

Research Article

Mind and Psyche as Roots of History

Roberto Bani* 

Department of Zoology, University of Florence, Florence, Italy

Abstract

The aim of all my work is to understand and explain relational life. The work is present in the articles and books already published. *Mind* - Since its origin, Homo sapiens acquired the potential that will allow history. These are qualities already present in primates and inherited from them, such as the prehensile limb, binocular vision, a good memory that allows knowledge, forms of reasoning present in chimpanzees. However, the human brain is three and a half times larger than his, hence the broad knowledge and rich language, and it is a brain capable of specializing in practical but also abstract and spiritual activities. All this constitutes a completely new interactive chain in the relationship between species and environment, because man knows how to adapt reality to his needs thanks to a completely new faculty: creativity, the spark of history. *Psyche* - I start from the *Primitive Horde* hypothesized by Freud in Totem and Taboo, and I follow Darwin to identify the *Origin of Man* however in his psychic and social heritage, a heritage that, we will see, has an enormous weight in societies, in history and life of people. Ideas and motivations are distinguished, among these the *trust* or *security* that each one seeks in the context in which he lives but following archaic feelings inherited from animals such as *property* and *rank*. It should be considered that the last genetic social structure in which the sapiens lived, and in which their best feelings were formed, is the *tribe* or multi-family community. This community no longer exists and has eclipsed its essential character of being a *face-to-face group*, or group in which everyone knows each other. Its disappearance, which occurred since the first civilizations, marks the beginning of history.

Keywords

Mental Faculties, Creativity, Horde Primitives, Trust and Protection, Property, Rank, Face to Face Groups

1. Human Mind and Dynamic Culture

1.1. Faculties of the Mind

Understanding history is understanding man. Investigating his physicality, his DNA and much more, to understand what makes him such a particular animal that he has rapidly upset the planet, sticking his nose everywhere, wanting to know and control everything. To understand, one can only refer to well-defined and describable models that relate to each other: models in the individual are Psyche and Mind, respective

seats of motivations and ideas with their structures and functions, models of every community are Society and Culture. Psyche with feelings expresses actions that give certain relationships whose interweaving is Society, which is a structure with physiology useful to the community. Minds express themselves and integrate into Culture through language: exchanging thoughts and ideas with words they give the common mentality. However, each model has different ways of specializing: Psyche can give rise to more human types for prevalent feel fearful; Mind takes on various ways of func-

*Corresponding author: baniroberto@tiscali.it (Roberto Bani)

Received: 15 May 2025; **Accepted:** 3 June 2025; **Published:** 26 June 2025



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2025. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

tioning, it can speak Italian, English, Chinese, Arabic, or have a certain religious and political thought.

The reader should keep in mind that (1) the socioculture in which we grow up conditions us but (2) like any other socioculture is only a piece of that global adventure of the species that is history, (3) the external phenomena, visible and easily describable, are expressions of the Psyche and the Mind that (4) for the particular human qualities contained are the roots of history. Thus, the human Mind is the result of a long evolution in which it has acquired the faculties that have overlapped up to us. As I have analyzed and described in *Cosmic Thinking* Bani, [4], memogenesis is an epigenesis (Figure 1) in which five levels are distinguished based on the faculties gradually acquired, such progression or *Enchanted Staircase* has occurred thanks to the increase of neurons as an independent variable but modulated by the peculiarities of the environment. In summary:

5s		Remote	Fantasy
5m		Regularity	Rationality
4s		Weft	Thought
4m		Next	Knowledge
3	Object		Objects
			Specific
2	Particular o Pre-object		Objects of Category
1	Element		Perceptive Medium
0			Nothing

Figure 1. Progressive scale of mental acquisitions.

Level 1 or Elementary Sensorimotor. After level zero, which had no specialized cells and therefore could not detect anything or almost nothing, the first neurons could only arrange themselves in sensory-motor lines to detect simple stimuli and give minimal responses. These lines are the reflex arcs that we have in the spinal cord and in the brainstem.

Level 2 or Sensorimotor Particular. Neurons increase and can capture forms of stimuli called *key stimuli* and give actions as structured responses. Category objects or pre-objects such as male, female, food are distinguished, recognized by innate ideas combined with emotions of fear, anger, hunger, libido: excited by the stimulus they activate a coherent action such as fleeing, attacking, eating, copulating. They are found in the basal nuclei, in the hippocampus and thalamus.

Level 3 or Sensorimotor Object. The faculty of memory has appeared that requires learning and allows us to recognize specific objects such as a specific territory, the mother, a child, a given animal, a person, a place. Minimal memory in archaic brain areas of the limbic system.

Level 4 or Mnemonic because the strong increase in memory areas allows us to remember and correlate many things, acquire many notions and unite them in Knowledge revealed by the mental maps present in dogs, wolves, ele-

phants, mice, baboons and others. These, like us, dream and the dream is already Thought, even if it is unconscious. But as brain matter grows, we also think or reflect when we are awake, as do some mammals, primates, and ourselves.

Level 5 or Operational in the sense that the cerebral cortex is so large that it allows certain parts, the areas of the frontal lobe, to operate on the memory areas and modify their content. They can do this either by using logical coherence through Rationality or by varying them with Fantasy.

We have thus passed from low metazoans to fish to low and high mammals in that progression that I wanted to define as *enchanted staircase* being the most splendid fruit of biogenesis, by which man, who uses all levels and faculties, namely knowledge, thought, rationality and creativity, has plunged into history.

1.2. Mental-Cultural Specialties

Cerebral cortex presents areas with different functions that explain the sociocultural specializations. In front of the fissure of Rolando there are the motor area and the frontal association area, very large in our species, behind are the sensory areas distinct for each sense organ, sight, hearing, touch, smell, among these memory areas.

SENSORY AREAS. They specialize in activities of Art, a notoriously multifaceted category for disciplines that favor one or the other sense organ. Drawing, painting, sculpture and architecture implement visual thinking that arises from ideas worked with imagination and reasoning but specialized in the visual area; music, poetry and prose use rhythms and harmonies coming from the auditory area; there is the art of perfumes that uses the sense of smell and olfactory area, and the art of cooking or culinary art for the gustatory area. Observe a sommelier at work and you will understand the commitment and importance of his mental gustatory ability and, to a lesser extent, olfactory and visual, all focused on the understanding of the sublime wine.

MOTOR AREA. Various forms of Sport using different muscle organs: arms in boxing and weightlifting, legs in running, cycling, high jumping and football. It is enough to follow an Olympics to see the wide spectrum of physical activities. In addition, each sport requires that the athlete, its officials and spectators have a certain way of thinking: everyone is mentally engaged in the rules, type of training, knowledge of opponents, level of performance.

ASSOCIATIVE AREAS realize the broadest syntheses of ideas in the common desire to explain the world and act in it; they are areas of memory but differ in the ways of specializing. Science is the mental-cultural sector supported by the constant osmosis of the mind with reality, animated by curiosity using observation and verification; Technology by ingenuity combined with manual skill: the hand produces what the mind invents, instead Economy grows on the body needs. Philosophy is specialization of thought in itself, the pleasure of logical passages and abstractions towards pure forms, as

rhetoric is the art and pleasure of arguing, of developing language in elegant logical- formal perfection, to the point of convincing listeners to lie by flowing on logical but unreal threads. Religion harmonizes our soul to totality of the world with faith, hope, love against fear, death and loneliness: it is the specialization of thought that from the absolute draws' certainties on the precariousness of life.

	>	>	>	>	
object		idea	value added	feeling	word
COSMOS		THOUGHT \Fantasy	CONCEPTION	EXISTENCE	CULTUR
NEXT	Sensorial	Practice \Talent	Materiality	Physicality	SCIENCE
REMOTE	Memory	Theory \Creativity	Spirituality	Ideality	RELIGIO

Figure 2. Antipodes to which the human mind turns.

Finally, the various forms of thought-culture are grouped into two general modes of mental physiology, indicated in [Figure 2](#): the proximate cosmos enters with the sensorium to give us the practice on which thought acts with ingenuity, values with *materiality*, feelings with physicality; in the remote memory the theory develops which is remodeled by creativity, favors the values of *spirituality* and feelings of ideality. It is the perfect, reassuring world, made of mythical things and characters that we carry within us and is our lasting ideal reference. Placing Ego in one or the other mode colors its existence towards physicality and realism, in the sensorimotor functions of art and sport, science, technology and economics, up to full materiality; or in the ideals of philosophy and religion, up to the most abstract spirituality.

But be careful: the brain always works in a unitary way using all its notions and faculties, however the prevalence of a certain area and its function, according to personality inclinations, leads the global functioning to be directed and specialized on it. For this purpose, the practice of training is useful, necessary to improve one's favorite activity in the Mind, Psyche, Physique. Furthermore, each mind relates to other minds by merging thoughts into culture. It follows that personal research is combined with collective research: if the individual artist or inventor or mystic or other in his creativity and reflection is committed to producing ideas and artifacts that satiate his spirit and his research, so these fruits pass to others so that they enjoy similar harmonies, recognizing his talent.

1.3. The New Animal

Animals sometimes exhibit typically human qualities.

Use of tools: the Galapagos finch uses cactus spines to stick insect larvae into the cracks in the trunk which it then extracts to eat them, the Egyptian vulture throws stones at ostrich eggs with its beak to break them, monkeys use stones and sticks, hominids chipped pebbles to make sharp blades. Extensive

interventions include the barriers made by beavers to catch fish or the nests woven by birds, and the burrows of mammals. However, these are occasional, rigid and limited events, while the transformative action of *sapiens* does not remain at a local level but is so broad and innovative that it changes the face of the planet. Like a nest, a burrow or an anthill, the village of primitive people is still a small portion of the world adapted to needs, inserted and lost in the wild realm of nature's cycles, while the agrarian revolution had a great impact: by cutting down forests and draining swamps to make fields, the anthroposphere began to explode, reducing the biosphere.

Mental maps: it has already been said that various mammals remember and orient themselves in known territories thanks to the cerebral memory areas [1, 7, 19]. It is a phenomenon completely identical, albeit limited to our knowledge.

Culture, a set of notions that circulate in a group, is known in mammals that live in societies Chance and Jolly, [6] and to communicate they use mimicry, but language also appears, the dependence of offspring on their parents increases because it takes longer to learn. With culture the knowledge of individuals becomes the heritage of the group and passes to posterity outside of genetic transmission, which however provides the anatomical bases; individual intelligences unite in collective intelligence, the memory of each becomes the memory of all and the discoveries and inventions of individuals are not lost with their death. Fire did not go out with its discoverer, making the bow has been handed down through the centuries and we know the Pythagorean theorem and Kepler's laws. However, culture in animals, in addition to being modest in the number of notions and words used, is above all static or more precisely it grows only with learning, while human culture is highly dynamic.

Mental Faculties, I take them back into consideration.

From the brain features of fossils we can deduce that *Homo sapiens* was already at the highest level of the evolution of intelligence, at level 5 or operational, whose new faculties allow us to understand history.

That genius of Charles Darwin [8, 9] had understood that the rich history of life, with its admirable variety of forms, derives from two complementary factors: genetic variability and environmental selection. In *Cosmic Thinking* [4] I argue that man has acquired a similar mechanism at the cerebral level but much more malleable, thanks to the imagination that ideas can vary infinitely and to the rationality that gives them coherence and selects them: thought chooses or discards the structures of ideas before the harsh selection of reality does so. All human things are born from creativity: the wheel, sheep farming, metallurgy, the internal combustion engine, the ship, the airplane, the computer and every other artifice, up to conceiving the big bang, the interior of the earth, the atomic model.

There are similarities and differences between the two mechanisms.

Variability refers to *genes* that vary infinitely while *selec-*

tion chooses, sends them forward or makes them disappear, so that useful genes spread throughout the *species* making it evolve overall. This is biological evolution. *Imagination* concerns *ideas* that it undertakes to vary freely to infinity, while *rationality* chooses, sends them forward or discards so that useful ideas spread in the *culture* which is dynamic and transforms, becomes cultural evolution, it is history.

Difference is that the first is rigorous and even ruthless in imposing coherence between structures and environment: innovation is rewarded if it is advantageous, it can be neutral, it will be eliminated if it is disadvantageous. Its results are long-lasting; genes are much more stable than ideas and last millions of years. The second is a virtual, theoretical mechanism, and requires verification in facts; it has left in history the memory of many useless constructions of the mind and gives space to inexhaustible chatter in unlimited magniloquence: too many people live on useless myths, fantasies, and it takes generations for historical hardness to show their falsity. Virtual, therefore fickle and ephemeral, *verbo volant*, hence the importance of the tools created to stabilize and pass on to the centuries, first writing, today computers, internet, films, magnetic media.

However, all mental faculties are present in large quantities and collaborate with each other, but it is fantasy that gives rise to dynamic *culture*.

Mental-Cultural Specialties, revisited.

Mind always uses knowledge, thought, rationality, fantasy, but in different ways, adapting them to different environments, different languages and different psycho-mental-social-cultural activities, it has been seen in its specialization according to distinct brain areas. Visibly in the various socioculture and in history, their complex, there is expansion and deepening in each of these specializations by various Subjects who create and spread to Others. From which figures, culture, places, traditions, history and museums of art, music, science, technology, religion and more are born. But let's go to the large historical sectors.

It is always said: primitive man was a hunter and gatherer.

But of course, he could go fishing, and by repeating and specializing, creating the necessary equipment, he could give rise to the fishing activity: fisherman, boat, oars, nets, hooks, fish. He chipped stone to make blades, so he was a craftsman, his dog accompanied him, and considering other animals, he could be a breeder, he saw a seed germinate and understand the reproductive cycle, he can repeat it and be a farmer. Each of the things produced, game, mushrooms, fish, blades, meat, fruit, he can exchange with another human: he can be a merchant.

From the brain's remarkable gift to direct its psycho-mental activity towards one or another brain area until it specializes in one activity. From the individual, who can do them all, the gift passes to the clan and tribe, and perhaps in the primitive village there were already people more inclined to be artisans, artists, shamans; to pass to civilization up to the finish line of the modern mega-economy. Therefore, the activities well

known in history were already present in the primitive but potentially. It was a matter of expanding them, multiplying them, involving a growing number of humans, putting knowledge, rationality, imagination into them, so many civilizations are born with the great variety of forms: buildings, tools, clothes, weapons, beliefs, rites, varieties of languages and writings, and ships, farmed animals, expanses of wheat, corn, rice, vines, coffee, sunflowers. And many other fruits, witnesses to the powerful creativity of sapiens.

Thus, in the human species, innovative events are not sporadic and occasional but continuous, indeed sought: we are in a new structure of relationship, and it contrasts us with the entire animal kingdom. Primates gave us the prehensile limb or hand that implements ideas, frontal vision, color perception and a fair variety of sounds, memory and mental maps, sociability, culture and cooperation. To these, however, are added the new qualities to give united a formidable cocktail. Widely intellectual because the great power of man before the ability to change the world lies in the gift of understanding it.

It is the fascination of the species that comes from three and a half billion years ago and from the dark unknown rises to search the most remote folds, to look at the richness of the signs on the cosmic scene, yearning for control of the Earth and spiritual control of Being. And it can do so thanks to the decisive gift. Creativity, ingenuity or genius, which unites the maximum variability of fantasy with the selection operated by logic: the collaboration between the two new faculties is an inexhaustible source of the billions of artifices with which civilization is built.

Theory of History [5, 3] has this premise: *Homo sapiens* had the potential, among them is the creativity that allows history.

2. Human Psyche and Social Feelings

2.1. Roots

For a long time, it seemed to me a tale for intellectuals the curious attempt by Sigmund Freud in *Totem and Taboo* [14] (p. 201 et seq.) to place the psychosocial origin of humanity in the events of the *primitive Darwinian horde*. Humanity was born from a horde in which... *there is only one powerful, violent and jealous father, who keeps all the females for himself and drives away the sons* who, however, rebel, kill and eat the father and then mate with their sisters; but they soon repent of the parricide and the expiation of their remorse leads them to establish the totem and the taboos, especially that of incest. The event was supposed to explain the origin of the Oedipus complex, the sense of guilt, the fear of incest, the hatred towards the father but also the desire to identify oneself. A hypothesis born and remained a pure tale to which no one has ever given sufficient credence. But, beyond the rudimentary formulation, the ancestral horde hypothesis contains a substantially correct logical thread: since the Oedipus complex, with the various phenomena attached, is universal, pre-

sent in all people and populations overcoming cultural diversity, it must be a deep, genetic inheritance, and its origin must coincide with ancestral events of humanity. The historical episode of the killing of the tyrant and polygamous father is a novella, a false and unprovable myth. A hypothesis, moreover, certainly not Darwinian but Lamarckian in that it considers the event, although intensely emotional, capable of fixing itself and being transmitted as a hereditary characteristic. We can safely exclude the myth but not the significant brilliant intuition of having to resort to proto-human ancestral events and to inheritance to explain universal facts.

As with all living things, ours is a long history of three and a half billion years, step by step minutely encoded in DNA; along the entire line our body has been forging itself, and at all levels, from anatomy to biochemistry, it tells us that we are heirs to an incessant creative process. If the long progress of the nervous system derives penetrating intelligence, we have just seen that social evolution was already rich when *Homo sapiens* appeared.

Almost all Fish, Amphibians and Reptiles live solitary: without stable relationships they only give temporary meetings as in fighting, courting or at the same food source; however, the bond with the territory or occupied area is frequent. The first social bond in Mammals is the conspicuous closeness between mother and offspring, associated with the affectionate expressions of protecting, nourishing, teaching, playing; the only one present in solitary animals remains the most solid even in subsequent broad associations [2]. Our ancestors acquired such affective psycho-ethological drives that from solitary species they passed to male-female couples with offspring: even among us the couple bond is born with falling in love, characterized by overwhelming infatuation and expressed in courtship, but is made lasting by the feeling of love. Thus, along the stages of the Primates, human phylogeny went from solitary prosimians to stable couples like the gibbon today, to polygamous unions like in the gorilla, to groups of several adult males and females, young and infants, like in baboons, macaques and chimpanzees; and it is plausible that australopithecines and hominids lived in similar promiscuous groups. In their social history, Primates present and human phylogeny has gone through polygamous stages and hierarchical groups that may well represent the *primitive horde*, stages that have been overcome but have also remained traced in our DNA.

But the problem is more complex and requires a leap in quality.

2.2. Ideas and Motivations

Eibl-Eibesfeldt [10] certain “behavioral modules have a communication function (are) trigger signals.... evolved as a function of the coordination of social behavior”

Behavior is expressed as a force or as a signal towards the other. It is a modifying force is evident when it is directed at inert bodies such as building a den or in the predator to kill the

prey and of this to contrast it: if attacking serves to control the other and the resources, fleeing serves to escape from a dangerous and adverse situation. In the action the subject modifies himself, his appearance and spatiality by advancing or retreating, but also modifies the object on which he acts in its appearance or position, up to its interior with wounds and tears. Signal is an external modification of the body with which a psychological pressure is exerted on the other to induce him to the purpose of the signal itself; many motor expressions are in fact signals to communicate and coordinate conspecifics with each other. If between two rivals the threats are the clear exchange of messages to impose predominance on the other, the fight is an exchange of pressure and agility, of actions in the role of forces and no longer of messages alone: the threats are for psychological supremacy, the fight for physical supremacy. Precisely to act on things, behaviors have been structured as vectors, assuming the qualities of physical forces, as I have said on other occasions.

So: (1) individuals are programmed to receive signals and express actions, (2) from whose exchange between two or more of them a certain relationship arises, (3) the totality of all communications and interactions creates an intraspecific structure. Therefore, individuals are inserted in a field of messages, each one acts following the signals, and in a field of forces, because it exerts pressures and undergoes them. Fields that in their forms are typical for each species in order to differentiate it from the others. But there is also a field of energy or resources that flows from the environment into the species and is regulated by the field of forces with which the totality of resources is distributed among individuals. That is, the specific population is structure in which the messages field circulates and regulates the force field between members to which the distribution of energies fallow.

Ethology is revealed in forms, often used as signals, and forces to modify situations to one's advantage. Duality is inherent in the universe where all bodies have form, structure, and are subject to forces or pushes that move and shape them, think of gravity, buoyancy and other forces. These are evident, visible facts, and moving inside the subject, in his nervous system, we find the parallel *software duality*, of essential importance. We know the motivations because we feel them from within: rough like hunger, thirst, libido, fear, anger, or elaborate like courage, dignity, ambition, trust, esteem. Ideas are known because we think and communicate: we spend a large part of our social time talking to exchange ideas and opinions. We must convince ourselves that we are animals and that they too, the other animals, albeit in smaller and simpler quantities, have them: the simple distinction of the nervous *software* into ideas and motivation is certainly not exclusive to man, and leads back to the universal duality of forms and forces.

Motivations: *instinct* for Wheeler and Etkin [12], *emotional drive* for Mc Bride and Jolly, *motivational state* for Leuthold, *emotion* for Harlow [15]. Ideas: innate and learned *gestalts* according to Eibl-Eibesfeldt [10], *patterns* for Mc Bride,

specific instinctive action for Heinroth and Lorenz [17]. We know that the animal becomes familiar with a safe area and knows its contours [13], the existence of *mental maps* and orientation with memory in various mammals such as the baboon Altman and Altman, [1] and the wolf: “Wolves have cognitive maps, well-organized memories for the locations and resources and spatial relationships among them” [19]. I myself, while walking through woods and mountains, observed how my dog, from the second time we took a certain route, remembered the deviations, the springs and other typical points: where necessary, he was able to choose without my instructions. I have reported that in many species of mammals the members know each other.

If certain relationships orient with anonymous category signals, as in distinguishing adult males, adult females, puppies, food, shelter, which may well be innate, others reveal the identification of one object from another, with the emission of signals and actions that show that they remember and distinguish the specific source of stimuli. In all cases, the subject, in order to recognize and orient himself, must have an idea of the object: innate or archetype in the first case, learned or neotype in the second. The scholar must acquire the existence of ideas as internal forms in the nervous system corresponding, by translation made by the sensorium, to external forms: sensory forms in the NS well explain the key stimuli, as motor forms or *fixed action schemes* express the actions.

And there must be a specific neural pathway between a certain key stimulus and the specific response.

For Lorenz [17] (p. 155) “... two fundamentally different physiological mechanisms are part of that functional unit of behavior that Oskar Heinroth called 'specific instinctive action'. First, the innate triggering mechanism, which allows the animal to recognize a biologically relevant environmental situation; second, the hereditary and phylogenetically programmed coordinated movement which, set in motion by the innate triggering mechanism, masters this situation”. Specific instinctive action is to be considered a normally inactive but always present sensorimotor nervous pathway: the appearance of the external sensory form (key stimulus) is specifically recognized, like a key opens a lock [12], by the coherent idea that triggers an emotional state activating the internal motor idea that the musculature translates into a specific action. That is:

Key stimulus > coherent idea > emotion > instinct and action

For example:

Obstacle > idea of obstacle > anger > aggression and attack
 Danger > idea of danger > fear > instinct to flee and escape
 Female > female idea > libido > courtship and copulation

Anger makes you appear big, stand up straight, broaden your shoulders and puff out your chest (if you come across someone angry, notice how funny he looks like a gorilla), become dark and threatening; if the signals are not enough, the attack follows, which has the typical purpose of knocking down the obstacle. On the other hand, fear makes you appear

small, lower your gaze in a condescending way, bow your head, your back down to your entire body, prostrates yourself; flight distances you from danger. Libido or sexual desire seeks copulation with that mixture of emissions and collection of signals that intertwine, courtship, intended for understanding between the sexes. These are obvious and well-known facts but too simple, inadequate to explain the sociality that comes from a psychic level superior to that of emotions and instincts.

2.3. Protection and Trust

Regarding duration in time, two types of interactions have been seen, and they must be supported by two coherent types of motivation. Reports are momentary relationships aroused by impulses, perhaps of intense emotion but temporary, brief in appearing and disappearing, they are hunger, desire, anger, fear, libido. Bonds are instead lasting relationships that by articulating themselves give the global organization of the species, they are evidently due to lasting motivations that I find adequate to be feelings. In both, sensory-motor nervous pathways are predictable whose internal form or *sensory idea* recognizes the object and orients towards it, however in reports this happens for a limited time while in bonds it is lasting. Since the subject tends to stay permanently close to the object, what pushes him cannot be a momentary impulse but a feeling, continuous in presenting itself and pushing towards the object; interrupted only occasionally by other impulses such as hunger or fear, needs that are pressing at the moment but once satisfied, this tendency returns to dominate the subject's spatiality.

Common quality in all bonds is protection: the territory offers it to the occupant, the mother to child, the social individual to the other; another aspect is that the territory and mother also provide food. Furthermore, when the subject is near the object he shows less anxiety and agitation, a lower emotional state; the tranquility induced by proximity leads me to believe that this motivation is security: once the appropriate signals are perceived, it is security that the territory offers to occupant and the mother to child. From his interesting experiments carried out on the mother-child relationship in the rhesus monkey *Macaca mulatta*, Harlow derives the three *fundamental duties* of the mother: 1) intimate physical contact, 2) satisfying biological needs and 3) protection from dangers, this provides the puppy with *personal and social security* [15]. And he refers to the psychoanalyst Erikson [11] who first proposed trust as a basic personality trait fixed in the newborn by maternal care. The ethologist Eibl-Eibesfeldt refers to Erikson in defining trust *as an absolutely fundamental attitude towards oneself and the world and a pillar of an integrated personality* [10]. This convergence of three authors with different backgrounds and orientations is of great value because it demonstrates the substantial unity of what we are dealing with.

Thus, security is acquired as a psychic push that durably induces a spatial relationship of closeness or distance; trust is

the positive aspect of closeness up to physical contact and is associated with protection, tranquility, calm. In evolution by increase of bonds each socio-structure derives from a certain number of articulated bonds and the passage from one to the other follows from the variation of the bonds directed in the age-sex classes. Each bond can be traced back to the associative mechanism described: territory or the conspecific is recognized as a signal by the coherent sensory idea to which

trust is associated, so that its memory and appearance pushes the subject to stay close to him. The signaler belongs to one of the age-sex classes, so it is easy to deduce that it is precisely the multiplication of this mechanism, however, aimed at the other classes, that produces an increase in bonds and the social evolution. Trust as need, search, utility, it is always the same push but following new signals that arouse and direct it originates new bonds. See Figure 3.



Figure 3. Motivations were initially just pulsion, then overcome by feelings. Among these, trust allows the bond between individuals of the species, allowing ever larger societies with more individuals.

Property. In its archaic formation our genetic makeup belonged to territorial solitary vertebrates, so it is not surprising that there are psychic drives that bind to areas or zones that are acquired, controlled and defended. This drive is security, but being tied to territory it becomes ownership, possessiveness, jealousy, in fact we feel that certain goods, properties and money belong to us and are ours, driven to this by feelings of possession and jealousy or by the security that having them arouses. This feeling, which is a lasting directed motivation, if it is not directed towards any specifics, makes one lonely.

With mammals from the mother-offspring bond appears

then the monogamous one: with them the affection, care and love that we give to our children and spouse was selected; it continues in polygamy and in hierarchical or dominance/submission groups, stages of the *primitive horde*. The bond between mother and child, which is also observed in birds, is due to the fact that the figure of the other arouses trust in one, and this is reciprocal: the trust initially directed towards the territory is passed to the mother and cub and then to the partner in monogamy-family; later, it is established between adult females giving the group of females and polygamy. Acquiring each time a new direction of the bonds unites

new individuals in ever larger social units, until the trust between males has created social groups of more adult males and females with offspring.

Rank, power relations and formation of hierarchies are common in groups: females stay close to the dominant male, males of lower rank a little further away, young and non-rank remain peripheral to the group. Much of movements into group are the result of reciprocal attention, largely polarized to dominant male: it is the leader, the guide in movements but also to external dangers. Chance and Jolly [7] distinguish two opposite cases. Acentric societies those of the small groups, formed by a modest number of elements, with a few males that are robust, that in front of the leopard or other predator disperse and each one flees towards the nearest refuge, bush, tree. Centripetal societies like those of baboons, macaques, chimpanzees, which in front of the predator or danger run towards the group which thus compacted, in particular around the dominant male: group and pack leader are the center of security with respect to natural shelters; their presence compacts the members who then unite and hurl themselves at the enemy by throwing stones and brandishing sticks. This psycho-ethology of tightening around the leader and then unitedly attacking the enemy is common among humans, extremely recurrent in history because it is part of the crowd psychology. It is a legacy of the *primitive ancestral horde*: Freud was right.

So, the basic Psycho-Social structure fixed in man, that is, those foundations that are always in humanity and condition it, define its limits and, as we will see, direct the entire process of History, have roots in our past as Primates. Well before differentiating into species, for millions of years our ancestors lived, and our DNA stayed in each of the progressive psycho-social stages detected. And we carry many of their feelings and archetypes fixed in us.

I use a minimal psychonervous model with which I explain the different sociostructures and their progression in mammals. It requires trust, or security, as a lasting attractive drive, already present in solitary vertebrates but directed towards the territory, while in mammals it is directed between female and offspring. If trust is not connected to the signal form of a conspecific, subject consequently lives alone; if on the contrary it is connected to a mental form-idea corresponding to a conspecific, this gives trust and subject establishes the bond, if it has two, it creates two different bonds, with three distinct forms it addresses three conspecifics, and so on. An increase in forms, or individuals in the age and sex classes that instill security and are reliable, increases the bonds in species. Increased in sociality can be seen as an increase in the trust of individuals in their conspecifics.

This model places and relates the forms and forces between outside and inside the brain, animal and human: with it ethology and sociobiology take a big step forward and finally connect to psychology.

Multifamily community is the intraspecific structure with which hominids pass through prehistory: into tribes Homo

sapiens arrive at the dawn of history, the tribe faces civilization. This is the result of certain bonds. An adult male, man, bonds with one or two adult females, women, and this is motivated by the well-known feeling of love whose core is trust; this conjugal love, which includes sexual activity, is accompanied by parental love established with children always based on security that is offered and received. Adults are then linked by ties of kinship and friendship for which families agree to give life to the clan and the tribe, precisely because of the trust between them. It was the late appearance of bonds between several male-female couples, families, of about the same age, bonds that last over time and are human friendship, that transformed previously highly conflictual social groups, between macaques and baboons. Groups with a marked hierarchy because the dominant male wanted to mate with all the adult females excluding the other males, in more egalitarian and more peaceful groups. Thus, the phase of domination of the strongest and of the continuous antagonism and tension between the members was overcome with multi-family groups characterized by strong friendship and greater tranquility, reaching a high level of cohesion. Thanks to the union of the minds and forces, to the common culture and solidarity, the tribe successfully faced the open spaces of the savannah, the predators, the impervious mountains and the infinite sea. Intrepidity pushed humans to the most remote corners of the planet, where the changeability of climates and conditions and the perennial danger of the unknown did not frighten their brotherhood.

2.4. “Face to Face” Groups

It all happened in small groups with one basic quality.

Sociologists and socio-anthropologists recognize the primary group, in all types of society, as the “face-to-face” group, in which all individuals meet each other in the course of daily activities. This type of group is similar in kind to those we have examined in subhuman primates [7].

Regardless of the particular form, be it the mother-children unit or monogamous or polygamous family, a clan or tribe, the small group is still a set in which all members interact frequently. The fact that is small and long-lasting allows members to meet during daily activities and have such frequent intercourse that they can get to know each other personally and establish feelings of togetherness. The *face-to-face* dowry of the small stable ensemble makes it possible to familiarize oneself, to socialize well beyond superficial formal relations, and to collaborate better in the common tasks of economy, collective organization, and defense against dangers. Precisely in order to foster and grow the state of internal harmony or concord, coherent sentiments arose such as sympathy, mutual esteem and trust, sociality, confidence and friendship, gratitude, solidarity. Different drives but all adequate to reduce antagonism and promote aggregation [16].

Primates Evolution therefore occurred in *face-to-face* groups. With very slow genetic transformations they rose

from solitary prosimians to the social groups of macaques, baboons and chimpanzees, then to australopithecines and hominids. To arrive at the tribes of sapiens as multi-family groups but whose members often gather in subgroups of age/sex, unions of women dedicated to gathering plants or other activities, of men for hunting, of elders committed to transmitting culture and wisdom, and children who play to learn. Human social prehistory is characterized by an imperceptible transfer, prolonged without disturbances from ancestral monkeys similar to the chimpanzee to the most recent primitive peoples, of the continuity in limited units of several adult males and females, subadults and young up to the inept offspring. Human diversification progress occurred in changes to the body and in a few basic technical innovations: from the stone or stick in the monkey's fist to the two-faced chipped pebble used by the first hominids, to the stone transformed into an amygdala and handled like a spear to pierce horses and mammoths, with the help of the powerful ally fire. What better way to transform the quadruped into biped, the frugivore into a hunter? No longer climb but walking and running, chasing prey, surrounding them in groups, scaring them with fire and piercing them with unnatural weapons, artificial fruits of the ingenuity. Bipeds to run but also two-handed, two ancient and very handy limbs born for climbing but now used as powerful tools to manipulate the world. Neanderthal groups could easily bring down the mighty mammoth, and sapiens herds of horses or bison. Up to the Redskin.

Tribe is the community primeval. A durable union of several families where people meet daily or almost daily and know each other well; a *face-to-face society* or known community, i.e. not anonymous, such as the family, clan or *gens*, friends, work team and similar groups. The last stage in which the genome was formed precisely in the human part, in those feelings or virtues that we feel are optimal: each small group favors the feelings suited to the highly familiar, friendly, fraternal context, which makes it cohesive. Society of equals committed to forging strong and sociable personalities so that low internal competition favored cohesion towards outside. Tribe went through the radical changes of the agrarian revolution unscathed, preserving itself in the groups of peasants - and shepherds, while it will be overcome and cancelled by the subsequent urban revolution. However, under the massification of historical societies, the tendency of small stable groups to reconstitute *face-to-face societies* remains constant, in peasant villages, of seafarers or mountain people, in small towns but also in the districts and neighborhoods of cities. Internally, relationships tend to remain horizontal and egalitarian. With a simple explanation.

Let's say I want to do something, for example a trip. If I'm alone I decide one hundred percent, that is, I do what I want in total freedom. If there are two, friends or spouses, in a climate of equality I can choose and decide fifty percent; if there are three of us my participation in the decisions will be a third, if there are four my weight is reduced to a quarter. Not only that,

but we have to talk and come to an agreement: if I'm alone I don't talk to anyone and I don't waste time explaining and listening; if there are two of us it takes a bit of time to understand each other. Even just the time needed to talk and listen, and evaluate, the more the number of members of the group grows the more time, and patience, is needed. And if there are ten of us? I, for my ideas and my will, am worth one tenth but even the time to converse is ten times that needed by just two people. And twenty, thirty, fifty, which is approximately the number of participants on a bus trip, how much does each one count and how much time does it take for fifty people to come to an agreement? So, if small groups of five or maybe ten people can equally dialogue and reach an agreement, the large group does not remain equal but delegate, entrust to one: the leader. Furthermore, as the number grows, the leader needs faithful sub-leaders who locally direct the mass, who require sub-sub-leaders and so on. Thus, history begins.



Figure 4. A famous Native American.

2.5. The Man of the Tribe

And there is a decisive reason, anchored in deep of our soul, why the life of prairies Indians fascinates us, and their tragic epilogue offends us. It offends us, modern people of the most powerful historical culture, who could crush, and even forget, their memory like we crushed their society.

The matter crux is that the Red Indians themselves, established in our minds conveyed by so many books and films, behind the imaginative folklore, the headdresses of eagle feathers, the arrows and axe, villages of conical *tepee* and buffalo hunt, the pride of the looks, the nobility of thought, the fight for freedom. Behind the proud and colorful folklore, they show us the life of small groups where everyone is himself but with others, accepted in his originality and appreciated for the qualities and virtues useful to himself and the group, in brotherhood and community of ideals. A culture aimed at cultivating and elevating the best feelings that the subject can address to himself and the group: individuality and sociability, industriousness and cooperation, fortitude and solidarity, production of goods and generosity.

Among the Sioux Dakotas:

So sometimes the dances and ceremonies still proclaim the existence of the strong-hearted man who has learned to use the means of his cultural heritage to extend his hunting powers beyond the limits of his body.... With bow, arrow, and axe he has enlarged the reach and strength of his arm; pipe smoke has won for him the sympathy of men; the sound of the love flute that of women; magic incantations have given him every form of success by means of a force greater than that of mere breath, mere speech, or mere desire. But the great spirit, he has learned, can be approached only through the restless concentration of the naked and defenseless man who retires into solitude to fast and pray. [11].

Qualities widespread: the feelings that primitive people favor appear very homogeneous beyond the different geographical and economic conditions. Thus... *cooperation in its various forms is a universal phenomenon of African culture... in traditional societies education aims at the harmonious integration of the individual into the social group* [18].

The man of the third millennium, with all his science and well-being, today microbe of the mega-economy and the megalopolis, can also envy the condition of the small community: limited in members, not anonymous but confidential, collaborative and with direct democracy. In which to grow in the best personal and social feelings that are part of human genetic nature. Because for millions of years humanity lived and was forged, in Psyche, by individuals who were members of small groups with high sociality, of the *face-to-face* type. Strong and cohesive groups, victorious in the long competition between groups that selection favored precisely by rewarding their members as bearers of high personal and social virtues.

And we, thinking about it, keep in mind: beyond the physical transformations highlighted by fossils, behind the artefacts that tell of progressive intelligence, what has been genetically shaped over the millions of years of omination is, in sphere of feelings, the man of the tribe.

3. Conclusion of This Article

Is that history, a vast and overwhelming socio-cultural adventure, is a consequence and continuation of our roots.

In mammals, a notable progress of the MIND has taken place, so that many species have qualities of knowledge, language, culture, some even of rationality and self-awareness (see dolphin and chimpanzee). Already equipped with all these, Homo sapiens has acquired creativity, or imagination, the engine of that revolution that is history, from the agricultural revolution onwards.

Always with mammals, territorialism (property), rank (hierarchy), sociality or sense of belonging (society) have been acquired. Feelings that are now part of the human PSYCHE that expresses them widely to coloring the different civilizations.

Therefore, our roots sink into mammals and explain history.

Author Contributions

Roberto Bani is the sole author. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Personal Ethics Statement

I declare that this manuscript of mine, that my proposals and my commitment comply with the common ethical standards of scholars and men.

Ethical Declaration

That no human beings and/or animals are involved in the research, they are not objects of my study just as there are no collaborators, reviewers, committees of any kind. Therefore, I have no ethics committees, internal review boards, or guidelines followed to report.

Declaration of Consent

I have carefully read the Instructions for Authors; I am informed and declare my full consent to participate in and publish the manuscript.

Funding

The article, the author, does not receive any funding, there is no institution or private body that contributes to the publication. If necessary, I will pay for it myself.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Altmann, S. A., and J. Altamann 1970. "Baboon ecology: African field research" S. Karger, Basel.
- [2] Bani, Roberto - "Evolution by increase of bonds / An interpretative model of sociality in mammals". Proceedings of the Tuscan Society of Natural Sciences - Pisa, April 1987.
- [3] Bani, Roberto – 2025a – " Psyche and Society" Edistella edition.
- [4] Bani, Roberto – 2025b – " Cosmic Thinking" Edistella edition.
- [5] Bani, Roberto – 2025c – "Theory of History and Discomfort of Civilization" article in Science PG - Social Sciences <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ss.20251402.20>
- [6] Bani, Roberto - 2024 – "Historical Framework of Civilizations" article in SN Social Sciences <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-024-00999-2>

- [7] Chance, MRA, and CJ Jolly - 1970 "Social groups of monkeys, apes and men" *It. trans.*, 1972, "La vita sociale delle scimmie: gruppi sociali di scimmie, antropoidi e uomini" Garzanti Editore, Milan.
- [8] Darwin, Charles - 1859 "The Origin of Species" *Italian translation*, 1864 "L'origine delle specie" Nicola Zanichelli, Bologna - anastatic reprint by Fabbri Editor, Milan.
- [9] Darwin, Charles - 1871 "The descendant of man, and selection in relation to sex" *Trans. it.*, 1972, "L'origine dell'uomo e la selezione sessuale". Newton Compton editors, Rome.
- [10] Eibl-Eibesfeldt, Irenaus - 1967 Grundriss der vergleichenden Verhaltensforschung Ethologie. *It. trans.*, 1976, "The foundations of ethology". Adelphi editions, Milan.
- [11] Erikson, Erik H. - "Childhood and Society" *Italian translation* 1966 "Infanzia e società" A. Armando Editore, Rome.
- [12] Etkin, W. - 1964 "Types of social organization in birds and mammals" In W. Etkin, editor, "Social behavior and organization among vertebrates". University of Chicago press, Chicago: 256-298.
- [13] Ewer, R. F. - 1973 "The carnivores" Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.
- [14] Freud, Sigmund - 1913 "Totem und taboo" *trad. it* 1973 "Totem e tabù" Aldo Garzanti Publisher, Milan.
- [15] Harlow, Harry F. McGaugh, James L. Thompson, Richard F. "Psychology" *trad. it* 1973 "La psicologia come scienza del comportamento". Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, Milan.
- [16] Hassrick, Royal B. - 1964 "The Sioux. Life and Customs of a Warrior Society" *Italian translation* 1983 "I Sioux. Vita e costumi di un popolo guerriero" U. Mursia Editore, Milan.
- [17] Lorenz, Konrad "Ethology" *Italian translation* 1980, Boringhieri, Turin.
- [18] Pirzio Biroli, Detalmo - 1978 "Black Africa" Laterza Editori, Rome.
- [19] Peters, Roger - 1979 "Mental maps in wolf territoriality" in Erich Klinghammer, editor. "The behavior and ecology of wolves". Garland STPM Press, New York.