

Philosophical Anthropology and Management

Sotiris Fournaros*

Department of Philosophy, Pedagogy and Psychology, Section of Philosophy, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

Abstract

This article discusses the impact philosophical anthropology can have on management issues. Conceived as human openness and self-creation, philosophical anthropology exceeds the psychological limits on human understanding. The significant point stems from the fact that we are humans before becoming professionals (teachers, lawyers, managers, physicians, merchants, manufacturers, etc.). Can the unceasing self-formation of us, our beliefs, our attitude towards life, work, achievements, etc. be underestimated by a manager? Is he/she aware of his/her open and holistic philosophical anthropology dimensions, which occur to his/her, working personnel too? For example, is he/she correct when he manages humans based mainly on personality tests only? The negative answer arises out of the lack of detailed records on daily events or, often, due to interactions between managers and employees. Philosophical anthropology's openness and self-actualization potential can be the basis of an enhanced managerial practice. The aforementioned insights interest the working personnel, the managers importantly, and the educators for a new era on business executives predominantly.

Keywords: Openness; Wholeness; Anthropocentricity; Human essence; Change; Effective and efficient management

Introduction

The renewal of philosophy and management is not only an accomplished reality in the history of mankind. Most of all it is a necessity in a fast-evolving world, where human beings are responsible for the reality they create. Let us consider where management would be without its continuous evolution, without the emergence of new models, of innovative ideas and perspectives, of new insights. It would have perhaps ended exactly where it started. No gurus of management would have come to existence and all its content would have been suppressed to an absolute and ultimate idea overruling it and not leaving way-outs for new insights.

However, that is not the story. If we take a good look at the fundamentals of such an evolution, we will come up with an undeniable outcome: the presence of reflective humans. Indeed, the protagonist is man and his thought. But, that's exactly what philosophy is all about. Most importantly, its evolution is exactly identical to that of management: new ideas, new insights, everything following incessantly the path of human thought and creativity.

What would the world be if philosophy had stopped with sophists? Thought would have perished then, 2500 years ago. In opposition to this, Socrates criticized the Sophists, his pupil Plato and his platonic Socrates extended the sophistic criticism and then Aristotle, Plato's pupil, doubted his teacher and came up with new concepts, although some of them are platonic but expressed differently. And then what followed are the Socratic schools, the Stoics, the Sceptics, the Epicureans, the medieval, the modern and post-modern philosophers.

What's the background to all these? That philosophy and management share the vigorous power of their healthy existence, which is the human-centred unstoppable creativity. A possible disappearance of continuous creation equates to the death of both philosophy and management. The congenital philosophical factor of thinking applies to all human disciplines, especially to management where the innovative and modern ideas consist its content and its mode of survival.

No doubt, since *humans* create it and manage other *humans* to implement their plans and reach their goals, we have to focus on thinking deeply-philosophically on *anthropology*. Thus, the principal philosophical anthropology's issue arises, such *anthropocentricity*, as well as its impact on management. Why should we manage philosophical anthropology and not just educate managers to reside exclusively

in psychological tests of personality regarding the employees? And, concurrently regarding managers? Why a psychological profile of both managers and employees does not suffice?

In order to answer these questions, the article was based on a literature research survey, including recent extensive work (books, articles, etc.) on the topic. The selected at the end material centers on the article's objectives and may assist the reader in his initial understanding of the issues involved, whereas an extended bibliographical approach would distract the reader's attention from the principal, prevalent and prominent idea: the unceasing human openness which paves the way for the formation of the self and its impact on management. The adopted methodology provides us with socio-philosophical data, illuminating thus the existent reality by attempting concurrently idealism's avoidance and utopian implications. While engaging in the situational limitations and their profound relation between philosophical anthropology and management, this method with its focused bibliographical selections assures access to the acquisition of the relevant information

What Philosophical Anthropology is all About? Some Theoretical Background!

It is understood that some theoretical background maybe needed before we proceed to the Practical Insights section.

In one of his famous quotes, the English philosopher and political economist John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) puts explicitly that "people are people before they are lawyers, or physicians, or merchants, or manufacturers; and if you make them capable and sensible people, they will make themselves capable and sensible lawyers, physicians, or merchants" [1]. Accordingly, humans are humans before they are lawyers, or physicians, or merchants, or manufacturers, or *managers*;

*Corresponding author: Sotiris Fournaros, Department of Philosophy, Pedagogy and Psychology, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece, Tel: 00306944348891/00302107277506; E-mail: sotfour@ppp.uoa.gr

Received August 01, 2016; Accepted August 19, 2016; Published August 19, 2016

Citation: Fournaros S (2016) Philosophical Anthropology and Management. Int J Econ Manag Sci 5: 368. doi: 10.4172/2162-6359.1000368

Copyright: © 2016 Fournaros S. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

and if you make them capable and sensible *humans*, they will make themselves capable and sensible lawyers, physicians, or merchants, or *managers*. Therefore, the main issue stems from the inquiry on what makes people become human, or what is human, and specifically what is the essential trait of a human being becoming human.

Philosophy dealt, and still deals, with this important question. Although philosophical anthropology is a rather recent independent philosophical discipline – in Germany of the late 19th and early 20th century, the inquiry on “what and who is man” and “what is human” goes back to the origins of philosophy, almost 3000 years ago, together with the question “what is cosmos”. The primary and main advocates of the modern discipline, the German philosophers Max Scheler (1874-1928) and Helmuth Plessner (1892-1985), shed light to “what and who is man” in a metaphysical manner. Yet, we must not underestimate their concepts due to their basic, but not exclusive, metaphysical core. This set of ideas provides us with human characteristics and opens a wide horizon for meditation and reflection.

Scheler (*Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos*, 1928) depicts the human core in a tripartite construction: body, soul, spirit. Most importantly he extracts the traditional feelings of love and hatred from psychology and introduces them to the spiritual part of the person conceiving them as intentional feelings. Plessner (*Conditio humana*, 1961, *Der Mensch als Lebewesen*, 1975, et al.) shifted his anthropological overview from the spiritual grounds to the amalgamation of philosophical biology and anthropology. His central idea is the eccentricity of intentionality which takes place in the material world of nature and especially in the environmental relations of humans. This eccentricity defines humanity and differentiates humans from other animals.

The inquiry on humanity started with Socrates and his unstoppable turn to self-diagnosis. His famous saying that he knows one thing that he knows nothing (also called the Socratic paradox) paves the way for non-stop continuity in self-diagnosis (otherwise he would have known everything and there would be no need for diagnosing himself) and, furthermore, simultaneous creation of the self after uncovering its pros and cons.

In the recent years, which are strongly bonded with the managerial evolution, the inclination to self-creation's continuity is apparent. What Socrates inaugurated is being lately transformed into a specific area of philosophical anthropology: human openness. The ancient philosopher's implicit claim has become an explicit thesis. Humans are humans because they are open to their ceaseless self-creation. Such openness occurs naturally – it's the life-lasting way from immaturity to maturity. Its underlying creation of the self happens also naturally, but most importantly deliberately. When people are deliberately open to reach higher standards of humanity – which equates to their constant body-and-soul cultivation or *paideia* in Greek –, then human progress and its humanistic environment makes a big entrance.

Philosophical anthropology can be currently conceived and understood within the epicentre of open man. The openness of the human subject “does not have anything to do with the undefined. Specifically, open man does not mean a recipient of the external conditions, chaotically in a disorganized manner and ineffectively. Nor does it mean the passive observation of the external components which come towards him [...] His leading role, his active power in opposition to his passive weakness, the special feature of his openness is creation, namely the non-a-priori defined and determined (from an external to humans state) power of formation (*vis formandi*)” [2] of the human being.

Openness could resemble to multiplicity, since nowadays we face so many and different challenges in every aspect of a multiple life: professionally and personally. Moreover, the internet revolution shapes new worlds where we live in, a virtual reality affecting variously human relations and professional networks. Thus, virtual worlds stand for a new entry in recent multiplicity providing a new horizon for human action. What counts here is the overview of a possible resemblance between multiplicity and openness. How could we define a “multiple human”? Most probably by his strive to successfully cope with the multi-dimensional worlds we live in.

However, it must be stressed that the most important issue is not the inescapable struggle towards the confrontation of a multiple life with multiple worlds. The weighty matter originates in the human stance towards the unavoidable struggle for life. This would be better conceived within openness, since intentional attitude and life-practices shape ourselves ceaselessly and make this life worth-living.

A meaningful life comes out of openness regarded as gives and takes, self-reflected feedback, dialogue with a strong will to shape ordinariness. “I do not know the meaning of a ‘multiple man’. I would mostly talk about the ‘open man’.” [3] The intrinsic value of openness is recognized in our will to form ourselves and not to become passive recipients of multiplicity. The Aristotelian shift from potentiality (*dynamis*) to actuality (*energeia*, *entelecheia*) is transformed here into the “of extreme importance castoriadic keystone of *will*, which converts potentiality into reality, the *dynamis* to *energeia*”.

And what philosophically, which means a concept in its deeper and clearer sense, makes humans capable of their own constant self-formation? It is the *open ontology*, the fact that the definition of a being (e.g. management, table, democracy, justice etc.) is not given to us once and for all, but it is shaped from humans within the dialectics with our lives. That's why things change, people change, definitions change, attitudes change, new ideas and proposals emerge and management attracts different models of practice. Nothing is predefined. We are responsible for the meaning of our life. On the other hand, what would have happened if nothing new had come up, if everything was perfectly set? There would be no progress in medicine, in informatics, in management, in giving the meaning of life within this progress.

All these happen because anthropology is entirely philosophical, based upon its open ontology in its deepest and most crucial core. The “Being is chaos, an abyss, it's the bottomless, the unlimited, but at the same time it's creation. It is a *vis formandi*, an unpredetermined power of shaping and formation” [4]. That chaotic being is not messy. Nor is it undefined. When artists create their art, they formulate a new aesthetic being. They bring about new forms of aesthetic beauty. This has nothing to do with mess and undefined formations. It is chaotic in the sense that it only opens the wide way for an unconditional human creation.

Hence, the aforementioned John Stuart Mill's saying that “people are people before they are lawyers, or physicians, or merchants, or manufacturers” can be now clarified under the light of constant, unlimited and unreserved understanding of human creativity. The “essence of man is self-creation, and this phrase is enlightened in two ways: man creates his essence and this essence is creation and self-creation. Man creates himself as a creator”. We are congenitally gifted with the open ontology of perpetual self-creation. The philosophical anthropology's essence gives rise to humans as creators of the self and of the worlds, where the sky cannot be perceived as a limit. There are no limits.

The Holistic Human Creation

A meaningful lifelong strive for gradual and progressive shape of the self and of everything around us encompasses the whole entity of humanity. Humans may be different personalities, may have different skills and talents, may also have diverse attitudes and grasp of a meaningful life, but they are not aimless creations of themselves. Difference and diversity and, thus, division and contradictory parts of the self-do not distort human wholeness. On the one hand, they demonstrate it within its peculiar beauty and, on the other, they consist the “airway” of human amelioration. The “human being is, no matter what someone may say, a sort of ‘wholeness’, even if it is divided and contradictory”.

Such an open, all-embracing human entity creates many areas of self-formation: rational, emotional, bodily-materialistic, aesthetical, ethical. Inherently, humans are holistic beings, creating more or less our many and different parts. And humanity now comes into view as a holistic fostering and balance of the multiplicity and diversity of human parts. In that regard, we can read John Stuart Mill’s proposition that “people are people before they are lawyers, or physicians, or merchants, or manufacturers” within a balanced and unceasing advancement of human wholeness, which emerges as a potentiality from the first day of our lives. Afterwards it becomes a non-stop actuality.

Therefore, we could illuminate Mill’s thesis by suggesting that “people are holistic creations of themselves from day one potentially and after the upbringing and mature life perpetually and actually, and hence human balance can be conceived. These exist before people are lawyers, or physicians, or merchants, or manufacturers”, or managers. Such a reality provides all human actions with a sine-qua-non-attribute, including definitely management.

No doubt, the main advocates of the modern discipline “philosophical anthropology” stress, too, the holistic overview of humans, even if they do it differently compared to the recent concept of openness inside mundane affairs where metaphysical presuppositions lack. Max Scheler’s metaphysical claims entail a whole evidently outlined in his axiology, and especially in his value-ridden reality versus the disvalues. Such an antithesis enlarges the wholeness spectrum. E.g. values of life and the noble versus disvalues of the vulgar, values of the holy versus disvalues of the unholy, values of pleasure versus disvalues of pain, values of the spirit (for instance beauty versus ugliness) etc. Additionally, in Helmuth Plessner will suffice his focal point on the environmental relations of humans, which unfold the whole of human actions based on his fundamental concept of the eccentricity of intentionality.

Philosophical anthropology cannot but illustrate the holistic understanding of humanity. It is not only our materialistic part, but our rational, spiritual, emotional, ethical, aesthetical parts composing human wholeness. People cannot be one-way understood and accordingly managed. We are *all* made of different – maturing and changing throughout our lifetime– parts. If we don’t start from these fundamentals and principally from our – either conscious and deliberate or sub-conscious– route of openness and unceasing creation of the self by us, which is by the creator, how can we manage people? By disregarding it we face the foe of managerial misfire. The “identity of this openness consists of human ‘wholeness’ with discrete but communicating traits which compose, that is jointly place, the whole of human existence”.

Managers and Employees: Open and Holistic Human Interactions

Only humans

Obviously, management cannot be conceived without humans. It starts and ends with them. A “key aspect of managing is recognizing the role and importance of others. Good managers know that the only way they can accomplish anything is through the organization’s people” [5]. Managers and employees are crucial parts of the management circle. For sure, organizing people incorporates organizers and the organized ones. In a different case, a purposeless organization and a corresponding management would take place.

Consequently, there would be no management recipients. This first step needs to be considered. We go nowhere without it. It was already stressed by the early twentieth-century management scholar Mary Parker Follett whose definition of management focuses on “the art of getting things done through people”. This stands for a prerequisite so far as effective managerial attainment of goals is concerned.

The organizational resources are too many and they cover fields like education, action, decision-making, control etc. Such a multiplicity is strongly bonded with human multiplicity of the self. Indeed, we have so many parts of ourselves to manage in order to constantly create our creation, that the existence of multiple organizational resources is totally reasonable as an outcome. The holistic human nature with its main feature, the emblematic open horizons of human creation, stands before any other depiction of humanity (an artist, an athlete, a lawyer, a physician, a merchant, a manager, etc.).

Skills and wholeness

Undeniably, technical skills are needed in a manager. But, simultaneously and, more specifically before this, the wholeness of the human being makes its presence clear. Either as a potentiality or an actuality, the holistic and open human being is born before the choice of a profession takes place. And when the professional life occurs, the managerial and that of the employees in our case, wholeness and openness still move on, either deliberately or sub-consciously.

Humans change, evolve, ameliorate or sometimes deteriorate. Independently of this, the open and holistic philosophical anthropology functions ceaselessly – a fact that illuminates the sine-qua-non turn of managers to themselves and to their employees. And when we have to talk about a big number of personnel, lots of managers are needed to develop their multiple human and technical skills and a general manager to get hold of this whole of multiple human evolutions.

In fact, managers “use a multitude of skills to perform [the] functions [of planning, organizing, leading, and controlling]”. Why should we sacrifice this anthropology of multitude and multiplicity in the name of technically effective management? Can we deny our holistic and open nature and shrink it exclusively into technical traits? For sure, we *cannot* by human nature and, moreover, managers *should not*, because such a disregard would result in less effectiveness, whereas the first managerial principle is detected in the best managers’-employees’ performance. How is it possible for managers and employees, especially for the former who plan, organize, lead, and control everything in organizations, to deprive themselves of being non-stop creators of their creation due to their humanity? How can we not invest in human capital conceived philosophically-anthropologically?

Personalized management and human capital

The aforementioned human capital's perspective provides a different answer to the raised question "so why could this approach to managing people as human capital

(as resources) through systems be understood as humanistic?", and to the proposed answer that "on the grounds of intuitive perceptions, this approach appears as highly depersonalized, possibly even as dehumanizing; because the key features of a person or human being in any comprehensive, holistic, behavioural, psychological, sociological, or anthropological sense are just abstracted off" [6].

Nevertheless, it provides the answer that the holistic and open man is totally a personalized figure and in its all-embracing entity he/she is made from the collaborating comprehensive, behavioural, psychological, sociological, or anthropological parts practically, inside mundane affairs, and not in an abstracted manner. Holistic openness amalgamates this multiplicity into one entity and is essential exactly because of this unity and not due to the prevalence of a part or just one perspective of human understanding. Unquestionably, closer to the personalized, humanistic management stand behavioural "classifications" like honesty, trust, decency etc. between managers and employees. But, the profound classifications' grasp is based upon their inclusion to the general and interminable evolution of human openness. Otherwise, we'll have to regard human essence as isolate, not intertwined, parts, changing without affecting man's wholeness.

A usual reception of human capital "implies skill- and knowledge-based views of human nature, which is grounded in learning and the cognitive autonomy of the individual". This is an extremely important viewpoint, because it sheds light not only to knowledge, but to the autonomous creation of it.

Educated managers

For sure, educating managers and employees deepens and widens the range of innovation, improves the cognitive collaboration between the working staff and facilitates the goals set by an organization. In this respect, knowledge is significant. The "knowledge society *must* have at its core the concept of the Educated Person. It will have to be a universal concept, precisely because the knowledge society is a society of knowledge's, and because it is global – in its money, its economics, its careers, its technology, its central issues, and, above all, in its information. Post-capitalist society requires a unifying force. It requires a leadership group which can focus local, particular, separate traditions onto a common and shared commitment to values, onto a common concept of excellence, and onto mutual respect" [7,8]. The above unifying force committed to common values, concept of excellence and mutual respect should be recognized in the openness of human wholeness, which encompasses such qualities.

And this happens, because openness is the primary unifying force of human nature. In addition, the "Educated Person [that] needs to be able to bring his or her knowledge to bear on the present, if not to mould the future" is exactly this open to self-creating holistic human being, whose non-stop creation sets aside the – usually attributed and connected to humanities disciplines-antiquarianism and induces a new world comprised of new selves, ideas, proposals, and constantly modern and insightful people as well.

Certainly, while managing the holistic and open philosophical anthropology we'll have to stress the more general autonomy of the creation of the self, and not exclusively the cognitive autonomy. This

embodies the latter to the overall autonomous stance of humans within our cultivation and formation of the self. And such a procedure has nothing to do with heteronomy, specifically with a predefined and predetermining power or process which overrules human amelioration.

Win-win situation

Philosophy is exactly that thought path, the autonomous and personalized freedom to think about the new, to redefine ourselves and the world, as well as practice all these to the benefit of all. Nobody can live by himself. If he could, he should be either a beast or a god [8]. Ergo, philosophy cannot be but a win-win situation for all humans, who in fact cannot live by themselves. There isn't "a given divine or automatic law [a predefined power] governing the cosmos, namely heteronomy does not exist, that's why Philosophy can be created, that is human thought, which attempts to put the initial cosmic chaos in order" [9].

Besides, the ancient notion of "humanitas" (the origin of humanity) "was not just learning but *wisdom*. Aristippus anticipated humanitas when he said, 'I had rather be a beggar than a dunce; the beggar has no money, but the dunce has no humanity [*anthropismos*]'. And Thales, the first philosopher, expressed a similar sentiment when he said, 'I'm glad I am a man and not a beast.' (I would elsewhere protest on behalf of the beasts)" [10].

The management of philosophical anthropology is a win-win situation, too. Not only due to its DNA, obviously derived from the philosophy's womb with its victorious two-partite direction: managers and personnel. But, additionally it is people's presence that makes a manager effective and efficient. He/she needs the others and the others need him/her. He/she cannot accomplish anything, independently of how big it is, without the collaboration with people-employees. A "philosophical anthropology of the 'capable person,' one that acknowledges the vulnerabilities and capabilities that humans display in their activities" [11] provides us with the cornerstone of effective and efficient management.

Anthropocentricity and managerial functions

Such anthropocentricity paves the way for open and holistic conceptions, scientifically weighty and including momentous decision-making. Hence, "the process of scientific explanation begins with the observation of partial regularities (the domain of the empirical), the separation of the causal components (the domain of the actual), the inference of the underlying mechanism(s) (the domain of the real) that can account for these regularities and, finally, the validation of the mechanism(s) empirically and the elimination of rival explanations" [12]. All these anthropocentricity domains – the empirical, the actual and the real – form substantial fields of the entire human understanding and shaping of the self.

The four managerial functions – planning, organizing, leading, and controlling – occur assuredly within human beings. And people are people before they are professionals. Everyone is open to multiple changes through his lifetime. So are managers and employees. Their necessary interaction equates with a two-partite, holistic and open, interaction of humans.

In that regard, a manager could get more from his employees when realizing his and his staff's openness to new self-formations, which are definitely built upon a stable but potentially changing ground of personal characteristics. Could psychological tests of personality suffice so that a manager is able to attain effective human management? They

would not. Surely, they are important and provide with significant info. Nonetheless, they cannot unravel the continuous change in people.

Apparently, every-day or very often interactions would prove to be more sufficient, specifically so far as the accomplishment of best employees' performance is concerned. Such an attitude is connected to the "major breakthrough occurred with a series of experiments at a Chicago electric company, which came to be known as the *Hawthorne Studies* [...] The interpretation that employees' output increased when managers treated them positively started a revolution in worker treatment for improving organizational productivity. Despite flawed methodology or inaccurate conclusions [of the *Hawthorne Studies*], the findings provided the impetus for the human relations movement" [13]. In this respect, managing philosophical anthropology demonstrates a deeper focus on the factor "human beings", who can be managers and employees, and their changing formation of the self and accordingly of their two-partite relations.

Regarding big organizations, small departments would be extremely helpful, where many managers interact and discuss with their workers, while simultaneously try to learn and invent new forms of the self in their staff. In short periods of time, especially when important matters occur, they exchange their personalized outcome with a general manager, in order to reach the highest working performance. Most importantly, we must put emphasis on the fact that this personalization introduces the Kantian ethical thesis on looking people as ends in themselves and not simply as means to an end. *Humanity, thus, is an end in itself*. This is the second formulation of Kant's Categorical Imperative: "Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of another, always at the same time as an end and never simply as a means" [14]. The first of the many formulations refers to universalizability: "Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law" [15].

Cultural implications

In its universal, holistic and open, understanding of people, philosophical anthropology and its management refer to human essence without facing obstacles from cultural peculiarities. By considering them, on the one hand, managers include cultural peculiarities in the scope of the anthropological openness and, on the other, are ready to collaborate with the personnel more effectively, as people change within different cultural identities.

A study which found that "the prevalent American attitude that treats employees as a resource to be used (an instrumental attitude toward people) can impede business success in countries where people are valued as an end in themselves rather than as a means to an end (a humanistic attitude)" stands only for a partial understanding of humans. Management's cultural characteristics (religion, attitude towards life, work, achievements etc.) illuminate nothing but philosophical anthropology, especially the *open* conception of humanity's essence. Bearing this in mind and the ceaseless evolution of himself/herself, a manager can be successful and humanistic as well.

Humanistic understanding and change

By avoiding impersonal working environment and, moreover, when excitement in work takes place, effectiveness can be better obtained. In order to "enable individuals to exhibit traits of maturity the organization has to assume a humanistic/democratic value system. In this type of environment individuals will develop trusting relationships and they will be motivated to put in the effort to enhance

organizational effectiveness. The organization will become an exciting place to work in" [16].

When managers and employees invest in their continuous understanding and change, when specifically the former, while creating incessantly themselves, centre on the entire changing personalities (in values, general stance towards life, towards labour, etc.) of the latter and they both collaborate democratically, that is openly, an organization can reach higher standards. In parallel to this openness, it must be stressed that democracy is itself a perpetual open question, a goal to be achieved. Serving such a goal, new legislation appears and always will, derived from the majority's will.

A conscious realization of the holistic and open interactions between all parts helps managers schedule and achieve an organization's goals to the benefit of all. We must not forget that wholeness together with openness does not only bring the human essence into the philosophical fore as its undeniable starting and fundamental point. It is further interwoven with the philosophical end of living together and offer to one-another as an absolute antidote to human isolation. Even an egocentric needs the other to demonstrate his egocentrism. But isolation is not what philosophy is all about. On that account, an extremely important helping hand, one "step in the change toward a humanistic business curriculum is to hire those trained in humanities disciplines" [17,18].

Practical insights

Never before our planet had more than seven billion people, effectively living in a borderless world where any shrewd and capable individual could achieve within a few years the social status and recognition of Pharaohs or Emperors or Kings.

In fact, today, any individual can become part of this landscape, part of a new systemic reality, engaging not only stockholders, persons of family wealth or fame, or people historically destined to command power, but all types of stakeholders! Observe that "reach your full potential" has become the recruiting motto of even government agencies promoting a global peaceful reality and allowing talents to move where new opportunities emerge, where inner happiness of the self creates quality means for the masses and forces promising identities to emerge.

This part of practical matters centres its attention on three specific objectives: (a) Global business educational trends, (b) the corporate governance model, and (c) restatement of the relationship between management and philosophy.

(a) Global business educational trends

Elements of business existed always. The "silk road", the construction of Pyramids or the Napoleonic wars, contained elements of contemporary business doings. However, only after World War II we can observe a defining inclusion of these elements within a business educational framework that was also sensitive to tactical versus strategic objectives, perspectives and needs, requirements arising from organizational demands and their evolution, respect to the individual's *modus vivendi*, such as local and industry-wide practices, legal systems differences, talents and capacities, sex-age-handicap differences, and course functional specificities (eg., accounting versus marketing).

The above are textbook copy-paste ideas of more than thirty years ago. Think of additional cutting-edge concepts that define today's management education realities and additional trends. They include education innovation, ethical undertakings and teaching of ethics,

distance learning, identify, use, train and constantly evaluate suitable teaching members, customer-focus and service personalization, self-actualization and creativity perspectives, rapid adaptation to changes, offering not only theoretical background but also building usable skills, stressing entrepreneurship and talent hunting, promoting team building and active learning.

Moreover, and in accordance to the local cultural realities and pressures, all the stakeholders should assume educational responsibilities that will combine cutting-edge managerial knowledge with the individual philosophical understanding of the self, of self-actualization potential, inner happiness and social betterment. Welcome to a new era managerial responsibility, rapid adaptation to change, creativity and constant innovation.

(b) The corporate governance model

In 1974 at *Fortune (Magazine)* Max Ways had an article “Business Faces Growing Pressures to Behave Better!” Forty years ago, at the then developed world, business was taking over the roles of government. Today, only 65 million people, less than 1% of the planet’s human population, are managing the 500 “best” corporations with annual revenues equal to about the 41% of the world’s GNP. As an example, study the government environment and the business one. Which creates more opportunities for social and individual betterment?

But how business is now taking over the roles of government? Through a concept that most authors and practitioners describe as the corporate governance document, let me present it as the “corporate constitution,” on which a company outlines all process, rules and regulations that are to be followed.

Development of this document must have a practical orientation (theory alone is of no use) and requires sufficient preparation time in accordance to a viable business plan with appropriate time limits. It demands in depth understanding of the corporation, substantial previous experience on similar matters, sound analysis of parallel cases, in-depth investigation of the company’s stakeholders demands and expectations, perceptions of environmental situations and differentiations.

What is missing from the above description?

(c) The relationship between management and philosophy

The main concept of this article! In the today’s realities more and more people-in-charge, in-power and of social status, avoid the superfluous living domains and the unnecessary demands of luxury. Of course, they do have the ability and the means to redefine again their well-being. We see similar perspectives to the well-educated and ordinary employees satisfied with their present life styles. What is happening? The Kings, the Pharaohs and the super-rich are not any more the “models” to imitate?

Many business leaders of the world and many “to be” managers, have already spent a significant amount of their time studying religions and philosophy over and above traditional management theory and appropriate skill development. They have read not only Aristotle and Plato, but also Confucius and Himalayan Buddhism.

And in the process they understood that happiness has little to do with richness and more with social betterment, and smiles and creativity and self-actualization. It is not a coincidence that dozens great MBAs include Management and Philosophy together.

Yes, dear reader ... we are planning a better world where motivation

is based not only in material means (of course, this is a given!) but in in-depth understanding of the self and his evolution and needs (Thanopoulos, 2016).

Concluding Remarks

Only continuous and personalized conduct with the working personnel can lead managers to success. This is a safe way-out for either preventing problems or achieving the best working performance and, thus, for managers to attain organizations’ goals effectively and efficiently. If the first step to success is self-knowledge, and specifically self-diagnosis, namely a human’s advantages and disadvantages and accordingly the amelioration of the self and of the self’s performance, recent philosophical anthropology with its open and holistic identity appears in its entirety. The epicentre of open man gives rise to the essential understanding of self-knowledge as a wide horizon of incessant change.

Consciously or not (most importantly consciously), we are the creators of our creation. The constant shaping of ourselves as all-embracing human entities (rational, emotional, bodily-materialistic, aesthetical, ethical collaborating parts of our wholeness) happens by nature first and by choice afterwards. In that regard, people are people, meaning that they are open and holistic self-creations, before becoming managers.

Congenitally deepened in the open ontology, which encompasses the unstoppable definition of the being called “self” either as potentiality or as actuality, managers and working staff change themselves. New ideas and concepts, new attitudes and proposals always emerge into managerial life, merely to prove practically the recent philosophical anthropology’s fundamentals of openness and non-stop holistic self-creation in mundane affairs.

How can we manage people without the aforementioned elucidations? The “art of getting things done through people” stands for a management’s definition better conceived in the light of recent philosophical anthropology. Ergo, taking for granted the inevitable for managers and employees deprivation of themselves of being non-stop creators of their creation, their two-partite win-win situation comes into view. The former and the latter need one-another in order to succeed and gain materially, ethically, scientifically etc. In such anthropocentricity, psychological texts of personality would be of important help but cannot suffice, apparently because of their description lack of the every-day or very often two-partite interactions, in which unstoppable change underlies. In big organizations, their departmental division will help their several managers interact better with the employees and exchange their personalized outcome with a general manager, so as to reach the highest performance in the organization and accomplish its plans.

Finally, in its entirety and in our universal world, the philosophical anthropology of open and holistic humans grants managers with a deep understanding of management’s different cultural characteristics (religion, attitude towards life, work, achievements etc.), which affect it. These are nothing but open and continuous conceptions and creations of humanity’s essence within different cultures. And this must be considered by managers as a natural law in constant progress till the last day in work and in life from all sides. It will assist them in conceiving their worker’s essence and collaborate with them more profoundly, essentially, effectively and efficiently.

References

1. Donaldson, Thomas J (1994) The Ethics of International Business. In

- Donaldson, Thomas J, Freeman, Edward R Business as a Humanity. Oxford University Press.
2. Fournaros S (2014) The Philosophical Anthropology of the "Open Man" in Castoriadis's elucidation. In: Pantazis Vassilis E, Stork Michael (eds.) Ommasin allois. Festschrift für Professor Ioannis E. Theodoropoulos zum 65. Geburtstag. Oldib.
3. Castoriadis C (2010) Ungoverned Society. Eurasia.
4. Castoriadis C (2001) Anthropology, Politics, Philosophy. Ypsilon.
5. Daft, Richard L (2008) Management, (9th edn), Thomson, South-Western.
6. Wagner T, Sigmund (2013) Economic Humanism and Western Management: Theory and Practice. In: Shiban K, Wolfgang A (eds.) World Humanism. Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Ethical Practices in Organizations. Palgrave MacMillan, UK.
7. Drucker, Peter (2004) Post-Capitalist Society. Routledge.
8. Aristotle (1253) Politics (Part II).
9. Alatzoglou T, Kiki (2011) Castoriadis and the Hellenic Peculiarity. In: Oikonomou YN (ed.) Studies on Cornelius Castoriadis. The Genesis of Democracy and the Contemporary Crisis. Eurasia.
10. Solomon, Robert C (1994) Business and the Humanities: An Aristotelian approach to Business Ethics. In Donaldson, Thomas J, Freeman, Edward R. Business as a Humanity. Oxford University Press, UK.
11. Barrett, Frank J, Powley EH, Barnett P (2011) Hermeneutic Philosophy and Organizational Theory. In: Tsoukas H, Chia R (eds.) Research on the Sociology of Organizations, 32: Philosophy and Organization Theory.
12. Bechara J, Van de Ven, Andrew H (2011) Triangulating Philosophies of Science to understand Complex Organizational and Managerial Problems. In: Tsoukas H, Chia R (eds.) Research on the Sociology of Organizations 32: Philosophy and Organization Theory.
13. Daft RL, Marcic D (2006) Understanding Management (5th edn) Thomson, South-Western.
14. Kant I (1785) Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. In: Driver J (ed.) (2007) Ethics: The Fundamentals. Blackwell.
15. Kant, Immanuel (1785) Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, In Rachels, James (1999), The Elements of Moral Philosophy, (3rd edn), McGraw-Hill, UK.
16. Kermally S (2004) Gurus on People Management. Thorogood Publishing, UK.
17. De George, Richard T (1994) Business as Humanity: A contradiction in Terms? In Donaldson, Thomas J, Freeman, Edward R, Business as a Humanity. Oxford University Press, UK.
18. Thanopoulos J (2016) Key Note Speech on "The Era of Corporate Governance: Management and Philosophy", at 12th Annual Conference of Hellenic Society for Systemic Studies on Professional Systemics and Stakeholder Engagement, Athens, Greece.