Antithetic Foundations of Economics

Marin DINU
Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies
dinumarin@ase.ro

Abstract. This paper aims at decrypting the manner in which the foundations of Economics as a science and the meanings of the relevant explanatory formulas are being shaped. My analytical endeavor focuses on understanding the peculiarities of what is referred to as the object of study of the science known as Economics, an academic synthesis of concept-related breakthroughs regarding economicity. The explicit purpose of this analysis is to identify perennial benchmarks in economic cognition whereby this ensures its consistency. The implicit purpose is to shape a cognitive model in line with the specifics of the conceptual universe of Economics, as well as with the sources of the economic realities that are subject to a sui-generis relativism. The primary benefit of this endeavor consists in systemizing the conceptual prospects with an antithetic nature that allow for the explanations of the state of economic rationality and generate the understanding of what the source of economicity is and how it behaves. As such, the conclusions are marked by the stringent need of more precisely defining economic knowledge in order to match the changing nature of economic reality, as an expression that embraces the meeting point of two ontological vistas that are methodologically separated by some theories: human nature and human condition. Economics as a science thus features, apart from a conceptual substrate that needs to be spotted, an ontological background that needs to be revealed. The role played by this background appears to be most frequently ignored. The joint identification of both direct and contextual determinants for a sensitive area of humankind, i.e. the economy, is a direction to be followed by the royal path of rational knowledge.
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Introduction

What we understand as economic science is a coherent set of antithetic conceptual benchmarks with an explanatory function for the state of rationality observed between action-oriented intentions motivated by measurable needs and consequences. From this perspective, economic science observes the generic scheme of any rational knowledge formula rated as a science from Enlightenment onwards and is based on the cognitive algorithms validated by the cause-effect determinist principle. The pragmatic option, confirmed by focusing on the final result in its specific wealth version, awarded Economics the epistemic comfort of methodological conformity, on the one hand, and the benefit of de-subjected, rational knowledge of things as such, on the other hand. In a “placenta-like” physicalist fashion ensured by natural philosophy, economic cognition had to bear an illegitimate offspring of human condition rationalized by abandoning human nature. But the genetic heritage cannot be annihilated by the exclusive taking into custody of the illegitimate offspring. The absolute rationality of homo œconomicus has always proved a typical assumption of mono-parental mythology, since the texture of the economic universe reveals the leitmotiv of the heir’s double descent.

The entire conceptual architecture of Economics is based on the genetic signs of mating. In fact, these constitutive signs make up a genuine substrate of the epistemic constitution of Economics. It is the substrate that ensures the specificity of economic knowledge, which stands out by its antithetic configuration arising directly from the dual origin of cognitive genes. Things were consolidated by the fruitful communion between human nature (adventure-prone, vagrant and whimsical, egoistic and imprecise) and human condition (stable, calculated and real, pragmatic and dedicated). The substrate of Economics has double fundaments: the irrational fulgurations of human nature and the imposing materiality of human condition. Even in the cases where the original sources are lost, centring Economics upon the strength of human condition elements (e.g., Labour Economics, Product Economics or Money Economics) finds out that the sense of solutions to the yield problems also pertains to the ineffable condition of human nature, and even goes beyond that. The antithetic constitution of economicity signifiers is organic in nature and any detachment of one or another of the epistemic foundations from the viable whole only tampers the essence.
The economicity signifiers are the result of the unification of antithetic descriptors of human nature and human condition by the rules of the body. This natural feature expresses the understanding of confluences between real and abstract actions, between the material world and the ideas’ world. It is in this particular way of setting economicity that the eternal openness of its finality to either gain or loss should be sought. In a formula spearheading free will, economicity is a fine tuning between rational and irrational determinants of humankind.

Economicity is at the same time calculation and hazard. As a calculation, it aims either at a rational combination of the factors underlying predetermined finality or at preserving the target functions, in line with its foundation: human nature or human condition. In the former case, it is marked by the regulatory approach, while in the latter case by the positive approach. Moreover, in the former case, it is a science similar to physics, while in the latter case it borders on metaphysics. Economicity has a double constituency, as it comprises both empiric and ineffable parts. It is equally a handy object and an expectation of the object to materialize.

The fate of Economics of being driven by the will to be part of the glorious platoon of natural philosophy opened *en fanfare* by Physics, but also
by the “call of the blood” that reminds of the subjectivity that generated it as a form of reason, closes within itself its very status as an identity troubled science. To ignore economic cognition underlying on counterforts annihilates the chance of Economics to become a full-fledged science responsible for a dual issue whose solutions should consider the double perspective where it applies. Economics, the identity of which derives from the confluence between human nature and human condition, focuses on the inter-subjectivity interested in trading yield-related conditions as utilities judged as antithetic benchmarks.

Without this double-perspective foundation of causes, intents or prerequisites and effects, consequences or conclusions, Economics becomes void, turning into geometrical imagination or ideological patchwork.

The conceptual dualism underlying Economics also encompasses the fact that these assumptions per se, for example, should be the result of a mix of origin-related perspectives, and consequences should be explained in a binary rational-irrational fashion. For instance, assumptions should have meanings in both the conceptual horizons of human condition and that of human nature, and consequences should have meanings in both linear and stochastic order.

The manner in which economic knowledge has shaped itself throughout centuries testifies to its dual perspective character (Dinu, 2010) in the form of an antithetic substrate. The object of study of Economics is related to this double reinforced pattern: natural and artificial, subject-related and object-related, ideal and functional, conceptual and action-driven, individual and social, viable and reliable, process-related and final. It is about a cognitive balance between antithetic signifiers that render Economics the status of a science responsible for the reality extant both beyond Physics, i.e. artificial matters, and within Physics, such as random, selection risk and the uncertainty of material rationality.

It is particularly this physical extra-territoriality that makes Economics a hybrid cognitive entity, seen both as the result of rational thinking, implying measurable objects, and as the state of existence of the weightless forces of the art in attaining the target at a faster pace.

Within the universe of Economics, the origin of things in a solely human-like manner is liveliness, the single entity responsible for a ceaseless big bang. Within the universe of Economics, there are permanent beginnings, whose evolution is driven by causes in inter-subjective contexts. In Economics, the observer observes himself as a force of gravity bringing together intents (inertia) and consequences.
Economicity occurs once at a time in both semi-spheres crystallized by substance and thinking, thus revealing its two-tier structure: subject-related and object-related, conceptual and action-driven, etc. Intermediate states have a continuous translation between the space coordinates of economicity, on the one hand, understanding-explanation-cognition and, on the other hand, labor-matter-action.

This texture of transcending significances pinpoints the breakdown of economicity vis-à-vis the other components of the global social system. Yet, above all, it shows the need to protect the field of economicity from interfering with other coordinates or takings into custody of these coordinates, such as politics.

Even the antithetic foundations of economicity that have their peers in other areas of humankind, such as the individual-social couple which in politics comes in the form of formulas to manage the adversity of individual interest and collective interest, retains in the inter-pole Economics-economy complexity the value of an indestructible complementarity between human nature and human condition. Deep down inside, economicity is organically non-ideological.
Understanding the substrate of Economics conceptualization is all the more relevant as deficits build up. The shortfalls arise directly from methodological purification attempts, as they appear now, amid the ongoing economic crisis. Fundamentalist prospects have always generated cognitive deficits manifest at times of crisis in particular. Economic crises proved to be
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the natural expression of puritans’ methodological options, especially those developing ideological approaches. To return to the reflection on the nature of Economics fundamentals is not only the duty of the economics researcher responsible for the fate of the science he serves, but also an emergency of avoiding the stroke looming its status as a science. As such, explaining the manner in which the meanings of antithetic fundamentals of economicity take shape becomes a principle.

Below is a description of the antithetic fundamentals of economicity and especially the challenges arising in the context of the economic crisis for the epistemic constitution of Economics.

**Natural – Artificial**

The distinct cognitive methods are largely absent in the economics researchers’ skills.

Ever since becoming autonomous from the original theoretical body of metaphysics (which occurred, according to common knowledge, in its rationalist propensity that generated the Enlightenment breakthroughs referred to as *natural physics*), Economics bore with it, for operational purposes, the cells of the original cognitive body. In other words, it sought to rescue the benefits of the umbilical dependence within the time and the space destined to its own evolution, thus endangering the finitude of the prodigal-son-like adventure of knowledge (as the fattened calf could no longer be needed!).

This genuine epistemological dependence of Economics to the host body of *natural philosophy* where it took shape entailed, for survival, methodological transfers, from Physics in particular. They have constantly fuelled the rule of treating economicity, for instance, as the physical room of producing wealth, a novel isotropic substance being the space of yield-certified rationality. Understanding economicity as the yield-related functionality of the wealth mechanism (a kind of clock world of materialism of Economics) is the prime evidence of the transfer, and among the final ones there is the virtualization of producing value added (a structure dominated by conventions in which speculation not only dematerializes the triple dimension of human condition, but also removes it as a source of economicity). Without exaggerating, it can be proved that nearly all conceptual prospects of Economics have crystallized in the melting pot of the laws governing the physical world.

Any transposition of cognitive images from *natural philosophy* is however susceptible of inadequacy at a totally different content, including the fact that the random factor, pertaining to the essence of entities naturally endowed with sense and emotions whose behaviours are covered by Economics
as a science, fails to obey the determinist linear relationships. The intervention of conscience in the economic equation makes time a relative measure whose physical precision is thwarted by the lack of determinism of the subjective space. Moreover, the rational relation between input and output is denied by the sway of unintentional consequences on performance. Beside the measure, the elements of economicity are not homogeneous, above all since they generate processes whose finality is contrary to the combined elements, as they belong to another world than the natural one.

The substantial consequence of economicity is the world of artificial things, with an ephemeral order, run by immaterial forces of subjective projections and inter-subjective compensation of individual interests, even symbolic claims. Economic rationality is manifest, on the one hand, in some kind of haziness made of immaterial complexes (originating in the order of viability) and material sets (justified by the order of reliability). On the other hand, it becomes a whole in a different universe, where things are created by conventional laws which tend, by excessive multiplication, to dislocate all that is natural, and Nature itself.

This synthesis of viable elements (belonging to life) and reliable elements (belonging to physical forces, with a material nature) turning into artificial (of a conventional origin, with geometric, unnatural features) renders economicity an ontological identity and, consequently, epistemological distinction. Its separation from the methodological prospects of Economics is doubtlessly justified both in terms of breakdown (since its conceptual universe pertains to human nature) and action (the targeted order serves the yield-related performances of human condition).

The epistemological distinction introduced by Economics (different from anthropology) refers particularly to decrypting the universe of human nature in its competition-related stances, with inter-subjective consistency, to appropriate the artificial Concrete reinforcing the pillars of human condition consisting in labor, work and action.

The state of economic rationality is a special universe where forces are amassed at a high level (meaning something completely different!), via manifestation or their conscious use in a transactional formula deriving from an exceptional function generating artificial things. Due particularly to this issue, although any natural law explaining the physical world does not become ineffective in principle, measurable influences can be ignored while configuring the explanatory model of economicity.

The difficulty of the measurement belongs to the process-like nature of economicity, not to the artificial things substantiating the final result of the state of economic rationality. The ambition of remaining in the universal rule of
measurement, which is conveyed to Economics by natural philosophy, mutilates the operational whole by removing what cannot be measured, i.e. human nature. In the general explanatory model of Economics, human nature boils down to quantity, it is viewed as a resource that is measurable (since it can be consumed) and treated conventionally as being equivalent to the material component, as part of reliability.

This equivalent relation between an animated force (human nature) and the stances of elements of human condition ensure a possible resort to mathematic methods just like in Physics, but the cognitive tragedy occurs inevitably because *reductio ad absurdum* simply annihilates the universe of economicity. The price for the abuse of cognitive analogies is so high that Economics is no longer considered a science.

In fact, Economics is a science, but different from either Physics or Mathematics. It is not a science focusing on the forces linked to the origin of phenomena such as mass, energy, light or magnetism, neither a science of abstract conventions logically built and validated.

The determinist symmetry is rational for Economics along with the cause-effect asymmetry, in the same way consistency is irrelevant in the absence of time irreversibility, homogeneity is not substantial but can be accepted as a version of the yield-related state, obviously as a nonlinear function dependent on transactions in inter-subjective contexts. Finally, the balance of process-like fundamentals is questioned by the imbalance of forces involved in the process of economicity and by the uncertain quantitative stability of the final product that should properly meet expectations within the business cycle. The state of economic rationality remains a trend via the clash of rational and irrational factors, with intertwined influences of specific dualities such as *viable – reliable, ideal – functional, processual – final, subject-related – object-related* a.s.o.

Adding to these is the *natural and artificial* combination in the universe of economicity, the support of cognitive autonomy and the reason behind Economics imitating the method of Physics and economics researchers daring to abandon it.

**Subject-related – Object-related**

The inter-subjective nature of these processes is still avoided when it comes to the determinant of economic cognition.

Frankly speaking, the process as such (as an expression of natural being) and its largely subjective contents are no preferential benchmarks of the conceptual distinction of economicity problems. Within a continuity meant to substantiate – through methodological analogy – the same scientific origin,
Economics employed the same approach as Physics (which in turn proceeded as Mathematics did) in defining its own universe as being dominated by conventional, abstract rules.

On this path the classic logical rules are resorted to, as they are solidly anchored in the habitual deductions from abstract assumptions, although in the case of Economics the algorithms of situation logics, of approximating the truth value in inter-subjective contexts would become operational. By replacing the perspectives, economic cognition earns through fraud, namely forgery and use of forgery, its right to the Fortress of Sciences, thus removing from the conceptualization equation its very specifics, i.e. the transactions-related processes, with an inter-subjective contents. In the resulting hinterland, Economics appropriates the function of a science of the possible grounded on geometrical assumptions, developing assertions in a purely conventional and, therefore, perfect order.

Of course, the process of imitation would not be so serious if it had not been never-ending. The perseverance of Economics in conceptualizing what is depleted by the ineffable substance of subjectivity has classified it as a subordinated science, a sort of physics of social objects, if not some kind of magic of the recipe to obtain the essence of materiality, namely wealth. It is common knowledge that, following this methodological and epistemological option, Economics is applied as a science of calculation and wealth amount. In this formula, it studies from a determinist perspective the correlation of influences between objective and object-related factors, as perceived in their temporal appearances of statistical indicators. Economics thus earns its capacity as a derivate science of phenomena and results.

The likely (in ontological terms) and likelihood (in epistemological terms) penetrated Economics both as phenomena and abstract matters, thereby substantiating the introduction of uncertainty in the resulting hazard. The relative approach resorted to in economic cognition has a bizarre nature since it is not defined in relation to the subject, which is left out of account, as if phenomena were not caused by a man’s cognition and action limits.

Inconsistency is both logical and epistemological since, on the one hand, it differentiates substitutes for reality such as statistical appearances and, on the other hand, what is largely not determined by physical causes is over-objectified. Both the result-object and the indefinite object-related intent have nothing in common with economic reality, which is subjectively generated in a complex form, as an ongoing cohabitation of objects converted purposefully and of intents traded in a gradual process on the substrate of harmonized discernment.
This process, seen as an economic universe, should not remain a no man’s land since it represents the very essence of economicity, a trade-related result of yield-related limited intents. It bound us to keep the methodology within the subject-related benchmarks of economic universe, to realize the inter-subjective causalities defining certified assertions via algorithms of contextual logics. In process-related Economics, inter-subjectivity is object-related, shaping the context of the transaction to validate the return. The subject-related feature is embedded in the object-related one, as life is contained by the natural.

The expression of the subject-related feature in economicity is the very human nature. The relation between the final result of economicity and the subject-related feature shape the substantial relation between human condition and human nature. The deep substrate of this relation is founded on the energy generated by human nature, materializing in labor, work and action.

If we admit this vision, we find the solution to the axiom that everything involving man is implicit in process-related terms: not only human nature, but also human condition is accessible via cognition as an implicit process. The genuine end result of economicity is human condition as a gradual fulfillment formula. However, in an old-established habit we treat human condition also through its material effects, i.e. the process state is cancelled to reduce it to what replaces the process, namely the end result, the statistical indicator. Statistical prudence of the result as the essence opens the cognition gap through appearances, a reversal of the relations between process and phenomenon in explaining economicity.

The expulsion from the economic cognition universe of anthropogenic determinants, including the inter-subjective conditionality of the rationality state, opens up the imaginative way of the possible with irrational-like weightings. The recourse to speculation, for instance, and to externalities is the result of the object-related conventional, founded on a possible de-rationalization or limited rationalization (ceteris paribus!) in Economics.

The entire history of economic knowledge is, in fact, saddled with solutions to rationality problems at a yield-related scale. They are valid in the perimeter theoretically defined by extremely restrictive assumptions. Ecological research works show, with compelling arguments, that, without exceptions, Economics certified the yield-related performance by ignoring some often huge costs left in the loss account of the natural environment. Somehow even on the verge of the state of rationality, Economics established as a universal procedure the preponderance of appropriating value added by a factor in the equation of economicity, namely capital, while the other key factor attached to the subject-related feature gets the surplus.
Minimalizing the subject-related feature until being excluded from consequences does not have, despite some visions, only ideological grounds, and in fact we speak of something totally different, i.e. an inadequate epistemological positioning of Economics in regard to its object of study which is not wealth and its distribution. Economics is a social science, belonging to inter-subjective processes ultimately resulting in wealth. Economics studies mankind in its state of rationality, it is a science of human nature behaviors given the restrictions of the human condition.

In order to elicit human nature, statistics developed no instruments, since in fact human nature cannot be rationally expressed by resorting to appearances. Human nature is neither probable, nor a statistical median. What philosophy teaches us is that ontology is befriended with the world of whole integers and that it gets restless when it is denied (in a teleological way) from bringing everything to the unit or a multiple thereof. The theory of fractals, for instance, established as the statutory law of the real the process-like propensity of natural towards the whole, being limited in scale by a unit, a double or a triple of a unit. Only what is conditioned by human nature in achievement degrees, similarly to fractals, namely the material stances of labor, work and action (the forms of the finality of human condition) are subject to achievement probability and statistical calculation.

Economicity is the road to finality, the pursuit of compromise between the inner expressions of the object-related feature. Whereas, centering cognition not on economicity, but on statistic kinematics of the final object, is equivalent to altering the status of social science of Economics, its conversion, if not in technology, surely in the science of commodities. The economic truth is objective insofar as inter-subjectivity becomes objective, and thereby the space of economic rationality gets filled, or not, with traded certainties. The economic truth is triple-faceted: it gets validated as a process-like finality via the object, is a yield-related function for the material component of economicity and represents the cohesive form of human nature antinomies.

Statistical phenomena appear, hence, beyond the essence of economicity. This is the truth that speaks for itself, since existence cannot be appearance or an approximation of appearance. Everything that is related to phenomena can be probabilistic, especially as an expression of phenomena via statistical indicators (i.e. approximation by approximation). Just for fun, one can say that the essence of the process can be written, while the form of the process can only be rewritten (by copying).

The economists’ lack of perseverance as to their science fundamentals entails the risk of marginalizing the social function they pretend having
especially at times of crisis. In fact, this cannot be grasped as a phenomenon, neither overcome via solutions derived from statistical appearances.

**Ideal – Functional**

The conceptual fixation of Economics in the theory of equilibrium (as an equally ideal and functional state) does not differ from the manner in which Physics and Cosmology had remained, until a few centuries ago, captive to Aristotelian materialism and Ptolemaic sphericity respectively. Mankind has immersed its ignorance into the sufficiency of the ideal, building structures and relations in which the functional principle was only accepted if the path of *sui-generis* balancing between the demands of the authority (including the scientific one) and their tacit acceptance by the remaining majority was made possible.

Equating perfection to the attainment of the ideal form, and performance to striking a balance, pushed Economics into the obsession for growth. Its sense was understood as a progressive compensation – over large time spans – between gains and losses. Somewhat scholastically, starting from its very birth, the theory of economicity has conformed to the precepts of the universe put into motion by the mechanics of infallible cyclicity. The control of surpluses was, obviously, the attribute of the authority (in its various expressions) and it eventually ended in identifying itself to the money-managing power.

The rule of the mechanic equilibrium generating trends towards the ideal shaped Economics as a science by way of transferring methodological perspectives, especially from Physics. It is known that the rationality of the physicalist universe is partial, the idea of the primary impulse with regard to the movement of bodies being accepted as coming from outside the system. Economics founded it dynamic universe in the same manner, with finality being the trend-setting expression for the ideal equilibrium and the prime cause coming from a nebulous nature, destined to self-generate and to induce self-regulation in the functioning of the wealth-producing mechanism.

The metaphor of the invisible hand inculcates this vision. It means that Economics has constructed a mechanism by which it – invariably – gives solutions which cumulate the surpluses of wealth in favor of the part which holds the right (as being born from the ideal) to pretend for the equilibrium to be favorable to it.

The fixation of Economics in the ideal is completely transparent in this crisis when it materializes into a crisis of solutions. In fact, the perception of Economics as an explicative formula for the (short-term) fluctuations in the contribution of factors to the infallible (long-term) growth does not differ from
Newton’s perspective when he had to explain why the universal clock does not stop. Cognitive tolerance allows the cohabitation of the rational and the irrational, while Economics shows excessive tolerance in its explanatory model – whose result is the equivalence between the desirable ideal and the functional possible.

The crisis of solutions originates in this very tolerant composition of desirable things and functional things, which awards Economics the quality of a self-sufficient dogma. According to a somewhat Middle-age formula, its axioms related to functionality may be regarded as assumptions that explain alternative patterns to the ideal state. This vision, which in cosmology has denied the sun the central position for about 1,500 years, denies in Economics the structuring function of man and the anthropic determinism of the functional in favor of the ideal – Olympus-like – consistency of the market. Ideality as a self-sufficiency of the mechanism of economicity plays down any solution to the real situation, to that which truly functions in an anthropic context. At most, the solution could be accepted as a working hypothesis, in order to imagine intervention as possible when covering losses, because it cannot be accepted for the ideal stance, which pretends to self-replicate its performance.

This heavenly vision on Economics tolerates the earthly competition for solutions only because it accepts it as an oblation of the anthropic ignorance on the inexpugnable altar of economic ideality. The final form of unassailable ideality was in Economics the natural right of master of economicity held by the financial market together with its first born (from its alliance with speculation), that is the banking system.

The crisis of solutions is the perverted expression of the intention for conservation and, after the recession, of the performance in redistributing the added value, the appropriation ideal being now equally divided between speculation and rationality. Any solution which would remove the absurdity of this partisan ideality is categorically rejected. This proves that reality is being disregarded, ideality being defined as opposed to functionality no matter the costs, especially the social ones. For no other reasons, the solutions for socializing losses are accepted tacitly and the solutions for settling the own surpluses are vehemently rejected.

The ideality of economicity is saved by sacrificing what runs on a rational impulse: the real economy.
Conceptual – Actional

Of all the types of conceptualizations that have been developed from Enlightenment onwards none has been as debatable as Economics. A rational explanation pertains to the strong perception of a correspondence deficit between the expectations generated by theory and the findings arising from the real life.

In fact, the conceptual economicity is not enough to devise rational benchmarks for all the fluctuations in the field of action for the substantial forces of economicity, basically those expected to occur on the precise path from assumptions to effects, as they are presumed by consistency. In a relevant unavoidable form, Economics is at loggerheads with economy, i.e. its conceptual order appears not to match (nor overlap with) the order of economicity as a real action.

This manner in which the meanings of rational thinking are asymmetrically arranged versus those of empirical data, trending towards a disjunctive sufficiency, originates in the attempt of assigning Economics a function deemed as the certification of its forging as a mature science: to make predictions. But forcing its entry to the Fortress of Rational Knowledge imitated the model that has steadily aroused fascination: prophetical thinking. As such, Economics developed an entire tradition of over-mundane projections, actually refining the belief that the making of economicity merely comes from the idea, as economic reality is nothing but the materialization of ideas.

It is beyond any doubt that we speak of a boldness that not always has a bad end, although not always a happy one. Anyhow, except for the economic ideas adjusting to utopias (some of them even time resistant), there is no conclusive evidence about the success. But the field of experiments had already been opened. The semi-darkness of this metaphysical inversion was penetrated, naturally, by the extremely fast vehicles of faith.

In a formula that synchronizes with the acquisitions of scientist visions, but the other way round somehow, Economics also supported the dichotomy of epistemological prospects, wandering on the path of regulatory theoretical structures and moving cautiously towards positive measures. It appears that the force of attraction of ideological beliefs led to this odd situation and the theories are adversely structured in terms of response, particularly for macroeconomic issues. The background ensured by the antinomies of societal governments, stuck in the exclusive patterns of indirect government (as suggested by monetarism) and direct government (inspired by Keynes) shaped the ideologically opposite ways pursued by Economics and the formulas underlying social experiments that marked economic action.
It must be generally found that, in case of operating with theoretical theses in practice, the state of economicity is indecisively stuck in the specifics of the two perspectives: conceptual and actional. This oddity at the level of knowledge is due to the circumstances shaping the cognitive support it resorts to: either the conceptual universe of economicity or that of solutions recommended by the shortcut of political ideology. Actually, this lack of determination of the reporting also comes from the habit of preferring the conceptual and instrumental horizon of economic policies in the real economic action. In other words, we resort to an intermediate version at the very best, although it is a deviating version from the natural acquisitions of Economics, being centered upon values and interests (not necessarily yield-related in terms of the economy) of politics.

The caesura created by tradition in the correspondence model between the conceptual hemisphere algorithms of economicity and those of its actional hemisphere is hard to pass. What makes the recovery of the substrate’s economicity difficult, as an antithetical whole also comprising the conceptual-actional alignment, is the conditioned reflex of the dependence on the patterns of Political thought and action that the two forms of shaping economicity (Economics and the economy!) have created over time. So far went this manner of understanding things that Economics produces post-Keynesian ideological theories and the economy is a plot organized with the expertise of Politics.

Somehow unexpectedly, even the instrumentalization of the space of economic rationality is made with rationality gaps that the political exercise feels it has to treat with sufficiency in order to reach its targets. Economic conceptualization becomes at best the logistic warehouse of elements Politics resorts to in fuelling the power’s chain reaction. This subordinated condition of Economics relative to the needs of practical action does not relieve it of the risk to be punished for being the scapegoat for the failure of Politics. This occurs in an aggravating form, because of its lack of responsibility for one’s own action area. Culpability arguments also take account of the fact that Economics appears to ignore that its problems have a double form, i.e. in conceptual and actional terms, and the solutions must have in turn the substance of conceptual-actional dualism. It is clear that the blame can logically be put on the part that fails to deal correctly and directly with its problems.

The frequently invoked excuse that Economics is responsible only for the significances of the primary problems concerning the three elements of human condition (labor, work, action) does not remove the incongruences arising from the explanatory models in conceptual and actional terms. The strategic self-exile in the field of current expertise and placing Economics on the management path of conceptualization and actions in local contexts, as well as
on the critics’ positions of welcoming the projection of public policies, are no evidence for assuming the specific cognitive function, but only subterfuges to conceal the epistemic failure. Of course, Economics had its heyday when, in Greek antiquity, it only used to prepare procedures responsible for household performance. Today there is no way of imagining, except for epistemic declassification, Economics as being isolated from the Agora’s idea-related unrest and its manners of understanding performance.

The curse from which Economics cannot (and even should not) get away from is, on the one hand, to set limits it had to live with for three quarters of a century and, on the other hand, to settle once and for all a gold rule in its cohabitation with Politics. What we mean here is certainly to define what and how much does Economics itself pretend it resolves and especially how much does it allow Politics to expand its pretences of being a designer and manager of the actional space of economicity. The key to the success of Economics in this genuine renegotiation of convention regarding its epistemic composition is to put the antithesis between human nature and human condition at the centre of cognitive concerns and explanatory models. And this is only because animal spirits haunting human nature can no longer be left to be managed by someone else, as experience shows that Politics fuels solely their irrational propensity, being deprived of the cost-cutting body.

The fundamental antithesis between conceptual and actional reveals cognitive protocols that are compromised in the Economics-Politics relationship, a mutual mix of elements that led to the weakening of the covalent link with the anthropic substance of their worlds. The most surprising facet of Politics’ intervention in economicity mechanisms is to highlight the emergency of reconstructing the manner in which knowledge is founded in what was to become social sciences, including Economics. The endeavour consists in overcoming the materialistic obsession in social sciences, the excess of validating the truths by the rule of mathematics-prone formalism and the temptation to resort to the facilities of methodological “loans” from experimental sciences in order to finance social schemes. At the same time, Politics has enough reasons to accept surrendering the abusive right over economicity; somehow it even awaits getting rid of the responsibility of having drawn on wealth as an argument for the rationalized capacity of controlling the freedoms.

The ongoing crisis is a painful and merciless testimony to the inevitable restoration of order antithetically circumscribed to the conceptual and actional specific to economicity, but also the rational sign of Economics’ opportunity to revert to its basic tools, the astral hour of resuming the negative inverse links between economic thinking and action.
Individual – Social

Of all the antithetic constituents of Economics, the cognitive perspective individual-social has and will have the greatest potential to generate non-scientific disputes. The particular fate of the spiritual adventure of this category couple resides in the sizes of the clash, which have reached staggering heights through antinomy-based theories such as the theory of capitalism and that of socialism. It is interesting to note that in the original theoretical body of Economics the individual-social relationship ensured, in an upbeat approach, the basic structure of understanding the manner in which the regulating mechanism of economicity, i.e. the market, is shaped and operational. Somehow salutary, Economics enters the Fortress of Science in a compliant, innocent and chiefly natural way.

Unfortunately, Economics grappled with persistent disturbances of its conceptual universe at a faster pace than other non-experimental sciences, and such turbulences have gradually become so subtle that they have removed the bases and replaced the explanatory models. The most extensive and intricate negative effects were the ideological seizure of theories, the use of suggested solutions to the issues of certifying yields as non-conventional ammunition for conquering political power. As things developed in time, it appears that Economics had to grapple with all kinds of ideological assaults and what we deal with today is a terrible ideological terrorism responsible for the outset of the financial crisis and its turning into an economic crisis as well as for the unimaginable protraction of its devastating effects on the society.

So aggravating is the ideological invasion of Economics that few of those interested in the theoretical and practical issues of an economic nature are still able to discern whether they work or not in environments that can be shaped with the tools of a perverted science. The habits of appropriating as economically correct the ideas or the solutions of political ideologies are quasi-general.

This dissolution of the epistemological condition of Economics entered this irreversible course after the post-enlightenment option of managing power in the framework of representative democracy. The need has emerged ever since to multiply the sources for impacting eligibility beyond those assumed by public confidence and the natural recognition of merits. Economic science provided via wealth the strong argument of the possible substitution of every election-related criterion for the fact that the owner of the argument appeared entitled to gain confidence (standing out as the most envied prototype of the winner) and particularly for being in the best position to buy confidence. The political class based on the economic argument of power proved to be the invading army of Economics in order to increase its range of techniques needed
to hold the others under control. On this path as well, and especially on this one, Economics served Politics, thereby abandoning its scientific condition to become a Moloch referred to as Political Economy.

“Individual and social” are in fact the benchmarks for the process called “economicity”. According to the Cartesian coordinate system, individual is the abscissa of performances in the field of economic rationality and social is the ordinate (Frankly speaking, the correct representation would be that of polar multi-axes, including the other fundamental antithetic aspects of Economics such as: viable and reliable, ideal and functional, process-related and final, subject-related and object-related, natural and artificial, economic and ideological, etc.). By making an analogy, we underscore that individual and social have a rational content, including the function to measure the states of economicity, basically in correlation terms. “Individual and social” stands out as a chiefly systemic entity, shaped by the dynamics of the joint influences of both elements. Any segregation of the roles could only lead to a disintegration of the field of economic rationality.

The analogy with the unified field theory is even more relevant, with “individual and social” being for the conceptual world of Economics what “mass-energy” is to the theory of relativity. Leaving aside this epistemological principle, it is impossible to rationally understand the fundamentals of Economics or to provide a logical explanation for the inner consistency of the field of economic rationality. In fact, the Smith-type intellectual breakthrough is particularly due to the benchmarks of validating the statements on the market mechanism in the innovating individual-social interrelations. The breakdown of the world of economicity by antithetic element opens up the path of unilateralism, imbalances, adversities, namely in epistemological terms pure, parsimonious representations and, in practical terms, tribal-like organization, setbacks, and identifying the sense of life with the absurd.

Extreme solutions, solely for an antithetic element, are typical of ideological approaches. However, they became an integral part of Economics once the innovating Keynesian genius made quite a stir by labeling macroeconomics as a heal-all for the social effects triggered by the economic crisis. Macroeconomics has quickly and completely proved useful to power management as well, and even provided as a bonus the power of the possibility to extensively exert the political right to resource allocation, i.e. to rise to the occasion really capable of a cognitive revolution: to convert power to wealth. What followed is subordinated to the logics of wealth-power equivalence starting from the de-rationalized version of the antithetic individual-social foundation approached thereafter as a methodological distinction between the individual and the society, reaching an antinomy apex through the
irreconcilable contraposition individualism-socialism and a critical mass-like limit through the recent rivalry between corporate capitalism and state capitalism.

Perverting the order prospects via extreme solutions not only defies common sense as a regulatory instance for human nature and human condition, but also attacks the grounds of nature in general. Most frequently such reckless actions occur by using the language of freedom (as well as its regime) as an intermediary (including as a dictionary of dialectical symbols) between individual/individualism/individual and social/community/society. The explicit formula developed in the property right theory embraces the triple-shared breakdown of economicity (micro, macro, institutional) through abstract equivalences like property=freedom to justify the exclusivity of methodological individualism as the single principle ordering the world. People say (in the attempt to recover common language and thought): Property is power! (Obviously, in total contradiction to the Paretian legacy regarding the natural rules of property fragmentation).

The most serious distortion of the meaning and essence of economicity, achieved by replacing the fundamental antithetic social-individual feature with the explanatory model derived from the ideological assumption of ownership is based on freedom, establishes not only the equivalence between wealth and power, but also its decay in a conflicting prevalence order fuelled by the forms of individualism. During this stage, the generally human values are overthrown, ending up in a reality not entirely different from that induced by the obsession of highest yields after eliminating human nature from the equation and minimizing democracy-related costs by prohibiting free will.

Theorization of the elite capitalism superiority (of the corporate one, for instance) at the expense of more sensitive types of capitalism centered on the functional individual-social entity brings the developments in the global economy under the full control of ideologies and the world on a path of uniformity-creating unilateralism, which is nothing else than sublimed totalitarianism.

**Reliable – Viable(2)**

The ongoing crisis has revealed that for economic theory, apart from its fundamental inconsistencies, living side by side with political ideologies can only spell failure. We, the ones from the European Orient, are somewhat entitled to declare – based on our direct experience with ideology-creating contexts – that in the Economics-Politics functional relationship the winning games are as such
because... Society loses. Of course, the economy loses first, even in both its forms: as a theory (Economics) and as an activity (the economy).

What really appears to be shocking is that the loss – of consistency (in the case of Economics) and of substance (in the case of the economy) – is not related to the quality of the prevailing economic vision. Being rigorous, something such as this does not exist because, essentially, what we call dominant economic vision is proven to be the Economics-Politics mixture, in which the control function for the effects is held by Politics. Otherwise, there is no alternative reason for the economy to be considered – in spite of fundamentalist perceptions – a product which does not sell but under the brand of Politics, coming to be exactly what we believe it should not be: Political Economics.

By transposing the explanation for this knowledge in the range of meanings of the fractal theory, it could be argued that the functional entity resulting from the merger of the two instruments for the functioning of the societal is made up of one third Economics (with conceptual and actional contents) and two thirds Politics. In the projected arrangement the homothetic relations are observed regardless of either form or scale.

What is construed as a potential for bifurcation (towards either failure or win) in the mix area resides in the control of the segment (either linear, of perimeter or of volume) disputed at the confluence between the one third of Economics and the two thirds of Politics. Two situations can be noticed here: on the one hand, the case of the prevalence of the propensity to economic rationality, where the trend is for the moderation of a little over one half of the double measure of the Politics segment, thereby reducing the risk of crisis and entering an upward trend; on the other hand, the case where the expectations of Politics weigh heavier, where rationality is often defied and the one third of the confluence belonging to Economics is being altered, even in its integrity.

The state of permanent tension illustrated by the trends in the confluence area holds explanations from different perspectives, to which specific procedures of action are being attached. They indicate that the control of the wealth mechanisms matters for Economics (equivalent to one third of a viable entity) and the function for the control of power gains the upper hand in Politics (equivalent to two thirds of the resulting societal entity). The coming together of the two functions is inconsistent, because the possibility of compromise is excluded, and the result can only be one or the other. In fractal language, Economics has the function of generating the rule for covering the territory of Society with the homothetic dimension specific to the state of rationality, while Politics has the function of generating an internal structure of the Social according to the rule of fluctuating arrangements, with no internal homothecy in
the Mandelbrotian sense. And for this reason the double target is proven to be a one-way highway to failure.

The automated solution to covering the Social is the very raw failure which we experience as generalized crisis, when Politics forcefully pushes it way towards achieving its goal. It achieves, though, this counter-performance by minimizing the reliable manifestation of the specific segment of Economics. The solution is to restart the dynamics in the Economics-Politics area of confluence. For this, the function of Economics is to enlarge the space of rationality over at least half of the fractal dimension with which Politics adjoins. This means Economics has to functionalize its own segment and, at the same time, in order to achieve a viable confluence it has to control – based on socially-tested efficiency criteria – the most part of Power.

The fine tuning between the two levels of action in the area of confluence (which, obviously, is also a noise interval) pertains to the awareness to the link between the physical entities and the biological entities (between artefacts and human nature in the field of Economics and between decisions and intersubjectivity in the spectrum of Politics). But it also pertains to the fact that the mechanisms of wealth and power put together tend to eliminate the societal goals of both Economics and Politics.

The most important issue for this explanatory model inspired by the theory of fractals is that the area of confluence between Economics and Politics has to be characterized, at some point, by a mechanism for managing the tension-riddled movements of influence. It is obvious that something like this must exist when the final goal belongs to a different level in the configuration of reality, where the reliable sense transcends into viable, because we are talking about a complex, dynamic and open system, i.e. the human society. In such systems the fracturing (not as much methodological but operational) has catastrophic consequences. Fractalization seen as a support for understanding and explaining gradually reveals both the mysterious confluence between being reliable and being viable (simultaneously and non-contradictory), as well as the influences of transforming the state of rationality by levels of substantiation, meaning one represented by the mechanism of wealth and the other represented by the organism of power.

The fractalization of the functional Economics-Politics complex demands to be understood as a perimeter where the societal entity which contextualizes the tensional trends is permanently being configured, through interpolations and extrapolations (which in the end are nothing but consensual arrangements). This eminently rational perspective protects us from compromising the reliability of yield-oriented mechanisms and from altering the viability of the societal organism. Thus, the fractalization of the Economics-Politics post-Enlightenment
super-territory distinguishes the demarcation line of the horizon of the understanding of the compromise between conflicting states in the dynamics of societal systems and, at the same time, points to the level in between whose limits the explanation is coherent and unavoidably consistent.

The Reliable-Viable transformational consequence of the tension-riddled dynamics in the Economics-Politics area of fractal confluence is the sole natural resource which neutralizes the spillover effects which open/close the cycles of modernity.

**Processual – Final**

In Economics, the object of knowledge is an intermediate issue of the essence of things, namely the phenomenon related to economic facts. For instance, economic growth is formally rendered as GDP dynamics, i.e. the direct process of expansion is superseded by a quantitative phenomenon measured in approximate terms, namely the GDP variation.

Setting perceptions into facts, somehow even beyond the phenomenon, indicates a **sui-generis** cognitive model interested in the material consequence and by no means in the path to economic facts. Herein resides the source of uncertainty in establishing rationality criteria, since they refer to final aspects, not to those shaping the conditions ensuring finitude. This is also the source of uncertainties surrounding the yield-oriented algorithms in the form of negative expectations on completion.

In addition, the cognitive image-based operation augments the appearance twice, because, despite its transcending in the final result (perceived only subsequently), growth is approached in statistic terms, as a phenomenon based on the assumption of relevance of the law of large numbers and extremely long terms in Economics. Within these benchmarks, with economic knowledge being trans-generational, it becomes absolutely non-individual, creating unacceptable inconsistencies.

It is the process which should stand alone under the magnifying glass as a potential to reach finitude. Reversing the expression of reality (its representation through finitude, not through the intermediate processuality with finitude as its consequence) complicates the understanding of Economics as a science, including its being viewed as inverted metaphysics, with facts generating solutions, and solutions (for the circumstances of the path to finitude) not ending up in economic facts. From such a perspective, the solutions concern (paradoxically) the phenomenon, i.e. the partial state, related to the appearance, seen as central tendency, and not the processual reality.
The function of finitude, deriving from original materialism and the cognition of appearances as a principle of science-like experimentalism made Economics the territory of confusing and diffusing conceptualizations. In fact, Economics appears to have insulated itself in the world of inverted assertions.

Escaping from this experience of counter-nature would involve determining economic cognition in what alters the state of the phenomenon emanated from the fact, i.e. in the processuality of the conditions on which the consequence is based. In a rational formula, one may say that Economics should overcome the replacement states of the process, in this case the perceptions in the approach to finality. Cognition conceptualizes the process, summing the limits of rationality sources. Only sporadically cognition uses the appearance of a process conception of rationality that is referred to as the phenomenon of economic growth (measured by the GDP variation).

The process reveals the kinematics of rationality sources in an intersubjective context. The process itself is a concept of transactional intersubjectivity related to factual finitude. Mediating between the conceptual substance of economic cognition and the factual concreteness of the GDP is made by steadily accommodating the limits of rationality sources in the context of transactional inter-subjectivity.

The process bears an economic meaning only by relying on the premise and by drawing on the substance of transactional inter-subjectivity of yield-oriented states. Insofar as economic cognition is fixed in this constitutinal reality gap, not in phenomena or finalities, potentialities and certainties put together, it succeeds in freeing itself from failure or utopia. The process signifies the impending change of inter-subjectivity composition, driven by both conceptual and factual factors.

Focusing on the essence is the very function of economic cognition: to detect the process as a feature of transactional inter-subjectivity targeting yield validation. The essence appears to be accepted as an immutable state only if we go by the inverted formula of targeting the economic fact as the substance of economic cognition. It is reasonable to see the essence as achieving the process and the process-like yields, generating a movement of conceptual and factual performance limits of transactional inter-subjectivity.

Of course, such a manner of understanding the function and the algorithm of economic cognition is struck by habituette and the deposits created in the area of theoretic visions, as well as by the convenience of resorting to measurable matters in building explanatory models. Paradoxically, as economic science is expected to grow stronger, it limits its meanings to the invariant horizons of assimilated concepts. The most persistent obsession in economic cognition came from the easy handling of statistical tools and the maximum deviation
from the fashion of quantitative separation of economicity. The pressure from these extremes translated into economic cognition through the excessive resort to indicators, to cognitive prevalence by measuring the economic fact, as if Economics were a science of the final product.

The epistemic tragedy of Economics occurs when growth would be (as it should be!) separated as a process, not as a phenomenon linked to the GDP. The entire theory about economic growth takes appearances for essence, shaping a mirror image of reality, from the post-factum fluctuations in economic facts to the conditionalities of the path leading to the result, as if they would be the result. Even when insisting upon analyzing the conditionalities, economic cognition does not aim at emphasizing the generative qualities of the result, because evidence relates to the GDP variations, playing the major role in the analysis. One cannot speak of indirect knowledge, but simply of overlooking the process as a formula resulting in economic facts.

The lack of cognitive insistence on the algorithms of growth as a process in which things happen, as they say, on the run, on the race track where, by using up subtle energies, the fair measure of the geometry of influences pertains to human (more precisely, the projection of his/her comfort on the distribution of consequences), not to abstract substitutes, deprives the function of Economics of the conceptual support to maintain a natural balance between human nature and human condition.

Economics got used to work with appearances and conventions (following in the footsteps of cosmology, which in turn had traced geometry) in Plato’s and Euclid’s style.

The statistics of the result conceals the process, making Economics a science of chance, namely the chance of things by themselves, with no human presence required.

**Concluding remarks**

Economic science, in its fundamental instance referred to as Economics, is a complex conceptual construction of a dialetheic nature, combining antithetic perspectives in a context marked by inter-subjective meanings, centered upon the transaction function of utility in a yield-oriented formula. Excluding the double methodological reporting in defining algorithms that shape the state of economic rationality, deprives Economics of its object. The unilateral approach in understanding the fundamentals empties the scientific content of Economics. For retaining the right of being a science, Economics should treat its object of study as a viable entity because it generates something reliable, as a projection of its intention with the tools of rationality and as a relational world of tensional units aimed at the same yield-oriented purpose.
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Notes

(1) Ideas contained in this paragraph have been advanced through the editorial of the 12th issue of 2010.

(2) Ideas contained in this paragraph have been advanced through the editorial of the 11th issue of 2010.
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