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0. Introduction

The creation and development of the German historical school and the so-called socialism ex cathedra fell on a highly turbulent period in the Polish history.
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Until 1918 it had been deprived of its own statehood, partitioned by three empires. Following the quashing of the anti-Russian uprising of 1863-1864, modern political movements started gradually budding within the Polish society, the most relevant of which came to be nationalism and socialism. Although both originated with similar traditions, at the turn of the centuries these political movements became hostile toward each other. Present day political parties started developing in the 1990s.

Western European political ideas were arriving in the Polish soil and were being supported and interpreted by many. Interest in the achievements of the German historical school in Poland arose not only from them coinciding with “socialism ex cathedra” and the development of modern political movements on the Polish soil. The German “socialism ex cathedra” was a movement for social reform, modernizing social life and improving the lives of the less fortunate social strata. It was hardly a coincidence that this community’s organization came to be referred to as Verein für Socialpolitik. Enforcing the economic policy, the state was to have been at its heart, not merely one of its participants. Broadly considered national socialism, in which socialism ex cathedra may also be included, tended to glorify the state as such1. Siding with the state, Gustav Schmoller was among the sceptical of, for instance, organized labour.

The turbulent and dramatic history of Polish attempts at regaining independence and failed insurrections resulted in modern political movements and partially social elites growing aware of the need to institute far-reaching social reforms. Political parties and movements differed from one another in terms of the pace and scope of such reforms. It was believed by the main Polish socialist movement - the Polish Socialist Party - that the rebirth of independent would guarantee progressive social reforms and that the continuity of the state hinged on the support of labourers and peasants. Poland was mostly impoverished farmland, moreover the Poland of 1918 comprised territories which used to belong to three different states. The German scenario was thus interesting to Poles due to the German problems related to particular regions of the country developing asymmetrically. Apart from the modernization challenges which Germany was facing, what drew Poles’ attention to the German historical school was the presumption that each nation would develop separately2. This implied a significant role of the state in the economy as a development factor, and not merely as a “night watchman” - as believed fitting by the classic economic theory. As per the writings of German “socialists ex cathedra”, the natural state was by no means perfect3. There was a prevalent awareness that the working class would not free itself from poverty, unless aided by the state4.

Internal social stratification and backwardness - especially that of Eastern Poland, prompted taking into consideration the educational function of the state in addition to simple economic interventionism. Gustav Schmoller used the notion of Kulturstaat, which was something more than liberal Rechtsstaat. It ought to have been more to social life than merely a constitutional body. It was expected
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3 J. Rae, Contemporary Socialism, New York: Charles Scribner’s Son, 1884, p. 196.
to assume the role of an agent creating social life in a positive manner\textsuperscript{5}. The state was to be the largest moral institution for development and education in history\textsuperscript{6}.

What also did not go unnoticed by Polish politicians and scholars was patriotism declared by “socialists ex cathedra”. The official representative of the Ministry of Labour was present at the Eisenbach convention\textsuperscript{7}. Toward the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, part of the scholars affiliated with the German historical school found themselves influenced by imperialist ideologies\textsuperscript{8}. Imperialism in the social context also garnered interest. One of the criticisms of the classical economic theory was rejecting its cosmopolitan nature\textsuperscript{9}.

Polish nationalism was strongly influenced by the Catholic church, thus acknowledging it to be an element of the Polish nation’s ethnogenesis. Hence ethical issues prevailed in culturally conservative Polish nationalism. However, the Polish Socialist Party was under a strong influence of Austrian Marxism (mostly so in the South, in Austrian Poland). Austrian Marxists strived to supplement the Marxist theory with ethical reflections. In the meantime, according to German historical school scholars, the economic doctrine cannot be devoid of either the idea of progress or the moral component. Economic entitlements are ethical, not physical rights. Economic policy is not morally neutral as it concerns human life. “Socialists ex cathedra” accused the advocates of “Manchester economy” of negating not only the role of the state, but also ethics\textsuperscript{10}.

Antiliberalism, advocated by the German historical school, was considered attractive by Polish interpreters. Schmoller stood against the “tyranny of the
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Manchester Party". What is worth remembering is that its genesis featured the weakness of urbanites and liberalism in Germany after 1848 - the policy of abandoning liberalism in Germany in the 19th century. Polish urbanites, traditionally associated with liberalism, were much less abundant in comparison with the more affluent Western world. Political parties with liberal leanings played a marginal role.

Supporters of various political ideologies were interested in the German historical school owing to its ambivalent stance on socialism. It was perceived as a Third Way between socialism, liberalism and individualism. On the one hand it approved of some diagnoses of the socialist left wing, suggested similar social reforms, the development of education, etc. It remained particularly close to the experiences of German lassalism. However, in terms of political leanings it was a meeting place for a broad spectrum of individuals ranging from lassalist social democrats to conservatists. It grew out of criticizing the idea of social revolution. Its leading representatives did not spread the main slogan of socialist ideologies, i.e. nationalizing the means of production. Adolph Wagner, who was perceived as radical and close to the left wing, acknowledged the need for private property to serve the common good. Thus, it ought to be modified rather than liquidated. He only considered the prospect of turning municipal grounds into social property. Schmoller did not advocate the clash of social classes, but rather improving inter-class relationships. Nor did he negate the natural differences between individuals. “Socialists ex cathedra” warned against the threat of social and political experiments. Their activities were partially aimed against social democrats. The animating congress Verein für Socialpolitik of 1873 in Eisenbach was held in order to, among others, show that social democracy does not have a monopoly over social issues. In 1881 Adolph Wagner ran for Parliament against August Bebel.

The writings of the historical school leading figures were read by Polish economists of various leanings, including representatives of the liberal, post-classical movement, whose views differed greatly from those of Schmoller and others. It would be impossible to include all economists who may have partially shared the ideas of the German historical school. The idea of the Polish chapter of the historical school would be difficult to conceive, despite accepting many of its claims. It was accompanied by criticism of other views of German scholars.
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What is worth adding is that inconsistent views also characterized both the German economists affiliated with this ideology, and their Polish interpreters. The purpose of this paper is to explicate the Polish interpretations of "socialism ex cathedra", including the work of Gustav Schmoller, from the point of view of the Polish political thought, and not simply as an element of discussion among professional economists. The leading Polish interpreters of the German historical school would lean toward the main political parties, despite being professional economists. Therefore, they may be placed somewhere on the left wing - right wing continuum. The economists and politicians closer to the right wing end of the spectrum mostly saw in Gustav Schmoller and Adolph Wagner the German historical school, which took into account the significance of the nation and resentment toward individualism, while at the same time perceiving its representatives as reformers contributing to saving capitalism. What seemed appealing to nationalisists and conservatists was the rejection of Anglo-Saxon liberalism and combining the conservative morals with striving to reform in the spirit of social harmony. The theorists closer to the left wing mostly saw socialism ex cathedra and a call to resolve social issues by way of state intervention. They criticized ideological conservatism and contested the scholarly foundations of the historical school.

1. Conservative and nationalist interpreters of socialism ex cathedra

1.1. Leon Biliński: a conservative and social practitioner of socialism ex cathedra

The most prominent Polish advocate of socialism ex cathedra was Leon Biliński (1846-1923). His prominence consisted not only in the fact that he was one of the forerunners of drawing attention to the German historical school, but also because he directly participated in Verein für Socialpolitik and he was an active and significant practitioner of social policy in the Habsburg state. He held a doctoral degree in law and he was a professor of economics. He was also Dean of Lviv University in the years 1878-1879. His political career began in the City Council of Lviv (1880-1882). He later went on to take a parliamentary seat in Vienna. In this capacity he contributed to introducing social laws in the Austro-Hungarian state. In 1886 he reported on the Labourers Health Insurance Act. On several occasions he was the Minister of Finance (1895-1897, 1909-1910, 1912-1915). During WWI he was also engaged in the struggle for Polish independence, lending his support to those political forces which counted on rebuilding Poland in cooperation with the central powers. In 1919, he briefly served as the Minister of Treasury in one of the first governments of independent Poland.

In 1878, already holding the title of economics professor in Lviv, he travelled to Jena, where he met Bruno Hildebrand - one of the key figures of the German historical school. Biliński was among the participants of the Verein für Socialpolitik founding convention at Wartburg castle. He networked particularly well with...

---

Adolph Held. As he later recalled, he participated in the discussion without much success. He wrote of the German participants: "there were kind to me, but reserved: it was already the time of anti-Polish sentiments, after all"26.

At the outset of his political career he was close to the liberal democratic circles in the Polish part of the Habsburg Empire. Yet he was quick to become one of the most prominent conservatives. His views, however, were rather unorthodox - closer to the left wing. He warned against the ramifications of social inequality, which may disrupt the social balance and lead to a revolution. Therefore, social reforms were in order. However, Polish conservatives from Galicia - the Polish part of Austro-Hungary, denounced the idea of social reform and continued advocating the elitist concept of social life.

Biliński perceived the German historical school as part of the anti-liberal tradition. He divided it into three parts. The first, German romantics (among others Adam Müller), the second, advocates of protectionism (among others Friedrich List), and the third, the German historical school, whose leadership he credited to Karl Knies i Wilhelm Roscher27. He saw Jean Sismondi as the forerunner. The Polish conservative contested putting the German historical school and socialism on equal footing, because socialists ex cathedra rejected the perspective of a political revolution28. Biliński considered Schmoller’s concepts, and those of others, as a Third Way between Adam Smith’s liberalism and socialism, defined as total involvement of the state in the economy. He recognized the similarities between Schmoller’s and Lassalle’s ideologies. Socialists ex cathedra were “the softest shade of reformers”29. In a similar way he placed socialism ex cathedra within the dispute over ownership. At one end of the spectrum were the conservatives, blindly defending private property, at the other - social democrats, demanding nationalization. Socialists ex cathedra were in the middle of this spectrum. Biliński quoted the opinion of Wagner and Adolph Samtner, who accepted property socialization to a very limited extent. Social economy should strive to limit the use of private property, rather than abolish it entirely.

He acknowledged the merits of the historical school on two plains. One was social policy. He appreciated the role of the historical school, which “provided the impetus to a great turn of the economy, both in terms of scholastics and practice, in the historical and programatic direction,” pointing to the impact of Bismarck’s reforms30. He believed Bismarck’s social policy to be the only rational direction and recognized that its practice had been more radical than the concepts advocated by socialists ex cathedra31. In that regard, he praised Great Britain, which was the first to understand that legalizing labour organizations would be beneficial32. He noted, however, that freedom to make agreements between the employer and the employee meant upholding the inferior position of the latter.

31 Leon Biliński, O istocie, p. 94.
32 Ibidem, p. 45, 50.
Analyzing Schmoller’s work, he saw objection to social inequality and criticism of state policy, which in its current form only deepened it. Biliński used this opportunity to criticize Brentano for the concept of restricting employee protection to women and minors only. The Polish conservatist advocated admitting women to the labour market.

The second plain on which the historical school’s merits were considered was the issue of state interference in industry. Schmoller proved that industrial development was possible because of state interference. However, he criticized Schmoller for defending customs policy.

Appreciation of its social merits did not entail a lack of criticism of the German historical school in the scholarly realm. Biliński claimed that essentially socialists ex cathedra as economists were copycats and they had not created anything innovative. They truly believed in Smith’s theories, which have after all been debunked. They were unable to create alternative models. Collecting historical dates replaced methodology.

The second Polish member of Verein für Socialpolitik was Mieczysław Bochenek (1883-1887), an economics professor and city councillor from Cracow. He acknowledged the necessity to conduct historical research on the national economy and he negated the monopoly of people’s action’s egoist motivations, pointing, among others, to the social justice factor.

In 1878, another Polish economist - Władysław Ochenkowski (1840-1908) from Lviv - received a post-doctoral degree at Jena under the tutorage of professor Hildebrand. As luminaries of the German historical school, they emphasized the historical vicissitude of economic rights and the newly-coined phrase homo oeconomicus. He attempted at reconciling classic economics with the achievements of the historical school. He accepted state interference in moderation.

1.2. Nationalist politicians and market economists - the historical school as an instrument of nationalism

In the first quarter of the 20th century, National Democracy was the strongest political group in Poland. It was an umbrella organization for a variety of nationalist parties. The nationalists entirely dominated Western and Northern Poland (until 1919 under German rule). They were also very strong in central Poland, also in Warsaw.

33 L. Biliński, „Znaczenie i dążeń tzw. Socjalistów z katedry (Katheder-Sozialisten) w Niemczech. Dr Gustav Schmoller”, p. 161-165.
35 D. Grzybek, „Wstęp”, p. XX.
38 A. Lityńska, Czołowi przedstawiciele, p. 367.
40 Paradoxically, the most prominent nationalist economists interested in the German historical school came from Austrian Poland, which was rather the stronghold of peasant and socialist
Poland in 1919 and 1922, even though they did not receive the majority of the votes cast. They were supported by various social classes, particularly among the middle class, as was the case with other European nationalisms. They had a tremendous influence within social elites. They were mostly supported by degree holders. Many prominent Polish economists also found themselves supporting them. Polish nationalism, unlike that in many different countries, advocated a liberal and pro-capitalist view of the economy. Leading nationalist economists in Poland remained critical of corporationist ideologies.41

Liberal, nationalist economists, who were also prominent politicians, grew scholarly and politically interested in the German historical school. This was particularly the case with two economics professors - Stanisław Grabski and Stanisław Głąbiński. "Any and all concepts advocated by Grabski, Głąbiński and Rybarski regarding the role of the society, customs and the law in shaping economic phenomena have one common source in the form of the doctrines of German economists representing the younger historical school. They may have been inspired particularly by Gustav Schmoller's argument stated in the first part of his *Grundsätze der Allgemeine Volkswirtschaftslehre* (...)42.

Stanisław Grabski (1871-1949) was an economics professor at Lviv and Cracow Universities (and after WWII in Warsaw). In the last decade of the 19th century he was a socialist movement activist, but as of the beginning of the new century he started making more ties with the nationalist circles. Growing interest in Schmoller's concepts constituted an element of breaking away from Marxism and the socialist movement.43 Between 1919 and 1928 he served as a Member of Parliament. In 1892, while at university in Germany, Grabski attended Schmoller's lectures.

Grabski's economic analyses were correlated with his nationalist views. He took it upon himself to find an ontological status of the nation and he viciously fought any individual aspects of the liberal thought. He would always seek to research economics in terms of sociology.45

Grabski considered various humanist thinkers and List to be the precursors of the historical school, Hildebrand - its creator,46 and Schmoller - its "spiritual leader".47 To him, the achievements of German economists were where he could find arguments to criticize the Austrian economic school. He accused it of treating individualism as an absolute48 and removing an individual from the context of a
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44 Grabski's autobiography was read in English by S. Duda, „The Subject and Method of the Social Economy of Stanisław Grabski“, *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska. Sectio H, Oeconomia*, vol. 18, 1984, p. 221.
46 S. Grabski, K. Kelles-Krauz, op. cit., p. 32.
47 S. Grabski, „Historyczna szkoła ekonomistów niemieckich a metoda badań historycznych w dziedzinie ekonomii politycznej“, *Czasopismo Prawnicze i Ekonomiczne*, R. II, 1901, p. 53.
48 S. Duda, op. cit., p. 223.
community. “A human being so defined is rather a specimen of a biological species, rather than a social individual”. The historical school was a well justified reaction to the hypertrophy of classical economy’s individualism49. Classical economics acknowledged egoism to be a human being’s sole motivation. It made light of the existence of social classes and national discrepancies. It also marginalized the context of time and place - alleged Grabski in the final years of his involvement with the socialist movement50. What it only took into consideration was a material relationship to a thing. By any means necessary, it wished to restrict institutions to a bare minimum and cease any state involvement. The argument that egoist motivations were secondary to social ones fell on deaf ears51. Consequently, in the scholarly realm, classical economics is helpless when approaching particular nations and their economies52.

Grabski not only appreciated the critical upsides of the historical school. He can also be credited with accumulating an enormous body of historical knowledge, acknowledging the existence of an ethical factor in economics, as well as with being an inspiration for socialism ex cathedra. Simultaneously, this Polish nationalist criticized German scholars, both on scholarly and axiological grounds. He accused them of theoretical shortcomings. The younger generation of the historical school, with Schmoller and Brentano at the helm, acknowledged that only historical monographs were valid in the scholarly realm. There were also attempts at making economics a subfield of historical studies53. As a result, Schmoller and others reduced economic history to a mere description. In the meantime, historical research should have rather served theoretical ascertainments, for instance by aggregating facts. The shortcomings of the theory were reflected in the language used by Schmoller. It was a historical, rather than economic, jargon. Moreover, even historical research itself was reduced by the historical school to studying institutions. Besides, the historical school was inherently contradictory in its statement of economic objectives, which also concerns Schmoller himself. Consequently, Grabski pointed to the deficit of the historical school’s and its methodologies’ explication role.

Despite recognizing the anti-liberal leanings of German economists, Grabski accepted that the criticism of classical economics by the historical school was reduced to being formal and logical. Although Schmoller and others astutely acknowledged that human activity is the basis of economic life, they failed to delve into the sense of such activity. They were unable to appreciate the nation as a subject and a continuum. The historical school rather researched the activity of particular parts, not that of the nation in its entirety54. German economists appear to perceive the society only as a collective of individuals occupying a certain territory. Even the organicistic elements in Wilhelm Roscher’s concepts pointed to the state as a subject and a whole, not just a nation. The German

49 S. Grabski, „Wstęp do metodologii ekonomii politycznej”, Przegląd Filozoficzny, z. 4, p. 57.
53 S. Grabski, K. Kelles-Krauz, op. cit., p. 41-42.
historical school erroneously believed that legal and political institutions join people to form societies and nations\textsuperscript{55}. He also criticized Schmoller for putting Germany and entire Western Europe on equal footing, which is a simplification\textsuperscript{56}. Polish nationalism gave primacy to the ethical not state factor.

As a result, Grabski strived to combine the historical school with a theory-seeking approach. He thought much of Brentano’s psychologizing concepts, though he would rather place human psychological reactions in the context of social determinants\textsuperscript{57}.

Stanisław Głąbiński (1862-1941) was one of the most prominent politicians of the nationalist right wing during the inter-bellum period. He served in Parliament in the years 1928-1935. He was a law professor, although he held the chair of economics. He was also the Dean of the Lviv University. Głąbiński was one of Professor Leon Biliński’s students. Stanisław Grabski and him shared their opinions about the German historical school. He was the first to attempt to situate the Polish advocates of the German historical school within the entire realm of Polish economic studies\textsuperscript{58}. He was also working upon the assumption that economics may not be separated from sociology. Like other nationalists, he praised including ethics in the economic context. He believed Sismondi to have been the forerunner of such approach\textsuperscript{59}.

He appreciated the approach by socialists ex cathedra to property rights and to them indicating that it is a historically determined right, thus rendering social reforms possible\textsuperscript{60}. With this in mind, he ascertained the fall of Manchester economics from the 1870s. It proved helpless against the labour issue. Yet he was adamantly emphasizing the distinctiveness of socialists ex cathedra from socialism, since the former acknowledged private property and economic freedom after all. He also noticed some internal differences among the supporters of the historical school - Brentano, together with Charles Gide and others, supported labour organizations as an instrument of social reform, the majority, Schmoller, Wagner and Biliński included, sided with the state. It was his belief that the historical school is essentially present in certain other schools - that of social economy, national economy, and the like\textsuperscript{61}. Like Grabski, he continued to be critical in the scholarly realm. He postponed the historical school for its attempts at reducing economic research to merely historical research. It was him who pointed out that this would deprive economics of the possibility to study current phenomena. Researching the past may be flawed\textsuperscript{62}.

Roman Rybarski was the third prominent nationalist economist who shared similar views, inspired by the experience of the German historical school (though referring \textit{expressis verbis} to its representatives on fewer occasions than Grabski and Głąbiński). He was also an attorney and an economics professor at the

\textsuperscript{55} S. Grabski, K. Kelles-Krauz, op. cit., pp. 39-42.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibidem, p. 109.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibidem, pp. 300, 310, 345, 368.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibidem, p. 27.
Jagiellonian University in Cracow. He most probably came to familiarize himself with the achievements of the historical school while attending seminars taught by Professors Franciszek Bujak and Czerkawski. He was a prominent politician and one of the ideologists of the nationalist right wing. His interest in the historical school was related to nationalism and acknowledging the phenomenon of a nation and uniqueness of each nation, as well as to referring to the past in the course of economic research.

The concepts of economic rights being universal were approached by him sceptically. Liberalism and Marxism shared a belief in scholarly rights concerning the economy, similarly to the rights in other fields of academia. Under specific historical circumstances, various factors may have a bearing on economics. Each nation is different and the economy is but one of manifestations of its life. Local conditions always bring about modifications of economic processes. He pointed to the irrational and emotional tendencies of humans. He admitted that politics and the economy have always been interconnected. Nonetheless, he did not rule out the possibility of formulating scholarly rights within economics, pointing to the distinctiveness of economic history and economic theory. He argued with another renowned economist, Franciszek Bujak, defending the possibility to formulate scholarly rights while likening the opponent to Schmoller.

His anti-liberalism was very moderate. He attempted at separating economic liberalism from liberalism per se. The former accepted global trade, the latter, positive, allowed for economic freedom within a nation. He also pointed out that what lay at the heart of liberal ideas - private property - was older than liberalism as an ideology. He sought to reconcile capitalism with state interference. In Poland of the 1930s, when the government elites were strongly influenced by statist tendencies, he warned against state omnipotence. Apart from wanting to defend the market mechanisms, Rybarski remained faithful to the nationalist principles - the nation is more important than the state. What is worth adding is that he happened to criticize Wagner for acknowledging taxes to be a desirable instrument of social reform. Coercion will not lead to positive changes in the economy. He was rather critical of the ideas of corporationism. He believed them anachronic and adequate to the structure of the Medieval society. He dismissed as unproductive the idea of centrally planned economy, but not in the name of individuals’ best interest, but that of the nation.

64 S. Rudnicki, op. cit., p. 8.
66 S. Rudnicki, op. cit., p. 11.
67 R. Rybarski, „Narodowy program gospodarczy [1925]”, in S. Rudnicki (red.), Roman Rybarski..., p. 45.
68 J. Chodorowski, op. cit., p. 300-308.
70 Roman Rybarski, Idea przewodnie, p. 197.
72 Roman Rybarski, Przyszłość, p. 201.
It was in this context that he perceived socialism ex cathedra. In the 19th century, two huge ideologies were on a collision course - liberalism, which was set to weed out state interference and strengthen the market, and socialism, seeking to socialize the economy. “The so-called state socialism was the middle ground. On principle, it acknowledged economic freedoms, scrutinized economic life to a certain extent, and delegated particular business sectors to the state”. According to Rybarski, this group also comprised the supporters of protectionism, Christian and social movements, as well as - regarding the 19th century - of nationalism.

2.2. The historical school as a legitimization of corporationism - the case of Leopold Caro

Corporationist movements in Poland appeared outside mainstream politics, particularly in the Catholic Church circles. The most prominent proponent of corporationism in inter-bellum Poland was Leopold Caro (1864-1939) - an attorney and economics professor in Lviv. His political views were extremely conservative. He adamantly condemned the ideas of social equality, which he considered unnatural, pointing that revolutionary and socialist ideologies lead to new, unjust privileges and inequities. At the same time, though, he was one of the most avid critics of current capitalism on the Polish right wing. His work of 1893, written in German, titled Der Wucher, in which he postponed usury, was acclaimed by Schmoller and Brentano and was reviewed in „Jahrbuch für Nationalökonomie”74. Upon the request of Schmoller, who was the president of Verein für Socialpolitik, he published his work titled Auswanderungspolitik in Österreich in 190975.

Caro was seeking a continuity of anti-liberal views in history, which had been the battlefield of two doctrines - liberal and anti-liberal. The latter was co-created by, among others: Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, Thomas Carlyle, and Sismondi. He also referred to Bruno Hildenbrand’s speech of 184876, the achievements of Ferdinand Lassalle, and Emperor Wilhelm I’s manifesto of 188177, which symbolized the beginning of Bismarck’s social reform. At this point he also included Schmoller and the historical school. Such initiatives were a safeguard against Marxist communism. After 1918 he ascertained the rebirth of liberalism and the need to combat it. In this context he mentioned Christian democracy, the French Protestant cooperative movement in the form of the so-called Nimes school, teachings of the Catholic Church and Italian fascism (and its

76 B. Hildebrand, Die Nationalökonomie der Gegenwart und Zukunft, Frankfurt am Main: Literarische Aushalt, 1848, pp. 1-329.
corporationism)\textsuperscript{79}. Contesting capitalism and individualism he could even quote anti-Darwinist concepts, voiced by Kropotkin, concerning mutual assistance in the animal world\textsuperscript{80}.

He used the notion of social solidarity and credited the German historical school with being its model example, personified by Schmoller and Wagner, as well as by the French ideas of Gide. He appreciated Wagner, who lay the foundations for the solidarist program for the German Evangelist circles\textsuperscript{81}. Social solidarity combined the elements of socialism and liberalism, taking into consideration the ethical factor, which separated it from liberal economics and Marxist socialism, devoid of the ethical factor\textsuperscript{82}. Caro strongly emphasized the presence of axiology in economics\textsuperscript{83}. He criticized efforts to transpose the experience and laws of natural sciences onto the field of economics\textsuperscript{84}. He stood in stark contrast to Ludwig von Mises, among others for defending private property, even if it is to the detriment of the community, and also for obsessively treating each opponent of Mises as a socialist\textsuperscript{85}. Caro was an adamant supporter of state interference, increasing the scope of state ownership in the economy, and restricting free trade. It was only the state and its moral authority that was able to save the market through instituting reforms\textsuperscript{86}.

1.3. The liberal-conservative exception - the case of Adam Krzyżanowski.

Adam Krzyżanowski (1873-1963), one of the most orthodox economic liberals in Poland, had a brief encounter with the historical school. This attorney and economics professor at the Jagiellonian University attended seminars taught by, among others, Professor Czerkawski. The young scholar became interested in the achievements of Schmoller and others while seeking avenues for development for backward Galicia\textsuperscript{87}. From 1894 to 1895, while studying in Berlin, he attended Schmoller’s seminars dedicated to malthusianism. Under the influence of socialism ex cathedra, he declared his resentment toward economic liberalism. He was also critical of the prospects of big industry development\textsuperscript{88}. He considered state socialism to be the Third Way between Manchester capitalism and the socialist concepts of socializing the economy. He was sceptical of the concept of universal economic rights, similar to the natural ones. Nonetheless,
while arguing with the German historical school, he saw a possibility to formulate
them\textsuperscript{89}. In the course of his later life he severed any ties with his salad days’ interests.
What he disapproved of in independent Poland was excessive statism. He came
to be known as the chief representative of Polish liberalism, voicing his extremely
pro-market leanings\textsuperscript{90}. He shared views with Mises and Hayek, and he also
leaned toward monetarism\textsuperscript{91}. Noteworthy is the fact that Krzyżanowski noted a
paradox. He pointed to the moderation of indirect schools - including socialism
ex cathedra, while at the same time noticing that they were stauncher opponents
of individualism than the left wing budding out of the Great Revolution\textsuperscript{92}. In 1928
he was elected a Member of Parliament from the list supporting Józef Piłsudski.
In 1945 he was a party to the talks between the independence circles and the
communists. In the years 1945-1947 he was reelected representing the liberal
democratic Democratic Faction, which cooperated with the new authorities.

2. Left wing politicians and intellectualism versus socialism ex cathedra.

2.1. Socialist critiques of the historical school

Socialism ex cathedra did not garner much interest on the part of Polish
socialist parties and organizations. This was due to the fact that socialist
movements reached the Polish masses relatively late in regard to the onset of
socialism ex cathedra\textsuperscript{93}. Some interest was attracted during the pioneer period of
it permeating to the Polish socialist ideas from the West. News of socialism ex
cathedra aided in the arrival of news of Marxism in German Poland in the 1880s\textsuperscript{94}. Karl Rodbertus, associated with the historical school, found his way to the reading
lists of the socialist immigrant circles, fleeing the repressions from Russian
Poland, next to Marxists and anarchists\textsuperscript{95}.

The more ideologically consolidated it was, the more the labour movement,
headed toward internalizing Marxism, was critical of socialism ex cathedra.
Among the first generation of Polish Marxists, Cezaryna Wojnarowska (1861-
1911) was the one to criticize. She became involved with the international faction
of the Polish Labour movement, which was the breeding ground for the
communist movement. She fell victim of a variety of repressions, which forced
her to emigrate. She participated in the preparations for the establishment of the
Second International. In 1883, she met Jerzy Plechanow, and then befriended
Rosa Luxemburg. In 1884, “Walka Klas (Class Clash)” magazine, published in

\textsuperscript{89} A. Krzyżanowski, „Założenia ekonomiki”, Czasopismo Prawnicze i Ekonomiczne, R. XVII, z. 1-4, 1917-1918, pp. 75, 85.


\textsuperscript{91} M. Kuniński, „Nauka posępna a chrześcijańska filozofia polityczna. Uwagi o myśli Adama

\textsuperscript{92} A. Krzyżanowski, Socjalizm a prawo natury, Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1911, p. 18.

\textsuperscript{93} In 1874, Schmoller’s work was published in Warsaw, titled O wynikach statystyki zaludnienia i
obyczajów (On the outcomes of population and customs statistics), Warszawa: Nakład Spółki Wydawniczej Księgarzy, 1874.

\textsuperscript{94} J. Myśliński, „Echa pierwszego wydania "Kapitału" Karola Marks a w czasopismach polskich

\textsuperscript{95} A. Próchnik, Studio z dziejów polskiego ruchu robotniczego, Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1958, p. 189.
Geneva, featured her text about the attitude toward socialism ex cathedra. She ascertained that in terms of theory there were no substantial differences between the historical school and socialism proper. They are in agreement when it comes to criticizing capitalism. They are also one in believing that “only political authorities are able to cut the Gordian knot of capitalism”. The difference between socialism ex cathedra and the labour movement is their attitude toward revolution. The allegations also concerned solidarity and rejecting the class clash, as well as the fact that socialists ex cathedra supported Bismarck’s repressions against the socialist movement.

The name Adolph Wagner surfaced during the trial of Ludwik Waryński, the leader of the first Polish socialist circles, who also cooperated with Wojnarowska. Using Wagner, he defended himself against alleged revolutionary activity. He quoted the German economist as Bismarck’s advisor. Wagner allegedly noticed that the pressure of the socialist movements forced governments to embark on social reforms.

Mainstream Polish socialism remained faithful to Marx’s position regarding Poland, adamantly advocating the necessity to rebuild the Polish state, which will guarantee the introduction of socialist relations. Kazimierz Kelles-Krauz, the chief representative of Polish II International Marxism, the most prominent ideologist of the Polish Socialist Party, introduced Schmoller as an example of attempts to discredit Marxism as a scholarly discipline. The achievements of Austromarxists were greatly admired by mainstream socialists, particularly the tendencies to supplement Marxism, defined as a positivist scholarly field, with the ethical factor. In this regard, Kazimierz Czapiński, one of the ideologists of inter-bellum Polish Socialist Party, quoted Sombart.

From amongst the economists belonging to the Polish Socialist Party, the most significant social democratic party in Poland, Zygmunt Heryng (1854-1931) paid the most attention to the historical school. He started his social democratic activity as early as in the 1870s. He faced repressions, among others he was sent to Siberia. The writings of Rodbertus were the first to find the way to the economic reading lists. He was arrested in 1878 together with Wojnarowska. He was a member of the Polish Socialist Party since 1898. He also took part in the revolution of 1905. In 1909, several years after he was forced to flee Russian Poland, he became an economics professor at the Technical University of Lviv. Like most socialist economists, he advocated the class aspect of economics. In his most significant works from 1896 to 1897 (in which he referred to the correlation between economics and physics) he drew attention to the historical school. He considered Adam Müller and List to be its forerunners and Roscher.

---

97 „Przemówienie Waryńskiego na Sądzie Warszawskim”, Walka Klas, nr 8-9-10, April-May-Juni 1886, in A. Molska (red.), op. cit., p. 605
its pioneer. Be believed Wagner to be a representative of state socialism. By and large, he was critical of the German historical school. He acknowledged that it comprises “a mechanical cluster of professors” who lack common opinions. He pointed to the historical school’s theoretical weaknesses. In a manner that was typical of the time, he opted for applying the methodologies similar to those of the natural sciences to economic studies. The gap between the historical school and Poland was widened by the fact that it was deemed to support the anti-Polish policy of Germany. Yet it was two activists who were close to the Polish Socialist Party that took the greatest interest in the achievements of the German historical school among the Polish left wing.

2.2. Zofia Daszyńska-Golińska and Stanisław Kempner-socialism ex cathedra versus reformism.

The most prominent figure among those affiliated with the socialist movement who took an interest in the German historical school was Zofia Daszyńska-Golińska (1866-1934). This economist and sociologist was educated in Zurich and Berlin, where she earned a doctoral degree. She was a Marxist, a feminist and a supporter of cooperativeness. The area of her scholarly expertise was social policy. Over the years, she was close to the Polish Socialist Party. Toward the end of her life she became affiliated with the ruling circles close to Józef Piłsudski and from 1928 to 1930 she served in the Senate. During the interbellum period her views evolved toward liberalism. Already holding a doctoral degree, she participated in Wagner’s seminars in Berlin, where she was from 1894 to 1896.

Remaining close to Austromarxism and the concepts of supplementing social development theories with the ethical and humanist factor, she appreciated the similar aspect of the historical school, its anti-individualism and awareness of the complexities of the social reality. She perceived Schmoller and his methods as essentially researching psychological phenomena. Schmoller and others attempt to include the correlation between economics and social life in their entirety. She appreciated that historical research even covers Antiquity and the Middle Ages, as well as the fact that economic history serves the purpose of understanding the present.

---

104 Such was the point of the article devoted to Schmoller’s 70th birthday in a left-leaning magazine “Społeczeństwo (The Society)”-M. Aleksandrowicz [Epstein-Aleksandrowicz], „Gustaw Schmoller”, Społeczeństwo, nr 30, 25 lipca 1908, p. 2.
108 Z. Daszyńska-Golińska, Teoretyczne podstawy polityki społecznej w XIX stuleciu, Warszawa: Księgarnia Naukowa, 1906 p. 44.
110 Ibidem, p. 106.
The second aspect of the interest in the historical school was its contribution to the social policy practice, where it is concrete programs rather than abstract ideas that count. She appreciated that manual industrial labourers were the addressees of social policy, as well as the fact that the need to institute separate programs for rural and urban areas had been acknowledged. On principle, socialists ex cathedra pointed to the social obligations of the class of owners. Daszyńska-Golińska also defended the active role of the State in the economy, citing Wagner.

Another aspect of Daszyńska-Golińska’s interest in socialism ex cathedra was growing criticism of revolutionary ideas and seeking reformist ways toward social progress. No longer did she support the thesis of the inevitable fall of capitalism. Its existence remains viable, yet it ought to be supplemented with the ethical factor. She did not negate the progress brought about by modern capitalism. What she did notice was that even Wagner incessantly argued with socialism.

She considered List to be the precursor of the historical school, Roscher-the pioneer, and Schmoller-the most prominent representative. Wagner’s state socialism was seen by her as one of the factions within the historical school, singled out by an alternative approach social reforms and by theoretical discrepancies.

Daszyńska-Golińska criticized the historical school for being unable to work out its own theory, in fact, it merely pointed to the scope of economics as a scholarly discipline. Schmoller organized the scholarly achievements to date, rather than created something innovative.

Stanisław Kempner (1857-1924) was an economist, a journalist, a free thinker and a socialism sympathizer. He was known for his engagement in the struggle against anti-Semitism (while at the same time remaining critical of Zionism). Like the other Polish interpreters, he appreciated the historical school for its criticism of classical economic theories. It revealed "contradictions and flaws" of the classical school and the belief in free trade. Kempner saw economics as part of sociology, researching social life in its entirety. One must also not divide economics into practical and theoretical. The historical school and Schmoller were right to add the issue of social life practice to the definition of what economics deals with. They correctly exposed the “spiritual, moral and legal bases of economic and social life.”

---
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acknowledging the spiritual factor in the writings of Smith and Marx\textsuperscript{123}. He also defended utopian socialism, even from Marx’s views, because visions of the future may inspire and motivate to act\textsuperscript{124}. He mentioned Wagner’s term “social mercy” as an inspiration for humans to act, as juxtaposed with the assumptions of the classical school\textsuperscript{125}.

Kempner described this school as “a historical direction with a touch of ethics; a realistic and historical methodology, a laissez-faire-contesting theory justifying scholarly research toward mild social reforms”\textsuperscript{126}. He believed Friedrich Albert Lange to be the predecessor of the historical school, though he was not affiliated with it. Kempner clearly separated two movements. The first was described by him as the old historical school, where he included Roscher, Hildebrand and Karl Knies. It did not entirely negate economic rights. The younger generation, realistic and ethical, comprised, among others: Schmoller, Wagner, and Gustav Schönberg. They were closer to the notion of socialism ex cathedra, yet, according to Kempner, only Wagner deserved to be dubbed a socialist due his inspiring role for Bismarck’s social policy. Schmoller was the first to lead to breaking away from the old economic notions. What was rather unheard-of in Polish analyses, Kempner pointed to the representatives of the historical school in other countries (Luigi Cossa in Italy, Cliffe Leslie and Henry Sidgwick in Great Britain). In Poland, he acknowledged ties to this school in Daszyńska-Golińska, Heryng, Głąbiński, Biliński and also, among others, Zygmun Dangel, Witold Żałęski and Czerkawskiego. He pointed to Erazm Majewski as an early precursor, taking into account the “soul” in economics.

He placed the historical school between individualist liberalism and collectivist socialism. Its direct nature can be also expressed by situating it between liberalism, which believes in people’s spontaneous activity, and socialism, which praises the power of institutions\textsuperscript{127}. Close to undogmatic interpretations of Marxism, resentful toward Kautski’s orthodoxy, Kempner dismissed economism and mechanicism, present - according to him - both in liberalism and in Marxism.

Kempner accepted the concept of class clash and he praised Schmoller for doing so as well. At the same time, the Polish economist considered the Marxist view of the classes as unilateral, based entirely on the material and economic factor. He indicated, for instance, that leaders of revolutionary movements more often than not originated with the privileged classes, which proved other, non-material motivations of humans. Simultaneously, he staunchly criticized Schmoller for accepting class divisions in general. It was treated by the German economist as a just outcome of inequalities in terms of talent and merit. It was Schmoller’s mistake to consider the division of labour in the society as the sole source of social stratification. Schmoller’s theses in fact strive to acknowledge that aristocratic or bourgeoisie systems were natural and fair\textsuperscript{128}. He also noticed that Schmoller belittled Marx, which may have simply resulted from their differences of opinions. Schmoller failed to see the changes in social life, for instance the development of cooperativeness and trade unions. He continued to

\textsuperscript{123} S. Kempner, „Idee społeczno-gospodarcze Polski porozbiorowej”, in Z dziejów polskiej myśli ekonomicznej, Ekonomista, Warszawa, 1918, p. 3.
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\textsuperscript{126} S. Kempner, „Teoria ekonomii Gustawa Schmollera”, p. 268.
\textsuperscript{127} S. Kempner, „Teoria ekonomii Gustawa Schmollera”, p. 275.
\textsuperscript{128} S. Kempner, „Walka klas”, Nauka i Życie, nr 5, 10 March 1907.
believe in the power of top-to-bottom reforms. In fact, according to Kempner, Schmoller went on to support Manchester capitalism.  

The Polish economist considered Bismarck's social policy, inspired by socialism ex cathedra, to be a pioneer form of state socialism, a movement in the right direction, yet failing to resolve the social issue. At the same time he remained critical of this Chancellor's anti-Polish policy. He was a vocal critic of German socialists ex cathedra for their attitude towards Poles. He accused Schmoller of voicing opinions far from scholarly and closer to racism in their approach to the national issue. He quoted him as accusing Poles of being rowdy, patriarchal and unable to handle the modern economy. He also recounted his arguments regarding the Ukrainians and Belarussians, his anti-Semitism and glorification of the German nation.  

Kempner also did not spare Schmoller criticism of his approach to scholarly theory. He noticed that he lacked scholarly synthesis, stopped at merely describing facts and failed to see correlations in an organic way. Although Schmoller had accumulated a huge body of empirical material, he was complacent about describing them. Historical description is only a method, not the content of economics as a scholarly field. He noted that the representatives of the historical school, as the years went by, generally came to a realization that theories needed to be formulated. What particularly irritated Kempner was Schmoller's unwillingness to make clear assertions. "The author's reticence oftentimes creates an impression that he does not display an agnostic's caution, but rather a conformist's and opportunists' lenience."

Conclusion

Interest in the German historical school appeared in Poland at the juncture of economic and political discussions. It coincided with the time when new political movements and their ideologies were budding. Although it was not significant, what is noteworthy is the fact that it concerned the politicians who were close to Polish mainstream politics. Internal inconsistency of the German historical school is conducive to a variety of interpretations. What ought to be borne in mind is the subjective factor, i.e. the affiliation of some of the school's leaders with the anti-Polish, nationalist policy of united Germany, which hindered internalizing the concepts advocated by socialists ex cathedra by Polish politicians.  

The period during which the German historical school garnered interest in Poland finished when WWII broke out. In the second half of the 20th century Schmoller and the German historical school remained primarily in history textbooks and publications.

---
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