

# Ethics as Management (of Everyday Thinking, Feeling and Acting). A Transdisciplinary Social Semiotics Perspective

**Liviu DRUGUȘ**

**“George Bacovia” University, Bacau, ROMANIA**

**Keywords:** *management, ethics, transdisciplinary approach, social semiotic perspective, EMMY, education reform, neutrosophic logic, transductive logic.*

**Abstract:** The end/purpose of this article is to stimulate a transdisciplinary, holistic, unifying, synthetic vision on socio-human behavior. The main means/tools used are the transdisciplinary vision itself, the end-means methodology (EMMY) and the semiotic perspective. The work hypothesis of this research implies an act/ attempt of gradually lifting the barriers between disciplines that study human behavior and its determinants. The following results could be reached: a) saving time in the teaching of too many and non-correlated disciplines that study human action (thinking, feeling and acting); b) a more clear understanding of human life for improving the managerial processes of any kind; c) to include in research feelings (not only rational thinking); d) to put an equal between management and ethics – this being redefined as the simultaneous and permanent result of comparing ends (political dimension) with means (economic dimension); e) to stimulate the transdisciplinary and holistic thinking; f) to use semiotic discourse in explaining and fulfilling all the above things.

Anghel N. Rugina (Quinta methodica), Basarab Nicolescu (transdisciplinarity), Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen (holistic vision on (bio)economics and ecology), Amitai Etzioni (ethics and economics), Michel Foucault (the intricate vision on labor, love and life), Charles Sanders Peirce (the semiotic and integrative thinking), Charles Morris, Rudolf Carnap, Umberto Eco and Lorenzo Magnani promoted new visions which constitute solid foundations for the transdisciplinary construction. Behaviorism, pragmatism and the theories of communication have helped a lot in the building and consolidating the end means methodology. Of course, the Kantian morale („human beings should be always only ends and never mere means”) is rejected. EMMY sees human beings as real things and not (only) as idealistic abstractions.

The over 30 years of studying human essence and behavior resulted in founding EMMY as a transdisciplinary new vision to be implemented especially in primary schools and high schools. A radical education reform is needed. The art of thinking, feeling and doing seems to be the very essence of management. Management (decision making) is not only rationality, but emotionality as well. That is why I (re)defined the theory and practice of management as “thinking, feeling and doing”. At the same time, ethics studies the human behavior, i.e. human thinking, feeling and acting. Ethics is not (only) a (possible) set of given and immutable rules for human conduct, but a general theory on human conduct/ behavior. In my opinion, ethics, management, politics-economics-ethics continuum, psychology, logic, semiotics and hermeneutics are either identical or so closely intricate that they could never be understood and taught separately or consequently. As a matter of fact, this vision is a truly transdisciplinary one, approached in a semiotic and hermeneutical manner (there are a lot of signs to be interpreted) just in order to create a holistic and unitary vision on human beings and their moral behavior.

**Introductory and explanatory words**

As a young researcher at the Iasi branch of the Romanian Academy (1971 – 1976) I was attracted more and more by the human dimension of existence. After entering the educational system, in 1976, I was also confronted with the rigid and dogmatic definitions given to (Marxist) Political Economy and to economic policies. There were the medical students at the Institute of Medicine and Pharmacy (nowadays Gr.T.Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy) who addressed me more whys than I addressed myself concerning the utility of the content of economic thinking I taught them. In that period, (1976-1989) I redefined the field of economic thinking as the „place” where there are collected, combined, consumed and produced means (Marxian concept was only „means of production” and this concept addressed only to the material resources). Extending the sphere of the means used by people to attain different ends, I included medicine as a true and important part of the economic activity (the official point of view considered health care and education only as non-productive and consumptive sectors). Year by year, an End-Means Binom appeared as a theory that tried to better explain the human behavior. My doctoral thesis on American economic Radicalism (especially the left radicals) stimulated me to change the Marxian and non-Marxian vocabulary with more essential and true humanistic messages.

In 1990, August, in Paris, at the First ISINI Conference (International Society for Intercommunication of New Ideas) located in Boston, USA, and created by prof Anghel N. Rugina in November 1988) I presented for the first time abroad my proposal for redefining Economics, Politics and Ethics by using End-Means Binom. I concluded that Ethics is nothing else than a true, intimate and profound combination of Economics and Politics. Meeting professor Rugina was another opening to the world of research, and the dialogues (sometimes, in contradictory terms) with him helped me to learn how scientific research is and could be made. Over some years, I have read a cooperative work of him with Florentin Smarandache [Smarandache, 2001], the author of Paradoxism, and the dialogue (by reading his papers or by writing e-mail letters) with him, helped me to see that mathematics is useful and good for transdisciplinary visions. What I am saying in literary terms Smarandache demonstrated mathematically that transdisciplinarity is to find out common features to disjunctive sets, or otherwise said to find out common features to things that have (apparently) nothing in common....

The three fields (studied by Politics, Economics and Ethics) are impossible to be studied separately. As a matter of fact this was the starting point of End-Means Methodology (EMMY) that was used by me in teaching Economics or Management, Ethics or Methodology of Scientific Research. In these days I am using EMMY as General Management, after redefining Management as „everyday thinking, feeling/ sensing, and acting”, i.e. as a scheme for a GOOD human behavior. But human (good) behavior is the very essence of Ethics, so the conclusion that Ethics and Management are essentially identical was inevitable.

Necessary to say that for me was a true support the theological explanations I have found about the Holy Trinity. Very difficult to understand its essence and significance for the human life, Holy Trinity is a real test for being able to understand human being(s). That is why I recommend to those who intend to understand EMMY, Ethics or Management to start first with reading and understanding the Christian Holy Trinity. Our three-dimensional space, our triadic culture (or a culture based on triadicity) oblige us to understand, first of all, the context/ framework/ cradle we are born and living in. And just because God created man after its own blueprint, it is quite normal to study, first of all, this blueprint before studying humans.

Promoting the inter- and trans-disciplinary visions from my initial formation as a researcher, I was happy to meet Basarab Nicolescu, in Iasi, at the First International Conference on Stefan Lupascu. This stimulated me to read transdisciplinarity papers and to know the concrete results of them. From 2005 I am an active member of CIRET (Centre

International de Recherches et Etudes Transdisciplinaires), located in Paris and lead by its founder, prof Basarab Niculescu. For the so called Social Sciences, the transdisciplinary vision is better than the interdisciplinary approaches, the result of this application being my proposal to replace the Social Sciences with a very homogenous, coherent and compact corpus of knowledge on human beings. This is part of a greater project of curricular reform that will simplify and make more understandable the knowledge on issues from politics, economics, ethics, law, sociology, psychology, logics, semiotics, linguistics, anthropology, hermeneutics a.s.o., or, in a word, on Management, i.e., on how people think, feel and act. As I already mentioned, I called all these as EMMY, putting ends and means at the basis of all this theoretical, explanatory and practical construction. A lot of brakes appeared. The most important of them are: the materialistic thinking, the atheistic thinking, the dogmatic thinking, the modern (Cartesian) thinking and the fear to be wrong in supporting new ideas.

It is interesting to observe that the three fundamental disciplines (Politics, Economics and Ethics) I just redefined by using ends and means, could be directly linked with the theological thinking and especially with the Holy Trinity from the Christian religion. This link may be suggested if we try to imagine, in terrestrial terms, the three Persons as symbols/ signs of Information (God Father), Energy (Holy Spirit) and Substance (God Son/ Jesus Christ).<sup>1</sup> It is worth to note that the God Father could be assimilated with Politics (information on human ends established in function of existing means), God Son with Economics (the melting of the means' substance to attain established ends) and Holy Spirit with Ethics (the dynamic/ energetic equilibrium between proposed ends and consumed means).

The triadic definition of Management is not a mere coincidence, but it just respects the triadic structure and significance of the Holy Trinity. So, thinking-feeling-acting triad directly refers to information (God Father) – energy (Holy Spirit) – substance (Jesus Christ). Thinking works with *information*, feelings are just *energizing* and motivating people, and actions are concretely trans-forming *material* things (but not only the material ones). The human triadic behavior (studied and improved by managerial thinking) is congruent and isomorphic with Holy Trinity.

## **1.Theoretical support for EMMY from recognized scientific sources**

Any new approach is only partial new, having a lot of roots in other similar or rather different approaches. In my opinion, a such a large vision on human being behavior (or, the same thing, on management – described within EMMY only by ends and means) has, inevitable, a very great amount of contact points with almost every other theories on individual or/ and social human behavior. Twenty century contributions (especially in its

---

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to observe that Christian religion is named after Jesus Christ – (only) one of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity, fact that explains why many of Orthodox thinking (mostly linked with Jesus Christ) is a materialistic/ substantialistic one. INRI is the most present iconic message of orthodoxy with a very concrete and visual content. Catholic thinking is mostly linked with the Holy Spirit and its essence generated the Industrial Revolution and capitalism system. Holy Spirit is the dynamic, energetic and mechanistic dimension of the capitalist (modern) society. The Weberian vision on Protestantism as the stimulus of capitalistic thinking refers to the already matured social system named capitalism, but in my opinion (early) capitalism should be linked with catholic thinking, while protestant thinking is more linked with postmodernity and postcapitalism (in Druckerian meaning). Another triadic structures and parallels could be generated in order to better understand the history and the world we are living in: „premodernity – modernity – postmodernity” is useful to be compared with „precapitalism – capitalism – postcapitalism” and with „Orthodox – Catholic – Protestant” confessions/ churches. „Substance – Energy – Information” could be usefully superposed over the above triadic structures. So, it easily comes to a conclusion that postmodernity, postcapitalism, protestantism and Information (New) age are very intimate connected. It is not my aim to underline the differences among the structures of the above mentioned triads. On the contrary, I promote an ecumenical vision on the three Christian churches, and on world religions as well.

second part) such as cognition theories, pragmatics (Charles Pierce), (social) semiotics (Charles Morris), hermeneutics, neuronal networks, theories of complexity, chaos theory, choice theory (Gary Becker), emotional intelligence (Daniel Coleman), transdisciplinarity (Basarab Nicolescu), Quinta Methodica (Anghel N. Rugina) business ethics, ethical relativism (Amitai Etzioni), postmodern visions, integrative approach, (integronics), systemic thinking (systemics) and holistic visions, cybernetics, decision theory, abductive logic (Lorenzo Magnani), logic of the third included (Stefan Lupascu), paradoxism (Florentin Smarandache), the consonantist theory (Stefan Odobleja), management theory (Peter Drucker), leadership theory (Ychak Adizes), organization theory, behaviorism, pragmatism, praxeology (Kotarbinsky), political economy (Aristotle, Lionel Robbins), sociological schools (Vilfredo Pareto, Max Weber, Durckheim), constructivism, etc., all of them have a contribution in defining and redefining areas of research (abusively called „sciences”, or „research field”). In such a view, Management is the synergic effect of all the above mentioned disciplines or approaches, as well as of Politics, Economics and Ethics. Of course, psychology, sociology, statistics, demography, anthropology, history, prognosis, logic, neurology and neurophysiology, and many other disciplines concerned with human thinking, feeling and acting are studying the human action as well. Management is a vision that includes all of them and which is transgressing them (beyond, between and across – in nicolescian transdisciplinary sense). Management appears to be the transdisciplinary model of human thinking, feeling/ sensing and acting I called End-Means Methodology (EMMY). But Ethics is the largest vision on human behavior that is offering and analyzing criteria of choosing a way of action/ living etc. That is why I concluded that Ethics is identical with Management, at least in their very essential aspects of human behavior. It is worth to note that more and more, the Management textbooks (especially the American ones with a strong pragmatic tradition) include large chapters on Ethics, Business Ethics or Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). The Enron case created a large scientific movement towards redefining the ethical and business behavior.

## 2. What is EMMY

The metaphorical definitions of the human being are of big use in our (re)definitional work, but only after the rationalistic definitions are given. So, pragmatic, praxeologic and concrete underlying of the human essence(s) is, at the beginning, the desired one. Every human being has (rational and emotional) aims, purposes, targets, ends, finalities or simply interests to be followed. In any second/ minute of our life people have in their minds, consciously or unconsciously, something to be done in the near or far future. This process of describing the possible futures for everyone is named by me the establishing of ENDS, no matter if it is about final or intermediary ones. But, in normal thinking (different from utopian thinking) any END is transformed into an action plan only if there are some present or future MEANS to be used in that respect. So, normally, ENDS and MEANS are inextricable/ interwoven essences of any human being. All our actions may be described in terms of ends and means, or their derivatives. For ex., some derivatives of “means” are: resources, instruments, tools, intermediaries, raw materials, energies, information, knowledge or other (cvasi) synonyms. A longer demonstration may be used to show that the ends and the means are best describing the human essence.

Although the ends and the means are so closely interwoven, the “feudal” (scientific) proud of having autonomous/ independent “domains”/ “fields”, the Economics was separated from Politics (Political Science) as an imitation of Pure (and separated) Sciences that were studying only small pieces of reality. Specialization was the religion of modern times, but transdisciplinarity comes to be the religion of our postmodern times (since 1950). I proposed a new definition of the politics and of the economics, as being the theories on ends and on means, respectively. In 1990, in Paris, at the First ISINI Conference, I (re)defined the ethics as the theory of getting most adequate and

equilibrated way between proposed ends and consumed means. This way of (re)defining them (by ends and means) generated the conclusion that these ones should be studied ONLY together as a continuous and simultaneous space of knowledge.

EMMY is the short for End-Means Methodology - a theoretical construction built in the 80s but developed especially in 90s and after. The first reason of creating EMMY was a quite practical one.

Teaching (Marxian) Political Economy to medical students I was obliged to answer them a lot of “whys and why us?”. I tried to put into evidence the essential characteristics of the “fields of interest” called “economy” and “policy” in the most simple and human words. Not only Marxian but also Samuelsonian or Radical explanations of those words were presented in the classical textbooks in alembicated, long and boring forms.

So, what is, first of all, Politics about? I found out that any (collective) end/ aim is the very field of policies and political sciences. Even the individual ends are often determined/ influenced by the social context. Or, the collective aim or the human social context action is the very reason of creating a “polis” – the Greek word for an organized community (town, state or town-state). Finally, the words “policy”, “political” or “politics” are intimately connected with human ends. What is the real coagulant of those people accepting to live and work together if not their real human interests/ ends? So, any policy is about establishing and fulfilling proposed ends with the existent or possible to create/ attract means. For short, **Politics (as a theory) is about ends in function of means.**

But what is Economics about? It is a theory trying to explain and to improve the necessary means in order to attain certain specific self proposed or accepted ends. So, economy as a reality and Economics as a sum of theories are about means, more exactly about collecting, combining (producing new) means and about consuming them as an intermediary or a final end. For short, **Economics (as a theory) is about means in function of ends.**

And just because Politics is about ends in function of means and Economics is about means in function of ends, it is quite logic, normal and human to know and to study the ends (policies) and means (economies) in their intimate and permanent interconnection. Putting these two fundamental and essential human aspects together it results that Political Economy/ Economics is - in my definition - the study of establishing ends, of collecting, combining and consuming means, and of matching human ends and means.<sup>2</sup> As you observed I discussed generally about human beings and not about capitalists and workers, producers and consumers, suppliers and demanders. This neutral position generated, over decades, an attraction to the third way (ideology) of Gibbons or to the older theories on the convergence of the opposed social systems of W. W. Rostow. Instead of discussing about Political Economy I discussed only about human ends and means. Of course, Nicollo Machiavelli was a very interesting author... Not to mention the American Radical School that had a similar view on ends and means but in a too strong and narrow ideological context.

In the 80s I presented my theory as the “End-Means Binom”, but in August 1990 at the first Congress of ISINI (in Paris), I already spoke about “End-Means Methodology” which was no more a binom but a trinom, the third term being End/Means Ratio. This third term of the general human equation was/ is studied by Ethics as a preoccupation to study the human behavior (thinking, feeling and acting). Although I didn’t know about the Stefan Lupascu theory about “the third included” logic, it was clear that I already applied it. Later I

---

<sup>2</sup> Some textbooks still present “Political Economy” as a Marxian ideology or at least a leftist vision and Economics as a true scientific approach without any political implications. Presenting my EMMY in Scotland in October 2005 a colleague was quite surprised of my vision. His argument was as follows: “My professor of Economics told me not ever mix Politics with Economics”. I suppose that the postmodern times will disseminate largely the mixing up of all fundamental human dimensions and will narrow the space for (former) modern/ classical dogmas.

realized that I combined three disciplines (Politics, Economics and Ethics) in a single, synthetic but unitary approach called EMMY. This approach already had a name: transdisciplinarity.

### What is EMMY's real content and usefulness?

My transdisciplinary approach is a postmodern, holistic and integrative model which is more and more accepted and applied all over the world. So, the general human equation is as follows:  $H = f(E, M, E/M)$  where:

- H is for human beings viewed simultaneously and continuously as individuals (micro level), social groups/ societies (macro level) and humankind (global or mondo level).

- E is for any human ends proposed and accepted by the vector resulted from calculating the "parallelogram of forces" between individuals, societies and humankind in function of the real dimensions of the means they have. E is studied by classical discipline called Politics.

- M is for any means (be them viewed as substance, energy or information) that are created, combined and consumed for attaining the proposed and/or accepted ends of those three levels of human realities (micro, macro, mondo). M is studied by (neo)classical discipline called Economics.

- E/M ratio is for the permanent process of comparing and matching ends with/to means and means to/with ends. The name of this ratio could be "to adequate" (of means to ends and of ends to means) or "ad equation". E/M ratio is studied by the classical discipline called Ethics. Ethics is including and transcending Politics and Economics.

EMMY is a transition from dialectics to trialectics, from modernity to postmodernity, from the study of disciplines to the transdisciplinary approach. Its principal attributes are holism, integrism, triadity, simultaneous and continuous thinking. The logic of EMMY is based on the third included and on the abductive/ transductive logic. By this model, humanistic disciplines could be more and more concentrated in order to offer the student a holistic picture of the human being. Finally, the final result could be a real and complete anthropology.

The complete dimension of all our concepts and realities is a triadic one. In order to use EMMY usefully it is necessary to know some fundamental triads that could explain the human being existence, its knowledge (learning) and behavior. I suggest that the most important part or component of it is the third one. Pay attention to it! The most important triads we need to study, to learn and teach are as follows:

1. Time = Past → Present → Future
2. Space/Context = Micro → Macro → Mondo
3. Cosmic Existence (Composition/Structure of all microcosmic and macrocosmic understanding) = Substance → Energy → Information
4. Levels of human existence = Individual → Social → Global
5. Levels of human action = Establishing ends → Combining means → Harmonizing ends with means and means with ends
6. Theories on (human) action = Politics → Economics → Ethics
7. God as a triadic model of cosmic existence (Holy Trinity) = God the Son (Iesus Christ) → Holy Spirit → God the Father

Of course there are a lot of other possible triads (important for a specific research) but the seven ones are, in my opinion, quite important for any human thinking and acting.

In my mind, EMMY has exactly the same content with the Management theory and practice. I make a plea for this new way of teaching and learning the managerial tools. I start from the point of view of real human life and not from a simple collection of technical tools and methods of "smart" decision making. Of course, some would ask how I do respect the steps of any scientific process in using this triadic and transdisciplinary

approach. My answer is that disciplinary approach is using other methods than transdisciplinary approach. To make it clearer, sometimes the researchers in complementary and alternative medicine are asked to use the classical methods of mainstream medicine. The answer is the same: you cannot be (totally) modern and (totally) postmodern at the same time, or you are not able to be simultaneously dead and alive, even some common things could be found out...

### **The Doxa–Praxis Continuum as an application of EMMY to the improvement of human thinking, feeling and acting performance**

The “theory and practice” expression is an example of dual and binomial approach. This is generating the idea of opposition, of contradiction and of ineluctable differences. More than that, between theory and practice it is suggested to be a barrier, a wall or a frontier not to permit them to mix up. The theory and practice differences were stimulated to maintain their specificity and separateness just by all Cartesian modern sciences, when the logic of the third excluded (the logic of “or-or”) was the dominant and the single accepted one. In the postmodern (new) age, when the logic of the third included (the logic of “and-and”) the differences between theory and practice are less and less visible and the barriers between them almost disappeared. So, a new era of synthesis (after an era of analysis) came at the mid of the last century. After the big current of fission (nuclear one included) it appeared a new big trend: that of fusion (the nuclear one included). The era of cooperation is taking the place of the wild competition, after passing through the era of competition. So, the theory and practice are not still two different fields or domains one was very specialized to work in and not to permit the specialist from the other field to enter. OK, the borders disappeared and there is a lot of communication and cooperation between them. Just because some of us do not accept this postmodern event of disappearing borders I try to underline, put into evidence and even to exaggerate the lack of specificities and differences between theory and practice. Finally, the two former fields of activity are defined exactly as ends and means: I mean one exists for the other and everyone is transforming permanently into the other one. More precisely, the theory has as a reason of its existence the improvement of the practice, of the real and concrete things. On the other hand, the reason of practical activities is to improve our well being, happiness and peace – all of these being objects of our theoretical discourse. More than that, theory is working with information extracted from practice and practice is improved by information offered by different theoretical models. By information we may demonstrate that theory (doxa) and practice (praxis) is a continuum, no one being possible to be canceled out or to be subordinated to the other. The information is the common field of theory and practice, exactly as money is the common field of real and nominal economy.

The Doxa Praxis Continuum [Drugus, 2005] is defined now just in order to:

- improve the human performance (both in its theoretical and practical aspects)
- encourage the curricular development (education reform)
- reduce the false differences and specializations that are creating inefficiency
- create a special feeling of a real global world that needs common vision and unitary approaches for studying it
- offer a good example of giving up old modern separatism and promoting the new postmodern globalism
- stimulate researcher to adapt methods to the new realities that need a more general approach
- eliminate the long list of so called “sciences” (as a matter of fact a lot of simple and exaggerated disciplines: over eight thousands!)
- eliminate the false differences between “exact sciences” and “social sciences”
- to create new educational structures that shall evidence the common features of the so called “sciences” and

- prepare the soil to make a single body of science (this new wave of encyclopedic approach is possible now to generate a common and unique science due to computers)
- prepare the conditions for Christian ecumenism to succeed over the schismatic, non productive and reciprocal weakening
- prepare the conditions for European and global integration on rational and humanistic basis
- prepare conditions for a common approach to science, religion and philosophy for a possible future integration

As a first conclusion I suggest those implied in the European Education Reform to introduce the transdisciplinary research instead of disciplinary one. And, as a final remark, I am ready to teach the new vision to future teachers, to work in curricular development teams in order to build new and more efficient vocational and research curriculum, to associate with other postmodern thinkers in order to write articles and books for promoting the Doxa Praxis Continuum, transdisciplinarity, theory of systems and of complexity a.s.o. be them in their explanative or applied dimension. Just to confirm my economic background: if there would be a real demand for improvement in education we shall supply new tools, products or ideas.

### 3. What is Transdisciplinarity?

The big (Christian) legends and myths of the humankind consider – as a decisive moment in its evolution – the evadamic (Eve and Adam) story of first nourishment of the human being from the (forbidden) Knowledge Apple Tree, more exactly the story of tasting from the informational apple, a gesture that opened the people's appetite for knowing more and more. How much and how to know is – in the already passed modern society – the preoccupation of Gnoseology (theory of common knowledge) and Epistemology (theory of scientific, highly systematized knowledge).

Now, in our new postmodern era (after 1950), the gnoseological and epistemological approaches are going closer and closer one to each other, interfering and interacting each other. The old Modern epistemology – overcome by XXIst century exigencies – based on clear disciplinarity and on a growing narrow specialization recognizes that cannot offer any scientific progress in any of those thin slides of reality emphatically and arrogantly called “sciences”. As a matter of fact, many of them are only scientific disciplines exhausted from information point of view.<sup>3</sup> Those preoccupied by improving the educational system should, first of all, give up the old modernist mentality of

<sup>3</sup> Let's take the example of Economics. After overcoming the pahse of Political Economics, with ist well known limits, the economic theory knew the top of its development (called by Fukuyama as the end of history, ie as the moment of completely and forever victory of the neoclassic liberalism or neoliberalism). The American left radicals, postmoern amd transdisciplinary in their thinking (not only as a Marxist reminiscence, but as a sign of our new information era) proposed a sui-generis merger of Economics and Political Economy. Some of them adopted the new coined term of Political Economics. I do agree this denomination as a very adequated one to our postmodern inter and transdisciplinary era, when the politic and the economic are highly interdetermined and closely interconnected. I do consider that if someone declares him/herself as a transdisciplinarity thinker/researcher (s)he sold give up to use and fully support the (neo)classic Economics or clasical Political Economy. The only good connection between transdisciplinary thinking and a normal vision on the politic and the economic is adopting the Political Economics denomination of the politic-economic continuum. I am using the present plea for transdisciplinarity in order to make (as a matter of fact to reiterate) a proposal to the education officials: to merge the Economics, Political Science and Ethics studies – with a slighty accent put on one of them in order to offer a „specialization” to those graduates. These studies shoilod be interconnected, complementary and equilibrated from the quantitative point of view. In my opinion is quite unacceptable to have graduates of a political science or administrative graduate with zero (or almost zero) knowledge of economics or/and ethics.

a “disciplinary” curriculum and to replace it with a pragmatic, “transdisciplinary” and more adequate to our present postmodern times, and especially to the future ones.<sup>4</sup>

Referring to ways of scientific research people should have to learn more from old works (The Bible included). If we take the Greek culture as a landmark we may say that the holistic, global vision on knowledge was then widespread. Almost paradoxically, the postmodern thinking existed even in those pre-modern times. That is why there is a great need for a clear discussion on terms used (“modern” and “postmodern”).<sup>5</sup> A writer as Aristotle wrote with the highest clarity both on physics, politics, economics, metaphysics, rhetoric or poetics. The Greek culture is “guilty” only for not having more “aristotles”. The nowadays postmodern “normality” asks for more Picco de la Mirrandola, for more Aristotles and more encyclopedic/holistic scholars, skipping the details and concentrating the knowledge especially on essences.

Trans – is the Latin term for beyond, across and between. This term implies three parts/ components: A, B and the way from A to B. Holy Trinity is the most fundamental and well known paradigm to explain the essential structures of The (Divine and Humane) Existence. The three tri(u)nitarian Persons are so much interwoven that no one is possible to be perceived/ felt/ understood without directly implying the other two. The Holy Trinity is a mirror image of the tri-dimensionality of the terrestrial life. The triadicity seems to be the most efficient, fundamental and complete system of analyzing and understanding different levels of reality. The understanding of the human essence is possible by describing the triads that are defining the human body, human action, or human existence. For example: mind-body-soul, love-wisdom-power, substance-energy-information, end-means-end/ means ratio etc. That is why the aim of this paper is to open a new way in linking former autonomous disciplines, not only to inter-connect them, but to trans-pose everyone in our minds by means of other two. Finally, transdisciplinarizing of the so called Social Sciences or socio-human sciences into a common, essential and unitary vision is quite possible starting of the most important ones: politics, economics and ethics. Here the problem of “which is most important” is simply solved by putting them on the same level of reality and not seeking the differences but the common features. For example, one may say that ethics is (only) a philosophical discipline, while economics is a part of science, and the political science (politics) is the art of the possible (things to be done, i.e. ends). Of course, the unification of the three former disciplines from different branches of human knowledge into a common and synthetic one, suggests that the very former branches could be unified

---

<sup>4</sup> Regretfully, there are still some teachers that dictate to students – although the same words are already printed in books. In such a way there is much time consuming and killing the students’ curiosity and interest. Case studies, problematizing, vivid interactive dialogue and the accent put on the practical finality of the received information are still „rara avis” to be able to say there is a real reform in the Romanian education system. A real reform means also to stimulate the new postmodern, transdisciplinary, holistic, triadic, systemic and the third included mentalities. Creativity should be highly stimulated and the partial and final exams should have a teaching role, based to creativity and innovation tests.

<sup>5</sup> „Modern” meant (and still means partially) „presently”, „of high actuality”, „contemporary”. Some centuries ago, the word „modern” meant „very new”, a characteristic of the newly born „capitalism”. Now, after capitalism (word that is a synonym for industrialism, mechanicism, machinism) is changing its essences (industry is replaced by services, mechanization is replaced by automatization, machinism is replaced by automatization) some influential and credible authors argued speak about postcapitalism (see Peter Drucker) term that I consider a synonym for postmodernism. In my terminology „modern” means „old fashioned”, classical old capitalism, industrial and based on engines. That is why the word „postmodern” means something very new, fresh ie exactly what meant „modern” some centuries ago... Postmodernity is a critical and protestant reaction towards the abusing capitalism ideology that identified modern industrialism with the idea of progress, well being and peace. I consider is the same type of abuse made by the communist ideology putting an equal between communism and wellbeing, peace and progress. In such conditions it appears as very useful to replace the word „modern” with „postmodern” to reflect the new and fresh realities. Of course, over some decades „postmodern” should refer strictly to the mentality from the second part of the XXth century and the first part of the XXIst one...

or at least put into an inter-communicative position. Not only science, philosophy and religion should be melted and trans-formed into a continuous and simultaneous vision of different levels of reality, but also arts, sport, music could be more melted and thus reaching a level of a more interwoven reality. In my opinion, this is the royal way to a better understanding of human beings, to harmony and equilibrium.

In my opinion the Social Semiotics is a transversal/ transdisciplinary vision on human existence explained by its fundamental signs to be interpreted and explained. So, demand is a sign of lacking something for human wellbeing and supply is the sign of something that could be offered in order both to fill a human ends (needs) and to obtain further means in order to fill some other specific human ends. EMMY could be presented in semiotic terms, but this needs more space and effort. My aim was here to promote this new vision as a more simple and transdisciplinary based.

### **Management as applied transdisciplinary approach to Ethics or EMMY**

Management is more and more connected with Ethics, as they are – as a matter of fact - one and the same thing.<sup>6</sup> This happens just because Management is about GOOD decision, GOOD action and GOOD results. Or, the essence of Ethics is the problem of knowing, understanding and achieving the GOOD(ness). As a matter of fact, managerial decision is about the right/ *good* way to obtain *good* results from the point of view which satisfies both the actor's and the others ends (consumer, distributor or state). Here, it proves to be very useful the **End-Means Methodology (EMMY)** plea for a triadic and transdisciplinary thinking, where micro, macro and mondo (i.e. global) are the very *good* way to obtain an equilibrated result, which may be considered as (pretty) *good* for all actors. Of course, there is a relativity of what *good* is (see: moral relativity and moral relativism).

I reiterate here the fundamental triads of our existence because just these ones are creating the real support of an equilibrated world. The example of a three legs chair is a very good one for an action/ thing which attains its end/ mission/ destination by using the minimum of means/ resources/ raw materials. In the same sense should be understood our triadic dimensions which must be taken into consideration when we hope to attain more equilibrium, more adequacy and more happiness in our common/ global world.

Using only the local/ individual/ present dimension is the first wrong step in managing any human action. Some may find it as an exaggeration, but really, *any* human action should have a **true managerial thinking** if someone hopes to attain the desired result. Of course, a question like this may appear: What happens if more actors try to obtain one and the same (competitive) end? Let's consider the competition game. This is win - lose situation. Ten persons are trying to obtain a market segment which offers a good return rate. Only one of them will gain the game. Which one? The most well informed, most adaptive and most well prepared to obtain the consumers' votes. Why the other 9 of them will lose? Simply, for not having sufficient information, which behavior is most fruitful? For sure, the **most informed** one. On the contrary, in a win – win situation, information in bigger quantities and better combined will generate bigger gains for all ten co-opetitors, even bigger than that of the winner in the previous case..

It results that the triad **Substance-Energy-Information** should be equilibrated, and the best combination is the wining one. Is it about Ethics? Sure! Ethics is anywhere we are seeking the GOOD or even the BEST of the things/ events/ situations. Any human action is about life, happiness, wellbeing, satisfaction, acceptance or just living. This is the very subject of Economics and of Politics, because fitting the right means to the right ends is

<sup>6</sup> A child was asked why people have two names. The answer was: "because one name seems to be nicer than the other and they can choose which one is more pretty and convenient for them". The same could be the answer to the question: why human behavior has more names: management, ethics, social semiotics or EMMY?

Political Economics, i.e. Ethics. Managing our actions by equilibrating the economic and political dimensions is searching the most ethical dimension of our acts. At the same time, if any human action has an ethical dimension, the same is when we are doing “economic” activities. I mean any human action may be evaluated from a business ethics point of view. Dissociating ethics from business is the first wrong step in a bad managed human action. Some words could be said about ethical dimension in the so-called political field. EMMY has an answer in this respect. The economic field, the political field and the ethical field are one and the same, identical in their essences and separated only in our (modern) minds. A **postmodern** mind will take all of them into consideration simultaneously and continuously (permanently). This is the true managerial/ethical vision on the real world (of course, until another “true one” will appear...).

As I already told before, **Management** is about GOOD (decision, result, image, attitude, consumption, etc.). In order to obtain that GOOD, you should **manipulate** some **means** in order to attain the desired **end**. Or, sometimes you need to **manufacture** some raw materials (means) in order to attain some consumption goods. The word “goods” has a huge ethical content in itself. When we say “goods” we are accepting that those things are really GOOD. It is the (left) radicals’ position to deny the inclusion of arms, drugs, drinks etc in the large category of “goods”. How to say about a thing it is a good one if we do really know that it is just very bad (at a certain level of reality, e.g. for the human race). Management is a synonym for manipulation, manufacturing, handling etc. Of course, the manipulation/ manufacture/ handling is about combining means in order to attain certain ends.

For this article sake, it is sufficient to mention that every human action has a (known or unknown, conscious or unconscious) final end, and everyone is seeking **better** results in comparison with the situation of non-acting at all.

### **Concluding remarks**

Sometimes we are doing things/ acts without having in our minds their entire significance and meaning. Other times we are supposing we are acting/ doing only one thing or activity, but in reality this activity have multiple dimensions, meanings, interpretations and finalities. It was in 1990 when I first time communicated in an international Conference (First ISINI Conference, Paris, 1990) my view that Economics, Politics and Ethics are so interwoven and inter-correlated that they seem to appear as one single field of activity and of scientific study. More than that, later on, I found that all three “disciplines” treated altogether generated a true transdisciplinary approach in Basarab Nicolescu’s vision<sup>7</sup>. I called this approach EMMY (*End-Means Methodology*) as a tool of unifying Social Sciences and other knowledge. I already proposed to SPACE ERA Committee, in 2004, to promote in universities “*Developing (of) Research Units Generating Unified Science*”. This is also a former dream of ISINI founding father Acad. Anghel N. Rugina [Rugina, 1993, 1998, 2000]. Unite the knowledge and do not narrowly specialize! This could also be the motto for any research department nowadays. I need to underline that transdisciplinarity, synthesis and unification are not against disciplinarity, analysis and separation. All these should be used in a complementary manner, with the accent on the most fitted/ adequate one. Anyway, the trend to synthesis in science is very active after 1950 all over the world, especially in US and some European countries. After having “united” Politics, Economics and Ethics into EMMY, I realized that human behavior is the real essence of all these “disciplines” and fields of activity. But behavior is studied by Psychology, Logic and Neurosciences. The art of thinking and doing seems to be the very

---

<sup>7</sup> Basarab Nicolescu is the most world well known promoter of transdisciplinarity and nowadays he is the president of CIRET and is conducting doctoral work on transdisciplinarity at Babes Bolyai University in Cluj Napoca.

essence of management. But management (decision making) is not only rationality, but emotionality as well. That is why I (re)defined the theory and practice of management as “thinking, feeling and doing”. At the same time, Ethics is studying the human behavior, i.e. human thinking, feeling and acting. Ethics is not a set of given and immutable rules for human conduct, but a general theory on human conduct/ behavior. In my mind, Ethics, Management, Politics-Economics-Ethics continuum, Psychology, Logic, Semiotics and Hermeneutics are either identical or so closely interwoven that they never could be understood separately or consequently. As a matter of fact, this vision is a truly transdisciplinary one, approached in a semiotic and hermeneutical manner (there are a lot of signs to be interpreted) just in order to create a holistic and unitary vision on human beings and their moral behavior.

There are at least some very practical consequences of the new methodological vision:

*Firstly*, it is possible to concentrate the three fundamental or even more disciplines in a solely and integrated corpus of knowledge called Management or the "Theory of human thinking, feeling/ sensing and acting" or, simply End-Means Methodology (EMMY);

*Secondly*, at every new level of formal/ institutional education (starting from gymnasium) it is possible to constantly and systematically enlarge and develop this theory, until the very philosophical, scientific and theological level (at master's and doctor's degree).

*Thirdly*, the political and economic processes will be more oriented towards human beings than towards strictly technical aspects. The scientific research will be much improved using the simple, synergic and transdisciplinary approach defined by Basarab Nicolescu [Nicolescu, 1996] as one "between, across and beyond disciplines".

At the **individual** level, there is simultaneity *and a continuum* among “Thoughts – Feelings – Actions”.

At the **social** level there is a *simultaneity and a continuum* among „Social theory – Social perception – Social action”. This is a true Social Semiotics vision, based on the fundamental signs that mark the humans' life.

The inter-action between the continuity of the individual living and the simultaneity of the social facts (as theory, perception and action) generates a full framework for (social and individual) Praxeology as a general theory of human behavior and which may be optimized by different criteria (e.g. material welfare, social harmony, individual/ social survival etc.) all these being able to be formalized/ quantified.

The continuum „Political field – Ethical field – Economic field” could be demonstrated through the Neutrosophic Logic created by F. Smarandache [Smarandache, 2001]. For example, using the smarandachean terminology, the Political field may be noted as A, the Economic field as Anti-A, and the Ethical field should be the Neutral A (i.e. nor entirely political, nor economic entirely). All these altogether generates the Non-A, i.e. a relative negation of the Political field, a re-coming at social real/ normal/ acceptable dimensions. In this respect it is quite easily applicable the Lupascian Logic of the Third Included, i.e. the middle term – Ethics – is included both in Politics and Economics. So, between the Political field (the realm of Ends to be obtained from existing Means) and the Economic field (the realm of collecting, combining and consuming Means for proposed and/ or accepted attainable Ends) there is no contradiction, no antithesis or breakdown, nor even essential differences, but there is a continuum offered by the permanent presence of the Ethical field, fact that shall generate (a temporary) equilibrium. I just remember here a dedication written for me by prof Rugina on the 25th volume and 5th

number of the International Journal of Social Economics<sup>8</sup>. This testing came only after reading the Neutrosophy Logic of Prof. Smarandache, which offered (me) the operational and logical tool. The three fundamental dimensions of the human existence (ends, means, end-means equilibrium) are now included into a general theory of equilibrium that is not limited to economics, to politics or to ethics, but includes all the three in a general theory and practice of human behavior (See the Doxa- Praxis Continuum [Drugus, 2005]). This neo-praxeology may be very useful in analyzing all the three spatial human dimensions (individual, social and global) in the all three temporal human dimensions (past, present, future), but this analysis should be done as a simultaneous and continuous process.

## References

- Attwater, Roger; "Transdisciplinarity and Natural Management" paper presented at "The 1<sup>st</sup> Sino-Japan Workshop on Metasynthesis and Complex System", Institute of Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, P.R. China, Sept 21-23, 2001
- Bart, Engelon; *Why not define Politics, Economics and Ethics only by Ends and Means?* ISSEI 9<sup>th</sup> Conference, Pamplona, 2-7 August 2004
- Drucker, Peter, Post-Capitalist Society, New York, Harper Business, 1993
- Drugus, Liviu; "Tertium datur : < Tres unum sunt> și arhetipul treimic unitar în cercetarea transdisciplinară potmodernă" (18p) Paper presented at "Lupașcu 2000" Conference, Iași, 16-17 oct 2000, organized by Romanian Academy, "Ștefan Lupașcu" Foundation and "Al. I. Cuza" University, Iași
- Drugus, Liviu, *Transdisciplinaritatea: o cunoaștere sistemică, globală, holistică, triadică și postmodernă*, in: Ateneu, An 41, Nr 11-12 (423-424), Bacau, 2003, pp. 22 -23
- Drugus, Liviu; *The Politic-Economic-Ethic Continuum. Is it possible to define the Economic, the Politic and the Ethic only by Ends and Means?* ISSEI 9<sup>th</sup> Conference, Pamplona, 2-7 August 2004
- Drugus, Liviu, *Doxa-Praxis Continuum as a result of applying EMMY to human thinking and acting, Post-Conference publication, „University College in the Bologna Process: Quality Culture and Applied Research”*, Vilnius, Lithuania, 28-29 April 2005. Printed in December 2005. (Electronic version at: [www.eurashe.be](http://www.eurashe.be))
- Etzioni Amitai, *Modern Organizations*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1964
- Etzioni, Amitai in: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amitai\\_Etzioni](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amitai_Etzioni)
- Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish*, New York, Pantheon, 1977
- Kelly Thomas H., PhD; "Integrated Education for Holistic Thinking" la adresa web: <http://www.ulsf.org/dec1-3/dirmess.html>
- Kenny Anthony, Kenny Charles; *Life Liberty and the Pursuit of Utility. Happiness in philosophical and economic thought*, ia inprint academic.com, Exeter, 2006 (Book reviewed by Liviu Drugus for the European Legacy – the book review will appear in 2008).
- Kuffer, Cristoph; *Transdisciplinarity*;: [http://www.transdisciplinarity.ch/bibliography/about\\_td.html](http://www.transdisciplinarity.ch/bibliography/about_td.html)
- Marsland, David; Sins of Omission, in: The European Legacy, vol 12, No. 5, pp. 611-614, 2007
- Mittelstrass Jurgen; *Transdisciplinarity – New Structure in Science*; <http://www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/ringberg/Talks/mittels%20-%20CHEC...Mittelstrass.html>
- Nicolescu, Basarab; *The Transdisciplinary Evolution of the University Condition for Sustainable Development* <http://nicol.club.fr/ciret/bulletin/b12/b12c8.htm>
- Nicolescu, Basarab, *La Transdisciplinarite. Manifeste*, Paris, Éditions du Rocher, 1996
- Nicolescu, Basarab *A new vision of the world – transdisciplinarity . Extract from the book "Transdisciplinarity. A Manifesto"* Watersign Press, May 1998. See internet address: <http://perso.club-internet.fr/nicol/ciret/english/visionen.htm>
- Passet, Rene; *Le developpement economique, un concept eminentement transdisciplinaire: Le regard de la destruction creatrice en economie* la adresa web: <http://perso.club-internet.fr/nicol/ciret/bulletin/b3et4c4.htm>
- Rugina, Anghel N., *Prolegomena to any Future Study in Economics, Finance and Other Social Sciences: The Road to a Third Revolution in Economics, Financial, Social, Ethical, Logical and Political Thinking*, in: International Journal of Social Economics, Vol 25 Number 5, 1998, pp. 1-388, MCB University Press, Bradford, UK, ([www.mcb.co.uk](http://www.mcb.co.uk) and [www.emerald-library.com](http://www.emerald-library.com))

<sup>8</sup> „To my colleague, Prof Liviu Drugus, Iasi. Encouraging your new ideas further work, but test them with the standards of Equilibrium vs Disequilibrium. Anghel Rugina. Boston, Mass. 20 aug 1998.PS This is the first copy sent to Romania.”!

Rugina, Anghel N., *Prolegomena 2: To any Future Study in „Integrated Logic” and a more Comprehensive Methodology for the Unification of all Sciences, Natural and Social: An Orientation Table for Economics and any other Science and its Application in Theory and Practice*, in: *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol 27 Number 5/6, 2000, pp. 1-328, MCB University Press, Bradford, UK, ([www.mcb.co.uk](http://www.mcb.co.uk) and [www.emerald-library.com](http://www.emerald-library.com))

Rugina, Anghel, N., *Principia Oeconomica*, Ed Academiei Romane, Bucuresti, 1993

Roegen, Nicholas-Georgescu, *The Energy and the Economic Myth*, 1975, <http://dieoff.org/page148.htm>

Smarandache, Florentin, "On Rugina's system of thought", in: "International Journal of Social Economics", Vol. 28, No. 8, 623-647, 2001, USA.  
Internet address: <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0010098> (abstract) and the full article at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0010098v1>

Sperber Dan; *Rethinking Interdisciplinarity*, Paris, 2002, la adresa de web: <http://www.interdisciplines.org/interdisciplinarity/papers/1/6>

Wilk, Richard; *Being Transdisciplinary*, January 19, 2000: <http://dizzy.library.arizona.edu/edu/ej/jpe/transdisciplinarity.htm>

<http://www.laetusinpraesens.org/docs/trandis.hp> *Transdisciplinarity through Structured Dialogue. Beyond sterile dualities in meetings to the challenge of participant impotence*, 1994

[http://www.transdisciplinarity.ch/bibliography/search\\_doc.html](http://www.transdisciplinarity.ch/bibliography/search_doc.html)

*Documents relating to Integration, Transdisciplinarity and Synthesis*, at: <http://www.laetusinpraesens.org/themes/azsynth.php>

<http://gimenei.com/directory/top/Society/Philosophy/Transdisciplinarity/>