

WHAT ARE ORGANISATIONS?

1

When you have read this chapter, you will be able to:

- analyse and critique definitions of organisation
- evaluate potential conditions for an organisation to be said to exist.

DEFINING 'ORGANISATION' IN TERMS OF MEMBERSHIP

1.1 The most fundamental question in any philosophical enquiry into organisations and management is: what exactly is an organisation? We can distinguish the two following senses of this question:

What is it for something in general to be an organisation?
How can we decide whether a specific 'thing' is an organisation or not?

Although the two questions are clearly related, it may be possible to answer the first and not be able to answer the second. I may accept that an organisation possesses features *a, b, c, d*, but not be able to find out whether some particular collection of people has all of these features. Or I may see features *a, b, c* and *d* all present, but not be sure that they all attach to the same identified entity.

When we talk about an organisation, it goes beyond the physical manifestations – we do not mean just the buildings, or the people. Take away the buildings and you have an operational problem – but the organisation has not ceased to exist. Take away the people, leaving the rest, and you have a bigger problem, but arguably there is still an organisation there, something waiting to be re-populated. The 'organisation' is somehow abstracted from its people and its buildings – just as it would be from the machinery, the legal documents, the goods and services it produces and delivers. It 'exists' – but we do not seem to be able to explain how in terms of its components. Each of the things mentioned above are part of something being an organisation,

but no specific cluster of them represents 'the' organisation. None is necessary, and none on its own is sufficient – even a set of legal documents defining a company is not enough for us to say that an organisation exists. Some cluster of these elements must be sufficient for us to say that an organisation exists, but it is difficult to pin down exactly which.

Let us start by looking at a couple of 'standard' definitions of an organisation, as given in Box 1.1.

BOX 1.1

DEFINITIONS OF 'ORGANISATION'

Business Dictionary (online)

A social unit of people, systematically structured and managed to meet a need or to pursue collective goals on a continuing basis.

Oxford English Dictionary

An organized group of people with a particular purpose, such as a business or government department

As this indicates, one well known attempt at a definition of an organisation is that it is a collection of individuals somehow associated with the achievement of certain goals. The first example of this kind of definition makes clear that these are somehow 'collective'. One would presume that this indicates that they are commonly agreed amongst that group of people. But this on its own is not enough – a group of protesters demonstrating in the street will often have a set of commonly agreed goals, but they will not comprise an organisation.

Both of the definitions given above also include some aspect of control – in one the idea of the group being 'systematically structured' and in the other of being 'organised'. But again our protesters might be systematically structured – one group is set up to go to the palace, and another to the government buildings – without that making them an organisation. Some definitions of 'organisation' include the idea of being self-consciously structured and purposive, but again a group of protesters might be fully aware of what they are doing, how and why, without this making them an organisation.

We might turn this around and ask what are the differences between a collection of people such as a group of protesters, and an organisation? One presumably is that there is a formal process of including someone in an organisation – it possesses *recognised members*, which the protesters would generally not have. Another might be that it has a *degree of longevity* that a group of protesters would not have, these having come together often almost spontaneously for a specific and defined event.

So perhaps our definition could become:

An ongoing group of individuals who are formally recognised as associated with the group, and with a common set of goals which they are systematically structured to accomplish

Is this enough? Well, the standard turn in philosophical discussion is to see if we can construct a *counter-example* – here this would be either a case that we would all agree is an organisation but lacks some aspect of this definition, or one that we would all agree is *not* an organisation but has all of these features (in fact we already did the latter when discussing the previous purported definition, by looking at the example of groups of protesters). If that attempt fails then we might feel justified in accepting this as a definition, provisionally at least.

Now consider this case: a number of customers of a retail computer company have been asked by a PR company to form a users' group for the company. They regularly visit an online forum, where they express their views, give feedback, swap explanations of how to deal with certain problems, etc. They have to register online with a password and user name in order to be able to read or write to the forum. They participate because they all want to improve the services of the company. And they are clear that their role has a place in the structure of how the company gains feedback from their customers. Are they an organisation in their own right?

It is not clear how we should answer this. The collection fits the purported definition given above. The individuals have an ongoing relationship, they have some kind of formal association, they have a commonality in their goals, and there is a structure to their contributions. But do these individuals regard *themselves* as part of an organisation? Some might but it is just as possible that some might not – indeed it is not impossible that *none* of them thought this.

Such an 'organisation', where no one thinks that they are members, would seem to be a weird kind of set-up, almost an illusion or a deception, and runs counter to what people generally seem to say about organisations. The *recognition* of the organisation's existence seems to be a key part of the idea. So it seems that a further part of something being an organisation is that it is somehow or other perceived by members or others as a unit, an entity.

Around this point some readers may be feeling impatient. Why do we need to spend so much time worrying over definitions? We all know what an organisation is – look at the examples: Tata Motors, Goldman Sachs, Amazon, the Australian Government, the International Monetary Fund, Amnesty International, FIFA and so on. It is pretty clear to most people that these are organisations, so if we cannot give a watertight definition does that matter?

It may matter more than appears at first sight. If we cannot give a clear definition then we will not know how to deal with new cases. Today some organisations have very small physical manifestations, being mainly organised around internet networks. If I have a problem with a particular organisation, where do I go for redress? If there is a building then it is clear where I go. But some organisations nowadays are what are called 'shell' companies, with no physical office, and perhaps just a website to indicate their presence to me. Similarly, in so-called group structures, where there is a holding company and a number of subsidiaries, it is often extremely difficult to sort out which is the 'real' company from a legal pyramid of cross-holdings and so-called 'paper' companies. So what exactly is 'the' organisation can in some cases become confusing, even though in many other cases (e.g. a small store in our local area) we can see and know clearly that it is an organisation. Furthermore, as we have indicated above, some collections of people may form quickly and without the supporting manifestations of offices, legal contracts etc. that we usually look to as signs of an organisation.

DEFINITIONS IN TERMS OF AGREEMENT

1.2 So we see that there are problems with the membership aspects of standard definitions. There are further issues with what counts as 'agreed' or 'common' goals, as well as with who exactly are the people who might be counted as 'members' of an organisation.

Consider what makes something an *agreed* goal of an organisation. Does this mean that everyone in the organisation agrees to it? Hardly – it is well known that many employees do not share the official goals of their organisation. So is it a *majority* accord that is necessary? One problem with this is that we might not actually know what proportion of the workforce agrees with the official goals of the company: people often do not admit to their doubts over corporate goals, in case this might adversely affect their position in the organisation. Another is that it would seem odd to say that one group of people with, say 51 percent agreement, with goals, is an organisation, whilst another, with say 48 percent agreement, is not. And whatever percentage one specified, a similar argument would apply.

So is agreement with corporate goals not necessary at all for something to be an organisation? Remember that here we are trying to understand what it is for something to be an organisation at all, not whether an organisation is well run, or healthy, or effective. Consider the opposite case: suppose there were a collection of people, systematically structured in their activity, where *no one* actually agreed with corporate goals. It might be unusual but it would seem plausible to say it is an organisation – perhaps someone once set the organisation up with certain goals in mind, set these out in a codified form, and no one has ever questioned these, even though no one now really accepts them.

So it looks like ‘common’ goals in our definition of an organisation is not exactly the same as ‘agreed’ goals. But we would presumably still want to have some sense in which the goals that people are working towards have some connection. A group of individuals, however systematic in their behaviour, who are working towards completely different goals is not an organisation in the sense of an economically or socially relevant collective activity. So we presumably will need to include in our definition some idea that people are working towards similar or common goals. Exactly how many people, and exactly how similar, may be difficult to establish. That a few people are working against corporate goals would not mean that the collective was not an organisation. And in many cases there may not be an exact identity between people’s understanding of what the corporate goals are. Various departments in an organisation will often have their own slant on what is being done – the marketing department of a car manufacturer may talk of meeting the customers’ needs for new and reliable vehicles, whilst the HR department may talk of enabling staff to have the right skills and rewards for the efficient production of cars. Producing cars is central here, so variations between different departments’ or individuals’ understanding of this may not matter.

However, a couple of unusual cases may clarify this aspect of our definition. Firstly, consider a group of scientific experts, called together by their government to work on a certain project; in reality the government wants to spy on them to see if any of them are likely to reveal state secrets to a foreign power. Now, here there is a structure, and there are common goals. But these goals are not the reason why the ‘organisation’ was set up. This seems to be on the fringes of what we might regard as a genuine organisation – we might say that it was an organisation with deceptive official goals. Now change this example a little – each expert is told a different story about the project, so that each of them has a different understanding of what it is about, and is instructed that under no circumstances must they reveal this to any of their fellow project workers. So we have a whole collection of people, working in a structured way, but all with a different idea of what they are doing.³ Again this is odd, but probably we would still say that it is an organisation – the scientists are working in a concerted way towards a goal, though it is not actually one that any of them knows about, still less accepts.

So maybe we can discard the idea of commonly agreed or shared goals. What is important is not whether the members of the organisation share or agree the goals, so much as that there is some goal towards which all are in some way working, even if they do not actually know what that is. So ‘common’ goal

³Perhaps this is less far fetched than it might at first sight seem. Governments, especially when they are developing military technology, may not wish to entrust their scientists with the knowledge of what is being done, in case one of them might violate security and reveal the nature of the project to outsiders.

for the purposes of our definition is not the same as 'commonly understood'. It need not carry any sense of someone being aware of the real object of the organisation.

Now let us look at yet another similar case. Consider a similar group of scientific experts who are asked to work on a project, but are not told that they are doing so. Each may be asked to work on a specific task, without being informed that it is intended to fit in with what others are doing. Here they may still be working in a systematic way towards a goal that someone at least has in mind, but lack any sense that they are working together. As far as they are concerned they are dealing with one specific task that has no bearing on what anyone else is doing. True, they might suspect that there is some further value to what they are doing – after all, nothing is much use in isolation – but as far as they know there is no co-ordinated collective activity or end to which they are contributing. Some government research establishments may well work like this – investigating a range of different things, one or more of which some official hopes may lead to a valuable result, but of which the scientists are unaware, and without any formal link between what each researcher is doing. In such cases it may not even be that their activities can in fact be co-ordinated – it might require an investigation to determine whether this process or that can fit together at all – but what would count is that someone at least hopes or expects that they might. It is probably a matter for each reader to read this and consider for themselves whether or not this would be justifiably considered as an organisation – but it is at least plausible to say so.

Now consider a more extreme version of this example, where the scientists happen to be working somewhere, on things that *some external individual* thinks might lead to some useful result. Perhaps a criminal mastermind is observing the work of a variety of scientists, perhaps even subtly influencing what they do, in the belief that if this scientist achieves result x and this other scientist achieves result y , and so on, then s/he, the mastermind, can use the knowledge gained to construct some deadly weapon. It seems less plausible to consider this as an organisation. It would be incidental to the formal activity of the scientists that any co-ordinated result came about, even though someone – the criminal mastermind – was actively trying to make this happen. In the earlier case the scientists might be aware, in some vague sense, that some co-ordination of their work might take place, even though it was not part of their detailed understanding exactly what or who was doing it, whereas in this case it seems that such co-ordination is the specific intention of no one directly formally associated with the activity of the scientists.

So, our discussion of these various hypothetical cases seems to have established the following:

- Physical manifestations of an organisation are not necessary elements of an organisation.
- Members or participants of the organisation need not be aware of the common goal.

- Someone formally associated with the organisation needs to have a goal that relates to the activity of the collective.
- The activities of members/participants need by and large to be co-ordinated, or to have the possibility of being co-ordinated.

What is interesting about these points is that they do not actually refute the two definitions given in Box 1.1. They do place them in context, clarifying especially the ideas of collective goals and of co-ordination. The arguments on which they are based do, however, turn on our instinctive, intuitive ideas about what we would be prepared to call an organisation, and someone might simply challenge such intuitive responses. Certainly, at some points the decision as to whether a case was one of an organisation or not, seemed to be if not arbitrary at least rather close.

Maybe, however, we are searching for too much. Up until now we have been trying to answer both of the questions we stated at the start of this chapter; not only what we mean by the idea of an organisation but also how we would decide in any particular case that something was or was not an organisation. The Austrian philosopher Wittgenstein suggested that we understand meaning differently. He said that the totality of examples of a word or term is not always exhaustively set by an existing explanation of its meaning – this is one of the consequences of his argument about not being able to predict a whole series of steps when following a rule after being given a series of examples. He said instead that when faced with a fresh case that raised a question of whether it might count as an example of the term or not, we would make decisions based on a range of features. Each new example that we accepted would have a *family resemblance* to other examples already accepted, but there would not necessarily be a specific set of properties that they absolutely had to have. In our case, we might say that the family resemblances would cluster around ideas of collective activity, of co-ordination, of a collective outcome or purpose. But arguably the examples we have encountered suggest that there is no specific interpretation of these that is the determining factor in whether or not something is an organisation.

HOW DO ORGANISATIONS EXIST?

1.3 At this stage we will move away from the issue of defining an organisation (not that we have settled the matter) and look at the other question we posed ourselves in this section: in what way would we say that an organisation exists? When does one come into being, and when would it cease? When can we say that there is one organisation or many present in a situation?

We can see that our discussion of *definitions* helps us to understand some of the issues about the *existence* or otherwise of organisations. We could say that an organisation exists when some of those features identified in what

we called the standard definition are present. But this is easier said than achieved. For one thing, we have argued that whilst some aspect of co-ordinated objective is involved, it does not seem to be connected directly with the conscious intentions of any individual. So it would be difficult in some of our more extreme examples to detect whether there really was an organisation present or not – in some cases there may be a collection of people without anyone consciously having a structured plan as to what they are doing, and yet their behaviour looks very similar to another group where in fact someone did have such an intention. Box 1.2 indicates a puzzling example of this issue.

BOX 1.2

THE SHORT LIFE OF AN ORGANISATION

The High Fields Arts Collective was the idea of Johan Roers, a retired theatre manager. He realised that in his local rural community there were several people who had some connection with the performing arts. He contacted 16 people and suggested that they form an amateur arts group serving the community. Several were interested in such a move, although they mostly expressed some kind of reservation: one said that they would be ready to support the initiative so long as there were sufficient other supporters with professional experience, to ensure that it was of a good standard.

Mr Roers felt that this was good encouragement, and wrote a short business plan, sought and obtained a small degree of funding from the local council, hired a space for rehearsals and with an office, printed leaflets and notified local media. An inaugural meeting was set for a specific date and Mr Roers contacted everyone who had expressed some interest, inviting them to this.

No one arrived for that meeting. When Mr Roers contacted each of the invitees, the message was the same – they thought it was a good idea but wanted to see how much interest there was before they would make a commitment to joining. Regretfully, Mr Roers cancelled the room hire and returned the council grant. No more was heard of the High Fields Arts Collective.

Did this organisation exist at all? If so, for how long? If not, what did it lack?

There are however further potential problems with the existence of an organisation. Generally speaking if one can talk about an 'it' one should be able to identify an example. Now in one sense this is very clear – we can give lots of examples of organisations. But could we point to one? I can

point to the offices of, say, Citibank. I can even point to its head office. But is this the same as pointing to *the organisation itself*? Suppose Citibank changed its head office, or decided to have just virtual offices; it is still the same organisation. So the physical presence of a building does not constitute its existence. And similarly with its staff – no one individual or group of individuals comprises the organisation: if the organisation changes its people it does not change into a different organisation, it is the same business but simply with different workers.

As we saw earlier, similar things could be said of its legal documents. But Citibank exists, in a way that Lehman Brothers does not (these days).

Lehman Brothers is an interesting example of a former organisation. It clearly once upon a time existed: people traded with it, worked for it, lent it money or borrowed from it, and yet at a certain point it began to cease to exist. However, at the time of writing (summer 2011) the organisation has not entirely disappeared – there is an operation called Lehman Brothers Holdings which is carrying out tasks such as preparing to deal with creditor demands, etc. So even bankruptcy is not exactly the final moment in the existence of an organisation; there are various legal moves that need to be finalised before a firm completely disappears, and in some cases a company may be rescued during those final days or weeks, say if some investment ‘angel’ comes along and decides to bale out the bankrupt company. This has happened several times with sports clubs, which have loyal followers but on several occasions have come close to being shut down. And even when an ‘angel’ does not come to the rescue of a company, it may have residual obligations, and even funds, that require something to persist for some time to come. Where one organisation ends and another begins may be difficult to easily indicate. For example, upon the closure of the Greater London Council (GLC) in the UK in 1988, an organisation called the London Residuary Body took over some of the remaining funds of the GLC and administered some of its services, even employing some of the GLC staff, and using its premises. How different is this from the situation where a government official continues to administer the finances of a company, paying tax, bank loans, and obligations to shareholders? In the first case it is clear that one organisation has ceased to exist and another has taken over some of its activities. In the second it looks more as if one organisation is being slowly wound down, so it is in the process of ceasing to exist, even though it has not finally ‘died’.

The position can become more fuzzy still – suppose a company whose name is a well known brand goes into bankruptcy, and then as it finally is disappearing an entrepreneur comes along, buys up the brand name and carries on producing and selling the product in exactly the same way as it had been produced before, under the old company name. Has the old organisation continued, albeit with a brief interruption, or is it a new organisation that happens to look very similar to one that existed before?

HOW DO ORGANISATIONS COME INTO BEING?

1.4 If we look at the other end of the life of an organisation – when it comes into being – there are parallel areas of uncertainty. Clearly there are some points at which we can definitely say that an organisation exists, for example when it has been constituted by legal deed. However, although that may mark the beginning of the legal existence of an organisation, it is clear that it may have already existed for some time already, outside of a legal definition in effect.

Suppose two people start doing something together, working out a systematic division of activity between them, with a common purpose. Has an organisation come into being? If they intend to carry on then one might be tempted to say that it has. Suppose, though, that the two people do not intend to work together for more than one event (perhaps they are organising a street party for example) and yet afterwards they decide they will – when did an organisation come into being? When they decided to carry on working, or when they started working together originally? Either answer seems plausible. If we were to say that it was when they first started working together, this would have the odd conclusion that some such ‘organisations’ come into being and then pass away without anyone ever noticing this – when, say, these two people started organising a street party together but never decided to do anything else. On the other hand, if we say that an organisation exists when two people decide that they will work together on an ongoing basis that would seem to suggest that the critical feature is someone’s *intention* to work collectively. But what if one person of the two decides that they want to do this and the other does not, and then eventually the first person persuades the second to work together – did the organisation come into being at that time or at the earlier time when someone first thought of this?

In practical terms it may not look as if an answer to this matters, but it is extreme and unusual cases like this that probe our understanding of what we mean by talking of an organisation existing. Certainly there are many anecdotes of successful visionary entrepreneurs who had an idea and then had to persist in overcoming opposition and apathy before anyone took them seriously. Suppose one of these had a clear idea of what they wanted to do, and how the organisation that they wanted to set up would operate. Do we identify the beginning of the organisation as the point at which someone else agrees to work with the entrepreneur, even though the entrepreneur already has a clear picture of how the organisation will work? Look back at Box 1.2 – it is tempting to say that there never was an organisation in this case, but presumably if just one person had turned up to the inaugural meeting we would probably conclude that the organisation did in fact exist.

Related to this is the question of whether there can be such a thing as a single-person organisation. A two-person organisation where one person leaves is presumably still an organisation, and there are after all many one-person companies. So if our entrepreneur decides that s/he will run a business in such and such a way, even though later on they will need other people to help them, once they have thought of this then it would seem that we have to agree that an organisation has already come into being. But what about bright ideas of this kind that never reach the light of day? Are these organisations that never started, organisations that started in someone's mind but never got any further, or are they not organisations at all unless they eventually gained some kind of physical manifestation? The latter, though reasonable, would make it possible that two people might have exactly the same idea, with the same conception of how to operationalise it, and yet one of these is the beginning of an organisation (because it does eventually turn into a real organisation) whilst the other is not (because it never goes any further).

Puzzles also appear with the idea of how we identify or individuate organisations. The typical modern multinational company is in reality a cluster of legally separate companies, for example each national subsidiary may have a distinct legal status, the 'only' connection being that a holding company back in the home country owns a controlling share in the subsidiary. Some conglomerate corporations own companies that they have no intention of absorbing into their main operations, and hold others that they are trying to fully merge into the main firm. One or many organisations? This is indeed a practical issue as we need to know exactly who is finally accountable for the actions of a subsidiary, and there have been cases where a holding company has avoided being taken to task for illegal or unethical behaviour specifically because they deny direct responsibility for a subsidiary's actions.

Further, when one person starts working with someone else, and then decides to do something separately, when is this a different organisation? A famous example concerns the social networking company Facebook – the originator of this, Mark Zuckerberg, was associated with three co-students who later claimed that Zuckerberg had agreed to work with them on developing their version of a social networking website.⁴ Whatever the specifics of this particular case, it is clear that in some cases we might regard someone as working as part of an organisation by assenting to do so, and therefore whatever is so developed could in principle be regarded as the property of the original 'organisation'.

These examples indicate that especially in the case of business start-ups, where there is often a degree of fluidity about what is being done and on

⁴Which they called HarvardConnection.com. The three co-students were Cameron Winklevoss, Tyler Winklevoss, and Divya Narendra. The story was dramatised in the movie *The Social Network*.

whose behalf, the question of what organisation, and how many of these, has come into existence may become a substantial matter. Our discussion seems to indicate that at least sometimes someone's *intentions and beliefs* may be an important element in whether or not an organisation exists, or has come into being. But as we have seen, the presence of an intention does not seem to be a necessary condition of an organisation existing, and in some cases may not even be sufficient.

THE SUBSTANCE OF AN ORGANISATION

1.5 Of course these puzzles only appear because we are trying to pin down exactly what an organisation is. They need not create serious problems for a professional manager or entrepreneur, but they do underline that the concept of 'organisation' is not easily explained with absolute precision.

One of the most celebrated discussions of existence is to be found in the work of Aristotle⁵ where he explains that although we can use the idea of existence in many different ways, these all stem from a fundamental sense, in which something is what he calls a *substance*. This is not to be identified with anything material, but is related to the *essence* of something, what something is at root (what makes something an organisation at all) as opposed to accidental features it may have (this organisation is large, that one is small etc.). Essence is what something is by definition. Although Aristotle's views are difficult to clarify, and commentators differ strongly about what he actually meant, we can summarise his view as being that the essence of something is related not to its material content but to its *form*. We could therefore infer from this that the essence of an organisation is not the bricks, or the people, but the means in which these are combined.

Without being committed to a full acceptance of Aristotle's ideas, we might draw on this idea and construct an interpretation of an organisation as a certain kind of form. Organisations have to have physical manifestations, just as a statue needs to be made of something. As we have seen, the essence of the organisation is not bricks, people, or documents etc., but some other underlying feature. We have not entirely clarified this, but arising out of the many puzzles we have identified there seems to be a core sense of an organisation as being related to *the intentions* of individuals to work to achieve certain outcomes or purposes. The puzzles we encountered mainly stem from treating an organisation as rather like an object,

⁵Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book Zeta.

with specific boundaries in space and time (when does it start? where is it? and where does it stop?). Once we focus on the essence of an organisation relating to intentions then these go away, for this makes the essence of an organisation more of an idea than an object, and ideas do not have beginnings and endings, or insides and outsides. Note that we said ‘more of’ – organisations would not be purely ideas: they have physical aspects, such as the people, documents, buildings etc. referred to previously. But following Aristotle’s style of thinking, we might say that these are accidental aspects, and the underlying reality of an organisation is its idea.

Where have we got to in this discussion, then? We have seen that there are many puzzles if we regard an organisation as basically a kind of object. An Aristotelian kind of account, one that identifies the essence or form of an organisation as related to its intention, ducks these problems. This is not, though, to suggest that such an account is absent from its own problems. As we have seen – whose intention? And also when do these intentions come into play? Several of the puzzles previously considered come into play all over again, and other fresh ones may also become apparent (e.g. how to account for changes in the intentions of key individuals within the organisation). However, we have seen enough to recognise some at least of the issues involved in considering how an organisation may be said to exist.

The key lessons we have learnt from this chapter are:

- The definition of what it is for something to be called an organisation appears to rest on the idea of an intention.
- The existence of an organisation also involves reference to intentions though there are problems with this.
- An approach such as Aristotelianism provides partial answers to these issues, though in doing so they tend to make clearer the problems, rather than provide definitive final answers.

In the next chapter we will again try to establish definitions – in that case, looking at what work is.

QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION

- 1 If two people decide to form an organisation, but then never do anything about it, has an organisation ever existed? If so, how long does it exist for? If not, what needs to happen for us to say it has come into being?
- 2 In what circumstances could you have a fake organisation – one that someone makes out exists when it does not at all? What if someone is fooled by this and genuinely starts ‘working’ for this fake organisation?

FURTHER READING

There is a massive literature on Aristotle's metaphysics. Interested readers are advised to start with an introduction such as the *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Aristotle and the "Metaphysics"*, by V. Politis (Routledge, 2004).

An interesting alternative view of criminality and organisation (a topic which will be referred to again in the next chapter) may be found in *Alternative Business: Outlaws, Crime and Culture* by M. Parker (Routledge, 2011)