
Artificial Economy

Author: Alexandru JIVAN, West University of Timisoara, Romania,
alexandrujivan@gmail.com

This paper proposes to eliminate, a routine in the economic thinking, claimed to be responsible for the negative essence of economic developments, from the point of view, of the ecological implications (employment in the planetary ecosystem).

The methodological foundations start from the natural origins of the functionality of the human economic society according to the originary physiocrat liberalism, and from specific natural characteristics of the human kind.

This paper begins with a comment-analysis of the difference between natural and artificial within the economy, and then explains some of the most serious diversions from the natural essence of economic liberalism.

It shall be explained the original (heterodox) interpretation of the Classical political economy (economics), by making calls to the Romanian economic thinking from aggravating past century. Highlighting the destructive impact of the economy - which, under the invoked doctrines, we call unnatural - allows an intuitive presentation of a logical extension of Marshall's market price, based on previous research.

Besides the doctrinal arguments presented, the economic realities inventoried along the way (major deficiencies and effects, determined) demonstrate the validity of the hypothesis of the unnatural character and therefore necessarily to be corrected, of the concept and of the mechanisms of the current economy.

The results of this paper consist of original heterodox methods presented, intuitive or developed that can be found conclusively within the key proposals for education and regulation.

Keywords: *liberalism, classical economics, natural economy, green economy, productivity*

JEL Classification: *Q50, O40, O10*

Natural - Artificial. Preconceived ideas and reorientations

In the preface to the book “The Other Path” of Hernando De Soto, translated into Romanian¹, invokes a memorable scene: the fetus about to be subjected to extirpation (curettage) shouts unheard. The idea is to draw attention to the painful unnatural character of any forced approach as well as an extraction of the fetus outside the natural birth moment (other that it would have been by the nature of things): the economists make right away the analogy between “natural” and freedom of action, such as the famous adage liberalist *laissez faire* : and the cries (dull) of pain” is the effect of the destructive character and therefore inefficient from an economical point of view, in terms of efficiency (productivity, productive results) and also of the resources allocation, which the “unnatural” has.

The problem that we want to put to discussion, concerns another perception (or conception) - renewed, unorthodox - about several common approaches, which we consider already a routine, preconceived ideas: because any chance of discussion offers the chance to find new aspects, disclosing some new ignored issues and mistakes. The issue we raise concerns the assumption (acceptation) that is made about what is natural and what is forced (unnatural, such as a birth before due time, such as abortion, such as the disturbing case exemplified): in the preached ideology on the usual coordinates of liberalism the action of the entrepreneurs is assumed to be the natural one and state intervention so declared to be the forced one; but in the traditional approaches it's not about the unnatural character of treating food with chemical preservatives, although by this the natural constraint is infringed - decisive for the market - the natural

¹ Hernando De Soto-*The Other Path*- SEDONA Publishing House, Timisoara, 1999, translator's note, page VII, is invoked a memorable scene where Vasile Mitu, the translator of the book, appreciates it in a courageous manner, the concrete image of the ideational and problematic content of the book of De Soto. The comparisons are dramatic, harsh but definitely genuine.

perishable; it's not about the unnatural character of the growth stimulants either (forced amplification of the living biological material, including animal) thus further distorting the natural mechanism envisaged between the laws of nature, dominant in underlying the laissez faire principle by the physiocrats. Such denaturalization's are not made by the state, but by independent individual companies. Similarly, the increase in the size of some companies (sometimes up to the point where they become far superior to the force of several states²), and then carrying out interventions on the extent of these dimensions and enormous forces: these are now on the agenda.

So, judging outside of the preconceptions instituted (normal), forced is represented by anything that aims some purposes- or follow some paths- against the natural³. Moreover, violating some routine of the contemporary world (but in harmony with the Antique Greek philosophers' conception and with the original Christian spirit) we might say that natural is related to the coverage of needs, but it is not chrematistic, doesn't aim any business purpose⁴, following the natural determinants (according to the laws of nature) and not by pursuing mercantile targets, of monetary gains over the individual needs. Pursuing and artificial track (compared to the natural needs) is something abnormal; individual actions- indifferent towards nature of everything around, or even hostile to the environmental framework [environment] - are not natural at all, nor as effects nor in terms of routes followed, methods used.

As a result, the metaphor from the foreword to his book *De Sotto* may refer to any mutilator intervention force, not only, as we are already accustomed (up 'till routine), all the way to the force of the state. Or even, for broadening the horizon towards common practice, one can relate primarily to the (private) giant companies: Having regard to the forces

² Stepping out, entirely, of course from the ideal competitive models conceived at the beginning of liberalism.

³ Constitutes at least a diversion preserving the state's position as the unique, interventionist" (disturbing in the idyllic tournament [fair competition] between private entities).

⁴ Which is something else that to leave things to run in the direction given by the casual connections, bound to the laws of nature: following the laws of nature means to saw when the time comes, to hose, to remove weeds, to harvest when the crop is ripped, and there are proper conditions, in order to insure the basic needs for living (but not for speculation purposes to enrichment).

applied by such giants (their interventions) on individuals natural persons⁵ (applied forces consist of aggressive marketing and others) and on small business units⁶ (over which destructive forces is practiced, imposing prices and other coercion, by the unbeatable force of the stronger ones according to the short term needs). Can be explained several evolutions and decisions taken “for the market” and also other methods used in the market struggle – seen by Veblen, a new picture of free competition taking form other than the idealistic one.

Industrial processes rely on physical and chemical laws to the extent to which people discover and exploit them. But the conduct of life processes (in general, and particularly in humans) has some forms shaped in millennial evolutions that are crucial not only for human society but in great measure for its component which is economy. Parts of the same nature are the other species of the planet, each with its own manner of conducting the processes necessary to obtain basic needs, which describes specific types, of “economic life”. All these are integrated in the particular ecologic and global balance, on which we do not wish to insist in this paper⁷.

In the case of the human society, more evolved, it can be considered that the natural boundaries are quite labile, that they are not (and cannot be) fixed accurately, can evolve over time. We do not wish to clarify in detail and rigorously (to develop) this issue in this paper: the reference we make here (on natural⁸ and artificial) concern only the basic distinction between, for example, on the one hand, (i) deforest, deadheading, etc. and finally to

⁵ Buyers (customers, for the big company). In any case, to Romanians at least, big companies have brought unexpected limitations (we avoid examples because it would require the use of real names of some companies).

⁶ All buyers or bidders (to which the company is in the position of monopoly or “which constitutes competition” for the large company) that are candidates to be swallowed by it (or to be ruined by it, in the free competition).

⁷ As the man makes the selection between what’s considered useless and what he is interested in (for example, between plants that we call “ones weeds” ones and the “ones cultivated” ones), and elephants deforest, large areas to help better grow _the type vegetation they need for food, and other creatures have certain means of action well designed. In various papers, we make such mentions and clarifications. I quote here, for example, only the introduction to the paper “Services and Servicity” (World Services Forum Bulletin, no. 3.4 / 1993, pg.16-24)

⁸ Today flavors’ generated by chemical factories are called “natural” – on the only reason that their smell looks like (appears and is declared identical with) certain natural smells, containing certain similar chemical substances (even if never all the same and never exactly the same components and in the same conditions and quality for biologic use (for people, for health on the very long term); only Mother Nature generates the actually and really natural substances).

harvest (including with more productive tools⁹) and on the other hand (ii) to use chemicals to cause artificial growth of meat (muscle) on still immature organisms, like chickens or cattle, or to make tomatoes and eggplants to gain a red color faster (in order to look “ripped”; these type of practices- so called “more productive” – are used for profit, but are carried out precisely by “cheating’ mother nature, therefore by violating the fundamental principle of productivity developed by the physiocrats based on liberalism; better yet contradiction the principle; because they mean precisely the deviation for the conduct of things as it happens in nature (in a natural manner). Natural aspects can therefore be ignored or avoided, and in many cases they are rather fake.

Such evolutions (interventions) are considering a single aspect: the commercial one, regarding the quantitative result that can be construable into market profits, mercantile benefit (not qualitative for the client). Initiated by businessmen, they are nevertheless declared “natural” and thus amenable considered such by the economy’s theorists- who don’t take note of the fundamental difference, of the same nature as the difference between (i) natural agriculture from the period of emergence of the liberal spirit in the French physiocracy around the revolutionary events of 1989 and (ii) agriculture “factory”, industrialized up to the loss of its natural roots, as shown above, which has come to ignore what is crucial for agriculture (in terms of the specific nature of birth and exploitation of biological assets, different from those synthesized industrially) and this difference is clear.

Artificial Economics

Following the revolutionary spirit during the French Revolution („*liberté, égalité, fraterninté*”), the liberal concept about the economy was based on the principles of the *divine order*. *The goods exist through creation*: through the *original creation*, and created further by „God’s blessing” of the germination, and biological growth, with the help of the – same divinely – sun, rain and earth’s juices, etc.; as well as with the contribution of work, care and know-how (competent, adequate care) of the

⁹ No one should imagine that we are considering labor with „bare hands” of the primitive man: he used tools also.

appointed (unique) „productive class”. Physiocracy focused on the *product* (or *production*) itself or substance or goods plainly created. Physiocrats did not analyze the income luring, the absorption from the environment, but focused on realizing (creating) absolute surplus. Everyone lives because of what is produced on this planet, even if some produce these *plus-product* themselves (with God’s help), while others attract (win and enjoy) parts of *the same plus-product* (even if they do not contribute to the creation, but are involved otherwise), through various changes, activities and means (including the transforming of the same goods), but starting from this fact that such goods already exist: they were created by God and by *others’* contribution (by the merit of the „productive” ones)¹⁰.

The latter’s activity appears this way as basic compared to all other human actions and activities. This way, physiocracy generated a logical delimitation between the meaning of being productive (creating or bringing contribution) and of living upon anything else other than contribution (maybe only by consumption and destruction). The principle “*Laissez faire, laissez passer; le monde va de lui meme*” that they introduced for the first time in the economy) wanted to promote the ideas of equity and exclusion of privileges, in a humanistic and anti-aristocratic logics; precisely the thought of the ‘social contract’ itself should include aspects of social responsibility and other non-selfish and extra-private features as well. The humanistic goals of their approach were obvious. In the Occident, the liberalism problem was put quite like a reaction to limitations, to absurd rules that were used for some ones’ interests (encroaching upon the good work of the facts). And from those times they were chiseled, during hundreds of years, and the spirit of order and laws respect was kept.

Originally, in the physiocrats’ thought, the above mentioned delimiting did not necessarily suppose a „conviction” of those who weren’t producing a surplus. But their unproductiveness from this economic point of view, at least *excluded their rights* (pretension) *to an economic decision, because their decision could have other motives (reasons) than the natural good progress: “le monde va de lui même”* and should go like this. In other conditions than following the mentioned principles of *creation* and *divine*

¹⁰ Their aspects were described in our paper „Marketing, Liberalist Spirit and Nature, (in *Timișoara Journal of Economics – TJE*, Vol. I Issue 4, 2008, p. 321-342)

*order*¹¹ of things (natural progress - *de lui même*), this natural good progress is obstructed, blocked. Essentially, the motives could be natural (according to natural demands) only if the people carrying them were an integrative *part of the creative process* (the process of production, in our matter), working under the grace of the (divine) laws of nature, so exclusively subordinated to the justified merit, to individual's *contribution*. It is the only foundation accepted by the basic, physiocrat liberalism, which serves as base to the economic decision-making: mission granted only to those who are constructively involved, by the nature of their contribution itself.

This is the spirit of physiocracy and of the idea of freedom - impossible without justice (equity) having reference to worth, to clear merit, to bringing real contribution.

The classical approach moved industry in the "productive class" (branch). The single argument supporting this "productivity" of industry was the impressive amount of labor involved. But Smith kept practically the most of all the other activities like "sterile".¹² Classics depicted a reality (the artificial, being overwhelmed, for the phenomenon of industrialization) based on the premises conceived by physiocrats in other conditions (natural elements economy). But for the industrialized economy (and with the generalized market from now on) they were no longer adequate: one cannot enforce the laws of nature (with the default order for succession of seasons, for example - and other purely natural elements) to an economy that persuades precisely this circuitry of this order, as its primary goal (starting with the removal of natural perishability, with changing the conditions of production, etc..) because they represent natural constraints, perceived as obstacles by the developer, limited in this way in his gains. Classic (English) economic thought was originally based on the *industry patterns* - wrongly mistaken for everything that could be considered economic business - and extended those criteria on agriculture, services etc., *excluding (from Economics) any processes not fitting those patterns*. And all this while, from the physiocrats' point of view, agriculture was the primary *human* economic activity.

¹¹ Please see further M. Manoilescu, N. Georgescu Roegen and the two main mistakes of the English economic thought.

¹² See the debate around the subject (productive vs. unproductive), the multitude of nuances and the ambiguity of the criteria system employed.

Later, for the neoclassical economics all activities are useful (if they exist). And the classical-neoclassical economics became dominant (value-related debates almost disappeared from economics). In the purpose of the extended perception of “productive” and “unproductive”¹³ (for including industry as productive), the supreme validating criterion choose by neoclassic was simply *the market*. God’s (Mother Nature’s) contribution also became to be ignored by the economists.¹⁴ And *the contribution* of the plus-product (surplus) creators *was replaced with the prices* they were paid by an extremely blur, indefinite and unreliable market – in both its “appreciation” and definition (as a deciding factor).¹⁵ The word *natural*¹⁶ itself (whose meaning referred to the divine laws) was confiscated by this “greater instance” *substituting Divinity*, to the benefit of and to justify the functioning of the market (whose results would be declared “natural”, by ignoring the means¹⁷). This thought (also) renounced to the (determining) link with the divine *order*, replaced by (allowed) lay and precepts (not subordinated to such a superior order), ultimately simple *market* effects – results of much more petty (mean) causes. In the same purpose, the only link with the causal element (*work*, in Smith’s view) was severed as well, passing completely to the very effects on the market. This represented a greater shift from the superior genuine natural order of things, like it was seen in the physiocrats’ vision. The *essence of productivism* itself, its original meaning and its authentic, genuine sense, were lost forgotten.

Although economic theory has strong influence on economic life (inter-influencing is mutual) one cannot claim that real economy should follow a certain model (theoretical), with the purpose to fit into some accepted standards established once (like pure and perfect competition model); real life evolves. But the claim should be to reflect economics as it is, and not through a (deforming) theoretic model- beautiful, maybe “comfortable” in terms of a preconceived idea or of some business interests,

¹³ Term used by Smith instead of “sterile”

¹⁴ Just a century later Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen will mention it again, trying to correct this *primordial mistake* of standard economic thought – that of *ignoring the laws of Mother Nature*.

¹⁵ Mihail Manoilescu struggled to correct this *second fundamental mistake* of English economic science (From in our paper „Marketing, Liberalist Spirit and Nature – in *Timișoara Journal of Economics – TJE*, Vol. I Issue 4, 2008, p. 321-342).)

¹⁶ God given

¹⁷ Question of capital importance in the Physiocratism and for the genuine liberalism

but that are far from reality. The theoretical model- that each way would try, cannot be but a scheme (a simplification, on some essential elements) of the extremely complex reality- must change its landmarks that are those elements from reality noted as defining (essential): according to the reality, they represent. Choosing the elements considered as essential is a process with philosophical meanings and thus with moral laden: related to education, not just scientific, but also to the conceptual structure of the individual who develops models¹⁸). As the lengths are measured against a benchmark representing thepart of the lengths of equator etc. (called "meter"), in the same way the economic acts (actions and decisions with effects, of economy) are judged by certain criteria, related to certain "measures"- either declared, either hidden, perhaps not acknowledged, but anyhow real (again, related to the conceptual formation of models developers); it follows that they must be judged multidisciplinary, including according to moral, social ecologic benchmarks(according to the knowledge based economy)- marks that are currently (in the current manner apparently amoral, but in fact anti-moral) are repudiated¹⁹.

Man-Made Economy

Under the supremacy of God (natural laws), the French physiocrats set the logics of human life (including economics) on the natural laws: this is the core and the only condition, explanation and argument for the "laissez-faire" principle: the purpose and the necessity of obeying to the governance of Mother Nature. The natural economy was practiced by the natural farmstead and the natural process would give the best results to the people who well pursued Mother Nature: the plus-product²⁰. Today not only the

¹⁸ The moral elements are ignored, by the currently dominant economy self proclaimed as being „positive”

¹⁹ The economic realities should not be conceived, understood and judged solely by the benchmark profit, which excludes the multidisciplinary and narrows the horizon, up to the destruction of the planet for reasons (justifications) of short-term gain.

²⁰ As previously said, production and productivity was conceived in the terms of real creativity. See, for instance, the explanations and comments we made on this matter in papers like „Marketing, Liberalist Spirit and Nature”, *Timisoara Journal of Economics (TJE)*, Vol. I Issue (nr.) 4, 2008, p. 321-342 and „From Georgescu-Roegen to Manoilescu. And further to Sen”, in Vol. *International Scientific Symposium "Economy, Society, Civilization"*, Bucharest, 6-7 July 2007, ASE Bucharest. But after it, English Classicism avoided the genuine criterion and became to explain its own criteria and logics: firstly the economic facts got work criterion, then the

economic theory, but economic life itself became artificial, unnatural, compared to how economic life of the human kind once was on earth: as other beings, that is in their natural frame, but humans artificialized it. For the craftsman who made sustainable shoes (and lived from customers' service quality) is has passed to pre-computed perishable production and disposable products, to the high plant productivity, whose marketing policies focus today on the "NEW" stamp (and on commercial slogans from the same category). I mean from utility, creative work, intrinsic quality (and existence by it) to superficiality, focus on forms, speculation and deception, to the consumer society (the use of substitutes, encouraging destructive consumption): the market has become final, the purpose itself, result instead of being a simple mean (broadly useful). Humans' life is itself entirely transformed in trade; the "market culture" mostly replaced all cultures. Training behavior is made through commercials; unfortunately, thinking is also formed on the same shoe tree, generating logic, rigor deficiencies, lack of foresight or ignoring long-term effects, other form of ignorance, stimulating diversion, trickery, lies, gambling, intemperance, etc.

Since the industrialization, the practice economic style (generalized)- namely the one focused on profit- is that one who required subsidization of agricultural production (intended to cover the primary human needs for food): otherwise it is no longer attractive to entrepreneurs; instead there are extremely attractive a number of other activities, from playing the stock market, to production and trade of drugs²¹, is only one of the examples on the effects of free market mechanisms; "casino economy" development has been reached, focusing on speculative business and planet degradation²². Certain of the human and social principles are put under question, because of the growing domination of the "economic moral". But under the classical and neo-classical liberalism, industrialization and avoiding Mother Nature commandments was generalized in the entire economic field and in the whole human society.

utility, and thus, market became the most determinant.

²¹ The subject is developed in our paper "Do People (no longer) Need Food? A Few Reflections on the Market Mechanisms and Their Effects "(paper translated into English by Adina Popovici), International law books, Year VI (2008): 153-158.

²² See next section

In the artificial world in which we live today, the exchange is no longer a means of diversification of consumption, but became the only way to meet any needs: the natural economy has practically disappeared, people no longer work the land to be able to eat what they produce- as they did for millennia, but to make money (for about 2 centuries²³), as much money as possible. And vice-versa in order to satisfy a need, one no longer works to cover it, instead other methods are used: in the best case²⁴ something else is being produced, in order to gain money and then, with that money, one can buy what he needs from the market. In the unnatural economy²⁵, and exists exclusively through generalized trade, can- as a result to this generalization- intervene more often (sometimes almost as a rule) deception. Namely, can be offered on the market food products with strong food spell (even boosted) with attractive characteristics(for e.g. juice box with fruits drawn on, along with written words like "peaches", with large font and in different languages)but that has nothing in common in regards to its content, with those certain natural food products. The market and meeting the needs through the market makes the mean (taste, smell, appearance) to become purpose itself; and the true purpose (covering the food needs, in the given example) is eliminated (or at least ignored, in the majority of cases) and therefore the need won't be covered anymore²⁶. The current economy represents an artificialization of human life.

Anti-human impact exerted by economic ideology ("of the market" in fact mercantile) is manifested in an obvious manner on training people (education), starting with the fundamental fact that, increasingly, people are not being prepared, but workforce (simple economic factor), in the sense that there are provided computer and technical skills, while the human

²³ Of course the period is longer for the case of words greatest retailers, that have conquered not only military but especially from an economic point of view.

²⁴ Because methods are also theft, and mendicancy and others- ignored, unfortunately by economic science, despite the great expansion of such phenomena.

²⁵ See definition of natural economy

²⁶ We reiterate our analysis from works such as "Do People (no longer) Need Food? A Few Reflections on the Market Mechanisms and Their Effects "(paper translated into English by Adina Popovici), International law books, Year VI (2008): 153-158 and" Determinants and Compulsions into Setting Priorities at Macroeconomic and microeconomic Level "(Volume of International Symposium into the Economics and Management of Transformation, Timisoara, Romania, May 11, 2002, p. 539-544).

background, spiritual, moral is increasingly ignored, and even the cultural one and general knowledge. Culture is the last chapter in the budgets of all states. Education is in its turn a business, focused on the market. It's like a denaturalization similar to the major orientation of medicine on shortening noses, enlarging breasts and sexual reassignment of some eccentric stuffed individuals, instead of treating the greatest needs- the many and oppressed. Various artificial needs have been generated (by "entrepreneurs"), induced or caused (of course for gain purposes of the provocateurs).

In the consumer societies, the share of economy need has become so small that it may no longer be of interest for the bidders. The economy of pleasure is much more advantageous. It really is one of the reasons, which contribute to the poverty existence²⁷: under the conditions where wealth exists, the offer - oriented toward profit- focuses on its conquest, on the segments owned by the customers, not on those from which small gains can be obtained, with relatively high efforts. It follows, neglecting some important categories of consumers and accentuation of polarization. Here's how the "invisible hand" of Smith (that is market mechanisms) act not in the direction of good of all, neither immediately nor eventually, nor in principle, but only in favor of the rich, least for the intermediate layers and practically against the poor.

Such tendencies were evidence for realities especially after the Reagan era (in the US) and Thatcher (in the UK) of "liberalization" (in fact "deregulation") and also at the beginning of the actual crisis: especially in Iceland, but also in the USA where everything began with deregulatory measures. One of the most fundamental errors of the deviant liberalism (deviated from the genuine one²⁸) is replacing God with the market: this means eliminating all rules, principles of order (moral and others) such that liberalization comes to be perceived (and applied, like in the above examples) exclusively against the state. Thus not only it loses sight of the effects of supreme headquarters (considered to have divine origin, by the physiocrats that initiated the laissez faire principle), but it is limited to increasing market confrontation, thus of the relative advantages of the most

²⁷ See also our paper "Correlations of Demand Marginal's to Subsistence", the Volume of International Symposium Economics and Management of Transformation, Timisoara, Romania, May 11, 2002, University of the West, Timisoara, Faculty of Economic Sciences, p. 545 -554

²⁸ See Section (Chapter) above

ones capable of imposing their own interests, at the expense of others, of the surrounding framework, of nature). In the third mentioned example (the actual crisis) the negative effects were observed, strongly, not only on the poorest (through polarization- between the 1st ones and the latter) but on the whole world (and still for the benefit of some large opportunist, including among these the rating companies in the USA, that gave best quotations/rating to some actions, generating artificial bubbles, for their benefit and towards the destruction around the world, unprecedented in size), even if once (and usually) the effects are much less extensive, this is the essence of deregulation²⁹ beyond limits: it is always favorable; remains to be seen to whom; and also at whose expense.

Interventions of such giants (private and independent) against nature and against future generations are on the agenda. Victorious today's market gains (based on current market principles victory) are more expensive, including for the entire planet for the future of mankind. The analysis of reality leads to the revelation of an important reality in the detriment of destructive individualism for the environment. "some economic thinking currents, that are not devoid of interest, shouldn't not hide a reality, namely, as shown by numerous works relating to collective action³⁰ ...that individual rationality, alone, is far from leading the collective rationality"³¹. And such findings could already be revealed from the research of Marshall and Pigou in the late 19th century. It is therefore immoral to insist on propaganda and apologetically in the narrowness of diversionist liberalism³², when the anachronism and unscientific character are obvious for too long.

Economic liberalism appears today somewhat equivalent of a purely capitalist vision, where prosperous economic life constitutes the sole reason for the future³³; or economic life should be only a basis for the broader value

²⁹ The paradox is that exactly the denigrated states were asked to save something: and they intervened but nit for saving countless destroyed destinies (natural persons with inferior social status and waged) but to help the large companies in difficulty

³⁰ The quotation is the conclusion of Mancur Olson's article jr., "But Why is Some Other rich nations poor?", *Problèmes économiques* n ° 2510-2511, 5-12 March 1997, p. 60. Quoted author refers to other works (his and of other authors).

³¹ My emphasis.

³² See paragraphs (chapters) above

³³ According to Mihai Eminescu: coming "from outside the economy," he is one of those who, since then (in his time), drew attention on the risk of narrow thinking and of losing the true

ideals (historical, religious, moral, and so on) of the nation's life. It is useful to ask ourselves, compared to those described by Eminescu, also about the today's situation. We will not insist on other concepts (although many Romanian economists give revealing theories).

The very long time

Genuine liberalism was presuming the *natural* regulation. "...Le monde va de lui même" but it was about, implicitly, only the *natural* world! This assertion, this principle of the Physiocrats was correct because it was referring to a natural world (meaning if there was a natural world). Or industrialization eventually made our world so artificial that the usual appeal to the natural logics of things becomes nonsense: preaching the slogan of liberalism – but in the perverted artificial forms, like the gain from all, from the entire environment, through the market mechanisms, made *the destruction of Mother Nature to appear like something natural!* It is not called "destruction", but "the fight of the man with Mother Nature", "the power of the technology", "the rational intervention of the man on the blind forces" and other diversionist wording.

To a large extent the profitable activities according to the market, are in fact cost-effective using the method of recording exclusively the expenses of the actant entrepreneur: failure to register the expenses of damaged individuals in general, and primarily of and of future generation and changing their character as expenses (reporting them as profits, in this case in the favor or the actant). Economy and economics should no longer be indifferent to the method of obtaining profit, its origin³⁴.

The passing time proved the sad reality that, in fact, economic development by industrialization had proportions that made resulting artificial transformations irreversibly destroying – getting out from the

essences and human goals. Focusing his analysis on a strictly national level, he sees Romanian economy as a model contrary to long-term interests of the nation, by predatory exploitation of the resources and of productive labor by public men and foreigners who have seized the country's most profitable branches of our country, with the state's support and by invoking the principle of free exchange.

³⁴ See in this regard concepts like computed productivity and servicity which we have called upon in numerous works (for example in the volume *Modern Services - A Challenge for the Economic Theory and Practice* (in Romanian), Mirton Publishing House, Timisoara, 1996

natural logics...³⁵ this industrialized and very technologies intensive process was, unfortunately, also the process of Mother Nature's destruction. Artificial³⁶ process is every day growing, with the men's artificial power, bad oriented power (involving direct destroying aspects, like atomic bombs, drugs, guns etc.).

Today we arrived at the state that we realize the "payment" mankind itself³⁷ must pay for the emphasis on trade qualities (features) and for the concern rather for adaptability to market requirements than to human superior goals³⁸. Forests are disappearing, dyes and chemical flavors are inserted in food (aiming only at growing consume - and incomes of enterprisers). Managed by the economic principles (profit concern), we arrived in the position of buying *water*³⁹ from stores and there already are first signs of buying also the *air*⁴⁰ on the market in a foreseeable future, because it is more and more breathable... Seeing that the bear conditions for life are *sacrificed for gaining more money*, people should adapt and realize *the need to change the set*. It means a knowledge concerning the impact of economic activity on the environment, the impact of mankind on Mother Nature and, implicitly on its own future on a longer time that market can appropriately manage.

Centuries pass, and the effects determined by short and medium interests and regulated on the long run only by mercantile criterion (costs, gain and profit) consist in the planet destruction. Even economic activities became more and more expensive because of the resources exhausting.

The most important is neither demand and the *utility*, for it, of the goods, on the market (like the marginalists said), nor supply and the *costs*, for it, of the goods, in production (like the classics defining of value was), nor even the mix of those two determinants (like in the Marshall's "reconciliation" between them): as we shown in our paper "Completions to

³⁵ The unnatural character arise both from the economic realities inventoried along the way (deficiencies and major effects, determined) and from the presented doctrinal arguments.

³⁶ Out from the Mother Nature capacity to naturally repair itself.

³⁷ Mankind being the author of the destruction.

³⁸ For what we mean by superior human goals, please see our article "Completions to Marshallian Out-Look, Consistent with Knowledge Based Economy". *Timisoara Journal of Economics*, no. 13(2011)., where from we use certain ideas here.

³⁹ It was free in the times of Smith and of Marshall...

⁴⁰ Another vital genuine resource

Marshallian Out-Look, Consistent with Knowledge Based Economy”, *Timișoara Journal of Economics (TJE)*, Vol. III Issue (nr.) 13, 2011. Furthering what Marshall made, economists could surpass the strictly economic angle of perceiving reality, which proved already to be also too narrow. The short run and long run must be completed with the *very long* run, taking into account different means and fields of action in the human society.

Not only the economic actors (both buyer and seller) should be taken into account, but also the others, directly involved and not involved, present and not present, the entire environment of the persons directly decisive in the trade, from the most comprehensive point of view: in the space as well as in the time dimensions. It includes the whole human society, Mother Nature, the Planet, the not-yet-born generations.⁴¹ In the theory of knowledge society, in an interdisciplinary view Europe has a big self-respect for a higher cultural level and concerns also the social matter and other concerns that are out from the pure market approach, explicit care for the environment: main goal for knowledge society and for the new economy, meaning requirements for any economic actors.

In fact the prospects of the planetary evolutions that have alarmed the mankind in the recent years are the result – much delayed, but implacable, unavoidable, however we all ignored it (and managed to delay it)⁴²- of what we, have done to ourselves through the economic activity, because of the manner of breaking our economy from the context of the planet: even elephants (for example) destroy whole areas (to promote the consumption they are interested in), and other animals produce large damage to nature, but all in the limits within which the recovery is enabled; which means they don't jeopardize their own existence. But human society – through its artificial economic developments –has left the natural.

Unfortunately, humans are the ones who damaged – and continue to destroy- not only other species (some, many, even disappeared because of humans), but also the chances of their own existence, of our future generations. It is an environmental issue, as noticed by Maltus. “God give birds in the sky just enough to survive” (Jesus Christ said). We, humans, who

⁴¹ This is a third (new) approach – by report to the two considered by Marshall (in our paper *idem*, where we demonstrate that people will react not only in the economy (on the market) or only by economic means.

⁴² Like the saying "the U.S. exits the crisis by deepening it" (Joshua)

could have covered the need of physical living- and we could have handled with the supreme and eternal- we were not satisfied with this: but wanted more, and more, destroying more and more, until nature could not recover.

Conclusions

The complex evolutions of the economy show at least the need for elaborated, complex, not only commercial logic, the need to think about superior, capable to guide (not quantitative but qualitative) – in fact to reorientate - competition toward “sports” results and not “warrior” results and of course, constructive results. Reglementation in favor of the natural and social environment are derived from the economy’s natural evolution: while, as a result to the planet’s sorrow, already translated through personal sorrow (and being disclosed through science, the perspectives, humans see where pure profit orientation leads to, and beginning to think more, on long term (hence, reglementation emerge); because they raise above the narrow approach, limited, of business, they come to rely from now on supreme values. The economic system (and the social and planetary one) must be perceived not only from a spatial point of view (extended, comprehensive) but also from a temporal dimension, in other words with the analysis and foreshadowing of the long term effects (not just those commonly targeted, in business or the “myopic” logic of the market): the scientific analysis of economics is much more demanding in terms of the analysis complexity than the managerial one.

Such superior approaches – and adequate measures- relate to the real economy based on knowledge; based on rationality, but not on the one economic limited, but on a human rationality, superior (given the principles, not only individual interests, picayune or on short-term and insensitive to side effects). Human values come to matter more than the mercantile ones. Once again with Aristotle chrematistics (at least) the superior values are those genuinely their own (natural) for the human being. Regarding the informative role, special tasks are assigned to the educational realm, on all its level and everywhere, through a necessary return of education to the intended mission of carrying the supreme values of the mankind- those who have ensured the separation of human from animals: at the level of individuals and society, the value is given by the quality of the adopted and

respected values. We note, in particular that compared to the common approaches of this issue, the policies for lessening the negative effects of some unfair conditions (allowed or aggravated by the market) must be viewed as designed to ensure, not equalization by violating the differences between individuals, but as measures aiming precisely putting value on the qualitative differences (in a productive, stimulating, benefic manner); otherwise the surplus of quality (which sees itself annihilated by the quantitative differences) decreases its entrepreneurial spirit. Leaving things to the mercy of chance and to the arbitrary interference of the big and strong from a financial point of view, in lack of care to ensure a fair and moral balance between qualities and final results, between efforts and general living standards, the inclination to work, toward economic activity, can be discouraged and oriented towards what it shouldn't and against humanity (drugs, weapons of mass destruction etc. various forms of fraudulent businesses and criminality, up to terrorism). A reinstatement closer to the equitable, of the dawning data and of the conditions for ongoing deployment⁴³, has a stimulating role for the economy, and in addition, a formative role (educational in benefic ways, human, superior) for the long shot (individual, social, cultural, universal).

References

- [1] Barde P., *Économie et politique de l'environnement*, Editura PUF, Paris, 1992
- [2] Barret S., *Economic Development and Environmental Policy*, FAO, 1996
- [3] Băcescu Marius and Fota Dyonisus, *The Economic Crisis in Romania's 2009* (in Romanian). Bucharest: Universitară Publishing House, 2009

⁴³ For example, the underprivileged areas, should be favored: to the qualities of the agents in question conditions for manifestation should be created, similar to the others, of those which are not underprivileged. Because not all economic agents and not all the inhabitants of a underprivileged area, for example (where they were given to live) are guilty its underprivileged character. As not all people are guilty of the destructive evolutions for the planet generated by the economic activity

-
- [4] Brown L.R., *Eco-economy. Creating an Economy for Our Planet* (in Romanian), Tehnică Publishing House, Bucharest, 2001
- [5] Dăianu, Daniel, *Where goes Capitalism? The Economic Crisis, the Going of the Ideas, Institutions* (in Romanian), Polirom Publishing House, 2009
- [6] Friedman, Thomas L., *Lexicus and the Olive Tree*, Polirom Publishing House, 2008
- [7] Friedman, Thomas L., *The Earth is Flat. Short History of the 21st Century* (in Romanian), Polirom Publishing House, 2007
- [8] Gadrey, Jean. *Adieu à la croissance. Bien vivre dans un monde solidaire*. Paris: Les petits matins/Alternatives Économiques, 2010
- [9] Gadrey, Jean and Gallouj, Faïz (Edited by). *Productivity, Innovation and Knowledge in Services*, Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar, 2002
- [10] Gallouj, Faïz and Djellal, Faridah (Edited by). *The Handbook of Innovation and Services. A Multi-disciplinary Perspective*. Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA, USA: , Edward Elgar, 2010
- [11] Georgescu-Roegen, Nicolas, *Entropy Law and Economic Process* (in Romanian), The Publishing House of the National Bank, 2009
- [12] Giarini, Orio and Mircea Malitza, *The double helix of learning and work*, UNESCO-CEPES, Bucharest, 2003
- [13] Giarini, Orio and Walter Stahel, *The Limits to Certainty – Facing Risks in the New Service Economy*, 2nd revised edition, by, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993

-
- [14] Jivan, Al., *Servicity – More than Productivity in Service Economy* (in Romanian), Sedona Publishing House, Timisoara, 2000
- [15] Jivan, Alexandru, „Performance in a different view: an indicator of ethical performance”, in 4-ème Colloque sur le Gouvernement d’entreprise: *Performance et Problemes d’Etique*, Faculté Warocqué, Centre de Recherche Warocqué, HEC Montréal, Chaire de Gouvernance et Juricomptabilité, Mons, Belgique, 9-10 mai 2005
- [16] Mayumi, Kozo, *The Origins of Ecological Economics: The Bioeconomics of Georgescu-Roegen*, Routledge Publishing House, London and New York, 2001
- [17] Popescu, C.; Ciucur, D.; Popescu, I., *The Tranzition to Human Economy* (in Romanian), Economica Publishing House, Bucharest, 1996
- [18] Popescu, Constantin, *Rationality and Hope. The Paradigm of the Whole Living* (in Romanian), Renaissance Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006
- [19] Hernando De Soto, *The other path*, (in Romanian), SEDONA Publishing House, Timisoara, 1999
- [20] Stiglitz, Joseph, Amartya Sen, Jean-Paul Fitoussi, *Vers de nouveaux systèmes de mesure*, Eds. Odile Jacob, Paris, 2009
- [21] Zakaria, Fareed, *The Post-American World* (in Romanian), Polirom Publishing House, 2009