# From Organisms to Nations: A Systems–Evolutionary Perspective on Social Development

**John A Challoner, January, 2026**

**Abstract**

Contemporary human societies face a growing set of interconnected challenges, including environmental degradation, geopolitical instability, institutional fragility, and persistent failures of large-scale coordination. These challenges are often treated as political, ethical, or technological problems, yet they increasingly resist resolution within any single domain. This paper proposes that many such difficulties are better understood as developmental rather than moral failures, arising from a mismatch between the scale of human activity and the level of integration achieved by human social systems.

Drawing on general systems theory, evolutionary biology, and evolutionary developmental principles, the paper advances a systems–evolutionary framework in which human social systems are understood as products of progressive assembly under constraint. It argues that social systems exhibit recursive structure across scales, that their establishment depends on cooperative commitment, and that their subsequent development proceeds through progressive functional differentiation. As scale increases, functional capacity tends to outpace integrative and control mechanisms, giving rise to predictable forms of fragility and pathology.

The paper further argues that human needs themselves reflect an evolutionary developmental sequence, from existence to relatedness to growth, and that social systems tend to follow a similar trajectory. Pathologies such as institutional capture, criminality, misinformation, and environmental overshoot are interpreted as symptoms of insufficient integration and unmet systemic needs rather than intrinsic defects of human nature. The analysis identifies two primary constraints on further social evolution, informational coherence and systemic commitment, and suggests that future viability depends on advances in large-scale coordination and regulation grounded in accurate information, shared understanding, and strengthened coupling between social subsystems and the wider national, global and ecological systems. The framework is offered as an orientation for understanding the present moment in social evolution and the challenges that lie ahead.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Why a Systems–Evolutionary Perspective Is Needed

Human societies are facing a growing number of persistent and interconnected challenges: environmental degradation, geopolitical instability, institutional fragility, informational breakdown, and increasing difficulty in coordinating action at global scale. These systemic challenges are often addressed separately, through politics, economics, ethics, or technology, but they increasingly resist resolution within any single domain.

This paper begins from the premise that these difficulties may not be accidental, temporary, or primarily moral in nature. Instead, they may reflect a deeper developmental mismatch between the scale of human activity and the level of integration achieved by human social systems.

 

To explore this possibility, the paper brings together insights from general systems theory, evolutionary biology, and social organisation, and asks a simple but far-reaching question:

*What if human society is undergoing a process of multi-level evolutionary assembly analogous to biological evolution, and what if many contemporary social challenges arise because this process is incomplete at larger scales?*

**1.2. Systems, Assembly, and Recursion**

In general systems theory, a system is commonly described as an entity with inputs, processes, and outputs, bounded in some way from its environment. Importantly, systems are typically composed of subsystems of the same general form, and are themselves embedded within larger systems. This produces a nested hierarchy of organisation. (Boulding,1956) (von Bertalanffy, 1968)

At a sufficiently high level of abstraction, this recursive structure gives systems a fractal-like quality: similar patterns of coordination, control, feedback, self-maintenance, and adaptation recur across multiple scales, even though their physical forms differ.

However, this apparent fractality is often obscured by specialisation. As systems grow and become more complex, their components differentiate functionally. Cells specialise, workers adopt different roles, organisations establish departments. The underlying structural logic remains, but it becomes harder to see.

This paper argues that human social systems, i.e., individuals, organisations, sectors, and nations, exhibit the same recursive structure, that their establishment can be understood as a process of assembly via cooperative commitment, and that their development proceeds as a process of progressive differentiation under constraint, analogous in important respects to biological evolution.

**1.3. Evolution, Development, and Constraint**

Biological evolution proceeds through random mutation and natural selection, but it does not operate only at the level of species change across generations. A crucial additional insight from evolutionary developmental biology (often referred to as *evo–devo*) is that the development of an individual organism follows a structured pathway shaped by its evolutionary history.

Embryos do not assemble randomly. They develop by traversing a constrained sequence of stages encoded in the genome (Carroll, 2005) (West-Eberhard, 2003); stages that reflect the historical solutions evolution has brought to earlier systemic challenges of assembly, coordination, and control. In this sense, development recapitulates evolution, not by repeating it exactly, but by building upon it.

This paper extends that insight beyond biology. It proposes that:

- Human social systems develop along pathways constrained by human biology and human needs.
- As social scale increases, development lags behind functional capacity.
- Many large-scale social “pathologies” arise where assembly has outpaced integration.

Human needs can be understood as evolutionary products that emerge in a constrained developmental sequence. At the most fundamental level, biological systems must satisfy existence needs: maintaining internal stability, securing energy, and avoiding immediate threats to viability. Only once these needs are reliably met do relatedness needs emerge, reflecting the evolutionary advantages of coordination, cooperation, and commitment among components within a larger system. Growth needs arise later still, as cognitive, social, and organisational capacities expand, enabling exploration, abstraction, and long-term planning. This ordering is not arbitrary or cultural in origin, but reflects the historical sequence of problems evolution has had to solve. Because human social systems are assembled from human beings and operate under the same biological and informational constraints, they tend to follow a similar developmental trajectory. When social systems attempt to prioritise growth before existence and relatedness needs are adequately stabilised, they predictably exhibit fragility, conflict, and pathological behaviour rather than mature integration. (Maynard Smith & Szathmáry, 1995)

### 1.4. From Individuals to Social Systems

Humans are highly integrated biological organisms. Their cells are tightly coupled, committed to the organism as a whole, and coordinated by sophisticated control systems. Human social systems, by contrast, are far less integrated, especially as scale increases.

Small groups and simple organisations often function effectively because:

- communication is direct,
- shared purpose is clear,
- and coordination costs are low.

Larger organisations, sectors, and nations, however, are assembled from these smaller units. As they grow:

- communication becomes more constrained,
- integration weakens,
- and coordination costs rise.

Despite this, large-scale systems acquire enormous power, technological, economic, and ecological, often without a corresponding increase in systemic maturity.

### 1.5. Scope and Aim of the Paper

This paper does not propose political solutions, institutional designs, or ethical prescriptions. Its purpose is instead to:

- clarify the systems-level dynamics underlying social development,
- situate contemporary social challenges within an evolutionary–developmental framework,
- and establish a conceptual foundation for more detailed analyses of organisational, institutional, and global pathologies.

In doing so, it aims to provide readers with a coherent way of understanding where human society appears to be in its developmental trajectory, the difficulties that this creates, and why the coming decades may be decisive.

 

## 2. Evolution as Progressive Assembly Under Constraint

To understand how complex systems arise and develop, it is helpful to view evolution (not only biological evolution, but universal evolution more broadly) as a process of progressive assembly under constraint.

At every stage in the history of the universe, new forms of organisation have emerged only when specific barriers to further assembly were overcome. These barriers are not obstacles in a metaphorical sense; they are real physical, informational, or organisational constraints that prevent components from combining into more complex, stable wholes.

### 2.1 Universal Evolution and Assembly

Before life emerged, the universe already exhibited a long history of assembly. Fundamental particles combined to form atoms; atoms formed molecules; molecules formed increasingly complex chemical structures; stars and planets formed from diffuse matter under gravity. The most significant stages are outlined in Appendix A. Each transition depended on new conditions or capabilities, such as stable energy gradients or new bonding mechanisms, that made higher-order structures possible. (A stable energy gradient is a long-lasting imbalance in energy that can be reliably exploited by physical, chemical, or biological systems to maintain structure or drive change.)

From a systems perspective, these transitions involved:

- the creation of boundaries,
- the establishment of persistent internal processes, and
- the ability to maintain structure over time in the face of environmental disturbance.

This pattern, i.e., components combining into systems that then become components of larger systems, is the basic logic of evolution at all scales. (Maynard Smith & Szathmáry, 1995) (Smith & Morowitz, 2016)

### 2.2 Biological Evolution as a Special Case

Biological evolution represents a particularly powerful extension of this general process. With the emergence of self-replicating molecules and later cellular life, evolution acquired a new mechanism: heritable information. This enabled variation, selection, and cumulative adaptation across generations.

However, biological evolution did not stop at single-celled organisms. A further major barrier was overcome when cells began to assemble into multicellular organisms. This transition required something fundamentally new: close coupling or commitment. Cells had to relinquish independent replication and accept functional specialisation in service of a larger whole. In return, they gained stability, protection, and access to resources they could not secure alone.

Crucially, this transition also involved the emergence of control systems, e.g., nervous, immune, and endocrine systems, that regulated internal processes and maintained viability at the organism level.

### 2.3 Development Recapitulates Evolutionary Solutions

Evolutionary developmental biology shows that the development of an organism is not an open-ended process. Embryos do not experiment randomly with all possible forms. Instead, development follows a constrained pathway that reflects the evolutionary history encoded in the genome.

Earlier evolutionary solutions, such as basic body plans and control mechanisms, appear early in development. Later refinements are layered on top. In this sense, development is best understood as the reuse and extension of previously successful solutions to systemic challenges of coordination, control, and integration.

This insight is important because it suggests a general principle: *When systems scale up, they do so by reusing and adapting structures that have already proven viable at smaller scales.*

### 2.4 Extending the Logic to Human Social Systems

Human social systems can be understood through the same lens. Individuals form groups; groups form organisations; organisations form sectors and nations. Each level represents a new stage of assembly, made possible by earlier ones.

Historically, simpler forms of organisation appeared first and proved their fitness. Over time, they aggregated into larger and more complex arrangements. As scale increased, so did:

- population size,
- productive capacity,
- and functional specialisation.

However, increased scale also brought new constraints, especially those related to communication, coordination, and control. Just as in biology, successful scaling required new mechanisms to manage these constraints. Where such mechanisms were weak or absent, instability and failure followed.

This paper proposes that human social evolution is best seen as an ongoing, incomplete process of multi-level assembly, one that follows the same general logic as biological evolution but operates through cultural, organisational, and informational means rather than genetic ones.

This logic of constrained assembly underpins the analysis of scale and integration that follows.

## 3. Scale, Integration, and Functional Differentiation in Social Systems

### 3.1 Integration, Coordination, and Scale

In systems terms, integration refers to the degree to which a system's components are mutually dependent, tightly coupled, and constrained to act in ways that support the viability of the whole. Highly integrated systems exhibit strong internal coordination, rapid feedback, and limited component autonomy. In such systems, local actions are reliably aligned with global system requirements. Coordination, by contrast, refers to the effort required to align the actions of differentiated components. Coordination costs tend to rise with the number of components, the diversity of their functions, and the distance, physical, organisational, or informational, between them.

 

As systems increase in scale, a persistent pattern emerges: coordination demands increase while integration becomes harder to sustain. This is not a contingent feature of particular social arrangements, but a general consequence of scaling under constraint. Larger systems require more communication, more regulation, and more abstraction to maintain coherence, yet these same mechanisms introduce delay, distortion, and fragility. The result is a structural tension between autonomy and coherence that intensifies with scale.

Human social systems exhibit a clear gradient along these lines. Individuals are highly integrated biological systems, with strong internal coupling and sophisticated control mechanisms. Small groups and simple organisations retain moderate integration through shared purpose, direct communication, and interpersonal trust. As scale increases to large organisations, sectors, and nations, integration weakens. Coordination increasingly relies on formal rules, hierarchies, incentives, and abstract representations rather than shared context or direct feedback. At the global level, humanity forms a loosely coupled system-of-systems that is functionally interconnected but minimally integrated.

At each successive level of scale, component autonomy increases and commitment to the parent system weakens. This does not imply dysfunction by default. Weak integration can confer flexibility, adaptability, and innovation. However, it also means that local optimisation increasingly diverges from system-level viability. Actions that are rational and adaptive for subsystems may undermine the stability of the larger system of which they are a part. (Simon, 1962) (Arrow, 1974)

This integration gradient helps explain why large social systems can possess extraordinary functional power while remaining fragile and difficult to govern. As scale increases, systems acquire new capabilities faster than they develop the integrative and control mechanisms required to regulate those capabilities effectively. Understanding this mismatch is essential for interpreting the pathologies of large-scale organisation explored in the sections that follow.

**3.2 Functional Differentiation and Its Consequences**

As systems grow, they tend to become functionally differentiated. Tasks are divided, roles specialised, and expertise deepened. Functional differentiation is a powerful source of efficiency and innovation. It enables systems to:

- exploit economies of scale,
- develop advanced capabilities,
- and respond flexibly to diverse demands.

However, differentiation also introduces new challenges:

- Components become less aware of the system as a whole.
- Local optimisation can undermine global performance.
- Communication becomes filtered, delayed, or distorted.
- Control must be exercised indirectly, increasing the risk of error.

In biological organisms, these challenges are addressed by highly evolved control systems that maintain coherence despite differentiation. In social systems, such control mechanisms are partial, contested, and unevenly developed.

### 3.3 Developmental Maturity and Fragility

An important implication of the integration gradient is that larger social systems tend to be developmentally immature relative to their scale. They possess:

- high productive and technological capacity,
- extensive functional differentiation,
- but limited integrative control.

This mismatch helps explain why:

- large organisations can be powerful yet brittle,
- sectors can dominate without serving broader societal needs,
- nations can struggle to coordinate internally,
- and global systems can generate risks they are unable to manage.

From this perspective, many contemporary social challenges are not anomalies. They are predictable consequences of scaling without sufficient integration.

### 3.4 A Developmental Interpretation of Social Pathologies

When integration lags behind functional differentiation, pathologies emerge. In biological systems, insufficient integration manifests as disease. In social systems, it manifests as:

- corruption,
- institutional capture,
- extreme inequality,
- environmental externalisation, i.e., the system enjoys the benefits, while its environment absorbs the damage,
- and persistent coordination failures.

These are not best understood as moral failings alone, nor as inevitable features of human nature. Rather, they are symptoms of developmental arrest, i.e., situations in which a system has acquired new capabilities without the corresponding control and commitment required to regulate them.

These dynamics can be illustrated by analogy across biological and social domains. In biological organisms, pathologies such as cancer can be interpreted as arising when cells no longer receive adequate satisfiers, such as regulatory signals, resource flows, or functional integration, from the parent organism. Under such conditions, cells may revert to locally rational but systemically destructive behaviour, prioritising unchecked proliferation over organismal viability, as emphasised by tissue organisation field perspectives.

Analogous patterns appear in social systems. Criminality, for example, often emerges where individuals or groups experience chronic deprivation of satisfiers provided by the wider society, e.g., security, recognition, opportunity, or belonging, leading to locally adaptive behaviours that undermine system-level stability.

Similarly, patterns of social commitment vary with perceived interdependence: more individualistic orientations tend to arise in sparsely populated or resource-autonomous environments, whereas denser urban settings, where interdependence is immediate and unavoidable, more readily foster norms of coordination, regulation, and mutual constraint.

In each case, pathology or behavioural divergence is best understood not as an intrinsic defect, but as a response to insufficient integration and unmet needs within the parent system.

### 3.5 Section Summary

This section has shown that increasing scale systematically reduces integration while increasing coordination demands, and that functional differentiation both enables and destabilises large social systems. The next step is to examine what enables systems to remain viable despite these pressures.

The next section will therefore focus on control systems, drawing explicit parallels between biological control mechanisms and the partial, emergent control structures found in human social systems.

## 4. Control Systems and the Viability of Large-Scale Organisation

As systems grow in size and complexity, their continued viability increasingly depends on effective control, understood in a systems-theoretic sense as the regulation of internal processes in response to internal disturbances and environmental feedback. (Ashby, 1956)

### 4.1 Control Systems in Biological and Social Organisation

In biological organisms, the transition from single-celled to multicellular life required more than aggregation. It depended on the emergence of specialised control subsystems capable of monitoring internal states, coordinating differentiated components, and constraining local behaviour in service of organism-level viability. Nervous, endocrine, and immune systems exemplify such control (Noble, 2012) (Kauffman, 1993): they integrate information across the organism, detect deviations from viable ranges, and trigger corrective responses at appropriate timescales. Crucially, these control mechanisms function only because cellular components are tightly coupled to the organism as a whole. Cells relinquish independent reproductive autonomy and accept regulatory constraint; when this commitment breaks down, as in cancer, systemic pathology results.

Human social systems face analogous challenges as they scale. Larger groups, organisations, and societies require mechanisms to coordinate behaviour across diverse functions, roles, and interests. However, unlike biological organisms, social systems lack a shared nervous system, unified sensory apparatus, or automatic commitment of components to the parent system. Social control therefore emerges imperfectly through institutions, norms, laws, governance structures, and informational systems such as science, education, and media. These mechanisms perform functions analogous to biological control systems, but they are slower, more contested, and more vulnerable to distortion.

As scale increases, the limitations of social control become more pronounced. Functional differentiation expands productive capacity, but also fragments awareness and accountability. Control must be exercised indirectly, through abstract rules and incentives rather than direct feedback, increasing the risk of delay, misalignment, and unintended consequences. The result is a growing gap between the power of large social systems and their ability to regulate that power coherently.

This contrast highlights a central asymmetry between biological and social organisation. Biological systems achieve viability through strong coupling and integrated control before acquiring high functional power. Social systems, by contrast, often acquire substantial functional capacity before developing the control structures required to manage it. The consequences of this mismatch, i.e., fragility, instability, and recurrent pathology, are explored in the sections that follow.

**4.2 Governments as Control Subsystems of Nations**

It is important to distinguish between nations and governments. Nations are complex social systems comprising populations, organisations, cultures, and economies. Governments are best understood as control subsystems within nations, tasked with:

- regulating internal interactions,
- managing external relations,
- and maintaining systemic stability.

This distinction mirrors biology, where control subsystems are embedded within organisms rather than identical to them. Confusing the two leads to misplaced expectations: either attributing too much agency to governments or underestimating the autonomy of other social subsystems.

Crucially, governments themselves are often weakly integrated, internally fragmented, and subject to capture by powerful sectors. As a result, their control capacity is frequently limited relative to the complexity of the systems they are meant to regulate.

**4.3 Scaling Control: From Nations to Global Systems**

At the global level, the problem becomes more acute. Humanity now exerts planet-scale influence over climate, ecosystems, and resource flows, yet there is no fully developed global control system capable of regulating these impacts.

International institutions, treaties, and norms exist, but they:

- lack strong enforcement mechanisms,
- rely on voluntary compliance,
- and compete with national and sectoral interests.

From a systems perspective, global humanity resembles an incipient control system: it has sensing capabilities (science), communication channels (global media), and some coordination mechanisms, but these are insufficiently integrated and weakly coupled to decision-making structures.

**4.4 Two Barriers to the Emergence of Effective Control**

The analysis so far suggests that the failure of large-scale social control is not accidental. It reflects two unresolved barriers in social evolution.

 

**The first is informational.**
Effective control requires accurate, timely, and trusted information. Fragmented epistemologies, misinformation, ideological distortion, and delayed feedback severely undermine the capacity to model reality and respond appropriately.

**The second is commitment-based.**
Effective control also requires that subsystems accept constraint in service of the whole. In social systems, individuals, organisations, sectors, and nations retain a high degree of autonomy and often resist subordination to higher-level viability conditions. This weak coupling is a direct analogue of biological pathologies arising from failed cellular commitment.

Until both barriers are addressed, control systems at large social scales will remain fragile and incomplete.

### 4.5 Control Without Maturity

A defining feature of the present moment is that human society has acquired enormous functional power, technological, economic, and military, without the corresponding maturity of control systems.

In biological terms, this is a dangerous configuration: powerful effectors operating without adequate regulation. The result is not coordinated progress, but oscillation between overreach and collapse.

This interpretation reframes many contemporary crises. They are not best understood as isolated failures of policy or morality, but as systemic consequences of immature control at unprecedented scale.

It is important to note that influential cybernetic models such as the Viable System Model, developed by Stafford Beer (Beer, 1979) (Beer, 1981), implicitly assume a level of systemic integration, commitment, and internal coherence comparable to that of a mature biological organism. In such systems, information channels, control loops, and recursive structures can be expected to function reliably because components are already sufficiently coupled to the viability of the whole. However, much of the preceding analysis suggests that many contemporary organisations, nations, and global social systems do not yet possess this level of developmental maturity. They are often assemblages whose functional capabilities have outpaced their integrative and control capacities. In these cases, failures attributed to poor design or misapplication of organisational models may instead reflect deeper developmental limitations: the system itself has not yet evolved the degree of integration required to operate in the manner that organism-centred models such as the Viable System Model presuppose.

### 4.6 Section Summary

This section has examined the role of control systems in maintaining viability as scale increases, and has shown why existing social control mechanisms are insufficient for planetary-scale regulation. The next step is to explore how control, differentiation, and development interact over time.

The next section will therefore examine developmental stages in social evolution, showing how earlier solutions are reused, where development stalls, and why humanity appears to be approaching a decisive evolutionary threshold.

 

### 5. The Current Evolutionary Bottleneck: Information and Commitment

Two unresolved constraints now limit further large-scale social integration: informational coherence and systemic commitment.

#### 5.1. The Informational Barrier to Further Social Evolution

Throughout evolutionary history, major transitions have occurred when living systems acquired new ways of coordinating information. Each transition enabled tighter coupling, larger-scale organisation, and more effective control:

- genetic encoding enabled stable inheritance;
- nervous systems enabled rapid internal coordination;
- language enabled shared meaning and collective action;
- writing enabled coordination across time and space.

Modern human societies now operate at planetary scale and generate vast amounts of information. Yet the informational mechanisms available to them remain fragmented, distorted, and poorly coupled to reality. Decision-making is distributed across institutions that operate with incompatible models, incentives, timescales, and epistemic standards. Information flows are noisy, politicised, delayed, or selectively filtered (Arrow, 1974) (Tainter, 1988). Societies struggle, therefore, to transform this information into *shared understanding*, *coherent action*, and *adaptive coordination*.

This is not a problem of data scarcity, but of:

- fragmentation of meaning,
- incompatible belief systems,
- distorted, delayed and even absent feedback,
- misaligned incentives across scales.

As social systems grow larger, information must be simplified, abstracted, and transmitted across increasing distances, organisational, cultural, and geopolitical. At each step, information is lost, reinterpreted, or strategically distorted. The result is a growing gap between:

- what is known locally, and
- what is acted upon globally.

At smaller scales, human groups can still coordinate using shared context, trust, and embodied interaction. However, at national and global scales, coordination depends on abstract representations: statistics, models, narratives, ideologies, and media. These representations increasingly fail to track underlying physical, ecological, and social realities.

As a result:

- systemic challenges are misdiagnosed or oversimplified;
- short-term incentives override long-term viability;
- feedback loops amplify error rather than correct it;

- coordination costs rise faster than adaptive capacity.

This constitutes an informational barrier to further social evolution. It limits our ability to respond coherently to system-level risks such as climate change, ecological degradation, technological disruption, and geopolitical instability.

This barrier is not merely technological. It is systemic and cognitive. Better data alone does not resolve it if interpretive frameworks, institutional incentives, and belief systems remain misaligned. Nor can it be solved through centralisation alone, which tends to increase distortion and brittleness.

Overcoming the informational barrier requires new forms of epistemic coordination: ways of generating, integrating, validating, and acting on information across scales while remaining grounded in physical and biological constraints.

**5.2. The Commitment Barrier and Social Pathologies**

Alongside the informational barrier lies a second, deeper constraint: insufficient commitment or coupling within humanity itself and to the larger ecology of which humanity is a part.

In biological evolution, higher-level systems emerge only when components become sufficiently coupled or committed to the parent system. Cells surrender independent reproduction to become multicellular organisms. Organs specialise and relinquish autonomy in service of organismal viability. This commitment is enforced through tight coupling, shared fate, and irreversible dependency. In each case, increased constraint enables greater collective capability.

Human societies have not yet achieved comparable commitment at planetary scale. At the global scale, humanity remains weakly coupled to any shared parent system. Nations, organisations, and individuals still act primarily to satisfy local needs often at the expense of larger-scale viability. The incentives that stabilise lower-level systems often destabilise higher-level ones. This manifests as what can be described, in systemic terms, as social pathologies.

Examples include:

- short-termism,
- competitive exploitation,
- externalisation of costs,
- denial of systemic risk,
- prioritisation of status over function.
- economic systems that degrade ecological foundations;
- political systems that prioritise short-term electoral success over long-term resilience;
- information systems that reward attention capture rather than truth;
- organisational hierarchies that prioritise self-maintenance over purpose.

From a systems perspective, these pathologies are *developmental symptoms*. They are predictable outcomes of the insufficient coupling of systems that have not yet achieved stable integration at a higher level (Holling, 2001). Components that are not adequately bound to the fate of the larger system will rationally act in their own local interest.

From this perspective, many contemporary crises, e.g., environmental degradation, geopolitical instability, institutional mistrust, and ideological polarisation, are symptoms of premature scale expansion without corresponding developmental integration. Humanity has achieved unprecedented reach without equivalent commitment.

### 5.3. Pathology as Developmental Signal

Importantly, these pathologies should not be interpreted as evidence that large-scale coordination is impossible. Rather, they suggest that humanity is attempting to operate at a scale for which it is not yet fully developmentally prepared.

In biological evolution, transitional stages are often unstable. Intermediate forms exhibit high failure rates, experimentation, and maladaptive behaviours before more stable configurations emerge. Human society may now be in such a transitional phase.

From this viewpoint:

- misinformation is a failure of immature epistemic coordination,
- ideological polarisation is a failure of shared meaning formation,
- environmental overshoot is a failure of system-level feedback integration.

Each points not to the end of social evolution, but to its unfinished nature.

## 6. Toward Planetary-Scale Coordination and Regulation

If this analysis is broadly correct, then future social evolution will depend less on new technologies alone, and more on advances in:

- shared frameworks of understanding,
- systems-level literacy,
- institutional designs that align local and global incentives,
- forms of commitment that enable humanity to act as a partially integrated whole.

In evolutionary terms, the next transition is not primarily physical or genetic, but informational and organisational. A plausible transition would involve the emergence of a human planetary control system; not in the sense of global domination, but in the cybernetic sense of adaptive regulation in service of system viability (Ostrom, 2009).

In biological organisms, control systems do not dictate outcomes. They:

- sense the internal and external environment;
- integrate information across subsystems;
- regulate behaviour within viable bounds;
- enable learning and adaptation over time.

A planetary control system for life on Earth would function analogously. Its purpose would not be political unity or ideological conformity, but ecological and civilisational viability.

 

Such a system would require:

- reliable, reality-tracking information flows;
- feedback mechanisms that operate across generations;
- institutions capable of acting on long-term constraints;
- cultural norms that support restraint, cooperation, and revision.

Importantly, this system cannot be imposed by force. Like all viable systems, it must emerge through progressive integration, overcoming informational and commitment barriers step by step.

Failure to do so does not halt evolution; it merely shifts its trajectory. Systems that cannot regulate themselves eventually encounter limits in the form of collapse, fragmentation, or replacement.

Whether humanity can cross this threshold, and at what cost, remains an open question. What is clear, however, is that many of the challenges we face are better understood as developmental bottlenecks rather than terminal failures.

**7. Purpose of This Framework**

This paper does not propose a political programme, an ideology, or a utopian design. Its purpose is more modest and more demanding:

- to situate human social systems within universal evolutionary principles;
- to explain current crises as developmental constraints rather than aberrations;
- to clarify what kinds of capabilities must emerge next if humanity is to remain viable.

In this sense, the framework serves as an orientation device. It offers a way of understanding where we are on the evolutionary ladder, why familiar solutions fail, and what kinds of developments are necessary though not guaranteed.

Subsequent work can explore:

- specific social pathologies as failures of coupling or feedback;
- institutional designs that improve informational integrity;
- cultural mechanisms that support long-term commitment;
- risks associated with false coherence and premature centralisation.

The task ahead is not to design the future in detail, but to remove the barriers that prevent it from emerging responsibly.

 

## Appendix A - Stages in Universal Evolution

### Stage 1: Physical Assembly

The earliest stage of evolution consists of the assembly of physical structure under universal constraint. Fundamental particles combine into atoms, atoms into molecules, and matter aggregates into stars, planets, and large-scale energy gradients. The primary barrier overcome at this stage is the persistence of structure in an otherwise entropic environment.

No control, purpose, or adaptation exists at this level. Assembly proceeds solely through lawful interaction and probabilistic constraint. Nevertheless, this stage establishes the preconditions for all subsequent evolution by producing stable substrates, energy flows, and gradients upon which further organisation can build.

### Stage 2: Chemical Self-Organisation

Chemical evolution introduces the first form of self-reinforcing organisation. Networks of reactions arise that maintain their structure over time through autocatalysis and cyclic processes. The barrier overcome at this stage is the maintenance of complex organisation in the face of dissipation.

These systems are not alive, but they prefigure life by demonstrating how local feedback can stabilise structure far from equilibrium. Importantly, persistence is still conditional and fragile; there is no enclosure, no heredity, and no cumulative adaptation.

### Stage 3: Proto-Life and Cellular Life

With the emergence of membranes, metabolism, and replication, chemical systems cross the threshold into biological life. The critical barrier overcome here is boundary formation and internal regulation, allowing systems to distinguish themselves from their environment and maintain internal conditions.

Cells represent the first minimal systems capable of Darwinian evolution. Heritable information enables variation, selection, and cumulative adaptation. At this stage, needs such as existence and maintenance become intrinsic drivers of system behaviour, grounding later biological and social dynamics.

### Stage 4: Multicellular Organisms

Multicellularity marks a decisive evolutionary transition in which independent living units integrate into a higher-order system. The barrier overcome is coordination among specialised components. This is achieved through genetic regulation of differentiation and the emergence of internal control subsystems.

Crucially, cells relinquish independent reproductive autonomy and commit to the survival of the organism as a whole. New forms of regulation, i.e., nervous, immune, and endocrine systems, enable internal feedback, control, and stability. This stage establishes the canonical template for commitment-based integration that later stages will partially replicate and partially fail to replicate.

 

**Stage 5: Embryonic Development (Evo-Devo Principle)**

Embryonic development addresses the barrier of reliably re-assembling complex organisation across generations. Developmental programs encoded in the genome ensure that organisms do not assemble randomly, but follow structured pathways that reflect evolutionary history.

This stage reveals a general principle: development is constrained replay, not free construction. Earlier evolutionary solutions appear first; later specialisations emerge only after foundational organisation is in place. This principle will later extend beyond biology into social development.

**Stage 6: Cognition and Intentional Agency**

With the evolution of nervous systems, organisms acquire the capacity to act on internal models of the world rather than purely reflexive responses. The barrier overcome is flexible behavioural coordination in complex and changing environments.

Learning, memory, and symbolic representation enable anticipation, choice, and non-genetic adaptation. Behaviour becomes increasingly shaped by experience rather than inheritance alone. Darwinian evolution continues, but developmental and cognitive processes now dominate moment-to-moment system behaviour.

**Stage 7: Small-Scale Human Social Organisation**

Human social systems emerge when coordination extends beyond kinship and immediate biological relations. The barrier overcome is cooperative action among non-kin, achieved through communication, shared norms, and reciprocal trust.

Families, bands, and tribes form as loosely integrated systems that mirror early multicellular organisation: integration is real but weak, coordination is fragile, and fitness gains are substantial but contingent. Social organisation begins to exhibit emergent properties, though commitment remains largely interpersonal rather than systemic.

**Stage 8: Large-Scale Organisations and Institutions**

As societies grow, coordination at scale becomes the dominant challenge. The barrier overcome is local coordination, addressed through roles, hierarchy, law, and bureaucracy. Organisations and institutions emerge as durable social structures capable of sustaining large populations.

However, unlike biological organisms, integration weakens as scale increases. Communication costs rise, functional differentiation intensifies, and commitment becomes increasingly role-based rather than systemic. Developmental maturity begins to lag behind organisational power.

**Stage 9: Nations and Sectors**

Nation-states and large functional sectors represent further aggregation of social systems into systems-of-systems. The barrier encountered at this stage is integration across diverse populations and organisational forms.

Governance structures, ideology, and infrastructure partially address this challenge, but commitment becomes fragmented. Sectors optimise locally, identities diverge, and coordination across boundaries degrades. Functional differentiation increases capacity, but at the cost of systemic coherence.

 

**Stage 10: Global Social Systems (Current Frontier)**

At the present frontier, humanity functions as a de facto planetary-scale system without having achieved planetary-scale integration. The primary barriers are informational coherence and commitment to the global parent system.

Global challenges, e.g., climate change, ecological degradation, technological risk, require coordination beyond the maturity of existing social structures. Information is abundant but fragmented; power exists without corresponding control. Humanity exhibits the capabilities of a control system without the integration required to function as one.

**Synthesis Across Stages**

Across all stages, the same evolutionary logic recurs: assembly encounters constraint; innovation enables integration; stabilisation permits growth; insufficient commitment produces pathology.

The instability of contemporary human societies is therefore not anomalous. It reflects a system that has reached a new scale without yet acquiring the informational integration and coupling required for viable operation at that level.

**References**

Arrow, K. J. (1974). *The limits of organization*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Ashby, W. R. (1956). *An introduction to cybernetics*. London, UK: Chapman & Hall.

Beer, S. (1979). *The heart of enterprise*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Beer, S. (1981). *Brain of the firm* (2nd ed.). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Boulding, K. E. (1956). General systems theory—The skeleton of science. *Management Science, 2*(3), 197–208. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2.3.197

Carroll, S. B. (2005). *Endless forms most beautiful: The new science of evo devo*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Holling, C. S. (2001). Understanding the complexity of economic, ecological, and social systems. *Ecosystems, 4*(5), 390–405. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-001-0101-5

Kauffman, S. A. (1993). *The origins of order: Self-organization and selection in evolution*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Maynard Smith, J., & Szathmáry, E. (1995). *The major transitions in evolution*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Noble, D. (2012). *Dance to the tune of life: Biological relativity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social–ecological systems. *Science, 325*(5939), 419–422. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1172133

Simon, H. A. (1962). The architecture of complexity. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 106*(6), 467–482.

 

Smith, E., & Morowitz, H. J. (2016). *The origin and nature of life on Earth: The emergence of the fourth geosphere*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. New York, NY: George Braziller.

 