

Monocentrism as a New Ontology of Economics

Mokiy M. S

Abstract

The vast majority of economists acknowledge that there is a wide range of issues concerning economic relations. The need for economic relations control became obvious, not only at a country level, but also on a global scale, by virtue of the worldwide interrelationship and interdependence of each country.

If we consider knowledge to be a conjunction of data – which ensures an understanding of reality and enables us to take appropriate actions – it is clear that economists do not share the same view of what the economy actually is.

US President Harry S. Truman once asked to find a “one-handed economist” because every time he consulted his economic advisors on economic policy development, he heard “on the one hand..... on the other hand”. Seventy years have passed since then, but comprehension of reality has not altered, so that even now our actions – translated into an economic policy – lead to crisis. It follows that, for an accurate understanding of reality, it is necessary to answer the question of what an economy is. In other words, it is essential to take a new look at the ontological basis of economics. This is the only way to accurately assess the complexity of economic issues and economics as a science.

Monocentrism is a philosophical approach that allows us to take a fresh look at the complexity of the subject being studied, alongside existing socio-economic development issues. According to this outlook, the world is unique. Everything we see or do not see is a fragment of the world. Every fragment’s task is the transformation of substance and energy. The transformation process of each fragment generates needs. The world represents a functional assembly of fragments from atoms to the planet as a whole. Humans and humankind are fragments of the planetary functional assembly. For humankind, from a social aspect, the transformation process translates into economic relationships – in other words, into social interactions in the production, exchange and distribution of amenities.

The set of values, i.e., what people consider necessary at every stage of humankind’s development, defines sets of amenities as well as means of their production, exchange and distribution.

Identification of values, needs, amenities, means of production, exchange and distribution – as immanent features of economic relationships – allows us to determine the complexity of economic relations and economic science.

In this context, the principle of monocentrism, an underlying feature of the system-based transdisciplinary approach, can be used to interpret national economy, corporate economy and household economy as global economy fragments, and economic relations as a fragment of the relationship between humankind and other fragments of the global functional assembly.

The logic determining the world's unity allows us to divide socio-economic development problems into actual and pseudoissues. Just as knowledge of the laws of refraction allows us to understand that a spoon bending in a glass of water is not a 'fact', so too the principle of monocentrism will not allow us to mistake pseudoissues for real ones.

Keywords: ontology of economics, holism, monocentrism, systemic transdisciplinary approach

Introduction

The current state of economic science is characterized by the fact that most economists acknowledge the considerable combination of attributes related to economic contacts. There are famine, poverty, money, development disparity, environmental pollution, etc. Despite the anti-globalization movement protests, globalization is a fait accompli. It has become clear that there is a need for regulation of economic contacts not only on a country level but also on the global level.

However, the current experience in regulating economic relations (from absolute to minimal) has made it clear that the principles and methods of influence offered by contemporary economic theory do not bring the "desired" result. Despite the progress in individual countries, the actions based on modern economic thought lead to the life improvement for only some people or their aggregates. Economic reality manifests itself in a way different from economic theory. Today, it is obvious that none of the dominant paradigms of economic development serves the goals of mankind. No doubt it is related to the fact that economic relations are a complex structure.

These facts are superficial. Using them as a basis for our decisions, we carry out practical activity. Their superficial character works up to a certain point of time and for certain types of problems. After all in order not to get lost in the woods it is enough to know that the Sun rises in the East. However, if you need to launch satellites, it should be understood that this fact has a superficial character. Anyway, do we always see the things as they are? If you put a spoon in a glass of water, you will see its bend. Bear in mind that the bend is not morbid imagination, but a fact, you can take a picture or video of. But no one will take the visible spoon bend for a real one. Awareness of the physical reality allows us to interpret the visible reality in the right way. Then let's ask ourselves the following questions: "Don't we take visible economic facts for the "essence" of economic relations?", "Don't the existing problems in economic development represent the effect of "a spoon in a glass"?"

In his time Einstein wrote: "The wording of the problem is often more essential than its solution which may only be a matter of mathematical or experimental art. Raising new questions, developing new opportunities, considering old problems from a new angle require creative imagination and reflect the real success in science" [1].

A new perspective implies the solution to a fundamental philosophical and methodological problem, namely the ontological one. It is necessary to specify the theoretical model and understanding of the object and subject of the research, i.e. identify the significant properties of the object under research. This will allow to take a fresh look at the scope of the facts and problems of economic reality. Failure to

understand what we are studying does not allow us to apply suitable methods to the object of the study which creates an epistemological problem. In any case, it leads to a wrong setting of objectives, finding wrong solutions which hampers the achievement of goals.

I. The ontological problem of economics

Holism and monocentrism

Today the vast majority of people understand that their activity influences the nature. In other words, humankind is integrated with nature.

The beginning of the 20th century has enriched science with new scientific trends aimed at finding universal laws of development of nature and society. In 1926, South African philosopher J. Smuts elaborated the methodological principle of integrity, now known as "holism" (from the Greek word "holos" - whole) [2]. These ideas have become widespread in the world. Of course, the idea of holism is extremely fruitful. Many solutions have been developed based on this world outlook position, even on the International level. However, there is a fundamental difference between "whole" and "integral". The point is that:

The whole consists of parts. Thus, the holistic "whole" World consists of parts. The "whole" World theoretically admits the existence of other "whole worlds". The whole World does not prohibit all its elements, as parts of the Whole, to have their law, characteristics, and their own internal ways of interaction between the parts. So, elements, parts of the Whole World with the same "legal" possibility, may prefer to confront other parts up to their complete destruction or conquest. Looking around is enough to see that the human being and humanity struggle with the nature and the World around to survive. For every person or a group of people, other people constitute the world around them. So it is quite acceptable either to struggle with them or to find ways to co-exist. This perception of the world and its sustainable existence and development focuses the researchers' effort on finding the compromise.

Choosing the Unity as a significant attribute leads to a completely different conclusion. In this case, the mental picture of the World looks quite different. The World is unique. There are no other "worlds". All of its fundamentally possible objects may be only its natural fragments. They are the World itself. Elements, fragments of a unity, do not have a unique significance outside the World, as well as one piece of a puzzle or a fragment of a broken cup. The role, place and interdependence of each element-fragment in the unique World are determined by its structure and the order of its existence. Then the existence and development of the World should be built on the basis of *co-evolution* principle, i.e. *joint development of all fragments*. [3]. It leads to a very important conclusion. The man and mankind are fragment of the World like all other pieces such as other people, trees, rivers, mountains, etc. We are the World itself. But then our struggle with the world and our wish to conquer it is as ridiculous and pointless as a fight between a liver and a left foot. The man can not "negotiate a solution" with nature. A compromise between a man and a hurricane or winter is impossible. We can only look for ways to survive during a hurricane or winter, understanding and accepting the laws of nature. From

this point of view, the existence and development of the man and mankind should be co-evolutionary to the development of the single "organism" of the planet.

Thus, understanding of the World as a whole (holistic concept) and the World as a unity (concept of monocentrism) [4] determine the fundamentally different approaches to the study of challenges to human development and ways to deal with them:

1. Either a person exists separately from the World and looks for ways "to conquer" it. Then, the concept investigates into the mechanism of finding a compromise between the humankind and the nature, between countries and people, and meeting the growing needs in resource limited conditions, etc.
2. Or a person finds himself as a fragment of the World, with no independent meaning outside of it. In this case, there is a need to look for the mechanism ensuring both the integrity of the world and the collaborative, directional, co-evolutionary development of all functional fragments of the planetary ensemble.

According to this, every element-fragment of the system transforms the matter and energy in order to ensure the existence and sustainable development of the fragment itself and that of the system as a whole. Transforming energy and substance, the fragments have to establish links between each other, forming so-called "functional ensembles" of fragments both vertically (from elementary particles to the universe) and horizontally (combination of elementary particles, microorganisms, etc). At the same time the quantity and quality of the matter and energy *must be* strictly determined. Violation of this irreversibly leads to dysfunction, i.e. contradicts the objectives of preservation and of sustainable development of the system.

From this point of view, the human and the humanity are fragments of the vertical ensemble of the planet from chemical elements to the whole planet, while humanity itself represents the horizontal functional ensemble. Complete human dependence on natural conditions of existence is concentrated within a narrow strip of the Earth atmosphere of about 4000 meters wide over the sea level, which is equal to 0.0003 (three ten-thousandths) of the planet diameter which is a vivid proof of that. Even to express a variety of thoughts, including those of the ontology of social development, a man has to breathe, drink, eat, etc. Opponents not willing to recognize themselves as "natural fragments" are encouraged to check this statement by putting a plastic bag on their head thus limiting the oxygen access. Acknowledgement of this scientific fact will certainly come in a couple of minutes! This experiment also proves the determinacy of the quantity and quality of benefits essential to meet the needs.

If we accept the monocentral outlook, then a chain of inferences concerning detecting the essential ontological characteristics of economic relations look as follows:

First. Without entering into a discussion about the time and the cause of human appearance of on the Earth, we should admit that the planet it should have had appropriate conditions for this. It means that while transforming the matter and energy of the planet, the fragments of the planet created an atmosphere, fertile soil and other appropriate conditions for the human existence. It was a process of a joint directional

development of all elements of the planetary system, i.e. co-evolution process. Since the birth of the human (humanity), the process of converting the condition of planet's own substances has not stopped. Moreover, people got actively involved in this natural process, just as other natural fragments of the planet used to do and are still doing. Due to *the co-evolutionary development nature, no one can be "excluded" from the process.*

Second. Participation in the substance transformation of the planet generates demand for substance and energy for each person individually and for humanity as a whole (as well as all other fragments). To meet the needs while fulfilling his part of work in transforming the substance of the planet, the human enters into diverse relationships with other people and natural objects. These relationships are related to the creation of benefits, their distribution and exchange.

Third. Benefits consumption requires determining their significance to meet the needs. Metaphorically, in order not to "play out of tune in the planetary ensemble" a **mechanism for assessing** the quantity and quality of the benefits is required. Unlike atoms, molecules or turtles, the assessment is a conscious process for high level mammals and it takes the form of a system of values. Yet a man receives the system of values only in a society. A man is not born with a set of values. The formation of values requires a group of people which is united by historically established social forms of common life and activities, in other words the society is a prerequisite. Namely, a number of public institutions are required: a family, a tribe, a clan, faith, education, etc. As a result the needs and especially ways how to meet them are being transformed in people's minds into "images" of what is currently "required". Emphasizing the mechanism of meeting the needs as an essential property of values, benefits, methods of production, exchange and distribution allows us to define of the object of study of the economic science by the term "economy".

Economy is a connection (relationship) between people in a society arising from the production process, exchange and distribution of benefits and formation of values.

So, the term "economy" will be further referred to as "economic relations". From our point of view, this kind of a linguistic formula gives this definition a greater semantic potential which allows to define the meaning and the range (field) of economic relations clearly.

1. It allows us to outline the object of the study of economics correctly. Economic relations should be understood as a realization of a transformation process of a planetary matter and energy within the planetary system by a human. It is an immanent natural attribute of the human community development as a fragment of the planetary ensemble. They originated together with the human community. They changed in time from prehistoric era to a slave society, etc. At the current stage, with the emergence of personal freedom, it has become possible for market economic relations to exist basing on individual freedom and subsequently on free and equivalent exchange of benefits. In other words, whatever group of people and whatever stage of their development we choose as the object of the study, the nomenclature of

benefits, methods of their production, distribution and exchange change. Still the relations concerning production, distribution and exchange of wealth remain the same. The main factor of these relations development is a change in the system of values in the human society and the corresponding change in institutional settings. It is the set of values or at this or that time or in this or that society that determines the set of needs and benefits, the choice of methods of production, methods of distribution and exchange.

2. The suggested "image" of economic relations allows highlighting the economic objects correctly as objects of the study. It should be a conditionally sorted out fragment of human relations, which implements the process of production, distribution and exchange of benefits as well as formation of values. The primary condition for this sorting is a sorted out group of people who have economic relations. In this case, we can study the economy of the family, industry, the economy of a city, a region or a country. At the same time any given object is a conditionally sorted out fragment of the global economy, i.e. the fragment of economic relations between all people on our planet. It should be noted that according to our definition the key economic object is the household. The household is the final consumer and the human race is reproduced in the household. The activity of all other groups of people such as governments, parties, organizations, firms, etc. should be directed to meet the needs of the household. At the same time, the nomenclature of benefits, methods of production, exchange and distribution should meet the requirements of co-evolutional development of the planetary ensemble. So is it possible to say that Robinson Crusoe had economic relations on the island? No, at least until Friday appeared.
3. Currently, the features mentioned in the definition, are the subject of the whole complex of disciplines studying these relations in different aspects and at different levels:
 - philosophy and methodology of economics;
 - theory of economic relations (political economy, micro- and macroeconomics, management theory, etc.);
 - individual stages of these relations such as production, exchange, distribution (production management, production organization, marketing, taxation, regulation, etc.);
 - ways of estimating economic relations (economic statistics, econometrics, accounting, finance, controlling, etc.);
 - spatial and geographical features of economic relations (economic geography, regional studies, urban studies, etc.);
 - psychology, ethics of economic relations, etc.;
 - human relations rules in the field of production, distribution and exchange of goods. These rules can be formal (economic, commercial, financial, tax, etc. law) and informal (customs, morality, etc.);
 - history of these relations and so on.

However, the ontology of economic relations based on the philosophy of monocentrism dramatically changes the approach to the identification of the problems which are being studied by these disciplines. Advancing co-evolutional human development as a functional fragment of the planetary ensemble allows not only to

divide these problems into “superficial” and valid, but to reframe the problems of economics. Let us show it by one of the most known concepts of the economy.

The fundamental problem of managing economic development is the problem of choice. As it is pointed out by P. Samuelson [5], there are three key tasks in economics:

1. What goods to produce and in what quantity?
2. How to produce goods, i.e. what resources and technology to use?
3. Whom to produce goods for?

Always and *everywhere* these three tasks are solved based on the system of values managers have. But even when leaders of various ranks sincerely want to improve citizen’s lives, it does not always lead to success. And it is not about incompetence, though it might be the case. The fact is that the management solutions to these tasks are developed from the following *evident* postulates:

- people’s needs are increasing;
- the resources to meet people’s needs are limited. As a result, benefits are limited.

However, the potential in the above mentioned ontological statements does not allow accepting this obviousness of the “superficial” for real.

What actually is the problem? The thing is that, by default, co-evolutionary character of human development denies unlimited growth of needs and limited resources. Meeting the needs of the household depends on how people treat their needs and how methods of production created and “designed” by people as well as rules of exchange and norms of distribution of goods do not contradict the development of other elements of the planetary system.

We will consider the first postulate concerning the growing needs from this world outlook point of view. According to the principle of co-evolutionary character, benefits are not limited because needs are increasing, but primarily because of *people’s attitude to needs* (what they consider values) *is not co-evolutionary*. No matter a billionaire or a pauper, one cannot breathe in more air or drink more water than it is determined by the laws of nature for one’s body. Then a human being, as a natural fragment of the planetary system, should have other equally harmonious needs. The need of some people in several houses or in hundreds of pairs of shoes cannot be considered harmonious. It is a problem of personal outlook, which, of course, is being corrected by the public outlook. Earlier we showed that in the human society the system of needs, both personal and public, is being transformed into the system of values which determines the economic behavior of people. Thus, native Americans did not understand why Spaniards are so interested in gold, or why for one a stamp is just a piece of bad paper with a worn-out pattern and ink residue, and why for another it is the most valuable item of his collection, and why he is willing to give up many other benefits for it. (To be noted that the value of the stamp is set by the community of philatelists, in their minds). It is obvious that entire industries emerge as a result of an inharmonious attitude to the needs, such as the production and sales of drugs, tobacco, etc. which require huge resources.

Today's dominant system of values and lack of understanding of the co-evolutionary character of development made people think that their needs are constantly increasing. From the point of view of the outlined ontology it is the question of “a spoon in a glass of water”. It is important to note that in the main religions and in the modern society, there is a strong criticism of consumer society principles. However, this institutional setting has not yet become dominant in economic policy.

You may say that even according to the harmonious understanding of the needs, the growth of people's needs is simply proportional to the growth of the population! It is also a “superficial” problem. First, according to the co-evolutionary requirements of development and determinism of the matter and energy exchange, the population cannot exceed a certain size. And the discovery by V.I. Vernadsky confirms that the biomass of the planet represents a value. It is also indirectly proved by the fact that the growth of educational and cultural level of people leads to a reduction of the number of children in the family. Second, the benefits indeed are made of what nature provides us with which is transformed by a man one way or another. Even if we listen to a song performed by a singer, the singer should at least eat to produce this benefit. This is obvious, and it is hard to disagree with this as well as with the fact that the needs should be met in the most efficient way. Unfortunately, “efficient” often means the least expensive way to meet the needs. However, understanding of co-evolution and determinism of economic relations in this case does not allow to “fall into heresy”.

From this point of view, many ways of producing benefits are controversial. For example, one can hardly blame the mankind for the use of fertile soil that the planet has been generating for millennia. However, it is well known that its unbalanced use has led to climate change over large areas of the planet. Moreover, this concerns the use of fuel produced of non-renewable resources, such as coal, oil and gas, that nature has been creating for thousands of years. In the early 20th century, Russian scientist D. I. Mendeleev wrote about the fact that to burn crude oil is all the same as to burn banknotes. Even processing these resources, for example, into plastic packaging (by the way, very convenient), leads to environmental pollution on a global scale. The effectiveness of one or another method, in the context of co-evolutionary development, does not always have to mean its lowest cost. This way, we do not throw the garbage out of the window but take it to a special area, although this is more energy-consuming.

Thus, the problem of choice should not be solved from the perspective of increasing human needs and limited resources, but from the ideological position of harmonization of needs and co-evolutional ways of the production to meet them.

Money is another fundamental problem of economic relations. The problem of choice is always connected with money both in the family and in the world. Such a “financial approach” seems to many as the only valid one as the financial circulation for many centuries has been an integral part of economic and other activities. In the minds of the majority of individuals based on dominant today's economic ontology, economics and money are synonymous. “Making money” is the main motive which is explicitly or implicitly present in the system prevailing in the global system of values today.

From the point of view of the proposed ontology, it is the manifestation of “the issue of a spoon in a glass of water”. It is connected with the observed patterns because it is the money that possesses the role of the universal equivalent. It is clear that people always find some sort of evaluation criteria of received and given benefits that allows us to consider this exchange as an equivalent one. Any kind of equivalent has always been present in any exchange in economic relations. Historically, equivalent carriers have been subject to metamorphosis from shells, furs and gold coins to virtual, imaginary, non-cash money or bitcoins.

Value of money, supposedly given its specific essence, and formed in the minds of people, has led to the creation of modern rules of circulation. The quality of the “designed” rules can be judged by the recurring crises in the economy. Indeed, what lies in the core of the crisis? There are no hurricanes, earthquakes, wars, or catastrophic crop failures, people are alive, factories are not destroyed, harvest is ripening, and still the crisis exist. In this sense, people’s misfortunes from the financial crisis look like a misfortune of someone who has lost a game of poker or preference. Money represents a symbol similar to playing cards. Therefore, attempts to introduce other national currencies as a reserve ones and other financial activity is no more than changing the rules of a poker game or preference. Consequently, the global financial system is really in need of renovation, but the vector of this policy should be different. Money is differed benefits but the fairness of the exchange and distribution of wealth is another problem.

Any country, as a set of public authorities and institutions, fulfilling its functions of creating activity conditions for all participants of economic relations, first of all provides the following:

- **fair** distribution and redistribution of benefits within the existing worldview and outlook;
- **free** enterprise and **independence** of producers as a condition for equivalent exchange.

These conditions are reflected in the codified rules and regulations of production, exchange and distribution of benefits. A significant part of any country’s laws regulate and set these “written rules” from family law to international legal agreements. The state influences the economic behavior of people enforcing compliance with the law through legislative acts, instructions, regulations and government control. Political stability has always directly depended on these solutions from the Code of Hammurabi to the present day. However, society has *unwritten rules* in the form of customs, traditions, morals, etc. These unwritten rules and norms often have a greater impact on the economic behavior of people than written ones. The differences between the written and unwritten norms and rules lead to differences in understanding of the principles of fair exchange and distribution of benefits.

These differences cause the most social conflicts from dissatisfaction with the actions of the enterprises owners, government agencies, etc. to the strikes, unrest and revolutions, up to the change of social political system, i.e. up to the change of fundamental rules of exchange and distribution of benefits. Of course, it is always done under the slogans of freedom and justice for all. It means that the system of values determined by the world outlook serves as a motivation for human behavior, particularly concerning freedom and justice, and is the basis of the subjective

assessment of the economic reality. The processes of exchange and distribution will be perceived by people as fair ones only if management decisions are focused on improving the well-being of each household, not certain individuals or their aggregates. However, the problem of fair exchange and distribution of wealth can be solved only when the world community forms a value system based on the principle of co-evolutionary development and determinacy of requirements.

The examples discussed above illustrate the potential of the monocentrism principle providing a new look at an old problem. However, the use of transdisciplinary potential of this principle allows us to solve another fundamental problem of economics which is epistemological.

II. The epistemological problem of economics

Our new definition of economic relations gives new ways to interpret their complexity and specifics of their research.

The fact is:

First. Development of a theoretical concept requires a certain amount of objects in order to identify common patterns. Economic objects as objects of the study are difficult to categorize. Even one and the same person behaves differently in the same situation depending on their condition, age, experience, nationality, traditions, etc. Also, they behave differently when alone or in a group of like-minded people, opponents, in a crowd, etc. Two families are never the same. Even in companies that use standard technology or produce a unified product, for example, "McDonald's", the specifics transpire in the location of each individual restaurant, customer diversity, relations with local authorities, etc. If we consider the macro-objects, at the beginning of the 21st century there are about 250 countries in the world, including unrecognized. Speaking about the economy of the United States, Russia, Iceland, Japan, Tanzania or Sweden, it should be noted that the specifics of their economies are so different that we can talk about them only in the singular form. In other words, it is difficult or even impossible to categorize the type of economic objects. So, the world economy exists in the singular.

But even if the researcher manages to identify some similarities in the economic objects, all the same the character of the processes in them demonstrate clear *endemicity* (author's term (from the Greek endemos - local, endemic)). This, in our opinion, is one of the reasons why actions that lead to success in one country, city or firm, become ineffective in another. Extrapolation of management experience in most cases gave results only when the experience was successfully adapted to the conditions of economic objects.

Second. To develop a theoretical concept, it is necessary to fix some stationary conditions of the object or the occurrence of these conditions. The peculiarity of economic objects lies in their continuous development. For example, the economy of any country today is not what it used to be ten years ago. Therefore, management decisions that have led to success for a number of years have become ineffective, and sometimes even detrimental when extrapolated into the future. In other words, the

economic system is temporally dependent. Its development includes phases, periods and cycles. Therefore, despite constant effort of the management to ensure sustainable growth, economic objects show clearly that their development is not linear both on macro- and microlevels.

Third. Not only economic relations are in constant development, but there is a constant change in external factors, such as political, social, environmental, and others. Even if one is able to identify any patterns in the past, these patterns may shift as a result of the dynamics of the external environment. For example, in medieval Europe pepper was worth its weight in gold, while in the late 80s of the last century a car was traded for a studio in Moscow. Therefore, the use of economic-mathematical models built on the famous simplification of the “ceteris paribus” is very limited, as it cannot exist due to a constant transformation of economic relations and environmental conditions. In this sense, the subject of the study looks like a clock, with rotating hands as well as the clock face.

Fourth. In economics an experimental test of the hypothesis is very difficult, and in most cases impossible, because it will mean experimenting with people. The most importantly, such experiments will not be representative due to the scarcity or uniqueness of the objects and dynamics proper to the object and its environment. While other branches of science bring new knowledge into practice using multiiterative process, i.e. “hypothesis – experimental verification - new hypothesis”, then theory and practice; in economics this sequence looks like “hypothesis - theory - practice - new hypothesis”. This results, at best, in deterioration of company finances (or even in its bankruptcy), or, in the worst case scenario, it “reels” the economy of a country and even of the planet. In any case, this chain "affects" either welfare, or people's lives.

Fifth. The co-evolutionary character of the development of economic relations leads to a huge number of factors that should be considered when elaborating a theory, or at least a concept which allows affecting them. As we have mentioned before, no one would doubt the need for economic development management. However, the accelerated dynamics of the economic processes both at micro- and at macrolevels determines the «speed» and proactive decision-making in the economic systems management, on the one hand. On the other hand, this accelerated dynamics does not give managers time to collect the necessary information, or to analyse and interpret it when it is possible. As a result, economic relations management finds itself in a situation where decisions are made in the context of lack of information, thus increasing the risk and damage from wrong decision-making. We should admit that development planning of economic systems, both territorial and sectoral, presumes a complex approach. Economic projects are coordinated with ecologists, biologists, geologists, etc. Even when there is time for such approval, the situation raises a number of fundamental issues:

1. Who, among the professionals, should take responsibility for generalized results of the conducted research? What concept of a scientific direction the generalized results should be based on?
2. Language of what scientific discipline should be used to present them, so that they were equally understandable to experts in various scientific fields and to administrative workers who take fundamental decisions?

Thus, the economists face a very difficult task to find investigation method of the object:

- which is difficult (or impossible) to experiment on because there will be speculative experiments, or experiments on people, often without their consent;
- which is hard to categorize, or which does not belong any type at all because it is unique, i.e. endemic;
- which is in constant development as well as its environment.

The situation is aggravated by the fact that the researcher, especially studying macroeconomic systems, is often "inside" of the system, but according to mathematical logic this position makes it difficult to come to right conclusions. While physicists seek to understand the structure of the World, the economist's task is to give recommendations on how to manage the object, that is to affect it deliberately. For achieve this goal, we need to understand the purpose and patterns of development of the object and to take into account a huge combination of factors, which is often not possible to collect and organize.

The above complexity of economic relations allows economists to be proud that they are dealing with an object which complexity is comparable to the one of the Universe.

Naturally, studying objects of similar complexity requires using methods and approaches with transdisciplinary potential. The principle of monocentrism is the basis for the systemic transdisciplinary methodology according to which *the system is understood as a procedure contributing to the unity of the system elements*. The procedure involves a certain form of organization of elements and relations between them. This has enabled to develop models of structural and functional organization of the system, so called model order. These models are successfully used in various branches of science [6]. In economics, systemic transdisciplinary approach increases the potential for research in various branches of science at different levels. But the illustration of using the systemic transdisciplinary approach in economics and management is a topic for another article.

Conclusion

Of course, it is difficult to draw a line between problems and pseudoproblems. The complexity of this division is largely due to objective factors, which are:

Firstly, the character of ideology and the level of mentality in a given historical period when the problem is formulated. For example, the Council of Christian bishops in the city of Mâcon in 585 raised an issue whether women have a soul;

Secondly, the degree of maturity in the understanding of the scientific research object. This is particularly relevant for economics and for all science studying historically developing objects. With time more and more significant properties of the object come to light, thus the understanding of the object is changing. Therefore, at each stage of the science development there is a risk of elaborating pseudoproblems and finding ways to solve them. For example, the problem of finding a special "vital energy" in biology or "ether" in physics.

The economic science is still relatively young. Only 240 years have passed since the release of the book *The Wealth of Nations* by Adam Smith in 1776, but the humanity has made a huge leap in its development. Economists only have time to describe what they observe. They explain very well why certain events have taken place, such as the crisis of 2008, but they cannot predict when the next one will brake out. This does not undermine the dignity of economists, as seismologists cannot predict earthquakes either, although their object of research is much easier.

In order for the science to perform its forecasting function, scientific approach has a responsibility to formulate the "sphere of obligation" for the object or subject of research. The truth means how it should be. Let us return again to the image of a spoon in a glass of water. Please note that in the objective reality there is a normal spoon as well as its visible and imaginary bend in a glass of water. The bend is the truth. However, knowing what a real spoon is does not allow the researcher to take a "visible" true bend in a glass of water for the truth.

In our opinion, the principle of monocentrism underlying the ontology and epistemology of economics allows to create "sphere of obligation" for economic relations.

If knowledge is a set of information that provides understanding of reality and ability to perform actions, then we have shown that the dominant system of values determines the set of benefits, methods of their production, exchange and distribution. Unfortunately, the system of values is the slowest to change. Despite the fact that all religious denominations and the best of mankind declare harmonious attitude to the needs, success is still judged today by the amount of money on the bank account.

However, the potential of the above ontological positions allows not only to declare but to prove scientifically that value systems in human development and socio-economic relations must be changed. In fact, if the person is a fragment of a planetary system, then the formation and development of the humankind is determined by the order that exists in the world through which the humankind appeared and exists. So, people's attitude to the needs, methods of production of benefits, their exchange and distribution should be in harmony with this order. Otherwise they will be incorrect! As well as management decisions in this field.

Of course, we are aware of the fact that many provisions in this article are disputable. So we hope for a constructive discussion on this issue.

References

1. Einstein, A. (1936). Physics and reality. In Author, 1956, Out of My Later Years (pp. 59-95), Secaucus,NJ
2. Smuts J. Holism and Evolution. London: Macmillan, 1926.
3. Moiseev N. N. Coevolution of nature and society. The way of noospherogenesis "Ecology and life" №2-3. 1997
4. Moki V.S. Transdisciplinary philosophy the noumenal world – Nalchic: ANOIT, 2011/ [Electronic resource].– Access mode: URL: <http://www.anoitt.ru/tdbiblioteka/tdnoumen.php> (reference date: 01.09.2015).

5. Samuelson, Paul A. (1947), Enlarged ed. 1983. Foundations of Economic Analysis, Harvard University Press.
6. Institute of transdisciplinary technologies. <http://www.anoitt.ru>.

Author details

Mokiy Mikhail - professor, Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, State University of Management, Moscow, Russia.
E-mail: mokiy2000@yandex.ru