

# **Cumulative Cultural Cvolution – A Flawed Concept**

David R. Wood

RSG Federal

[dwood@rsgfederal.com](mailto:dwood@rsgfederal.com)

ORCID ID: 0009-0003-4622-224X

Publish Date: 05/10/2025

---

**Abstract:** The concept of cumulative cultural evolution (CCE) is fundamentally flawed. The second process of evolution is enacted via imagination at the individual level. This process utilizes an artificial genome within our mind when conceiving a new idea. Homo sapiens has expanded the artificial genome available to each of us, but this does not amount to a cumulative process practically. It is the artificial variation of organisms expanding their genome within the context of natural reproduction. The concept of evolution already includes progressive accumulation making the word cumulative redundant. The concept of culture is also improperly defined. The concept of culture is really the ancient Latin definition of cultivation which meant – evolution. So, the word culture is also redundant. The concept of culture produced by modern academics is also improperly defined on its own terms. The concept they attempt to describe is an artificial species – the artificial segregation of homo sapiens based on distinct artificial structural and behavioral adaptations. This makes the concept of CCE to be practically defined as “evolution evolution evolution” which is nonsensical. The conceptual pattern of a culture is also improperly defined thus making a clear case for Alex Mesoudi’s proposed Darwinian synthesis of the social sciences.

**Keywords:** Cultural evolution, cumulative cultural evolution, artificial evolution, artificial species, artificial genome, natural genome, artificial reproduction, natural reproduction, natural mutation, artificial mutation

## **Section 1: Challenging the Prevailing Paradigm of Cultural Evolution**

There is no such thing as cumulative cultural evolution is a practically flawed concept. It may have been documented by scholars and then gained group consensus doesn’t make it a scientific fact. Humanity once believed the sun revolved around the earth and the planet was flat based on group consensus. So, that is no real factual argument to make in support of the academic community’s group opinion.

This is supported by the fact that cultural evolutionary science has no argument against my assertion since: a) they cannot as a group even define what culture is, and b) they haven’t worked out how the second process of evolution functions. This is in stark contrast to

my four books that document a full-blown theoretical framework for how this second process of evolution does work. A theoretical framework is a self-evidently observable pattern in nature anyone on earth can logically work out using their common sense and imagination.

And if you doubt that I could have achieved this result, then listen to the written transcript of a discussion on the podcast *Star Talk Plus* on YouTube between Neil deGrasse Tyson and Richard Dawkins titled: *Why did it take so long to discover evolution by natural selection?* below. Academics might scoff at the use of citing a social media post, but scholars will be doing just that when we are all passed from this earth. This is because so much information will not be in text form that future scholars will inevitably research and cite. It is another example of current bias impacting academia's ability to make scientific discoveries by leveraging any source of information – not just academically produced information. It also preventing them from reading Napoleon Hill's book, *Think and Grow Rich*, prejudicially deeming it "pseudoscience" not realizing much of today's legitimate science was once itself thought pseudoscience in its own time.

Dawkins: ***"...Before Darwin came along it seemed obvious to everyone that big complicated things like humans and oak trees had to have an explanation in terms of design...To me it has always been strange that it took so long..."***

Tyson: ***"That's the interesting one because it speaks to the bias...This is why I'm intrigued that Daniel Dennett, a philosopher, who in principle any philosopher could have come up with this because unlike relativity and unlike quantum physics, which are realms of the universe, large and small. That you can't just deduce from your armchair. But evolution by natural selection could have been deduced in an armchair."***

This is exactly how I completed the work that Darwin began. I used my deductive reasoning ability, imagination, common sense, and extensive field work experience to make the discovery. I possess exceptional deep and broad field work experience in utilizing and adapting frameworks implicitly designed to enact the second process of evolution to produce new adaptations. This is superior practical knowledge to that of theoretical knowledge possessed by cultural evolutionary academics. And, as a result, my theoretical framework has successfully been replicated by evolutionarily reframing the best practices of *The Prince*, *The Art of War*, and the *ITIL 4 Framework* (Wood 2024, Wood 2025a, Wood 2025b). Best practices that have proven practically effective in producing non-natural adaptations for actual homo sapiens competition here on earth. The patterns of competition that the natural adaptations of consciousness and imagination evolved as a means to the end of our survival. This is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

So, from our own armchair, let us deconstruct the concept of cumulative cultural evolution one word at a time to be very thorough. This is the logically analytical and deductive basis of all my – and any credible scientist's thought process. We will do so as philosophers Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle would millennia ago. And in this deductive logic chain we will presume nothing is accurately defined by anyone. So, just like Socrates, we will question the validity of the premises upon which the group consensus is founded. No one needs to base their thinking on the information produced by others when using their own imagination and common sense. This was Socrates' basic point – think for yourself.

## **Section 2: The Use of the Concept of Cumulative is Redundant**

The concept 'cumulative' has basically the same meaning as the concept of evolution in a practical sense. Merriam Webster dictionary defines this term as "increasing by successive additions" and "made up of accumulated parts". This meaning is already expressed in the concept of evolution in Merriam Webster's "cumulative inherited change in a population of organisms" and "a process of change in a certain direction". So, it seems logically unnecessary to repeat this concept again. And the key to mastering any subject is simplifying the pattern –not adding unnecessary complexity.

There also is nothing cumulative about the second evolutionary process. This views the process of evolution homo sapiens enact as a group activity – it is certainly not. We enact this second process individually in our own mind. And we can only do this with the information we have available at the time. It doesn't matter if there is a vast amount of information possessed by society if you don't have access to it at the time you are in the process of conceiving a new idea. You are literally doing it right now in your mind as you consider the assertions of my paper to produce a new opinion of this work. Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever. This is why a non-academic, Napoleon Hill, was able to roughly document this process using his intuition in his book (Hill 1937).

## **Section 3: The Concept of CCE Fits Academia, Not the War of Nature**

So, to frame the evolution of human adaptations of cumulative in that way is purely due to the perspective of the people who framed it that way – academics. This speaks to the bias that Tyson identified in the transcript above – it isn't a question of intelligence or education, but of perspective. So, the academics are making the error of thinking that the way they operate is the way the rest of the world operates – it just isn't so in practical reality. In effect, they have developed a concept that applies to how the university system functions to incrementally evolve scientific information over time. It is a very egocentric worldview that is consistent with how they view the rest of our species passively evolving our thinking through imitation. And it is a constraint of the prevailing paradigm that only an outsider, like me, could accurately and unbiasedly perceive. It is because as a digital transformation consultant I am highly skilled in identifying this type of cultural blind spot. And then removing this cognitive constraint to enable a community to achieve organizational breakthroughs.

So, the academic communities group assumption on CCE ignores the fact that human beings outside the university system are intentionally evolving our ideas and adaptations actively in fierce evolutionary competition – warfare, politics, business, sports, etc. In these competitive contexts we intentionally produce new ideas leveraging our natural adaptation of imagination. This enables both the deliberate and the random mutation of thought. This then allows our natural species to produce new artificial adaptations necessary to overcome any competitive and/or environmental constraints that check our expansion. And this does not require building on information artificially inherited from society. In fact, some of the ideas randomly conceived are superior to those produced by academia (e.g., Charles Darwin,

Srinivas Ramanujan, Albert Einstein, etc.). Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

In addition, much of the conceiving of new ideas has been within isolated homo sapiens communities with access to different sets of information than others. In fact, most businesses are attempting to conceal their information as a competitive advantage as trade secrets every day on earth. They intentionally do not want someone to build on the information they have produced. This is because business competition isn't like academic competition – it is a purely zero-sum game. If your competitor gains advantage, then he takes your consumers from you. So, to frame the evolution as some macro level cumulative process flies in the face of how the evolution of artificial adaptations produced by homo sapiens really occurs. Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

The artificial adaptations that are produced are either selected for use or not. So, as a variation of natural selection, homo sapiens select from available adaptations (i.e., horses, chariot, etc.) for use. But once an artificial adaptation (i.e., horse & buggy, payphone, catapult, geocentric cosmological model, etc.) is no longer useful it is artificially deselected for use by homo sapiens. In time this artificial adaptation becomes rare and then often just ceases to exist entirely in a practical sense. This is an artificial variation of how natural evolution deselects sets of adaptations in the form of a natural organism for existence as well. There is nothing cumulative about this since each artificial adaptation is selected by homo sapiens based on their practical problem in the moment. Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

#### **Section 4: Rediscovering the Ancient Greek Concept of Artificial Evolution**

Ironically, it was the ancient Greeks who had the more accurate understanding of this individual process. This is despite them not having the “cumulative” set of information modern academics posit exists. The ancient Greeks explicitly documented this evolutionary pattern in the myth of Eros & Psyche. The male ancient Greek god of both sexual power and profound artistry, Eros, is married to a woman, Psyche, whose name is the basis of the term psychology today. This is no coincidence, and it is obvious when you think about it for a minute. I have covered this pattern extensively in my books. The human mind functions as an artificial womb by which we conceive new patterns – a new idea. Why do you think we use the word “conceive” to describe how we produce a new idea? Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

This new idea can be in the form of a modified conceptual model for a new type of car or rifle. It is the artificial variation of a genotype in natural evolution – it serves the same basic purpose. This is why Plato described the texts Homer produced as his artificial offspring in his dialectic *Symposium*. Plato was never being metaphorical – he was being quite literal. Why else do you think the ancient Greeks used the same words interchangeably for brining both natural offspring and art into the world? It is because the ancient Greeks leveraged the exact same lexicon to describe the products of both processes of evolution. The process of evolution enacted by the gods to create all natural ‘things’ on earth and the process of evolution humanity enacted to produce all new artificial (i.e., art) ‘things’. It was done

because the ancient Greco-Romans all fundamentally understood how evolution functions in both processes. You can't conceive new ideas at the group level any more than you can conceive a new homo sapiens child as a group – it just doesn't work that way. Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

This is the practical context within which cultural evolutionary science really should have placed their efforts. It is a variation of our ancestors individually surviving and reproducing in nature. Our ancestors were conceiving these new ideas in their mind in the process of evading saber tooth tigers and hunting woolly mammoths. I cover just this scenario in my book *The Last of the Greco-Romans*. In this accurate view of evolutionary reality homo sapiens have access to an artificial genome (i.e., all information available to them) individually. They then leverage and sometimes artificially mutate, this artificial genome individually to enact a variation of the process of natural evolution enacts with a natural genome. I used the example of a young homo sapiens individually mutating the conceptual pattern of their hunting tactics (i.e., artificial behavioral adaptation) to something more competitively advantageous – an artificially adaptive trait. He then shares this new artificial adaptation with the council of elders who then artificially select it for use in evolutionary competition with woolly mammoths.

It is just this simple. And it conforms to everyone's practically lived experience. I have never been in a meeting where everyone conceived the exact same idea simultaneously. One person conceives and then expresses the initial rough idea to the group. And then we hopscotch between minds until someone finally conceives the idea ultimately conceptually selected by the group. The final document that expresses that new conceptual pattern is then selected – artificial selection. This is what artificial selection is – the selection of artificially produced adaptations.

This is literally common sense obvious if you just think about it for a moment. The second process of evolution is an individual activity, just like our natural species mating process, for conceiving new patterns – mental patterns in the form ideas. Mental patterns we then develop into a physical pattern – a new rifle design. This is an artificial variation of transforming a genotype (i.e., pattern) into a new set of natural adaptations (i.e., pattern). And a concept is equivalent to a gene in its function in the second process of evolution.

So, it makes no sense for anyone to view this process at the group level. The modern concept of individual learning is really what these scientists were supposed to be looking for and working out in their research efforts. The ancient Greeks already knew this and practically worked out this invisible pattern in nature. So too did Napoleon Hill in his book, *Think and Grow Rich*, which focused on “sexual transmutation” as the creative force that fueled the engine of human creative imagination. This is exactly like the pattern of the god Eros and his wife Psyche. Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

## **Section 5: Cultural Evolution Conflated Two Distinct Processes – Individual & Group**

We had to develop a variation of this individual process in the form of the ITIL Framework in order to enact this process as a group. I would now – I'm an ITIL Master which means I am an expert with what Aristotle would term 'practical knowledge' in

transforming a conceptual model (i.e., genotype) into a physically existent new service (i.e., adaptation). This is a superior equivalent to what modern cultural evolutionary scientists would term “fieldwork”. I didn’t just study what others were doing – I was actively enacting and optimizing the second process of evolution myself at an expert level. Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

This is practically superior to the academic education and credentials of modern cultural evolutionary scientists. Any non-commissioned officer in the United States Army will tell you that their practical knowledge is far more reliable and effective in “the war of nature” than any academic treatise produced at West Point intellectually. This is exactly why almost every new second lieutenant that commission into the U.S. Army is paired with a seasoned and experienced noncommissioned officer to get a practical education to begin their career. And why all smart commissioned officers listen carefully to their noncommissioned officers if they know what they are doing. This is so that the fighting unit can blend theoretical and practical knowledge to produce a perfected strategy and tactics necessary to achieve victory in “the ware of nature”.

The ITIL Framework functions much the same way. ITIL Masters possess theoretical knowledge just as commissioned officers possess. They then combine this with practical knowledge accumulated by the service provider organization. They do so by collaborating with senior management and technical leaders within the organization that individually possess a valuable artificial genome in their minds. And the ITIL Framework also possesses a practice, knowledge management, that maintains the artificial genome of the community. And ensures it is available to the individuals of the community so they can conceive new ideas to gain competitive advantage. These artificial mutations are then added to the existing artificial genome, expanding the knowledge collectively available to the community of homo sapiens. Cultural evolutionary scientists just had to talk to me, or any other ITIL Master, for a day and we could have resolved this logical error on the spot. And I wouldn’t have had to write four books to point out this fact.

## **Section 6: A Culture is Really a Form of an Artificial Species**

Now, let’s look at the concept of culture. What cultural evolutionary scientists are attempting to define as “culture” does not possess the evolutionary worldview to frame it properly. Every human cultural is a form of artificial species – a group of natural organisms, homo sapiens, that all possess similar artificial genomes, (i.e., conceptually perception of reality), similar behavioral artificial adaptations (e.g., customs, traditions, habits, manners, etc.), and similar structural artificial adaptations (i.e., clothing, architecture, weapons, cuisine, etc.). We classify natural organisms as species on this basis and practically that is what the term culture really means. I documented this practical reality in detail in my book, *The Prince of Evolution*. And professor Joseph Henrich in his text has already begun describing us a “cultural species”. He is already logically evolving his thinking towards my scientific discovery without conscious awareness of the fact.

We see this concept literally play out in the ancient world. The two artificial species, the Roman Republic and the Carthaginian Republic, became locked in a coevolutionary struggle for existence in the ancient Mediterranean basin natural ecosystem. Their societies

entered into an evolutionary arms race at sea and on land over three successive wars – “the war of nature”. This then led to the extinction of the Carthaginian artificial species and the expansion of the Roman artificial species. Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

This is the exact same pattern that played out in “the war of nature” between other natural species at some point in the exact same Mediterranean basin in geological time on earth. The fact that cultural evolutionary scientists are blind to this repetitive pattern of evolutionary history is their conscious choice to not frame the competition between cultures as the standard evolutionary pattern that has eternally repeated on earth. This is even though homo sapiens are natural organisms no different than any other.

So, logically, what is good for the goose should be just as good for the gander – if we are a natural species then we should be perceived the exact same as any other. We should not let the recent pejorative view of “colonialism” corrupt our logically accurate perception of earth’s evolutionary reality. This would be to place matters of personal preference before matters of the scientific accuracy – something the rest of us would hope academics are far above in their profession. A culture is logically a form of artificial species that segregates homo sapiens like how we group natural organisms which has usually, but not always, be along ethnic lines as well. The historical cultural distinction of being a Greek vs barbarian and Roman vs barbarian were both great examples – they were more determined by your language and customs than just purely by your ethnicity.

The historical term of culture that exists today is also improperly defined. This is definitely not how Marcus Tullius Cicero defined this concept known as “cultura” in his text, *Tusculanae Disputationes*, from which the modern concept of culture traces its etymology. The concept of “cultura” in ancient Latin means “evolution”. And the word “cultus” means “evolutionary perfection” for a specific competitive end. So, the Romans were knowingly and intentionally evolving their religion, agriculture, and their young men to be perfected for their specific ends.

The ancient Greeks might have studied the two processes of evolution, but the ancient Romans practically organized their society as an evolutionary framework. I cover this reframing of the concept of culture in detail in my book *The Last of the Greco-Romans*. The entire ancient Roman society was an evolutionary framework for producing a security service provider – the Roman legions. They produced a human resource with the ability to execute and employ a combination of both process and product for use within that service model – a Roman legionnaire. Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

It is exactly as the ITIL Framework functions to produce a service provider that also makes use of a consistent pattern of people, processes, and technology in the form of a trained helpdesk agent. You could use the same framing of the Roman legions as you could for an enterprise IT helpdesk – combination of people (i.e., helpdesk agent vs legionnaire), process (i.e., SOPs vs battle drills), and technology (i.e., ServiceNow vs Armor/Gladius). This is literally why the United States government terms their security force “The Armed Services”.

In the case of the Roman legions they were literally competing in what Darwin termed “the war of nature” – warfare. And they were continuously evolving their society, their legions, and their young men to stay aligned with the same value stream Darwin described – the struggle for existence. Adrian Goldsworthy literally and directly expresses this very idea regarding the Roman society in his book *Roman Warfare* – and he was logically accurate in his observation.

## **Section 7: Kuhnsian Paradigm Shift – The Process of Artificial Evolution**

So, this makes the concept of cumulative cultural evolution to really read as “evolution evolution evolution” which makes no logical sense. This means only the concept of evolution being necessary to express the concept they were attempting to express. This isn’t entirely the cultural evolutionary scientists’ fault. They simply artificially inherited an inaccurate artificial genome that caused them to develop an inaccurate worldview. In my role as a transformation consultant I have repeatedly seen this community pattern before in other professional contexts. The community was ineffective in accurately framing the challenge confronting them. And after analyzing cultural evolutionary texts, I have found this to be the case once again.

So, my scientific discovery is the type of paradigm shift Thomas Kuhn described in his book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Ironically, this book describes an evolutionary cycle exactly like that of Thomas Siebel in his book, *Digital Transformation*. A book organized on the natural evolutionary concept of punctuated equilibrium as occurring in business competition by new digital technologies (i.e., artificial adaptations). The book that caused me to open Darwin’s text, *On the Origin of Species*, in the first place. This is described in my book *The Last of the Greco-Romans* and will digitally disrupt the entire scientific community. Basically, Kuhn’s paradigm shift is just an artificial form of punctuated equilibrium – in an intellectual competitive context. Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

## **Section 8: The Unified Framework of Evolution – Natural & Artificial**

So, to summarize, there is no cumulative cultural evolution. The concept is redundant and is not practically accurate in describing how homo sapiens enact the second process of evolution. The ancient Greek myth of Eros & Psyche and Napoleon Hill have already practically documented the pattern of artificial reproduction that cultural evolution has been searching for all this time. And the ITIL Framework is an artificial adaptation created to enact that process at the group level. These are the two distinct variations of natural evolutionary processes that cultural evolutionary has conflated as one process. So, it is time the academic community stop considering the process of evolution homo sapiens enact as “passive”. And instead perceive our natural species as enacting this process aggressively and actively to intentionally compete in the different variations of the survival of the fittest contest on earth – in war, business, politics, sports, etc.

If do they do so, then they will realize that there is just one unified framework of evolution that is being enacted in all competition on earth – whether intentionally or



unintentionally. However, they both generally function using the same conceptual pattern – 1) random genetic mutation vs random imaginative mutation of thought, 2) sexual selection vs conceptual selection, 3) natural selection vs artificial selection. This is the reason that these processes of evolution are all perfected best practices for transforming information into adaptations in the exact same competitive and environmental conditions. And they are enacted in a very similar, if slightly different, way.

This also makes sense since although there are many different variations of the crablike form, they are generally similar given convergent evolution. Why would a second process of evolution be any different? Are they both not just sets of adaptations like the crablike forms? Darwin already hinted at the answer in his text – evolutionary value streams for survival and reproduction. This is why you keep getting the same best practice set of adaptations repeatedly on earth.

***“We can, in short, see why nature is prodigal in variety, though niggard in innovation. But why this should be a law of nature if each species has been independently created no man can explain...Many other facts are, as it seem to me, explicable on this theory...these facts cease to be strange, or might even have been anticipated.”***

There is nothing strange about it and it should have been anticipated. The same value stream keeps leading to the production of similar variations – whether unintentionally or intentionally. Doesn’t this accurately describe every commercial industry on earth? Of course it does – that too is evolutionary competition that is organized on the value streams of selection by consumers. A literal artificial variation of the natural survival of the fittest contest on earth. Again, this is a self-evident obvious fact of human existence that needs no empirical validation whatsoever.

### **Conclusion: Nature’s Best Practices are Being Unintentionally Reinvented by Humanity**

So, there is one best practice produced by the divine patterns that created the universe and the earth while the other was produced by an anomaly in earth’s history – human imagination. It doesn’t matter if the best practice was intentionally or unintendedly produced – it is the same means to the same ends all the same. And natural selection doesn’t care whether an adaptation was naturally or artificially produced when the mechanism selects winners and losers in practical competition on earth. And neither does your boss at work when he evolutionary selects you for firing or promotion – whether it was your natural adaptation of your mind, or your artificial adaptations produced by education or experience. One might logically posit there is now an evolutionary selection mechanism existent on earth – not just a natural one that has existed for billions of years.

This artificial construct of perceiving our evolutionary reality needs to be removed and our society needs to return to Aristotle’s worldview – everything is part of nature in his text, *Physics*. This is the worldview of **The Unified Framework of Evolution** that must now be adopted by humanity. This paradigm shift is exactly that called for by Alex Mesoudi in his text, *Cultural Evolution*. In this Mesoudi puts forth the proposal for Darwinian theory to both reframe the concept of culture and synthesize the social sciences. He was logically correct, and I have done just that with the publishing of my four books.

So, the academic community needs to stop looking at the inaccurate information it has produced using the artificial adaptations of empiricism. And instead look the accurate information produced by human imagination by experts (e.g., Sun Tzu, Machiavelli, PeopleCert, etc.) with practical knowledge gained in practical evolutionary competition – warfare, politics, sports, business, etc.

This is the breakthrough they have been searching for since Darwin discovered the first conceptual pattern of evolution. A breakthrough that was already practically achieved by our ancestors, and then lost, many centuries ago. And this is exactly why philosophy must continue to be part of the scientific process – not just empiricism. It is because philosophers operating outside the academic system (i.e., Einstein, Ramanujan, Darwin, Wood, etc.) keep removing the constraints of bias from the knowledge of the academic community.

This is a pattern because like Tyson and Dawkins stated about both Copernicus' and Darwin's discoveries – they are essentially simple. It is because the patterns in nature when discovered always possess elegant simplicity. So, you don't have to be a Ph.D. credentialed tenured professor at Harvard or Oxford to discover them. In fact, ignorance of the knowledge generated by academia means there is no bias that must first be unlearned. The ancient Chinese philosopher Laozi summed up exactly how and why this is the case in the text the *Tao Te Ching*:

***“A good artist lets his intuition lead him wherever it wants. A good scientist has freed himself of concepts and keeps his mind open to what is. Thus the Master is available to all people and doesn't reject anyone. He is ready to use all situations and doesn't waste anything. This is called embodying the light...If you don't understand this, you will get lost, however intelligent you are. It is the great secret.”***

I am not a scientist, but a philosopher-warrior with extensive practical knowledge in enacting the second process of evolution in both warfare and business competition. An artist of philosophic inquiry trained in the applied sciences for producing the non-natural adaptations that are the very subjects of cultural evolutionary science. It is time for pure science and the applied sciences to now be integrated as both Plato and Aristotle would have advised.

The reason is that the user always has a better understanding of how an adaptation should be designed than a maker. For the adaptation produced by the maker is always the means to the end of the user. This is ITIL 4 Framework 101 wisdom. The value stream of the user drives the design of the maker (i.e., developer) – not the other way around. So, logically the patterns of the applied science should drive the patterns of the pure science – not the other way around. The cultural evolutionary scientists keep viewing the subject like Darwin did. However, Darwin's discovery had no associated applied science – nature itself was the artist. This is not so for the second of evolution – homo sapiens are the intentional artist.

This will then cause the breakthrough that the cultural evolutionary scientific field has been searching for since Darwin's discovery. The academics will finally be able to see the evolutionary forest through the bureaucratic trees. All that is required is for one academic to humble themselves as Laozi espouses and the breakthrough will begin to occur. An self-evidently obvious breakthrough that shouldn't be thought strange, but instead should have been anticipated

## References

Darwin, Charles. (1859). *On the Origin of Species*. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland: John Murray.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. United States: University of Chicago Press.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius (1<sup>st</sup> Century BC). *Tusculanae Disputationes*. Ancient Italy, Rome.

Mesoudi, Alex. (2011). *Cultural Evolution: How Darwinian Theory Can Explain Human Culture & Synthesize The Social Sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Henrich, Joseph et al S. (2016). *Understanding Cumulative Cultural Evolution*. United States: Academia.edu.

Siebel, Thomas. (2019). *Digital Transformation: Survive and Thrive in an Era of Mass Extinction*. Rodin Books.

Niles Eldridge & Stephen Jay Gould. (1972). *Punctuated Equilibria*. United States: *Evolution journal*.

Wood, David R. (2023). *On the Origin of Artificial Species*. Gaithersburg: RSG Federal.

Wood, David R. (2024). *The Prince of Evolution*. London: Austin Macauley Publishers.

Wood, David R. (2025). *The Last of the Greco-Romans: The Unified Framework of Evolution, the Sunset of the Scientific Revolution, and the Dawn of the Age of Light*. Gaithersburg: RSG Federal.

Wood, David R. (2025). *The Artist of Evolution – Sun Tzu*. Bloomington: Archway Publishing.

Hill, Napoleon & Rosa Lee Beeland (1937). *Think and Grow Rich*. The Ralston Society.

Axelos/PeopleCert (2019). *ITIL Foundation – ITIL 4 Edition*. The Stationary Office (TSO).

Goldsworthy, Adrian (2019). *Roman Warfare*. Harper Paperbacks.

Aristotle (4<sup>th</sup> Century BC). *Physics* (I.e., Lectures on Nature). Ancient Greece, Athens.

Plato (4<sup>th</sup> Century BC). *Symposium*. Ancient Greece, Athens.

Laozi, (3<sup>rd</sup> Century BC). *Tao Te Ching*. Ancient China.

Merriam Webster (2025). *Merriam Webster Online Dictionary*.