

# The Philosophy of the Business Enterprise by Józef Maria Bocheński

**Wojciech W. Gasparski**

Uniwersytet Leona Koźmińskiego

wgaspars@kozminski.edu.pl

The article aims at discussing the crucial theses of Józef Maria Bocheński's dissertation in which the concept of philosophy of the industrial enterprise was presented in outline. The dissertation is a record of the lecture titled *Zur Philosophie der industriellen Urternehmung*, which was given by

the author on March 18<sup>th</sup>, 1985 in Zürich, at the invitation of Bank Hofmann AG.

**Key words:** Józef M. Bocheński, enterprise, goal, philosophy of industrial enterprise, system

## 1. Introduction

In April 1985, Józef Maria Bocheński, a Polish philosopher<sup>1</sup> – professor of University of Fribourg – gave a lecture in Zürich aimed at local bankers financing Swiss industry. The lecture was titled *Zur*

<sup>1</sup> J. M. Bocheński was a Pole and a patriot, a representative of a Polish school of mathematical logic, or rather a Polish analytical school, who spent almost his entire academic life outside Poland (after World War Two). He was a Swiss citizen. The very field of intellectual activity and achievements of Father Bocheński is very extensive. Apart from original concepts and solutions to various philosophical problems, he made, among others, assessment of contemporary social tendencies at the interface between religion, morality, ideology-worldview-politics, analysis of authority and business enterprise philosophy. He was not only a theorist, but also a well-known political expert, a man of strong personality and faith. His authority is recongnised in many fields (cf. Staniak 2006: 252).

*Philosophie der industriellen Urternehmung* [Bocheński 1987]<sup>2</sup>. In this text, we find a philosophical projection of the essence of the social artifact which is a business enterprise, especially an industrial one, and principles of its functioning. The author criticizes contemporary discussions on business enterprise analysis (i.e. from the turn of the third and fourth quarters of the 20<sup>th</sup> century) in the context of political systems of capitalism and socialism. According to him, these discussions did not take account of the current economic conditions, and moreover were very one-sided. Thus, the lecture was to introduce a new business enterprise analysis: better suited – Bocheński writes – to contemporary circumstances and, at the same time, applying more appropriate conceptual tools.

These conceptual tools are philosophical ones, logical in particular. He gives examples that logic tells us “it is raining or it is not raining” and that “if it is raining, it is in fact raining”, and also deals with logical functions of the conjunctions “and”, “if” etc. These may seem trivial to those who do not deal with logic. For a similar reason – the author writes – his philosophy of business enterprise may also be considered banal by some readers. A praxiologist will agree with this supposition, as not once he has met with an accusation of speaking about obvious matters when presenting a praxiological analysis of action<sup>3</sup>. Bocheński asks the reader of his business enterprise analysis not to reject it hastily but, instead, note that: “reconsidering the banalities discussed here is nothing other than an attempt at a more comprehensive reexamination of the entire issue” [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): <introductory remarks>]. This encouragement is supported by a remark that it is a new conceptualization of the issue, which does not aspire to be considered as the final result, but rather constitutes a “set of suggestions to be

<sup>2</sup> Besides the original German publication, the Polish edition of the text elaborated by Jan Garewicz (the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition in Polish) has been used here; see in: References.

<sup>3</sup> The readers are invited to study the original dissertation by Piotr T. Makowski on Kotarbiński’s “Action Theory” [Makowski 2017].

applied in further research”. [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): <introductory remarks>].

In the dissertation, Bocheński presented in turn: conceptual prolegomena pertaining to understanding of philosophy, a preliminary definition of business enterprise, characteristics of the concept of system and systemic perceiving of issues, static and dynamic analysis of the business enterprise, elements of general goals-setting theory, issues related to an entrepreneur’s role and ethics. These issues will be discussed later on in this article. It should be noted that a discussion on J. M. Bocheński’s philosophy of business enterprise could also be found in the article by Andrzej Kmiecik [2013]<sup>4</sup>. The author remarks that Bocheński’s concept is not known in the circles of specialists in the field of business enterprise theory [Kmiecik 2013: 162–163].

## **2. Preliminaries**

### **2.1. Validity of philosophical analysis of the business enterprise**

The first one in a set of questions preparing for philosophical analysis of a business enterprise is the problem of the legitimacy of such inquiries. The answer to this question depends on philosophy that is being taken under consideration: whether it is the philosophy that Bocheński calls *synthetic* or *analytic* philosophy. The former is focused on building systems that are “substitutes of world-views or their apologiae” [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 1.1]. The latter does not deal with worldview issues, but instead focuses on analysis of most abstract aspects of things and processes, using its conceptual, logical and ontological tools. That is what its legitimacy is based on.

<sup>4</sup> The author points out Aristotelian inspiration in Bocheński’s “ontological perspective”, cf. Bukafa 2019: 41–42.

The second issue is the possibility to define the business enterprise. We have the knowledge of what a business enterprise is, yet it is difficult to give it an unambiguous definition. Therefore, Bocheński proposes that a business enterprise should be understood as “something like a shoe factory” [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 1.2], “an enterprise that produces certain – quite specific – goods” [*ibid.*] with no consideration of “a difference between industry and agriculture” [*ibid.*], which he considers negligible. However, it would be good to overcome difficulties and try to formulate a classical definition of the business enterprise. A classical definition specifies the *genus* to which a defined object belongs, and shows differences within the *genus* – such definition indicates how a defined object differs from other objects of the genus. Bocheński indicates “the system” as a *genus proximum* to which the business enterprise belongs. The next subsection of the lecture is devoted to this concept. The following part of the lecture discusses elements of difference, i.e. *the differentia specifica*. It is conducted by using static and dynamic analysis of the business enterprise, and more precisely the analysis of its structure. In this order, we will review below the continuation the lecture *Zur Philosophie der industriellen Urternehmung*.

## 2.2. System

It may seem that *genus proximum* of the business enterprise should be the term *organization*, i.e. “a dynamically organized group of people” [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 2.1]. However, there exist one-man business entities too, and these are not groups of people. Moreover, in organizations where groups of people work, there are also other objects: machines and devices, as well as buildings. Bocheński calls them real objects. Besides them, there are also unreal objects such as patents or *know-how*. Thus: “Business enterprises usually comprise an organization, but they are not identical with it” [*ibid.*]. Therefore, one should follow methodological advice and “climb up the ladder of abstraction” – the author

proposes. However, we encounter difficulties. Climbing this ladder of abstraction, we reach three categories, namely: thing, property, relation – yet a business enterprise is none of these categories. Although it contains some things, it has some properties, it also comprises some relations, but in itself it is neither a thing, nor a property, nor a relation. Hence, there is nothing else left but to consider as *genus proximum* the most general concept, viz. system. A “system” is perceived, however, “not as in computer science” [*ibid.*], but in the most general sense; that requires new logic, those seeds, according to Bocheński, are only just being created.

It seems that Bocheński had in mind the general theory of systems, and probably in an ontological sense similar to that of Mario Bunge [1979]. He writes about it in the article on the concept of system [Bocheński 1990], published in volume 18 of the series “Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities”. In the footnote, we read that Bocheński became interested in the subject of the system in the mid-1970s working for a large Swiss industrial enterprise. At that time, he was not familiar with the works of Mario Bunge, and when he became acquainted with them, he was surprised by their similarity to his own ideas. Above all, he values that Bunge conducted studies on systems beyond – as Bocheński calls – the “information technology ghetto”. The scientific discipline to which the subject of the system belongs is the philosophical one; and the concept of the system is abstract to such extent, that it could be qualified as the philosophical category [Bocheński 1990: 99].

The definition of the real system and the theorem on the concept of the system given by Bocheński [1990: 102] are presented in Box 1.

Box 1

**DEFINITION OF SYSTEM**  
(according to: Bocheński 1990)

Definition: *The real system is an object whose elements are interrelated by causality*

$$RS = \lambda[S(x): (\exists y, z): EL(y, x). EL(z, x). y \neq z. \supset AC(y, z) \vee AC(z, y)]$$

Where: EL (x,y) to "x is an element of y"; RS is "real system";  
"AC(x,y)" is „x affects y”

Theorem: In ideal systems, there is no causal relationship between unreal elements (e.g. in poetry).  
A more abstract term is needed, it is dependence DP.

Thus the general definition of a system is as follows:  
*A system is an object that has at least two elements and all its elements are interrelated*

$$S = \lambda[(Ey, z). EL(y, x). EL(z, x). x \neq y: (t, u): EL(t, x). EL(u, x) \supset DP(t, u)]$$

After that *addendum*, let us return to philosophy of business enterprise. Bocheński jokes that for lack of anything better, the seeds of some kind of logic of a system will be presented:

(a) "A certain ordered class of elements corresponds to each system" [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 2.3].

(b) A system is not identical to the class. A class is never real, however, a system can be.

(c) The basic property of each system is that it consists of elements and entails the principle of ordering (synthesis) which makes these elements a whole, i.e. the very system.

(d) The unifying factor differs from elements.

Bocheński indicates the following features of the system elements:

- (1) Each system comprises many elements; a one-element object is not a system.
- (2) Elements can be real (as nails) or ideal (as concepts).
- (3) Systems can be parts of a larger system (they are usually called “supersystems”, but Bocheński does not use this term).
- (4) The elements are interrelated; the correlation is internal or necessary because a change of any element causes a necessity to change other elements.
- (5) If a system is an element of a larger system, then it is correlated with elements of the larger system; these latter elements are extrinsic elements (e.g. viewers are extrinsic elements of the cinema) [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 2.3].

Systems are divided into homogeneous and heterogeneous. The former are composed of analogous elements; they are either real or ideal. The latter are a mixture of real and ideal elements. A system composed of real elements is a real system. Moreover, systems can be static, i.e. not performing any action, or dynamic – exercising activities, like machines, animals, etc. Dynamic systems may be mechanical, i.e. those that cause changes in other objects (for example a hammer), or organic, causing changes in themselves (for example plants).

### **3. Analysis of enterprise**

#### **3.1. Static analysis**

Bocheński summarizes the classic analysis of business enterprise derived from works of David Ricardo:

“[...] this classical approach amounts to the following assertions: in an industrial enterprise there are only two elements, viz. capital and labor (1); the bearer of the first element, the capitalist, always acts as the connecting factor (2).” [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 3.1].

Socialists added – Bocheński continues – that employees or their representatives can also be a connecting factor. The whole idea is incorrect – Bocheński argues – and useless today due to changed circumstances. Many types of enterprises cannot be taken into account in such analysis, *exempli gratia*: municipal institutions playing the role of a synthesis factor in enterprises, consumer cooperatives or state officials managing enterprises. That makes it necessary to replace traditional analysis with a new one.

The intrinsic elements necessary in a business enterprise are capital, labor and technical inventiveness (which “is of such major importance that it can never be compared to the labor of a highly-qualified engineer working in a routine environment [...]” – Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 3.3]. Bocheński adds that the inventor may stay outside the business enterprise. Nevertheless, the author underlines that “not any single element but the industrial enterprise as a whole is the real producer”. Besides the mentioned intrinsic elements the enterprise also comprises “[...] also essential connections to objects outside the system, typically other systems. Without these relations a given system cannot exist or operate” [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 3.4]. They are extrinsic connections.

The first kind of the extrinsic elements of a business enterprise is customers for whom it produces specific products. Manufacturing goods for customers is the sense of business activity. Another extrinsic element is the region in which the business enterprise operates, to which it supplies products, which it pollutes, etc. Bocheński points out that if the business enterprise is large-scale, or very large, the fate of the region may depend on it. The third extrinsic element is the state in which business enterprise functions. Other extrinsic elements are suppliers of raw materials, semi-finished products and so on.

The intrinsic and extrinsic components of the business enterprise are held together not by the capital – as it has been supposed and is still believed – but by an entrepreneur: “He is indeed the one who finds capital, buys inventions from inventors, hires



employees, searches for clientele, and makes agreements with the commune and the state” [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 3.5].

Thus, an entrepreneur: “creates the industrial enterprise out of elements which on their own are scattered and unproductive” [*ibid.*]. Bocheński wonders how overlooking this was possible for so long, and he observes that it testifies the “incredible inertia of human thinking” [*ibid.*].

In continuation of the static analysis, Bocheński indicates that so far considerations allow building a scheme of all a *propri* possible organizational forms of business enterprise. If we limit ourselves to certain number of element-kinds, it is possible to calculate the number of possible forms; we can assume, for example, the said six kinds of elements, i.e. capital, labor, invention, as intrinsic elements; and customers, region and state as extrinsic elements<sup>5</sup>. Bocheński presents possibility of existing – or at least considering – many forms of business enterprises. He points to the fallacy of limiting it only to two forms: capitalist and socialist.

### 3.2. Dynamic analysis

Dynamic analysis of the business enterprise requires, in preparation, applying the general theory of goals-setting (theory of end). The enterprise – Bocheński writes – resembles an organism, and it is founded by people, thus it has its goal. The dynamic structure of the enterprise results from its goal (end, *finis*). When we ask a manager who is in charge of a company or its part, what is the goal of the business, he will answer that it is the maximum possible dividend for shareholders. When asking authors of many books, some will answer that the goal is the happiness of employees. It is not difficult to note that the mentioned objectives are the goals of representatives of different elements of the system, i.e. of the enter-

<sup>5</sup> Bocheński calculates that with six elements of the system the number of possible forms of organization is 64:  $\sum_{p=0}^{p=6} \binom{6}{p} = 1+6+15+20+15+6+1=64$

prise. Shareholders strive for dividends, and happiness is the goal of company staff. Let us note that the said goals of different elements are sometimes mistakenly identified with the goal of the enterprise as a whole. It turns out that the concept of a goal taken from everyday language is not enough for dynamic analysis of enterprise. The general theory of goals-setting is necessary here.

The general theory of goals-setting identifies two kinds of ends of any dynamic system: immanent end<sup>6</sup> (*finis operis*) and transcendent end (*finis operantis*). When someone is involved in action, he means to achieve a certain condition of the object – this condition is a goal that we will call the immanent end. Bocheński gives an example of action of washing a car, with a clean car being its main end and only result. It is the immanent end imposed by the structure of washing action. At the same time, this end may be a means and serve another purpose, such as impressing a neighbor, which would be a transcendent goal. Bocheński notes that people are afraid of immanent ends, calling them “mechanisms”, and seek to replace them with goals chosen of their own free will. Is it what students do, when, instead of reading a set book, they would rather read one that interests them more? You can, of course, not wash the car, not read the set books, following the advice: “Just do what you want”. However, if you start to wash the car or read the book, you have no leeway in doing so. The immanent end of action and its structure determine the course of action.

What, then, is the immanent end of an enterprise? At first glance – writes Bocheński – it seems that the fact of an enterprise being founded by humans excludes an autonomous regularity independent of human will, i.e. the immanent end. Moreover, any enterprise undergoes changes in the course of its functioning. Is that not an obstacle – asks the author? A system being constructed in an

<sup>6</sup> Immanent, a philosophical term: existing within something, remaining within something, appropriate to a given phenomenon, not resulting from the action of external factors [Editors' note].

unrestrained way and its changes aimed at improvements, does not prevent the enterprise from doing what it is supposed to do and what it was founded for – and it was founded in order to produce. Termination of manufacturing would be tantamount to the end of the industrial enterprise. So what is the immanent end of the business enterprise, what are the kinds of goal or goals, and how are they correlated? The immanent end of the industrial enterprise is production, for which the enterprise has been given its immanent structure. This is the main immanent end of any industrial enterprise: “[...] any enterprise by virtue of its immanent goal performs an important social function, viz., the production of goods. This, and nothing else, makes up its social significance.” [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 4.4].

In addition to the main immanent goal, any industrial (or more broadly: business) enterprise has additional, auxiliary immanent goals that result from its organic nature. Namely, it strives to survive, is interested in its development, and tries to function rationally, i.e. in accordance with the principles of economy. Thus, surviving, growth and rationality are auxiliary immanent goals of an industrial enterprise [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 4.5].

As was said before, elements of the system (i.e. of the enterprise) and groups of elements have individual or group goals. Each group of elements makes up a partial system, a subsystem (although Bocheński does not use this term). An important issue is the relation between goals of these subsystems and the goal of the enterprise as a whole, i.e. of the system. Bocheński formulates two theses:

“First: necessarily, there are oppositions between the individual subsystems’ goals and between them and the overall goals of the enterprise. Second: the goals of the subsystems can only be achieved if the overall goal of the enterprise is reached.” [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): 4.6; highlights by W.W.G].

The oppositions are essential because shareholders (Bocheński calls them capitalists) strive to maximize dividends, employees strive for the highest wages and best working conditions, customers – for

cheap goods, etc. Nevertheless, simultaneous fulfillment of all stakeholders (Bocheński does not use this term) is not possible, because they are contradictory. Moreover, there is an opposition between interests of different groups of stakeholders and the goal of an enterprise as a whole. According to Bocheński: "Internal tensions are pre-programmed into the structure of an industrial enterprise. Whoever dreams of an enterprise free of tension is simply dreaming: such enterprise is impossible." [*ibid.*]. On the other hand, without achieving goals of the entire enterprise as a system, it is impossible to reach the goals of different groups of elements. A certain state of dynamic equilibrium is necessary: solidarity of goals of different groups of stakeholders with the goals of an enterprise as a whole. This necessary state is (and should be) assumed in the business enterprise structure.

In the paper titled *Normy etyczne a normy sprawnościowe w zarządzaniu, biznesie i gospodarce* [Ethical Norms and Efficiency Norms in Management, Business and Economy]<sup>7</sup>, I wrote the following:

"Józef Maria Bocheński, the author of the dissertation on philosophy of enterprise [Bocheński 1987], introduced a distinction between thinking and serious thinking [Bocheński 1965: I–1]. The latter is thinking whose objective is knowledge, and thus cognitive value. It seems that a similar distinction needs to be made to distinguish action from entrepreneurial action aimed at economic value. Therefore, business action would be a serious action. In both distinctions, the seriousness is measured by positive values of efficiency aspects of the action. Seriousness also requires that the social axiological context of actions is taken into account – otherwise these actions could be regarded unacceptable in a given culture. Analysis of human actions in terms of the "triple E" (efficiency, economy, ethics) is a condition of the actions' seriousness, understood in its

<sup>7</sup> The quoted fragment (with minor changes and additions) comes from a work presented at "Seminarium Krytycznej Teorii Organizacji" [Seminar of Critical Theory of Organization] at Akademia Leona Koźmińskiego [Koźmiński University]; publication: Gasparski 1998 (later republished, see: References).

highest dimension – the condition of wisdom. Wisdom here is the art (*τέχνη*) relying on a strong character of an acting person. Praxiology – according to Bocheński – belongs to disciplines in which we find theorems corresponding to the precepts of wisdom. Finally, note that the English adjective *businesslike* means (among others) *just serious*.”

In his contribution to the philosophy of enterprise, Bocheński also pays attention to ethical issues, in particular to the ethics of an entrepreneur. An entrepreneur, according to Bocheński, is a representative of a whole enterprise, regardless of its organizational form:

“It is often said that there is no »holy entrepreneur« or »holy manager«, but in the light of the foregoing, this is not true. The very structure of the industrial enterprise dictates the ideal of the entrepreneur: a person who selflessly – and, if necessary, in strife with everyone – serves the enterprise as a whole.” [Bocheński 1987 (in translation): <conclusive remarks>]<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The Finnish philosopher Timo Airaksinen criticizes the concept of “holy entrepreneur” explaining the reason as follows: “[...] we can use the term ‘ideal’ in two senses. The former means something as good as it is only possible, or something that one would like to emulate with a clear conscience ... This use of the »ideal« is common ... But there is another idea of the »ideal«, the transcendental kind. The normative meaning of this term implies perfection in every possible perspective and value system. Such perfection is good for the gods, it is a true ideal, the Tao, that we can try to emulate, but always without success. It provides us with valuable guidance and shows us the path we should follow if we hope to be good people. Perfection is an ideal that we should strive for, even if we never achieve it. I know this all sounds paradoxical, but there is nothing we can do about it; on the contrary, if our lives are planned and our actions are not guided by ideals, we can never become what we potentially are, the age-old saying goes, »Become what you are.« Therefore, I cannot accept Bocheński’s idea of a Sainly Entrepreneur, even if I do accept the ideal of an entrepreneur in the limited sense of the word.” [Airaksinen 2017: 144–145].

## 4. Conclusion

The overall – systemic – approach to philosophy of business enterprise outlined by Bocheński can be presented synthetically in the form of ten theses (Box 2).

Box 2

TEN THESES

about the enterprise as a system  
compiled according to the philosophy of the industrial  
enterprise of Józef Maria Bocheński

1. What is an enterprise? It is a SYSTEM.
2. What elements is it composed of? They are: CAPITAL, LABOR, INVENTORY.
3. Who is a producer? It is the ENTERPRISE AS A WHOLE.
4. What are its extrinsic components? They are: CUSTOMERS, REGION, LOCAL CUMMUNE and the STATE.
5. What/who is an connecting factor? It is the ENTREPRENEUR.
6. What is the goal of the enterprise? The main end is PRODUCTION; the other goals are: SURVIVING, because it must exist; GROWTH, because it must be powerful enough; RATIONALITY, because it must be economic. These are immanent goals. Achieving other goals (transcendent) can only derive from realization of immanent goals.
7. What is the social function of an enterprise? Social sense of any enterprise is MANUFACTURING GOODS.
8. What does an enterprise consist of? An enterprise as a dynamic system comprises SUBSYSTEMS, i.e. smaller systems formed by elements of different kinds or their bearers (joint-stock company, trade unions, etc.).
9. How are the goals of individual subsystems and the goals of the entire enterprise correlated? (a) There are necessary oppositions between goal of different subsystems; (b) puposes of individual kinds of elements can only be achieved by achieving the goal of an entire enterprise.

This approach may require some modifications or complimenting on account of some new concepts of enterprise proposed in contemporary literature. Particularly noteworthy is the book by Fred-eric Laloux, *Reinventing organization: A Guide to Creating Organizations Inspired by the Next Stage of Human Consciousness*. The author of this book points out that a turning point in shaping organizations occurred when robotics and artificial intelligence caused the loss of many jobs:

“[...] many people sense that the current way we run organizations has been stretched to its limits. We are increasingly disillusioned by organizational life”. “[...] Behind the façade and the bravado, the lives of powerful corporate leaders are ones of quiet suffering too. Their frantic activity is often a poor cover up for a deep inner sense of emptiness. The power games, the politics, and the infighting end up taking their toll on everybody. At both the top and bottom, organizations are more often than not playfields for unfulfilling pursuits of our egos, inhospitable to the deeper yearnings of our souls” [Laloux 2014: 3–4]

According to the quoted author, a creation of the so-called teal organizations is supposed to be helpful in overcoming the above-mentioned problem<sup>9</sup>:

“In Evolutionary-Teal, we shift from external to internal yardsticks in our decision-making. We are now concerned with the question of inner rightness: does this decision seem right? [...] Recognition, success, wealth, and belonging are viewed as pleasurable experiences, but also as tempting traps for the ego. In contrast with previous stages, the order is reversed: we do not pursue recognition, success, wealth, and belonging to live a good life. We pursue a life well-lived, and the consequence might just be recognition, success, wealth, and love” [Laloux 2014: 44–45].

<sup>9</sup> Laloux assigned colors to the types of organizations in their historical development, functioning according to their own rules, calling them paradigms (P.); reactive – infrared P.; magic – magenta P.; impulsive – red P.; conformist – amber P.; achievement – orange P.; pluralistic – green P.; evolutionary (self-realization) – teal P.

That is a challenge to today's philosophy of a business enterprise, and consequently also for praxiology and ethics, in particular business ethics.

## REFERENCES

- Airaksinen T. 2017, *Professor Gasparski on Design and Entrepreneurship*, "Zagadnienia naukoznawstwa" 2 (212): 135–147.
- Bocheński J. I. M. 1965, *The Methods of Contemporary Thought*, transl. from German by P. Caws, Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company; in translation: *Współczesne metody myślenia*, Poznań 1992: W drodze.
- Bocheński J. I. M. 1987, *Zur Philosophie der industriellen Unternehmung*. Vortrag gehalten am 18. März 1985 auf Einladung der Bank Hofmann AG im Zunfthaus zur Meisen, Zürich: Bank Hoffmann AG (republished in: Idem, *Autorität, Freiheit, Glaube. Sozialphilosophische Studien*, München-Wien 1988: Philosophia Verlag: 119–138); in translation: *Przyczynek do filozofii przedsiębiorstwa*, [translated from German by] J. Garewicz, [in:] J.M. Bocheński, *Logika i filozofia*, [ed. by] J. Parys, Warszawa 1993: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN: 162–186<sup>10</sup>.
- Bocheński J. I. M. 1990, *On the System*, in: P. Weingartner, G. J.W. Dorn (ed.), *Studies on Mario Bunge's »Treatise«* (Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities, 18), Amsterdam–Atlanta (GA): Rodopi: 99–104.
- Bukała M.W. 2019, *O niesłuszności deprecjonowania rozważań ekonomicznych Arystotelesa*, "Archiwum Historii Filozofii i Myśli Społecznej" 64: 33–43.
- Bunge M. 1979, "Ontology: The World of Systems", in: M. Bunge, *Treatise on Basic Philosophy*, Vol. 4, Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Gasparski W.W. 1998, *Normy etyczne a normy sprawnościowe w zarządzaniu, biznesie i gospodarce*, in: *Krytyczna Teoria Organizacji*, fasc. 3. *Seminaria: Zaufanie – podstawa relacji społecznych. Normy etyczne a normy sprawnościowe w zarządzaniu, biznesie i gospodarce. Ewolucja państwa opiekuńczego*, [ed. by.] M. B. Kamiński, Warszawa: Wyższa Szkoła Przedsiębiorczości i Zarządzania im. L. Koźmińskiego: 63–88 (republished in: W. W. Gasparski, A. Lewicka-Strzałecka, D. Miller (ed.), *Etyka biznesu, gospodarki i zarządzania*, Łódź–Warszawa 1999: Wyższa Szkoła Humanistyczno-Ekonomiczna w Łodzi & Fundacja „Wiedza i Działanie”: 15–36).
- Kmiecik A. 2013, *O filozofii przedsiębiorstwa Józefa M. Bocheńskiego i współczesnym kryzysie finansowym*, „Filo-Sofija” 21, 2: 159–170.
- Laloux F. 2014, *Reinventing organization: A Guide to Creating Organizations Inspired by the Next Stage of Human Consciousness*, Nelson Parker – Brussels; in translation: *Pracować inaczej: Nowatorski model organizacji inspirowany kolejnym etapem rozwoju ludzkiej świadomości*, Warszawa 2015: Studio Emka.
- Makowski P. T. 2017, *Tadeusz Kotarbiński's Action Theory: Reinterpretive Studies*, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Staniak B. 2006, *Józef Maria Bocheński OP – portret i oblicza erudyty*, „Człowiek w Kulturze” 18: 249–258.

<sup>10</sup> The quoted edition of Józef M. Bocheński's text in Polish, elaborated by Jan Garewicz, is the 2nd Polish edition; see list of earlier editions of text in p. X of this volume (*editors' note*).



## STRESZCZENIE

### **Filozofia przedsiębiorstwa według Józefa Marii Bocheńskiego**

W artykule zaprezentowano najważniejsze tezy rozprawy Józefa Marii Bocheńskiego, w której przedstawiona została filozofia przedsiębiorstwa przemysłowego w zarysie. Rozprawa jest zapisem wykładu wygłoszonego przez jej autora 18 marca 1985 r. w Zunfthaus zur Meisen w Zürichu, na zaproszenie Banku Hofmann AG. Wykład nosił tytuł *Zur Philosophie der industriellen Urternehmung*.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Józef M. Bocheński, cel, filozofia przedsiębiorstwa, przedsiębiorstwo, system

