

The 11<sup>th</sup> International Conference of ISINI, University of Sonora, Sonora  
Mexico, August 17th – 20<sup>th</sup>

## REDEFINING HUMANISTIC DISCIPLINES TO REFORM THE KNOWLEDGE ON HUMANS.

The case of Management, Economics, Politics and Ethics

*Prof. Liviu Drugus, PhD, George Bacovia University, Bacau, Romania*

[www.liviudrugus.ro](http://www.liviudrugus.ro)

[www.liviudruguswordpress.ro](http://www.liviudruguswordpress.ro)

[liviusdrugus@yahoo.com](mailto:liviusdrugus@yahoo.com)

**Motto:** *Crescat Scientia, vita excolatur*<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

The aim of this paper is to offer an original vision about teaching (postmodern) Humanistics, vision that is based on a compact, essentialized, simplified, holistic, transdisciplinary, postmodern and synthetic knowledge *on humans*, as it is NOT offered by the

---

<sup>1</sup> This motto is on the frontispiece of the University of Chicago (see: <http://www.uchicago.edu/about>) followed by its translation in English: “*Let knowledge grow from more to more, and so be the human life enriched*”. My preoccupation to concentrate long texts to their essences, stimulate me to offer another translation in English: “*More knowledge, richer life*”. And a small comment. It seems that quantitative knowledge was/ is wanted, but nowadays we need to improve the quality of our enormous quantity of knowledge. “Non multa, sed multum” (not many, but much) Latin people said. The movement from over eight thousands of disciplines to some transdisciplinary approaches is really needed. Let me note here that the Honorary president of ISINI, Anghel N. Rugina was seriously preoccupied by “unification of all sciences, natural and social” (see Rugina, 2000). My ambition is a bit smaller: unification of all humanistic disciplines (sometimes called “Social and Humanistic Sciences”), i.e. all knowledge concerning human beings (art, religion, philosophy, “social sciences”).

so called “Social Sciences” (Economics included) and modern Humanistics. I do not intend to establish a new “science” (i.e. a new discipline along with the other thousands) able to explain and to solve all the problems in the world. Such an illusionary way of “doing science” with the hope of generating the rightist direction of action was experienced, in modern times, by **F. Taylor** with his “*Scientific Management*” and by **K. Marx** with his “*Scientific Socialism*”. Then, “*Scientology Church*” (**L. Ron Hubbard**) came to prove, once again, that any use of the word “science” is quite dangerous and manipulating... Fascism tried to scientifically prove that there are inferior and superior races, killing people “scientifically”. Too much “science” and too many disciplines raised the question “what is to be done?”. One possible answer is to review the real info contained by “autonomous and independent disciplines” and to concentrate useful and compatible info in larger approaches with better consequences on the educational process and to the life of humans. My intention is to improve the teaching of the knowledge about human life and to suggest a proper pedagogy to generate an adequate background for future larger specializations and more integrated disciplines. The nowadays reality is that narrow (humanistic) disciplines are taught beginning with grammar school as slides of knowledge with very low interconnectedness among them, or even underlining the differences. Some disciplines are presented as more important than others... **John Henry Newman** delivered in 1852 lectures on “*The idea of a University*”, and criticized, in 1864, the “*scientific pedantry*” of one who was “*imprisoned or fossilized in his erudition*” (see Pelikan, 1992, p. 4) and so do I in 2011 when observe a lot of “scientists” who created nothing but are repeating the findings of some true researchers or proclaim themselves as “*founders of a new science*”. The disciplines taught in grammar school are then repeated year by year until the students are licensed to work in a certain field (“field” and “domains” are very feudal reminiscences...) as “specialists” in a quite narrow activity, a more and more robotic one. After finishing the university specialization in one of these humanistic disciplines the life proves that the connections with other disciplines are more important and useful than any specialization. Politics is really nothing without understanding Economics, Law, Ethics, and Human Geography etc. But, these are taught separately in separate faculties as “autonomous” entities, the other disciplines being considered less important or even as enemies... Lack of morality in business, shows that (Business) Ethics is needed. Also, immoral policies show that ethical education is useful in so called Political Science faculties. And, after many years of learning the differences between “sciences”, at master and doctor’s degrees students are taught about the interconnectedness and the usefulness of inter-disciplinarity and transdisciplinarity. My proposal is to reverse this order of things, to, firstly, learn transdisciplinary knowledge about humans and only at master or doctoral degree one may, secondly, specialize on a specific and narrow slide of theory. For short, let’s begin the education of very young humans with holistic, transdisciplinary and compacted knowledge about humans, and finish with a discipline or another, but having in mind the complete picture of knowledge about humans. I suggest here a fruitful cooperation among professors/ teachers with larger knowledge that the one mentioned in their diplomas, having a true disposal to connect the essences of their “disciplinary” knowledge with other essences from other “fields” emphatically

called “sciences”. Pedagogical skills are highly needed in this quite revolutionary re-education approach.

First of all, it is highly needed to realize that there are too many gaps and distinctions among different parts of knowledge (lat. Scientia) on humans: religious, artistic, philosophical, and/ or “scientific” ones.. After an initial (in immemorial times) compact and very coherent corpus of knowledge, there followed periods of dividing this compact knowledge into more and more disciplines. Now, I think it is necessary a permanent preoccupation to (re)integrate all this dissipated knowledge. The purpose of this process is to improve the understanding of humans and to enrich the volume of useful knowledge.

Although in 1990, in Paris, I already presented my End-Means Methodology (EMMY) as a transdisciplinary and integrative approach in Social Sciences, some of my later developments were influenced and encouraged by the large vision of the Ruginian way of thinking. It is important to stress here that ISINI’s roots are – in conformity with its bylaws and with motto of the “Motion of Prof Anghel Rugina” (Rugina, 1997) -“In searching for new ideas, new better concepts, new better theories and new better interpretations of past and/or present theories”. In order to attain such results it is necessary to develop the “*methodology of science*” (Rugina, 1997) just because “*final dream is a methodological unification of all sciences*” (Rugina, 1997). And another final dream is a practical one, i.e. “*to show consistently and systematically how to realize and to maintain in the real world the great ideal of all nations, of all races, that is of HUMANITY: the dream of a Free, Just and Stable Economy and Society*” (Rugina, 1997). Unfortunately, the evolution of ISINI members researches proved that these are more and more technical, strictly factual and less preoccupied for new ideas. The next ISINI Conference may organize debates on ISINI’s mission and future.

Every education system has a lot of examples of quite unuseful information offered to pupils and students as forms of “science”. I do consider that using the word “science” as an attribute to different kinds and categories of knowledge is an abuse and an exaggeration. (see more on this at: **Drugus**, 2010, pp. 5-6). “Science” is the Latin word for “knowledge”. There are few arguments to divide this knowledge in thousands of slides called (scientific) disciplines or even “sciences”. Or, science is not possible to be composed from sciences... (in the same way as a human being is not composed from human beings...). Medieval thinking was in a great battle to harmonize the religious and scientific truth, by help of philosophy. Postmodern and cosmodern thinking tries the same thing of not opposing different kinds of truths, disciplines or ways of thinking. My EMMY is a postmodern transdisciplinary preoccupation to harmonize the huge number of disciplines, many of them artificially created by universities in their desire to attract more students, to have more class hours for professors and to generate a conviction that things are so complex that it is necessary to create new disciplines able and necessary to study it. As a matter of fact, a true solution to this complexity is transdisciplinarity and simplification of too many and too large disciplines. Modern thinking (16<sup>th</sup> century to the mid of 20<sup>th</sup> century) culminated with the “discovery” and foundation of thousands of new and new disciplines.

Postmodern thinking (especially after 1950) tries to reverse this process and to compact the huge quantity of knowledge in order to make it more understandable. Although the postmodern thinking fragmented the rigid corpuses of knowledge in order to show that a few of it is useful and necessary to be retained and memorized, I think that cosmopolitanism, promoted by Basarab Nicolescu, is the second phase of postmodernism, i.e. to recompose the broken things and letting aside the unnecessary information and “scientific truths”. In order to do this I suggest to essentialize the well known disciplines and to redefine their content. For example, instead of having hundreds of (complementary) definitions for Economics, Political Economy, Political Economics a.s.o., I will offer another definition to comprise most of the previous ones. I observed that every definition was the result of a cultural background of the author, of real or imaginary purposes, of the epoch and of level of technology, but they have common features. The metaphor of blind people describing an elephant by touching different parts of the animal is quite suggestive for explaining the interminable row of definitions for one and the same “scientific” discipline. By redefining some fundamental (humanistic) disciplines by essentialized features is possible to observe new connections with other disciplines and to be able to imagine the entire “elephant” without seeing it entirely. The approach of Dortier (1998) of presenting in a book the essentials of (in his mind) the most important domains connected with human life is a good start to concentrate all knowledge on humans in a compact and single approach. At the end of this paper, after I’ll show the benefits and loses of such a big change, I’ll propose some stages of the reforming process, a quite tough task both to politicians, experts and researchers in education. It is my hope that this reforming process may start from civil society, and ISINI may offer a good example of well organizing and supporting this process.

### **Redefining Politics**

Etymologically, the word “politics” comes from the old Greek “polis” (town, city, state) and its essence (in democratic terms) is a specific way of attending the ends (purposes) of most inhabitants by creating a mechanism of empowering some of “polis” representative in attaining some fundamental ends: security/ peace, well-being, solidarity, health, education, etc. Of course, some personal ends remain to be fulfilled by everyone in specific ways. But, since this personal attainment may influence the life of the others “polis-men” I do consider them as part of the polis affairs. As a conclusion, the simple fact of establishing some ends is the object study of Politics. Or, otherwise said, Politics is studying the ways of establishing ends by individuals, groups or whole society. In EMMY terms this means that Politics studies the way humans are establishing and fulfilling their ends, at micro, macro and mondo (global) level, using specific means. Every person is pursuing specific ends and these may conflict with the other people, but society does not like to have a conflictual life. In this respect (or, to this end) the political power creates institutions for solving problems like these. In democracies, the political power should respect the will of majority with the help of institutions. During the history of states (as during the history of families) some institutions are not working properly or towards the proclaimed ends. Some considered that the institutions are guilty for that, and they propose to fight them. For

example Foucault wrote in 1974: *“It seems to me that the real political task in a society such as ours is to criticize the working of institutions which appear to be both neutral and independent; to criticize them in such a manner that the political violence has always exercised itself obscurely through them will be unmasked, so that one can fight them”*. (Foucault, 1974, p. 171). Although Foucault is “on my taste”, the idea (from title of the book) of putting power against justice (“justice vs. power”) seems that we need to mention the concrete cases in which this adversity appear. Not every power conflicts justice, or not all the time a political power institution conflicts a justice institution. In accordance with my main thesis that all disciplines concerning humans I do consider that justice, like management is applied Ethics. Both managers and judges are making and taking decisions addressed to the human behavior. That is why I make a plea in favor of presenting all these attributes linked with human life from the very first years of young education. After having a common background, graduates may specialize in Law, Management, Politics, Economics or Ethics. But not every of these specializations need the same duration of time for getting the necessary info in order to be able to be a specialist in one or in more of these (former) disciplines.

### **Redefining Economics**

Defining Economics in many and different ways is quite confusing and misleading. For example, defining Economics as “the study of the optimum allocation of scarce resources” without mentioning “for whom” is big lye since “the optimum allocation” (i.e. the best one) is impossible to attain for all the people implied... Some may claim that simple getting more resources is better (for him, of course), but often “more” means “worse”. Also, allocation is a political process (see chapter on Redefining Politics) with a quite specific and determined end (purpose): profit, development, peace, health, social equilibrium etc. That is why it is necessary to clearly define the end to which we are allocating some means (resources). So, I propose a neutral term: combination of means (instead of allocation of resources). Resources (i.e. means) may be combined in a large range of ways and methods and in function of a clearly predetermined end, these combinations could be considered as being good (i.e. acceptable, useful etc.). In Radical Economics, the bad things like cigarettes, drugs etc. are not accepted as economic “goods”. As a matter of fact, any economic activity is impossible to be defined outside its political (finality) and ethical (morality) dimensions. They are intrinsic and inseparable aspects and they need to be treated, understood and taught only together. Some will react that the human life is a big fight and people may be educated how to make foolish other people. This is a part of my plea for integration of all things connected with human life. But not only politics, economics and ethics are implied in the human’s life. For example, in order to attain some (productive, spiritual, cultural etc.) ends, people need to communicate. Communication as a process is an economic one, since it is about combining means (words, sounds, rules, alphabets, money etc.). The reluctant attitude against considering languages and communication as part of economic discourse will be smoothed if we realize that a lot of economic faculties are offering specializations called “Marketing and Communication”,

“Negotiation skills for marketers and managers” or “The language of traders”. Again, some may consider this is only a proof that interdisciplinarity is needed. I say more: integration is needed! Probably the critics will ask: so, if we accept the idea that linguistics is a component of economics, shall we teach linguistics only in economic faculties? Not at all! But it is useful to explain to pupils of different ages that combining anything is economics. This will help them to understand that economics is not only studying material resources, but ALL kind of means: natural resources, information, ideas, colors, forms, time, words, sounds, etc. etc. This is really very useful to understand that no part of our existence (cosmic order included) is out of the economic field. All these *combinations* are *producing* different (desired or not) results. Economics is not only about the production of desired results (i.e. producing wealth), but also about the management of non desired ones.

Since the modern definition of (neo) classical economics was “the study of allocation of scarce resources” many asked themselves: what is economic and what isn’t? Still today we are hearing assertions like these: “this is not economic, this is political matter”, “be careful not to confuse political and economic things”, “and do not expect to find out morality in economic or in political life”. This way of splitting things generates a huge schizophrenia when trying to understand human thinking, feeling and acting. Any human action is both political, economic and ethical simultaneously and continuously just because every human action is done with a specific (political) end, uses certain (economic) means and tests the level of (ethical) adequacy between them. Is it possible to imagine a human action lacking any finality? I think not. Even the clinical cases with severe sickness (conscious) actions are done in function of a future expected result (pain, pleasure, satisfaction etc.).

Economics is more and more disconsidered as it is not able to respect its promises concerning the human’s life. Any economic and financial crisis should suggest people to throw out their huge treatises on Economics and to rethink the premises and hypothesis of this too proud “science”. A lot of excellent (economic) ideas are sunk now in mathematical formula that could demonstrate that risk and future actions are to be only approximated, not determined. If complicate aggregate formula are to be used in financial analysis, then it is (only) computers work to generate possible directions of action. “*It is taken for granted that every modern economist must be steeped in mathematics and statistics*” (Villegas Bernardo M., in: De Torre, 2010, p. XV).

So, my definition of economic field is: any human action which refers to collecting, combining and consuming MEANS, in order to reach a specific, predetermined and/ or accepted END. The action is permanently correlated with the level of adequacy between the proposed ends and the chosen means (see Drugus, 1972). Thus, economic activity is made from end(s), means and end/ means ratio.

### **Redefining Ethics and Management**

My starting hypothesis is: Management = Ethics (or, good management = adequate behavior). Bad management is, practically, bad behavior, generated by bad thinking and feeling concerning a present/ future action/ behavior. I do consider that behavior is applicable both to individuals, organizations, corporations, states and the mankind as a whole. More than that I need to underline that in defining a kind of behavior at a certain level of social aggregation we have to consider, simultaneously and continuously, all the other possible levels. As Ethics is not only about “good” behavior, the Management is not only about “good” management. Both bad behavior and bad management are implied in the two names of the (still) two academic disciplines: Ethics and Management. As a matter of fact, there exists only one such a discipline: some call it Management and others call it Ethics. It is really non ethical (or, the same, it is bad management) if we’ll continue to consider the two as separated and different. The history of last half century demonstrates that every year the management books included larger and larger chapters on (business) ethics. The other chapters of any management book are also about thinking, feeling and acting in function of goals/ purposes (ends), principles, rules, codes, contexts, resources (means) etc. The first bad consequence of not putting an equal between Ethics and Management will be the necessity to have books on Management and books on Ethics, and then to have books to show the necessity of including business ethics in ...management. Lose of time and, worse, lose of the key point: there couldn’t be any management activity without ethical dimension. It is like the definition of God (God is where the big infinite includes the small infinite and vice versa). So, we have Business Ethics when Management includes Ethics and Ethics include Management). Or, the same, Ethics is (good) Management. When we forget it, we open the door to bad management or to unethical behavior. This assertion is the very result of a three decades research ended in a coherent and general theory of human action called **End Means Methodology (EMMY)** and I prove that **EMMY = Ethics = Management**. We need to have such a general theory that condenses both Ethics and Management in it in order to be more convincingly and to save time in education and to diminish the misunderstandings in teaching and applying social rules, legal laws or civic attitudes.

Management = theory/ practice on/ of thinking, feeling and acting of human beings

Ethics/ Morality = theory/ practice on/ of thinking, feeling and acting of human beings

EMMY = theory/ practice on/ of thinking, feeling and acting of human beings

Any of the three denominators have exactly the same content, but this may be demonstrated later. Any of the three theories/ practices are starting with defining/ proposing the **ends** to be achieved in function of the **means** we may use (this is mostly referred to feeling, thinking, and acting), then continues with choosing the adequate **means** to achieve the proposed **ends** (this is mostly referring to thinking, feeling, and acting), and finally ending by simultaneously and continuously comparing the proposed **ends** with chosen **means** (this needs simultaneously thinking, feeling, and acting). Proposing an **end** is more emotional, choosing **ends** is more rational, and comparing **ends** to **means** presupposes/ implies both.

Humans could be defined by the following formula:

**Human being = f (Ends; Means; Ends/Means ratio)**

i.e. any human being could be defined as a function of the ends proposed, the necessary means to be used in order to achieve that purpose and the permanent analysis of the degree of adequacy of means to ends and ends to means. But an individual needs to take into consideration all other existing humans with their ends (hopes, desires etc.) and the means to be used. Such a framework determines us to be as transparent as possible, to take into consideration “the otherness” and the wholeness (holism) of the world(s) we are living in.

Management is a relatively new term describing organizing, leading and optimizing processes in organizations with different levels of aggregation. Of course, management practices existed long before its “scientific” approach. Recently there are preoccupations to change the way of doing management education, but this needs to have another image and approach to management process as such. New dimensions of the managerial process are nowadays underlined, developed and criticized (political skills, aesthetic epistemology, service learning, distance learning, doctoral education, training and learning processes, etc) (see: Wankel Charles, DeFillippi Robert, Rethinking Management Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century). In my vision, management as practice is human behavior (and ethics is studying it) and Management as a theoretical approach is defined as “thinking, feeling and acting”. It is easy to observe that practical management and theoretical Management are connected by “acting”, i.e. by human activity called behavior. I called this process as Doxa-Praxis continuum, trying to suggest management is about applied Ethics in everyday human life. But Ethics is the intersection of Politics (ends) with Economics (means). As a consequence, we may put an equal not only between Politics and Economics, but among these two and Ethics. By redefining the content of Management, Politics, Economics and Ethics using ends and means, it comes that all these disciplines are about ends and means and it is not only possible but quite necessary to compact them and to teach them as a single approach. And because all things need a name, I called it **End Means Methodology** (EMMY).

Young learners will find out that management is quite an everyday process, and the study of it is something that implies, simultaneously and continuously, some former autonomous disciplines such as: **Politics** (ends/ purposes establishing), **Economics** (means collecting, combining and productively consuming) and **Ethics** (comparing the proposed ends with the obtained results, i.e. the new means obtained through combination). Only in higher education (master’s degree or doctor’s degree) students may specialize and take a slide of reality to study, slide called “discipline”. My vision on transdisciplinarity is that this should precede interdisciplinarity, and interdisciplinarity should precede disciplinarity. Otherwise, the cancerous growth of a huge number of disciplines will continue indefinitely and will create greater confusion in research field and in its management.

I used sometimes “human beings” instead of “individual” or “collective” decision makers, just to underline the idea that by human beings I understand an individual, a collective/ group or the entire humankind. EMMY is referring, simultaneously and continuously to all three levels of aggregation. No individual action is strictly individual; it is both collective and global at the same time. Or, any human action is to be considered – simultaneously and continuously - as individual, collective and global.

EMMY is using triadic structures in order to obtain consensus: Temporal (past-present-future continuum), Spatial (micro, macro, global or individual-collective-humankind continuum) Structural/ Ontological (Substance-Energy-Information continuum) to mention only three fundamental triads. All these refer only to contexts of human action. But there are triads that are directly connected with the human action: **end** (goal, aim, target, purpose, hope, ideal, desire, wish, plan, strategy, and program); **means** (human resources – not only the human actors but also contextual and tangential people, material resources, time resources, money or financial<sup>2</sup> resources, experience, creativity, new ideas, climates, social realities, human contexts, level of aspirations etc, etc.). A lot of journalistic stuff using **ends and means** as keywords in banal contexts generates a lot of confusion just because they simplify excessively the realities. Or, the world is more and more complex: there are hidden ends, future ends or collateral results when we are fulfilling a certain **end** and choose specific **means**. When I say “my end” I need to compare it with as many as possible other present and future ends. Computers and programming are called to help in this immense world of ends and of means. The chaos theory, games theory and complexity theory are nowadays most appropriate approaches in management/ ethics.

One example of un-appropriate using of end-means rationale is: “could bad means justify good ends?” (a propos to Machiavellian ethics). But good and bad are relations between ends and means. There is no end in itself. The ends are all the time intimately co-related with means. The means are all the time directed to specific ends. There is no means collected, combined and consumed as such, without any purpose in our mind. Even Sissify work had a kind of purpose...

- 
1. It is interesting to observe the etymology of the word “finance”. It comes from the French “fin” that means “end”. So, if English speaking people were the founders of what the French people called “finance” the French term may be “end-ance”... But the realm of ends is the object study of Politics, as the realm of means is the object study of Economics. No Politics without Economics is possible and no Economics without Politics is possible. They are not only twins but intrinsically intertwined and impossible to be studied separately. That is why I compare the ends-means continuum as a stick with the two heads. We may consider one head as a means and the other one as an end. Or vice versa. From here we may put an equal between ends and means and define any thing or action as an end or as a means. This is a kind of relativistic Ethics, i.e. there are no rigid rules to be followed but to continuously and simultaneously adapt ends to means and means to ends.

(may be to demonstrate that an endless work is nonhuman and stupid by definition). According to EMMY, “good” is the result of considering that means are adequate to the proposed ends. So, “good” (situation/ action) implies both ends and means, not only ends or only means. Saying “good ends” is a non sense; it is possible to say only “adequate ends to means”, or “adequate means to ends”. That is why EMMY is often rejected: it is oversimplified and then appreciated as vulgar psychology or common thinking ...

Some found out that there is an End Means Ethics (this is tautological just because Ethics is about adequate ends and means) and reject it as “unscientific” because do not explain a lot of “bad” situations...This is because most of the examples are postfactum ones. A true ethical behavior is based on provisioning most if not all possible consequences and assuming the responsibility of doing that or that. The present global (economic and financial) crisis is the very result of in-adequate decisions, i.e. means used to attain strictly personal or corporate profit, *pereat mundus!* Or, the “good” management, or the ethical behavior is to keep in mind that only micro-macro-mondo continuum may decide what ends and what means are chosen and what degree of adequacy is between them. Otherwise, we may sometimes decide to destroy the global environment (i.e. the mondo level) for personal profit (i.e. micro level). Of course, this will be also the death of all three levels... It is not the place here to develop EMMY but it may be studied from other articles or books. Here it is sufficiently to declare that discussing and planning in terms of ends, means and end-means adequacy is a very good beginning to avoid ethical dilemmas. But remember, EMMY is about future actions not for justifying the past ones... We may use it for a post factum analysis but only to test is the plans to action are correctly done.

If this (new) vision on Management/ Ethics is accepted a lot of good things could happen in the process of understanding of human life. Business and Medicine are the most visible stakeholders of EMMY. A sound curricular reform in pre-university level of education is imperative. This reform will put together all info on humans in one and the same discipline and no separation between Politics, Economics and Ethics could appear. We may call it either Ethics or Management.

Business Ethics is Ethics/ Management applied to any kind of activity/ business. There is no specificity of Business Ethics in comparison to other kinds of human actions, others than the specificity of business itself: profit seeking, corporate social responsibility and contractual relations.

### **A strategy to apply the essentialized, compacted, transdisciplinary and synthetic knowledge about humans**

In order to introduce in practice the new compact system of education based on EMMY the following steps are needed:

1. To previously prepare a group of teachers with a real opening to EMMY and transdisciplinarity

2. All of them would give up to the disciplinary proud and to adopt the transdisciplinary background, transdisciplinary attitude and transdisciplinary approaches when teaching or researching human life. This means (at least) that no one of the three fundamental dimensions (political, economic, ethical) would not be considered more important than others.
3. The politic-economic-ethic continuum may be taught under the name of EMMY or any other more suggestive denomination
4. It is necessary to have a common textbook permanently discussed and analyzed by anyone interested in proving that something is wrong, nonadequate or possible to be improved. This "common" task may be a competitive market using the very results of the propositions made. Of course, political will is necessary to do a single textbook for public or private secondary and higher education.
5. The new concept of integrated teaching of knowledge needs to be worldwide disseminated (if not accepted as such, it may obtain many improvements). The real end of this new approach is not to glorify an author or to minimize the importance of some disciplines. It is much more than that. It is about human performance, time saving and creativity stimulating.
6. More literature than a single textbook is necessary. Transdisciplinarity is little by little penetrating the interest of researchers, but there is a lot of conservatism and lack of courage to introduce new ideas into practice. In crisis times one may think many times ahead of continuing to maintain an education system that generates big problems to humankind. Analysis and examples of best practices obtained in schools using EMMY might be very useful.
7. A pedagogical and educational management analysis should be made not only before introducing the new system but for a longer period. The educational track must be revisited in order to decide the optimum moment of starting studying EMMY and when to begin specializations. Only concrete results should help in this decision.
8. Experimental classes are needed before extending the new system at a region or country level. Summer schools should be good opportunities make dialogue and improve terminology, definitions, teaching methods a.s.o. An alternative system may be imagined by selecting volunteers (teachers, parents and children) to make a parallel teaching in extra curricular programme.
9. The total teaching hours (compared with the total number of hours taught for all disciplines that should be compacted into the new system) must be (at least) two or three times less. This is not a Stakhanovist or economicist manner of measuring efficiency, but all the (real) advantages should be took into consideration. At the same time the level of understanding and of knowledge should be higher. Otherwise we do not need such a reform.

10. It is necessary to have this evaluation at different levels and ways of reform. I am sure that those regions or countries that will be more open to this new system will have a clear competitive advantage.

## . Conclusion

ISINI is an excellent place to promote new ideas. This is the real *raison d'être* of this organization. I am opened to any criticism, improvements, collaboration, teaching sessions without financial burden or any other proposals.

## References

**De Torre, Joseph M.**, *The Historical genesis of Modern Science and its Effects upon civilization and culture*, Gabriel Books, Inc., Quezon City, Philippines, 2010

**Dortier Jean-Francois**, *Les sciences humaines. Panorama des connaissances*, Sciences Humaines Editions, avril 1998, 418 pages

**Drugus Liviu**, “*Informatie si decizie*” (Information and decision), in: Flacara Iasului, Iasi, 1972

**Drugus, Liviu**; *Ethics is political economics. Moral behavior is good management Applying End-Means Methodology to Health (Care) Systems and to their Management* <http://eng.bioetica.ro/bioeng/ie2/info.jsp?item=9572&node=1336> in: Revista Romana de Bioetica, vol.1, issue 3, 2003

**Drugus, L.**, *Ethics and Ethical Behavior in Education and Health Care. A Postmodern View (2)*, in Revista Romana de Bioetica, Vol. 1, Nr. 2, april-june 2003, pp.27-33

**Drugus, L.**, *The Scope of the economic, the politic and the ethic. What is, at last, studying the Political Economics?*, in: Economica, Vol. 3, Nr. 3-4, 1995, pp.35-51, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova

**Drugus, Liviu**; *Reshaping the Social Sciences by the Transdisciplinary End Means Methodology (EMMY)*, in: Nicolescu, Basarab and Stavinschi Magda (editors), Transdisciplinary approaches of the dialogue between science, art, and religion in the Europe of tomorrow, Curtea Veche Publishing, Bucuresti, 2008

**Drugus, Liviu**, “*Science is dead! Long live knowledge*”, in: Economy Transdisciplinarity Cognition, vol. XII, Issue 2, 2009, pp. 1-2 (<http://www.ugb.ro/etc2009no2/edit.pdf>)

**Drugus, Liviu**; In memoriam Anghel Rugina  
[http://www.ugb.ro/isini10/index\\_files/Page1081.htm](http://www.ugb.ro/isini10/index_files/Page1081.htm)

**Drugus, Liviu**, “*On Management: Is it scientific management? No! Is it Management Science? No! Is it Changing Management? Yes!*”, in: *Economy Transdisciplinarity Cognition*, vol. XIII, Issue 1, 2010 (<http://www.ugb.ro/etc2010no1/edit.pdf>)

**Drugus, Liviu**, “*I am transdisciplinary (since the 80s)/ You are transdisciplinary (when you’ll decide to/ We are transdisciplinary (this approach has proved its utility,* in: *Economy Transdisciplinarity Cognition*, vol. XIII, Issue 2, 2010, p 5 (<http://www.ugb.ro/etc2010no2/edit.pdf>)

**Hook Derek** (2010, first published 2007), *Foucault, psychology and the analytics of power*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York (USA), Houndmills (UK)

**Foucault, M.** *Human nature: justice versus power*. In: E. Fons (Editor), *Reflexive Water: The Basic Concerns of Humankind*, London, Souvenir Press, pp. 135-197

**Meijer, Gerrit**; *Some Facets of Life and Work of Rugina*, in: *Buletin Stiintific* edited by George Bacovia University [http://www.ugb.ro/etc/etc2008no1/ks03%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.ugb.ro/etc/etc2008no1/ks03%20(2).pdf) Gerrit

**Nicolescu, Basarab** (Editor) (2008) *Transdisciplinarity – Theory and Practice*, Hampton Press, Inc. Cresskill, NJ, USA

**Pelikan Jaroslav**, *The Idea of University. A Reexamination*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1992, 238 pages

**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 (all the 388 pages of this issue are dedicated to Anghel Rugina work).

**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, 5/6, 2000. (all the 328 pages of this issue are dedicated to Anghel Rugina work).

**Rugina, Anghel N.**; *Purpose, Vision of ISINI: Motion of Prof Dr Anghel N Rugina*, Honorary President addressed to 4<sup>th</sup> ISINI Conference in Maastricht, 23 August, 1997

**Scruton Roger**, *The Idea of a University*, in: Stephen Prickett & Patricia Erskine-Hill (editors) “*Education! Education! Education!! Managerial Ethics and the Law of Unintended Consequences*”, inprint academic, 2002, pp. 73-84

**Sommerville Margaret A., Rapport David J.** (Editors), *TRANSDISCIPLINARITY: reCREATING INTEGRATED KNOWLEDGE*, Eolss Publishers Co. Ltd, Oxford, UK

**Steiner, George A., Steiner, John F.**, *Business, Government, and Society. A Managerial Perspective*, Text and Cases, 11e, McGraw-Hill / Irwin, New York, 2006, 221-222

**University of Chicago** <http://www.uchicago.edu/about>

**Wankel Charles, Defillippi Dobert** (editors) *Rethinking Management Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Information Age Publishing, Connecticut, USA, 2002, 236 pages