

ECONOMICS CANNOT BE ELSE THAN A SOCIAL DISCIPLINE (I)

The Newtonian Mechanics had such a mirage on all the cognitive disciplines (as well as on the theoretical philosophy – see the Kantianism), so Economics could not make an exception. Consequently, Economics has developed for the most part as a social mechanics, by „finding” its own invariances, in order to appear as close as possible to the physics. Even today there are many economists (or coming from other fields of knowledge) which continue to ask that Economics remain a physics (see, for example, the barbarism *Econophysics*). Fortunately, in last certain decades, there were insistent appeals to Biology (evolutionism) in order to reconstruct the philosophical ground of a new Economics (I would consider the behaviourism only a palliative to the mechanical model of the economic theory, because its ignorance about the causality in the economic action). However, this is not sufficient. The main reason for this incompleteness is a too pale presence of the social and historical framework of the economic life. Below I'll provide some reflections on this issue.

- (1) The economic action arises in connection with the biological survival only. So, the life-linked resources scarcity is not the basis of economic action. Even when the life-linked resources weren't rare, the economic action was needed in order to ensure the surviving (I would say the entropic exchange between the humans and the nature is the real basis of the economic action; but, such an entropic exchange is not at all conditioned by the life-linked resources scarcity). Consequently, the economic action was present in the human beings life still from their beginnings.
- (2) The question now is if the social feature of the economic action is necessary. Logically, such an „ingredient” is not necessary, at least so long the life-linked resources weren't rare. Of course, after the threshold that marked the life-linked resources scarcity is exceeded, such a social (more exactly, a societal – NB: the social term should be used for the non-human beings which have a non-solitaire life, while the societal term should be used for the human beings life) nature of the economic action becomes logically necessary. Historically, however, because the human nature as well as because the life preservation need against the natural dangers, the human beings formed, still at their beginnings, groups (so, societal structures) inside which the economic action was designed and performed.
- (3) So, it seems the societal character of the human life was generated both by the economic action needs, and by the societal non-economic action needs (NB: both for non-human creatures and for humans, the biological reproduction doesn't imply the sociality; not the education, in its basic elements, doesn't require the sociality, which can be made also outside of the sociality). In any case, in what regards the general life of the humans, the economic action requires the societal context.
- (4) The sociality necessarily requires the historicity. By historicity I understand a structural, functional, and (in some extent) a causal determination of the present by the past. Where the sociality is, the historicity is also. So, the sociality and the historicity are semantically equivalent (either it is talked about the non-human social creatures, or about the humans). However, such an equivalence must be examined attentively, since there are some areas of non-interferences between them (or, area of independency or autonomy). For example, the natural selection can provide historicity without requiring the sociality (although, of course, the natural selection operates inside the species). However, while the historicity is inferred from the sociality, the

reverse is not true: we can have historicity outside of the sociality. As consequence, as the mankind is necessarily associated with the sociality, it must be associated necessarily too with the historicity.

- (5) Based on the above mentioned, Economics must be based on (no more, but not less) five pillars (in this logical order): biologically, psychologically, socially, historically, and linguistically (BPSHL model). As it is well known, there were many approaches of the economic process within the social and historical framework (including Marxism), while recent incursions in Biology (for evolutionism, especially) and in psychology (namely the cognitive psychology – see the behaviourism) have arose, but the orthodox Economics (that is, the neoclassical model) hardly retrieve such a perspective. As results, Economics has developed, in its main philosophical coordinates rather outside of the sociality and the historicity. Increasingly more, this direction is proved to be wrong, even from a narrow point of view, namely the prediction power. But, of course, the crucial loss of the neoclassical model of Economics is the explanation. Prediction is possible either based on true explanation, or based on fictive one (see the Friedman's suggestion), but the certainty is provided only by the true explanation. In my opinion, there is no chance to find the economic explanation outside the five pillars before evoked. Among them, the sociality and the historicity are the least considered in our days in order to rebuild the Economics.
- (6) To note that there are certain works, older or more recent, trying to restore the social determination in the humans behaviour, especially from the communicative action (including the linguistic competence and performance), although the linguistic pillar could be considered as an effect of the sociality and historicity. However, since the language already gained a great autonomy and self-organizing capacity, it must be listed as a distinct pillar aimed to rebuild Economics, because, even inside the societal framework, it exerts an important causal role, especially regarding the cooperation and the synergy.
- (7) Only by integrating the proposed five pillars in its reconstruction can Economics become what its founders wished: a moral philosophy of the human action. In contrast to von Mises (see, for example, his work *The Human Action*) I don't believe Economics should be a simple praxeology, (i.e., a discipline outside of the moral judgement) but more than that, namely a social-historical discipline, aimed at to describe, to explain and, as far as possible, to predict (otherwise, rather normatively) the human action in the economic field. Taking into consideration the five pillars above evoked, it seems such a discipline could integrate almost completely the human person (not the simple human individual), and for this reason I sustained for a long time it should be named Sinnomics, not Economics.

In this first part of the theme regarding the societal „destiny” of Economics, I have talked about the ontological reasons which require Economics must regain its statute of social discipline. In the part two of the theme, in the next meeting, I'll talk about the methodological reasons for such a statute.