurous, chaotic, massive, reckless and revolutionary re-organizations of the Western sphere of Europe, which resulted in the partially overlapped Renaissance, Reformation, Enlightenment and Industrial Revolution. Such re-organizations and revolutionary vortices, variously referring to changes in political philosophy, religious reformation, trade relations and academic fractionation, which entailed furious military violence for hegemonical competition.

Such hegemonical competition may have encouraged one-sided military aggressions, missionary work on the so-called “pagans”, exploitation of resources outside Europe, forceful international-trade expansion, imposition of Western rationality, methodologies, ideologies and values on the other. Industrial Revolution, in particular, expanded Western economic activities with the Enclosure Acts and the introduction of “market economics” across the world. All such variety of pre-modern to early modern aggressive/forceful “political, religious and market activities”, in particular, were successfully engineered to aggrandize the wealth and power of the Western vested-interests. Consequentially, Great Britain/United Kingdom emerged as the first “modern-world” hegemony to be later referred to as “Pax Britannica”, which was followed by the similar vested-interests: “Pax Americana” (which developed and used first the indiscriminate mass-murder nuclear weaponry) and “Big Market” (“a god-send child of Anglo-American hegemonies).

Indeed, all these Western-based hegemonical leaderships resorted to self-seeking aggressive warfare for conquering, plundering, colonizing and/or exploiting many countries across the world, on the way to acquiring their respective hegemonic worlds. On the basis of their underlying common-aggressive backgrounds, they have been similarly eager to self-justify and self-empower to maintain and reinforce their respective leaderships, by means of technologically superior military forces and abundant financial resources. For self-justification, most likely, they worked hard continuously by forcing, encouraging, inculcating and/or brainwashing the world people at large for the importance of “aggressive mentality”, as well as of “self-favoring market system”, “free market competition” and “liberalization of international trade”. Such self-justification of the hegemonic leaderships has served, as a matter of course, for their self-enrichment and self-empowerment.

The “hegemonic force of habit”, following such hegemonical self-oriented/self-seeking aggressive practices, might have led to opening the “Modern Pandora’s Box” and emancipated the variously interpretable ideas/ideologies, including “freedom”, “equality”, “progress”,...
“efficiency”, “convenience”, “private property”, “human rights” (among other things). Also emancipated were extremely vicious monsters, such as “aggressively self-seeking aweless swellheads”, “reckless and consuming ambitions”, “insatiable greed-and-lust” and “indiscriminate mass-murder weaponry”, as well as “excessively liberty-oriented individual motivations, attitudes and behaviors” (among other things). Worse still, some disguised “hopes” (freedom, convenience and human rights, as well as digitalized communication, generative AI, hydrogen energy, and so on) have been found emancipated from the Modern Pandora’s Box. All the emancipated have been trumpeted for the amplification by the leadership of “vested interests” in market, politics, media, schools and research institutes.

All the emancipated ideologies and aggressiveness, put together, might have contributed to the repeated short-run economic growth for accumulation of hegemonic wealth and power in Modern Civilization, based intentionally on the short-run approach. Such short-run approach could allow to ignore most of the external costs (meaning the long-run global Social Cost). Also, they might have helped form the Modern Core Synergism that corresponds to the Market Value System (the present author’s conceptual term). In short, the Market Value System (MVS) consists of the mutually-reinforcing methodological ideologies, including antagonism, materialism, individualism, progressivism and egotism. Such mutually reinforcing ideologies might have served as a highly effective political/psychological tool to inculcate or persuade the people across the world to participate in the propagated “lucrative market activities”, hiding behind most of the unpaid Social Cost.

It cannot be too much emphasized here that the Modern Core Synergism has compelled continually the people at large to become busier, lonelier, more frustrated and more insecure, as well as to help the rich-and-strong get richer and stronger. Under the growing influence of the Modern Core Synergism, the people at large might have come to give up or forgot more long-lasting, more mutually considerate, more comfortable and more harmonious lifestyles, as well as more cooperative, more empathetic, more amicably-oriented personal characteristics. In the meantime, Big Market – a godsent child of the Anglo-American hegemonical plutocracy – and the Market Value System (MVS) emerged and spread worldwide along with the classical-virtual “market” by the continuous endeavor under Pax Britannica and Pax Americana.

The Market Value System (MVS) may have characterized the modern economic activities as an increasingly-biased ones which, in turn, may have inculcated and forced the world people at large to compete “aggressively” among themselves, as well as to play mostly the “losing-battle” with the already well-established, wealthy and powerful Western people and business organizations. Such unfair “market competition” has become rhetorically referred to “free market competition”. Thus, such competition may have greatly favored the individuals, families and business establishments, possessing the already accumulated wealth-and-power well protected by the modern legal defense of private property (regardless of the used methods and tricks for the accumulation in the remote past and recent past).

As a matter of course, Big Market has eagerly and tenaciously inculcated and compelled the world people at large to become accustomed to “modern unchecked liberalism”, “modern extreme biases to short-run changes”, “self-help individualism”, “self-seeking egotism”, “endless efficiency for profit-making”, “profit-driven incessant innovations”, “economic encouragement of speculation”, “short-run economic growth”, “continuous neglect of long-run Social Cost”, and so on. In a strong sense, the Modern Core Synergism has come to correspond very well to the Market Value System (MVS) that has helped the young people “individualized” to think only of themselves as “aggressive challengers/soldiers”, fighting hard in “market/battlefield for their own well-being and the national strength.

**Market Value System as Mutually-Reinforcing Ideologies**

The Market Value System (MVS) may have come to consist of the mutually-reinforcing methodological ideologies, including Antagonism, Materialism, Individualism, Progressivism and Egotism. To begin with, Antagonism (“Enmity”) may have come to represent the central market value of the “money, technology and violence combined” aggressive-predatory competition for profit maximization and accumulation of wealth-and-power. Materialism (“Material”) may have come...
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to represent the market ideology of the “money, material and energy combined” market-centered lifestyles, marginalizing non-market activities, such as household chores and mutual barters of goods and services.

Individualism (“Individual”) may have come to represent the market ideology of “isolated individuals”, marginalizing “empathetic persons”. One major purpose of this ideology is to separate humanity from their intimate natural-and-traditional ties, by deceptively guiding as if he/she were “individual with autonomy and independence”. For modern employers, it is more convenient and easier to deal with each “individual” employee who does not have complex relations with other humans lingering from the pre-modern traditional times, such, as “mutually helping and reciprocating persons”, maintaining closely-related families, relatives, friends and local communities.

Progressivism (“Progress”) may have come to represent the market ideology of repeating short-run economic growth based on profit-and-progress-oriented, incessant, piecemeal innovations, as well as based on changing fashions and insatiable wants. Thus, Modern Civilization’s “reckless-run” may have come to encourage “progress-likened” repeatable short-run economic growth, “profit-driven” piecemeal innovations, “superiority-seeking” technological competition for goods-and-weaponry, and “convenience-chasing” insatiable wants. Finally, Egotism (“Self-interest”) may have come to represent the market ideology of “exclusive, self-seeking, wealth-power accumulation and privatization of property”, on the belief that “Money is might that makes right”. This market ideology has, in a sense, opened the “Modern Pandora’s Box”, emancipating the extremely vicious modern monsters.

Such MVS can be easily inferred from the expanded and popularized market theories and practices in modern/contemporary times. Having inherited the modern hegemonic force of habit from Pax Britannica and Pax Americana, the faceless contemporary power structure (Big Market) has become capable to influence international-trade regulations, fiscal-and-monetary policies of other nations, deceptive SDGs-related global-policy coordination, future directions of energy-and-technology development, and so on. Also, Big Market has been able to take advantages of the ideologies, such as “The winner takes all”, “Might makes right” and “Money is might that makes right”. Unfortunate to the world people in the long run, such hegemony-oriented ideologies may have helped accelerate the accumulation of the above-mentioned “long-run unpaid global Social Cost”.

In a diagrammatic expression (Fig. 1), the Market Value System (MVS) shows by the two-way arrows the mutually reinforcing interactions, of the five modern values/ideologies, including Antagonism, Materialism, Individualism, Progressivism and Egotism. Placed in the center of the diagram, Antagonism represents the market value of highly aggressive and antagonistic politico-economic way of life. This central value reinforces mutually with four other core values (Materialism, Individualism, Progressivism and Egotism). Materialism represents the market value of excessively biased to material-oriented lifestyle. Individualism represents the market value of illusional autonomy and self-sufficiency of individuals. Progressivism represents the market value of “profit-seeking” innovation and economic growth. Egotism represents the market value of “self-seeking exclusive” accumulation of wealth-and-power.
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Alternatively put, Fig. 1 indicates the self-augmenting MVS of continually-mutually reinforcing the winner’s short-run biased, one-sided market values. Thus, MVS is emphatic on the short-run, aggressive, market-centric, growth-oriented and self-seeking values. All such values, however, seem to lack the “long-run” and “big-picture” perspectives. Also, MVS may be the collective representation of modern ideologies popularized by the “faceless” Big Market that, unfortunately, seems to have been eagerly marginalize the highly important human qualities, such as mutual empathy, personal morality, social ethics, capacity for steady maturation, and long-run collaborative consciousness. All these human qualities may be considered most necessary for Sustainable Development.

**Sustainable Human Evolution**

As suggested above, Sustainable Development cannot be pursued by an extension of the excessively aggressive, short-run, profit-oriented market approach of Modern Civilization, which has given rise to the winner-favoring, pervasive, contemporary capitalism. For such capitalism has the features of profit motivation and aggressive short-run market activities, marginalizing most of the non-profit, non-market activities. Also, it may have incessantly distorted the self-evolution of humanity. This statement, by no means, recommend the socialistic strong power of the state. Very different in the ideology of governance, however, both capitalism and socialism have emerged from the same foundation of Modern Civilization. Thus, both have shared very similar inclinations towards “hegemony-seeking military-superiority”, “heavy reliance on natural-material sciences”, “endless search for efficiency”, “incessant technological innovations”, “ideological standardization of human mindset” and “marginalization of diverse Native Cultures” (among other things).

Also, there are some significant differences between capitalism and socialism, as far as the respective populations at large are concerned. Generally speaking, such differences can be expressed, as follows: The capitalist leadership has emphasized the importance of “private property” and “market competition”, while the socialist leadership has emphasized the importance of “common property” and “nationalistic collaboration”. A highly important similarity between the ideologically-divided hegemonical competitions before, during and after WWII, both capitalism and socialism have severely exploited the under-developed and/or traditional societies, hardworking poor peoples, and natural-and-human environments, as “stepping-stones” for pursuing supremacy.

In a sense, such ideologically-divided rivalry between the hegemonic leaderships of two camps after WWII, in particular, came to escalate violent conflicts and wars by proxy, arms race and proliferation, including development of atomic bombs to hydrogen bombs, short distance-missiles to intercontinental ballistic-missiles (ICBM), space rockets of weather satellites to spy satellites and to attack satellites, and AI-facilitated killer robots, among other things. Rapidly escalating respective “opportunity costs” of both the rival camps not only have accumulated the long-run unpaid global Social Cost, but also have threaten lives of all people in the world (not to mention all the living things on the earth).

Now, disposal and/or compensation of such unpaid Social Cost, even if the leaderships wanted, have become extremely difficult, if not impossible. This may tell the story of encouraging human consuming/inordinate ambition, insatiable greed and ridiculously accumulated almost unmanageable “worldwide burdens” as mentioned above, the reckless-run of Modern Civilization under the modern hegemonical force of habit has, no doubt, come to endanger a viable human future. Given such dangerous contemporary conditions and situations, it is not farfetched to say that humans have derailed the trajectory of normal self-evolution in modern/contemporary times. Now, only chance/choice left for humanity, perhaps, is to grapple most seriously and collaboratively with Sustainable Development to return to the appropriate self-evolutionary trajectory soonest possible.

**An Alternative Framework of Human Evolution**

After the publication of *On the Origin of Species* by Charles Darwin [Darwin, 1859], it has become increasingly clear that human evolution is not totally biological. Also, it has become evident that human evolution is positively influenced by the complex spiritual-moral-intellectual human factor. In other words,
such human factor has created diverse Native Cultures, which, in turn, influenced human evolution. Against Darwin’s simplistic human evolution, Biologist Richard Dawkins in his book, *The Selfish Gene* [Dawkins, 1976] proposed the concept of “Meme” defined as a self-reproducing pseudo-genetic code which he considered to be an important factor in human evolution. His aim was to interpret “Meme” in terms of a “unit of culture” and a “unit of imitation”, which he conceived in relation to the English meaning of “memory”, relating to culture and imitation.

Dawkins characterized Meme in terms of a “cultural” counterpart to the “biological” Gene. From this basis, he proposed that any change in human culture was necessarily evolutionary and attributable to “Meme”. After describing both Meme and Gene as *selfish*, Dawkins also offered an insight into “human peculiarity” or the human gift of “deliberate foresights” – a natural anticipatory quality which neither Gene nor Meme in and of itself possesses. In other words, the concept of Meme on its own is insufficient for addressing the complexity of humanness, personhood, intellectual advancement and spiritual development.

In view of this, we (Kensei Hiwaki and Frank Hassard) believe it necessary to incorporate a *third factor* (“Civie”) which is no less fundamental to complex human evolution. In order to embark on our new hypothesis, it may be necessary to give advance notice to the reader that the present Section draws heavily on our previous article “Pursuing Integral Harmony in Sustainable Human Evolution” [Hiwaki-Hassard, 2019]. Our article refers to a wide range of literature and experimental evidence deriving from philosophy, quantum physics, neuroscience, evolutionary psychology, evolutionary biology and epigenetics (among others) to present a more comprehensive understanding of what we mean by “sustainable human evolution”.

The *third factor* (Civie), in question, describes broadly the “self-civilizing feature” and/or “civility and discretion of humanity” commonly associated with well-functioning diverse holistic Native Cultures. Now, the term “Native Culture” as used in this article refers to a reasonably sound native *society-specific holistic way of life* which collectively encompasses the long-accumulated totality of personal and societal learnings/ experiences including knowledge-skills, wisdom, values, beliefs, insight, foresights, ways/mores, customs, traditions, linguistic and other means of communication, and knowledge relevant to past-and-present civilizations (among other things). Conceived as such, a Native Culture provides the link between the past, the present and the future, as well as the meta-contextual foundation for human judgment and action.

Here, it is important to contrast Dawkins’ Meme with our Civie. Dawkins’ concept of Meme specifies “unit of culture” and/or “unit of imitation” (perhaps, in line with the “proof-oriented modern scientific methodology”), and thus essentially refers to very limited *particularistic-reductionistic effects*. Our concept of Civie refers more broadly to *complex-holistic factors* inclusive of diverse holistic Native Cultures, which interact mutually and systemically with each respective people, society and natural environment. Such *complex-holistic factors may capture* not only their mutual relationship with each people, society and nature, but also *capture their mutual enrichment-and-development* of diverse peoples and societies worldwide, as well as of the global environment over time. Most likely, such important *factors* have often been completely ignored in modern times to mislead humanity, for they are tended *too complex* to be captured by the modern “proof-oriented” scientific methodology nor by contemporary data processing.

We, however, uphold that a constantly enriched, reasonably sound Native Culture is most important for generating a sound Social Value System (SVS) which helps create, integrate, enrich and sustain a variety of natural human-evolutionary qualities and capacities. Thus, we argue for restoration and enrichment of diverse Native Cultures across the world as a means to modify, rectify and/or overcome the modern *mental-physical derailment* toward barbarianism as well as toward the dangerously “imbalanced nature”, caused by the reckless-run of Modern Civilization. At the same time, a collaborative conscious human endeavors to restore and enrich diverse Native Cultures may provide a means by which humanity might return to a *more normal, steadily-maturing and sustainable evolutionary trajectory*.

Building on this, the present Section offers a new theoretical model which asserts that Civie, Meme and Gene are “essentially collaborative”
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with one another, not “selfish” as asserted by Dawkins about “Meme” with the biological “Gene”. The trilateral, mutually-reinforcing interaction of Civie, Meme and Gene could provide a framework for “sustainable human evolution” with the help of the normative framework of “Integral Harmony” to be elaborated in the following section. In this section, we further discuss our futuristic view of human evolution by arguing for the potentiality of Civie as Native Culture “creating, integrating and enriching human factor” which, we propose, influences the future direction of sustainable human evolution.

Civie is characterized by a self-reproducing, self-proliferating, self-organizing and self-enlightening purposeful human factor, as well as by an empathizing, collaborating, communicating and problem-solving future-oriented human factor. In this way, Civie is constantly stimulating and/or stimulated by the prevailing and changing human mental and physical activities relevant to the diverse Native-Culture enrichment for steady human maturing, far beyond “imitation” and “memory” attributed to Meme by Dawkins. Such human activities refer to the enhancement of creativity, intelligence, awareness, cognition, sentence, insight, foresights, empathy, morality, social ethics, linguistic capacity, future orientation, complex perspectives, and so on. From this basis, we propose that such long-term mutual/collaborative interactions between and among Civie, Meme and Gene may have resulted in the respective enrichment of diverse Native Cultures across the world. While, in the meantime, human beings, within the nurturing context of their respective Native Cultures, have come to accept Culture-oriented greater and broader social commitments, responsibilities and versatile activities for their continued survival, well-being, maturing and sustainable self-evolution.

In addition, Civie may have continually augmented the complex and Native Culture-enriching human capacities conducive to creativity, intelligence, awareness, cognition, sentence, empathy, wisdom, insight, morality, languages, future orientation, complex perspectives, foresights, and so on. From this basis, we propose that such long-term mutual/collaborative interactions between and among Civie, Meme and Gene may have resulted in the respective enrichment of diverse Native Cultures across the world. While, in the meantime, human beings, within the nurturing context of their respective Native Cultures, have come to accept Culture-oriented greater and broader social commitments, responsibilities and versatile activities for their continued survival, well-being, maturing and sustainable self-evolution.

In accordance with such features, Civie may have provided Culturally and socially important wisdom, long-term orientation to the future and complex human dispositions, deliberate-purposeful-anticipatory foresights, together with stimulating the human inclination towards mutuality-and-solidarity, inducing collaborative consciousness, empathy, compassion, tolerance, moderation, and so on. Through all these special human attributes, Civie may have worked constantly for Native Culture-enriching and ethnicity-proliferating human capacities by expanding a “morality circle” [NHK Special Crew, 2012] or “empathy circle” to shape and inform ever larger human societies towards the Global Community. It may also have worked constantly for natural-Cultural strategies of symbiotic well-being and harmony between humans and other living beings.

An Image of “Civie-Meme-Gene” Collaborative Interactions

Being always difficult to express an “invisible thing” in a diagram, we draw here, in our own way of imagination and simplification, a framework for mutually interacting-reinforcing factors of human evolution - Civie, Meme and...
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Gene - as “spheres” (simplified as “circles”) with differently condensed time-spans of the respective factors. In terms of time scale, Gene is the longest contributor to human evolution, while Meme is in-between Gene and Civie. However, this does not necessarily mean the order of importance for human evolution, in which, we believe, Civie is most special for contributing to the evolution of unique human characteristics among other lives on the earth.

Among many other things, Civie is a purposefully complex self-reproducing, self-proliferating, self-organizing, self-enlightening and self-evolving human factor, as well as a complex long-term future-oriented and mutuality-oriented. As such, Civie contributes largely to harmony-oriented empathizing, collaborating, communicating, and common-problem solving human features. With such versatile contributions to the highly complex human features, Civie is now depicted with Meme and Gene to indicate a continuous mutual-reinforcement of trilateral-interactions in a diagrammatic image (Fig. 2), as follows:

Fig. 2. Interacting Civie-Meme-Gene for Human Evolution

The above diagram shows a trilaterally intersected/overlapped black area (“Area B”) of the mutually interacting and reinforcing factors - Civie, Meme and Gene – in human evolution. This may reflect our realistic assumption that the respective factors change at much different speeds. Thus, Area B may imply a variety of shifting/changing/transfiguring combinations for mutual reinforcements in the process of trilaterally interacting Civie, Meme and Gene. Also, Area B, representing “all things and all changes” in humanity, can be regarded as a microcosm of the Universe with the known-and-unknown dynamics of mass energies, with their little-known effects on the change of the microcosm.

Such little-known complex and mysterious phenomena may involve processes of adaptation and mutation through human conscious selection as well as natural selection in human evolution. It surely seems reasonable to suggest that the on-going trilateral interactions and mutual reinforcements among Civie, Meme and Gene may have helped shape diverse human societies, encompassing diverse Native Cultures, economies, beliefs, arts, technologies, and so on, broadly commensurate with the respective natural, climatic, geographical, geological and geopolitical environments. The way of Civie working as such, together with Meme and Gene, may further suggest normal collaborative-conscious human endeavors in each society as well as varying enrichment of diverse Native Cultures across the world (or the Global Community).

The trilateral interactions and mutual reinforcement of Civie, Meme and Gene may also reflect a perpetual integration of human value aspect (“time-and-mental” dimension) with human real aspect (“space-and-material dimension) for a trilateral virtuous circle/spiral of each society’s holistic Native Culture enrichment [Hiwaki, 2011, 2014a, 2015a]. Similarly, such trilateral and mutual reinforcements may also suggest an idea of constant interactions and mutations between/among human beings, giving rise to an appropriate model of social value system. Such a model may accommodate differences of social, natural, climatic and other environments, as well as commensurate with social harmony, personal integrity, social solidarity, societal continuity and relational mutuality, all which are to be discussed in the following section.

In view of our present hypothesis, as the most important factor contributing to human characteristics (“humanities”) – Civie - must have helped over time the emergence of respective human societies with Native Cultures (NCs) and Social Value Systems (SVSs), continually enriched by the social constituents over time. Such NCs and SVSs in the respective societies must have worked for helping humans
mature personally and socially to collaborate for their survival and well-being (Sustainable Development), given the respective climatic peculiarities, geographical locations, geological features, geopolitical settings (among other things).

Having been severely distorted, over modern-centuries, by the increasingly and overwhelmingly empowered “modern hegemonical force of habit”, Civie may have had to compel the human self-evolution severely derailed from a more normal evolutionary trajectory. The reigns of the mutually well-connected Pax Britannica, Pax Americana and the contemporary “faceless” Big Market have reinforced incessantly the positivist-biased, short-run, irresponsible, aggressive, reckless features of Modern Civilization. The contemporary reign of Big Market, in particular, has compelled humanity worldwide face inessantly “win-or-die competitions”, by means of political, military, technological, financial and market forces. It is not impossible, however, that the people at large could be awakened to their unworthy modern sufferings, in due course of time. Such “sufferings” may have resulted from continuous imposition of frustration, insecurity, uncertainty, illness, disasters, due to the short-run positivist unfair/predatory free market competition as well as due to the repeated violent conflicts and disastrous warfare, with the development of atomic and hydrogen bombs, ICBMs, huge number of satellites, among many other things. In a strong sense, the short-run and aggressive escalation of reckless Modern Civilization has necessitated such unworthy modern sufferings for the sake of Big Market.

For bringing back the human evolution onto the normal evolutionary trajectory, the people worldwide must work together to overcome the prevailing hegemonical inhumanity, by restoring and reinforcing the reasonably sound, respective Native Cultures (NCs) and Social Value Systems (SVSs). This means that such reinvigorated NCs and SVSs must help restore the reasonably sound natural-human environments, based on the world people’s collaborative-conscious endeavors for Sustainable Development. Also, the world people must collaborate seriously to rectify the modern extreme values/ideologies that have forced the human evolution widely derailed from the normal evolutionary trajectory. Such collaborative endeavors worldwide may greatly encourage human steady maturing for restoring Civie’s sound function. Hopefully, the human evolution back onto the normal trajectory will take place before too late. In the following section, a philosophical-normative discussion is offered to emphasize the necessity of human steady maturing for Sustainable Development.

MATURING HUMANITY FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

It is, indeed, near impossible for any ideas to provide all the world people with a viable, peaceful, mutual comfort-oriented way of life, so long as the extremely-biased modern value system (represented by the Market Value System) prevails. Figuratively speaking, the Market Value System (MVS) may have constantly inculcated and compelled all people spending all time competing one another. In other words, MVS may have incessantly driven the world people at large into a dead-end lifestyle. Such is the modern “manipulated lifestyle” to chase the shifting convenience with insatiable wants, by almost always making aggressive competitions. Such lifestyle can be characterized with a short-run-oriented, individualized aggressive way of life that may constantly accelerate an insecure, uncertain, unstable, stressful, workaholic, unpleasant, atomistic, isolated, powerless and lonely life of individuals. This sort of manipulated lifestyle cannot be justified any longer by the societies that take pride in the idea of Modern Democracy, in particular. In this section, therefore, an alternative and reasonable Social Value System (SVS) is taken up to emphasize the importance of human steady maturation as a solid support for the sake of more meaningful-worthwhile lifestyles in pursuance of Sustainable Development.

A Middle-Path Framework of Social Value System

Social Binary Oppositions and Buddha’s Zero

As suggested above, Civie constantly influences Native Cultures and Social Value Systems worldwide and vice versa, the modern extreme value system - Market Value System (MVS), consisting of Antagonism (Enmity), Materialism (Material), Individualism (Individual), Progressivism (Progress) and Egotism (Self-interested), need to be marginalized soonest possible for the sake of a viable human future (Sustainable Development). In other words, MVS is extremely lopsided, consisting of only
the “right-hand side” of five social binary-oppositions as shown in the following Fig. 3, viz., “Amity and Enmity”, “Spiritual and Material”, “Social and Individual”, “Traditional and Progressive” and “Altruistic and Self-interested”.

The well-known Indian “Middle-Path” philosophy may reveal that the concept of “binary opposition” may grossly underestimates the mental capacity and complexity of humanity. The idea called “Buddha’s Zero” in a “re-interpreted version” by the present author indicates that a Middle-Path Social Value System can be derived from the above binary oppositions by regarding the two opposing elements in a binary opposition as the two extreme ends of one value entity. Such re-interpretation of “binary-opposition” suggests the usually existing “personally-different” perceptions, feelings, ideas, thoughts, decisions of any things and matters. In other words, a variety of indefinite/ambiguous personal-social mentality for choice may exist in each value entity (in-between each binary-opposition), rather than a one-sided clear-cut, definite and simplistic choice. Such alternative “collective-choice” is shown in Fig. 3, by each numbered area/intersection (or, “Middle-Path Area”) in-between “Amity and Enmity”, “Spiritual and Material”, “Social and Individual”, “Traditional and Progressive” and “Altruistic and Self-interested”.

The above re-interpretated binary oppositions are derived from a teaching of Indian Philosopher Buddha (567 BC-488 BC). According to the philosophical teaching called “Buddha’s Zero”, all views could be classified into “four possible views”, viz., “Yes”; “No”; “Neither Yes nor No”; and “Both Yes and No” [Chatterjee, 2010, 2014]. The present author attempts boldly to re-interpret the “four possible views” by means of a highly abstract image in the following diagram (Fig. 4). In this diagram, the intersected area $Z$ of each two ovals (Positive $X$ and Negative $Y$), indicates “four possible views”.

*Fig 4. Re-interpretation of Buddha’s Zero*

- “Yes” ($Z = X$): Area $Z$ viewed as only representing Positive $X$ is one extreme view. This means that “Yes” (“positive”) is a one-sided extreme view.
- “No” ($Z = Y$): Area $Z$ viewed as only...
representing Negative $Y$ is another extreme view. This means that “No” (“negative”) is another one-side extreme view.

- **“Neither Yes nor No” ($Y \neq Z \neq X$): Area $Z$ viewed as representing neither Positive $X$ nor Negative $Y$ is a heretical-and-nihilist view.** This means that Area $Z$ viewed as neither $X$ nor $Y$ is ridiculous and unreasonable.

- **“Both Yes and No” ($Z = X + Y$): Area $Z$ viewed as representing both Positive $X$ and Negative $Y$ is called “Buddha’s Zero”. This means that Area $Z$ is viewed most appropriately as representing the “Middle Path”.

According to Buddha, Area $Z$ viewed as “Middle Path” means “sunya” (Zero) that is the home and identity of everything. Buddha’s philosophical teaching about “Zero” (Middle Path) has persuaded the present author to the effect that a “binary opposition” should be regarded as “one” value entity with “two” extreme ends. For example, a binary opposition “Amity and Enmity” indicates one value entity that has one extreme-end (Amity), on the one hand, and another extreme-end (Enmity), on the other hand.

**Derivation of Middle-Path Social Value System**

On the basis of the above “Middle-Path view” (“Buddha’s Zero”), we now go back to the diagram (Fig. 3: Framework of Social Binary Oppositions), with the five intersected Areas which indicate the respective middle-path social values (also called “sublimated social values” here). It is assumed here that each Area indicates a socially balanced important value being sublimated from a binary opposition. Such “sublimated” social values are derived from the intersected Areas numbered from (1) to (5), each of which is shown as the intersection between the “two ovals” (one shaded and another unshaded). Such “sublimated” system of social values (“Integral Harmony”), corresponding to our simplified “Social Value System” (SVS), consists of (1) Social Harmony, (2) Personal Integrity, (3) Social Solidarity, (4) Societal Continuity and (5) Relational Mutuality. Now, each sublimated social value is briefly explained, as follows:

1. **(1) Social Harmony** (abbreviated as “Harmony”) is a first reasonably-balanced social value sublimated from the broadly-ranging value entity between “Amity and Enmity”. This sublimation is crucial to encourage tolerance and friendliness of the social constituents for restoration and maintenance of a relational-and-harmonious human society (or, the “prospective” Global Community). Such Harmony accommodates both “Amity” and “Enmity” as the two opposite ends of one value entity. Such sublimation is a result of continuous process of “reconciliation/harmonization” within the binary opposition to achieve a socially reasonable balance of “Amity versus Enmity”. Over time, the social constituents may be increasingly accustomed to Harmony as important social value of the increasingly enriched own Native Culture, by improving their personality, mutual empathy, cultural identity, social amenity, socio-economic balance (among other things) for a viable future. Thus, Harmony may offer an incessant harmonizing impetus to all the other sublimated social values (viz., Integrity, Solidarity, Continuity and Mutuality).

2. **(2) Personal Integrity** (abbreviated as “Integrity”) is a second reasonably-balanced social value being sublimated from the broadly-ranging value entity between “Spiritual and Material”. This sublimation is crucial to encourage maturation and discretion of the social constituents for restoration and maintenance of a morally-and-ethically sound human society (or, the “prospective” Global Community). Such Integrity accommodates both “Spiritual” and “Material” as the two opposite ends of one value entity. Such sublimation is a result of continuous process of “reconciliation/harmonization” within the binary opposition to achieve a socially reasonable balance of “Spiritual versus Material”. Over time, the social constituents may be increasingly accustomed to Integrity as important social value of the increasingly enriched own Native Culture, by improving their personal characters, including honesty, decency, sincerity, prudence and discretion (among other things). Thus, Integrity may offer an incessant integrating impetus to all the other sublimated social values (viz., Harmony, Solidarity, Continuity and Mutuality).

3. **(3) Social Solidarity** (abbreviated as “Solidarity”) is a third reasonably-balanced social value being sublimated from the broadly-ranging value entity between “Social and Individual”. This sublimation is crucial to encourage reliability and reciprocity of the social constituents for restoration and
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maintenance of an empathetic-and-helpful human society (or, the “prospective” Global Community). Such Solidarity accommodates both “Social” and “Individual” as the two opposite ends of one value entity. Such sublimation is a result of the continuous process of “reconciliation/harmonization” within the binary opposition to achieve a socially reasonable balance of “Social versus Individual”. Over time, the social constituents may be increasingly accustomed to Solidarity as important social value of the increasingly enriched own Native Culture, by improving their mutual respect, personal reliability, social credibility, empathetic relationship, collaborative consciousness (among other things). Thus, Solidarity may offer an incessant solidifying impetus to all the other sublimated social values (viz., Harmony, Integrity, Continuity, Mutual). (4) Societal Continuity (abbreviated as “Continuity”) is a fourth reasonably-balanced social value being sublimated from the broadly-ranging value entity between “Traditional and Progressive”. This sublimation is crucial to encourage mutual flexibility and personal-and-societal resilience of the social constituents for restoration and maintenance of Native Culture-enriching human society (or, the “prospective” Global Community). Such Continuity accommodates both “Traditional” and “Progressive” as the two opposite ends of one value entity. Such sublimation is a result of the continuous “reconciliation/harmonization” within the binary opposition to achieve a socially reasonable balance of “Traditional versus Progressive”. Over time, the social constituents may be increasingly accustomed to Continuity as important social value of the increasingly enriched own Native Culture, by improving their collaboration-conscious endeavors, personal-social entelechy-and-resilience, personal-societal flexibility, sound personal motivations, long-term oriented perspectives, close inter-generational relations (among other things) for a viable future. Thus, Continuity may offer an incessant continuing impetus to all the other sublimated social values (viz., Harmony, Solidarity, Mutual and Integrity). (5) Relational Mutuality (abbreviated as “Mutuality”) is a fifth reasonably-balanced social value being sublimated from the broadly-ranging value entity between “Altruistic and Self-interested”. This sublimation is crucial to encourage mutual collaboration and personal self-control of the social constituents for restoration and maintenance of a life-treasureng and symbiotic human society (or, the “prospective” Global Community). Such Mutuality accommodates both “Altruistic” and “Self-interested” as two opposite ends of one value entity. Such sublimation is a result of continuous “reconciliation/harmonization” within the binary opposition to achieve a socially reasonable balance of “Altruistic versus Self-interested”. Over time, the social constituents may be increasingly accustomed to Mutuality as important social value of the increasingly enriched own Native Culture, by improving their mutual benefits, reciprocal personal behaviors, mutual responsibility, empathetic mutual relations, collaborative consciousness, mutual prosperity (among other things) for a viable future. Thus, Mutuality may offer an incessant mutualizing impetus to all the other sublimated social values (viz., Harmony, Continuity, Integrity and Solidarity).

The most important feature of the Social Value System (SVS) here is the allusion to the “Middle-Path” philosophy (Buddha’s Zero) as well as to the complexity of human perceptions, thought-frames, motivations and worldviews, which may constantly influence the sublimation process of social values [Hiwaki, 2022]. The five middle-path social values may be derived from the respective binary oppositions by means of a gradual sublimation process in each Area (interacting-intersecting area of “two ovals”), on the basis of steady human maturation/evolution. Such sublimated five social values (social harmony, personal integrity, social solidarity, societal continuity and relational mutuality) comprise our framework of “Integral Harmony”. The framework of Integral Harmony is discussed in the following Sub-section (5.2.), assuming it a more generalized framework that corresponds to our simplified and sublimated SVS.

Integral Harmony for Human Maturation

As suggested in the above, Integral Harmony is our broadened, globalized and generalized framework that corresponds to the respective Social Value System(s) under different Native Cultures. Each Social Value System (SVS) under the Native Culture may encourage the social constituents to understand the importance of social harmony and mutuality, by steadily maturing in humanity, personality, identity and
morality (among other things). Integral Harmony may encourage the world people in general to understand the importance of relational mutuality (all sharing the Planet Earth), which in turn encourage them to take part in an earnest global collaboration for Sustainable Development. Further, Integral Harmony may promote a continuous broadening of human empathetic circle worldwide for a viable and harmonious human future. Moreover, Integral Harmony encourages the world people in general to aspire for steady maturation by creating or emulating “more humanly-and-naturally appropriate” Social Value Systems.

In spite of the existing social/cultural differences, Integral Harmony (broadly corresponding to the society-specific SVSs) can be simply expressed in the following Fig. 5. As suggested in the figure, Harmony (social harmony) may broadly represent the Native Culture-oriented “societal amenities”. Likewise, Integrity (personal integrity) represents broadly “humanity and humanities”. Solidarity (social solidarity) represents broadly “mutual reliability”; Continuity (societal continuity) represents broadly “mental-physical flexibility”; and Mutuality (relational mutuality) represents broadly “collaborative viability”. In short, Harmony, Integrity, Solidarity, Continuity and Mutuality, respectively and collectively, reinforce the sublimated social values to enhance Integral Harmony and the society-specific Social Value Systems. In other words, Integral Harmony (global) may be mutually reinforced with the Social Value Systems (local), for the sake of steadily maturing humanity.

Fig5. Framework of Integral Harmony

It goes without saying that both Integral Harmony (global) and the Social Value Systems (local) indicate the value systems of long-term nature. Here, the expression “long-term” implies much different from that of “long run”. The former, as a temporal expression of the present author, implies “the time period long enough” to accommodate “a significant change in the society-specific Social Value System”, while the latter is a usual term in Economics to imply “the time period long enough” to accommodate “a significant change in the economy-specific capital stock”. As explained above, the Social Value System (SVS) may maintain and improve the five “middle-path” social values by reinforcing each other, as well as by adjusting them to the increasingly enriched Native Culture (NC). The continually improved SVS may help the people “mature steadily”, by encouraging them to cultivate their personal characters fitting well to the increasingly enriched NC. This may suggest that SVS helps the people maintain the “past-present-future linkage” for reasonably consistent lifestyles, by encouraging them to endeavor for enrichment of the society-specific NC continually, as well as to improve the prospect of Sustainable Development for a viable human future. As the most important global long-term value foundation, Integral Harmony may serve broadly to improve the society-specific Social Value Systems as well as to support continually Sustainable Development.
Sustainable Development with Steadily Maturing Humanity: A Guideline for the Prospective Global Community

For Integral Humanity may help encourage the world people at large to go through their maturing process of balancing and harmonizing complex-and-diverse personal mentality towards mutual recognitions, understanding and respects. Also, Integral Harmony may fully complement each other with our long-term theoretical framework of balanced socioeconomic development (corresponding to Sustainable Development) to be discussed in the following section.

For better understanding of the above figure of Integral Harmony (Fig. 5), the following diagram (Fig. 6) may also depict the five sublimated social values as continuous spheric interactions.

**Fig. 6. An Alternative Image of Integral Harmony**

**LONG-TERM BALANCED SOCIOECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

For any worthy long-term project, it is highly important to have a simplified theoretical framework as a general guideline for its long-term logic and process towards the probable accomplishment. Sustainable Development of the prospective Global Community may be considered the worthiest global project which cannot be left for a “trial-and-error” approach. By all means, it is important to construct a long-term-oriented theoretical guideline for the possible survival of humanity. Therefore, such simplified theoretical framework for Sustainable Development is presented and outlined in this section, since an equally important practical guideline has been provided by the United Nations with the 17 SDGs. For our theoretical framework, the present author draws heavily on his book and article, respectively, entitled, *Culture and Economics in the Global Community: A Framework for Socioeconomic Development* [Hiwaki, 2011] and “A Balance Paradigm for Post-Plutocracy: Toward Sustainable Development with Integral Harmony” [Hiwaki, 2017]. Since the concept of “Balance Paradigm” is crucially important in the theoretical framework, this section starts dealing with “Balance Paradigm”.

**Balance Paradigm for the Global Community**

For Sustainable Development, a steady paradigm shift, perhaps, is a must from the ongoing “Explosion Paradigm” toward our middle-path oriented “Balance Paradigm”. Here, the “Explosion Paradigm” represents the extremely dangerous “short-run oriented” reckless Modern Civilization, with its “incessant creation of violent conflicts/warfare”, “lingering poisonous pollutions” and “increasing climatic disasters worldwide”, as well as “instable, insecure, stressful, uncertain lifestyles of estranged and unsoundly-conditioned individuals”. Such modern reckless creation of dangerous world and insecure human lifestyles may have been largely based on the Modern Core Synergism (or “the modern hegemonic force of habit”) corresponding to the Market Value System (MVS), dictated by the hegemonical, plutocracy-driven contemporary power structure (Big Market). The alternative “Balance Paradigm” represents the gradually increasing long-term freedom of choices as regards the “reasonably balanced socioeconomic activities and empathetic personal lifestyles”, based on Integral Harmony largely corresponding to the respective Social Value Systems (SVSs) coherent with the increasingly enriched diverse Native Cultures (NCs).

Here, the term “balance” implies a reasonably “broad and flexible balance” in the long term, reflecting a certain balancing-power of nature, which normally works for human mind and body and in-between them. Thus, such “balance” refers to reasonable balance between the physical and the spiritual, between work and
leisure, between freedom and duty, between benefits and responsibilities, between stress and relaxation, between urban life and country life, and so on. Also, it refers to enjoying reasonably sound health, comfort, empathy, family-life, friendship, longevity, amusements, aesthetics, sports, hobbies, studies and researches (among other things).

Such a shift to “Balance Paradigm” from “Explosion Paradigm”, most likely, is realizable, by continually restoring, enriching, invigorating and empowering the reasonably sound, diverse society-specific holistic native cultures (abbreviated as “Native Cultures” – NCs) across the world for, most importantly, ushering into the Global Community. This may suggest that the world people in general to endeavor collaboration-consciously for a new age of balanced, integrated and harmonized socioeconomic systems worldwide with the help of the most important human legacy/property – diverse Native Cultures (NCs). Generally speaking, each Native Culture (NC) has been deeply interwoven with its Social Value System, belief system, natural-societal-political environments and long-term experience-based knowledge and wisdom.

Almost all over the world, such NCs, however, have been mostly devastated by the modern lopsided market fundamentalism (abbreviated as “Market”), idea of which has been created to favor the contemporary hegemonic plutocracy-driven power structure (“Big Market”) and the so-called “winners”. In order to seek Sustainable Development for a viable human future, by endeavoring for successful shift to the world of “Balance Paradigm”, the diverse NCs need to be restored, enriched and empowered properly for the Age of Sustainable Development and the Global Community. Most likely, such global project requires all-out, long-term collaboration-conscious endeavors of the world people in general, for we cannot rely on the existing dangerous lines of modern short-run, aggressive, hegemonical habit, thought, theory and practice.

Unfortunately, such modern lines have divided and reduced almost everything into fractional parts of data, information, knowledge and disciplines on the basis of materialism, reductionism and the utterly dubious idea of humans “being likened to machines” composed of various inorganic parts. Perhaps, it is most important now to reexamine, recover and re-integrate appropriately human gifts, features, motivations, and means, pertinent to sensitivity, sentience, perspectives, knowledge, wisdom and analogical-and-analytical thinking, as well as pertinent to empathy, relational-mutuality and capacity for collaboration-conscious endeavors. All such “mind-related” activities were integrated largely by the diverse, reasonably sound, holistic Native Cultures for solving difficult and important human problems. Such re-integration of human gifts, features, motivations and means may be helpful for restoration and maturation of humanity in pursuit of Sustainable Development.

As seen already, reasonably sound Native Cultures (NCs) across the world are considered most important when contemplating a shift to “Balance Paradigm” from “Explosion Paradigm”. Here, the use of the term “Paradigm” indicates a distinction of “ethos”. For “Balance Paradigm” represents the “Ethos of Native Culture”, indicating the long-term accumulative/integrative inclination of NCs, providing the respective peoples worldwide with identities, amenities and harmonious/symbiotic lifestyles, as well as with the continuous linkage of past, present and future. In contrast, “Explosion Paradigm” represents the “Ethos of Civilization”, “Ethos of Market” and “Ethos of Supremacy, all which have been imposed on Modern Civilization, to provide the world people with rapidly changing material-centered stressful lifestyles, violent conflicts/aggressive warfare, and endless efficiency-oriented working conditions, all which entailed instability, insecurity and uncertainty.

The “Ethos of Civilization”, in particular, has disposed of the long-standing rich-and-complex skills and wisdom irresponsibly, thoughtlessly and/or intentionally by means of modern wastefully short-sighted reductionism and narrowly divided specializations. Perhaps, escalated simplification, standardization, division-of-labor and other brainwash campaigns in Modern Civilization may have extremely distorted human versatile qualities, mentalities and perspectives to drive the people at large toward excessively self-seeking, short-run reckless and irresponsible activities under “Explosion Paradigm”, such as: 

- **merciless and endless** power-struggles for supremacy;
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- endless escalation of inhuman “efficiency drive” for profit maximization;
- short-run, reckless, inhuman way of technological innovation;
- rapid “short-run” recovery of direct investment;
- aggressive-predatory “free” competition with inhuman detachment to “the loser”;
- “now-oriented” escalated convenience and insatiable wants;
- irresponsible/wasteful/hazardous “throw-away” lifestyle; and
- scarce attention to the long-run “unpaid” global Social Cost (or, “Boomerang Effects”).

In the process of shifting from “Explosion Paradigm” to “Balance Paradigm”, many steady long-run changes are going to be required for future lifestyle in the Global Community. For “Balance Paradigm” calls for naturally-culturally-personally harmonized, reasonable balances for Sustainable Development, such as, between nature and human lifestyle, between Civilization and Native Cultures, between social values and economic values, between spiritual and material emphases, between short-term and long-term orientation, between microscopic and macroscopic viewpoints, between market and non-market activities, between individual and mutual responsibilities, and between work and leisure orientations, and so on.

Our “Balance Paradigm” for development of the prospective Global Community may require, to begin with, reasonably sound Social Value Systems (SVSs) worldwide that are assumed capable to modify the one-sided Market Value System (MVS). Each society-specific SVS must consist of reasonably balanced and sublimated social values, for example, from five respective binary oppositions. As already explained above in details each society-specific SVS, at least, consists of:

- Social Harmony (balanced and sublimated from “Amity & Enmity”);
- Personal Integrity (balanced and sublimated from “Spiritual & Material”);
- Social Solidarity (balanced and sublimated from “Social & Individual”);
- Societal Continuity (balanced and sublimated from “Traditional & Progressive”); and
- Relational Mutuality (balanced and sublimated from “Altruistic & Self-interested”).

In other words, “Balance Paradigm”, most importantly, aims at a steady maturation of human-beings to cope with a variety of serious “short-term and long-term” problems that have been left by the reckless “Explosion Paradigm” of Modern Civilization. For this purpose, such SVS may help prepare and facilitate fundamentally for human maturation that has long been neglected, obstructed and/or distorted by Big Market with the extremely lopsided Market Value System (corresponding to the excessively “short-run oriented” Modern Core Synergism as well as to “Explosion Paradigm”). Sustainable Development (“long-term oriented, reasonably sound local and global socioeconomic development”) may require a steady human maturation to carefully/discretely guide the complex theoretical-and-practical process, on the basis of rich knowledge, profound wisdom and long-term broad perspectives accumulated in the diverse and respective Native Cultures across the world. For the contemporarily prevailing technological innovations may have been mostly encouraged and financed by Big Market’s short-run, profit-oriented, wealth-and-power accumulation for self-aggrandizement and hegemonical supremacy, not for humanity’s long-term comfort, security and well-being.

A Theoretical Framework of Sustainable Development

In addition to the most important “steady maturation of humanity in general”, Sustainable Development may require a broad theoretical framework of “long-term, peace-and-harmony oriented” guideline for the “long-term process” of collaboration-conscious endeavor of the general public worldwide [Hiwaki, 1995a, 1998, 2011, 2017]. Our present theoretical framework, therefore, is an antithesis to the aggressive/antagonistic competition-oriented neo-classical main-stream Economics. Such theoretical framework needs to be coherent largely with the practical guideline for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [UN, 2015]. The present theoretical framework encompasses many new premises and assumptions in terms of Sustainable Development as complex global long-term project. Such premises and assumptions are elaborated in the three articles by the present author, entitled (1) “Alternative Economics and
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Sustainable Future” [Hiwaki, 2015a], (2) “A Balance Paradigm for Post-Plutocracy: Toward Sustainable Development with Integral Harmony” [Hiwaki, 2017], and (3) “From Growing to Maturing: Integral Harmony and Global Integrity” [Hiwaki, 2021]. In the following Subsection, only major premises and assumptions are explained briefly.

Major Premises and Assumptions

A first major premise of our “Balance Paradigm” framework refers to the crucial importance of diverse society-specific Native Cultures (NCs) and the coherent Social Value Systems (SVSs) (in view of the prospective Global Community). This premise is, perhaps, most important for promoting steady human maturation for the pursuance of Sustainable Development.

A second major premise emphasizes the cultivation of reasonable human character relevant to our “Balance Paradigm”. This may suggest such human character to reflect reasonably the balanced and sublimated social values, such as, social harmony, personal integrity, social solidarity, societal continuity and relational mutuality). In other words, such human character tends to mature steadily encompassing empathy, mutuality, morality, ethicality, symbiosis and harmony, in coherence to the long-endured-and-enriched, respective and diverse Native Cultures worldwide.

A third major premise opts for an open/borderless democracy in the Global Community. Such democracy is intrinsically different from the prevailing “nation-specific closed democracy” in which, the hegemonic power can claim its own “national interest”, at the cost of the less powerful ones (which have been continually subordinated to and marginalized by the former’s high-handed power politics).

A fourth major premise is a new temporal definition. The “short term” and “long term” of our Balance Paradigm refer, respectively, to “short of” and “long enough” time-span for a significant change of the society-specific Social Value System (SVS). This temporal definition is quite different from the prevailing economic definition of “short run” and “long run”, which largely mean, respectively, “absence” and “presence” of a significant change in capital stock.

A fifth major premise emphasizes the influence of “Own Hands”. The “Own Hands” is a shorthand expression of “the people’s own invisible hands” that corresponds to a “long-term society-general orientation to the future” that decides the nature and speed of socioeconomic development. Such “orientation to the future” helps balance the “supply side” and the “demand side” of the socioeconomic activities over time by exerting the overarching effects on the “aggregate saving and investment”. Most likely, such “future orientation” may also help the people mature steadily.

A sixth major premise emphasizes the importance of the “long-term” socioeconomic development (or, Sustainable Development), which helps replace the contemporary emphasis on the “short-run” economic growth. For the short-run economic growth tends to ignore largely the long-term accumulated “unpaid Social Cost” that has intensified a variety of serious illness, disaster and violence.

A final major premise refers to the important variables in terms of “ratios”, including T/r, C/V, S/V, I/V and R/V are considered much more important in view of the prospective complex “inter-cultural/inter-societal” Global Community, than the respective variables of absolute figures (T, r, V, C, S, I and R).

Mathematical Construct and Concept of “Time Preference”

Based on the above major premises, our “Balance Paradigm” framework of socioeconomic development (corresponding to the global theoretical framework of Sustainable Development) can be expressed in the following basic mathematical construct consisting of five approximated equations “ (refer to: [Hiwaki, 2011], for the mathematical derivation)

(1) \[ \frac{T}{r} = \frac{C}{V} \]
(2) \[ \frac{T}{r} = \frac{W}{V} \]
(3) \[ \frac{T}{r} = 1 - \left( \frac{S}{V} \right) \]
(4) \[ \frac{T}{r} = 1 - \left( \frac{I}{V} \right) \]
(5) \[ \frac{T}{r} = 1 - \left( \frac{R}{V} \right) \]

The left-hand term \( (T/r) \) of each equation in the above is called here “Basic Ratio” that is the pivotal ratio in the theoretical construct, consisting of the people’s psychological/mental “long-term ratio of time-preferences”. They are defined into two different categories, “the society-general” and “the economy-specific”.
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Here, the term “time preference” indicates the “present-time preference” on the assumption that “the present-time” is normally preferred to “the future-time”. More concretely, the “present-time preference” suggests that the people in general tend to prefer “today (present-time)” to a less certain “tomorrow (future-time)”, for the less certain “future-time” being riskier than the “present time”. The term “society-general” here refers to “the whole people” and the term “economy-specific” refers to the specific part among the whole people, viz., “highly business-oriented and profit-seeking social constituents”.

Such “Basic Ratio” (T/r) includes Numerator (T), indicating the “long-term trend of society-general time-preference” (abbreviated as “Trend Preference Rate”), and Denominator (r) the “long-term trend of economy-specific time-preference” (abbreviated as “Trend Interest Rate”). Here, a declining Numerator (T) takes initiative for a long-term balanced socioeconomic development, and Denominator (r) follows suit with a significant “time lag”. This means that “the economy-specific” constituents, highly interested in “making profit”, may want to take advantage of the declining Trend Preference Rate (T). The declining “T”, indicating the “rising society-general future orientation”, may suggest more profit-making opportunities to the economy-specific social constituents, inviting increasing Investment “I”.

Very important to repeat, Numerator (T) of Basic Ratio (T/r) takes initiative in a long-term balanced socioeconomic development. The steadily maturing people in general (suggesting “the maturing society-general”) tend to augment the society-general long-term future orientation with a decline of the present-time preference “T”. This decline of “T” suggests “growing profit opportunities”, and the economy-specific social constituents reduce coherently the present-time preference “r”. This process indicates a time-lag adjustment of the economy-specific present-time preference “r” to the declining society-general present-time preference “T”. This “adjustment” may indicate a “time-lag” decline of Basic Ratio (T/r), as a whole, which may, in turn, raise the level of long-term balanced socioeconomic development.

The above “time-lag adjustment” of the economy-specific social constituents indicates our re-interpretation of the “idealized risk-taking entrepreneurs” in Economics. Modern individuals with strong motivation for making money/profit, such as merchants, firm owners, corporate managers, financiers and investors, among others, have often been likened, in Economics, to such “entrepreneurs” of “courageous-honorable risk-takers” as well as “initiators” of the “highly coveted” economic growth. Our concept of “economy-specific” social constituents, however, are more realistic and rational, tending towards “risk-averse”. For our economy-specific constituents are not only “interested” in making profit in the “long-term” but also “prudent” to be concerned of highly probable long-term relationship between risks (costs) and returns (gains), where “costs” include “long-term Social Cost” and “gains” includes not only “long-term profits” but also “long-lasting trust and good reputations”. With this re-interpretation, our “Balance Paradigm” framework now presents the idea of “Optimal Development Path” in the following.

Basic Ratio and Optimal Development Path

As the “Mental-Aspect” of our theoretical construct, Basic Ratio (T/r), consisting of Trend Preference Rate (T) and Trend Interest Rate (r), respectively, placed on the vertical axis and the horizontal axis in the following Fig. 7. In this diagram, the “ideal-theoretical path of the perfectly balanced” long-term socioeconomic development is shown by the 45-degree straight/diagonal line from Point F downward to Origin O (the Path F-O). There, the straight/diagonal line indicates that the declining Variable “T” and Variable “r” trace, together, the Path F-O (perfect development path). Put differently, the 45-degree line indicates the “theoretical” image that the “present-time preference rates” of both the “society-general T” and the “economy-specific r” move constantly, together. This image of a long-term balanced development, however, is only theoretical without any practical implication.

Our Optimal Development Path (ODP) is represented by Path F-D-O, a “concave-upward” curve that traces a more reasonable and practical path from Point F to Point D and to Origin O. This path is a practical-realistic image of ODP based on the assumption that the declining Variable “T” takes initiative and the declining Variable “r” follows with some time-lag, forming a “reasonably-balanced” curve - Path F-D-O (practical-realistic path) - of long-
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term socioeconomic development. Here, Point F is the theoretical starting point of both the declining Variable “T” and Variable “r”, and Origin O is the theoretical converging point of both Variable “T” and Variable “r”. Also, as seen from the diagram, the “horizontal distance” between Path F-O (the 45-degree diagonal line) and Path F-D-O (ODP) expands initially and contract after passing Point D.

In view of the optimal socioeconomic process depicted by Path F-D-O (viz., ODP), the “expanding horizontal distances” between the two paths from Point F to Point D implies the “Growth Process”, while the “contracting horizontal distances” on the way from Point D toward Origin O imply the “Maturation Process”. In an early period of the Growth Process, the short-run view in economic activities may overwhelm that of the long run and, gradually, the long-run view to gain strength along with steady maturation of the people, and eventually the long-run view may prevail at the end of the Growth Process. When the Maturation Process begins at “Point D” of Path F-D-O (ODP), the long-run view of economic activities may become the standard of a reasonably sound socioeconomic development. This means that the long-run Social Cost would be well-attended, along with the greatly diminishing aggressive and violent conflicts/warfare. This may also mean that Sustainable Development takes root itself, when the Global Community comes to be blessed with Maturation Process.

In short, the "society-general" “present-time preference rate T" declines faster than the "economy-specific" “present-time preference rate r” during the Growth Process. Variable “T” declining faster than Variable “r” means that the "society-general" “future orientation” is augmented faster than the "economy-specific" “future orientation”. These different temporal phenomena, being called “time-lag” here, are assumed to provide an “accelerated future profit-opportunity” to the highly “business and profit-oriented” social constituents. Under such favorable condition for the "economy-specific" sector, rapidly increasing investment is encouraged to take advantage of the profit opportunities (accruing from the augmented "society-general" future orientation), leading to an accelerated socioeconomic development.

In contrast, the "society-general" “present-time preference rate T" declines slower than the "economy-specific" “present-time preference rate r” during the Maturation Process. This phenomenon (“T" declining slower than “r”) means that the "society-general" “future orientation” is augmented slower than the "economy-specific" “future orientation”. In other words, the "economy-specific" sector is becoming less “profit-oriented” and more “social-collaboration/harmony-oriented” to adjust to a more balanced, comfortable and harmonious social life for attaining a greater spiritual comfort and enlightenment. Also, the "economy-specific" sector is becoming a more long-term future-oriented as well as a greater collaboration-conscious. This suggests that a steadier development of harmonious social life with growing social/societal amenities would be emphasized during the Maturation Process.

Delving deeper into the “Mental-Aspect” (represented by Basic Ratio “T/r”) during the “Growth Process”, the people in general tend to
be increasingly involved in a rapid socioeconomic development by significantly shifting Variable “T” (the society-general “present-time preference rate”) continually downward, at the same time, encouraging the economy-specific sector to hold in check the long-run Social Cost that arises mainly from social conflicts of rapid socioeconomic changes. The economy-specific sector, on the other hand, by shifting Variable “r” (the economy-specific “present-time preference rate”) downward coherently with “T”, takes advantage of the general public’s “long-term future-oriented lifestyle”. For this purpose, the economy-specific sector would step up investment for the expected demand growth, with an increasing concern of long-term Social Cost that entails greater future risks.

When it comes to the Maturation Process, the people in general, on the one hand, tend to be more eagerly concerned of “balanced, sound, integral and holistic” socioeconomic development, now shifting the “present-time preference rate T” further downward to encourage diverse and comprehensive human maturation. Such encouragement includes greater humanistic, cultural, personal, aesthetic, moral, ethical, empathetic capacities, as well as complex inter-cultural relational capacities, in addition to intellectual, administrative, technological capacities. The economy-specific sector, on the other hand, by shifting the “r” downward more rapidly than “T”, collaborates more consciously with the people in general for such diverse and versatile human capacity developments. The economy-specific sector also thinks it important to accelerate human maturation and reduce the long-run global Social Cost (“environmental risks”, in particular) for a steadier enjoyment of reasonable profit opportunity.

Summarily stated, Numerator “T” of Basic Ratio (T/r) declines faster than Denominator “r” during the Growth Process. At the Growth-Maturation Turning Point D on Path F-D-O (ODP), Numerator’s declining speed is just matched with that of Denominator. During the Maturation Process, the decline of Denominator “r” becomes faster than that of Numerator “T’, to narrow gradually the gap between the theoretical-ideal Path F-O and the practical-optimal Path F-D-O, as the people in general mature steadily. 

Balancing Mental Aspect and Real Aspect

The Basic Ratio (T/r) as the “Mental Aspect”, representing the “personal, spiritual, moral, psychological, temporal and intellectual spheres of socioeconomic activities, is now examined as it relates closely with the “Real Aspect”, representing the “material/physical, spatial and monetary spheres” of socioeconomic activities. The latter aspect consists of Consumption-Income Ratio (C/V), Wage-Income Ratio (W/V), Saving-Income Ratio (S/V), Investment-Income Ratio (I/V) and Rent-Income Ratio (R/V) in our theoretical construct. The Mental Aspect (or, the Basic Ratio) initiates and induces “well-balanced” coherent changes to all the ratios in the Real Aspect, by means of the declining society-general “present-time preference rate T” and the declining economy-specific “present-time preference rate r” with a significant time-lag, as described in the previous Sub-section. Thus, such changes in the Real Aspect indicate the coherent-concrete reactions to the changing Mental Aspect for the sake of a long-term “balanced” socioeconomic development. For example, Equation (T/r = C/V) suggests that the changing Real Aspect (C/V) becomes equivalent with the changing Mental Aspect (T/r).

The right-hand side variables of our theoretical construct include the “single aggregate variables”, viz., Income/Value-added (V), Consumption (C), Wage (W), Saving (S), Investment (I) and Rent (R), in addition to the “proportional aggregate variables”, viz., Consumption-Income Ratio (C/V), Wage-Income Ratio (W/V), Saving-Income Ratio (S/V), Investment-Income Ratio (I/V) and Rent-Income Ratio (R/V). Now, the “single” Real-Aspect variable” (V), as well as all the “Real-Aspect proportional variables”, are explained, as follows: -

Income (V), here, means the long-term aggregate Income (or the long-term total value-added). For the present purpose, this variable includes approximately all the society’s socioeconomic productive activities “paid and unpaid in market”. All such productive activities in the long term may be calculated monetarily by “market price”, “shadow price” (reasonably based on market price), and “psychic price” (meaning, tentatively, the “socially reasonable mental-and-emotional price”). Put differently, such aggregate Income (V) refers to the monetarily aggregated all of “market”,
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“shadow” and “psychic” incomes, which accrued to the long-term productive activities, which may be diversely different among societies. In short, the aggregate Income (V) indicates the society’s all-inclusive incomes/value-added in the long term. As a matter of course, this includes, among other things, all the unpaid productive and training activities within the respective households, such as cooking, cleaning, washing, fixing and other diverse household chores.

Consumption-Income Ratio (C/V) means the long-term ratio of the aggregate Consumption (C) to the aggregate Income (V). Aggregate Consumption (C) includes the “unpaid” long-term household consumption of the own household outputs, in addition to all long-term consumption of market products. Such aggregate Consumption (C) here includes approximately all the long-term Consumption, other than household expenditures on “effective human-capital formation” which are accounted as part of the long-term aggregate Investment (I). Such effective human-capital formation may include “household expenditures” on high school-and-advanced education, professional training for career-advancement and also on mental-physical healthcare.

Wage-Income Ratio (W/V) means the long-term ratio of the aggregate Wage (W) to the aggregate Income (V), or “Labor-Share of Income”. W/V is assumed approximately equivalent in size to Consumption-Income Ratio (C/V) in the long term. Such aggregate Wage (W) here indicates the income accruing only to the “simple labor”. The so-called “simple labor wage (W)” here is assumed to include the payment only the standard minimum skills of reading, writing and calculating, as well as only the standard minimum nurture/knowledge of the own Native Culture on customs, manners and morality. Such labor-income is the minimum accessible/obtainable by all the workers of the society as part of the aggregate Income (V).

Saving-Income Ratio (S/V) means the long-term ratio of the aggregate Saving (S) to the aggregate Income (V). The S/V is pivotal to the maintenance of long-term balance with Investment-Income Ratio (I/V). The aggregate Saving (S) here consists of the total household, corporate and government savings, which include amount of future-oriented general surplus resources for maintenance of the own Native Culture and social infrastructure, as well as for reasonable provision against future contingencies, such as pandemic, famine, climatic change (among other things). Thus, the aggregate Saving (S) implies a socioeconomic readiness to maintain the people’s minimum sustenance, reasonable peace of mind and future orientation.

Investment-Income Ratio (I/V) means the long-term ratio of the aggregate Investment (I) to the aggregate Income (V). In turn, the (I/V) is assumed approximately equivalent to the Rent-Income Ratio (R/V) in the long term. The aggregate Investment (I) here includes the broad category of human-capital formation, financial-capital formation, new enrichment of own Native Culture and other investments in plant and equipment, agricultural land, socioeconomic infrastructure and residential facilities, to mention only the major items. Such aggregate Investment (I) embodies the dynamic functions to transform the aggregate Saving (S) into human, material, financial and own Native-Cultural capitals to continue the on-going socioeconomic activities to the future. Also, the aggregate Investment (I) provides for continuing appropriate balance with the aggregate Saving (S), which is pivotal for the long-term balance between Demand and Supply of the on-going socioeconomic activities.

Rent-Income Ratio (R/V) means the long-term ratio of the aggregate Rent (R) to the aggregate Income (V), or approximately the long-term “Capital-Share of Income”. The aggregate Rent (R) here is assumed to be approximately equivalent in the long term both to the aggregate Saving (S) and the aggregate Investment (I). In other words, the aggregate Rent (R) is assumed to be “saved” and “invested” in the long term. Such aggregate Rent (R) or the total long-term income accruing to the capital stock which includes the physical, material, financial and “effective human” capitals, among other things. The stock of “effective human capital” consists of a variety of complex human skills, abilities and qualifications, which are supported by reasonably sound mental-and-physical health. Accordingly, such stock may encompass intelligence, wisdom, knowledge, ingenuity, creativity, imagination, insights, foresight, communicational skills and Native Culture-oriented skills, as well as the sound temperament, empathy, compassion, tolerance, benevolence, courage, public spirit, morality, self-control, and so on. The stock of “effective human capital”, in particular, is essential for
sound-steady human development/maturity for Sustainable Development. For it is also “effective” to both the long-term balanced socioeconomic development and the enrichment of the respective Native Cultures.

**Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Balanced Development**

Now, the long-term “balanced” complex relationship between the Mental Aspect (T/r) and the Real Aspect (C/V, W/V, S/V, I/V and R/V) is explained in the following diagram (Fig. 8), where the Mental Aspect leads the Real Aspect for the global “long-term balanced” socioeconomic development (or Sustainable Development). The starting action is that Numerator “T” of the Mental Aspect declines to invite Denominator “r” to follow with some time-lag. Such initial action reduces (T/r) to decline, and the coherent changes of (C/V), (S/V) and (I/V) of the Real Aspect follow suit. As qualified in the above Subsection, the special meanings of our variables are also important and necessary to explain the “big-picture” long-term theory of “balanced” global socioeconomic development.

The “long-term balance” between aggregate “demand” and “supply” suggested in the diagram is indicated by grouping the five equations into the “demand side” (“expenditure side”), including (1) \( T/r = C/V \), (3) \( T/r = 1 - (S/V) \) and (4) \( T/r = 1 - (I/V) \), and the “supply side” (“distribution side”) including (2) \( T/r = W/V \), (4) \( T/r = (I/V) \), and (5) \( T/r = 1 - (R/V) \). Here, Investment Ratio “I/V”, acting as the linkage variable in the long-term socioeconomic development, functions as a bridge between the “demand side” and the “supply side”. Total Investment (I) in the long term facilitates to transform Total Saving (S) into a “capital stock” for the sake of \( I = S = R \), where Variable R indicates the total capital income (Rent).

![Fig8. Long-term Balanced Socioeconomic Development](image)

As shown in the “four-quadrant” diagram in the above, the Mental Aspect (T/r) on the upper vertical axis leads the Real Aspect (Consumption Ratio C/V) on the right-hand side horizontal axis, by maintaining constantly the “equivalent” relationship with each other, as shown in the 1st quadrant. This constant relationship corresponds to the Saving-Investment equality (S = I) in the 3rd quadrant, where the constant equivalent relationship is depicted between Saving Ratio (S/V) and Investment Ratio (I/V).

Also, the changing relationship between the Mental Aspect (T/r) on the upper vertical axis and the Real Aspect (Saving Ratio S/V) on the left-hand side horizontal axis is shown in the 2nd quadrant. Such “inversely proportional” relationship corresponds to the relationship between Consumption Ratio (C/V) and Investment Ratio (I/V) in the 4th quadrant. The four quadrants are now connected into the two square forms (two random samples of diagonally higher square form and diagonally lower square form), both of which indicates the respectively “balanced” socioeconomic development. Each “square form” indicates the interactions between (T/r) and (C/V) in the 1st quadrant; between (T/r) and (S/V) in the 2nd quadrant; between (S/V) and (I/V) in the 3rd quadrant; and between (I/V) and (C/V) in the 4th quadrant. An earlier “balanced” socioeconomic development is shown by the diagonally higher square form and a later “balanced” development shown by the diagonally lower square form.

Such a diagonal-downward shift may continue,
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as long as the balanced global socioeconomic development is maintained.

The present diagram (Fig. 8) indicates an enhancing socioeconomic development viewed from the “demand side” (“expenditure side”). The same diagram can accommodate the “supply side” (“distribution side”) viewpoint, by simply replacing (C/V) by Wage Ratio (W/V) on the right-hand side horizontal axis and (S/V) by Rent Ratio (R/V) on the left-hand side horizontal axis. Such “demand side” and “supply side” together, the long-term “balanced” socioeconomic development continues through Growth Process and Maturation Process (meaning throughout ODP).

The diagram of the long-term theoretical construct emphasizes the balance between the Mental Aspect and the Real Aspect (for example T/r = C/V), where the former leads the socioeconomic development and the latter follows, in principle. It is important to note that Fig. 8 captures such Mental-Real balance with the lead-lag relationship. As explained already Fig. 7 emphasized the lead-lag relation within the Mental Aspect (T/r) between the society-general “present-preference rate T” and the economy-specific “present-preference rate r”. Also emphasized there is the difference between Growth Process and Maturation Process as regards the long-term cost factor and profit motivation.

It is also important to note that, from the same equation (T/r = C/V), both the Necessary Condition and the Sufficient Condition for the long-term balanced socioeconomic development can be derived mathematically [Hiwaki, 2011]. In words, the Necessary Condition requires the long-term continual increase of per-capita consumption (equivalent to per-capita wage). This means that the Necessary Condition represents the long-term steady improvement of the people’s living standard. While, the Sufficient Condition requires the long-term continuous enhancement of the society-general orientation to the future (meaning the continuous decline of the society-general “present-reference rate T”). The Sufficient Condition, requiring a continual enhancement of the society-general future orientation, prescribes the nature of the Necessary Condition. On the one hand, Consumption “C” must be characterized by a continual shift (1) from the short-run emphasis to the short-long run balance, (2) from the quantity bias to the quality orientation and (3) from the material centeredness to the personal-spiritual-intellectual-cultural emphasis. On the other hand, Wage “W” must be characterized by a continual shift (1) from the low income of the short-run instable labor to the growing income over time with more stable work and improving abilities and (2) from the income based on material-centered piecwork to the gradually growing income that reflects spiritual and cultural oriented work, as well as work experiences and aspirations.

A long-term growth of Wage “W” is guaranteed by the Sufficient Condition, for such growth may be necessitated by guiding the “simple labor” toward “long-term involved work” with mutual, spiritual, intellectual and cultural enrichment. The Sufficient Condition may also shift upward the standard minimum knowledge/skills as well as the standard minimum incorporation of own Native-Cultural knowledge/skills for the gradual improvement of living standard, comfort and harmony of the people in general. These effects of the Sufficient Condition may contribute greatly to the people’s aspirations and incomes over time.

INTEGRAL LIFELONG EDUCATION

Here, “Integral Lifelong Education” (ILE) is defined as “lifelong formal, informal, continuing education” for all people to improve morality, personality, spirituality, intellectuality, humanities, sciences, relational mutuality and global mutual concerns. Thus, ILE aims at enhancing their steady maturation with continual enrichment of long-term broad perspectives and aspirations for a viable human future, based primarily on their respective Native Cultures and Social Value Systems. Also, ILE is expected to integrate the diverse educational/academic dimensions, facets and functions of home-school-community-virtual-higher educational varieties. Further, ILE is expected to augment human empathy, vitality, resilience and viability. Such ILE may mean a paramount importance to pursue Sustainable Development for a viable human future.

A practical approach to ILE that facilitates acquisition of motives and capacities for the implied importance of friendly personal-social relationship, may demand a framework of personal-and-societal maturation that broadly entails, as follows [Hiwaki, 2012, 2014a]:

- Greater human capacity for mutual respect
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with well-balanced mutual understanding;

- Clearer awareness of the mutual contributions for human past, present and future;
- Keener insights into complex human nature and diverse human needs;
- Greater ability to accumulate, integrate and understand a complex human knowledge and wisdom;
- Long-term, broader personal concerns of, and perspectives for human future;
- Greater motivation for enriching own Native Culture as well as helping enrich diverse Native Cultures for a viable human future; and
- Greater aspiration and endeavor for a peaceful and sustainable human future.

Integral Lifelong Education: A Guideline

For the prospective Global Community, perhaps, we will need education very different from modern education. The Integral Lifelong Education (ILE) may offer a guideline for such education that aims at cultivating as much potential as possible of respective persons and peoples for expanding their frameworks of thoughts (“thought-frames”) [Hiwaki, 2012].

First, ILE encourages to avoid bureaucratic manual-oriented operations primarily based on the “established” habits, facts, precedents, formalism and methodology.

Secondly, ILE encourages to place the utmost emphasis on a systemic-and-holistic grasp of complex human past, present and future, rather than justifying only the modern history, knowledge, paradigm, values, worldviews and perspectives.

Thirdly, ILE encourages to have the long-term purpose of serving all people, by contributing to their purposes of well-balanced and comprehensive human development for sound, active and fruitful longevity.

Fourthly, ILE encourages always to remain open and flexible, as well as discretionary and critical about newly emerging knowledge and technology.

Fifthly, ILE encourages always to remain respectful to the long-endured wisdom of diverse Native Cultures and Social Value Systems.

Sixthly, ILE encourages to recognize an important responsibility for enriching the own Native Culture, in view of mutually respectful-beneficial interactions with other Native Cultures across the world.

Seventhly, ILE encourages to expand each personal thought-frame for respecting personal, spiritual, social and cultural values that represent the inherited unique risk factors, perspectives, motives, concerns and thoughts on the basis of climatic, geographical, geological, geopolitical differences.

Eighthly, ILE encourages to marginalize and counteract the prevailing excessive “individual self-interest”, “national interest” and “world-standardizing interest” of the contemporary power structure (Big Market).

Ninthly, ILE encourages to promote Sustainable Development, by triggering a trilateral virtuous circle of comprehensive human development/maturation, balanced socioeconomic development and holistic Native-Culture enrichment.

Tenthly, last but not least, ILE encourages to avoid promoting any specific/special interests, including ones of financiers, industrialists, stock-holders, corporate-leaders, aristocrats, religionists, militarists, bureaucrats, government-leaders and Big Market.

Frameworks for Integral Lifelong Education

Theoretical Evolution of “High Concern”

A theoretical evolution of the people’s “High Concern” (or, the people’s mental enrichment, maturation and empowerment), by means of sound and balanced human-capital formation, must coincide with a long-term balanced socioeconomic development (or Sustainable Development). This theoretical evolution is to emphasize the importance of human mental/spiritual empowerment for enhancing sound human character, personality, intellectuality, spirituality, empathy, nature-orientation, among other things, with due respects to sound material-oriented development. Promotion of such mental empowerment for pursuing a viable human future may heavily rely on Integral Lifelong Education (ILE) that refers largely to expansion and enhancement of complex personal-and-societal thought-frames. Thus, such Evolution of High Concern has a direct relation to our theoretical framework of the Mentally-led long-
term balanced socioeconomic development [Hiwaki, 1995b].

A diagrammatic approach to the derivation of Curve H, showing the Evolution of High Concern (or, “thought-frame enhancement”), reflects the image of Optimal Development Path (ODP) in Fig. 7, which is shown in the 1st quadrant of the following diagram, Fig. 9. This 1st quadrant indicates the relationship between the society-general “present-preference rate T” and the economy-specific “present-preference rate r”, representing the curve ODP (the bow-shaped curve) as explained in the above. In other words, the 1st quadrant portrays a schedule of our Basic Ratio (T/r) or the “Mental Aspect”, implying synergistic interactions of “T” with “r”. As suggested already, the Mental Aspect (Value Aspect) leads the Real Aspect, in principle, to enhance a long-term course of balanced socioeconomic development (or, Sustainable Development).

The 2nd quadrant depicts a downward sloping curve (convex to the origin O), which represents synergistic interactions between the society-general “present-time preference” (on the “upper” vertical axis T) and the “future-time horizon” (on the “left-hand side horizontal axis F1). A decline of “T” (meaning a rise in the society-general future orientation) indicates that the society places a higher value on the “future time”. Thus, the “shift” from T1 to T2 on the vertical axis T coincides with an expansion of “future-time horizon” (from F1 to F2) on the horizontal axis Ft. In other words, the rising society-general “future” orientation expands the society’s “future-time horizon” throughout such synergistic interactions.

A similar relation is depicted in the 4th quadrant, where the declining economy-specific “present-time preference” (on the right-hand side horizontal axis r) interacts with “human-capital formation” (the “lower” vertical axis Ih). As a decline of “r” from r1 to r2 (meaning a rise in the economy-specific future orientation) encourages an increase in human-capital formation (from Ih1 to Ih2). In other words, the 4th quadrant also depicts a downward sloping curve (convex to the origin O).

The synergistic interactions of the respective variables in the 2nd and the 4th quadrants, together, lead to further synergistic interactions in the 3rd quadrant that portrays the Evolution of High Concern (Curve H). This curve reflects/represents largely the Optimal Development Path (ODP) in the 1st quadrant, which augments over time the gradual mental enrichment toward maturation of the social constituents in general. Accordingly, the 3rd quadrant traces the change on ODP largely by depicting the synergistic interactions between the “future time-horizon F1” (reflecting a growing society-general future orientation) and “human-capital formation Ih” (also reflecting a growing future orientation).

Thus, Fig. 9 serves to derive Curve H (“evolution of high concern” or “thought-frame enhancement”) which is now explained step by step. In the 1st quadrant, the society-general “present-preference rate T1” placed on the upper vertical axis (T) interacts synergistically with the economy-specific “present-preference
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rate r1” on the right-hand side horizontal axis (r). The corresponding “future-time-horizon Ft1” of the people in general is shown on the left-hand side horizontal axis (Ft). The amount of “human-capital formation Ih1” at the given “economy-specific r1” is shown on the lower vertical axis (Ih). Then, Ih1 and Ft1 relate each other at Point H1 on “Curve H” in the 3rd quadrant. Next, a second T2 on the upper vertical axis (T) interacts with a second r2 on the right-hand side horizontal axis (r) in the 1st quadrant. Now, the corresponding “future-time horizon Ft2 is shown on the horizontal axis (Ft). Then, the second r2 interacts with the second Ih2 in the 4th quadrant. This interaction between Ih2 and Ft2 relate each other at Point H2 on “Curve H”. Such Point H1, Point H2 and other relevant points, together, form eventually the whole Curve H (“Evolution of High Concern”) in the 3rd quadrant [Hiwaki, 2000, 2001].

A Framework of Balanced Human Maturation

The Evolution of High Concern (Curve H) derived in Fig. 9, contributing to the long-term balanced socioeconomic development, as well as for enhancing human steady maturing, is now placed in the 1st quadrant of new four-quadrant diagram (Fig. 10), as follows. This figure is to indicate a framework of balanced/sound personal-and-societal maturation that accelerates versatile human development and maturation to enrich diverse Native Cultures worldwide as well as to promote Sustainable Development of the Global Community. The four axes of the diagram include Axis Ft (right-hand side horizontal axis), Axis Lt (left-hand side horizontal axis), Axis Ih (upper vertical axis) and Axis Is (lower vertical axis) [Hiwaki, 2002, 2003, 2012, 2021].

![Diagram](image)

**Fig 10. Sound & Balanced Personal and Societal Maturation**

Axis Ft shows the “average planning range” of the social constituents, which reflects the changes over time of the society-general orientation to “the present vis-à-vis the future” (or, the society-general “planning-time dimension”). The “planning-time dimension” reinforces mutually with the society-general “living-time dimension” shown on Axis Lt, indicating the average “active-life expectation. Thus, such “active-life expectation on Axis Lt is assumed to be reasonably correspond to the society’s “planning range on Axis Ft in the long term.

Axis Ih, as the upper vertical axis, shows changes in the society’s investment in “human capital” (or, “human-capital formation”), while Axis Is as the lower vertical axis, shows changes in the society’s investment in “socio-economic infrastructure”. Roughly speaking, Axis Ih (“mental”) and Axis Is (“material”), together, suggest the “mutual reinforcement” of human-and-material capital foundations that include the Native Culture, educational system, social value system, political-legal system, transportation system, utility system, water supply system, national safety system (among other things).

In this diagrammatic framework, the policy-amenable investments relevant to “mental-and-material space” are represented by the vertical axes (Ih and Is). Such policy-amenable investments interact for “mutual reinforcement”
with the **less-amenable** investments relevant to “mental-and-material times” (“planning time” and “life span”) represented by the horizontal axes ($Ft$ and $Lt$). This diagrammatic framework aims at the promotion of comprehensive human development, balanced socio-economic development and holistic Native Culture enrichment, for *sound-and-steady maturing of humanity*. For the same purpose, the *synergistically interacting* **four axes** reinforce mutually with the *synergistically interacting* **four curves** in the four quadrants.

To begin with, Curve $H$ in the 1st quadrant indicates the *Evolution of High Concern* (or, “thought-frame enhancement”) that refers to the growing motivation to enrich the own Native Culture and enhance human mental-and-physical *maturing* for a viable human future. Thus, Curve $H$ depicts the “personal-societal” *thought-frame enhancement* through continual integration of growing perspective, time-span, perception, awareness, sentence, knowledge, wisdom, empathy, compassion, morality and responsibility (among other things). In other words, Curve $H$, in the growing “mental space-time”, suggests to accommodate continual changes in the people’s thoughts, feelings and perspectives for augmenting human *steady mental maturing*. Thus, the “up-ward” sloping Curve $H$ in the 1st quadrant shows the enhancing *society-general “future orientation”* (reflected on Axis $Ft$), that reinforces mutually with the growing “human-capital formation” (reflected on Axis $Ih$).

In the 2nd quadrant, Curve $X$ indicates the personal-societal enhancement of over-all *human value* or, *value of humanities* as implied by continuously “up-dating” human-capital formation for steady *personal-spiritual maturing* (reflected on Axis $Ih$) that reinforces mutually with the *elongated time-span* of “active-life expectation” (reflected on Axis $Lt$). In other words, Curve $X$ indicates the simultaneous enhancement of “value of humanities”, “Native Culture”, “social value system” and “personal-spiritual maturing”.

In the 3rd quadrant, Curve $Y$ indicates the personal-societal *lifestyle enhancement* by means of the incessantly enriched Native Culture and Social Value System. This is implied by the *elongated time-span* of “active-life expectation” (reflected on Axis $Lt$) that reinforces mutually with the “investment in soft-and-hard socio-economic infrastructure” (reflected on Axis $Is$). In other word, Curve $Y$ indicates the enhancement of “life-and-health values”, as well as the enrichment of “Native Culture” and “sound and meaningful lifestyle”.

In the 4th quadrant, Curve $Z$ indicates the personal-societal “common goal” enhancement (as a result of the improving *mental-physical vitality, mutual trust* and *empathetic lifestyle*). This is implied by the growing investment in *soft-and-hard* socio-economic infrastructure (reflected on Axis $Is$) that reinforces mutually with the rising *society-general “future orientation”* (reflected on Axis $Ft$). In other words, Curve $Z$ indicates both the enhancement of long-term *common values* and personal-societal *maturation* (such as mutual concerns, collaboration consciousness and relational mutuality).

Finally, all the processes of *thought-frame enhancement* (Curve $H$) in the 1st quadrant, *human-value enhancement* (Curve $X$) in the 2nd quadrant, *life-style enhancement* (Curve $Y$) in the 3rd quadrant and *common-goal enhancement* (Curve $Z$) in the 4th quadrant, put together, indicate the Grand Integral Process (GIP) of long-term “balanced” *personal-and-societal maturation*. The complex theoretical framework – GIP - shows the long-term continual “corresponding eight-way” (4 axes and 4 curves) expansions from an initially *balanced rectangle* to a “stepped-up” rectangle. In other words, GIP may also help stimulate the *trilateral virtuous circle* of comprehensive human development/maturation, balanced socioeconomic development/maturation and the enrichment of society-specific holistic Native Culture.

Further, GIP may reinforce continuously *personal-societal vitality* by enriching the Native Culture and Social Value System. Moreover, GIP may give rise to continuous friendly interactions with other societies in the Global Community and promote the mutually-reinforcing trilateral virtuous circle of personal amenities (implying Personal Happiness), societal amenities (implying Socioeconomic Fairness) and global amenities (implying Global Harmony).

Thus, the “incessantly expanding rectangle” derived from GIP may suggests a possible simultaneous, synchronous and theoretical direction toward Sustainable Development. Such is a present *theoretical image* of the evolving Global Community on the basis of
universal Integral Lifelong Education (ILE). Most important, such “Mental” initiation of the “Real” collaborative action worldwide may suggest a hope for Sustainable Development.

The Grand Integral Process (GIP) that offers a complex, systemic, synergistic and integral methodology for lifelong education of the world people in general, may entail the long-term incessant improvement of human thought-frames, life-and-health values, meaningful lifestyles, societal common goals and relational mutuality of all humanity in the Global Community. Put differently, this methodological framework may give rise to a more comfortable way of personal-lifestyle, socioeconomic fairness and global harmony. Such complex framework for human lifelong education, corresponding very well to steady human maturing, as well as to comfortable-meaningful-productive way of life, may be considered highly important motive for pursuing Sustainable Development.

**Potential Innovations for Integral Lifelong Education**

In this Subsection, major educational dimensions and facets of potential innovations for Integral Lifelong Education (ILE) are now listed below, in view of Sustainable Development for a viable human future [Hiwaki, 2012].

A First potential innovation to be sought must develop new approaches and methodologies useful for the prospective Global Community that follows the modern world of aggressively competing individuals, societies and nations under “the modern hegemonic force of habit”. Such innovation must encourage the learner to find versatile knowledge and wisdom produced by diverse society-specific holistic Native Cultures under different geographical locations, climatic characteristics, geological features and so on. Such innovation must stimulate/motivate the learner to find a variety of ideas to deal with natural disasters in similar and/or different conditions/situations, as well as a variety of ideas for avoiding violent conflicts and warfare. Further, such innovation must help the learner dispense of simplistic ideas popular in modern times, such as “biological evolution of humanity”, “linear historical progression” and “humanity being likened to machine”.

A Second potential innovation closely related to a first potential innovation must help the learner understand and appreciate clearly the importance of “personal empathy”, “cultural ethos” and “relational mutuality” in the Global Community. Also, such educational innovation must encourage the learner the importance of compassionate, empathetic, generous and tolerant “human mutual relations”, as well as of serious concerns about the intrinsic, complex and basic “human needs”. Further, it must cultivate the learner for greater awareness of the presently devastated diverse Native Cultures, under the prevailing excessively biased modern ideologies and lifestyles.

A Third potential innovation to be sought must cultivate the learner for broader and longer-term perspectives for a viable future. Such innovation must nurture a more enlightened perspectives, as well as a stronger long-term orientation to the future. Also, it must encourage broader, deeper and richer knowledges and experiences for viewing a variety of phenomena both local and global, as well as for understanding them from longer-term, worldwide and symbiotic-and-cyclical perspectives. Further, it must encourage serious concerns of our future generations’ well-being, as well as of sound and effective actions for “balancing” economic development and human environment. Still further, it must aim at developing the learner’s ability to imagine, not only the immediate consequences of modern biased ideologies, individual behaviors, business practices and government policies, but also their long-term, worldwide and natural consequences.

A Fourth potential innovation to be sought must develop a new “methodology/curriculum” to help the learner expand a variety of literacy, vision, insight and imagination. Such educational innovation must help the learner see through deceitful words and expressions in political rhetoric, diplomatic language, advertising technique and fraudulent practices, as well as help the learner, more generally, cope with dubious ideas, logics and explanations. For such purposes, the educational innovation must provide the learner with a reasonable framework and guideline for connecting, respectively, “short-run and long-run perspectives”, “microscopic and macroscopic perspectives”, “insider and outsider perspectives”, “leader and follower perspectives” and so on, to decipher a variety of mental, physical, linguistic, digital, cybernetic and other manipulations.
A Fifth potential innovation to be sought must provide the learner with various ways of understanding historical events/occurrences, based on short-run, long-run, synergistic, systemic viewpoints, as well as based on a variety of combined viewpoints. Such educational innovation must be useful to examine the winner-biased modern explanations of historical events, for example, with a view to “long-term synergistic” consequences to human thoughts, behaviors and lifestyles. Also, the educational innovation must encourage the learner broader and deeper understanding of the winner-biased inculturation/education from different standpoints. Further, it must help the learner challenge the “established” historical explanations by new approaches and methodologies based on inter-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary studies.

A Sixth potential innovation to be sought concerns a methodological coordination for studies of “the modern hegemonical force of habit” and its long-run consequences. Such educational innovation must emphasize the importance of developing “alternative ideas/views” for the sake of a viable, meaningful and harmonious human future. Also, such educational innovation must encourage the learner to recognize that the prevailing ideas and views have a “strong undercurrent” of the winner-justifying high-handed opinions, such as “Might makes right” and “The winner takes all”, as well as of the winner-cherished human characters, such as “aggressive”, “violent” and “exclusive”. Further, it must help the learner see through the prevailing power politics that has the strong inclination to impose compelling ideas on the world people in general, such as “market economy, free competition and free trade”, together with “profit maximization”, “privatization of property” and “Money is might that makes right”. Furthermore, such educational innovation must help the learner understand that such high-handed opinions, viewpoints, ideas and values have imposed a strong worldwide influence “incompatible with” alternative viewpoints and perspectives that encourage a long-run steady restoration of diverse Native Cultures, human steady maturation, sound motivations and comfortable lifestyles for a viable human future (Sustainable Development).

A Seventh potential innovation to be sought concerns cultivation of the learner to be keenly aware that the long-endured knowledge and wisdom may have a highly synergistic relationship. Such innovation must help the learner awaken to the importance of synthesizing and integrating knowledge-and-wisdom of the own Native Culture, by enhancing the learner’s capability and maturity for more meaningful learning. This awakening must motivate the learner to be engaged in inter-disciplinary, trans-disciplinary and holistic approaches to discover unexpected synergistic effects for broadening and deepening the scope of thought and understanding. Such innovation must, at the same time, help the learner see “not only the trees but also the wood” (the important complex mutual relations among the soil, fungi, insects, birds, animals, tree-root interactions, water storage and the wood-induced weather and so on), as well as see “much broader phenomenon in the world”, for example, political, economic, social, psychological, physical and cultural phenomenon complexly related one another.

An Eighth potential innovation to be sought concerns cultivation of the learner for inter-cultural respectfulness and mutual understanding. Such educational innovation must encourage affinity to the own Native Culture and respect for the other Native Cultures with historical, climatic, geographical, geological, geopolitical and environmental differences. This is to encourage the learner to understand the important meanings of long endured/accumulated society-specific holistic Native Cultures to the respective peoples and societies as well as to the Global Community. In other words, such educational innovation must help the learner to think about the importance of Native-Cultural identity for mental health and spiritual-physical integral balance, as well as of Cultural foundation for comfortable/harmonious private and public lifestyles. Also, such educational innovation must encourage the learner to examine and enhance the Native Culture-bound environments for human relations, manners, languages, festivities, religious services and sound socioeconomic activities. Further, such innovation must help cultivate the learner to appreciate and respect the diverse Native Cultures for a meaningful, fruitful and viable human future. Still further, such educational innovation, by relating with all the above potential innovations, must aim at a well-balanced comprehensive human development in personal, spiritual, moral,
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intellectual, aesthetic and physical aspects, by enhancing overall personal-societal thought frames in the space-time and natural life for pursuing Sustainable Development.

CONCLUSION

With cruel warfare, rampant terrorism, prolonged pandemic, climatic disasters (among other human-invited predicaments), the ongoing aggressive and fierce market competition worldwide, on the one hand, and the exercise of strong power of the states based on “respective political systems”, on the other, have made the contemporary people feel increasingly insecure, restless, frustrated, dejected and uncertain about life in the future. Almost all the resulting sufferings and losses may have been uncompensated as far as the people at large are concerned, despite the fact that all such miserable-cruel conditions and occurrences have been incessantly created by the faceless contemporary power structure (Big Market), as well as by the nonchalant unhinging-unquestioning human beings in general. Most such sufferings and losses of the poor-and-weak across the world may have very well been caused by the “hidden, unpaid long-run global Social Cost”. Despite being “politically incorrect”, it is a must now to discuss openly the extreme danger of short-run oriented irresponsible world governance.

For their further empowerment, Big Market and its global accomplice (or, almost all modern/contemporary leaders) have now been campaigning “under the pressure of necessity” for a new revolutionary scheme of “Carbon-Neutral”, “Zero Carbon”, “Hydrogen Energy”, “Electric Vehicle (EV)”, “Paper-less Office Work”, “Digital Transformation (DX)”, “Artificial Intelligence (AI)”, “Generative AI”, and so on. In such campaign, many businesses have already jumped on the “fashionable bandwagon”, deceptively referring to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The massive campaigning for such revolutionary shift of the global politico-economic activities, without explaining their modern lingering mistakes, nor referring to the expected imposition of unbearably heavy cost on the poor-and-weak, in particular, may be intended to deceive once again the general public worldwide, as if everything were going to be solved by the initiation of Big Market (a “god-sent child” of Pax Britannica-and-Pax Americana). Similar “fanfare” was trumpeted often in the past, only to worsen the existing “unfair living conditions”, as well as “human predicament” and “natural imbalance”, by engineering people’s appetite, interests, aspirations and greed.

Such modern/contemporary global leaderships have been almost always silent about their imposition of extremely heavy cost and burden on workers, consumers and producers at large by switching to a new line of fashionable products from the currently accustomed ones. Also, such leaderships may have frequently hoisted high the “progress-promotion flag” for “creative destruction”, as if it were “the flag of public good”, without extending appropriate-adequate assistance and compensation to the persons-and-firms who would have to suffer and/or bear potentially the enormous/prohibitive time, monetary and spiritual costs for such revolution that may entail extremely heavy long-run global Social Cost. It is not simple and easy to acquire new competitive knowledge/skills to pay the replacement cost of the currently used products and capital goods, and to acquire sufficient funds to be put into the new human-and-physical capital formation. Further, such leadership may have no ideas/no concerns of the workers’ hard living after losing current job-and-income that had required long-run endeavors for acquiring/mastering relevant skills.

Furthermore, such leaderships, as usual, favoring the well-established rich and large multi-national enterprises may ignore all the excruciating burdens for survival of the “fund-poor” small firms. Moreover, such global leaderships may have cunningly plotted to offer “the same bed, but different dreams”, by manipulating modern mutually-reinforcing market ideologies of antagonism, materialism, individualism, progressivism and egotism. These mutually-reinforcing ideologies (as shown in Fig. 1: Market Value System) may have generally encouraged/forced people worldwide to work harder and compete more aggressively for achieving their individual better life. At the same time, however, the global hegemonic leaders may have been engineering to enrich-and-empower themselves, at the sacrifice of harder efforts of individuals for “better life”.

Viewed from the standpoint of Big Market, “antagonism” may indicate a continuing support for the idea “Might-makes-right”, as well as for
the inducement of “aggressive-predatory rivalry” in the world. Likewise, “materialism” may indicate a continuing support for aggrandizement of monetary/material wealth, as well as for accumulation of superior weapons and military facilities. “Individualism” may indicate convenience of the tactic “divide-and-rule”, as well as marginalization of the empathy-oriented personality. “Progressivism” may indicate encouragement of technological advancement, as well as of military supremacy. “Egotism” may indicate a continuing support for the idea “The-winner-takes-all”, as well as for the hegemonical self-justification and self-empowerment.

At this juncture, it is important for us humans to be keenly aware of the fact that the widely-spread ad hoc modern-contemporary tactics/ manipulations/policies (or “modern politico-economic aggressive-and-reckless methods) for short-run profit-oriented innovations and economic growth do not have any reasonable and appropriate long-term theoretical or moral backing. Such modern politico-economic methodology has been only ad hoc and reckless promotion of profit maximization, economic growth, technological superiority and Big Market’s hegemonic power. Our Optimal Development Path (ODP) is never meant to provide any support for such ad hoc short-run politico-economic activities which have encouraged an “endless, inordinate-and-inhuman efficiency”, “short-run profit maximization”, “short-run piece-meal innovations” and “supremacy of massive inhuman-indiscriminatory weaponry”.

Also, such reckless and ad hoc politico-economic tactics have functioned well mostly for the winner’s rapid accumulation of wealth and power, at the cost of the poor-and-weak worldwide and the natural environment. Further, such ad hoc tactics have been used for manipulation of raising stock prices for the very rich at the cost of interest-income for the hard-saving endeavor by the low-and-middle income households, as well as at the cost of marginalizing the latter’s human-capital value and income. Moreover, such reckless and ad hoc methods have functioned to create incessantly and dangerously the individualized and globalized aggressive/predatory competitions and severe conflicts, resulting in escalation of the already swollen hostility worldwide. Most likely, such methodology may have led the world people toward a human-made atrocious violence, warfare and, eventually, towards collapse of human world.

Further, such lopsided aim of the methods has inescapably accelerated an inordinate accumulation of the unpaid, long-run, globalized Social Cost, leading toward moral-ethical degeneration of humanity. Accordingly, such aim also has invited the global environmental devastation and worldwide disasters, which may, sooner or later, work havoc upon the world people in general. Therefore, such reckless and ad hoc politico-economic methodology may aggravate the impasse of serious human predicament, suggesting a dead-end human world. Most likely, such methodology may have worked directly against the long-and-hard endeavors of conscientious people for a viable human future, as well as the organizational endeavors of the United Nations for Sustainable Development. Thus, such ad hoc, short-run, material-biased, aggressive/predatory, market-centric contemporary politico-economic methods and manipulations, supporting only the continuation of the winner’s domination of all global human activities, may offer no hope for a viable human future and/or Sustainable Development.

It goes without saying that aggressive market competition and cruel warfare, as representative modern/contemporary politico-economic activities, can never be considered compatible with Sustainable Development. For such aggressive-cruel activities usually invite monetarily unaccountable human sufferings and casualties, as well as personal mental-physical disunity, social disharmony and international enmity, all which, put together, may, most likely, amount to much more than all sorts of human benefits derived from Modern Civilization. In a sense, the modern/contemporary hegemonies, over modern centuries, have taken advantage of “Dead men tell no tales”, as well as of the voiceless natural environment. Thus, such modern/contemporary politico-economic methods and activities can never find “a place” in our long-term balanced theoretical-practical framework and guideline, nor in our long-term collaboration-conscious endeavor for Sustainable Development. For Sustainable Development requires “peace and order”, as well as personal mental-physical soundness, social harmony and international amity.

As discussed above, the swelling unpaid long-run Social Cost has escalated the damage to the
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loser (including the world conscientious, the poor and the weak, as well as the voiceless natural environment), by the aggressive, predatory, cruel, reckless activities of Modern Civilization under the so-called “Modern Democracy”. Such frightful unpaid global Social Cost, as being extremely difficult to calculate even roughly, cannot be easily presented to the public as the “negative value-added” of “aggressive/cruel market-competition and warfare”. Nobody, however, can nullify something that actually happened. An accumulated long-run unpaid global Social Cost, representing an approximate total of globally lost/destroyed alternative opportunities over time, may suggest a prohibitive-and-unpayable amount. Viewed in this manner, can we just say “Let bygones be bygones”? Such a simple way of disposal of the matter, though “convenient” for Big Market, can only worsen the human predicament and natural environment, entailing a serious havoc sooner or later on the world people in general.

The above-mentioned philosophical, theoretical and practical frameworks and arguments for Sustainable Development and SDGs may not have any strong impact in the short-run on the betterment of global socio-politico-economic activities. Such frameworks and arguments, however, may help encourage a more and faster human maturation over the long term to promote Sustainable Development. Present author sincerely hopes that, before too late, such frameworks and arguments will help guide an increasing number of the world people over time to sweep away their nonchalant and/or optimistic views of human future, as well as to enhance their steady maturation for governance of the future world. Also, he seriously hopes that such guidance may work steadily so that an increasing number of people rethink the long inculturated “the winner’s bright-side views” of Modern Civilization” [Hiwaki, 2023].

As far as the present author is concerned, one of the most important things for the world public to see is that the on-going reckless-run of Modern Civilization has been continually degenerating our perspectives, worldviews, morals, values, attitudes and behaviors, as well as devastating human and natural environments. Another important thing to recognize is that we have been inculcated to enjoy “now”, with our naïve, carefree, unthinking, irresponsible, immature lifestyles. Such lifestyles have made our world increasingly devastated and dangerous, no doubt, to invite the unbearable future full of fears and miseries. As “social and reciprocal persons” [Graham, 2015, 2016], however, we humans are capable to hope and work for a “well-deserving life”, by endeavoring “collaboration-consciously” and aspiring, together, for Sustainable Development. The concept/hypothesis of “Sustainable Development” that presumes a very long-lasting human world, indeed, is a courageously proposed antithesis to the on-going reckless short-run orientation of the winner-favoring and conflict-inducing Modern Civilization. Perhaps, the world people at large, have been long “mesmerized” by the modern/contemporary hegemonies to believe in the “short-run oriented fictional world”, so as to ignore “other than short-run cost” unthinkingly, immaturely and/or irresponsibly. In the meantime, the unpaid long-run global Social Cost has rapidly accumulated under the short-run oriented reckless Civilization.

In other words, the short-run, reckless and highly biased free-hand politico-economic administration and governance of the world by the modern/contemporary power structures must fade away soonest possible, for the sake of a viable human future. No doubt, a complete fading may have to wait for the future prevalence of steadily maturing world people in general. In his book, The Future as History [1960], Robert L. Heilbroner quoted the words of Ignazio Silone: “Political regimes come and go; bad habits remain” (Voices of Dissent, New York, 1958, p.325). It may be highly difficult to wipe out “the modern hegemonic force of habit” soon, but it is highly probable when the world people mature steadily over the long term. The steadily maturing world people, with all possible collaboration for Sustainable Development, need to work harder to rectify, to begin with, the own socio-economically irresponsible neglect as well as carefree/nonchalant inaction. It would be a fatal human failure, if the hard-worked ideal of Sustainable Development -an ultimatum - for a viable human future ended up only as a “fashionable/fantastic fable”.
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