

The Paradigm of *Social Consensus* for Shaping the Structural Order in Development Management

Paradygmat *konsensus społeczny* dla kształtowania ładu strukturalnego w zarządzaniu rozwojem

Franciszek Piontek, Barbara Piontek

WSB University in Dąbrowa Górnicza, Poland
E-mail: bempiontek@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of the paper is to show the essence of social consensus, its origin and evolution from the norm inscribed in human nature to the paradigm. It describes selected management areas where consensus is applied and assesses effects. An attempt was made to indicate the conditions necessary for the efficient and effective functioning of the consensus.

The following hypothesis is adopted for research: The improvement of effectiveness and efficiency in the application of the paradigm of social consensus in development management by the public authority is determined by its building and verification based on the constituent norms of the *Constitution of the World*.

Conclusions from the discussion are as follows:

- social consensus, shaped as a result of its evolution as a paradigm, is still a measure of human dignity, democracy and freedom;
- its credibility in the functioning of social consensus is ensured by norms, the components of the *Constitution of the World*, both on the side of its entities, intermediaries and recipients;
- the upholder of social consensus is the social layer – the intelligentsia;
- it is the state that is responsible for the conditions of the functioning of social consensus in all dimensions.

Key words: social consensus, development management, structural order, the *Constitution of the World*, efficiency and effectiveness, paradigm

Streszczenie

Celem niniejszego artykułu jest wskazanie istoty konsensusu społecznego, jego genezy i ewolucji: od normy wpisanej w naturę ludzką do paradygmatu. Charakterystyka wybranych dziedzin zarządzania, w których konsensus znajduje zastosowanie i ocena ich skutków. Próba wskazania uwarunkowań niezbędnych dla sprawnego i efektywnego funkcjonowania konsensusu.

Hipoteza przyjęta dla badań: Poprawa efektywności i sprawności w stosowaniu paradygmatu konsensus społeczny w zarządzaniu rozwojem przez władzę publiczną uwarunkowana jest jego budowaniem i weryfikowaniem w oparciu o normy składowe *Konstytucji Świata*.

Wnioski wynikające z rozważań:

- konsensus społeczny – ukształtowany w wyniku jego ewolucji jako paradygmat – jest nadal miernikiem godności człowieka, demokracji i wolności;
- jego wiarygodność w funkcjonowaniu konsensusu społecznego zapewniają normy, składowe *Konstytucji Świata* – tak po stronie jego podmiotów, pośredników i adresatów;
- strażnikiem konsensusu społecznego jest warstwa społeczna – inteligencja;
- za warunki funkcjonowania konsensusu społecznego – we wszystkich wymiarach – wymiarach odpowiada państwo.

Słowa kluczowe: konsensus społeczny, zarządzanie rozwojem, ład strukturalny, *Konstytucja Świata*, efektywność i sprawność, paradygmat

Introduction

Nowadays the paradigm of social consensus performs priority functions in public management, science and many areas of socio-economic life. There are, however, reasons that justify the choice of the subject of the paper:

- no research into the assessment of the effectiveness of using this paradigm in selected areas, which determine the formation of the structural order in development management
 - no scientific research into the causes of negative phenomena and conditions necessary for the effective application of this paradigm;
 - no effectiveness observed in the real sphere, lack of positive effects of using social consensus in management (in formulating priorities and making decisions). An example may be undertakings related to limiting and eliminating socio-economic inequalities.
- Thus, taking up the topic is substantively and logically justified.

The purpose of the paper is:

- to show the essence of the category of social consensus and evolution in its meaning;
- to present the origin of its use in public management;
- to describe the selected management areas where social consensus is applied and to attempt to assess outcomes;
- to attempt to indicate the conditions that are necessary for the effective and efficient use of social consensus in development management by the public authority.

The paper adopts the following research hypothesis: **The improvement of effectiveness and efficiency in the application of the paradigm of social consensus in development management by the public authority is determined by its building and verification based on the constituent norms of the *Constitution of the World*. Public authority should create conditions for the effective and efficient application of social consensus in business management.**

In order to achieve the goal and prove the hypothesis, the following procedure was adopted:

- reflection on the category of *social consensus* and other key categories;
- the origin of the use of social consensus in public management;
- the paradigm of social consensus in key areas of the structural order;
- conditions for the effective and efficient application of social consensus in development management.

The formal object formulated for the purpose of the discussion in the paper is not really covered comprehensively in the literature.

1. Reflection on the category of *social consensus* and other key categories

The starting point for the discussion is reflection on the following key categories: social consensus, development management, structural order, the *Constitution of the World*, efficiency and effectiveness. It is justified by the principle of deregulation in globalization processes (the paradigm of volatility in addition to liberalization and privatization), which also applies to concepts.

A word *consensus* derives from the Latin word *consensus* and means consent, permission. Its etymological meaning is: Latin *con, cum* – a prefix indicating teamwork, cooperation and *sensus* – an idea, way of thinking; *sensus, consensus* – common sense (Jugan, 1958; Dictionary of Foreign Words, 1958). Thus, the category of social consensus can be defined as the unanimous thinking or action of a specific community. By definition, consensus is conscious thinking and action. In the history of civilization, however, this category was subject to a specific evolution from natural law towards paradigms (cf. point 2). It should be noted that in order for the thinking or action of a particular community to be unanimous, there must be compliance of the criteria that community members will use and determinants. And evolution may apply to these criteria and methods of their application.

The category of development management is complex. It consists of two concepts that require explanation in synthetic terms. The category of development is the overriding category because it defines what management should be like to ensure development.

An analysis of the category of development was presented in earlier works, also in graphical terms (Piontek, Piontek, 2014, 2017). Here, we limit ourselves to pointing to essential attributes that are the components of the category of development:

- the subject and recipient of development is a functional being – man – his existence and action;
- the components of the category of development are also norms, the constituents of the *Constitution of the World* and broadly defined paradigms (knowledge, skills, technologies, institutional solutions, and management);
- the norms of the *Constitution of the World* protect existence (of man in the development process) and control action;
- management procedures (paradigms) in development management should be verified by the norms of the *Constitution of the World*. This requirement determines the superiority of the category of development category compared to the category of management;
- the category of development differs from other synonymous categories (economic growth,

prosperity, socio-economic development, progress, technological progress, and innovation) as its constituents are the norms of the Constitutions of the World and this is a normative category (Piontek, Piontek, 2016; Borys, 2011).

The category of management includes reflection from the perspective of the category of development and criteria for the assessment of the tools (skills) used. The question is whether social consensus is a sufficient criterion (norm) for the efficient and effective focus of management procedures (tools) to ensure well-defined development? It cannot be denied that in management the choice of procedures, paradigms and institutional solutions can be made on the basis of social consensus. Hence the second question: how to ensure that social consensus, if applied, correctly focuses management on development, understood according to the abovementioned definition?

The multifaceted nature of management is as follows:

- management in the wide sense (*sensu largo*) as management, administration and public management - includes: planning, organizing, motivating and controlling;
- management in the strict sense (*sensu stricto*) as the implementation of decisions (appropriate management).
- as a set of procedures:
 - it may be a component of institutional solutions,
 - it may be regarded as technology (Ritzer, 2008).

Management as a set of procedures, may ensure not only the implementation of a decision, but can also be used to standardize human thought and action and to direct (stimulate) existential choices. This is particularly risky, because when man (Piontek, Piontek, 2016) confronts the standardization of technology, the former loses in terms of performance, speed and in the scope of analyses.

With regard to the classification of the category of management presented, the following questions arise: To what extent are the components of this classification open to social consensus? What criteria should consensus meet to be consistent with its definition? What conditions should management meet? It is worth encouraging the Reader to reflect on management understood technologically. We quote only M. Blaug's assessment of economics (which is a field, and management is its discipline): *the importance of technological progress in the real world is inversely proportional to the importance of these issues in economics today (...) economists cannot cope with this issue* (Blaug, 1996). There is a justified fear that as regards the discipline of management, the phenomenon shown by the author and reservations may be exponential. As regards the use of social consensus, this assessment cannot be omitted. Technologies (understood by Ritzer as the proce-

dures of conduct, including institutional norms) may create, and do create possibilities for consensus management.

The topic of the article includes the category of *the structural order*. It should be broadly defined in development management as shaping harmony in the system (The Dictionary of the Polish Language, 1984). This system is an open set. It can be analyzed statically and dynamically. A dynamic approach to it is important in shaping development.

The dynamic approach includes the principle of balance and the principle of shaping proportions. The principle of balance is understood dynamically and its violation is not excluded, which is important for development. However, the violation of balance is possible to the extent that its restoration is possible and real in terms of time and costs. The structural order includes shaping the relationship between:

- existence and action,
- economic, human and natural capitals, with the superiority of human capital,
- balance and the speed of action;
- the ratio between the growth rates of specific economic figures,
- between economic and social efficiency,
- building relationships between entities in the internal and external functional area.

In the *Constitution of the Republic of Poland*, the structural order is ensured by the principle of sustainable development (Article 5 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland) and it is a constitutional principle.

The question is whether the integration of distinguished entities is ensured in shaping the structural order and development management at the present stage when they refer to social consensus. And the second question is how they understand this consensus and order.

The component of the category of development is the *Constitution of the World*. If the principle of diversity underlies the functioning of the world, a functional being, i.e. man needs recommendations resulting from the norms of the *Constitution of the World* to shape the structural order and make development happen (Piontek, Piontek, 2016). The *Constitution of the World* is a set of basic norms that define the principles of the human functioning in the achievement of development, that is, existence and action. We distinguish three subsets in the set of the norms of the *Constitution of the World*:

- axioms, that is, fundamental (obvious) statements, whose truth does not have to and cannot be proven (they are unprovable). They shape thinking;
- natural law – directs action;
- superior values are weights assigned to selection variables.

Presenting the issue of the functioning of the *Constitution of the World* synthetically, one can say that the norms of the *Constitution of the World* in the process

of development protect existence and control action. The subsets of the norms of the *Constitution of the World* distinguished are discussed in the works cited (Piontek, Piontek, 2017).

The relationship between the category of social consensus and the *Constitution of the World* should be reflected on in the further discussion (cf. sections 2, 3 and 4).

The categories of efficiency and effectiveness are also important in development management. The essence of efficiency is the ratio of the output to input (a necessary condition) and the reference of this ratio to the criterion (a sufficient condition). The so-defined efficiency is economic efficiency. Two types of efficiency should be taken into account in development management: social efficiency and economic efficiency. In social efficiency, the output is a priority. Thus, the necessary condition is a sufficient condition and an additional criterion is unnecessary in the case of social efficiency. In this case, social efficiency can be equated with effectiveness.

Both types of efficiency apply to development management, but social efficiency is superior.

Social consensus as a paradigm, unverified by the norms of the *Constitution of the World*, may allow deregulation in the use of the category of efficiency in management. Economic efficiency is also identified with effectiveness and efficacy. Then the possibilities of using management understood technologically increase.

2. The origin and evolution of the category of social consensus

Social consensus is a category mentioned in the history of civilization. There are few studies available directly referring to this category. This does not mean that social consensus has not been used in management in real terms. It has been differently formulated and understood in the substantive sense. This category is subject to evolution.

In the PWN Lexicon, social consensus is formulated as *vox populi* (Latin) (PWN Lexicon, 1972). For example, in the *Constitution of the Republic of Poland* – as a nationwide referendum (Article 125 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland) and a referendum of a self-government community (Article 170 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland). The concept of social consensus from the eighth century is also known. It is attributed to Alcuin (730-806) (Świeżawski, 2000) or (735-804) (PWN Lexicon, 1972), an Anglo-Saxon monk, theologian and philosopher, advisor to Charlemagne the Great. He used the concept in a letter to Charlemagne the Great in the following wording: *vox populi – vox Dei* (voice of the people – the voice of God).

Based on the scientific achievements of Alcuin, synthetically presented by S. Świeżawski and W. Tatariewicz (Świeżawski, 2000, Tatariewicz 1958), we can say with a high degree of certainty that *social*

consensus formulated and understood in this way was, by definition, based on the constituent norms of the *Constitution of the World* and equating the voice of the people with the voice of God gave it an absolute dimension. Of course, it should be borne in mind that this voice of the people could be subject to various manipulations and be shaped accordingly in the conditions of media at that time. However, consensus in real terms, contrary to these norms, was not de facto such a consensus.

At various stages of the construction of civilization, views appeared that aimed at undermining the norms of the *Constitution of the World*. A documented example of this phenomenon is the decree of Antiochus IV of Epiphanes (1 Macc 1: 41-50), where the following commands are addressed to the whole country, to which other nations were already included, among them Israel:

- everyone has to be one country,
- everyone has to abandon their customs.

The decree includes written, detailed executive orders and sanctions for non-compliance. In terms of the subject taken up, a question should be asked: To what extent has deregulation in the norms, the components of the *Constitution of the World*, translated into change in the nature of social consensus?

Solutions that lead to the deregulation of social consensus in three subsets of the norms of the *Constitution of the World* should be presented synthetically

- **with reference to the norms of natural law;** H. Grotius (1583-1645) made a key distinction between *the law of nature* and *natural law*. Attention should be paid to the consequences of this distinction. According to Grotius, the basis of the law of nature is the social impulse (sociability, and according to Aristotle, man is a political animal by nature – *anthropos physei politikon zoon* (Kunzmann, P., Burkard, F. P. and Wiedmann, F., 1999). According to Grotius, the content of the law of nature can be determined on the basis of principles that result from the nature of man and in relation to the study of what is consistent in civilization views (e.g. man as the highest value in the world of nature, the right to equality, freedom, and work) (Kunzmann, P., Burkard, F.P. and Wiedmann, F., 1999).

On the other hand, natural law, according to his definition, is commands and prohibitions read and formulated by reason, by nature of man.

Meanwhile, Grotius limited *natural law* to reading orders and prohibitions *concerning the moral turpitude or moral necessity inherent in every act* (Kunzmann, P., Burkard, F.P. and Wiedmann, F., 1999, Tatariewicz, 1958).

Such a separation of natural law from the law of nature resulted in the fact that the law of nature became a platform for consensus for different world views (social consensus) in real terms. This means that in the area of public

management, the principle of contract replaced the principles (norms) of doing good and avoiding evil, inherent in the nature of every human being, and correlated with the decision-making process in the economic, social and environmental dimensions.

A conclusion is **that the nature of social consensus has been violated and consequently changed.**

The correctness of our assessment is confirmed by Cicero: *its (natural law's) commandments oblige one to fulfill obligations, and its prohibitions refrain from mistakes (...). Replacing (natural law) by opposite law is an offense* (Piontek, Piontek, 2016). Cicero's statement allows for formulating the thesis that in the Roman culture, *vox populi* consensus was affirmed in constituent norms of the *Constitution of the World*. The inconsistency of the real sphere with this statement does not undermine the truth of this assessment.

At the further stages of the construction of civilization, the deregulation of the category of social consensus was deeper in the area of other subsets of norms, the components of the *Constitution of the World*.

- **with reference to axioms responsible for the truth and certainty of social consensus (epistemological values);**

Development management, by its very nature, has a prospective horizon and has a strategic dimension. If social consensus is used in such management, it must have epistemological attributes, ensure ex ante truth and a high degree of certainty of formulated priorities. Social consensus can be deregulated through:

- negating a subset of axioms and replacing them with paradigms (Piontek, Piontek, 2017). In particular, this applies to the axiom that underlies the principle of contradiction and replacing it with a paradigm:

YES = NO = MAYBE

This also means that the rules of truth and certainty have been replaced by *the paradigm of volatility*;

- applying the rule: generate opportunities – do not solve problems (Kelly, 1998); A practical and literary presentation of this practice of an influence on social consensus is illustrated by W. St. Reymont in the book entitled *Rebellion: Fine words butter no parsnips (...)* *happiness lies in hope. And what have they lived in so far? And yet they say: hope is the mother of fools, and I would yell to all the world that hope is the mother of all (...). You're advised well, but what will happen when we get to the top? Then they will forget what they have heard, and they will be lured with these promises and will allow themselves to be guided.*

They must be deceived for their happiness (Reymont, 2004).

- **with reference to a subset of superior values that are important for the selection variables;**

They are important for shaping social consensus and development management. F. Fukuyama points out that they are shaped by nature and religion (Fukuyama, 1992). These values can be deregulated in two ways:

- by denying them,
- by undermining their foundations and creating institutional planes.

The deregulation of the subsets of the constituent norms of the *Constitution of the World*, presented in synthetic terms, results in profound changes in social consensus. Consensus changes its nature and becomes a paradigm. There may be different consequences of this change:

- in the real dimension, public management may not recognize the need to follow social consensus in shaping development;
- it is possible to shape social consensus according to particular needs;
- marketing interactions create a broad range of possibilities for shaping social consensus, and technologies can support it (Sadowski, 2003).

The correctly understood social consensus, based on norms, the components of the *Constitution of the World*, is open to globality and universality. The basis for such an opening is the dignity of man, accepted by all parties. The deregulation of social consensus can, however, make the globalization process erroneously identified with globality. As a result of this error, in public management, integration can be understood as superior to your own country. Meanwhile, in correctly understood globality, for example federation integration and the state should not be excluded. This statement can be illustrated by two constitutional provisions:

- 1) *The Republic of Poland may, on the basis of an international agreement, delegate the competence of state authority bodies to an international organization or international body in certain matters (Article 90 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland),*
- 2) *the purpose of the Constitution is to protect human dignity and freedom so as to confirm the value of the State of Israel as a Jewish and democratic state in the Constitution (Constitution of Israel, Article 1 A).*

The quoted constitutional provisions allow for asking the following questions: Has social consensus, which is their platform, been diversified? What reasons have determined this differentiation? Which of the quoted provisions ensure the structural order in public management and development management to a greater extent?

3. The paradigm of social consensus in key areas of development management

The effects of the evolution of social consensus can be illustrated by examples from reality. In this paper, it is necessary to limit oneself to three key areas where the paradigm of social consensus applies. They are important for shaping the structural order in development management:

- a field of science,
- the sphere of limiting and eliminating socio-economic inequalities,
- the plane for developing superior values.

It can be said with some simplicity that the selection of highlighted areas remains in a specific relation to three subsets of constituent norms of the *Constitution of the World*.

A hypothesis should be formulated that in the field of science, it is a research team that formulates and expresses social consensus. The scientific achievements of T. S. Kuhn (1922-1996) support the adoption of this hypothesis. It was T.S. Kuhn who promoted the view that *paradigms* are conceptual and methodological systems of a given team of researchers, defining the framework of accepted methods and deciding about recognizing something as a problem, and indicating ways of solving it (Kuhn, 1962; Kunzmann, Burkard, Wiedmann, 1999; Philosophy Atlas, 1999).

In this context, paradigms, which are not subject to falsification, can be used to change the nature of science (Toffler, Toffler, 1994) and to replace the objective truth with consensual truth (Kolodko, 2008), and this can deny the required intellectual honesty. If the consensus of the research team is not based on and verified by the constituent norms of the Constitution of the World, the reservations presented are justified.

However, it should be noted that S.T. Kuhn saw the difference between unambiguously defined rules and paradigms: *identifying common paradigms is not the same as defining common rules. The latter requires further efforts and a slightly different kind of (...) search for rules is both difficult and less satisfying than searching for paradigms. (...) On the other hand, if one wants to express the coherence of a research tradition in terms of rules, it is necessary to present a common basis underlying research in a given field. As a result, the search for a set of rules constituting a given tradition of normal research is*

a source of constant and deep disappointments (Kuhn, 1962).

Reflection on the presented problem leads to the following conclusions:

- T. S. Kuhn notices that in his model based on consensus, rules are replaced by paradigms. It can be said that paradigms fulfill the functions of rules. Based on research, it should be stated that the so-called hard rules, lack of which is indicated by T. S. Kuhn, are norms, the components of the Constitution of the World. The stages of their negation are highlighted above and in the cited literature.
- Social consensus understood as *vox populi* was formulated on the basis of the norms of the Constitution of the World. In certain cases, it could be a recommendation for science. On the other hand, scholars could read, formulate and articulate it. Paradigms formulated and articulated by research teams, in isolation from the norms of the *Constitution of the World*, also in a wide range, can be a recommendation for public opinion, for specific groups and for shaping choices.
- G. Vatimo notes that T. S. Kuhn assumes and explains that science can only act within certain assumptions. There is therefore no real continuity and cumulativeness in science (Vatimo, Paterlini, 2010).
- A following question should be asked based on the discussion: Should *vox collegii* replace *vox populi* in ensuring the structural order in public management and development management? Should research teams not be the guards of social consensus?

Socio-economic inequalities are a fact, they are increasingly deeper and have a global dimension. They are presented in a synthetic way by T. Piketty, who points to the structure of inequality and the relationship between the rate of return on capital 'r' and the rate of economic growth 'g'. Although the attempts to accurately identify these inequalities (Carley, Spapens, 2000) are not satisfactory and are not possible, the inequality $r > g$ is a fact (Piketty, 2014). They are confirmed by global undertakings for development based on sustainability processes to reduce socio-economic inequalities.

While presenting the issue synthetically, the following should be mentioned: global conferences for development, based on sustainability processes, memoranda formulated by authorities participating in meetings with a historical dimension, positions and postulates formulated by institutions responsible for the structural order in the world and for passing norms based on the *Constitution of the World*, the undertakings of non-governmental organizations, government undertakings and efforts of all those whose aim is to shape human consciousness and his existence in accordance with the purpose of human

existence and action, including works devoted to limiting social inequalities in economic growth.

It can be assumed that these undertakings are inspired and integrated to a large extent by social consensus. The question is whether this consensus creates conditions that ensure the implementation of these undertakings in real terms? Answers to this question are given by A. Payne and N. Philips in their book about development (Payne, Philips, 2010). They quote Arndt's stance and reduce the concept of development based on sustainability processes to a *more and more unthinkingly public discourse, often being put up simply as a slogan and everyman's road to utopia* (Payne, Phillips, 2010).

Such an opinion forces us to reflect on social consensus, used to limit and eliminate social inequalities in the global dimension. One can therefore point to four world conferences for sustainable development:

- the first United Nations Conference in Stockholm (5-16 June 1972);
- the second United Nations Conference called the Earth Summit on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro (3-14 June 1992);
- the third United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development – the World Summit in Johannesburg (26 August – 4 September 2002);
- the Conference on Financing for Development: a Global Approach in Monterrey (18-22 March 2002).

It should be emphasized that the final document of the Monterrey Conference was published under the title: *The Monterrey Consensus*. The above-mentioned Conferences had a global dimension, and the international community attached great importance to them.

The objective scope of the discussion in section 3 of the paper can be limited first of all to the Conference in Johannesburg, including specific arrangements in the Monterrey Consensus, as well as Stockholm and Rio Conferences.

The Johannesburg Conference (2002) was held under the slogan *RIO + 10*. It was the largest UN conference in history. It gathered 60,000 participants representing 190 countries, 4,500 non-governmental organizations, anti-globalists and many (Wójtowicz, Pazdan, n.d.). The scenario planned by the organizers anticipated that the leaders of the 110 countries would solemnly agree to respect the agreements reached. The estimated cost of the Conference, i.e. the financial dimension of the undertaking was USD 55 million (Wójtowicz, Pazdan, n.d.).

The basic message of the Conference was: *The Summit must unite the world and to forge global alliances (...) sustainable development is not only a necessity, but also a unique opportunity to create a lasting basis for the functioning of our economies and societies* (from the speech by Kofi A. Annan – UN Secretary General, October 2001).

The Conference in Johannesburg was preceded by an unprecedented UN Conference on Financing for De-

velopment held in Monterrey (Mexico) from 18 to 22 March 2002. It was attended by representatives of 182 countries, including about 50 presidents and prime ministers and 23 international organizations, including OAU, OCED, FAO, WHO, WTO, IMF, World Bank, the Inter-Parliamentary Union and others.

The Monterrey Consensus contains 73 points grouped into the following thematic blocks:

- Confronting the challenges of financing for development: a global response;
- Leading actions:
 - mobilizing domestic financial resources for development,;
 - mobilizing international resources for development: foreign direct investment and other private flows;
 - international trade as an engine for development;
 - increasing international financial and technical cooperation for development;
 - external debt;
 - addressing systemic issues: enhancing the coherence and consistency of the international monetary, financial and trading systems in support of development;
- Staying engaged

A vital category that appears in all four Conferences is the category of development. It appears inseparably from other categories such as sustainable development, the natural environment, poverty, and globalization. The frequency of the appearance of the category of development shows an increasing tendency. In *the Monterrey Consensus*, it is mentioned about 77 times and this proves the qualitative change of the undertakings.

The Johannesburg Declaration and *the Monterrey Consensus* mention the new, complementary attributes of poverty and related risks (*the Johannesburg Declaration* – items 7 and 22, and the word *poor* appears 22 times in *the Monterrey Consensus*). An important attribute of development in these documents, however, is a global partnership and enhancing the efficacy, coherence and consistency of macroeconomic strategies: monetary, financial, trading and investment and technological – to accelerate development and ensure globality (*the Monterrey Consensus* – items 10, 26, 27 and 52).

The Johannesburg Declaration indicates the new recipients of outcomes for development. They include humane, equitable and caring global society, the children of the world, humanity and people, the peoples of the world and of the private sector corporations (*the Johannesburg Declaration* – items 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 21, 10, 37, 15, and 29).

The Monterrey Consensus supplements the list of recipients of the outcomes of development with banks (item 48) and investors (item 21).

Documents from Johannesburg and Monterrey include new entities responsible for development, for

the implementation of tasks, and recommendations for practice

In *the Stockholm Declaration*, the state is a leading entity, which means that territorial integration, is taken into account. This is where development is achieved. It is the place where co-operation between states, social groups and nations develops. It has a right to sovereignty, to shaping environmental policy; it should develop and improve living conditions for all. Cooperation of states is necessary for the preservation of the sovereignty and interests of all states (the Stockholm Declaration – items 7, 11 and 22).

In the opinion of T. Hobbes (1588-1679), a social contract (consensus) (T. Hobbes, 1651, Legowicz, 1976) is the legal basis for the existence of the state and it enabled the identification of substitute entities: countries, institutional entities of various scales (Johannesburg Declaration – point 22, 26, 23, 29). In many cases, these entities have a dual role: as recipients of benefits and as entities responsible.

In *the Monterrey Consensus*, it is institutional arrangements (specific procedures), including *international trade* (item 4), *increased coherence, control and consistency* of the international monetary, financial and trading systems (items 52 and 69) that are responsible for achieving development goals.

At the Millennium Summit, the value of official development aid was set at the level of USD 53.7 billion for 2000. A total of 22 countries, the donors of official assistance (including the EU Commission), established the so-called Development Committee. However, their aid amounted to only 0.22% of the total GDP of these countries. It was not sufficient to reduce the number of the poor in the world by half (in accordance with the postulate of the Millennium Summit).

The World Bank estimated these needs at the level of 0.44% of the GDP of donor countries. In Monterrey, recipient countries requested USD 100 billion a year. And the aid rate proposed by the UN, set in 1970, was 0.7 of the GDP of these countries. It should be added that in 1992-1997 the official development assistance of donor countries dropped from 0.32% to 0.22% of the total GDP of donors.

The aid rate at the level of at least 0.33% of GDP until 2006 was considered in Monterrey as minimal and insufficient.

In addition to official (state) development assistance, unofficial assistance was provided, mainly by charities. It is estimated at tens of billions of USD annually in the United States.

The analysis of *social consensus* as the basis for reducing socio-economic inequalities, based on the Johannesburg Conference and *the Monterrey Consensus*, leads to the following conclusions:

- Formulating priorities and undertakings for reducing socio-economic inequalities and implementing sustainable development is highly positive and cannot be regarded as utopian;

- The method of using social consensus to finance these undertakings can be assessed as slightly effective and highly debatable, both from the point of view of donor and recipient countries;
- There is a discrepancy between priorities and undertakings declared in the area of balancing and eliminating poverty, and the applied (proposed) institutional solutions that in fact spread deeper inequalities in a wide range. *The paradigm of volatility* sanctions such solutions;
- The following question should be reflected on: Does social consensus, understood and used as a paradigm, help to ensure the structural order in order to balance development and reduce (eliminate) poverty in the global dimension?

Social consensus, based on the paradigm of volatility, can be used to change the nature of superior values, constituting the third subset of norms in the *Constitution of the World*. This paradigm makes it possible to build a syncretic structure as a plane including many different elements of human behavior, attitudes, relationships and decisions at various levels of commitment. Their mutual acceptance becomes a source of new values. In this way, values and their sources, highlighted unequivocally by F. Fukuyama, are denied or deregulated (Piontek, Nowak, 2004).

Superior values are weights attributed to the variables of choice, therefore their participation in shaping the structural order cannot be neglected (Piontek, Piontek, 2016) and cannot be understood relativistically: human nature (...) together with religion define (...) our core values (Fukuyama, 1992).

A detailed discussion of this issue goes beyond the scope of this paper.

4. Conditions for the application of social consensus in development management

Reflection on the category of social consensus, and in particular on its essence and evolution leading to a change in its nature, on its implementation into practice in the selected areas of building civilization justifies:

- a conclusion that social consensus is a component of our civilization, and its functions and significance are important;
- a question about conditions that should be met so that the application and use of social consensus could ensure the expected outcomes, *and for its owners as well*.

In a situation when the epistemological rules of truth (yes ≠ no) and certainty do not apply, and the paradigm of volatility applies (YES = NO = MAYBE), it is not possible to give an unambiguous answer. However, this does not absolve us from trying to determine the optimal conditions for its functioning.

Taking into account the fact that in the last centuries of our civilization social consensus changed its nature and became a paradigm, it is necessary to present the assumptions of alternative conditions for the opposite options of understanding social consensus. This approach is synthetic:

- opposing conditions result from the separation of assumptions about the essence (nature) of social consensus. They require additional explanation:
 - Aristotle clearly indicates that social consensus is inscribed in the nature of every human being. This means that consensus is the constituent norm (rule) of the *Constitution of the World*. The problem is that such norms are rules, criteria, obvious, real and certain ex ante assumptions. They are obvious, therefore their truth cannot be proven. They can be either accepted or rejected. Both will and a decision are necessary to accept them.
 - For Grotius, the law of nature became a platform for the formulation of contracts. This means that such contracts, as social consensus, have become only institutional solutions, free from the absolute order to do good and avoid evil. For such social consensus, further institutional solutions may be determinants. What can they and what should they consist of?
 - Recognizing the natural tendency of man to social life, T. Hobbes assumes that man is antisocial by nature. As a result of such assumptions, Hobbes formulated the thesis: thus the state is the only person whose will, on the basis of pacts between many people, should be considered the will of all people (...) for common peace and common defense (Legowicz, 1976). The views formulated by T. Hobbs allow for concluding:
 - social consensus, according to H. Grotius, is exclusively a social contract, and therefore an institutional solution,
 - the state is also only an institutional solution,
 - the goal of the state is only to guarantee common peace and defense rather than achieve development,
 - T. Hobbes pointed to the possibility and necessity of delegating social consensus,
 - pacts between many people on behalf of all people can decide about the transfer of social consensus.

The analysis allows for concluding that two opposing options of social consensus have been developed in philosophy:

- 1) **as a rule**, belonging to the set of the constituent norms of the *Constitution of the World* and inscribed in the nature of man,
- 2) **as a paradigm**, which is a contract (institutional solution) that can be transferred (delegated), assuming that the order to do good and avoid evil is not in force.

In the first case, the constituent norms of the *Constitution of the World* are the plane for creating conditions for the functioning of social consensus.

As regards the second case, the question arises whether – with the assumption that a *paradigm of volatility* described above applies at this stage – it is possible to create any conditions that determine the directions of the functioning of the social consensus. Throughout history, in social and economic areas, many catastrophic consequences of such definition, understanding and application of the category of social consensus can be identified.

By definition, the category of social consensus indicates conscious thinking and action (cf. section 1). A right to express it is inscribed in human nature. The upholder of social consensus is a social layer called the intelligentsia. Their functions were illustrated by M. Wańkiewicz, who compared the nation to the meadow and stated that the disease of a meadow starts with tall grasses, and the disease of the nation with the intelligentsia. The dysfunction of intelligentsia is a significant threat to social consensus.

At this stage, the practice of delegating powers to express social consensus, understood as a paradigm, is a fact and has become a common principle. Concern for the substantive content of social consensus becomes a challenge. It can only be pointed out that a proper criterion in delegating social consensus is credibility, which should be confirmed by the attitude towards the constituent norms of the *Constitution of the World* (Stiglitz, 2005).

The responsible articulation of social consensus, which, by definition, is thinking and conscious action, requires appropriate education in terms of attitude development, decision-making and substantive education. In a synthetic perspective, it can be stated that substantive education should cover two areas: Greek *sofia* (wisdom) and Greek *techne* (skill). It is not sufficient to provide only *techne* to responsibly articulate social consensus, all the more so with the increased robotization and automation of the economy. Thus, two issues arise:

- To what extent do modern education systems emphasize the need for development in the field of *sofia*? This is all the more justified in terms of the need for practical education.
- Are institutions responsible for the quality of education prepared to fulfill their inalienable functions and to what extent? We will diversify this question by the following detailed questions:
 - what goals and criteria determined the elimination of metaphysics, epistemology

and, more recently, logic in the classification of science?

- what goals and reasons justified K. Popper's demarcation line, which disqualified philosophy as unfalsifiable and unscientific?
- does the diversification of science into 'n' domains and 'n' disciplines ensure the inter-translatability of their results? What is the openness of modern science to *sofia*?
- What reasons justify the fact that in some fields of science, disciplines distinguished try to function independently of their field? This is a logical error: *pars contra totum* (the part more important than the whole). Promoting such an approach closes science at *sofia*. It is worth agreeing with A. Toffler, who quotes G. Steiner and states: *when asking more general questions, we risk getting wrong conclusions. Without asking these questions at all, we limit our cognitive abilities* (Toffler, 1980).
- Is the standardization of the discovery processes a factor that hinders *sofia*? Discovering something completely new often involves receiving worse results in already functioning areas covered by standardization processes.

As regards shaping the structural order, attention should be paid to two basic types of management: public management and business management. The material subject of both types of management is their fundamental and regulatory functions. And the dissimilarity of these functions in both types of management is determined by:

- A different source of managerial power. In public management, in democratic systems, it is the result of elections, which enable the delegation of social consensus. In business management, it is established in property law.
- A different type of goods. In public management, there is a category of public goods that everyone should have access to. The feature of public goods is non-competitive consumption rather than benefits for all consumers. In business management, manufactured goods are market products and services covered by a purchase – sale agreement.

For the functioning of social consensus, understood in accordance with the definition (cf. section 1) in the area of public management - business management, the following conditions should be fulfilled:

- the integration of public management and business management is absolutely necessary;
- such integration should be ensured by institutional solutions developed by the state;
- they should be based on the constituent norms of the *Constitution of the World* and on paradigms, verified by these norms, which are a

plane for integration and enable the formation of the structural order;

- the adoption of such solutions allows for ensuring the structural order in development management and a decision-making will is necessary to adopt them.

Conclusion

Synthetically, the conclusions from the discussion in the paper are as follows:

- changing the nature of social consensus is a fact;
- regardless of the current institutional conditions for its functioning, social consensus remains a condition for correctly understood democracy and freedom. It is also non-transferable;
- credibility in the functioning of social consensus can only be ensured by norms, the components of the *Constitution of the World*, both on the side of its entities, intermediaries and recipients;
- the upholder of social consensus is the social layer – the intelligentsia;
- it is the state that is responsible for the conditions of the functioning of social consensus. The free market cannot replace the state in this area.

References

1. BLAUG M., 1996, *Economic Theory in Retrospect*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
2. BORYS T., 2011, Zrównoważony rozwój – jak rozpoznać ład zintegrowany (Sustainable Development – How to Recognize the Integrated Order), in: *Problemy Ekorozwoju/ Problems of Sustainable Development* vol. 6 no 2, p. 75-94.
3. CARLEY N., SPAPENS Ph., 2000, *Dzielenie się światem. Zrównoważony sposób życia i globalnie sprawiedliwy dostęp do zasobów naturalnych XXI wieku* (Sharing the World: Sustainable Living and Global Equity in the 21st Century), Instytut na rzecz Ekorozwoju, Białystok – Warszawa, p. 212.
4. *The Constitution of Israel, The Constitution on Human Dignity and Freedom, Art. 1 A.*
5. *The Constitution of the Republic of Poland.*
6. PIONTEK F., NOWAK A., 2004, *Osobowy aspekt wartości w procesie rozwoju. Studium porównawcze (A Personal Aspect of Values in the Development Process. Comparative Study)*, WSEiA w Bytomiu, Bytom, p. 69, 130-134.
7. FUKUYAMA F., *The End of History and the Last Man*, The Free Press, New York, 1992.
8. KOŁODKO G., 2008, *Wędrujący świat (The Wandering World)*, Prószyński i Sk-a, Warszawa, p. 12-13.
9. HOBBS T., 1651, *Leviathan*.
10. JUGAN A., 1958, *Słownik łacińsko-polski (The Polish-Latin Dictionary)*, 3rd edition, Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, Poznań, p. 146 and 618.

11. KELLY K., 1998, *New Rules for the New Economy: 10 Radical Strategies for a Connected World*, Viking, New York.
12. KUHN T.S., 1962, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
13. KUNZMANN P., BURKARD F.P., WIEDMANN F., 1999, *Atlas filozofii (Atlas of Philosophy)*, Prószyński i S-ka, Warsaw, p. 53.
14. LEGOWICZ J., 1976, *Zarys historii filozofii. Elementy doksografii (Outline of the History of Philosophy. The Elements of Doxography)*, Wiedza Powszechna, Warsaw, p. 292-293.
15. *PWN Lexicon*, 1972, PWN. Warsaw, p. 1247.
16. PAYNE A., PHILIPS N., 2010, *Development*, Wiley, New Jersey.
17. PIKETTY T., 2014, *Capital in the Twenty First Century*, The Balknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, London.
18. PIONTEK B., PIONTEK F., 2017, *Development from Theory to Practice*, Shaker Verlag, Aachen.
19. PIONTEK F., PIONTEK B., 2016, *Teoria rozwoju (The Theory of Development)*, PWE, Warsaw, p. 14-20.
20. PIONTEK F., PIONTEK B., 2014, The contemporary concepts of development in terms of the diversifying criteria, in: *Problemy Ekorozwoju/ Problems of Sustainable Development* vol. 9, no 1, p. 47-62.
21. REYMONT W.S., 2004, Bunt, in: *Biblioteka Frondy*, Warsaw, p. 186-187.
22. RITZER G., 2008, *McDonaldization of the Society*, Pine Forge Press, Los Angeles.
23. SADOWSKI W., 2003, Byt i bajt (Being and Byte), in: *Polityka* no 40.
24. *Słownik języka polskiego (The Dictionary of Polish Language)*, vol. II, 1984, PWN, Warsaw, p. 63.
25. *Słownik wyrazów obcych (The Dictionary of Foreign Words)*, 1958, 4th Edition, PWN, Warsaw, p. 129.
26. STIGLITZ J., 2005, *Economics of the Public Sector*, Norton, New York.
27. ŚWIEŻAWSKI S., 2000, *Dzieje europejskiej filozofii klasycznej (History of European Classical Philosophy)*, PWN, Warsaw, p. 404.
28. TATARKIEWICZ W., 1958, *Historia filozofii (History of Philosophy)*, vol. I, PWN, Warsaw, p. 292.
29. TATARKIEWICZ W., 1958, *Historia filozofii (History of Philosophy)*, vol. II, PWN, Warsaw, p. 39-40.
30. TOFFLER A., TOFFLER H., 1994, *Creating a New Civilization: The Politics of the Third Wave*, Progress & Freedom Foundation, Washington.
31. TOFFLER A., 1980, *The Third Wave*, Bantam Books, New York.
32. VATIMO G., PATERLINI P., 2010, *Not Being God: a Collaborative Autobiography*, Columbia University Press, New York.
33. WÓJTOWICZ A., PAZDAN W., (n/d), *Johannesburg na żywo i co dalej (Johannesburg Live and What's Next)*, Wydawnictwo A. Grzegorek.

