

LEADERSHIP, THE CHANCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS LONGEVITY BY MEANS OF MANAGEMENT

Daniela BELU

“Henri Coanda” Air Force Academy

Abstract: *The changes that take place in high-tech era are connected to the fact that people tend to develop objective relationships with their fellows eventually assimilating them to an object. On the whole, relationships between individuals tend to decline impoverishing the human condition. These parameters being given we assist to the transformation of ethios into a business, managers truly blessed in leadership becoming more likely theoretical notions than humans in the flesh, although their existence is vital in the future organization.*

Key words: *homo cyberneticus, cyber-age.*

Business ethics has become, itself, important business. Teaching people how to be ethical or, in some cases, look ethical is a developing industry. What does this mean? Why should we be taught basic values?

The answer appears to be the fact that fibs, partial truths and elusion have all become so customary that we accept them as common practice. Remember when was the last time you were in the position of pleading in circumstances apparently unforgivable from a moral point of view using the sentence: “But this behavior has become common practice”!? In such situations it would be advisable to stop and, after taking a step back, try to acknowledge what you really feel and apologize for the slip, but, even so, admit your concern for the way your own consciousness has evolved. I have always been a person with a strong moral code. It sometimes is a bit of a hindrance, but I comply with it. However, it appears that in my daily life, at work, I am more inclined to make compromises. It is as if in business we wouldn’t have to deal with real people.

Things appear to be similar in the policy of certain organizations. People get involved in some activities that they would find unacceptable in their private life, but they seem to use the following excuse that *the end justifies the means* or that of the *upper right*. In

my opinion this is foolish. The means are part of the end. If what you do obliges you to act in a way that you consider wrong, then what you do is wrong. If you still want to do it, the choice is yours, but do not pretend that the ethical base is solid. My advice, if you will take it, is to always tell the truth. You should communicate to your bosses or employees, as well as your customers more than you feel comfortable to tell them. Any partial truth that you hide is almost certain to emerge some time later. You will then have the reputation of a person who cannot be trusted, which can not be the basis of a good manager, and much less of a leader. Therefore what does your ethic behavior rely on?

Most of our actions seem to be triggered by love or fear. The philosophy behind this idea depends on how much you love yourself. If this is a difficult question to answer then let’s split it. First of all, how much do you love your body? Does it serve you in what you want to do? How drastically would you change it if you could? Second, how much do you love your mind? What aspects of your reasoning would you change if you could? Would you like to have a better memory? Would you like to be more intelligent? Would you like to think and react faster? And finally, how much do other people love you? Do you believe you are charismatic? Every change that

you intend to make about yourself (your body, mind, reactions towards other people, other people's love towards you) is an indicator that you don't love yourself. True love is unconditional.

After finding out how much you love yourself, we will find out how much you love what you do. If you won the lottery and wouldn't have to work anymore, would you abandon working? Would you change your job? What aspects of your life would stay unchanged and what would you change? The final question is how much you love the people whom you are responsible for either at work, as a boss or colleague, or within your own family according to the part you play in it. This is a very dangerous territory, bearing in mind the fact that love also has sexual connotations.

You might love someone without being sexually involved with them. Think of the way you assume the training relationships of the fellow creatures whose evolution you are responsible for and ask yourself how much these relations are based on love. After this sentimental examination – which can be very difficult unless we do it with cleverness and utmost sincerity – we may ask ourselves about the changes that we would like to make about ourselves, about what we do and the relationships we have with the people that we are responsible for at work and at home. Further on the free will makes things get complicated, given the fact that in the future our capacity to understand will pervert diminishing instead of increasing. That is how unnatural and vapid the offers imposed to it are.

Everything contributes to setting the inappropriate food on our table: industrial growth and culture, automated manufacture of products, the conservation of products, their large-scale distribution, modern techniques whether we are talking of the preparation techniques (e.g.: microwave ovens), the presentation techniques (semi-prepared products) or sale techniques (e.g.: fast-foods).

Large scale production has given the death-blow to taste, eliminating the great chef, who set their hearts at making high quality products, stimulated by the competition among

the traders and the customer's exigency. Loosing the little shops and their owners, the streets will gradually loose their liveliness, their joy and taste.

Holding the monopoly of food production, the great companies impose the standardization of merchandize in order to obtain small prices and substantial income. There is a large number of local varieties of vine. A drastic reduction of these is expected to take place. Everything will take place naturally, under the pressure of the demand and offer reasoning in the global sphere.

What should be feared is that the degradation of the modern life stimuli might trigger the very regression of mankind. This would increasingly probable as, in Jean Pierre Changeux's opinion (*"The Neuronal Man"*), the extraordinary progress that led to the emergence of *"Homo sapiens"* stopped. All the studies conducted have shown that the evolution of human brains ceased suddenly about 500,000 years ago; its volume hasn't changed ever since (1500 cube centimeters for *"Homo sapiens sapiens"*; its morphology, its circumvolutions and blood vessels (all of them detectable through endocranial prints) stay unchanged. The reason of this stop is unknown. Whatever the reason, as evolution does not determine a growth of the brain, human beings must settle for what they have, and fortunately they are very rich.

Of the 30 billion neurons that man possesses, he only exploits 10 billion. It is true, as Coppens says, that the biological evolution has always taken place before the technical and cultural evolution. Looking back to our far ancestors, the difference between the capacity of the brain, which we can deduce from the morphology of the brain, and the technology of the tools was considerable. The beveled stones have been found, an invention of *"homo habilis"* (3 million years ago; cranial volume 650 cube centimeters). Such stones have also been found from the times of *"Homo erectus"*, who lived 1.5 million years ago and had a cranial volume of 1000 cube centimeters. Also the ax made by *"Homo erectus"* was also found to have been used by *"Homo sapiens"* (500,000 years ago, cranial volume 1500 cube centimeters).

This differences decreases nowadays, as the increase in the volume of information and the technical discoveries put new neurons to work. The reserve of unused neurons being considerable, if not unlimited, the development of the possibilities of the human brain will continue, despite its morphological stagnation. It is still to find out what man will do with the available cells and what purpose he will use them for. This use will be subjected to the laws of biology and genetics, especially the law of “*selective stabilization*” of Jean Pierre Chaugeux:

“The nervous system has the capacity to select its own useful circuits. Only those circuits will operate which make the proof of their usefulness and efficiency, i.e. those which best fulfill their task: adaptation to the environment. (...) The selective structuring of the encephalon by the surrounding environment is renewed in every generation”.

We immediately notice the danger threatening the sensitivity of the individual, (from the point of view of what people consider beneficial/pleasant) and even of mankind: sensorial stress keeps decreasing and therefore no part of the reserve of neurons will be allocated to the natural sensitivity. All these constitute a relative regression, which adds to the absolute regression through the loss of old neurons allocated to sensitivity, a loss due to the harmfulness of contemporary stimuli. All in all we can expect a significant decrease of our sensitive and hedonic functions.

The question still remains: “To which activities will the last part of the neuronal dowry of the modern man be destined?” Taking into account their preponderance in the industrial civilization, reason and will for power will probably be the beneficiaries. This will result into an imbalance of the human *psychism*, which will determine the extinction of human race as we know it.

“Aren’t we witnessing a major rupture between the man’s brain and the surrounding world? It is a question that we ask ourselves. Could the architectures within which man lives, the working conditions to which man is subjected, the threats with the total destruction (...) be favorable to a well-balanced functioning of his encephalon? We

can doubt. After preempting the surrounding nature isn’t man in course of preempting its own brain” worries Jean Pierre Chaugeux.

So it may be! As civilization alienates from nature, evolution will give rise to the “Cyberman” (phrase borrowed from Eric Fromm).

In our occidental culture the left lobe of the brain tends to dominate the other functions, but without managing to silence them.

The Christian, just like the industrial man, fell certain emotions and could let imagination stray wander. Love, the arts and the religions still existed.

Cyberman detaches himself from his body, his sensations, emotions and pleasures.

The Christian used to renegade his body because it was the source of all sins; the industrial man exploited his body just as the master would do with his slave; “*Homo cyberneticus*” doesn’t feel his body anymore, or refuses to. But he still uses it either as a precious case for his “ego”, either as a mechanical device well worn-in. Apart from that he commits it to trainers who model its muscles in accordance with the requirements of fashion. No, Cyberman does not neglect his body, but treats it as an object.

These creature do not have any emotional life. Reason censors any of their emotions. The lack of contact with nature and their own body deprives them of any sensation. Going out in the middle of nature is only a speed race and a demonstration of power, and not the celebration of the splendor of the mountains or of the boundlessness of the sea.

Cyberman’s creativity is diminished, as creative thinking sprinkles from the emotions of the body and the feeling of nature. The left side of the brain becomes sterile when breaking off from intuition, imagination, fantasies and the overall views of the right side of the brain.

In the *cyber-age* images, shapes and sounds will be novel, brilliant, but no thrilling or exciting. In fact they will not even be meant to excite anyone, but to furnish the visual and sonorous space. Human relations are degrading. A mother cannot understand her child “objectively”. A physician cannot find

the illness troubling his patient only by using his native intelligence.

We cannot establish an “objective” relationship with somebody unless we reduce him/her to the quality of object. Only intuition and sympathy, in their beautiful etymological sense, allow a real and efficient exchange, real communication and communion.

When logic and the will to dominate are stronger, human relations can be nothing but some strength tests. If this is the case, the strongest one is always right. When the only purpose is interest, when the cold calculation and manipulating intelligence command, human relations are only reduced to exploiting the weak.

Incapable of enjoying life, incapable of loving the others, Cyberman has nothing but material goals: to possess, to produce and to contribute to the progress of science. This last purpose would be laudable if its final product weren't a technology that leads to the

domination of man by machines, and to the exploitation and destruction of nature.

Mankind urgently needs the evolution of consciousness, a natural morality, the resolution of anxiety and the respect to nature. We had better hear, before too late, Schweitzer's warning: (“*The Decline and Restoration of Civilization*”).

“Man has become Superman, but the Superman with his superhuman power has not risen to the level of superhuman reason. The more his power grows, the more man grows poorer. (...) Our consciousness must wake to reality and see that, the more we become Supermen, the less we are human”.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Leleu, Gérard, *A Treatise about Pleasure*, Prietenii Cărții Publishing House, Bucharest, 2002.