

## **SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND BUSINESS ETHICS**

**Dr. Dr. Matjaz Mulej, Prof. Emer.**

*University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, and  
IRDO Institute for Development of Social Responsibility,  
Maribor, Slovenia (head of experts board),*

*And IASCYS International Academy for Systems and Cybernetic Sciences, Vienna (president),  
European Academy of Sciences and Arts, Salzburg (member),  
European Academy of Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Paris (member)*

[mulej@uni-mb.si](mailto:mulej@uni-mb.si)

### **Abstract:**

‘Problems cannot be solved with the mentality that has caused them’. Hence, the 2008- crisis cannot be solved with ethics of one-sided and short-term mentality of the industrial and neo-liberal economics, which has caused the ‘Bubble Economy’ of several recent decades. Neither the market nor the government alone have assured the common benefit of all humans so far, as they were supposed to in the so-called capitalistic or communistic/socialistic socio-economic order over the recent centuries. The pre-industrial mentality has neither been able to assure the common benefit that should result from the ‘invisible hand’ or the ‘visible hand’ of power-holders. The decisions/actions have always been made and taken by humans, making or heading organizations, be it families, enterprises, non-governmental organizations, public institutions, or government bodies. The role of organizations is to provide for synergetic co-operation of specialists toward holism as the basis of the common benefit.

These facts make us think about humans, their responsibility, values, culture, ethic, and norms (VCEN), with a focus on entrepreneurial and business life, in this text. They make us think about an innovative change in mentality (both as a process of beneficial change and as its outcome). Thus, we come to think of combining in a synergy (a) social responsibility (SR), (b) innovation, (c) the (Dialectical) Systems Theory (as the theory of attainment of the requisite holism (RH), without which the benefit of all can hardly be yielded). This means that we do not see the (corporate) SR as a simple charity or honesty of owners and managers in their relations with their coworkers, business partners, broader society (including charity as a part of SR) and nature (as a general precondition of human survival after centuries of nature’s destruction rather than maintenance), but as a/the new socio-economic order after neo-liberalism and its ‘Bubble Economy’. The latter disregards the natural and human capacities too much to be allowed to continue destroying humankind and its natural preconditions.

Without SR, the current civilization hardly has a chance to survive. In ISO 26000, namely, SR covers (1) governance, management and organization, (2) human rights, (3) labor relations, (4) natural environment, (5) fair business practices, (6) consumer issues, (7) community involvement and development; it links all of them with consideration of (1) interdependence as the basis, and (2) holism as the top intention/achievement. We prefer no limitation of SR to companies: they follow influential humans’ decisions. SR is a human attribute. Interdependence makes human honest and leads from one-sidedness to holism.

**Keywords:** global economy, invention-innovation-diffusion process, ISO 26000, requisite holism, social responsibility, socio-economic order, (Dialectical) Systems Theory.

**Abbreviations in this text:**

DS = dialectical system (mental picture of the chosen part of reality aimed at including all crucial and only crucial viewpoints in synergy into consideration in order for the observer, managers, researchers, or practitioners to attain the requisite holism rather than falling into the trap of one-sidedness and resulting oversights and failures).

IIDP = invention-innovation-diffusion process (process of making users' new benefit from a successful use of any new idea).

ISO 26000 = International Standards Organization's document on Social Responsibility, published in November 2010.

R&D = Research and Development (the professional part of the technological IIDP).

RH = requisite holism (realistic midway between fictitious onesided, and unattainable total, i.e. real holism) of approach. RH includes all crucial viewpoints, their relations and synergies. Also: requisitely holistic.

SMEs = Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (none to under 250 coworkers/employees).

SR = social responsibility (of individuals, enterprises and other organizations, governments).

VCEN = values, culture, ethic, and norms (in synergy). Also: socially responsible.

## **The Selected Problem and Viewpoint of Consideration of It**

When people talk about the (Corporate) social responsibility (SR), many tend to think of the corporations' SR (Esposito, 2009), i.e. of the large enterprises, only, but their share in the total number of businesses is small. We will not concentrate on them specifically, here, although we will not forget about them. The Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) with less than 250 employees are the most frequent enterprises, making +99 % of all businesses both in Slovenia and European Union (Rebernik et al., 2003) and providing for more than 50 % of all jobs, according to newer data even 64,7% (Babić, 2011) and more than 70 % of new jobs. About 80 % of producing rather than trading or servicing SMEs supply specialized parts to producers of final products around the world. This puts SMEs, too, in the global market in which they are exposed to double competition: between suppliers of their types of products, and services, and between producers of final products. This makes SMEs very vulnerable and needing competitiveness and SR, too.

In corporations or SMEs, the businesses' owners and managers cannot hide from their co-workers, partners, broader society, and nature, hence from SR as bosses' or organizations' SR toward them. The big corporations should work as a synergetic network of many SMEs, because the number of employees is best under 150 in a unit – for coworkers to know, control, and double-check each other; this increases their responsibility and good work (Gladwell, 2004). This requires all businesses to develop and apply modern ethics, such as SR ethics backed by ethics of interdependence (Mulej, Kajzer, 1998), although this is not 'fashionable' under prevailing of the neo-liberal economics of so far (Fistravec, 2010, 2011; Toth, 2008; Repovz, 2011; Šarotar Žižek et al, 2010d).

Many SMEs were established by persons who no longer wanted to tolerate bosses and alienation in bigger enterprises; these persons became sole or growing entrepreneurs, or started family businesses (Duh, 2010; Gerber, 2006; Stropnik, 2010; Štrukelj and Duh, 2010). Their aim at independence may poorly match their factual interdependence with their coworkers, suppliers, customers, broader society, natural preconditions of survival of the current humankind's civilization. Interdependence results from the unavoidable narrow specialization of everybody; it creates and requires VCEN of interdependence (Potočan, Mulej, 2007). Independence is a necessary legal status to prevent legal bases for abuse in business and other relations, in which dependence can cause subordination and resulting misuse and abuse that lead to additional, although short-term and, benefit of the stronger and abusing ones, and to revenge of the abused ones, later.

These situations and related VCEN leads to SR as a business strategy (Esposito, 2009), and as a sign of VCEN of interdependence backing this strategy in attributes of the decisive humans and their teams. In 2010, SR received international support by ISO 26000. SR might show humans a way out from the 'Bubble Economy' that has created a life beyond natural possibilities and human capacities of the current times (Senge et al, 2008).

These facts require SMEs, as well as corporations and all other organizations, to undertake an IIDP reaching beyond the technological innovation – for SR to come to prevail in society/world as a crucial non-technological innovation, helping humankind survive.

SR reinforces A. Smith's liberalism (full consideration of holism and interdependence) instead of the current neo-liberalism (supportive of one-sidedness too much and stressing 'diminishing of cost at any cost' causing too much damage to humankind to be acceptable any

more). Honesty is a precondition of the good capitalism (Hensley, 2008), but the current practice does not support honesty enough for SR to be unnecessary (.. Rop, 2011). Instead of honesty, humans currently experience risky societies (Kajfež-Bogataj et al, editors, 2010). A crucial innovation of VCEN and socio-economic order is needed (Senge et al, 2008). SR supports new VCEN (Mulej, Hrast, editors, 2010). The website on SR shows beyond a hundred million of contributions.

Here, a few suggestions for implementation of SR are briefed.

### **Small and Medium-sized Enterprises in A. Smith's Perception: Central for Social Responsibility of Businesses and Success of the Entire Economy and Society**

SMEs are what A. Smith (2010) has presupposed to be the basic components of the market economy, in which the 'invisible hand' of competitors' pressure demands honesty for 'the natural prices' to prevail under the name of the 'free market' rather than monopolies; thus, A. Smith may be called anti-capitalist rather than the author who has provided the basis for Hayek's model of the extreme current capitalism (Močnik, 2010). Toth (2008) also found something similar in A. Smith's thoughts: Smith allowed no division of rights from duties of entrepreneurs via share-holding and limited liability companies or monopolies, but local market with SMEs, and total personal responsibility of company owners; in addition, A. Smith's first book, the one on 'Moral Sentiments', is a crucial basis for his second book on 'Wealth of Nations' (Smith, 2000; Smith 2010).

These findings link us to SR as a basis of the theoretically real capitalism, of which A. Smith is considered the basic author, with the invisible hand, i.e. competition and honesty, prevailing over the short-term and narrowly defined interests of the most influential parts of society, i.e. of entrepreneurs. Consideration of interdependence is ascribed to A. Smith by other authors, too (Petzinger, 2000). Neo-liberalism of the Chicago school of Milton Friedman is essentially different; actually, it opposes A. Smith. It actually expects monopolies and allows neither companies' care for well-being of people and for nature to result from the free market, nor societal bodies to fight monopolies and limited competition (Halimi, 2008; Toth, 2008). Monopolies limit competitive pressure, thus limiting progress, SR, innovation and requisite holism (RH) of approach/behavior, and requisite wholeness; instead they support biased one-sidedness of behavior and resulting outcomes of business and official processes/activities. Good management prevent these problems (Malik, 2010).

In addition, both bigger companies and SMEs cannot avoid the following fact influencing their success. Researchers of business practice find, that

- hardly any more than one of 3.000 ideas (Derickson et al, 2010), and
- one single percent of patented ideas

become innovations yielding benefit to authors and owners along with users. Even ideas trusted as much as to become official company's development projects of the world top companies succeed in less than five percent (Nussbaum, 2005).

This poor success of IIDP covers data about the very complex, but though the simplest, type of IIDP – the technological IIDP. The non-technological IIDP, e.g. of VCEN toward SR, are less easy to capture in hard data and have been less usually included in statistics (Potocan, Mulej, 2007; Taylor, 2008). Though, the oversight of the non-technological innovations and similar soft IIDP belongs to critical causes of the current global

economic crisis with a crucial impact over businesses due to their double competition mentioned above. Importance of SR is hard to see, therefore; especially the fact that SR prevents or diminishes, at least, cost in advance, thus making them invisible in accountancy (Hrast et al, editors, 2007; Senge et al, 2008).

These circumstances demand companies to make SR a component of their business strategy, including sustainability, along with their influential persons' honesty toward employees, partners, and broader society, i.e. all stakeholders (EU, 2001; ISO, 2010). This is even more crucial in the current global crisis, in which the traditional measures and efforts no longer work for well-being, as the years after 2008 demonstrate (Babić, 2011; Nicolaci da Costa, 2010) world-wide. Reasons include the fact that nobody has the official legal authority to influence, or even press with legislation, the multinational companies for more SR; an honest and requisitely holistic world-government is needed, international law is not obligatory enough to stop their monopolies (Harris, 2008; Martin, 2006; Martin, Murphy, editors, 2009).

For the market competition to really work, both A. Smith (Smith, 2010) and current researchers (Rus, 2010) find a strong government crucial: it protects the common good rather than partial interests of the most influential groups of society, if it is not one-sided on behalf of e.g. a political party's members. Thus, government protects SR, in principle, but it hardly attains RH, if law is abused (Pavliha, 2000). This experience is fortified by another statement: 'capitalism is a very energetic horse that must be tamed by the government of law' (Petric, 2010). Let us add: it must be a SR law rather than the laws of Hitler, Stalin, Pinochet and similar one-sided bosses. – With no SR, crises are unavoidable.

What is actually capitalism, today, is an open issue reaching beyond this contribution; there are many diverse practices under this name, around the world (Fleissner, Wanek, ed., 2008; Goerner et al, 2008; Prašnikar, Cirman, 2008; Nicolaci da Costa, 2010; Socan, 2011; Zenko, 1999; etc.). We will rather discuss the current crisis; it requires IIDP and innovation of the basic socio-economic paradigm as a way out from the given blind alley – toward SR.

### **Businesses and the 2008- Global Crisis: a General Need for Social Responsibility**

We predicted the current crisis a decade ago; its surfacing matches Mulej's Law of the 2-generation cycle of VCEN's viability (Mulej, Ursic, 1989; Mulej, 1994; Mulej et al., 2000): it takes approximately 70 years or two generations for new VCEN to replace the previously prevailing ones. Signs of a visible paradigm change (hopefully: innovation as a beneficial change, rather than any change) of VCEN have the form of crisis, i.e. break, troubles, and opportunities. E.g. in USA there were two-generation cycles between its establishment, end of colonial dependence, civil war, the big depression of 1930's, and the current crisis; similar are data about other older capitalistic countries (Mulej, in Mulej et al., 2000). From the 3-part world-wide crisis of 1914-1945, consisting of two world wars and the big recession between them, until the current (seemingly) only financial, economic, and (really) also environmental and social crisis a 2-generations cycle has passed.

The big recession of early 1930's was not overcome by Keynes's reforms and the term of macro-economy (Udovicic, 2009), added to enterprise economy and political economy in economic theory, but also and first of all it resulted in the 2nd World War; ideas about government causing full employment were close to Keynes, but they were deployed by Hitler's Germany, too, and even before Keynes's book. (Today the production of weapons

does not seem smaller, but even bigger, or more destructive/efficient, at least, public media report; 28 wars are currently taking place, researchers reported at the conference of International Systems Science Society 2010 in an oral workshop). In 1930s, humans possessed no nuclear weapons like today. A 3rd World War would be detrimental and probably the last one - ending the current civilization (Bozicnik et al., 2008; Komat, 2010). In terms of Mulej's Dialectical and Bertalanffy's General Systems Theories (Bertalanffy, 1968, edition 1979; Mulej, 1974, 1975, 1979, 2007b, etc.; Mulej et al., 2000; Mulej and Zenko, 2004 a, b; Mulej et al., 2008; Mulej et al., forthcoming) one may say that all local, big, and World Wars and crises, as well as other troubles, result from one-sided rather than requisitely holistic behavior (made of monitoring, perception, comprehension, thinking, emotional and spiritual life, decision making, communication, and action; thus, the term behavior does not include superficial output-to-input reaction only, here).

One-sided approaches/behaviors cause one-sided, partial and oversight-including—rather than RH – insights, measures and actions, thus causing oversight of some crucial attributes of events and processes, hence reality, and they result in troubles. The resulting conclusion therefore reads: in the radically changed conditions of today compared to several decades ago, it is urgent to renew the basic concept of the given socio-economic practice, not only products and processes. Problems cannot be solved with mentality, methods, and decisions having caused them (Einstein; in: Thorpe, 2003).

Otherwise, businesses and their stakeholders, including shareholders, will share a dying Planet Earth with more or less all/few surviving members of the current civilization (Bozicnik et al, 2008; Brown, 2008; Hrast, Mulej, editors, 2010;Korten, 2009; Taylor, 2008; Mulej, 2010). There is no general agreement about how much and what can be done, e.g. about measurement of progress with GDP or other measures as an underlying information provoking action (Haverkamp, 2010; Malik, 2010;Mihalič, 2010; Monbiot, 2010; Salecl, 2010; Senge et al., 2008; ŠarotarŽižek, Mulej and Potočnik, 2010; Repovz, 2011; Stiglitz, 2009).

The new VCEN is clear, though: the frequent businesses' focus on cost only is no longer enough: total quality, range of choice, uniqueness, sustainability, and other components of SR, mentioned below, must be considered, too (Gerzema, 2010; Mulej et al, 2008, and forthcoming). Greed and shopping-addiction are no longer the right behavior (Zgonik, 2011). This requires a broader perception of innovation than in earlier conditions. Namely, the suggested IIDP/innovation of the socio-economic model, VCEN, and practice toward SR must take place and take in account the radically changed conditions:

- Since 1820, after the 3 (three) % per-millennium growth before industrialization, the growth reached 5500% (fifty five times) in less than two centuries; humankind is now facing three bombs – population, ecology, and resources, but is though using shallow information versus deep knowledge and versus wisdom available (Targowski, 2009). In reality these three problems are only results of one-sided/superficial human behavior, which is the real problem to be replaced by SR.
- Since 1945, in six decades only, humankind has grown 2.5 times, and its economy and related consumption of natural resources grew 7 (seven) times. But the Planet Earth has not grown and is becoming critically depleted (Bozicnik et al., 2008; Brown, 2008; Dyck,

Mulej et al, 1998; Ecimovic et al., 2002; Ecimovic et al., 2007; Hrast, Mulej, editors, 2010; Korten, 2009; Plut, 2009; Stern, 2006, 2007; Taylor, 2008; Wilby, ed., 2009; etc.).

- Due to human VCEN and habits causing, and resulting from, the above reflected development, humankind now emits every one hour (!) four million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere and 1.7 million tons of nitrogen in the arable soil, while cutting 1.500 hectares of woods; this makes 13 million hectares a year, according to Reuters, which is one size of Slovenia (or New Jersey, USA) every months (Trstenjak, 2010), on average in 2000-2010 and even 16 million hectares a year, earlier (Keršič Svetel, 2010), year after year; thus we face a very dangerous growth of temperature of air that is visible in melting of icebergs, etc. (See: Mulej, Hrast, editors, 2010, for details). This causes a very dangerous climate change; methane is found an even bigger danger than CO<sub>2</sub> (Hamman et al. 2010).
- We are all on the same – sinking – boat (James, 2008), but on different decks. The only 200 (two hundred) richest persons exceed the combined annual income of the world's 2.5 billion poorest people (Senge et al., 2008: 6). Almost half of the world's population lives on less than two US dollars per day while the average American earns 130 USD per day (ibid.). The poor ones cannot change the current trend, while the rich ones are not willing to change it by a radical non-technological innovation. For humankind of the current civilization to survive, climatologists warn of the need to reduce emissions in the air, water, and soil for 80%, which can be attained with the given technologies, but requires a critical IIDP of the current consumption patterns and big innovative structural changes in production and use of energy (Ibid.).
- Only the renewal of natural preconditions for our civilization to survive, after decades of competition by destruction of nature, would cost more than both world wars combined, in a best case scenario, if the action is undertaken immediately; postponing the action may increase cost to beyond 20 % of the world-wide GDP (Stern, 2006, 2007).
- The current affluence (James, 2008; Porter, 1990) makes GDP an obsolete measure of success, because it disregards crucial aspects of human well-being and happiness, thus making a wrong impression about reality. They started only recently to work on new measures (See: Mulej, Hrast et al., 2010; Stiglitz, 2009a, b; etc.). Actions of European Union are envisioned to take place soon (Kutin, 2011). The Bubble Economy must cease (Senge, 2008).
- The theory that the economic growth is unavoidable at any price (Baumol et al. 2007; etc.) is equally leading to a blind alley; it is also neglecting humans' natural environment and happiness; it is related to the above cited piling up of tremendous cost threatening to cause poverty with no well-being of the generations to come. What leads to poverty without well-being is the usual one-sided neglecting showing in synergy that only 15-20% of humankind benefit from the innovative society that has been ruining the natural preconditions of life of all 100% (Only 15% of humankind live on more than six USD a day (Nixon, 2004; Senge, 2008), but this data covers situation before the 2008- crisis).
- Now, 20% of children in European Union (!) face poverty, according to Andor and Courard (2011); data about the world are cited below. They require SR to prevail. Data find the income level of the poorer humans, although making people unhappy (and poor purchasers), in the entire world-wide population is higher than ever before in history. It is

exact in book-keeping terms, only, rather than in real economic terms (references above). The good picture is monetary only. Data is not requisitely holistic for the theory backing it to show the way out from the current blind alley.

- A similar blind alley results from the destruction of ambition by affluence; it is visible in abuse of drugs etc. rather than in the growing motivation for creation, while creativity is the central human and humane attribute (Mulej and Prosenak 2007a, b; Skafar, 2009; etc.).
- Such findings put questions that do not tackle knowledge only, but human VCEN. VCEN direct acquisition and use of knowledge for good or bad aims (Gladwell, 2004, 2009; Mulej 1974 and later, also: Mulej et al. 2008; Potocan, Mulej 2007; Zajc, 2011).
- Unemployment is growing, because the technological innovation replaces human labor with technical equipment, both on shop-floor and in offices and services, and because economists, business-persons, and governments wrongly presupposed that the growth of market will last forever (Gerzema, 2010; etc.). They disregarded data that only 15% of humankind live on more than six USD/day (Nixon, 2004), while the upper part of them live in affluence that destroys ambition to work hard (James, 2007; Mulej and Hrast, editors, 2010; Prosenak, Mulej, 2008; etc.).
- Countries' debts have negative influences on financial markets, as visible signs of doubtful feelings of the most lively, speculative, and influential parts of businesses, around the world. USA expects a new crisis, Greece and Ireland received European Union's support to not go bankrupt; Portugal is expected to be the next country needing help, while Spain's debt is bigger than the debts of Greece, Ireland, and Portugal combined, and this situation influences China, too (Bakovic, 2011; Nicolaci da Costa, 2010). Most countries of the world are showing their data now, according to which their liabilities reach beyond any acceptable limit, because they have been using a short-term and narrow-minded strategy, as public media report daily now. It is no longer clear, what is a normal business environment (e.g. Jakse, 2011). The 'Bubble Economy' is not it.
- In European Union, which still intends to become the strongest economy in the world,
  - every 6<sup>th</sup> person has hard times paying his or her bills;
  - three out of four of them think that poverty has grown, and
  - they worry about keeping their jobs;
  - more than 50% of them fear to not find another job in six months, if they lose the current one;
  - they do not trust that their foreseen pension will allow them a decent life in their old age;
  - the Lisbon strategy failed, the new strategy with the same aim is called European Union 2020 (Vidic, 2010).
- Nearly a billion of people in the current world suffer from hunger. Every six seconds a child dies due to illness related to hunger and poverty. In Sub-Sahara Africa 30% of entire population suffer from hunger (Data are quoted in: Vidic, 2010.).
- Businesses practice many abuses of their subordinate coworkers and business partners as well as consumers and nature (E.g. Heerden, 2010). But consumers in the areas of the world that are the most advanced in terms of technological innovations as well as having

the biggest habits of buying/consuming on levels of greed rather than need – have started to seriously change their consumer behavioral paradigm even over several years before the crises of 2008- (Gerzema, 2010). Six percent of women and 5.5 % of men in USA, and a good one % in Germany are shopping-addicted (Zgonik, 2011b).

- In the pre-industrial agricultural society, the European farmers had a much shorter work-time per year than the industrial workers have today, because they were not living on growing rice like in Southern China (Gladwell, 2009).
- The current speed of work and ‘bombing’ with data aimed at becoming information, i.e. influential messages, is too much for most humans (Zgonik, 2011a).
- Etc.

These data, though, do not show the essence of the problem, but its visible consequences only. The problem did not grow on a tree; it results from human behavior that lacks SR for humans to be less selfish for selfish reasons, i.e. less short-term and narrowly oriented in their behavior than so far – in order for the current human civilization to survive. The Planet Earth can live without humans (again, like it used to live for millennia), but humans cannot live without a healthy Planet Earth and hence without a healthy economy (Hrast, Mulej, editors, 2010; Mulej, Hrast, et al, 2010; Mulej, 2010; quoted references; etc.).

Thus, for very economic reasons, IIDP and innovation, as its outcome, need a broader definition than a technology-related one only. The EU’s definition (EU, 1995) is broad enough, in principle, although completely enterprise-based, but not elaborated in any detail; the technological innovation only is measured. This causes a misinformation in statistics, which make the misleading bases for governments’, businesses’, and individuals’ decisions.

Additionally, safety issues can be added. The 2011 earthquake in North-East of Japan with a number of nuclear power-plants, the following tsunami, destruction and radiation is well published in public media in March 2011, when this contribution is being created. The threats of one-sidedness rather than SR in e.g. human behavior toward humankind’s natural environment, though, have so far received more attention of ecologists than of criminal justice and security scientists (Mesko et al., editors, 2011).

From all these aspects, IIDP is badly needed, to reach SR, and to survive as the current civilization; in this connection a broader definition of innovation that reaches beyond technology is needed.

### **The Breadth of Perception of Innovation in the 2008- Crises Conditions**

Forty years ago, in 1971, OECD provided its broad and rather realistic official definition of innovation. But many still tend to limit this term to technological innovation, including the official international statistics. But: technology alone does not create the future; it is a tool of decisive humans and their followers (Collins, 2001; Collins, Porras, 1994). If it is a tool, does either one-sidedness or RH/SR in humans’ behavior show the way out from the 2008- crisis? Data about results of the recent decades expose the dangerous impact of one-sided decision makers, and the need for RH/SR (Bambaren 2010; Bozicnik, 2007; Bozicnik et al., 2008; Harris, 2008; Senge et al., 2008; Stern, 2006; Stern, 2007; etc.). SR reflects RH and wholeness of outcomes based on a RH, rather than one-sided approach to human activities.

The official international definition of innovation does not cover technology only, but the statistical guidelines in the related Oslo Manual cover technology only:

»Innovation is the renewal and enlargement of the range of products and services and the associated markets; the establishment of new methods of production, supply and distribution; the introduction of changes in management, work organization, and the working conditions and skills of the workforce« (EU, 2000: 4).

In the current trends, innovation may not be reduced to IIDP of products and services; it must rather cover the non-technological issues, too, or even first of all. See Table 1.

**Table 1: 40 basic types of inventions, suggestions, potential innovation and innovations**

<i>'Innovation is every (!) novelty, once its users (!) find it beneficial (!) in practice (!)'</i>				
<i>Three networked criteria of inventions, suggestions, potential innovations, and innovations</i>	<i>(2) Consequences of innovations</i>		<i>(3) On-job-duty to create inventions, suggestions, potential innovations, and innovations</i>	
<i>(1) Content of inventions, suggestions, potential innovations, and innovations</i>	<i>1. Radical</i>	<i>2. Incremental</i>	<i>1. Duty exists</i>	<i>2. No duty</i>
1. Business program items	1.1.	1.2.	1.3.	1.4.
2. Technology (products, work processes)	2.1.	2.2.	2.3.	2.4.
3. Organization (process-based rather than one-sided subordination-based)	3.1.	3.2.	3.3.	3.4.
4. Managerial style (co-operative rather than one-way commanding)	4.1.	4.2.	4.3.	4.4.
5. Methods of leading, working and co-working (supportive of co-operation)	5.1.	5.2.	5.3.	5.4.
6. Business style (co-operation with business partners)	6.1	6.2	6.3	6.4
7. Governance & management process (supportive of cooperation in daily practice)	7.1	7.2	7.3	7.4
8. VCEN (supportive of cooperation and reflecting interdependence)	8.1	8.2	8.3	8.4
9. Our habits (realizing contemporary VCEN in our practice)	9.1	9.2	9.3	9.4
10. Habits of others (realizing contemporary VCEN in their practice)	10.1	10.2	10.3	10.4

Innovation of VCEN tends toward SR, ethics of interdependence, sustainable future, and RH of approach leading to requisite wholeness of outcomes of the human behavior. Management style- and VCEN-related innovation is the most influential: it switches from

- 'I think and decide, you work only' to
  - 'We all think and we all work, and we all listen to each other to attain RH' principle.
- This double innovation enables other types to show up. Management, governance, and organizing must become crucially more RH than in the concept of the Chicago School of neo-liberal economy opposing and disabling Adam Smith's liberalism and its invisible hand, briefed above (Gorenak, Mulej, 2010; Senge et al., 2008; Toth, 2008; Smith, 2010).

The 2008- crisis was not caused in 2008; it only surfaced then, as a consequence of the neo-liberal fictitious, rather than realistic, model of omnipotent market, causing also fictitious innovations by bank- and finance- people and the break of the fictitiously working real-estate market in USA (e.g.: ..Rop, 2011). This crisis is obviously much deeper: the market cannot be relied upon, because it does not work as predefined by A. Smith (Smith, 2010). Neither can governments be reliable, if they are biased and onesided rather than requisitely or even totally holistic in their approach (Mulej and Kajzer, 1998). Thus, they can hardly attain the requisite wholeness of their insights and other outcomes. See Tables 2a and 2b.

**Table 2a: The selected level of holism and realism of consideration of the selected topic between the fictitious, requisite, and total holism and realism**

←----->		
Fictitious holism/realism (inside a single (subjectively selected) viewpoint)	<i>Requisite holism/realism (a dialectical system of all (subjectively selected) essential viewpoints)</i>	Total = real holism/realism (a system of all (objective rather than selected) viewpoints)

**Table 2b: Law of Requisite Holism in some details**

APPROACH TO DEALING WITH AN OBJECT AS A TOPIC OF THINKING ETC. - CONSEQUENCES	One-sidedness by a single viewpoint	Requisite holism by co-operation of all essential humans and only them	Total holism by consideration of totally all viewpoints, insights from them and synergies of all of them
TYPE OF APPROACH	(Too) simple	Requisitely simple	Very entangled
TYPE OF SYSTEM	Single-viewpoint based system	Dialectical system	Total system
ATTRIBUTES OF OBJECT INCLUDED IN SYSTEM	(Very) few	All essential	All
RESULT OF APPROACH	Fictitious holism (in most cases)	Requisite holism (good in most cases)	Total holism
FOCUS MADE POSSIBLE	(Too) Narrow focus (in most cases)	Requisitely holistic focus	Lack of focus
NUMBER OF PROFESSIONS	One single	Requisitely many	Literally all
TYPE OF WORK	Individual	Mixed team of all requisite and different experts	All humankind in co-operation for total synergy
CONSEQUENCES	Complex due to crucial oversights, dangerous	No problem due to no crucial oversights	Simple due to no oversights
AVAILABILITY	(Too) Frequent in real life	Possible in real life	Not possible in real life
HUMAN BEINGS AS INDIVIDUALS	Fictitiously holistic behavior, dangerous	Requisitely holistic behavior, best possible	Not possible in real life, even in team work

The problem lies in VCEN/mentality very much – in humans’ thinking and worldview as well as other values/emotions. This mentality is expressed in one-sided and short-term thinking of companies including their marketing and public relations messages (Goerner et al, 2008; Prosenak, Mulej, 2008; Prosenak, Mulej, Snoj, 2008; Senge et al, 2008). One-sidedness results in a lack of contemporary excellence, which requires more RH of behavior for the humankind’s future to exist.

**Future – Well-being by Creativity, RH, and SR, or Bad Life Again**

There is an interesting view of economic-development phases that stresses the notions summarized above. See Table 3.

Porter (1990, after Brglez, 1999: 23-24) defines several bases of competitiveness following each other. We extend his idea to development and add our ideas about the related culture and phase 5.

Obviously, the affluence phase in Table 3 is not the highest development phase so far, only; it is also the phase of growing problems of unemployment, supporting everybody, growing lack of ambition and related drug etc. abuse, etc.

Conclusion: one must attain and keep RH in order to enter the innovation phase quickly and remain in it as long as possible, and/or renew the prevailing VCEN; according to Gerzema (2010) consumers in USA have started this paradigm shift.

The 4<sup>th</sup> phase can hardly be avoided and may make room for a 5<sup>th</sup> phase, which is needed (Mulej, Prosenak, 2007). Porter and Kramer (2006) do not mention phase 5 either.

The ‘Related VCEN’ data are ours (Mulej et al, forthcoming).

**Table 3: From scarcity via complacency to the danger of a new scarcity or a new, 5<sup>th</sup> phase**

PHASE	ECONOMIC BASIS FOR DEVELOPMENT	RELATED VCEN
1. Ownership of natural factors	Natural resources and cheap labor, providing for a rather poor life of majority for millennia	Scarcity and solidarity, collectivism, tradition rather than innovation
2. Investment in modern technology	Foreign investment into the area's economic development; hardly/poor competitiveness in international markets	Growing differences, local competition, individualism, ambition to have more, be rich
3. Innovation based on local knowledge	Nation or region lives on its own progress and attains a better and better standard of living by international competitiveness	Growing differences and standard of living, global competition, ethic of interdependence, social responsibility, ambition to create
4. Affluence	People have finally become rich, which makes them happy in material well-being as a blind alley	Complacency, no more ambition, consumerism; what is quality, then?
5. RH creation and social responsibility (SR)	Material wealth suffices; effort aimed at spiritual wealth, healthy natural and social environment as requisitely holistic well-being	Ethic of interdependence and SR, ambition to create, diminish social differences to those caused by creation, including innovation

The affluence phase becomes a dead alley, once people lose ambition to work hard and create (so far they did so, in history). People therefore need:

- Either a prolonged innovation phase based on RH of IIDP rather than one-sided processes, or
- A new phase, a 5<sup>th</sup> one; it includes:
  - Creative happiness based on VCEN based on practice, and
  - Resulting ethics of interdependence and interdisciplinary creative co-operation
  - With SR replacing the content-empty phase of affluence;
  - For selfish reasons, people are less selfish, short-term thinking, and narrow-minded, and they apply more RH/SR, in order to survive.

To make this innovation of VCEN and economy happen, a part of population, only, must become the core of the active creative class: Lester (2005) found authors detecting that about 15-20% of people are willing to take risk and cooperate, about the same many want to be (abusing) free-riders, while the majority just waits to see, what will the opinion makers undertake. This majority includes many humans with creative potential (not only artistic and scientific creativity matters; equal importance belongs to creative gardening, house-keeping, living on poor income, etc.). Leaders providing role-models of interdisciplinary creative co-operation can activate this potential (rather than the commanding managers do, who are one-sided). This would make humans happy and society prosperous. But it requires RH behavior.

In other words: (informal) systems thinking is the back-ground of the creative class (See: Florida, 2005) and innovative society with SR and RH.

This might lead to RH of society and economy by SR. Namely: CSR is in the EU's definition a concept for enterprises to integrate, on the basis of their free will, social and economic concerns into their business (including sustainability) and relations with stakeholders. IRDO reaches beyond CSR, i.e. enterprises' SR to SR of individuals, all kinds of organizations, professional groups, nations, peoples, unions (IRDO, 2006). Following several authors, IRDO defines SR as the human obligation to realize shared objectives of the society and to be beneficial beyond legal obligation (Hrast et al, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010; 2011; Hrast, 2007; Knez-Riedl, Mulej, Zenko, 2001; Knez-Riedl, 2003a, b, c, d, 2006;

Knez-Riedl et al, 2006; Knez-Riedl, 2007 a, b, c). Other definitions even see SR as a next step in methods of IIDP/innovation promotion such as Total Quality Management, Business Excellence, etc. Such attributes of behavior create new ambition, reaching beyond complacency of the affluent ones (Crowther and Caliyurt, editors, 2004a; Crowther et al, editors, 2004b). No short-term efficiency, including e.g. abuse of external economics, is RH enough for SR. Then, a new economy can succeed, based on SR, hopefully world-wide.

Economic efficiency remains necessary. But efficiency, which is based on logic of the neo-liberal Chicago school of economics of 'Bubble Economics', is one-sided and short-term oriented (e.g. Senge et al, 2008). Unlike A. Smith, neo-liberalism has an un-realistic supposition that the market, although monopolized, is perfect with no biased human impact. Neo-liberalism therefore tends to leave every problem to market forces, including the abuse of e.g. the:

- Laws of private property, i.e. the owner's right to use and abuse one's property (that does not include things only, but also the right of commanding over dependent humans, in practice),
  - External economics (e.g. environment), and
  - Less innovative by the more innovative ones and other power-holders.
- It should rather support matching RH by SR, which it denied (Toth, 2008).

Thus, neo-liberalism leads to a fictitious quality of life, business and general economic and social situation related to 'Bubble Economy' (See: Senge, 2008). This is actually a blind alley caused by transformation of the A. Smith's model of market economy into a plutocratic fictitious one that is closer to the feudal times (Fleissner, Wanek, editors, 2008; etc.). The founding fathers of USA fought against feudalism (Goerner et al, 2008); so did establishers of democracy-and-entrepreneurship society in Europe of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and European Union.

In ...: Rop (2011) data were quoted that in the period 1995-2008 the percentage of wealth belonging to one single percent of Americans has grown from 37% to 70%, which has never been so in the entire history and makes USA look like a 'banana republic'. This bad socio-economic outcome is found to result from the prevailing of the very short-term criteria of economic efficiency and related lack of SR of the decision-making persons, especially bankers and Wall Street speculators.

Keynes, the most influential economic theorist of the 20<sup>th</sup> century supported short-term criteria, too, with his famous sentence that in the long term we will all be dead.

Fujimoto (2006) correctly classifies Keynes-based economic measures such as prices, taxes, tariffs, import quota, etc. in the superficial, rather than deep/crucial, bases of competitiveness: the deep ones include technology, management, and organization. The latter three factors can be much more related to creativity, IIDP/innovation, RH and SR.

### **Social responsibility – as a solution for problems caused by one-sidedness of so far**

SR actually supports solutions to problems that result from one-sided management and behavior, and are very costly to repair. They show up in many forms.

- Lack of non-stop IIDP attaining RH instead of one-sided keeping the obsolete practices. Solution must include education for RH and ethics of interdependence in practice.
- Lack of IIDP reaching beyond:
  - Closed-in R&D toward open-innovation IIDP (Chesbrough, 2003; etc.);

- Buying equipment for production and other work processes;
- Buying intangible goods such as patents, licenses, brands, models, and know-how;
- Industrial engineering, design-and-trial production.

It shall reach toward transition from such passive and one-sided to creative and RH approaches to the IIDP, including all types of innovation rather than the technological ones only (Table 1). Solution must include competitiveness etc., creativity and enjoyable work of co-workers and hence their commitment to their organization, and resulting high engagement at work (Sarotar Zizek et al, 2010a, b, c, d).

- Lack of RH-conceived selection of ideas that are suggested for R&D and IIDP. Solution requires end of destroying the available human, technological, and financial resources into small pieces that allow for only incremental rather than radical innovations.
- Lack of RH-consideration of all types of innovation (Table 1). Solution requires IIDP-friendly VCEN in the organization and in society at large.
- Lack of RH-respect for co-workers' and outer partners' creativity and RH in all phases of the IIDP. Solution requires managers to innovate their management style to attain less passiveness and feeling of co-workers as subordinated employees, that their only remaining right is their right of irresponsibility (Mulej et al, 1987).
- Lack of RH-consideration of potential future needs of potential future customers in the moment of decision to start an IIDP. For this consideration now the anthropologists, ethnologists and similar 'soft' scientists are found very useful because their observation methods discover more hidden attributes than the marketing and R&D methods do.
- Lack of RH-consideration of the theory of innovative business. Solution requires consideration of all of its very many attributes and their individual and synergetic impacts on success (Mulej et al, 2008).
- Lack of RH-consideration of all possible sources of inventions, innovations, and diffusion ways in the 'open-innovation' style of business. Solution requires innovation of innovation management by innovation of management (Mulej et al, 1994).
- Lack of RH-consideration of demographic changes in society to be served. Solution requires use of systemic thinking for the big picture to enter the scene and diminish the oversights (Mulej et al, 1992).
- Lack of RH-creation and control of IIDP in vision, mission, politics, strategy, policies, tasks, operations, monitoring, training, education, and rewarding, and related information acquisition and distribution. Solution requires the same (Ibid.).
- Lack of RH-consideration of the given and potential risks related to both the routine-loving/based and IIDP parts of processes and their synergies, be these risks personal, internal/organizational, in supply- or sales-markets of human, financial, technological, informational, motivational, etc. resources. Solution requires the same (Ibid.).
- Lack of RH-consideration of the entrepreneurial spirit, entrepreneurship, and entrepreneurship-supporting climate based on VCEN and visible in IIDP projects and their realization. Solution requires the same (Ibid.).
- Lack of RH-based transition from the closed-innovation to the open-innovation model of the IIDP. Solution requires innovation of VCEN and knowledge (Mulej et al, 2008).

- Lack of RH-consideration of the role of patents and other intellectual property rights. Solution requires buying and/or selling them in time rather than too late or too early, or even donated for market to emerge later on (Chessbrough, 2003).
- Lack of RH-consideration of organization's emissions into the natural environment. Solution requires eco-remediation, health care, disabled people care, curing of natural disasters, etc. (Hamman et al, 2010; Hrast et al, editors, 2010).
- Lack of RH-consideration of productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness factors and resulting benefits. Solution requires reaching managerial horizons beyond narrow-minded and short-term criteria of success (Senge et al, 2008).
- Lack of RH-work on creation and maintenance of the VCEN and knowledge as well as possibilities supporting IIDP. Solution requires a permanent daily practice of all opinion-makers and others in organizations and society at large supportive of IIDP (Mulej et al, 2008).
- Lack of RH-work on creation and maintenance of the VCEN and knowledge as well as possibilities of interdisciplinary creative co-operation of mutually different specialists. Solution requires managers to fight one-sidedness of specialists by strategy of IIDP (Mulej et al, 2008).
- Lack of RH-work on creation and maintenance of the VCEN and knowledge as well as possibilities of friendship. Solution requires managers' effort for creative co-operation of mutually different specialists, to fight one-sidedness of specialists and to enable them to not feel criticized, but rather completed up, by disagreements resulting from differences in selected viewpoints (Mulej et al, 2008).
- Lack of RH-knowledge of personal/professional attributes of all crucial co-workers. Solution requires companies to function as synergies of SME's-like units, which were mentioned here earlier.
- Lack of RH-understanding that the so called National Innovation System does not cover innovation and diffusion phases, but the invention phase only, or mostly, in a best-case scenario. Solution requires government to support IIDP and SR by having all parts of the public sector supplied only by the organizations with most innovation, SR, business excellence and total/systemic quality (Mulej, 2007b).
- Lack of RH-assessment of and respect for imagination capacity of managers and co-workers. Solution requires organization of work processes that supports coworkers' effort to reach beyond daily routine obligations (Mulej, 2008).
- Lack of RH-consideration of and respect for innovation of the managerial style, organization and methods supporting democracy at work rather than one-way commanding management. Solution requires application of Figure 1 in this text.
- Lack of RH-consideration of the fact that external focus, decisiveness, imagination and courage, and RH of inclusiveness and domain expertise belong to the dialectical system of crucial attributes of managers and their co-workers for the organization's business to be innovative. Solution requires permanent knowledge refreshment and related VCEN (Mulej, 2007b).
- Lack of RH-consideration of the fact that success of IIDP is not normal, but failure is. Solution requires the approach to the contemporary, i.e. innovative business to attain RH,

for more than only a small percentage of ideas pass from the pre-development to the development of new options, and from there to the operation phase, and finally to the replacement phase (Mulej et al, 2008).

- Lack of RH-consideration of the future market trends in order to prevent the going-down phase of the product or service life cycle, and hence organizational life cycle, rather than falling into the trap of “recovering from success” due to oversights. Solution requires employment of knowledge and expertise of soft-science professionals beyond marketing and engineering, such as anthropologists and ethnologists (Mulej et al, 2008).
- Lack of RH-consideration that measurement of business/innovation results matters, but the most crucial factor is the VCEN and related knowledge and resulting detection and use of possibilities. Solution requires use of opportunity cost calculation (Malek, 2010).
- Lack of RH-consideration that it is the nice/great experience which is sold to customers rather than products or services, only. It causes sending customers to competitors instead of SR service. Solution requires total customer orientation (Quinn, 2006).
- Lack of RH-consideration of the fact that organization can learn very much from good universities and institutes. Solution requires the organization to cultivate its absorption capacity and clear insight in its own needs for knowledge and VCEN to be absorbed from other organizations, of course, with an active adaptation rather than passive imitation of ‘best practices’ from other circumstances (Mulej, 2007b; Quinn, 2006; etc.).
- Lack of RH-consideration that there is no one single best model or practice of the IIDP that fits all organizations and all social and natural environments. Solution requires open mind and adaption capacity (Mulej et al, 2008).
- Corruption and other abuses of business relations, resulting in image that prevents people from dealing with corrupt people; it excludes them from business life and friendship, etc. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence (Mulej et al, forthcoming).
- Poor quality rather than excellence of supplies of goods, services and work, which lead to similar consequences as corruption. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence (Mulej et al, forthcoming).
- Poor reliability as business and personal partners, which leads to similar consequences as above. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence (Mulej et al, forthcoming).
- Bluffing or lying that both lead to similar consequences as above. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence (Mulej et al, forthcoming).
- Persuasion of potential customers into fictitious needs for products, including medicines, and fictitiously necessary packaging, etc.; it leads to similar consequences as above and greed. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence (Mulej et al, forthcoming).
- Fictitious democracy, in which on one hand most people feel excluded rather than invited to help and create, and on the other hand one-sided decisions are passed by ‘majority in sessions’ rather than majority in reality and the most holistic proofs. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence (Mulej et al, forthcoming).
- Poor pay/wages/salaries along with enormous managers’ and owners’ incomes; it causes a poor market due to a poor buying capacity of 85% of people as well as hate on their part,

like in slave-owning and feudal economies/societies. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence (Mulej et al, forthcoming).

- Poor working-moral resulting from feeling that owners and bosses misuse their employees, whom they view as cost rather than as their creative basis and co-workers. This managerial attitude means that the bosses and owners prefer to manage routine work rather than knowledge and creativity. The latter two cannot be ordered, but enabled by management including SR in e.g. the form of requisitely holistically managed work relations. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence (Mulej et al, 2008).
- Fluctuation of co-workers, mostly the better ones; they are able to find other jobs. This fluctuation results in loss of their expertise along with the resulting need to spend much time and money for acquisition and training of new co-workers. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence (Mulej et al, 2008).
- Lack of fidelity, feeling of belonging due to impression that 'we are not co-workers, but tools rather than humans, and our only remaining right is the right of irresponsibility toward our bosses and owners'. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence and innovation of the management style (Mulej et al, 1987, 1994, 2008).
- Strikes resulting from the same feelings and their causes, including the mismanaged revenues distribution. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence and innovation of the management style (Mulej et al, 1987, 1994, 2008).
- Terrorism resulting from the same feelings in combination with nationalism and religious cover of economic and social reality. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence and innovation of the management style (Mulej et al, 1987, 1994, 2008), both inside organizations and in government etc.
- Resistance against novelties that should become innovations, because of the prior experience that innovation can be used to cause un-employment rather than benefit except for the owners and bosses. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence and innovation of the management style (Mulej et al, 1987, 1994, 2008).
- Medical problems due to poor modernization of technology and work place safety. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence and innovation of the management style (Mulej et al, 1987, 1994, 2008).
- Medical problems due to abuse of the economic law of external economics by causing stress, polluting air, water, and soil, etc. Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence and innovation of the management style (Mulej et al, 1987, 1994, 2008) and knowledge about environmental problems that are, at their roots, mental problems (Ecimovic et al, 2002).
- Rapid growth of population, because women are not enabled to study, while the more educated women have many less children; in addition, according to Nobel-Prize-for-Peace-2007 co-laureat Prof. Dr. Lucka Kajfez Bogataj the growth of population and growth of energy consumption per person have together burdened the Planet Earth about forty times more over the recent two centuries (orally, 2008, at Otocec '08 conference on excellence, in round table). Solution requires cultivation of ethics of interdependence and innovation of the management style (Mulej et al, 1987, 1994, 2008).

- Etc. (Based on conclusions from papers presented at Hrast, et al, editors: IRDO 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 conferences, and my other research).

All these lacks of RH and resulting failures in taking all crucial attributes in account cause waste of both human and material resources instead of SR because the longer-term effects are over-looked as they are called less important side-effects. Side-effects are a wrong classification, as the above quoted data tell us; they diminishes competitiveness and hence benefits for all stake-holders and society at large. Both human and material resources are under-used, or wrongly used, especially the human creativity, capability, and VCEN. The usual accountancy does not show these facts, the opportunity cost calculation does.

### **Social responsibility: invention that must become innovation by the invention-innovation-diffusion process**

The way out of the above listed sources of blind alley is management with SR having its common denominator in bosses' provision of clear and well-founded respect for co-workers as experienced, knowledgeable, creative, inventive, and innovative human capital rather than cost added to the unavoidable cost of equipment. The same SR applies to treatment of other partners, society at large, and nature, in a short term, at least, but also in a longer term.

Thus, the RH as the middle way in Table 2 is close enough to reality in terms of both needs and possibilities (Mulej, Kajzer, 1998b). RH is based on the DS and it turned out to be a law: successful persons and organizations (tacitly) live with this law (See: Collins, 2001; Collins, Porras, 1994; Gladwell, 2004, 2008, 2009; Mulej et al, 1992; Quinn, 2006; Zenko, 1999). But, most of the – unavoidably narrow – contemporary specialists are poorly capable of inter-disciplinary creative cooperation, including their careful listening to those, who have another view because they start from other viewpoints. This difference disables agreement and success and can be solved by RH-consideration in the form of SR; application of methods such as USOMID combined with 6 Thinking Hats may help (Mulej M. and N., 2006) or others (e.g. Malek, 2011; Steiner, 2011).

Unfortunately, the public media influence humans by publishing many one-sided and superficial rather than RH messages, which is what they receive from their sources (including messages about SR; Novak, Hrast, 2010; Novak et al, 2011; etc.). Public media rarely match Mulej's DS (Mulej, 1974, and later, including forthcoming): 'in order to make no crucial oversight, we must cover all essential, and only essential, viewpoints in a synergetic entity called a (dialectical) system'. The DS is expressed in the RH of approach (Table 2) and results in the requisite wholeness of outcomes of human activity. The selected DS approach is neither a matter of any mathematical formula nor defined once for ever; it rather depends on decisions of the decisive persons. It promises much more success, if the process participants attain their RH, which does not depend on a good luck, only, but 'the good luck' can be well prepared, too (Gladwell, 2004).

On an empirical basis, Gladwell (2004) summarized the following factors of a better chance for good luck and success, making in synergy the tipping point of IIDP:

- (1) The IIDP begins with a small group acting as persuasive role models and opinion makers. Hopefully, IIDP experiences a diffusion comparable with an epidemy.

- (2) These persons work as connectors (to link people into networks), experts (to provide the necessary knowledge), and sellers (to persuade other/many that the novelty makes sense as innovation).
- (3) The novelty must be sticky, i.e. both suiting and improving the current situation. To make novelty sticky, its authors must be very persuasive and knowledgeable of trends.
- (4) Circumstances/conditions play a crucial role, too.
- (5) All these attributes require a broader view, including several generations of history as the cultural roots of the current behavior. (See more about these two points in: Gladwell, 2009. They are very much in line with Mulej's 'law of 2-generations renewal of VCEN', 'law of RH', and 'law of hierarchy of the following order and interdependence').
- (6) Immunity against the novelty may show up and must be considered very carefully to be overcome with a requisitely holistic action. (People love to keep the established routine.)

We would add our completed-up summary of the theory of diffusion of innovation that presents a reminder of what one needs to think about, when one starts an IIDP in order to attain an innovation, including the one considering SR (Mulej, 2010): Table 4.

**Table 4: Matrix of Essential Attributes of Diffusion Process from the Viewpoint of Change Agents (A case)**

VIEWPOINTS TO BE CONSIDERED (IN SYNERGY)		Phases of users' decision making about a novelty aimed to become innovation				
Phases of users' decision making about a novelty aimed to become innovation		1 Awareness	2 Persuasion	3 Decision	4 Applica- tion	5 Reconfir- mation
Novelty customers (potential)	Customers – innovators					
	Early customers					
	Early majority					
	Late majority					
	Laggards					
	Opponents					
<i>Requisite holism of potential suppliers/ authors of novelty – to-be innovation</i>						
<i>Requisite holism of potential customers of novelty – to-be innovation</i>						
<i>Requisite holism of pressure of market, government and bosses concerning novelty – to-be innovation</i>						
<i>Requisite holism of information system concerning novelty – to-be innovation for suppliers and customers to know enough</i>						

<i>Systemic quality of novelty – to-be innovation (based on requisitely perfect products, processes, leadership and commitment, linked in a synergy by organization, and expressed in the system (= network) price, quality, range, uniqueness, and social responsibility, incl. environmental care)</i>						
<i>Requisitely holistic vision, mission, policy, strategy, tactic, operation, and control of the entire process with suppliers (and users)</i>						
Opinion leaders						
Attributes of novelty	Relative advantage					
	Compatibility					
	Complexity					
	Testability					
	Visibility					
Communication channels	Public					
	Interpersonal					
Nature of the culture of customers						
Decision type about novelty	Optional					
	Group					
	Authority					
Consequences of novelty	Desired					
	Undesired					
	Indirect					
	Direct					
	Anticipated					
	Unanticipated					

Legend: the darker the area, more change agents' effort is needed

The double competition gives humans – through businesses etc. – a double chance to impact the trends, and a double exposure to decisions backed by no, poor, wrong, or right, i.e. RH, selection of their approach. Their general choice is discussed in the following chapter.

### Three Possible Tracks of Further Development – Long-term/SR/RH Approach is Urgent

Based on summarized data, humanity can opt between three further development/evolution tracks including IIDP of different types and different levels of holism/wholeness:

1. *Keeping the track of so far*; it demands more and more production and supposes that the natural resources are unlimited and the Planet Earth can grow (all way to 3 – 5 Planets' level that is consumed now). This cannot be. Several dilemmas show up, such as (Metcalf, in Bozicnik et al., 2008):

1.1. If the given material standard of living of USA is not acceptable, which one is?

1.2. If the Planet Earth can support one billion people, who and what will do with the others?

Obviously, if we continue using the track of so far, we will leave to our grandchildren, perhaps to our children or even to ourselves already, a dying, rather than a flourishing, planet with a bad rather than a pleasant life. The 'Bubble Economy' is no longer possible.

2. *Intervening like governments and decisive corporation are doing now*; they are aware of the crisis, but do not perceive it requisitely holistically – as a synergy of natural, climate change, legal, sociological, economic, political, psychological, i.e. personal and social attributes, but they 'shuffle chairs on Titanic, that is approaching iceberg in fog, rather than radically innovating their direction' (Taylor, 2008). The Planet Earth might lose the current civilization a little later, but anyway, because radical IIDP/innovation beyond technology does not take place. Again, awareness that the 'Bubble Economy' is no longer possible must prevail.

3. *Acceptance that we humans and our economy make a part of nature and not vice versa*. Nature requires long-term and RH behavior that the Chicago school of neo-liberal economics has been preventing for long decades by requiring the impossible totally pure market (while several authors of economics have been working on theory of limited competition, i.e. no pure market). Thus, they were actually supporting a kind of 'feudal capitalism' opposing the USA constitution (Goerner et al, 2008; data in .., Rop, 2011; Senge, 2008). Humankind needs a radical innovation of the paradigm, including a personal RH of individual as a basis of human well-being, based on creativity (For details see: SarotarZizek et al., 2009a, 2009b, 2009c, 2009d, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c, 2010d; etc.).

The long-term-and-RH behavior used to face obstacles earlier in history, too, since the narrow specialization of over-specialists – with a poor capability and willingness to join creative inter-disciplinary cooperation – has come to prevail over generalists, while the interdisciplinary creative cooperation of specialists did not replace one-sidedness. Over-specialists were attacked unsuccessfully 200 years ago by Humbolt (Peterlin, 2009) and over the recent many decades by Bertalanffy's General Systems Theory, Mulej's Dialectical Systems Theory, etc. Specialists are open, but over-specialists are closed in their arena.

As we have said above, unfortunately, economists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century have not considered the Adam Smith's liberalism's demand (Toth, 2008), that economy must be based on total transparency and personal responsibility of owners, hence on a local market without monopolies, share-holding and limited liability companies: the latter legal forms divorce rights from duties for which owners must always be responsible in person exclusively. Smith namely spoke for interdependence, not independence of enterprises, in economic, not only legal, terms: 'I need your specialty and your need mine, hence we are interdependent'(Mulej, 1974; Mulej, Kajzer, 1998; Petzinger, 2000).

Thus, A. Smith is very close to ISO 26000 (ISO, 2010).

Humans, who do not think in long-term criteria, can hardly see that only the third track can save humankind now. We humans live on the Planet Earth like in a closed bottle in which

population doubles, from one person on, every minute of the one available hour (Taylor, 2008). Five minutes before the end, the free room abounds, a minute before the end a half of the room is still empty. But, actually, we must worry like persons falling from a skyscraper and still alive on the second floor level, but unable to stop before hitting the hard floor in the street. In addition, the given information systems provide a poor information on essential topics such as sustainability (Gomez, 2010; Abu-Shanab and Al-Tarawneh, 2009).

Thus, we must worry even more for those humans and their information systems, making humans' basis for decision making and implementation, and as a consequence for our-selves, too.

One should better consider the entire DS of preconditions for IIDP to result in innovation: see Table 5 (We will tackle realization of it later).

**Table 5: Equation of preconditions of innovation as a dialectical system**

Innovation = (invention X entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial spirit X requisite holism X management X co-workers X innovation friendly culture X customers X competitors X suppliers X natural environment X socio-economic environment and other outer, i.e. objective conditions X random factors, such as luck)
--

The preconditions, which we have briefly discussed so far, are important also in the case of making SR become innovation in an IIDP about VCEN and management style.

### **Social Responsibility – a New VCEN to be realized as Innovation in New Conditions**

In synergy with

- Ethics of interdependence, because all humans are complementary to each other as specialized professionals and as humans and parts of nature, and
  - The fact than one depends increasingly on creativity, including innovation,
- SR may renew society to include social efficiency and sufficiency, social justice, honesty, and similar VCEN. These VCEN, among other references, make the core of all social teaching called religions, philosophy of moral and ethical behavior, etc. (Avadhuta, A. B., 2009; Hensley, 2008; Hrast et al., 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011; Kajfez Bogataj et al, 2010; Martin, Murphy, editors, 2009; Senge, 2008). Technological innovation, though, has been seen as a remedy for all troubles so far, although technology supports, rather than creates, future and development into it; technological IIDP/innovation can be used either with SR or abused and misused with detrimental consequences (Collins, 2001; Collins, Porras, 1994; Galtung, 2009; Zajc, 2011).

The choice depends on the most influential people and their definition of their self-interest as a background of the economy and humankind's future. Innovation of VCEN is unavoidable for the current civilization to survive; VCEN may be well supported by a next step in human integration (Harris, 2008; Martin, 2006; Potocan, Mulej, 2007). The process toward it may lead from (1) city-states prevailing before the industrial/entrepreneurial times, via (2) nation-states prevailing in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and (3) international federations coming into being over the recent decades, such as European Union, NAFTA, LAFTA, OAU, etc., and agreement-based international organizations such as GATT, World Bank, UNO and its specialized agencies, etc., toward (4) a world federation based on SR and providing for it by fighting one-sidedness. The General and Dialectical Systems Theories should be applied more than so far to make it happen with RH (Mulej et al., 2000).

Thus: VCEN of SR, including a world-wide federation and government might be a potential innovation able to help humans to switch from a too narrow and therefore dangerous and detrimental behavior to RH and thus to enable survival of humankind's current civilization or, at least, its way out of the current crisis.

Conditions have changed dramatically, including the case of natural environment as a crucial part of SR: Table 6. The Planet Earth can exist without humans as one of many living beings, but humans cannot live without a healthy Planet Earth.

<b>Viewpoints</b>	<b>Basic Relation/s Between Production and Consumption</b>	<b>Impact of Humans on Natural Environment</b>	<b>Humankind's Interdependence with Natural Environment</b>
<b>Type of Market</b>			
RANDOM MARKET	Producers' own consumption and occasional exchange of random surpluses	Minimal impact, growing as humankind grows in number and needs / requirements	Intuitive human consideration of nature based on experience in agriculture, gathering, hunting, wood cutting, fishing and mining
SELLERS' / PRODUCERS' PREVAILING POWER = PRODUCERS' MARKET	Growing production for poorly considered, known/unknown, customers, who lack impact over suppliers (supply smaller than demand)	Specialization and narrow thinking grow and so does the humans' detrimental impact over nature (especially by industrialized production)	Nature is subordinated to profit, jobs depend less on nature, more on growing urbanization and manufacturing as well as industrialized agriculture
BUYERS' / CUSTOMERS' PREVAILING POWER = BUYERS' MARKET	Growing impact of customers requiring satisfaction / total quality of products and services, and conditions of life (supply bigger than demand)	Specialization and its bad one-sided impact over nature keep growing, so does biased application of science, causing need for inter-disciplinary cooperation	Nature is still subordinated to profit, but nature is thought about more due to cost, caused by backlash of oversights caused for profit; inter-disciplinary insight grows
STATE / GOVERNMENT SUPPORTED BUYERS' MARKET	Increasingly organized / legalized impact of customers demanding total quality of products, services and conditions of life (supply much bigger than demand)	Growing awareness about the terrible impact of humankind's one-sided impact over nature & its dramatic consequences for humans' survival	Same as before, but world-wide official documents and actions urge governments and businesses as well as humans to be more holistic; so does a part of market (e.g. by requiring SR in daily life, work and investment, etc.)

Table 6: Development of market relations and environmental care quality – a case of growing awareness of the RH/SR as a precondition of humankind's survival

Thus, the name of the crucial innovation to be attained now is the new economy based on RH/SR of behavior that can be attained, we hope, with transformation of SR from a much-talked word into reality. RH and/via SR might lead to a new economy and survival, which asks humans as individuals, communities, organizations, societies, countries, and humankind to be less selfish for selfish reasons – in order to survive and live in peace and prosperity.

### **The New Economy and Social Responsibility**

A discussion about the 'new economy' (Ing et al, 2008) brought several insights that can be summarized as follows: the new economy' faces:

- Property revolution (because ownership of knowledge and creativity differs from knowledge of tangible properties);
- Information revolution (due to information/communication technology, education of many, many research centers, etc.);
- Serious new problems (due to piling up rather than covering cost of care for natural precondition of humankind's survival beyond the cost of both world wars combined or even much more);
- The need for much more transparency and participatory democracy in all organizations from families via enterprises, countries, to international associations (for RH in behavior), and SR (for less of the detrimental abuse/misuse of Adam Smith's concepts of self-interest and invisible hand, of the laws of external economics, market, and trust).

The resulting benefit belongs to a too small percentage of humans: in USA one single percent of citizens owns now seventy percent of all wealth; this change from 37% was attained in only 12 years and makes USA 'a banana republic' rather than an honest capitalism country (., Rop, 2011). The resulting current crisis seems to require innovation of the concept of innovation of so far to include RH. (See also several contributions in ISSS 2008; Mulej et al, editors, 2008; etc.). SR may support RH better than the practice of human relations of so far based on exaggerated selfishness and greed, narrow-minded and short-term behavior (Prasnikar, editor, 2010; Stibler, 2008).

Let us summarize!

- According to analyses, quoted above, the neoliberal capitalism, that has denied SR, caused the current crisis by creating 'Bubble Economy' with monopolism that provides chances only to a small minority of population. In less than 150 years the world-wide span of wealth (measured in national per-capita-income) has grown from 3:1 to +500:1, leaving 85% of humankind under six USD a day and hence angry and envious, or without ambitions.

- The natural carrying capacity of the Planet Earth to support the destructive living style of the current civilization has been overburdened several decades ago.

- The increase of standard of living after the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War has been fictitious because the huge cost of maintenance of the natural preconditions for humankind to survive have been postponed and piled up rather than covered in real time. The unavoidable renewal of these preconditions may cost more than both world-wars combined, if the action is immediate; or even 20% of the world-wide GDP, if the action is postponed for another 20 or so years.

- The big depression of 1930, to which the current crisis is quite similar, according to many authors, was not simply resolved with Keynes's economic measures, but continued as the 2<sup>nd</sup> world war in order for humankind to resolve the problems left over after the 1<sup>st</sup> world war. Similar problems are around. And so are nuclear weapons able to destroy the Planet Earth several times. People forgot that organizations, including enterprises and states are their tools rather than authorities above people; they are tools of those in the positions of higher human authorities, only, more or less.

- In other words, the lack of SR that has destroyed the slaves-owning and feudal societies and has created room for democracy and free-market economy – is surviving, called financial, neoliberal or feudal capitalism. Legal names are different, not much else. This is why SR is so much needed and discussed today.

- The 'Bubble Economy' cannot last. SR must replace it.

But the content of SR is differently understood.

- The simplest version of SR is charity, but it might only be a mask for real one-sidedness rather than RH of behavior of influential persons and their organizations.
- European Union (EU, 2001) mentions officially four contents of SR (of enterprises): the point is in a free-will-based acceptance of the end of abuse of employees, other business partners, broader society, and natural preconditions of humankind's survival.
- In literature on business excellence one requires more – upgrading of its measures with SR (For overview see: Gorenak, Mulej, 2010).
- In further literature one sees connection between systemic thinking and SR (Cordoba, Campbell, 2008).
- A fourth group of references links SR with world peace (Crowther, Caliyurt, 2004).
- ISO 26000 (ISO, 2010) requires a holistic approach (based on interdependence) and includes seven content areas: (1) organization, management and governance, (2) human rights, (3) labor practices, (4) environment, (5) fair operating practices, (6) consumer issues, and (7) community involvement and development.

If we consider the cited issues with RH, we find that SR only fictitiously and in a short term causes uncovered and avoidable costs (opponents of SR quote costs as reasons against SR, often; see public press). Costs of honest behavior replace – as an opportunity cost that is hard to see in book-keeping data – costs that are clearly visible in book-keeping data, although often indirectly, such as cost resulting from:

- Mistrust on the part of managers, coworkers, and business partners,
- Double-checking of creditworthiness of new business partners, replacing the lost ones,
- Dissatisfaction, causing poor work,
- Strikes, resulting from dissatisfaction, be them visible or white,
- Loss and regaining of high-quality co-workers and other business partners,
- Manager's and co-workers' routine-loving rather than creative/innovative behavior,
- Misery and poor health and illnesses (which are cured rather than prevented),
- Remediation of consequences of natural disasters, terror, and wars,
- Etc.

Thus, SR changes the practice of ownership as defined by the – still accepted – Roman law saying that the ownership gives to the owner the right of use and abuse. Abuse must be replaced by SR/RH for humankind – and its organizations, for that matter – to survive as the current civilization. This civilization faces problems of (1) extreme division and (2) affluence. Affluence is subjective; it causes the lack of ambition to work hard in order to have more, once one has everything one feels as a need (James, 2007). Need differs from greed that is said to mean that 'one buys things, which one does not need in order to impress individuals for who one does not really care'. Greed supports production beyond needs, but it ruins nature beyond needs, too, and is detrimental, in the longer terms, at least.

Development of SR is, hence, aimed to be an innovation of human behavior toward ethic of interdependence and resulting RH.

### **Ethic of Interdependence, New Economy, Affluence, and RH by Social Responsibility**

In preparation, passing, and realizing of decisions one succeeds, if one has attained RH. This does not depend on knowledge alone, but an equal importance belongs to VCEN, because

VCEN directs the application of knowledge. The RH of specialists who need each other is expressed in their ethic of interdependence (Mulej, Kajzer, 1998a, b). It expresses the specialists' feeling that they complete each other up with their differences in order to make the RH and therefore success attainable.

Due to these differences, clear boundaries and similarities are not enough: many in systems theory emphasize similarities, as tools to transfer knowledge from one usual specialty of knowledge to another, rather than a tool of their inter-disciplinary creative cooperation (François, 2004). What is needed is 'viewing the world through the eyes of the others: it extends vision' (Churchman, 1993, quoted by Lopez Garzia, 2008). It leads toward the DS approach (Mulej, 1974, 1975, 1979, 1992, 2000, forthcoming; etc.) and resulting RH of behavior and requisite wholeness of outcomes. RH is in line with European Union's definition of systemic thinking, since the total holism cannot be achieved (EU, 2000: 6). RH can be understood also in ISO 2600's holism.

European Union is trying to become a sustainable and knowledge/innovation-based society; the concept includes SR. European Union, and so does ISO 26000, stresses, that SR-behavior reaches beyond matching the legal obligations; hence SR reflects organizations' additional efforts to meet expectations of numerous/all stake-holders. European Union passed also several other documents that support development of SR (e.g. EU, 2000a; EU, 2006b). They only partially cover the real contemporary needs:

(1) The creativity-based society is replacing the knowledge-based one that has replaced the routine-based one (Chesbrough, 2003; Gams, 2011; Hofkirchner, 2010; etc.).

(2) The concept of sustainable future needs to replace the concept of sustainable development (Ecimovic, editor, 2008; Goerner et al, 2008; Hrast, Mulej, editors, 2008; 2009; 2010, 2011; ISSS, 2008; 2009; 2010; etc.), for humankind to survive.

The long-term and broader view is able to contribute more to the daily business success, too (Branson, 2009; Mesko-Stok, 2008; Quinn, 2006; etc.): it makes employees and other stakeholders more interested, motivated, creative, and loyal to their organization by providing well-being to them (Prosenak, Mulej, 2008; Prosenak, Mulej, Snoj, 2008; etc.).

European Union defined for the period until 2010 'A European Roadmap', stressing the sustainable and competitive enterprise, which considers both the short-term and long-term creation of value (Knez-Riedl, 2007b). The corporate SR can fortify the competitive position of single enterprises as well as local and regional communities, countries and European Union (Knez Riedl, 2007a). We prefer no limitation of SR to companies: they act along with influential humans' decisions.

For SR to become more than a word, a strategy of promotion of SR – as a potential innovation – might be needed (Hrast, Mulej, 2008; Mulej, Hrast, editors, 2010).

### **Strategy of Promotion of Social Responsibility**

SR is a demanding concept to promote as a specific case of RH having to do with the human approach to other people and nature. For success/survival many/all influential people should practice RH via SR. Work of a few individuals – professionals is not enough, except in the seeding phase, a general social support based on a clear strategy is needed, e.g. on the national, international, and world-wide levels. This is visible from the summarized data and cited references.

SR Mission should be to promote global VCEN of SR in order to help humankind, including one-self, survive by *doing something good* to all stakeholders (based on RH) rather than evil (based on one-sidedness) beyond the official legal obligation and rather limitation to stockholders or owners only.

A working group with an interdisciplinary composition should prepare a draft strategy. Later on a special Agency for Promotion of SR might have to be established, in any country, integration of states such as European Union, and world-wide. Its tasks should include co-ordination of country-wide and world-wide SR-related activities in co-operation with several professionals and institutions. Thus, the following goals should/could be met:

1. To create a basic interdisciplinary core of researchers working on monitoring the situation concerning SR in the area under investigation, to compare the collected findings and suggest changes in the given area.
2. To prepare legal draft bases for legislation changes, where they are needed to cover SR everywhere per areas.
3. To prepare professional, requisitely holistic bases for making up the SR program in all ministries.
4. To establish dialogue with professional associations, government bodies, public institutions, non-governmental organizations, businesses and other parts of society in order to attain a shared activity for promotion of SR.
5. To include topics on SR in primary, secondary, higher and life-long/adult education, and to promote values of SR in daily mutual contacts of youngsters and adults alike.
6. To create and implement a nation and world-wide program of public relations communication about SR in order to promote general awareness on how crucial a SR-based behavior of all humans and their organizations is for getting the society out of the current as well as preventing long-term crises.
7. To establish portals for both-way communication in public relations concerning the SR-based behavior with both good and bad examples.
8. To collect good and bad examples of SR and related practices of RH and innovation based on SR rather than on one-sidedness, for the society to become, be and remain an RH and innovative society with SR as a basic criterion of its excellence.
9. To collect information on development of SR anywhere and in the area under investigation in order to report about them.
10. To support initiatives of various stake-holders promoting SR and practicing it.

Tactics and operation should be defined per areas, but in the style of a coordinated decentralization: whatever can be done on lower administrative levels remains there.

Ethic of interdependence expresses VCEN enabling the strategy of SR. This includes weighing and concerting of solidarity and economic efficiency, sufficiency, and effectiveness by RH via SR. This may help humans to provide an equilibrium with no resulting need for too much solidarity (such as the 'equal stomachs philosophy' from the pre-industrial village solidarity) or too much protesting against the one-sided decisions and actions of authorities all way to terrorism (See also: Korade, 2011).

This strategy and ethics of interdependence may be well supported by a RH approach to the governance and management process. See Table 7.

**Table 7: The cybernetic circle of the preparation and implementation of the management process practicing SR (too) as a crucial IIDP (a simple model)**

MANAGEMENT PHASES		PREPARATION PHASES	
Definition of vision	←	Drafting of vision, mission, policy, strategy, tactics, operation	
↓			↑
Definition of mission		Definition of starting points for drafts	
↓			↑
Definition of policy/ies		Consideration of experiences	
↓			↑
Definition of strategies	<====	Intervening when and where needed in all management phases	
↓			↑
Definition of tactics		Checking the results of operation	
↓			↑
Running the operations	⇒		

- *Vision* may be briefed as “survival on the basis of competitiveness by RH/SR creative work and cooperation aimed at a systemic quality in accord with customers’ requirement.”
- *Mission*: “delight customers with an excellent systemic quality and attract them as sustained and sustainable customers.”
- *Policy*: “implement innovative business and SR as a source of a continuous systemic quality in all parts of the business process and all units.”
- *Strategy* towards implementation of such a policy may employ continuous self-assessment of one’s own quality in terms of the Deming Prize of Japan, the European Excellence Award, or Baldrige Award of USA, or (as a first phase) attainment and re-attainment of International Standards Organization’s rules as ISO 9000, 14000, 26000 certificates, and/or something similar (See the Slovenian reward for SR HORUS at [www.horus.si](http://www.horus.si)).
- *Tactics* for implementation of such an IIDP strategy include *organized critique*, followed by teams, and task forces, work on solution of the selected problems (on a *free-will* basis and on company time, one hour a week) with awards for inventions (symbolic in value, but with no delay) and innovations. *Innovation reward* is foreseen for all of the innovative team, all members of their own organizational units, every organizational member including managers, while a half of the value created by innovation enters the company business funds.
- **Practice**: permanent IIDP on a RH/SR basis as its management style and process.
- **Monitoring and Intervening**: Managers’ committee for promotion of IIDP and excellence based on SR – in session once in 3 or (later) 6 months, agenda: 1. comparative assessment of all units; 2. variable part of income of units' managers depending on this assessment; 3. approval of new innovation (of all 40 types in Table 1) related objectives of units.
- **Rewarding**: non-monetary (justified feeling of being considered creative and innovative by peers and bosses) and monetary (e.g. 50% of innovation-based profit goes to enterprise funds, 50% to coworkers, of which: 30% to authors and coauthors, 10% to all in the innovative unit, and 10% to all in the enterprise, including managers).
- **Training**: in profession and creation, including creative interdisciplinary cooperation.

We learned from practice and its summary in e.g. Gladwell (2004; 2008; 2009) that a good preparation is crucial, but it includes consideration of conditions and preconditions, too.

## **Making SR an Attainable (Potential) Innovation – some Practical Economic Preconditions**

As components of the way to make SR an innovation concerning the socio-economic order attainable, one can use several essential recent findings in economic literature, in a new synergy.

- Florida (2002, 2005) found in a comparative analysis of US regions that the best development had been attained in regions with the highest 3T: it is *tolerance* for differences between habits of people that attracts *talents* and thus it makes sense to invest in *technology* there. Malacic et al. (2006) found equal situation in Slovenia. The creative class is growing beyond 35% and becoming essential, the traditional working class is diminishing due to technological development based on technological innovations, and the service class only works on preconditions for the creative class to create for all. (In addition, these 35% should include the other 65% of people who must be creative to survive with the poor incomes.)
- Porter (1990, 2006) pointed out that the basis of competitiveness evolves in four phases: from natural resources via investment to innovation and then to affluence, which people have always wished to have (See Table 3). But affluence has a crucial side-effect: affluent people have no motive any longer to work in order to have, which results in a growing need of many citizens for solidarity, etc. In affluence sources are not scarce, but real needs are scarce, while marketing and advertisement try to persuade people to have wants/greed and try to buy like wants/greed would be needs. (See also: James, 2007). Baumol et al. (2007) do not even mention or quote Porter (1990), but they remind of this danger with a single quote on p. 288.
- The innovation of the traditional incentives for Total Quality as a way to innovation that are often taken in a too bureaucratic way to really work as incentives for contemporary excellent quality as an incentive for innovation and RH to flourish (Pivka, Mulej, 2004; Skafar, 2009) by practice of systemic thinking (SFPO, 2010; SZK, 2007).
- One should add here the reality that the governments are covering the public sector, which makes them big buyers in a modern buyers' market, giving them the bargaining power; thus they can demand that only the suppliers attaining the highest innovation, quality, and SR based on RH may supply the public sector with everything from e.g. toilet paper to scientific novelties (Mulej, 2007b).
- One should also add creativity-based ambition and life-style in both working and free time, and shorter working hours for people to have more time for their families and creativity of all contents from gardening and house-keeping to Nobel-prize winning results and artistic achievements.

The problem lies in transition of mentality that cherishes lazy life (like in times of too long working hours and work with stress and muscles without tools) toward cherishing creativity (which is the basic human attribute and used to be disabled in an assembly-line style of work very much) – in humans' thinking and worldview as well as other values/emotions (Brown, 2008; Ećimović, Mulej, Mayur, 2002; Harris, 2008; Korten, 2009; Martin, 2006; Mulej, 1979; Mulej, 2007a, 2007b; etc.). One-sidedness results in a lack of contemporary excellence, which requires more RH of behavior for the humankind's future to exist. Baumol et al (2007) fail to see this.

Thus, it is the practice of interdependence that makes people aware of their need for each other due to their differences in specialization, and their mutual complementary relations on the same basis; this leads them to using the briefed synergy in the form of ethic of interdependence and SR. This ethic is created in a process. See Table 8 (Potočan, Mulej, 2007).

**Table 8: Interdependence of values, culture, ethics, and norms**

Individual values (interdependent with knowledge)	↔	Culture = values shared by many, habits making them a rounded-off social group
↓	⌋	↓
Norms = prescribed values on right and wrong in a social group	↔	Ethics = prevailing values about right and wrong in a social group

In other words: (informal) systems thinking in the form of RH/SR behavior is the background of the creative class and innovative society, which does not limit itself to technological innovation only. But the creative society and class needs motivation, which causes some differences, obviously, because not all people are equally capable of RH and creation, including innovation. Though, differences in the basic wages/salaries/pays are one topic, differences based on innovation need not be limited; they take always a percentage of the newly provided benefit (Mulej et al, 2008). One might apply the income model that combines everybody's basic income from 'universal stock ownership', all employed persons' income from 'employee stock ownership' and/or Mondragon-style co-operatives ownership, from work, and 'innovation-based income' (Avsec, 1987, 1998a, 1998b, 2009).

Government should foster creativity and innovation – as a big buyer covering the entire public sector – by allowing only the most innovative organizations, including RH and SR into its criteria, to supply the public sector (Mulej, 2007b). Experience showed that it makes sense: it makes people more innovative, successful and therefore rich all way to affluence, and still remaining creative and ambitious (Dyck, Mulej, 1998). The 'Universal basic revenue of every person' is a similar idea, which is quite well promoted (see: [www.utd.slovenia.si](http://www.utd.slovenia.si)); it is not yet reality.

But the affluence phase might be a dead alley, if people lose ambition for creation (so far they did normally so, in history). People therefore need either a prolonged innovation phase based on RH of IIDP rather than one-sided processes, or a new phase, a 5th one. Its essence is creative happiness based on ethics of interdependence and interdisciplinary creative co-operation with SR replacing the phase of affluence; for selfish reasons, people are less selfish, short-term thinking, and narrow-minded, and they apply more RH (Prosenak, Mulej, 2008; Mulej, Hrast, editors, 2010).

Several lines of action might be necessary:

1. Humans as individuals act in the roles of consumers. Practice has already shown up that consumers prefer suppliers, who have the public image of SR. Greed is also less popular than it used to be. After a level of material satisfaction well-being depends on other factors (to be briefly discussed later).
2. Humans as organizations act in three basic roles: (1) suppliers, (2) customers, (3) public awareness makers. In all of them they compete with others. The one with the best image of RH innovators and SR actors in the market attract most customers and succeed. Reaching beyond low toward SR and RH helps competitiveness.

3. Humans as nations act via government and non-governmental organizations. Their bodies support competition and fight monopolies and other bases of abuse of influence of the more influential ones in their relations with the others. Thus, they support RH and SR with legal and moral tools.
4. Humans as nations do the same on the international levels, all way to the world-wide democracy, including a world government, made of very honest persons and coworkers.

This might lead to RH in society and economy by/based on SR (Hrast et al, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2009, 2010, 2011; Hrast, 2007; IRDO, 2006; Knez-Riedl, Mulej, Zenko, 2001; Knez-Riedl, 2003a, b, c, d, 2006; Knez-Riedl et al, 2006; Mulej and Hrast, editors, 2010). Such attributes of behavior create new ambition, reaching beyond complacency of the affluent ones. No short-term efficiency, including e.g. abuse of external economics, or of the law of supply and demand, is enough. Then, a new economy can succeed.

Who can start the process? Table 8 suggests: Many influential persons made history by making their individual values a culture, shared by a group of their followers, who then diffused this culture in order to make it a socially acceptable ethic, resulting in the social norms. Via these norms, one influences the individual values of other who have a dilemma to face: accept the novelty and be acceptable in the society or refuse it and be an outlaw. Norms may become law and support SR/RH, while SR reaches beyond law (ISO, 2010). Legal preconditions for law and habits to be innovated in order to support RH/SR and resulting survival of humankind are also needed, but they exceed the available room.

Contributions by Harris (2008), Martin (2006), several authors in Murphy and Martin, editors (2009), Letnar Černič (2009, 2010) etc. clearly demonstrate that survival of humankind cannot be taken care of well, as long as the international law has its legal basis on agreement without legal enforcement, thus denying itself as law. Similar problems show up with all other existing international organizations, including United Nations. Countries/states obviously tend to prefer their (businesses') more narrow and short-term interests over their citizens' broader and more long-term ones, thus ruining their basis of existence all way to threatening survival of their people and humankind.

### **What Should We Do?**

The above references are clear (more in: Mulej, 2010; Mulej, Hrast, editors, 2010): in order to survive, the current 'Bubble Economy' and consumer society must innovate itself into a saving society, adding sufficiency to efficiency. This fact requires structural changes in socio-economics. Now-a-days, actually, the end of the current civilization can be prevented, if RH/SR is applied:

- Technologies are available to solve current problems; innovation of VCEN can open the door for these technologies to be used rather the currently used obsolete ones.
- Humans know how to trade; hence one no longer needs wars like monopolists do.
- Humans know to respect each other; hence one does not need consumption meaning greed rather than need. Greed only shows that its proponents do not know how to live a peaceful and healthy life. Thus, they show they hate their children and grandchildren, perhaps even themselves, in a longer term, at least: to satisfy their fictitious needs, they are ruining the natural preconditions of humankind's survival. In anthropological and sociological terms

their greed may seem – to them – to be a real need; this might change with new prevailing VCEN instead the VCEN promoted by the neo-liberal economics ('greed is good').

- Humans were able to evolve from groups to tribes, and then to industrial nations organized in countries possessing nuclear weapons, and to planetary civilization and its awareness, that we are living on a limited planet with limited resources. We have local, national, and international types of issues and legal-power bodies, but we also have world-wide issues without world-wide, supra-national law.
- We see suggestions for supra-national law with a world parliament and government (Harris, 2008; Letnar Cernic, 2009, 2010; Martin, 2006; Martin, Murphy, ed., 2009; etc.), but also sense-making resistance against them (Estulin, 2008; etc.). Especially, there is a big danger that people might seize power, such as e.g. the Bilderberg group that consists of dishonest, not requisitely holistic, and bureaucratic persons.
- Humans know SR and international documents supportive of it, but it is implemented on a companies' free-will basis only (EU, 2001; Esposito, 2009; ISO, 2010).
- We know that SR enforces ownership as the right of use without abuse. Managers introduced this right for their subordinates as 'process owners' years ago. Now, they are supposed to apply this definition to them-selves and other managers of enterprises and governmental bodies – matching the international agreement, but voluntarily – too (Hrast et al, editors, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011; Prosenak, Mulej, 2008; Mulej, Hrast, 2009).

Humankind's awareness is changing radically (Boskovic, 2011; Gerzema, 2010; Zgonik, 2011a, b). More humans know we humans cannot do everything we want, and that we have more in common than differences, all of us being humans and parts of the same nature. If we enforce this awareness and insight and emotion called ethics of interdependence based on the experience of our interdependence as specialists per natural attributes and per professions, our children and grandchildren will live happily, otherwise on a dying planet Earth.

Hence, humankind of today, including businesses, is not facing only a financial crisis, visible in the lack of demand and loans, and in one-sided and short-term rather than RH behavior of banking and other business and political persons (... Rop, 2011). The point is much more complex: the given socio-economic model/practice is obsolete: it was created in times of poor life and legalized abuse of humans; it created affluence and abuse of nature beyond nature's capacity of renewal and survival (Bozicnik et al, 2008; Brown, 2008; Korten, 2009; Taylor, 2008; etc.). But it has created also very much knowledge, science, and technology – addressing both production and social issues – with which we can create our new future, if the influential humans and their organizations want so.

Instead of production/consumption/consumerism that does not consider nature/Earth and its limitations and hence makes us ruin our-selves with the 'Bubble Economy', we humans must use SR, including sustainable ideas, VCEN, and technologies – to survive as the current civilization. Knowledge does exist; the open issue is humankind's decision. (E.g.: if USA deployed the money they have used to assure oil in Iraq wars rather for new renewable energy sources, USA would have more than enough of energy at home with no damage to their population except a few at the top of the oil industry. Daily press reports about the solar

energy in European Union and Africa, about a bigger use of solar energy in Austria than in the more southern Slovenia, about new hybrid cars, etc.)

The remaining open issue reads: shall we humans opt for such a radical innovation of our own VCEN and behavior *in time and requisitely holistically*, not only by 'island solutions', e.g. in the banking or automotive production alone, and even by using obsolete, no longer unavoidable solutions rather than the new – sustainable/SR/RH – ones.

Literature, what and how to do is available. We have only cited it here in order to encourage *making of the political will*. Knowledge exists and grows permanently. We humans cannot return into the same old style; we are hanging above a deep cave. Businesses must support novelties, too, of all kinds in Table 1. The macro-economic measures might be able to support RH/SR, if the VCEN and knowledge of economists reached beyond neo-liberalism and the over-simplified supposition that people can be happy only if they have more and more of material goods, which is not true, after a level (Sarotar Zizek et al, 2010d, and references there in; Senge, 2008). Tables 4 and 7 must be used for SR as invention to enjoy IIDP and become innovation and diffused. This is not easy, because one renews VCEN and habits (Table 1).

To solve these problems, no specialist of any single profession is either unnecessary or enough. Interdisciplinary creative cooperation paves the way to RH, success, and democracy, which reaches beyond the one-sided outvoting. When survival was at stake during the WWII, a similarly quick transition from a narrow specialization and self-sufficiency was attainable for Hitler's Nazis and Fascists to lose the WWII; thus Allies prevented death of further millions of humans. Now we are facing a similar danger and need a similar innovation: the climate change e.g. is compared by the above quoted authors with a nuclear war (and climate change is only a visible consequence or the top of an iceberg, of the one-sided rather than SR/RH behavior of humans, especially the most influential ones); the same holds of over-population, growing lack of natural resources and growing masses of (dangerous) waste.

If e.g. the current climate change does not stop, there is no way to a normal life of the current civilization any more. Of course, such a quick and radical change is difficult, but its alternative is the end of existence (Ecimovic et al, 2002; Senge, 2008). The end of civilization, we hope, is even harder to take, although it is easier to make happen, if the old VCEN survive any longer. Businesses can contribute very much, being so many, not only big businesses, but also SMEs, and civil society, governments and non-governmental organizations.

Knowledge exists and develops. But all of us, working on IIDP to turn new knowledge into new benefit of its users and later on of its owners/authors, know that we must expect enormous obstacles. Technological innovations such as railway and car, faced big obstacles, but the social innovation such as democracy and obligatory education faced even more opposition. Invested interests have always been bases for their owners' arguments against the progressive changes that they claimed to lead to economic and social troubles. Similar was the experience concerning the initiative for nature protection, although it protects us humans under the label of sustainable development/future; thus, we are still facing more – one-sided and hence fictitious – economic development than sustainability (Ecimovic et al, 2007; etc.). Therefore we can no longer speak about the developed and developing countries, but about the self-ruining ones only (Taylor, 2008).

Oppositions against SR/RH innovation brought humankind to the brink, where a RH innovation of the socio-economic system toward a real market rather than a fictitious and monopolized one is no longer one of several options, but the urgent need. More efficient and sufficient, righteous and sustainable business, social, and personal lives will not lead to the economic failure that is here, no longer around the corner, already, but out from the economic failure. Time is ripe for the triple bottom line of Freedom & Equality & Brotherhood to reach beyond legal formalities – via SR based on practice and ethic of interdependence leading to RH preventing failures and their consequences, that reach all way to World Wars.

Well-being and SR of people costs much less than their poor work, or strikes, illnesses, medications or disabilities, and remediation of natural preconditions of life, etc. all way to local and international terrorism/wars. Thus, innovation of the management style and VCEN in the direction of SR is the best way now.

It must be measured to be believed and undertaken, of course. The old measurement does not work. This issue also reaches beyond limits of this contribution. Conditions, which the usual economic success measures used to match, changed essentially. Therefore, we opt for the radical innovation of VCEN in order to help humans survive as the current civilization. But it poses new issues and requires innovation of habits, including RH and SR of individuals, ownership rights and duties, and humans' WB.

### **Social responsibility, requisite holism and well-being: a way of promotion of freedom, equality, and brotherhood**

Let us repeat a basic finding and go on from it. The crisis of 2008- was not caused by the organizations, but by their influential members, to whom the influential members of the social decision-making bodies – such as the states/governments etc. – permitted to separate their responsibility from their rights. These persons forgot that:

- 1) The liberal capitalism had emerged to implement the French and similar revolutions' triple concept – freedom, equality, and brotherhood – in synergy against the earlier feudal abuse of humans by owners, whose subordinates resisted it; feudalism was liquidated because of its failure to foster requisitely holistic rather than one-sided behavior of power-holders (Goerner et al, 2008; Fleissner and Wanek, editors, 2009; etc.).
- 2) Humans are multilayered synergetic entities. In synergy – not in separation – humans have: (1) physical/biological, (2) professional, (3) social, (4) spiritual, (5) mental/emotional, and (6) economic attributes. Therefore humans are marked by a complex pattern of relatively, but not totally, permanent characteristics, making humans differ from each other (Sarotar Zizek, 2010a).
- 3) Humans have five types of interdependent needs: for survival, joy, power, freedom, and belonging (Tropenauer, 2010).
- 4) Human inner motivation works much more effectively than any outer motivation (Tropenauer, 2010; Udovicic, 2007).

These facts include promotion of SR. The concept 'freedom, equality, and brotherhood' opposes subordination, abuse, and absence/lack of solidarity, backed by absence of RH of thinking/behavior-at-large, especially of power-holders. The modern humans demand, and promise, freedom, equality, and brotherhood, in their United Nations Organization's basic documents, and in constitutions of democratic countries.

The neoliberal concept gives the upper hand to freedom alone and leaves the equality and brotherhood merely to legal rather than economic arena. This is one-sided and therefore dangerous and detrimental rather than holistic and beneficial, not only for subordinates, but also for power-holders, once subordinates rebel in strikes, insurrections, terrorism, etc. – if the market does not work perfectly. Market works perfectly exceptionally only, in the current global economy.

Democracy is more efficient than subordination; it activates dormant capabilities. Democracy depends on, and strives for, RH by cooperation and competition (Hensley, 2008). Now-a-days, every human is a specialized expert, and, hopefully, capable of creative interdisciplinary co-operation; this capability is developed less with over-specialists, against which Bertalanffy has created his General Systems Theory (Bertalanffy, 1979, VII), and more with specialists aware of, and having the ethics of, interdependence with each other and other nature around us (Mulej, 1974; Mulej & Kajzer, 1998a, b).

The current circumstances expose only freedom with no or poor consideration of equality and brotherhood. Competition without cooperation has prevailed in the period of the industrial and neo-liberal paradigm over the recent few centuries.

Therefore many humans became increasingly spiritually apathetic specialists, as they have not implemented the sense and essence of their existence: to be requisitely holistic, creative entities enjoying subjective and objective well-being. They were mostly living tools as subordinated employees or persons abused by monopolistic organizations/humans running them (Prosenak and Mulej, 2008; Prosenak, Mulej and Snoj, 2008; Mulej and Prosenak, 2007; Zgonik, 2011a, b). This threatens human's well-being and resulting economic success (see: Sarotar Zizek, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c, 2009d, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c, 2010d; etc.). Over history, humans have developed their attributes as subjective starting points (of their work and life processes) in synergy of:

- Values with which they can answer the question: what sense does their action make,
- Knowledge/insight with which they can answer the question: what is going on, and
- Knowledge/skill to answer the question: how to solve the surfacing problems/topics.

For details see (Mulej, 1974, and later; for a new English edition see Mulej et al, forthcoming). Application of these three interdependent attributes and resulting answers has always impacted humans' WB. Humans can accomplish subjective and objective WB by requisite holism. Thus, we can elaborate Table 2, according to Sarotar Zizek (ibid.), to define the RH of approach and behavior of human conscious of one-self as a synergy of one being a:

- Natural, physical and biological entity, implementing active techniques to gain physical balance (healthy food, Ayurveda, massage and aromatherapy, relaxation, breathing techniques, physical activity, observance of biological rhythm, additional medical treatments, etc.);
- Professional entity based on a specific expertise (education, training, gaining working experience within her professional career, etc.), including the capability of interdisciplinary creative cooperation, hopefully;
- Mental/emotional entity, enriching sentiments, perception, mind and will-power by life balancing techniques (emotional intelligence, life in the present moment, positive thinking, etc.);

- Social entity, building quality communication with others by techniques of professional and working development and social integrity;
- Spiritual entity, longing after self-actualization and the sense-making life, realizing it by techniques of spiritual development (spiritual intelligence, meditation, mantras, yoga, logo-therapy, practical Buddhist principles for building balance, etc.);
- Economic entity, striving to satisfy her material needs as a person, family member, as a coworker and as a member of a wider society (partnership, parenting, employment, membership in associations and political parties, etc.).

Background for personal RH/SR of humans is hence needed, but no model is known. One option is to have organizations and the entire world led by individuals, coming close to their own RH/SR of behaviour resulting in requisite wholeness and SR of its outcomes.

The individuals approach it by their personal and personality development that can be achieved by a synergic implementation of several techniques enabling physical balance, the techniques of life art, and techniques of personality development, to the techniques of professional and working development.

The RH of individuals as employees has a positive influence on the success of organisations, through the successful managing of stress, work satisfaction, and well-being. Thus, the organizations should create conditions for implementation of the mentioned techniques for developing and strengthening of RH of individuals as employees, because organizations will get, what they will enable and appreciate.

It all depends on influential individuals, their integrity/complexity and RH/SR.

On this basis the behavior of individuals, who are willing and able to practice interdisciplinary co-operation, attains SR. SR offers a possible answer to crisis, arising in 2008; hence the individuals evolve from being merely owners to RH creators, which has been considered necessary already by Erich Fromm, and before him also by A. Smith; such individuals enjoy subjective and objective wellbeing more than the others do, and have a better chance to overcome the 2008- crises (Sarotar Zizek, *ibid.*).

What attributes must influential humans develop to attain and support RH/SR?

### **The Necessary Personal Attributes of the Influential Humans**

Seven interdependent sets of the necessary attributes of VCEN of decisive humans can be summarized as follows (Mulej et al., forthcoming) – see Table 9.

This dialectical system of attributes is best used with one more attribute that is easier to have by nature than to learn, but it can be strengthened, at least, by learning and experience:

1. *Confidence in the agreed-upon objective,*
2. *Persistence and will to realize it with neither giving in nor stubborn sticking to wrong ones.*

Thus, these seven systems of interdependent attributes can become a dialectical system, leading to personal and organizational requisite holism and resulting wholeness of outcomes.

For know-how to realize these principles see e.g. (Mulej et al., forthcoming; Mulej and Ženko, 2004; Mulej et al., 2006; Mulej et al., 2000; Mulej, 2007b; Likar et al., 2006; Bulc, 2006; etc.).

**Table 9: Seven interdependent sets of the necessary attributes of VCEN of decisive humans**

Set of attributes	Basic characteristics
A	Seven S: strategy, structure, 'systems', shared values, skills, staff, style of management
B1	Seven F of all: focused, fast, flexible, friendly, free, fit, fun
B2	Seven F of managers: founders, forever innovating, flat, frugal, faculty of changes, fostering of awareness, fully professional and RH relations
C	Seven L: strategic, persistent and making room, creating the felt need for innovation, concrete steps, structural change, mastering of risk, political skills
D	Seven P: personal RH, innovativeness, capability of creative cooperation, SR, WB, emotional stability, self-realization
E	SIEDES: regular innovating, stakeholders interests, long-term interests rethought, their consequences, innovation of VCEN, developmental, economic, and social orientation
F	Methods of creative cooperation, e.g. USOMID and 6 Thinking Hats (in synergy)
Basis for their synergy and realization	<i>Confidence in the agreed-upon objective, persistence and will to realize it with neither giving in nor stubborn sticking to wrong ones</i>

Troubles are unavoidable, if VCEN are not innovated, which they can be (Baumgartner, 2011; Collins and Porras, 1997; Collins, 2001; Florida, 2005; Mulej et al, 2009; Mulej, N., 2011; Potočan, Mulej, 2007; Strukelj, Mulej, 2011; etc.). For all these and related suggestions to become humans' reality too, the principles of VCEN and strategy should include social responsibility (SR) and ethics of interdependence (Mulej et al., 2006) and creativity of any content. They should become the central attributes of human life and be supported with a shortened working day (not week, perhaps!) and related lower prices – to become a new general practice. This should help the requisitely holistic innovative society to replace the fictitious one (details in: Mulej et al., 2008; Mulej et al., forthcoming).

Our model for governmental support to implementation of this model was also published (Mulej, 2007b): government should not direct the economic and other public life with redistribution of money through taxes and subsidies only; the entire public sector – being as a whole the biggest buyer – may and must buy only from suppliers proving to be best of all bidders in criteria of RH innovation, business excellence, and SR, including the above dialectical system of personal attributes.

**Conclusions and suggestions: Radical Innovation of VCEN toward SR is unavoidable all over, incl. businesses**

Humankind of today is facing the toughest crisis since the triad made of both world wars and the big depression between them in 1914-1945, or even the toughest crisis ever. This crisis cannot be solved with means of so far that have caused it resulting from neo-liberalism that is leaving A. Smith's liberalism aside. Conditions are too different from the recent decades, namely:

- The market is fuller than ever, supply reaches far beyond demand. The 'Bubble Economy' is broken.
- Only 15% of humankind lives on more than four US dollars a day; the others are living in a saving society or even in hunger and illness, many millions with less than a single dollar a day.

- Life cycle of needs says that consumption can no longer grow in order for humankind not to destroy its natural preconditions of survival, unless IIDP/innovations become completely in line with SR, including sustainability.
- Non-material needs of humans are felt to be more important than earlier, especially with the richer 15% and those among the other who do not have big material ambitions.

Therefore:

- The problem of existence of the current civilization requires innovative change from unsustainable and sustainable development to development of sustainability for a sustainable future – as an essential component of human SR.
- SR reaches far beyond the old definition limited to some nice and beneficial charity – to the end of owners' right of abuse of property and related humans and nature.
- The concept of 'process owners', giving employees the right to use without the right of abuse, is extended to enterprise owners and all other influential humans, too.

Thus we might recommend the following actions to governments, non-governmental and similar organization and enterprises (from sole entrepreneurs, SMEs to multinational corporations):

- Awareness building about the crucial importance of giving up the one-sided and short-term behavior of so far in order to practice RH through SR in order to enable (1) survival of the current civilization of humankind in (2) healthy global and local social, economic, business and natural environment by (3) adding sufficiency to efficiency and effectiveness of life and work.
- Promotion of understanding that SR means (according to ISO 26000) attainment of RH by practicing of interdependence rather than the fiction that economic and natural independence is possible and that subordination causing dependence and resulting abuse is able to last rather than cause revenge all way to terrorism.
- Promotion of understanding that SR includes (1) governance, management and organization, (2) human rights, (3) labor relations, (4) natural environment, (5) fair business practices, (6) consumer issues, (7) community involvement and development; it links all of them with consideration of (1) interdependence as the basis, and (2) holism as the top intention/achievement. One should prefer no limitation of SR to companies: they act along with influential humans' decisions.
- Promotion of understanding, and including in the prevailing VCEN, the fact that SR belongs into (1) individual human ethics/VCEN, (2) organizational strategy, and (3) policy of governments on local, regional, national, international, and supra-national levels.
- Promotion of understanding that passing a decision that supports SR is not enough, because this decision is better considered as an invention or potential innovation that must become innovation. Therefore, promotion of SR must be considered, and worked on, as an IIDP of a non-technological invention with a potentially radical and crucial impact.
- Promotion of understanding that SR, as a tool helping humankind survive and organization prosper, demands fighting and abolishing any monopolies and oligopolies while supporting a fair total competition in combination with creative cooperation.
- Promotion of understanding that SR diminishes and prevents costs resulting from the lack of well-being (based on creation and IIDP rather than on lazy lifestyle) and from

dissatisfaction of human masses. The latter is visible in strikes, loss of business partners and customers, riots, unhealthy natural environment and related need for medication and renewal of humankind's natural preconditions of life, etc.

- Promotion of understanding that results of practicing of SR are hard to see in accountancy, because they show up in 'opportunity cost and benefit' assessment. This fact requires an innovation in data procurement for governance and management to be based on realistic rather fictitious information and disinformation.
- Promotion of understanding that the neoliberal concept of the omnipotent market does not match reality due to monopolies, and the neoliberal concept of 'reducing cost at any cost' causes 'Bubble Economy' that cannot work well without RH and SR. RH and SR fight one-sidedness and over-specialization and require consideration of interdependence for decision to come as close as possible to holism.
- Promotion of awareness that governments can do a lot for promotion of RH and SR with their rules considering procurement to the entire public sector: nobody is eligible to supply any organization in any part of the public sector from kindergarten and other schools to the governmental offices and bodies and army etc., unless the potential supplier can prove best in systemic quality, business excellence, SR, normal wages and rewards and business funds, including requiring the same from all suppliers, too.

Details are quoted above and require a quite radical non-technological innovation of VCEN. Many entrepreneurs practice the modern VCEN with clear business benefits; their criteria of benefit are not only short-term and narrow-minded. Details exceed the available room.

What can be expected, including in SMEs, is everybody's capability to attain knowledge and will to enter the interdisciplinary creative cooperation along with his or her specialization. Though: these attributes are rare birds, so far, because schools and bosses leave them to incidental acquisition. This sad fact is visible from data how few books, articles and papers are written in such cooperation (Mulej et al, 2006), and from experience reported about (Barabba, 2004; Quinn, 2006; etc.). Cooperation can receive support, instead of an empty content-poor sitting in meetings and losing time, from several methods such as the combination of USOMID and 6 thinking hats methods (Mulej, M., Mulej, N., 2006). What is essential is to acquire the habit to listen to each other because we disagree: being different specialists we have different bases and complete each other up by different findings. Completing up can be reached with no loss of time and arguing; the said method makes this possible.

### **Concluding remarks**

In the contemporary conditions we humans are condemned to RH, SR and related IIDP, in order to be competitive and improve our quality of business and personal lives, solve the piled-up problems of environmental preconditions of our survival that we have not been able, willing or knowing how to solve. Non-technological IIDP, especially about management style and VCEN and resulting habits, is unavoidable, but nobody can master its complexity without creative interdisciplinary cooperation. Fictitious holism of isolated specialists does not help them create innovations, which SR is supposed to become for human civilization to survive.

Nature on the Planet Earth can live without humans, but humans cannot live without a healthy nature, therefore SR is unavoidable, including as a component of entrepreneurial ethics.

## References:

1. .. (2011): Rop – zločin našega časa. *TV Slovenia I*, 08 March (Emission of the documentary ‘Robbery – The Crime of our Time’, created in USA in 2009)
2. ..ISO 26000; See: [http://www.iso.org/iso/discovering\\_iso\\_26000.pdf](http://www.iso.org/iso/discovering_iso_26000.pdf)
3. Abu-Shanab, E., Al-Tarawneh, H. (2009): Production Information Systems Usability in Jordan. Proceedings of CENTERIS 2009, IPCA, Ofir: 43-53
4. Andor, L., Courard, Ph. (2011): Boj proti revscini otrok. *Delo, Mnenja*: 10 January: 5
5. Babić, M. (2011): *Inoviranje državnega managementa v odnosu do manjših cestno-projektantskih podjetij*. Univerza na Primorskem, Fakulteta za management, Koper.
6. Bambaren, S. (2010): *Kristalna reka*. Eno, Nova Gorica
7. Barabba, P. (2004): *Surviving Transformation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
8. Baumol, J., Litan, E., Schramm, J. (2007): *Good Capitalism, Bad Capitalism, and the Economics of Growth and Prosperity*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
9. Belak, Ja. (2002): Politika podjetja in strateski management. MER, Maribor.
10. Belak, Je. (2008): *Business Ethics Implementation at Different Stages of Enterprise Life Cycle* (Doctoral dissertation). EBS, Winkel.
11. Belak, Je., Duh, M., Mulej, M., Štrukelj, T. (2010): Requisitely holistic ethics planning as pre-condition for enterprise ethical behaviour, *Kybernetes*, 39, 1: 19-36.
12. Belak, Je., Mulej, M. (2008): *Life Cycle Stage and Enterprise Ethical Climate*. Proc.of14<sup>th</sup> ICCS, WOSC, Wroclaw.
13. Bertalanffy, L. v. (1968, edition 1979): *General Systems Theory. Foundations, Development, Applications. Revised Edition. Sixth Printing*. Braziller, New York
14. Bleicher, K. (1995): *Das Konzept Integriertes Management. Das St. Galler Management-Konzept*. Campus Verlag GmbH, Frankfurt am Main/New York.
15. Bleicher, K. (2004): *Das Konzept Integriertes Management. Visionen – Missionen – Programme. (St. Galler Management-Konzept)*. Campus Verlag GmbH, Frankfurt/Main.
16. Bozicnik, S., Ecimovic, T., Mulej, M. (eds.) (2008): *Sustainable future, requisite holism, and social responsibility*. ANSTED, Penang.
17. Brown L. R. (2008): *Plan B 3.0; Mobilizing to Save Civilization*. Earth Policy Institute, New York.
18. Bulc, V. (2006): *Ritmi poslovne evolucije*. Vibacom, Ljubljana
19. Bygrave, W. D. (1994): The Entrepreneurial Process, in Bygrave: *The portable MBA in Entrepreneurship*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
20. Bygrave, W. D. (2010): The Entrepreneurial Process, in Bygrave, William D., Zacharakis, Andrew: *The portable MBA in Entrepreneurship*. Fourth edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Hoboken, New Jersey.
21. Collins, C., Porras, I. (1997): *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*. Harper Business, New York.
22. Collins, J. (2001): *Why Some Companies Make the Leap ... and others don't. Good to Great*. Random House, Sydney.
23. Derickson, R., Long, K. S., Gordon, V. S., Tana, A., Tremblay, W. (2010): Coyotes, Jazz, and Creative Teams: Facing and Seeking Variance. In: Trappl, R., editor, *EMCSR, Proceedings of the 20th European Meeting on Cybernetics and Systems Research*. Austrian Society for Cybernetics, Vienna
24. Diener E., Seligman M. (2004): Beyond Money. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*. 5, 1: 1-31.
25. Duh, M. (2010): Applying Agency Theory and the Resource-based View in Explaining Performance Differences between Family and Non-family Businesses. *Nase gospodarstvo*, 56, 1-2: 45-52
26. Duh, M., Belak, Je. (2009): The Influence of a Family on Ethical Behaviour of a Family Enterprise. In: *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica*. Journal of Applied Sciences, 6, 3.
27. Dyck, R., Mulej, M. (eds.) (1998): *Self-Transformation of the Forgotten Four Fifths*. Kendall/Hunt, Dubuque.
28. Ecimovic, T. (et al.) (2007): *Sustainable (Development) Future of Mankind*. SEM, Korte.
29. Ecimovic, T., Mulej, M., Mayur, M. (eds.) (2002): *System Thinking and Climate Change System*. SEM, Korte.
30. Esposito, M. (2009): *Put Your Corporate Social Responsibility Act Together!* Tate Publishing, Mustang.
31. Estulin, D. (2008). *Skupina Bilderberg – Gospodarji globaliziranega sveta*. Ciceron, Menges.
32. EU (1995): *Green Paper on Innovation*. European Union, Brussels.
33. EU (2000): *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Innovation in a knowledge-driven economy*. European Union, Brussels.

34. EU (2001): Green Paper on Promoting a European Framework for Corporate Social Responsibility. European Union, Brussels.
35. EU (2004): *Innovation Management and the Knowledge-Driven Economy*. European Union, Brussels.
36. Ferkov, K. (2009): Skromnost je vsec bogatim, revni imajo raje luksuz. *Delo*, 14 Aug.: 28-29.
37. Fistravec, A. (2010): Ubuntu. *Vecer*, 28 Dec.: 8.
38. Fistravec, A. (2011): Druzbeno odgovornost. *Vecer*, 7 January: 8.
39. Fleissner, P. and Wanek, N. editors (2008), *Bruch Stücke: kritische Ansätze zu Politik und Ökonomie im globalisierten Kapitalismus: Materialien zu Ringvorlesung, Sommersemester 2008*, Universität Wien, Wien.
40. Florida, R. (2005): *Vzpon ustvarjalnega razreda* (In Slovene). IPAK, Velenje
41. Fujimoto, T. (2006): *Competing to Be Really, Really Good*. Tokyo, International House of Japan.
42. Gams, M. (2011): Resetiranje v 23 tezah: Naprej v informacijsko družbo, v družbo znanja. *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 12 March: 12-14
43. Gerzema, J. (2010): ThePower of the Post-recession Consumer: *strategy + business*. <http://www.strategy-business.com/article/00054?pg=all&tid=27782251>. Downloaded on 10 January 2011.
44. Gladwell, M. (2004): *Prelomna točka (The tipping point)*. Orbis, Ljubljana.
45. Gladwell, M. (2008): *Preblisk. (Blink)*. Mladinska knjiga, Ljubljana.
46. Gladwell, M. (2009): *Prebojniki*. Mladinska knjiga, Ljubljana.
47. Goerner, S., Dyck, G., Lagerroos, D. (2008): *The New Science of Sustainability*. TCCS, Chapel Hill, N.C.
48. Gomez, M. (2010): Corporate Environmental Management Information Systems. In: Hrast, Mulej, editors, referenced here
49. Gorenak, Š., Mulej, M. (2010): Upravljanje popolne odgovornosti kot pot do celovitega vodenja podjetja = Total responsibility management (TRM) as an approach toward holistic business management. *Naše gospodarstvo*, 56, 1-2: 22-31.
50. Halimi, S. (2008): Misliti nemisljivo (in Slovene). *Delo*, Ljubljana.
51. Hamman, J., Ecimovic, T., Mulej, M. (2010): *Zum Klimawandel. Eine wissenschaftliche Einführung*. SEM Institute for Climate Change, Korte
52. Harris E. (2008): *Twenty-first Century*. The Institute for Economic Democracy Press, Sun City.
53. Haverkamp, J. (interviewed by B. Tavcar) (2010): Učinkovita raba obnovljive energije ali visok račun. *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 18 Dec.: 26-27
54. Heerden v. A. (2010): Making Global Labor fair. Downloaded on 11 January 2011. See:
55. Hensley, D. E. (2008): *Pozitivna naravnost in ustvarjalnost pri delu*. Lisac&Lisac, Ljubljana.
56. Hofkirchner, W. (2010): *Twenty Questions about a Unified Theory of Information*. Emergent Publications, Litchfield Park, AZ.
57. Hornung, B. R. (2006): Happiness and the pursuit of happiness: A sociocybernetic approach. *Kybernetes*, 35, 3/4:323-346.
58. Hrast, A., Kojc, S., Fistravec, A., Mulej, M., Anterer, A., editors (2011): *6<sup>th</sup> IRDO International Conference: Social Responsibility and Current Challenges 2011 Youth in Focus of World Changes. Conference Proceedings*. Zbirka Druzbeno odgovornost. IRDO Institute for development of social responsibility, Maribor
59. Hrast, A., Mulej, M. (editors) (2010): *Narava in človek = Social responsibility: Nature and humans* [On CD]. IRDO, Maribor.
60. Hrast, A., Mulej, M. (eds.) (2008): *Socialni izzivi in izzivi casa*. IRDO, Maribor.
61. Hrast, A., Mulej, M. (eds.) (2009): *Druzbeno odgovornost in izzivi casa*. IRDO, Maribor.
62. Hrast, A., Mulej, M., Knez-Riedl, J. (eds.) (2006): *Druzbeno odgovornost in izzivi casa*. IRDO, Maribor.
63. Hrast, A., Mulej, M., Knez-Riedl, J. (eds.) (2007): *Druzbeno odgovornost*. IRDO, Maribor.  
[http://www.ted.com/talks/auret\\_van\\_heerden\\_making\\_global\\_labor\\_fair.html?utm\\_source=newsletter\\_weekly\\_2010-11-16&utm\\_campaign=newsletter\\_weekly&utm\\_medium=email](http://www.ted.com/talks/auret_van_heerden_making_global_labor_fair.html?utm_source=newsletter_weekly_2010-11-16&utm_campaign=newsletter_weekly&utm_medium=email)
64. Husic, I. (2009): *Prenova poslovnih procesov kot dejavnik inovativnega poslovanja v sodobnih tranzicijskih razmerah gospodarjenja (in Slovene)* University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Maribor.
65. Husic, I., Mulej, M., (2010): Some of the Main Factors of Innovative Renewal of Companies' Organization. *Organizacija*, 43, 6: 238-246.
66. Huston, L., Sakkab, N. (2006): Connect and Develop. *Harvard Business Review*, March: 1-9.
67. IBM (2006): *Global Innovation Outlook 2.0*. IBM, Armonk.
68. Ilgo, P. (2009): Povezimo menedzerski tim!*Delo*, 24 Aug.: 32.
69. Jakse, L. (2011): "Zahtevamo samo normalno poslovno okolje". *Delo, Ozadja*, 10 January: 10-11
70. James, O. (2007): *Affluenza – a contagious middle class virus causing depression, anxiety, addiction and ennui*. Random House, London.
71. Kajfez-Bogataj, L., Müller, K. H., Svetlik, I., Tos, N., editors (2010): *Modern RISC-Societies*. Edition echoraum, Vienna.
72. Kersic Svetel, M. (2010): Okolje in družba. Mednarodno leto gozdov 2011. *Vecer*, 20 Dec.: 10.

73. Komat, A. (2010): Potopljena poplavna varnost. Narava ni propadlo podjetje, v stečajnem postopku je naša civilizacija. *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 25 Sept.: 6-7.
74. Korade, D. (2009): Novi somrak možnosti in tveganj (in Slovene). *Večer*, 24 Aug. 13.
75. Korade, D. (2011): Oni so subkultura (Dr. Rastko Mocnik, sociolog). *Večer, V Soboto*: 2-4
76. Korten, D. S. (2009): *Agenda for a New Economy*. Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco.
77. Kos, M. (2009): Napredek je povezan z znanjem (in Slovene). *Delo*, 31 Aug.: 6 – 7.
78. Kutin, A. (2011): Končno tudi dejanja. *Večer*, 14 March: 10.
79. Letnar Cernic, J. (2009): Fundamental Human Rights Obligations of Corporations. In: Hrast, Mulej (2009) – referenced here.
80. Letnar Cernic, J. (2010): *Human Rights Law and Business. Corporate responsibility for Fundamental Human Rights*. Europa Law Publishing. Groningen
81. Likar, B., Križaj, D., Fatur, P. (2006): *Management inoviranja*. Koper: Univerza na Primorskem, Fakulteta za management.
82. Linden, R. (1990): *From Vision to Reality*. Charlottesville, VA: LEL Enterprises.
83. Malek, F. (2010): *Management. The Essence of the Craft*. Campus Verlag, Frankfurt/New York.
84. Malek, F., editor (2011): *CI-Conference 2011 "SuperSyntegration"*. Malik Management, St. Gallen.
85. Mali, F. (2009): Novi družbeni izzivi razvoja konvergentnih tehnologij (In Slovene). *Delo*, 27 Aug.: 17.
86. Malicev, P. (2009): Boris Kolar, biolog in pisatelj (in Slovene). *Delo*, 08 Aug.: 22-24.
87. Martin, G. (2006): *World Revolution through World Law*. IED, Sun City.
88. Martin, G., Murphy, P (eds.) (2009): *Proc. of 12th International Conference of International Philosophers for Peace*. International Philosophers for Peace Society, Nainital.
89. Mencinger, J. (2009): Kam gremo? (in Slovene). *Delo*, 22 Aug.: 8-9.
90. Mesko, G., Dimitrijevic, D., and Fields, C. B. (2011): *NATO Science for Peace and Security Series – C: Environmental Security: Understanding and Managing Treaties to the Environment in South Eastern European Union/rope*. Springer, Dordrecht.
91. Mihalic, R. (2010): Poti in stranpoti do energetske neodvisnosti. Zakaj ne zamenjajo vseh škodljivih virov s sonaravnimi, če so tako super? *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 18 Dec.: 24-25.
92. Mocnik, R. (2010): Alternativno branje. Antikapitalistični Adam Smith. *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 02 Oct.: 12-13.
93. Monbiot, G. (interviewed by Kučić, L. J.) (2010): Ko kupimo varčno žarnico, je skoraj ne ugasnemo več. *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 18 Sept.: 10-12.
94. Moore, H. (interviewed by Megla, M.) (2010): Socialne razlike so najbolj destruktivna sila v družbi. *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 10 July: 28-30.
95. Mulej, M. (1974): Dialektična teorija sistemov (in Slovene). *Nase gospodarstvo*, 21, 3-4: 207-212.
96. Mulej, M. (1975): *Osnove dialektične teorije sistemov (in Slovene)*. UL, Ljubljana.
97. Mulej, M. (1976): *Toward the Dialectical Systems Theory*. ECMRS, Vienna (Published 1978).
98. Mulej, M. (1979): *Ustvarjalno delo in dialektična teorija sistemov (in Slovene)*. Razvojni center. Celje.
99. Mulej, M. (1990): Štirikrat "F" gospe Kanterjeve: več osredotočenosti, hitrosti, prilagodljivosti, prijaznosti. *Manager (Ljublj.)*, 1, 8: 25-27.
100. Mulej, M. (1994): Three Years of Support for a Theory. *Cybernetics and Systems*, 5, 1: 861-877.
101. Mulej, M. (2006a): Systems theory. In: *Proceedings of EMCSR '06*. ASCR, Vienna, pp. XXV-XXVII.
102. Mulej, M. (2006b): *Absorpcijska sposobnost tranzicijskih manjših podjetij za prenos invencij, vednosti in znanja iz univerz in institutov*. UP, FM, Koper.
103. Mulej, M. (2007a): Systems theory – a worldview and/or a methodology aimed at requisite holism/realism of humans' thinking, decisions and action. *Syst Res and Beh Science*, 24, 3: 547-357.
104. Mulej, M. (2007b): *Inoviranje navad države in manjših podjetij*. Koper: University of Primorska, Faculty of Management.
105. Mulej, M. (2009a): Nujnost in zapletenost ustvarjalnega sodelovanja za inoviranje kot pot iz krize 2008 (in Slovene). In: Hrast, Mulej (eds.) - Referenced here.
106. Mulej, M. (2009d): Lack of requisitely holistic thinking and action. In: *Proc. of 29th PODIM*, Maribor: IRP, Maribor: 161-175.
107. Mulej, M. (2010): [Five books review: stop hating your children and grandchildren] *Syst. res. behav. sci.*, 2010, 27, 1. Untitled book review
108. Mulej, M. (2010): Action Makes Innovation from Knowledge and Invention – Diffusion of Novelties revisited, and made more/requisitely Holistic. In: Rebernik et al: *Proceedings of the 30th PODIM Conference*. University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Maribor.
109. Mulej, M. (eds.) (1994, edition 2006): *Inovacijski management*. University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Maribor.
110. Mulej, M. (et al.) (1992): *Teorije sistemov*. University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Maribor.

111. Mulej, M. (et al.) (2006): Interdependence of systems theories. *Kybernetes*, 35, 7/8: 942-954.
112. Mulej, M. (et al.) (2008): *Invencijsko-inovacijski management (in Slovene)*. Korona, Ljubljana.
113. Mulej, M. (et al.) (2009b): Kriza - povod za inoviranje planiranja in vodenja v smeri k družbeni odgovornosti (podjetij) ter zadostni in potrebni celovitosti obnasanja ljudi. In: Proceedings of 34 Conference DEM, Društvo ekonomistov Maribor, Maribor: 7-31.
114. Mulej, M. (et al.) (2009c): Kriza 2008 - posledica neoliberalnega zanemarjanja primerno celovitega obnasanja do inoviranja. In: *Globalna finančna kriza ter trajnostni razvoj*, University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Maribor.
115. Mulej, M., Prosenak, D. (2007): Society and Economy of Social Responsibility. In: Hrast, Mulej, Knez-Riedl, (eds.) - referenced here.
116. Mulej, M., and co-authors (by ABC order): S. Božičnik, V. Čančer, A. Hrast, T. Jere Lazanski, K. Jurše, Š. Kajzer, J. Knez-Riedl, T. Mlakar, N. Mulej, V. Potočan, F. Risopoulos, B. Rosi, G. Steiner, T. Štrukelj, D. Uršič, Z. Ženko (forthcoming): *Dialectical Systems Thinking and the Law of Requisite Holism*. Goodyear, Arizona: ISCE Publishing.
117. Mulej, M., Devetak, G., Drozg, F., Ferš, M., Hudnik, M., Kajzer, Š., Kavčič, B., Kejžar, I., Kralj, J., Milfelner, R., Možina, S., Paluc, C., Pirc, V., Pretnar, B., Repovž, L., Rus, V., Senčar, P., Tratnik, G. (1987): *Inovativno poslovanje*. Gospodarski vestnik, Ljubljana.
118. Mulej, M., Espejo, R., Jackson, M., Kajzer, S., Mingers, J., Mlakar, P., Mulej, N., Potočan, V., Rebernik, M., Rosicky, A., Schiemenz, B., Umpleby, S., Uršič, D., Vallee, R., (2000): *Dialektična in druge mehkosistemske teorije (podlaga za uspešen management)*. University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Maribor.
119. Mulej, M., Hrast, A. (2009b): Družbena odgovornost podjetij in odnosi s skupnostjo. In: *Družbena odgovornost podjetij*, Skofja Loka.
120. Mulej, M., Hrast, A. editors (2010): *Eseji o družbeni odgovornosti. [Zbirka Družbena odgovornost]*. IRDO Inštitut za razvoj družbene odgovornosti, Maribor, ECPD Slovenija, Ljubljana, Ypsilon, Ljubljana.
121. Mulej, M., Hyvarinnen, L., Jurše, K., Rafolt, B., Rebernik, M., Sedevčič, M., Uršič, D. (1994 a): *Inovacijski management, 1. del, Inoviranje managementa*. University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Maribor.
122. Mulej, M., Kajzer, S. (1998): Ethic of interdependence and the law of requisite holism. In: Proc. of *STIQE '98*, ISRUM, Maribor: 56-67.
123. Mulej, M., Kajzer, Š. (1991): Focused, fast, flexible, friendly, fit, fun, free. FFFFFFFF : sedem, ne le štiri, pet ali šest F so pogoj za poslovno preživetje v devetdesetih letih. *RR, Rev. Razvoj*, 7, 2: 12-13.
124. Mulej, M., Knez-Riedl, J., Potočan, V., Hrast, A. (2006): Ethic of interdependence as a basis for ethic of social responsibility in logistic services. In: Kramberger, T., Liseč, A., Rosi, B. (ed.). *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Logistics & Sustainable Transport 2006. Vol. 1-2*. Celje: University of Maribor, Faculty of Logistics, vol. 1: 56-71
125. Mulej, M., Medvedeva, T. A., Potočan, V., Štrukelj, T., Ženko, Z., Šarotar Žižek, S., Hrast, A. (forthcoming): Innovation of managers' attributes by systemic methods and world-view. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*
126. Mulej, M., Mulej, N. (2006). Innovation and/by systemic thinking. In: Proc. of 18<sup>th</sup> ECSR, ASCS, Vienna: 416-421.
127. Mulej, M., Ursic, D. (1989): Cybernetics of a country in transition from preindustrial to modern life. *Systemica*, 8, 1: 265-276.
128. Mulej, M., Ženko, Z. (2004): *Introduction to Systems Thinking with Application to Invention and Innovation Management*. Management Forum, Maribor.
129. Mulej, N. (2011): Ustvarjalno in lateralno razmisljanje z metodo CoRT. Creative and lateral thinking by CoRT. In: Hrast et al., quoted here.
130. Nakamori, Y. (2008): Recursive Knowledge creation Model. In: *Proceedings of KSS 2008 conference*. KSS, Guangzhou.
131. Nicolaci da Costa, p. (2010): Jesenski ekonomski opomin. *Vecer*, 30 Dec.: 8.
132. Nixon, B. (2004): Speaking Plainly – A New Agenda for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. In: Crowther, D., and Caliyut, K. T., editors (2004a): *Stakeholders and Social Responsibility*. ANSTED University, Penang.
133. Norberg, J. (2010): *GDP and its enemies: the Questionable Search for a Happiness Index*. The Centre for European Union Studies, Brussels.
134. Novak, H. – L. (2010): *Radece. Moj drugi dom ali učitelj s šestimi razredi osnovne šole*. Založba Litera, Maribor.
135. Novak, T., Hrast, A. (2010): Objave o družbeni odgovornosti v slovenskih medijih (od leta 2006 do leta 2009). In: Hrast, Mulej, editors, referenced here.
136. Novak, T., Vilcnik, B., Lubej, A. (2011): Statistika objav v slovenskih medijih o družbeni odgovornosti. Media Clipping – statistic overview on social responsibility. In: Hrast et al, editors, quoted here.

137. Nussbaum, B., Berner, R., Brady, D. (2005): Special Report. *Business Week*, 08 Aug.: 51-68.
138. Pavliha, M. (2010): Prejeli smo. *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 09 Oct.: 39.
139. Peterlin, S. (2009): Alexander von Humboldt in spomenik narave (In Slovene). *Delo*, 30 July: 14.
140. Petric, E. (interviewed by Utenkar, G.) (2010): Uzda za žrebca kapitalizma je pravna država. *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 13 Nov.: 4-6.
141. Petzinger, T. (2000): *The New Pioneers*. Simon & Schusters, New York.
142. Plut, D. (2009): *Planet in Slovenija pred izzivi globalizacije in sonaravnega razvoja*. UL, FE, Ljubljana.
143. Porter, M. (1990): *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. Basics Books, New York.
144. Porter, M. E., and Kramer, M. R. (2006): Strategy & Society; The Link Between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Harvard Business Review* • [hbr.org](http://hbr.org) • December 2006.
145. Potocan, V., Mulej, M. (2007): *Transition into an Innovative Enterprise*. University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Maribor.
146. Prašnikar, J. in Cirman, A. (ur.) (2008): Globalna finančna kriza in eko strategije podjetij: dopolnjevanje in nasprotovanje? *Conference proceedings*. Časnik Finance.
147. Prosenak, D., Mulej, M. (2008): O celovitosti in uporabnosti obstoječega koncepta družbene odgovornosti poslovanja. *Nase gospodarstvo*, 54, 1: 10-21.
148. Quinn, F. (2006): *Growing the Customer*. O'Brien Press, Dublin.
149. Rebernik, M. (et al.) (2003): *GEM Slovenija 2002: Kako podjetna je Slovenija*. University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Maribor.
150. Repovz, M. (2011): Sreca in ekonomija: Svoje glavi krojaci blaginje. *Nedelo*, 02. Jan.: 8.
151. Rihtaric, M. (2008): Kopicenje kapitala ne resuje problema. *Vecer*, 22 Nov.: 48.
152. Rihtaric, M. (2009): Temne strani globalizacije (in Slovene). *Vecer*, 31 Jan.: 8 – 9.
153. Rus, A. (2010): Aktivno upravljanje državne lastnine. Strogost, kakršno pozna zasebni sektor. *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 16 Oct.: 25.
154. Salecl, R. (2010): Pomisleki. Zanikanje in nevrokuhinja. *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 11 Dec.: 40.
155. Sarotar Zizek, S. (2009c): Personal and personality development as a fundament of successful management of employee diversity in European Union. In: *Proc. Of Economic integrations, competition and cooperation*. University of Rijeka, Faculty of Economics, Rijeka.
156. Sarotar Zizek, S., Mulej, M., Treven, S. (2009a): Dobro pocutje sodelavcev v tranzicijskih organizacijah s primerjavo inovativnih in manj inovativnih (in Slovene). In: Mulej, M. (ed.) - referenced here.
157. Sarotar Zizek, S., Mulej, M., Treven, S. (2009b): Dobro pocutje/subjektivna blaginja sodelavcev kot bistveni dejavnik prehoda v inovativno družbo (in Slovene). *Organizacija*, 42, 3: 122-131.
158. Sarotar Zizek, S., Mulej, M., Treven, S. (2009d): Crisis and personal and personality development. In: *Proc. Of 6th AFE Conference*, National and Capodistrian University of Athens, Samos: 242-249.
159. Sarotar Zizek, S., Mulej, M. (2010a): Družbena odgovornost na temelju zadostne in potrebne celovitosti posameznikov ter njihovega blagostanja - možen odgovor na finančno, gospodarsko in družbeno krizo iz leta 2008 = Social Responsibility Based on Requisite Holism of Individuals and Their Prosperity: Possible answer to the Financial, Economic, and Social Crisis of 2008. *Naše gospodarstvo*, 56, 3/4: 19-32.
160. Sarotar Zizek, S., Mulej, M., Potocnik, A. (2010c): Human well-being under impact of human care for nature: happy planet index. In: Hrast, A., Mulej, M. (ed.). *Narava in človek: zbornik prispevkov*. Maribor: IRDO - Inštitut za razvoj družbene odgovornosti, 2010, pp. 1-6 (individual pagination).
161. Sarotar Zizek, S., Mulej, M., Treven, S., Potocnik, A. (2010d): Human's well-being: a cause or a result of human's requisite holism or both? In: Oškrdal, V. (ed.) *IDIMT-2010, Information Technology - Human Values, Innovation and Economy*, (Schriftenreihe Informatik, Bd. 32). Linz: Trauner: Johannes Kepler Universität: SEA Institut für Systems Engineering & Automation, 2010: 261-272.
162. Sarotar Zizek, S., Treven, S. (2010b): Uspešno premagovanje stresa - izziv sodobnega managementa. *Izzivi managementa*, 2, 1: 14-21.
163. Senge, P., Smith, B., Kruschwitz, N., Lau, J., Schley, S. (2008): *The Necessary Revolution. How Individuals and Organizations Are Working Together to Create a Sustainable World*. Dobleday, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland.
164. Sirec, K., Mocnik, D. (2010): How Entrepreneurs' Personal Characteristics Affect SME's Growth. *Nase gospodarstvo*, 56, 1-2: 03-12.
165. Skafar, B. (2009): *Inovativnost kot pogoj za poslovno odličnost v komunalnem podjetju*. Pomurski ekološki center, Murska Sobota.
166. Smith, A. (1759, ed. 2000): *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Prometheus Books, New York.
167. Smith, A. (2010): *Bogastvo narodov. Raziskava o naravi in vzrokih bogastva narodov*. Studia humanitatis, Ljubljana.
168. Socan, L. (2011): Nadgrajevanje globalizacije v gospodarstvo in družbo znanja ter položaj Slovenije: Od konkurenčnosti z znojem do konkurenčnosti z znanjem. *Delo, Posel & denar*, 10 January: 36.

169. Steiner, G. (2011): *Das Planetenmodell der kollaborativen Kreativität. Systemtheoretisch-kreatives Problemlösen für komplexe Herausforderungen*. Gabler, Wiesbaden.
170. Stern, N. (2006): *The economics of climate change* [online]. Available at: [http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/independent\\_reviews](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/independent_reviews).
171. Stern, N. (2007): Special Report. *Research\*European Union*, 52, 2: 14-15.
172. Stiglitz, J. (2009): Towards a better measure of well-being. Commission, Paris.
173. Stiglitz, J. (2009a): Ozivitev s spodbudami ali smrt (in Slovene). *Finance*, 21 Aug., 161: 12.
174. Strukelj, T. (2010): The Influence of Enterprise Values, Culture, Ethics, and Norms on its Vision and thus Long-Term Survival, *forthcoming*. Contribution at IDIMT-2010 Conference, the 18th Interdisciplinary Information Management Talks. Interdisciplinarity in Complex Systems. University of Economics, Prague (Czech Republic) and J. Kepler University of Linz (Austria), Jindřichův Hradec, Czech Republic, September 8th -10th, 2010.
175. Strukelj, T., Duh, M. (2010): Prenos podjetja kot strateški razvojni problem lastnika-managerja, podjetja in gospodarstva. *Organizacija*, 43, 6: A226-A234.
176. Strukelj, T., Duh, M., Belak, J., Mulej, M. (2010b): Entrepreneurial rationality for enterprise's long-term survival and development, in Hrast, A., Mulej, M. (ed.), referenced here.
177. Strukelj, T., Mulej, M. (2008): *Business policy and strategic management for the sustainable future*. In: Božičnik, S., Ećimović, T., Mulej, M. with co-authors (2008): *Sustainable future, requisite holism, and social responsibility (Against the current abuse of free market society)*. ANSTED University, British Virgin Islands, and ANSTED Service Centre, Penang, Malaysia; School of Environmental Sciences, in Cooperation with SEM Institute for Climate Change, Korte, Slovenia And IRDO Institute for development of Social Responsibility, Maribor, Slovenia.
178. Strukelj, T., Mulej, M. (2009): Enterprise management, innovativeness, market competitiveness and the case of global (transitional) economy, in *Marketing theory challenges in transitional societies*, 3rd International Scientific Conference, Maribor, Slovenia, September 24th-25th, Maribor: Faculty of Economics and Business, Institute of Marketing, 2009.
179. Strukelj, T., Mulej, M. (2010a): Vision as an instrument for becoming a socially responsible enterprise (including nature), in Hrast, A., Mulej, M. (ed.), *referenced here*.
180. Strukelj, T., Mulej, M. (2011): Ključni dejavniki večno mladega podjetja. Essential elements of a permanently young enterprise's culture. In: Hrast et al., quoted here.
181. Targowski, A. (2009): How to Transform the Information Infrastructure of Enterprises into Sustainable, Global-oriented and to Monitor and Predict the Sustainability of Civilization. In: like Abu-Shanab: 17-28.
182. Taylor, G. (2008): *Evolution's Edge: The Coming Collapse and Transformation of our World*. New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island.
183. Thommen, P. (2003): *Glaubwürdigkeit und Corporate Governance*. Versus Verlag, Zürich.
184. Thorpe, S. (2003): *Vsak je lahko Einstein (in Slovene)*. Mladinska knjiga, Ljubljana.
185. Toth, G. (2008): *Resnicno odgovorno podjetje*. GV, Ljubljana.
186. Tropenauer, M. (2010): *Celovito vodenje znanjskih delavcev v inovativnem proizvodnem podjetju*. Univerza v Mariboru, Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta, Maribor.
187. Trstenjak, K. (2010): V znamenju gozdov. *Večer*, 20 December: 10.
188. Udovicic, K. (2009): Kriza – neinventivnost resitev (in Slovene). In: Proc. of the 8th MBA conference, University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Maribor.
189. Udovičič, K. (2007): Marketing, trženjske poti, tržniki : vidiki in politika trženjskih poti ter človeške zmožnosti tržnikov kot komponenti marketinškega sistema /. – Elektronska knjiga. Aristej, Maribor.
190. Vidic, I. (2010): BDP ni mogoče pojesti, tudi če raste. *Večer v soboto*, 27 Nov.: 6-7.
191. Whittaker, D. H., Cole, R. E. (2006): *Recovering from Success*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
192. Wilby, J., editor (2009): *ISSS 2009. Making Liveable, Sustainable Systems Unremarkable*. In Proc. of the 53rd Annual Meeting of ANZSYS, ANZSYS, Brisbane.
193. [www.utd.slovenia.si](http://www.utd.slovenia.si)
194. Zajc, M. D. (2011): *Priloznosti in ovire za sodelovanje malih in srednjih podjetij in raziskovalnih organizacij na področju soustvarjanja in prenosa znanja*. University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences, Ljubljana.
195. Zenko, Z. (1999): *Comparative Analysis of Management Models of Japan, USA, and European Union*. University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Maribor.
196. Zgonik, A. (2011a): O dusevnem brezdelju: Hrepenimo po lenarjenju, a raje bezimo v vrvez. *Nedelo*, 02. Jan.: 9.
197. Zgonik, A. (2011b): Odvisnost od nakupovanja. *Delo*, 25 January: 19.