MANAGEMENT – BETWEEN ECONOMY, POLITY, AND ETHICS

Barbara PRZYBYLSKA-CZAJKOWSKA

Silesian University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Organization, Gliwice; bprzybylska@polsl.pl,
ORCID: 0000-0001-8028-1188

Purpose: The author of this text shares the opinion (expressed by quite a number of social researches) that the practical impact of social sciences on social practice, and particularly – on mankind's responding to the global challenges, is not satisfying. Enhancement of this influence can be viewed as one of these challenges. An analysis of the causes of the situation characterized above is required to achieve this goal. Such an analysis is outlined in this text and some its tentative practical implications are indicated. In other words, it could be said that the goal of this paper is to contribute to the debate on the current state of the management studies and management education.

Design/methodology/approach: This text belongs to the area where meet the philosophy of social sciences and their history. Thus, this text is based on historical description and on analysis of the described processes. Logical analysis connected with explication of axiological (ethical) assumptions allows to formulate some practical suggestions as to the further development of management studies and the (academic) education of the future managers.

Findings: The role of the emerging interdisciplinary theory of collective action – as basis for both research and academic education in practically oriented social sciences – has been exposed and justified in this text.

Research limitations/implications: Further historical and analytical studies seem to be necessary.

Practical implications: Some changes in the organization (defining research problems, methodologies etc.) of the research practice of social sciences in general, and of management studies in particular, as well as changes in studies programs might be planned and accepted if arguments presented in this paper are at least partly convincing.

Social implications: The text, suggesting and inspiring some changes in the education of managers, might also have some indirect impact on the quality of politics, self-government, or civil-society organization.

Originality/value: The paper contains an idea of management studies as an interdisciplinary science connecting elements of traditional management theory with sociology, political sciences and economics. The idea, and also its justification, seems to be rather new. The paper is addressed to the representatives of various social sciences interested in interdisciplinary cooperation.

Keywords: social sciences, sustainability, governance, collective action.

Category of the paper: Viewpoint.

1. Introduction

When do „our times" begin? – A few answers are acceptable. "The year 1945" is one of them. But also this short answer can be interpreted in several ways. So let's be more specific and say that "our times" began on August 6. 1945 – with the dropping of atomic bomb on Hiroshima. Formulating this opinion we follow Jean Paul Sartre who declared – in October 1945, in the first issue of "Les Temps modernes" – that "mankind: if it continues further its existence, it is not because it was born, but because it has decided to continue its existence." (cited after Picht, 1969) Some 75 years have passed and, happily, we have avoided nuclear disaster. From the perspective of an individual's life, 75 years is a rather long period of time; from the perspective of modern history – rather short, and from the perspective of the global history started with the Neolithic Revolution – just very short. Too short to justify the opinion that the threat of nuclear disaster has definitely disappeared.

Some twenty years later a new, and much more urgent, threat emerged: the threat of ecological crisis. Contrarily to the tragedy of Hiroshima (and Nagasaki), in the case of that crises no single event can be regarded as playing a role similar to the dramas in Japan. We should rather indicate the moments in which mankind began to realize the dangers generated by the dramatic side-effects of the uncontrolled economic growth. Having no place and time to outline the history of the contemporary ecological consciousness, let us mention but two events. First: the publication (1962) of "Silent Spring" – a book of Rachel Carson, a book that played a significant role in the development of environmental movements and in the creation of the U.S. Environment Protection Agency. And second: the Stockholm United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (1972).

Both, the actual ecological drama and the potential nuclear tragedy, are the source of the beliefs of the possibility of total self-destruction of mankind (the human civilization). Such pessimistic opinions are formulated very often by "professional Cassandras". But they are also expressed by serious and prominent scientists. By way of example only, let's invoke Martin Rees (a prominent British cosmologist and astrophysicist), who claimed that mankind has only 50% chances to survive until 2100 without a tragic catastrophe (Rees, 2007).

Probably many (most?) of us hold more moderate (less catastrophic) views on the future of mankind. Even so, most of us agree that – firstly – humanity faces great many serious problems (challenges) of a global (i.e. affecting the whole mankind and solvable by all mankind only) character, and – secondly – responsible for solving them are we all (albeit, it should be stressed, to a very different degree: responsibility of policy-makers, say, is obviously much greater than that of hard working workers). – Formulating this opinion we can rely on the very profound analyses contained in the "Global Catastrophic Risks", and – in particular – on the general overview (Bostrom, Circovic, 2008), on the text devoted to "The continuing threat of nuclear war" (Ciricione, 2008) and on the one concerning climate change (Frame, Allen, 2008).

The rise and development of global problems (challenges) is, according to the perspective assumed here, part and parcel of the complex process composed of various social and civilizational (sub-) processes, a process that can be called – globalization. Viewed from this perspective, the process of globalization is also co-created by another (sub-)process: by the process of the increasing complexity of the global natural-technical-social system (= Earth together with al living creatures, with all man-made objects, and with humans – with their thoughts, emotions etc.). Two important issues should be underlined here: First, the complexity of the system makes also the global problems (challenges) more complex, so – more difficult to be solved. Second, the more complex is an object the more complex should be its model (even if – as any model – is always a simplification); in other words: the more complex an object the more difficult is gaining sufficiently adequate knowledge about it (Czajkowski, 2015).

Now, a few words are to be said about processes which at least partly overlap those co-creating globalization but can or rather, as any other, even has to be (at a phase of researches) studied autonomously. We mean here the processes which could be described as "the rise of society of organizations". Schematically put, the process of dynamic development of organizations started at the second half on 19ᵗʰ century, the turn of centuries brought about acceleration of this process, and the end of the Second World War added still more impetus. To describe this process in both succinct and emphatic way, one might say about the evolution of the "world od organizations": on one hand – the growth of the sheer number of organizations (today there are approximately 15 000 only of international organizations), on the other – the increasing variety of types of organizations (economic, political, scientific, sport; more or less specialized).

The analysis of this process should be, in the author's opinion, regarded as comprising the process of institutionalization: institutions can (or, perhaps, even should) be regarded as organizations (of more or less specific character).

The above considerations might be summed up in the following way: The possibly adequate responses to the global challenges depend – *inter alia* – on the quality of organizations. So the problematics of the quality of organizations turns out to be still more significant than it is commonly assumed.

Ending this introduction, let us recall the famous phrase (attributed to David Browder or Rene Dubos or Jacques Ellul): "Think global, act local". It could be also suggested that its interpretation different from the "geographical" ("territorial") one – an interpretation that could be called "structural": one in which the word "global" refers to the whole (natural-technical-social) system while "local" denotes a part of it – is possible and useful. This interpretation suggests that if we accept that global challenges are both serious and urgent, we should also agree that we have responsibilities related to these challenges. These responsibilities are of various kinds; they are connected with various social roles we play: of parents, citizens, members of local communities…And of a person playing a professional role (or roles).

In particular: the role of a researcher (social scientist) and/or the role of (academic) teacher of social sciences. And to be still more specific: the role of researcher and/or teacher in the field of management studies.

Let us add to the said above: For the last four decades or so business ethics – a discipline belonging to the "border area" of philosophy and management studies (Griseri, 2013; Koslowski, 2010) – has been dynamically developing. Ethicists have emphasized, and rightly so, that business activities – in more and more complex world – originate many serious moral problems (Przybylska-Czajkowska, 2019b). But this situation is not specific for business (or medicine - profession since ancient times connected with ethics). In particular, Hiroshima 1945 gave rise to the ethics of science (Agazzi, 1997). Connected with ethics of globalization (Jonas, 1984; Singer, 2002) should deliver fundamentals for a sub-field of business ethics: ethics of research in and teaching of management studies. The present text is intended (partly) as a contribution to the reflection of this type.

2. Economy, polity, and culture – some remarks on social ontology

2.1.

Let us start this chapter from some general considerations on knowledge and its development. Since it is a huge subject (knowledge – in this or that form – has been a part of all history mankind, and – in a sense – perhaps also of some animal species) and not all its elements are very important for the discussion of issues to be undertaken in this chapter, let us limit ourselves to this epoch that begins around 25 centuries ago – in the time of Thales. But just about this epoch a lot could (and in other context: should) be said. Here, it is neither possible, nor – fortunately – necessary. So, but a five points on this issue will be formulated here. First, in this very epoch a considerable part of knowledge has been consciously produced: texts containing knowledge have been written, writing these texts has been becoming a profession, and this branch of activity (it might be even said: production) – more and more institutionalized. Second, from the very beginning of this epoch, the development of knowledge (about the Universe, life, history etc.) has been accompanied by the reflection (more or less elaborated) on knowledge – on its nature, methods of its acquiring, limits, etc. Third, as the result of the increasing amount of knowledge (to mention but the simplest though important factor) knowledge has been dividing into disciplines, sub-disciplines etc. Fourth, the history of science(s) is – in some respects – similar to the political history; in particular: the borders between intellectual domains have been changing (Dogan, 1995). Fifth, as a reaction to the growing specialization – some call it "Balkanization" of scientific disciplines (Wallerstein,

2001), some trends towards interdisciplinarity (transdisciplinarity, multidisciplinarity…) have in the last decades emerged (Weingart,1995; Weingart, 2000).

These five notes should serve here as a backcloth for considerations on the development of knowledge about social world. Also to this subject a long paper (or even a book) might be devoted. So, again, a few brief comments on the issues that seem to be of particular significance for further considerations will be added. First, the history of social thought starts from Plato and Aristotle. The tradition they initiated – tradition of political and social philosophy (the last word does matter in this context) – has been continued until our days. Second, social sciences (as distinguished from social philosophy) are, compared with natural sciences, relatively "young": Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) is generally considered to be the "father" of modern physics – the central part of modern empirical natural sciences (let's add that Newton's "Principia" – one of the greatest works in the history of world culture, containing a theory that has been and, almost for sure, will be in the future taught at schools – was published in 1687), and one hundred fifty years younger Adam Smith (1723-1790) is regarded as the "father" of economics – the first autonomous social science. Sociology is still younger: Even if we accept August Comte (1798-1857) as the "father" of this discipline – due to his invention of its name announced in 1835. But, except for this invention, he contributed very little to this science. According to the most widely accepted opinion, Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) and Max Weber (1864-1920) were the first great sociologist – in the strict sense of the word. The opinion that sociology became an autonomous science in the last quarter of the 19th century seems to be rather soundly justified. And just in about the same time political sciences came to the academic fore. It should be noted that the last discipline was originated in the United States and only later "imported" to Europe; interestingly, the establishing this new discipline was much more collective and institutional initiative than it had been in the case of economics and sociology. (Woodrow Wilson [1856-1924] – one of the scholars who played a significant role in creating this discipline – is much more known as making politics than researching it.) Third, three social sciences that can be, more or less precisely, characterized as theoretical social sciences, have been listed above. However, we should not forget that history, often counted to humanities (considered by many as an academic domain different from social sciences), shares with social sciences its object of study, at least if sufficiently broadly defined. The same can be said about such disciplines as ethnography/ethnology, and social and cultural anthropology.

Separately, let us say some words on management studies. This domain came into existence as a response to the changes and demands of economy at the turn of 19th and 20th centuries. To these transformations a book might be devoted. But analysis of them is not our goal here. So only two – both important and symbolic – events will be mentioned. First: In the year 1870 John D. Rockefeller (1839-1937) founded Standard Oil Company – one of the first great corporations (not only the organizational form but also the area of activity – oil – does matter). And second: a period of time – few decades later, between 1907 (when the first Model T was

produced) and 1913 (when in Motor Ford Company the assembly-line was launched) is to be mentioned here. In short: both profound organizational and technological changes.

The reaction to these changes was instant: In the United States the first business school – active still today, and one of the most respected – Wharton Business School – was founded in 1881. Interestingly, in Europe at that time a few such schools had already existed; among them – Budapest Business School founded in 1857 – it exists still today (Adams, 2008)

If management studies were to have a "father", it would almost certainly be Frederic W. Taylor (1856-1915) – the author of a book "The Principles of Scientific Management" (1911); one of the very few persons who gave his name to a (philosophical, ideological, scientific…) trend: Taylorism – the first "school" or paradigm in this domain. While speaking about origins of this fields we should also mention Henri Fayol (1841-1925). Though he was older than Taylor, his most important work "Administration industrielle et general" was published one year after Taylor's death and its English translation – in 1949. To the two important thinkers one should add Karol Adamiecki (1866-1933) – the pioneer in Poland of the theory of scientific organization and management. It should be stressed that Taylor, Fayol and Adamiecki were engineers, not only by training: they performed – with successes – their profession.

Ending this part of our considerations: At least one person from outside the management studies should be invoked: Max Weber, the great German sociologist, a few years only younger than F.W. Taylor. He studied great many problems and created an impressively great set of theoretical ideas. Out of them but one theory should be mentioned here: Weberian theory of bureaucracy. A detailed comparison of the Taylor's and Fayol's theory would require a separate text. Be here the reader's attention draw to the analogy that can be best characterized by a reference to one of the Garreth Morgan's metaphors, namely to that of organization as a machine (Morgan, 2006).

2.2.

The situation of social sciences is paradoxical: One can risk the hypothesis that the "internal border-lines" divide the domain of social sciences into numerous areas – areas that are more like and more connected than various areas of physical or mathematical sciences. But the "internal border-lines" dividing the latter two domains seem to be much less important (for the physicist and mathematicians; note the names – still in constant use!) than those crosscutting the domain of social sciences. This situation has its far-reaching, and – it can be supposed – mainly negative consequences for researches in social sciences and teaching them (Czajkowski, 2015).

And if we believe, as the author has declared in "Introduction", that the development of social sciences is – due to the global challenges –urgently needed, and that the internal borders separating them slow it down and make it more difficult, we should ask how to minimize the role these border play. Analysis of the mechanisms that created these boundaries and contribute to their reproduction should help to achieve this goal.

There is no doubt that all sciences (be it physics or sociology, history or biology, etc., etc.) are being developed by social groups. Some, if not all, of these groups deserve the name of "communities". And, as in the case of all communities, in the reproduction of those groups important part play their historical traditions defining their (in this case: professional) identities. Aa I suggested above, the borders seem to play in social sciences more significant role than in the other domains. Why? – This question seems to be very important.

It can be assumed that the quest for an answer should begin from the problem of the relations between social sciences and ideologies. It is a large subject – very controversial, often hotly debated…It is not possible even to review this problematic here. For this reason, we have to limit ourselves to presenting some views – those assumed here. It will be convenient to divide this presentation, though it should be rather concise, into two parts. First, a claim of philosophical character: Any science is in various ways connected with ideologies (to avoid considerations on this notion, let's put it simply: with axiological opinions concerning social order, its development etc.) For obvious reasons, it is particularly evident in the case of social sciences (though, as it is well known, debates around Copernicus or Darwin had not only scientific but also philosophical and – though rather indirectly – ideological character). Ideologies exert mainly negative influence on the their development. This influence may be limited; it is possible and desirable though – difficult.

Second: The rise of social sciences as autonomous areas of intellectual activity started (see above) in the 18th. Their development was connected with great transformations that began in that century. Schematically put, we should say here about Enlightenment (cultural revolution of a sort), industrial revolution and democratic revolutions (1776 – the American, 1789 – the French). If to analyze these transformations in detail – in a way that is proper for historical sciences, one should notice and pay attention to the variety of ideologies that started to emerge at that time. However, if to assume another perspective (more philosophical or sociological; let us stress: not opposite but complementary one) we may indicate a set of ideas that can be regarded as central and dominating – not only at the end of 18th century and throughout the whole 19th century but, after the first decades of the 20th century in which their role diminished, also over the recent four decades (symbolically: since 1979 and 1981 – since M. Thacher and R. Reagan). This set might be labelled with the word "liberalism". Of course, various ideologies took this name themselves, and various have been given it. But, even if not all "real", historical liberalisms have a common "core" then surely most of them. How to characterize this "core"? – Just for this purpose is convenient (or, perhaps, even necessary) to divide the social world (social reality) into three domains: economy, polity and culture. These domains are supposed to be governed (regulated) by different "logics": economy – by the "logic" of profit (free market), polity – by the "logic" of security and sovereignty (nation-state), and culture – by the "logic" of autonomous and rational thinking (science; or – alternatively – by the "logic" of tradition, e.g. religious or national).

Of course, liberalism does not maintain that such an image reflects precisely any real place at any time. On the contrary, liberalism criticizes real societies – for the interference of one "logic" on the others; the impact of political "logic" on the economic and the cultural is particularly strongly criticized, and freedom of economic activity and freedom of thought and word are regarded as ultimate social (i.e. concerning social order) values.

The "trinitarian" model of the social reality, if sometime slightly modified (Mann, 1994), has until our times dominated social sciences. This model has – from the current perspective – some serious disadvantages. This issue might also be a subject of separate text. Here but two points will be made.

First, on the cognitive adequacy and usefulness of the "trinitarian" model. It is possible that this model can be applied to ancient, medieval or even early modern societies. But its adequacy for the 20th century is rather poor. Let's think about medicine. To put it intuitively: it is a "combination" of business, social policy, science, worldviews…Or, let's think about sport: business and national emotions, mass culture and health… – Instances might be multiplied. But it is not our goal here. Adding one or two more examples would not change the sketchy character of the remark. And a systematic analysis would go far beyond the limits of this text.

And second point. This model has some significant and far reaching consequences for social axiology: it suggest such an axiology which is based on the – mentioned above – idea of three separate "logics" that are to determine three fundamental social values: profit, sovereignty and cultural development. Such an axiology is not adequate to the character of the contemporary social world. More systematic analysis of this problem will be presented in the next chapter.

3. Sustainability – some remarks on social axiology

"Sustainability" (*Nachhaltigkeit* in German, *durabilite* in French) is an interesting term. From a point of view, its history is relatively short: The publication in 1987 of "Our Common Future",known also as "Brundtland Report", gave this term its contemporary recognition and popularity. It was reinforced due to 2005 World Summit on Social Development. More and more often used (or even overused), it has become a part of political rhetoric and journalist jargon. Viewed from another perspective, the term's history is, interestingly, much longer. Its origins date back to the 17th century (Dale, 2018). The history of the term and of the ideas it expresses are very interesting but cannot be discussed here. (more: Przybylska-Czajkowska, 2019a) Our attention is to be focused on the systematic (if brief) analysis of its content.

Let us start from the definition of sustainability contained in Bruntland's Report: "Sustainable development…meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". (The World Commission, 1987). Quoting that definition provides a convenient opportunity for formulating a very general, one could say –

philosophical, remark on individual decision-making. Let us assume (in accordance with widespread intuition and everyday experience, and leaving aside more sophisticated philosophical ideas) that our decisions are – in a sense and to a degree – free (to put it in an intuitive way: an individual can be influenced by great many various factors such as: others' opinions, mass media propaganda, his/her mood etc., but – in the last instance – it is just an individual who makes a decision). Human freedom consists in the possibility and ability of choosing between a number of options – accessible in a situation. But this situation may be defined (or, perhaps better to say, perceived) by the given person in very different ways (it is useful to think about a situation on chessboard: depending on "chess intelligence and knowledge" in one and the same setting of chess pieces very different situations may be perceived). Each situation has many "dimension". Among them – very important – temporality: One can take into account only "instant" consequences of his/her possible decisions or can consider consequences very distant in time. Various social mechanisms (e.g. market, parliamentary election, etc.) favor various types of (temporality of) individual decision-making. On the other side, these mechanisms interact with (in turn variously – biologically, culturally… – determined) individual traits of personality and character. – It should be said now why a comment on individual decision-making follows the definition of sustainability. This accounting consists of a number of points: First.it is assumed here (this assumption is of both – axiological and scientific – character) that fundamental decisions about important social questions should be made as democratically as possible (Reykowski, 2020) (since there is no possibility to discuss here the issue., it should be at least stressed that the notion of democracy – and its derivatives – is regarded here as an ordinal, and not dichotomous, concept). Second, democracy is – from the point of view accepted here – particularly important when fundamental and difficult issues are to be resolved. Third: Just the problems of comparing and balancing our (current) and "theirs" (future) needs and interests are among those – fundamental and difficult – issues. Fourth (strictly connected with the previous one), the problem of acceptable/non-acceptable level of risk: virtually all decisions are based on predictions. And virtually all predictions are of probabilistic character. Therefore, a level of risk (perhaps very little but always positive and never equal to zero) is not eliminable from the process of decision-making. How small should be the risk to be regarded as "practically equal to zero" and negligible? There is no "scientific" answer to this question. It has fundamentally axiological (moral) character. And just such questions should be decided in maximally democratic way.

The above opinions might be generalized and connected with a somewhat different interpretation of sustainability. I mean here the so-called "three pillars of sustainability" (let's leave aside the subtleties connected with two variants of the graphical presentation of this concept) – economic, social, and environmental. To each of these "pillars" a set (a number) of parameters – such as GDP per capita, or amount of accessible water per capita (for the economic), level of social cohesion/solidarity or income inequality (for the social), the level of CO_2 emission or the pace of temperature growth (for the environmental) – can be ascribed.

It seems that the three "pillars" can be regarded as "first approximation" only. It could be said that we need much more comprehensive and much more systematic axiology of the (actual and possible) states of the world (of the global system). And only having such an axiology we could define – in a more precise (even operationalized – this remark is of great important: it's not about of lexicographical esthetics, it is about an instrument to measure objectively the progress, or regress of sustainability) way than today – the concept of sustainable development. And for the present moment, we confine ourselves to presentation of the intuition that might direct the quest for this definition. It can be characterized as follows: as we know it well today, not all parameters (values) can be maximized simultaneously. But perhaps for each parameter characterizing global system exists such a value which cannot be further minimized if the system is not to collapse. If all parameters satisfies this condition, the system can be characterized as sustainable. In other words: the notion of sustainability seems to be connected with that of "compromise" – between various values.

An axiologically homogenous society seems to be just impossible (if possible, it were for rather obvious reasons undesirable). Thus compromise between values is compromise between people, and sustainability can be (to a degree, at least) regarded as "other side" of axiological heterogeneity. Viewing at sustainability from this perspective, one can ask the question about the road to such a society. An outline of an answer to this question will be presented in the next chapter.

4. Management, governance, politics… – some remarks on collective action

Let us commence this chapter with some comments on one of the classic problems (controversies) of social theory. In simplified form it might be characterized as controversy between the Hobbesian and anti-Hobbesian stance, or – put in alternative terminology – between conflict-based and cooperation-based visions of social order.

All the history of social thought (since its very beginning in Plato until our days) might be written as the history of this controversy. So only selected views on this question can be presented here. First, conflict can manifest itself in various forms: from most brutal violence to verbal skirmishes. Second, conflict and cooperation are not mutually exclusive (look at the relations in many marriages or between members of a political party, etc., etc.) Third, due to various factors (both "material" and "ideal") the relative importance of conflict and cooperation is changing: at a period/place dominates conflict, at another – cooperation. Fourth, the hypothesis about the increasing domination of cooperation (Wright, 1999) seems to be plausible.

Cooperation in a group in which exist conflicts of interests (so in all groups – there exists no group in which a conflict does not exist, or – at least – existence of such a group is extremely improbable) can be based only on negotiations, If so, the Wright's hypothesis can be rephrased into one claiming for the development of society of negotiations.

As stressed in the 2nd chapter, societies in which we live are societies of organizations. Most, if not virtually all, of negotiations are and will remain negotiations between organizations. It is in the interest of societies, and – in particular – in the interest of global society that negotiations are effective.

A precise (operationalized) definition of effectiveness cannot be proposed here. But three elements of such a definition can be suggested. First and the simplest: time. Protracted negotiations, all other factors equal, should be evaluated critically, and in some situations – even very negatively. Second: the degree (scope) of compromise; in other words: the larger number of satisfied interested persons, the better. And third: the more lasting the effect of negotiations the better.

As already underlined the effectiveness of negotiations depends on many factors, among them – on mutual understanding. For this reason educating future managers should be based upon knowledge about all main types of organizations: business, political civil-society … Such education should improve for instance mutual understanding between participants of social dialogue between representatives of business, of civil-society organizations (e.g. trade unions) and of government.

 Such education should also prepare students to work as managers in virtually all types of organizations. This should have also a positive effect for society: It can be expected that variegated (in the broad, assumed here, sense of this word) professional experience of a manager should broaden his/her understanding of the social world and more sensitive to various values and interest. For instance such a manager working in a profit-oriented organization should be more sensitive to the interest of various stakeholders and not only to the interests of shareholders (Freeman,1982) (also from the point of view of the individual professional development, such type of his/her career might turn out advantageous).

To avoid information over-load, a theory of management – more general than most often taught – should be recommended. Such theory should synthetize knowledge from the classic management theory, from administration and political sciences and even military science. Such synthesis could have foundations in such disciplines as theory of (individual and collective) decision-making, social epistemology, psychology of motivation, microsociology…

The project of general management education could also have some positive consequences for gradual (allowing for reflection on and adaptation to) the process of overcoming the traditional but, as claims (Wallerstein, 2001) outdated divisions of the social sciences.

5. Final remarks

At the end of this paper, let the phrase "Think global, act local" be re-invoked. In this paper a justification has been looked for the opinion that we who do researches in the field of management studies and who pass the knowledge on management to students, we should consider the question about our moral responsibility – as researches and teachers.

Of course, the answer to this question depends on our opinions on the present state of the world. If you believe that we can look to the future with full confidence, you can maintain that we face no serious moral problems. But if you think that there are serious reasons to look to the future anxiously, you should agree that the question about our moral responsibility is serious and urgent.

If we accept this responsibility, we will have to reflect upon the simple question: What is to be done? The answer should be based on the analyses of the contemporary world – analyses developed on the interdisciplinary cooperation of historians and sociologists, economists and management students…But even now, availing of the already existing knowledge – however incomplete and fragmented it is – at least some elements of the answer can be offered.

Let us list them here: Solving global issues can be achieved by variously organized collective actions – actions which are conventionally classified as economic, political or social. But today virtually all collective actions can be regarded as belonging to all these three type. Therefore theory of collective actions (including theory of collective decision-making) can be regarded as the basis for both theoretical and applied management studies.

Theory of collective action – combined with comprehensive knowledge about society and its development – should also be a basis for teaching students. Such a reconstruction of the study program should help the to develop a new, better than currently existing responding to the challenges of our present day, model of manager.

Due to tradition, we might preserve the word "manager" as the name of the profession to be performed by our students. But the content of this word should be changed; briefly speaking: enlarged. Manager of the 21st century should be a person professionally prepared to play various roles in various organizations: The roles of leaders, counselors, organization-designers… In traditional business organizations, in state and self-government institutions, in civil-society organizations…

Many thinkers (political scientists, psychologists, philosophers and others) claim that in the 21st century democratic society (subnational, national, transnational, global) should be negotiations-based (Reykowski, 2020; Owen, Smith, 2015). And since our age societies are and will be societies of organizations thus the negotiations referred to here are and will be mainly negotiations between organizations. The effectiveness of negotiations depends on great many factors. On some these factors (e.g. conflicts of interests) education has little, if any, influence. The influence on other factors might be considerable. First of all, the negotiating competences

are meant here. And among them: understanding of "logics" regulating strategies and tactics of organizations of all types. So education that makes future managers familiar with these "logics" should contribute to the development of democracy. – Perhaps to a slight degree. It should not discourage us: we are well aware after all that no simple solution to any serious problem exists. But a sum of many small contributions might result in a better world – for us, for our children, grandchildren.

Let us summarize these finale remarks:

1. The global (world) society (as well as individual societies) is society of organizations.

2. In such society decisions about methods of responding to global challenges should be achieved through negotiations.

3. Effectiveness of negotiations depends – among others – on mutual understanding.

4. Mutual understanding depends – among others – on awareness of various (economic, political, cultural…) perspectives in which various problems can be analyzed.

5. Therefore it is desirable that the education of the prospective leaders' (managers') of organizations equips them with the interdisciplinary knowledge delivering variety of perspectives.

6. To achieve this goal some – rather profound – changes in the in the management curricula would be necessary. (Some suggestions as to the character of such changes have been formulated in this paper.)

7. These changes would contribute – modestly but concretely – to the struggle with the global challenges facing mankind+.

References

1. Adam, R.P. (2008). Business Education. In: G. Jones, J. Zeitlin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Business History* (pp. 581-602). Oxford University Press.

2. Agazzi, E. (1997). *Dobro, zło i nauka. Etyczny wymiar działalności naukowo-technicznej.* Warszawa: Oficyna Akademicka.

3. Boda, Z. (2013). International Ethics and Globalization. In: L. Zsolnai (ed.), *Handbook of Business Ethics* (pp. 167-196). Oxford: Peter Lang.

4. Bornstein, D. (2007). *How To Change World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of the New Ideas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

5. Bostrom, N., Cirkovic, M.M. (2008). Introduction. In: N. Bostrom, M.M. Cirkovic, (eds.), *Global Catastrophic Risks* (pp. 1-30). Oxford: Oxford University Press

6. Brown, K.G., Rubin, R.S. (2017). Management Education in Business Schools. In: A. Wilkinson, S.J. Armstrong, *The Oxford Handbook of Management.* M. Lounsbury (Ed.) (pp. 437-460). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

7. Burgenmeier, B. (1992). *Socio-Economics: An Interdisciplinary Approach. Ethics, Institutions and Markets*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishing.

8. Caplan, B. (2008). The totalitarian threat. In: N. Bostrom, M.M., Cirkovic, (eds.), *Global Catastrophic Risks* (pp. 504-519). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

9. Cirincione, J. (2008). The continuing threat of nuclear war. In: N. Bostrom, M.M. Cirkovic (eds.), *Global Catastrophic Risks* (pp. 381-401). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

10. Clegg, S., Berti, M., Jarvis, W.P. (2017). Future in the Past: A Philosophical Reflection on the Prospects of Management. In: A. Wilkinson, S.J. Armstrong, *The Oxford Handbook of Management.* M. Lounsbury (Ed.) (pp. 145-177). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

11. Czajkowski, W. (2015). O pojęciu kryzysu intelektualnego. In: J. Auleytner, J. Kleer, (eds.), *Rewolucja informacyjna a kryzys intelektualny* (pp. 119-145). Warszawa: Komitet "Polska 2000 Plus" przy Prezydium PAN.

12. Frame, D., Allen, M.R. (2008). Climate change and global risk. In: N. Bostrom, M.M. Cirkovic (eds.), *Global Catastrophic Risks* (pp. 265-286). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

13. Freeman, R.E. (1984). *A Strategic Management. A Stakeholder Approach.* Boston: Pitman.

14. Fridson, P. (2008). Business History and History. In: G. Jones, J. Zeitlin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Business History* (pp. 9-36). Oxford University Press.

15. Griseri, P. (2013). *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Management.* Los Angeles: Sage.

16. Jonas, H. (1984). *The Imperative of Responsibility*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

17. Koslowski, P. (2010). *Elements of a Philosophy of Management and Organization*. Berlin: Springer.

18. Lamoreux, N.R., Raff, M.G., Temin, P. (2008). Economic History and Business History. In: G. Jones, J. Zeitlin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Business History*. Oxford University Press.

19. Mann, M. (1994). *The Source of Social Power, vol. 1: A history of power from the beginning to A.D. 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

20. Mann, M. (2013). *The Source of Social Power, vol. 4: Globalizations, 1945-2011.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

21. Millward, R. (2008). Business and the State. In: G. Jones, J. Zeitlin (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Business History*. Oxford University Press.

22. Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of Organization. Updated Edition.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

23. Noveck, B.S. (2009). *Wiki Government. How Technology Can Make Government Better, Democracy Stronger, And Citizens More Powerful*. Washington, D.C.: Brooking Institution Press.

24. O'Doherty, D., De Cock, Ch. (2017). Management as an Academic Discipline? In: A. Wilkinson, S.J. Armstrong, *The Oxford Handbook of Management.* M. Lounsbury (Ed.) (pp. 461-480). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

25. Osborne, D., and Gabler, T. (1992). *Reinvent Government.* New York: Plume.

26. Owen, D., and Smith, G. (2015). Survey Article: Deliberation democracy and the systemic turn. *Journal of Political Philosophy, 23.2*, pp. 213-234.

27. Picht, G. (1969). *Mut zur Utopie.Die grossen Zukunftaugaben*. Munchen: Piper Verlag.

28. Przybylska-Czajkowska, B. (2019). Human rights – sustainability – corporate social responsibility, part I: some remarks on human rights. *Silesian University of Technology, Scientific Papers. Organization & Management, No. 141,* pp. 319-331.

29. Przybylska-Czajkowska, B. (2019a). Human rights – sustainability – corporate social responsibility, part II: some remarks on sustainability. *Silesian University of Technology, Scientific Papers. Organization & Management, No. 141,* pp. 332-344.

30. Przybylska-Czajkowska, B. (2019b). Human rights – sustainability – corporate social responsibility, part III: some remarks on corporate social responsibility. *Silesian University of Technology, Scientific Papers. Organization & Management, No. 141,* pp. 345-358.

31. Rees, M. (2007) Techno-Optimism and Energy Challenge. In: J. Brockman (Ed.) *What are you optimistic about?: Today's Leading Thinkers On Why Things are Good and Getting Better* (pp. 33-34). New York: Harper Perennial.

32. Reykowski, J (2020). *Disenchantment with Democracy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

33. Ross, C. (2012). *Leaderless Revolution: How Ordinary People Will Take Power and Change Politics in the 21ˢᵗ Century.*

34. Sewell, G. (2017). Management and Modernity. In: A. Wilkinson, S.J. Armstrong, *The Oxford Handbook of Management.* M. Lounsbury (Ed.) (pp. 400-418). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

35. Singer, P. (2002). *One World. The Ethics of Globalization.* New Haven: Yale university Press.

36. Stern, N. (2009). *The Global Deal: Climate Change and the Creation of a New Era of Progress and Prosperity*. New York: Public Affairs.

37. Sturdy, A., Wright, Ch., Wylie, N. (2017). Management as Consultancy: Ambivalence, Complexity and Change. In: A. Wilkinson, S.J. Armstrong, *The Oxford Handbook of Management.* M. Lounsbury (Ed.) (pp. 518-538). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

38. Tenacti, A. (2013). The Sustainability-Oriented Capitalism. In: L. Zsolnai (ed.), *Handbook of Business Ethics* (pp. 197-216). Oxford: Peter Lang.

39. The World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

40. Wallerstein, I. (2001). *The End of the World as We Know It: Social Science for The Twenty First Century.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Pres.

41. Weingart, P. (1995). *Grenzueberschreitungenin der Wissenschaft*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

42. Weingart, P., Stehr, N. (2000). *Practicing Interdisciplinarity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

43. Weizsacker von, E.U., Wijkman, A. (2018). *Come On! Capitalism, Short-termism, Population and the Destruction of the Planet – A Report to the Club of Rome.* New York: Springer.

44. Wilkinson, A., Armstrong, S.J., Lounsbury, M. (2017). Introduction and Theoretical Overview: Management – Past, Present and Future. In: A. Wilkinson, S.J. Armstrong, M. Lounsbury, *The Oxford Handbook of Management.* M. Lounsbury (Ed.) (pp. 11-16). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

45. Wright, R. (1999). *Nonzero. The Logic of Human Destiny.* New York: Pantheon Books.