

Instructions for authors, subscriptions and further details:

<http://rimcis.hipatiapress.com>

Politics, Law & Complexity: The Case of the Academic Policies in the European Union

Andrea Pitasi¹

1) Gabriele d'Annunzio University, Chieti-Pescara

Date of publication: November 30th, 2016

Edition period: November 2016 - February 2017

To cite this article: Pitasi, A. (2016). Politics, Law & Complexity. The Case of the Academic Policies in the European Union. *International and Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(3), 208-227. doi: 10.17583/rimcis.2016.1904

To link this article: <http://doi.org/10.17583/rimcis.2016.1904>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

The terms and conditions of use are related to the Open Journal System and to [Creative Commons Attribution License](#) (CC-BY).

Politics, Law & Complexity: The Case of the Academic Policies in the European Union

Andrea Pitasi

Gabriele d'Annunzio University

Abstract

The theoretical goal of this paper is the development of the connection between politics and law within the model of the complex system especially in the perspective of Niklas Luhmann, in a viewpoint linked with the economic analysis of law. The aim is to describe the differences that truly make the difference in the setting problem of policy or legal decisions more formalized by the subject with their values instead of in a system. Therefore, the vision of Joseph A. Schumpeter about the politics as a kind of market, a sub-kind market where votes are sold and bought it is very important and strategic as a bridge between the macro-systemic and the economic analysis of law becomes even more positive, artificial and global: the more is the scenario, the weaker is the function of the human subject in the decisional process, this also provides a report of the changes in the very idea of citizen in global scenarios, which is the Hypercitizenship.

Keywords: complexity, law, hypercitizenship, politics, system theory

Política, Derecho y Complejidad: El Caso de las Políticas Académicas en la Unión Europea

Andrea Pitasi

Gabriele d'Annunzio University

Resumen

El fin teórico de este artículo es el desarrollo de la conexión entre política y derecho en el marco del modelo del sistema complejo especialmente desde la perspectiva de Niklas Luhmann conectada con la del análisis económico del derecho. El fin es describir las características que verdaderamente marcan la diferencia en el problema de las decisiones políticas o jurídicas más formalizadas por el sujeto con sus valores en lugar de en un sistema. Por eso, la visión de Joseph A. Schumpeter de la política como un tipo de mercado, como un mercado subtipo, en el que se venden y compran votos es muy importante y estratégica como puente entre el análisis macrosistémico y el económico del derecho cada vez más positivo, artificial y global: cuanto mayor es el escenario, más débil la función del sujeto humano en el proceso decisional que ofrece también un informe de los cambios de la idea misma de ciudadano que en escenarios globales se hace iperciudadano.

Palabras clave: complejidad, derecho, iperciudadanía, política, teoría de sistemas

The theoretical goal of this paper is to describe the conceptual, epistemological and strategic link between law meant systemic communication of valid legal decisions and politics meant as the noisy black box which hosts all the hidden and undercover fights behind the scenes often also manipulating the media representation of the political matter within the epistemological frame of complex system theory. Specifically, system theory is hereby referred as it took shape since the 1980s (Luhmann, 2012-2013). Classic political theory, for example, is too rhetoric, value based and moralistically biased (Ovejero Lucas, 2013a, p. 293) to strategically and effectively set and solve political problems supported by a viable scientific methodology. It seems more and more evident the high viability of the Schumpeterian definition of politics as a kind of market, a sub kind of market, devoted to the exchange of votes (Pitasi & Ferone, 2008). That is why, the Law & Economics approach (Posner, 1998; Shavell, 2004) can be easily, heuristically and strategically applied to the social and political sciences at large according to a strong rationalization process of the lawmaking procedures. The bias to skip both about the system theory and the Law & Economics approach, is to consider that they might explain social and political phenomena as a whole. Here comes the strategic function of the complex system approach: the viable selection of complexity thus the system/environment coding to distinguish the differences which effectively make the difference. For example, the crowds in a square represent converging emotional energy but this energy converges as something/someone else not involved by that energy is leading and converging it (Canetti, 1984). To focus on the energy of the crowds might eventually lead to a typology of crowds. This typology would not be viable to understand the reasons why and the goals which let that unaware mass emerge and take more or less shape. Reframing the link between politics and law within the link between Law & Economics (L&E) and Complex System Approach (Laszlo, 2007) is the theoretical focus and aim of this paper. This focus is specifically investigated through the exemplary case of the reform of the educational system at its higher ranks shaped by a structural coupling of law and politics both rationalized by the L&E toolkit.

Theory: Hypercitizenship or the Emerging Shapes of Global Citizenship

Social change in global scenarios is usually top-down or eventually bottom-up if the bottom is nevertheless a system and not a natural person or group of persons. Social change is chaotic, unlinear but at the same highly shifting and very seldom shocking. Turbulence and volatility are not necessary a sign of change. No G7, G8 or G20 ever reset their agenda due to the streetfights. The July 2015 Greek referendum in Sintagma Square in Athens, for example, was pure fiction till Tsipras kept on talking about a referendum for Grexit but a couple of day before voting he began saying it was a referendum to let Greece remain the Eurozone in a different way. Shifting is highly frequent, shocking is a very unlikely trend inversion. At that point the fictional "shift" with no empirical shock was evident: the whole case for the referendum was a "soap opera" starred by Tsipras to remix his government alliances in but it was totally irrelevant at the EU level as the article 50 of the New Treaty of the European Union already had set and solved the problem in advance.

The traditional variants of the democratic theory of citizenship (deliberative, radical and procedural ones) are useless in systemic global scenarios in which crowds in the squares simply increase environmental noise as clearly described by Luhmann in his famous *Ecological Communication*, chapter 16 (Luhmann, 1989).

The three variants of democratic citizenship were clearly described and discussed by Fernando Fernandez Llebrez (2013, p. 347-372) and they need to be systemically selected and reset within a wider scenario frame systemically focused on the emergent shapes of citizenship.

From the deliberative variant, the important lesson in politics is that unskilled and uncompetent citizens are not viable voters i.e. not fully citizens in the emerging knowledge intensive society and economics scenarios. Is the empowerment of higher education policies a viable indicator of the citizen competence?

Thus to be deliberative, citizenship must be competent and skilled where "must" is not morally normative but merely isotropically normative.

The radical variant is nowadays the most noise and least effective: the example of Sintagma Square is clear and evident.

The procedural variant managed by a competent and skilled citizenship is probably the most effective in the current scenarios. The link between deliberative competence and procedural competence would be strategic for an emerging citizenship skipping the mud of noisy intermediate levels and setting the problem in the most adequate venue and in the most appropriate way. This link requires an evolution in the concept of citizenship from its (at least in the Western World) obsolete national–state level to a supernational one (van Schendelen, 2013) named hypercitizenship. This work reframes the key global changes of our times under the conceptual emergence of hypercitizenship (Pitasi, 2012b, 2012c, 2012d). I sketched out by designing a multidimensional convergence among different kinds of citizenship: cosmopolitan (Beck, 2006), scientific (Nowotny, 2008), societarian (Donati, 1993) and entrepreneurial (I evolved by reinterpreting Audretsch, 2007 who, properly, copes with the “entrepreneurial Society” not the entrepreneurial citizenship).

To update the ancient Greek concept *de Idiotikos* (self centered, egoist only focused on private life and indifferent before the public sphere, see Ovejero Lucas, 2011 and, first of all, Ovejero Lucas, 2013b), the increasing expansion of rights in the private sphere implies that also what the Greek called *Idiotikos* are nowadays automatically turned into citizens which leads to an inflation and downgrade of the concept of citizenship itself. This is the most important reason of the implosion of the effectiveness of “rights” and the explosion of right bubbles based on political promises impossible to keep: the labor rights increase, the unemployment rate grows even faster for example. The labor rights provide stability to the works but their jobs inevitably underlie an obsolescence process thus the more stability, the more unproductive work, the more destruction of added value, the fast decreasing of wealth, the more bankruptcies of companies, the more increase of unemployment, the higher demand of rights and stability generates a vicious circle in which the new *idiotikos* live as they expect the public sphere to exist and be customized on their own private spheres. The new *idiotikos* do not live a private sphere separated by the public one they expect the public sphere to be the mirror of their private ones. The new *idiotikos* use values and bias instead of concepts, judgments instead or before analysis, they think their microsphere is a concrete reality while the rest of the world is a big

amount of subjective points of view, they are centered on “here and now” emotional opinions and reject knowledge and learning and thus they deny competence and skilled judgments which are the pillars of a deliberative-procedural democracy, instead. These new idiotikos are politically active in the public sphere and represent the failure of the mass democracy vision.

Cosmopolitan Citizenship

The concept of cosmopolitan vision is a key contribution by Ulrich Beck (2006) who states that: “Cosmopolitanism [...] is a vital theme of European civilization and European consciousness and beyond that of global experience” (Beck, 2006, p. 2).

Beck brilliantly adds that: “What do we mean then by the cosmopolitan outlook? Global sense, a sense of boundary lessness. An everyday, historically, alert, reflexive awareness of ambivalence in a milieu of burying differentiation and cultural contradictions” (Beck, 2006, p. 3).

As a matter of fact the cosmopolitan outlook can be featured as follows: “As a counter-image to the territorial prison theory of identity, society and politics we can provisionally distinguish five interconnected constitutive principles of the cosmopolitan outlook:

first, the principle of experience of crisis in world society. The awareness of interdependence and the resulting civilizational community of fate induce by global risks and crises which overcomes the boundaries between internal and external, us and them, the national and the international;

second, the principle of recognition of cosmopolitan differences and the resulting cosmopolitan conflict character and the (limited) curiosity concerning differences of culture and identity;

third, the principle of cosmopolitan empathy and of perspective taking and the virtual interchangeability of situations (as both an opportunity and a threat); fourth the principle of the impossibility of living in a world society without borders and there consulting compulsion to redraw old boundaries and rebuild old walls; fifth the *mélange* principle: the principle that local, national, ethnic, religious and cosmopolitan cultures and traditions interpenetrate, interconnect and intermingle-cosmopolitanism without

provincialism is empty, provincialism without cosmopolitanism is blind” (Beck, 2006, p. 7).

The hypercitizenship concept is focused on the fact that systemic communication about key challenges of our times is increasingly meaning communication and public understanding of science and technology for governance and policy making. From this point of view, law becomes one of the à la carte products which can be bought by browsing a global “catalogue” (I call *Mundus* by evolving Galgano, 2005 perspective on law) surfing on a technological global platform (I call *Globus*) of which the Internet is the best metaphor and which can be seen as the most important platform for convergence developments and as a driver of numerous, key, changes. This new media platform is intrinsically cosmopolitan and while the mass media often still fall into the methodological nationalism trap which Beck describes as “the cosmopolitan outlook calls into question one of the most powerful convictions concerning society and politics which find expression in the claim that modern society and modern politics can only be organized in the form of national states. Society is equated with society organized in nationally and territorially delimited states. When social actors subscribe to this belief, I speak of a national outlook. When it determines the perspective of the scientific observer I speak of methodological nationalism” (Beck, 2006, p. 24). Cosmopolitanism is nowadays pivotal to reform higher education policies and strategies to let supranational, global and, of course, cosmopolitan, citizens evolve being equipped to cope with the global and complex scenarios and its key players.

Scientific Citizenship

Nowotny’s key contribution evolves into the concept of scientific citizenship which features the knowledge based society, as a matter of fact, she states: “A knowledge based society also increases its production of epistemic things, various kinds of abstract objects, and technical artifacts that are subject to the same rules. The democratization of scientific expertise is also merely the expansion of principles of governance that have served the Western liberal democracies well. Today, science and technology are no longer viewed with awe but are part of everyday life. Mediated by the

educational system and qualifications and certificates people acquire, they determine people's chances of upward social mobility, their working world, and the course of their biographies. It is thus logical to extend the concept of citizenship to science and technology. «Scientific citizenship» comprises right and duties and asks about both the functions that expanded concept of citizenship could fulfill in social integration and also the duties that arise from it for citizens as well as for political institutions and administrations” (Nowotny, 2008, p. 23-24).

Nowotny suggests that: “There is broad agreement that more money should be invested in research (that is, that science and technology must continue to expand). This is to be achieved by putting the unexpected and new that comes out of the laboratory into the widest possible variety of contexts of applications to produce in them new knowledge that in turn brings forth new abilities and continues to spread in society” (Nowotny, 2008, p. 83-84).

Moreover: “Today, the entire knowledge of humankind and its impressive technological capacities is oriented toward a future that does not so much promise a new beginning as further intensification and dynamic continuation of what has already been achieved. Science and technology cross the threshold between the present unhindered, for what appears possible in the laboratory today can already be in the market tomorrow or the day after” (Nowotny, 2008, p. 107).

What's next, then?

“The future we are now facing relies on innovation under conditions of uncertainty. This cannot be equated with lack of knowledge – quite the contrary. Uncertainty arises from the surfeit of knowledge, leading to too many alternatives, too many possible ramifications and consequences, to be easily judged” (Nowotny, 2008, p. 116).

In practice: “Exotechnologies aim at the expansion of possibilities of controlling the environment. They have enabled people to travel greater distances in less time and to settle the space they found more densely and efficiently. The processing of found and extracted materials finally enable the mass production of artifacts, the preservation of foodstuffs, and the erection of infrastructures that in turn made it possible to live comfortably in otherwise inclement climate zones. In contrast, the regime of endotechnologies – bio-, nano-, info-, and other converging technologies –

changes the dimensions and scope of action of the scientific objects. They form mostly invisible yet visualizable infrastructures that can penetrate into the smallest dimensions of matter or living organisms” (Nowotny, 2008, p. 132-133).

Thus: “Science and technology cross the boundary between the present and the future with a certain ease and thereby move the future closer the present. Nonetheless the future seems fragile. The loss of temporal distance blurs the difference between what is technologically possible and what is already present in the laboratory, between imagination and reality, which is often a virtual reality. Having lost all utopias, the future presents itself as a sketch of technological visions that block out the social knowledge that is needed to live in a scientific-technological world – and to feel well in it” (Nowotny, 2008, p. 155-156). The key challenge on this side is to educate and train competent and skilled citizens able to select and filter information by viable competence tools in an unbiased and professional way and by skipping emotional traps such as the “panic selling” in the case of filtering and selecting financial information, for example.

Entrepreneurial Citizenship

By sketching out our multidimensional convergence among different kinds of citizenship, namely: cosmopolitan (Beck, 2006), scientific (Nowotny, 2008), societarian (Donati, 1993) and entrepreneurial (Audretsch, 2009) the last one is still briefly to be introduced.

In the “entrepreneurial citizenship” label “entrepreneurial” is broadly and metaphorically meant. Citizenship to manage the Globus and select the Mundus implies a strategic, proactive and let’s say “protestant ethics to master the spirit of capitalism” whatever the job. The entrepreneurial mentality and vision are synonym of proactivity, wide horizon strategy, relentless evolution (Laszlo, 2008a), continuity in goal attainment, clear goal setting, high speed in changing methods, tools and tactics if required to reach to fixed goal and so on. The entrepreneurial attitude and vision imply “lifelong” learning, evolutionary citizens who are always ready to distinguish shifts and shocks are mostly in their own emotional self control and when the shock is coming (shaped as the Schumpeterian winds of

creative destruction as shown in Pitasi-Ferone, 2008) they are already aware of how to act strategically and consistently. They do not cross and not wish to cross their lifetime as Broch's Sleepwalkers (Broch, 2011).

Societarian Citizenship

The scientific citizenship is emerging faster and faster to solve the "incompetence" problem, and as a convergent meeting place between procedural and deliberative democracy the scientific citizenship is reconfiguring itself and is emerging as a shape of the societarian one (Donati, 1993) inspired by an autonomous, self organizing "spirit" and mood of the most competent and skilled knowledge based hypercitizen elites educated according to the most self reflexive relational responsible freedom. Social and public engagement by not profit organizations is crucial as far as it allows the emergence of new trends, requests and needs if these organizations are cosmopolitan, managed by an entrepreneurial spirit and science intensive to follow the deliberative systemic procedures.

When these organizations fail to accomplish or reject this cosmopolitan, science based, entrepreneurial and societarian model, they turn into noisy movement expressing the most emotional moods of the crowds in radical democracy participation fueled by bias and common sense. That is why e-democracy, for example, is becoming more and more procedural and complex. Organizations allowing e-voting have very clear settings and ranks to vote admittance.

Methodology: The Case of the Academic Policies in the European Union

This research is epistemologically focused on the systemic convergence of legal orders setting the political agenda at a very macro level splitting the normative production and the political micro level. We will link normative source both from the supernational level evolving from the intergovernmental one (just like in the case of the 1999 Process of Bologna, the EHEA and the article 53 paragraph 1 of the New European Union Treaty) and national/international laws just like the Italian Law 240/10 and the Spanish one 14/2011 (told "Ley de la Ciencia" that is "The Law of

Science”), nevertheless this research design is not inspired by a comparative methodology (Sasaki et al, 2014) which is usually aimed at setting analogies and differences between or among separate “items”, it is aimed instead at underlining that the global legal systems just a convergent one shaped by internal functional differentiations only few of them making the difference. The methodological choice on a comparative design (Goudsblom, 1994) would be totally unviable in the current scenarios as comparative research design still operates according to the idea of methodological nationalism (Beck, 2006) for example by comparing the Spanish legal system and the Italian one creating the misleading illusion of two separate items. The convergent, systemic approach sets just one legal system functionally differentiated by its code and program (Luhmann, 1989). The convergence towards just one European policy model for the university which is also taken for granted by the etymology of the term “university” is a trend in progress but still irritated by some outer noise just like in the case of the Dutch law.

The Dutch Law “WHW” dated October 8th 1992 is the general Dutch law for the university system and it was amended several times till September 2010 also to adapt it to the EHEA project, nevertheless the Dutch law is quite peculiar as its rationale is a very strong decentralization and a very important autonomous sphere for each teaching and/or research institution, independently from public or private, and this law seems not to imply third mission activities. While both the Italian Law 240/10 and the Spanish one 14/11 converge on the three mission policy model which can be briefly labelled as “Academic Capitalism”. It implies that the legal system is providing a variety of closing operations generating contingent selections which describe the trajectories and the trends of the communication flow of the legal system. For example, if patenting and licensing is high speed, high return on investment and low cost at a certain closing and selective operational level that kind of intellectual capital will flow from one “angle” to another of the legal system. Briefly and metaphorically, the comparative research design is a photo collection while the systemic convergent research (Laszlo, 2008b) design is an action movie.

The Academic Capitalism Policy and Governance Model

This model implies that each university which has the ambition to be named as such is excellent on three different and connected fronts:

- a. Didactics from Bologna 1 to Bologna 3.
- b. Research, both pure and applied, framed in as strong active/passive pro stakeholders network converging private and public capitals and setting strong privacy standards for private sponsored research and severe ranking & rating systems for scientific publishing.
- c. Third Mission functionally split among;
 - c.1 Public engagement policy;
 - c.2 Intellectual Property portfolio policy;
 - c.3 spin off entrepreneurial policy.

The idea is that Research inputs (R) generates Third Mission outputs (TM) and $R \times TM = \text{Academic Capital (AC)}$ that both shape together the Didactics (D) policy split into two levels:

- i) mass didactics (MD) to be the prêt à porter;
- ii) top didactics (TD) to be the dependent variable and function of AC thus $TD = (f) AC$ while MD is a contingent start up or restart for academic policies but a top quality university is fully represented by $TD = (f) AC$.

Thus the new academic policy model sets university as the heart of different systemic functions: teaching, researching, scholarly publishing, investing, enterprising, divulgating and more. It means to rethink the academic setting systemically as a triple helix (Leydesdorff, 2001; Leydesdorff-Pitasi, 2004; Johnson-Leydesdorff, 2015) among theory as strategy, methodology as scientific reliability and pragmatic use of scientific knowledge for policy modeling and policymaking.

The triple helix of multifunctional academic organization emerges in several cases for example in the following two ones:

1. The time matter. A research work efficacy cannot be separated and disconnected by its timing. A paper which summarizes a three year research and a two/three year reviewing and publishing process whatever data or findings it provides it is extremely likely they are obsolete, for example. The triple helix cannot be split into three separate item as government, university and business are always coevolving.
2. Systemic epistemology cannot be separated from systemic strategic theory otherwise some self defeating zombie ideas (Beck, 2006) might destroy the added value of a systemic policy model for the university.

Results & Conclusion

In a theoretical and policy modelling oriented the concept of results is meant as “suggested guidelines” for further big data based empirical research.

The isotropic rule setting is the key convergent level between a Law & Economics mapping and a complex system vision. Exceeding variety can neither be fully included by the system nor totally and definitely canceled forever: strategic agenda setting of contingency selections though high reliable isotropic standard is the key challenge in our times. The shaping of isotropic standards is efficiency based and implies a deliberative-procedural filter to set map the stakeholders to be admitted to the lawmaking process. The case of the emerging academic capitalism to reset the educational policies for global citizens is an exemplary case as the legal variety (see the opposite trends of the Spanish and Dutch law for example) and the political noise do not seem to generate countertrend functional evolutionary directions. The difference which makes the different in our times is the code shifts / shocks. Shifts are often generated by the political system, shocks by the legal one. The shocks are global trends, sometimes megatrends or gigatrends, shifts are very turbulent episodes, often scary for public opinion but which do not meaningfully impact on policy modeling and lawmaking. The gigatrends and megatrends of our times are converging into a metaconvergent spiral (Pitasi, 2014f) which turns local and comparative research into obsolescence.

The challenge to understand emerging world orders is to draw a clear distinction between the noisy and turbulent but irrelevant shifts and the

strong impact of shocks usually deriving from legal reconfigurations. Complexity, as exceeding variety requiring systemic selection, sets the shift and shock patterns in the frame of the variety / density correlation. Emerging global and world orders include both high density (also demographically as in the case of migrations) and high variety (of values or lifestyles for example) converging in the same space-time context. It implies that ehrlichian vision of law based on social local traditions are obsolete as they would be polarizing and radicalizing conflicts re-entering, for example, blood and soil political settings feeding social, religious and ideological hate, xenophobia and racism. The four potential scenarios of the Law-Politics coupling i.e. high density/high variety, high density/low variety, low density/high variety, low density/low variety are tendentially idealtypes which, turning into empirical analytics decrease to two:

High variety/high density and high variety/low density as in an interconnected low variety is extremely unlikely. Subsequently, the emerging shapes of academic capitalism lead to high density and high variety express the mass of graduates while low density band high variety feature the new academic and intellectual elites.

As shown above, the key idea is that Research inputs (R) generates Third Mission outputs (TM) and $R \times TM = \text{Academic Capital (AC)}$ that both shape together the Didactics (D) policy split into two levels:

- i) mass didactics (MD) to be the prêt à porter;
- ii) top didactics (TD) to be the dependent variable and function of AC thus $TD = (f) AC$ while MD is a contingent start up or restart for academic policies but a top quality university is fully represented by $TD = (f) AC$. The challenge to draw the systemic distinction between MD and Td is not in terms of variety, it is in terms of density.

That is why redesigning educational policies though legal technocracy leads to a neutrality principle of the social and cultural background of the students setting the operational closing of the career not on the past rather on the present and future of the student In brief , to make v an example, if for a

certain career a perfect competence in Spanish is required no candidates with mid-low Spanish might be considered. The fact that someone studied hard Spanish but had no vocation for foreign languages must not be hired to reward his/her efforts. Among the excellent Spanish speakers, assessment might eventually consider the reasons why of that excellence nevertheless the focus in the selection process would be on expected performances not on starting conditions. The increase of density and variety of the EU population requires converging standards in educational career settings and rating criteria to be shaped according to the gigatrends and megatrends of global and world orders (Pitasi, 2014b, 2014c) and to the three mission policy model which is the key to let variety emerge through reconfiguring and recombining memes easily focused on the European Union educational agenda setting (Ferone, 2013). In other words, the three missions serve as filters to cope with candidates selection focused on competence independently from race, sex, religious etc variables. Selecting supernational hypercitizens from the mass of national citizens is a process driven by legal technocracy first and followed by political actions then. As a matter of fact, most of the national citizens are as such as they ignore the deliberative procedures and expect to have voice simply by radical participation while it cannot be, as outside of the deliberative procedures no communication is generated, rather mere noise (Luhmann, 1989) and the deliberative procedures are nowadays set at the European Union level. As a matter of fact, according to the article 53, paragraph 1 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU): “In order to make it easier for persons to take up and pursue activities as self-employed persons, the European Parliament and the Council shall, acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure, issue directives for the mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications and for the coordination of the provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the taking-up and pursuit of activities as selfemployed persons”. Which strongly interconnects professional and educational careers at the supernational rank. Hypercitizenship, in brief can be a policy model pattern for the citizenship modelling of the European Union from the intergovernmental to the supernational setting to implement and evolve the TFEU article 20 which states “Citizenship of the Union is

hereby established. Every person holding the nationality of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union. Citizenship of the Union shall be additional to and not replace national citizenship".

Citizens of the Union shall enjoy the rights and be subject to the duties provided for in the Treaties. They shall have, inter alia:

- (a) the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States;
- (b) the right to vote and to stand as candidates in elections to the European Parliament and in municipal elections in their Member State of residence, under the same conditions as nationals of that State;
- (c) the right to enjoy, in the territory of a third country in which the Member State of which they are nationals is not represented, the protection of the diplomatic and consular authorities of any Member State on the same conditions as the nationals of that State;
- (d) the right to petition the European Parliament, to apply to the European Ombudsman, and to address the institutions and advisory bodies of the Union in any of the Treaty languages and to obtain a reply in the same language.

These rights shall be exercised in accordance with the conditions and limits defined by the Treaties and by the measures adopted the reunder". Nevertheless, hypercitizenship is not a policy model for EU citizenship only it can be adapted and viable to redesign global citizenship policies among institutional global players such as following up the TTIP and CETA works in progress.

References

- Audretsch, D. (2007). *The Entrepreneurial Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barash, D. P. (2007). *Natural Selections: Selfish Altruists, Honest Liars, and Other Realities of Evolution*. New York: Bellevue Literary Press.
- Beck, U. (2006). *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

- Broch, H. (2011). *The Sleepwalkers*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Canetti, E. (1984). *Crowds and Power*. Farrar, New York: Straus & Giroux.
- Dawkins, R. (1976). *Il gene egoista*. Milan: Mondadori.
- Dennett, D.C. (2004). *Freedom Evolves*. London: Penguin.
- Donati, P. (1993). *La cittadinanza societaria*. Rome-Bari: Laterza.
- Fernández Llebreg, F. (2013). Teoría Política y Acción Ciudadana. In I. Wences (Ed.), *Tomando en serio la teoría política*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.
- Ferone, E. (2013). *Regole e comunicazione del capitalismo accademico*. Napoli: Loffredo.
- Flecha García, R., Gomez, J., & Puigvert, L. (2014). *Teoría Sociológica Contemporanea*. Barcelona- Buenos Aires- Madrid: Paidós.
- Galgano, F. (2005). *La globalizzazione nello specchio del diritto*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Giner, S. (2010). *El futuro del capitalismo*. Barcelona: Peninsula.
- Goudsblom, J. (1994). *Fire and Civilization*. London: Penguin.
- Laszlo, E. (2007). *Science and the Akashic Field: An Integral Theory of Everything*. Rochester Vermont: Inner Traditions.
- Laszlo, E. (2008a). *Il pericolo e l'opportunità*. Rome: Aracne.
- Laszlo, E. (2008b). *Worldshift*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Leydesdorff, L. (2001). *A Sociological Theory of Communication*. New York: Universal Publishers.
- Leydesdorff, L., & Pitasi, A. (2004). The Triple Helix of University–Government–Industry Relations. In A. Riegler (Ed.), *Radical Constructivism Paper Collection*. Retrieved from <http://www.univie.ac.at/constructivism/papers/2004/pitasi-leydesdorff.html>
- Leydesdorff, L., & Johnson, W. (2015). Beer's Viable System Model and Luhmann's Communication Theory: Organizations' from the Perspective of Meta-Games. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 32(3), 266–282. doi: [10.1002/sres.2222](https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2222)
- Luhmann, N. (1989). *Ecological Communication*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Luhmann, N. (1990). *Essays on self Reference*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Luhmann, N. (1996). *Social Systems*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Luhmann, N. (1997). *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Luhmann, N. (2010). *Soziologische Aufklaerung*. Opladen: WestdeutscherVerlag.
- Luhmann, N. (2012-2013). *Theory of Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Normann, R. (2001). *Reframing Business: When the Map Changes the Landscape*. England: Wiley.
- Nowotny, H. (2008). *Insatiable Curiosity-Innovation in a Fragile Future*. USA and London, UK: Cambridge.
- Nowotny, H., & Testa, G. (2009). *Die glaesenen Gene*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1963). *Man and People*. New York: Norton.
- Ovejero Lucas, F. (2011). *Contra Cromagnon*. Barcelona: Montesinos.
- Ovejero Lucas, F. (2013a). Teoría y práctica en la teoría política. In I. Wences (Ed.), *Tomando en serio la teoría política*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.
- Ovejero Lucas, F. (2013b). *¿Idiotas o Ciudadanos?* Barcelona: Montesinos.
- Paolone, G., & Pitasi, A. (2013). *Comparing Systemic Business Paradigms: Chance, Complexity, Communication and Evolutionary Strategies*. Saarbruecken: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Pearce, F. (2010). *The On Coming Population Crash*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Pitasi, A. (2010). WCSA Declaration of Bologna, Dec. 4th 2010. *Nuova Atlantide*. 2010/1. Aracne, pp. 11-13.
- Pitasi, A. (2011). *The Hyperhuman World: Legal Systems and Social Complexity*. Saarbrücken: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Pitasi A. (2012a). Systemic Shifts in Sociology. In G. Mancini & A. Pitasi (Eds.), *Systemic Shifts in Sociology*. Saarbruecken: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Pitasi, A. (2012b). The Hypercitizenship Challenge to Methodological Nationalism. *REDES. Revista Eletrônica Direito e Sociedade*. Centro Universitário La Salle.
- Pitasi, A. (2012c). WCSA as an Hypercitizenship Lab. *Nuova Atlantide*, 2012(3), 25-29.

- Pitasi, A. (2012d). Hypercitizenship and the Management of Genetic Diversity: Sociology of Law and the Key Systemic Bifurcation Between the Ring Singularity and the Neofeudal Age. *World Futures Journal*, 68(4-5), 314-331. doi: [10.1080/02604027.2012.679571](https://doi.org/10.1080/02604027.2012.679571)
- Pitasi, A. (2012e). Epilogue: The Fourth Paradigm Redesigning Evolutionary Complex Systems Of Organizational Communication. In G. Mancini & R. Angrisani (Eds.), *Mapping Systemic Knowledge*. Saarbrücken: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Pitasi, A. (2012f). What is sociology for? *World Futures Journal*, 68(4-5), 221-224. doi: [10.1080/02604027.2012.679444](https://doi.org/10.1080/02604027.2012.679444)
- Pitasi, A. (2013). Hypercitizenship and the Evolution of a Global Identity. *Journal of Sociological Research*, 4(2), 318-335. doi: [10.5296/jsr.v4i2.4369](https://doi.org/10.5296/jsr.v4i2.4369)
- Pitasi, A. (2014a). Designing hypercitizenship methodologically. *Revista de Direito Econômico e Socioambiental*, 5(1), 2-18. doi: [10.7213/rev.dir.econ.socioambiental.05.001.AO01](https://doi.org/10.7213/rev.dir.econ.socioambiental.05.001.AO01)
- Pitasi, A. (2014b). Communicating Intangible Value. The Case of Contemporary Art. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal*, 5(2) 1-5. doi: [10.4172/2151-6200.100075](https://doi.org/10.4172/2151-6200.100075)
- Pitasi, A. (2014c). A systemic sociological theorem of global evolution. *Revista de Direito Econômico e Socioambiental*, 4(1), 92-103. doi: [10.7213/rev.dir.econ.socioambiental.04.001.AO05](https://doi.org/10.7213/rev.dir.econ.socioambiental.04.001.AO05)
- Pitasi, A. (2014d). The Sociological Semantics of Complex Systems. *Journal of Sociological Research*, 5(1), 203-213. doi: [10.5296/jsr.v5i1.5953](https://doi.org/10.5296/jsr.v5i1.5953)
- Pitasi, A. (2014e). System. In M. Ruzzeddu (Ed.), *Keywords of Systemic Vision*. Saarbruecken: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Pitasi, A. (2014f). The metaconvergent spiral: Rethinking sociological Working Styles Systemically. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(9), 160-165. doi: [10.6007/IJARBS/v4-i9/1145](https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v4-i9/1145)
- Pitasi, A., & Ferone, E. (2008). *Il tempo zero del Desiderio*. Milan: McGraw Hill.
- Pitasi, A., & Mancini, G. (2012). *Systemic Shifts in Sociology: Essays on*

world order model design. Saarbruecken: Lambert Academic Publishing.

- Posner, R. (1998). *El análisis económico del derecho*. Aijusco: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Sasaki, M., Goldstone, J.A., Zimmermann, E., & Sanderson, S.K. (Eds.) (2014). *Concise Encyclopaedia of Comparative Sociology*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Shavell, S. (2004). *Foundations of Economic Analysis of Law*. Cambridge Massachussets- London UK: The Belknap Press.
- van Schendelen, R. (2013). *The art of lobbying the EU*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Williamson, O. (1991). *L'organizzazione Economica. Imprese, mercati e controllo politico*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Wilson, E.O. (2000). *Sociobiology-the New Synthesis 25th anniversary edition*. Cambridge Mass: The B 23.

Andrea Pitasi is professor at the Department of Neuroscience and Imaging and Clinical Science, Gabriele d'Annunzio University of Chieti and Pescara

Contact Address: Department of Neuroscience and Imaging and Clinical Science, Gabriele d'Annunzio University of Chieti and Pescara. Palazzina ITAB 4th etage. Campus Universitario Chieti Scalo. Via Luigi Polacchi, 11 -66100- Chieti, Italy. Email:

profpitasi@gmail.com