

Editorial

LIVIU DRUGUȘ,
George Bacovia University, Bacau, ROMANIA
liviu.drugus@ugb.ro

I am transdisciplinary (since the 80s)

You are transdisciplinary (when you'll decide to)

We are transdisciplinary (this approach has proved its utility)

Transdisciplinarity is not against disciplines, but against rigid borders, dogmatic thinking, and feudal attitudes in the so-called “science(s)”. Our journal has transdisciplinarity as its middle name, so it is quite normal to promote it, to stimulate transdisciplinary research and to prove that knowledge is really enriched by applying transdisciplinary approaches. There are more and more adhesions to this trend, but there are reluctant people, as well.

In my adventure to make transdisciplinarity work I proposed to replace the feudal & modern word “science” with two distinct and more responsible words: “research” (looking for new ideas, information, truths, etc.) and “knowledge” (results obtained, added to the previous knowledge). Some reactions already appeared: this is not necessary, just because we already know how to prove what is “scientific” and what is not. **Karl Popper** (1934) showed how to. But **Wittgenstein** (1921) also already showed how to establish – empirically – if a theory has a logical meaning or not. **Thomas Kuhn** (1962) suggested to work with paradigms and against them (when we need a change). Eliminating the word “science” and its attributes (“scientific”, “nonscientific” etc.) I/ we do not need to ask God to permit us to be Gods. It is quite sufficient to be humans, I think, and to look for those truths/ things we need more, and to add them to the total quantity of known things. Economics is still considered to be a “science”, even crisis appear and the quantity of indeterminacy is bigger and bigger... Sometime is honestly to say “I am not sure” instead of building realities on instable grounds. So, the real problem is not to prove that a theory/ opinion/ conclusion are “scientific” or not, but to explain its (bad or good) expected consequences. It will consume more time to prove that “computer science”/ “social science”/ “management science”/ “scientific socialism”/ etc. are true “sciences” than to better organize some concrete and useful actions (to clean lakes, to plant trees, to read poetry or things like that). Debates on issues like “is philosophy a science?” are not very necessary even the answer will be “yes” or “no”. It is clear, I am a relativistic postmodern transdisciplinary thinker and I am not interested in becoming an absolutistic modern disciplinary thinker.

References

- Kuhn, Thomas** (1962) *The Structure of scientific revolutions*, Chicago University Press, Chicago
Popper, Karl (1959) *The logic of scientific discovery*, Hutchinson & Co., London The Original edition was published in **1934** at J. Springer Verlag, Viena
Wittgenstein Ludwig (1921) *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*, London