

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY – AN APPLICATION OF AND SUPPORT TO SYSTEMIC BEHAVIOR

Matjaž Mulej

University of Maribor and IRDO Institute for the Development of Social Responsibility

HUMANKIND'S NEED FOR A MODEL OF LIFE AFTER THE NEOLIBERAL MONOPOLIES

Data are clear: 80 percent of the global business is under control of less than 750 out of 30 million investigated organizations. This is happening under the label of free market, but it is killing the free market as a place of equal-footed economy. Besides, this neoliberal capitalism is killing the liberal capitalism in which the invisible hand directs business and consumers into long-term relations of mutual trust and reliability. In addition, the neoliberal capitalism no longer faces the dilemma 'either guns or butter', but uses the extremely extensive production of weapons to assure butter, but only to the single percent of the richest persons and their few employees, while causing more than ten current wars and more than one hundred million displaced persons. Those wars, of course, are far away from the countries that are the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and produce and sell the predominant quantities of weapons globally (USA alone sell one third of the entire huge production of weapons). The conclusion 1: the neoliberal capitalism is not capitalism in its original definition (free market, permanent innovation, consideration of the triple concept – freedom, equality, brotherhood, make-it-do and do-without), but a new kind of feudal and slave-owning society under a new label. The conclusion 2: the neoliberal capitalism is at the end of its blind alley and humankind needs to replace it – by a third world war or without it (the latter is a much less dangerous solution).

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY – THE ALTERNATIVE MODEL OF LIFE AFTER THE NEOLIBERAL MONOPOLIES

On the global level, humankind discovered the alternative to the dangerous neoliberal monopolies and its permanent crises, including world wars. Under the umbrella of UNO and ISO humankind called the alternative – the social responsibility. The name is somehow misleading; it should better be 'humans' and their organizations' responsibility toward the society, i.e. humans/humankind and their natural environment. Social responsibility is supposed to reach beyond law, but no way to replace law. It should change law to attain unconditional support to socially responsible behavior of humans as persons and as members, especially the influential members of organizations, be them enterprises, families, NGOs, countries and their parts and supranational unions, such as EU. This applies also to peoples' unions that have legally become countries over time, such as USA, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, India, China, South Africa, Japan, Pakistan, Indonesia, Australia, UK, Germany, Italy, France, Spain, etc.

The three critical concepts, summarized briefly and clearly in ISO 26000, namely are:

- Responsibility for one's influences over society, i.e. human and other nature;
- Interdependence;
- Holistic approach.



Monopolies have always in human history tended to generate irresponsibility:

- Bosses had no one to control them, including adaptation of law to their interests;
- Subordinates had no rights except the right of irresponsibility, e.g. by limitation of their effort to the bosses' orders without any own initiative, except the one opposing the bosses.

Monopolies have always in human history tended to generate the ethic of dependence and independence rather than the only natural consequence of specialization per natural attributes and professions:

- Bosses felt independent from their subordinates and other nature; this generated their feeling of their right of irresponsibility, because they tended to find their power a source of special rights rather than special duties covering the needs of other people and other nature;
- Subordinates felt dependent on bosses and other nature; this generated their feeling of their right of irresponsibility, because they tended to find their lack of power a source of no rights rather than many imposed duties covering the needs of other people and other nature, limited to their bosses.

Monopolies have always in human history tended to generate the ethic of one-sidedness rather than a holistic approach.

- Bosses used the principle 'divide and impera', i.e. divide and master, in order to enjoy special rights rather than to accept and realize duties resulting from their power holding positions;
- Subordinates learned to be narrow specialists with no knowledge on interdisciplinary creative cooperation, i.e. to be divided and mastered, rather than contributing as much as possible.

DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS: SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OFFERS THE WAY OUT FROM THE CURRENT CRISIS OF AFFLUENCE

There were in history for phases of development of the basis of competitiveness:

- Owning the natural resources (causing wars and colonies always in history, including today);
- Investing into the better and/or easier use of natural resources (causing the power of capital owners);
- Innovation into an even better use of natural resources (causing the affluence of the innovative ones and power holders at the detriment of others);
- Affluence is no longer a good base for competitiveness, because it kills ambition to have more, once one has everything one needs, and hence the hard work rather than free time and leisure (therefore tourism flourishes now like never before, and so does the illegal drugs abuse, because the free time has a poor content).
- A fifth phase is necessary. This is why the global humankind's bodies proclaimed social responsibility and briefed it in ISO 26000.

