

Tomasz Kizwalter

POLISH LANDED GENTRY OF THE MID-19TH CENTURY AND MODERNIZATION

Twenty years ago Reinhard Bendix wrote that “modernization” is a useful notion because, despite being somewhat unclear, it provokes the same emotions with present-day readers.¹ In common usage the term modernisation is identified with “modernity”. And what is modernity? Indeed it seems rather doubtful today whether the group of associations connected with this notion can be regarded as more or less uniform. Besides, these doubts are not completely new. The usefulness of the notion of modernity was questioned already in the sixties—as an evidence of it one can point to Bendix’s article in which the accepted views on tradition and modernity are subjected to revision.

Despite the criticism being voiced here and there this was a period of scholarly optimism, of intensive work and—as it would be stated later on—of illusory attempts to create a theory of modernization. These tendencies flourished at a time of growing transformation in the “third world” societies and if we want to indicate the reasons for that notion’s career then, first of all, that particular convergence should be mentioned. The wealth of new phenomena asked for being conceptually arranged. And so, particularly in the American sociological milieu, the concepts of functionalism were made use of. But now the view prevails that, anyway at the initial stage of these attempts, theoretical ambitions

¹ R. Bendix, *Embattled Reason. Essays on Social Knowledge*, New York 1970, p. 250.

were dominating over empirical foundations—initial hypotheses were turned into hasty generalizations.²

Gradually, as detailed studies inspired by the conception of modernization were progressing, the theoretical thoughts on modernity were becoming more complex.³ This was largely caused by a more serious than before treatment of the historical dimension of the phenomena under consideration. The studies of modernization, initiated mostly by students of sociology, became in time an object of interest of the historian which lent those studies a new perspective eliminating the established schemes.⁴

The range of researches was getting wider but there was little agreement on what was actually their object. One can distinguish—and I am referring here to Dean C. Tipp's analysis—two basic ways of defining modernization although both often combine or overlap in practise.⁵ The first definition links modernization with a concrete type of social change. Thus, following Max Weber's suggestions, modernization appears as a process of rationalization. Leaving aside the complex sense of the very notion of rationality it is enough to say that it has to do with "the ends of world mastery by the individual and collective employment of rationally effective means", "it is precisely this

² Editorial Foreword: *Varieties of Modernization*, "Comparative Studies in Society and History" [farther—"CSSH"] vol. XX, 1978, No. 2, pp. 175—176; R. Stęplowski, *Modernizacja—teoria czy doktryna?* [*Modernization: Theory or Doctrine?*], "Kwartalnik Historyczny", vol. LXXXVI, 1979, No. 3, pp. 741—749.

³ The problem is discussed concisely by H.-U. Wehler, *Modernisierungstheorie und Geschichte*, Göttingen 1975.

⁴ For 19th century France see: A. Corbin, *Archaïsme et modernité en Limousin au XIX^e siècle, 1845—1880*, Paris 1975; E. Weber, *Peasant into Frenchmen. The Modernization of Rural France 1870—1914*, London 1976; the Polish literature was studied in this respect by R. Stęplowski, *op. cit.*, pp. 749—752; cf. also: *Modernisierung und nationale Gesellschaft im ausgehenden 18. und im 19. Jahrhundert. Referate einer deutsch-polnischen Historikerkonferenz*, ed. W. Conze, G. Schramm, K. Zernack, Berlin 1979.

⁵ D. C. Tipps, *Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective*, "CSSH" vol. XV, 1973, No. 2, p. 203.

idea of the mastery of the world of nature as well as of the social world of man".⁶

In the other approach the basis of modernization is industrialization, that is such phenomena as: demographic growth, urbanization, an extensive administration and development of educational systems, all of them are supposed to be based on industrialization.⁷ In the light of these affirmations such notions as "modern society" and "industrial society" mean very much the same.⁸ Modernization is here also identified with the growing social chances for the individual—to quote one of the less popular conceptions.⁹

The other definition of modernization considers it as a passage from traditional to modern society. At the initial stage of studies over modernization there was a tendency—under the influence of a deeply-rooted sociological conviction—to regard tradition and modernity as two separate and excluding each other groups of internal features. With all the individual treatments of these particular problems, one can separate here a basic scheme of interpretation. Thus traditional society would be in it structurally rather uniform, without a distinctive division of labour, and rustic. Whereas modernity would be the opposite of such tradition, it would go together with dynamics, a high degree of differentiation and specialization, with urbanization. In politics, modernization would mean a growing tendency for democracy, and in the collective mentality the narrowness of cultural horizon in traditional

⁶ B. Schwartz, *The Limits of "Tradition Versus Modernity" as Categories of Explanation: The Case of the Chinese Intellectuals, "Daedalus"* vol. CI, 1972, No. 2 (Intellectuals and Tradition), p. 76; see: E. Shils, *Tradition*, London 1981, pp. 287—316.

⁷ D. S. Landes, *The Unbound Prometheus. Technological Change and Industrial Development in Western Europe from 1750 to the Present*, Cambridge 1969, pp. 6—7; A. E. Musson, *The Growth of British Industry*, London 1978, p. 7.

⁸ See: G. Germani, *Politique, société et modernisation*, Gembloux 1972, pp. 61—63.

⁹ J. Lee, *The Modernisation of Irish Society 1848—1918*, Dublin 1973, introduction (not pag.).

society would be contrasted by a liking for changes and innovation.¹⁰

This dichotomy of tradition and modernity created a sort of research paradigm—simple and simplifying. The writers who used them were obliged to face a lot of complications in their work and significant objections were not late in coming. Marion J. Levy wrote of “relatively” traditional or modern societies. While formulating her own definition of modernization, based on the criterion of inanimate sources of energy and the use of tools, she claimed that there can hardly be a society without elements of modernity in it. Thus the opposite poles of tradition and modernity would be the extreme points of a continuum. She added, however, that she was unable to go in her considerations beyond the level of precision proper to such statements that contemporary American society is more modern than the society of imperial China and the latter more so than the Australian aborigines.¹¹

The problems that kept arising in the studies of modernization stimulated a criticism of the accepted paradigm. Joseph R. Gusfield stated in the conclusion of his ethnographical researches that it was a mistake to oppose rigorously tradition to modernity because the relation between them must not necessarily be that of a conflict. Traditional societies—contrary to the stereotype views—are by no means static, stable and structurally uniform. And the progress of modernity does not always mean the weakening of tradition—occasionally modernization may be sustained by ancient values. This may be not so much a clash as a continuous mutual influence resulting eventually in new complicated structures. Gusfield was not alone in his critical pronouncements. The title

¹⁰ S. N. Eisenstadt, *Studies of Modernization and Social Theory*, “History and Theory”, vol. XIII, 1974, No. 3, pp. 226—227; see the same, *Modernization: Protest and Change*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 1966, pp. 1—18; C. E. Black, *The Dynamics of Modernization: A Study in Comparative History*, New York 1966, pp. 5—34; D. Lerner, J. S. Coleman, R. P. Dore, *Modernization*, in: *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. D. L. Sills, vol. 9, New York 1968, pp. 386—409.

¹¹ M. J. Levy, *Modernization and the Structure of Societies. A Setting for International Affairs*, vol. I, Princeton 1966, pp. 9—15.

of one of the works on this subject was formulated "The Modernity of Tradition".¹²

The new way of looking at tradition and modernity began to oust gradually the dichotomic approach.¹¹ This involved a major revision of the accepted views but did not in itself question them entirely because, having rejected the dichotomy of tradition and modernity, scholars did think it justified to use the notion of modernization.

Eventually the criticism touched also the very foundations of that conception. In this respect Dean C. Tipps had much to say as he summed the criticism formulated before and added to it his own remarks. He stated in the first place that it was a multiplication of unnecessary notions in identifying modernization with other types of social change (e.g. rationalization, or industrialization) then he rejected not only the dichotomic opposition of tradition and modernity but also any attempts to base the conception of modernization on new foundations. Modernization was for him a notion of a completely blurred meaning, a collective denomination of phenomena that cannot be reduced to a common denominator. Pointing to the heuristic aridity of the modernization conceptions he also stressed the ideological background which determined its shape in the 1950s and 1960s—this was, he said, putting on the cloths of universality formed after the American taste for a liberal utopia.¹⁴

This criticism—and Tipp's article, though incisive in its statements, is only one example of it¹⁵—led to the destruction of until

¹² J. R. Gusfield, *Tradition and Modernity: Misplaced Polarities in the Study of Social Change*, "The American Journal of Sociology", vol. LXXII, No. 4, 1967, pp. 351—355; L. J. Rudolph, S. Rudolph Hoerber, *The Modernity of Tradition. Political Development in India*, Chicago 1967, pp. 3—14; J. C. Heesterman, *India and the Inner Conflict of Tradition*, "Daedalus", vol. CII, 1973, No. 1 (Post-Traditional Societies), p. 111.

¹³ S. R. Graubard, *Preface*, "Daedalus", vol. CII, pp. V—VII; J. Szacki, *Słowo wstępne [Foreword]*, in: *Tradycja i nowoczesność*, ed. J. Kurczewska and J. Szacki, Warszawa 1984, pp. 5—13.

¹⁴ D. C. Tipps, *op. cit.*, pp. 199—226.

¹⁵ See H.-U. Wehler, *op. cit.*, pp. 67—68.

then popular schemes. Attempts to formulate a consistent theory of modernization failed. This could be put down in this case to heated discussions on functionalism, the theoretical background to many modernization conceptions.¹¹ Also a change of the intellectual climate must have had much to do with that failure—in recent years the problems of tradition and modernity became an object of controversy which went far beyond the field of purely specialist considerations.¹⁷

All this is the reason why the contemporary historian will view with scepticism any studies of modernization.¹⁸ And yet this notion is still used, although there is a tendency to attribute it a much less rigorous meaning than before, and there is a growing diversity of its definitions.¹⁹ This vitality can be ascribed to the increasing social topicality of the problems under discussion: in

¹¹ In the Polish literature on the subject see A. K. Paluch, *Konflikt, modernizacja i zmiana społeczna. Analiza i krytyka teorii funkcjonalnej* [*Conflict, Modernization and Social Change. Analysis and Criticism of the Functional Theory*], Warszawa 1976.

¹⁷ There is a great number of pronouncements on this subject; to refer only to the opinions by Polish historians see: J. Kieniewicz, *Jedność stanowczo niepożądana* [*Unity Highly Undesirable*], "Dzieje Najnowsze", (farther "DzN"), vol. XIII, 1981, No. 4, pp. 139—142; M. Kula, *Konserwatywna i postępową* [*Conservative and Progressive*], "Kwartalnik Historyczny", LXXX, 1983, No. 1, pp. 127—139.

¹⁸ G. Busino, *Le passage des sociétés traditionnelles aux sociétés industrielles. Quelques réflexions pour un débat*, in: *Les passages des économies traditionnelles européennes aux sociétés industrielles. Quatrième rencontre franco-suisse d'histoire économique et sociale*, Genève, mai 1982, études éditées par P. Bairoch et A.-M. Piuz, Genève 1985, pp. 211—236.

¹⁹ See R. Bendix, *Tradition and Modernity...*, p. 295, the same, *King or People. Power and the Mandate to Rule*, Berkeley 1978, pp. 5, 10—14; the same, *Force, Fate and Freedom. On Historical Sociology*, Berkeley 1984, pp. 45, 56, 67; D. Smith, *Domination and Containment: An Approach to Modernization*, "CSSH", vol. XX, 1978, No. 2, p. 177. Among the many suggestions of a new approach to modernization there is also one which treats tradition and modernity as merely Weberian ideal types (L. E. Shiner, *Tradition-Modernity: An Ideal Type Gone Astray*, "CSSH" vol. XVII, 1975, No. 2, pp. 245—252). Problems of the evolution, revision and application of the modernization idea are discussed extensively by S. N. Eisenstadt, *Studies of Modernization, passim*; the same, *Tradition, Change and Modernity*, New York 1973.

our time modernity is very much with us.²⁰ It used to be so before but now this fact has manifested itself more clearly and in a new way.

The concept of modernization was based on the conviction that transformations in many areas of life are connected to one another and form a complex of phenomena that can be described as modernity.²¹ This thesis struck deep roots in the nineteenth-century sociology which used to apply dichotomic divisions to society.²² But did common people feel and think like that too? The question would attract the attention of researchers, but the results of their investigation did not often prove satisfactory.²³ Lately attempts have been made to look at these problems from the point of view of social psychology by analysing the personality of "the modern man".²⁴

The attitudes of European societies towards tradition and modernity at the time feudalism was being replaced by capitalism constitute a very vast and complex subject the study of which has only just begun.²⁵ This must be also said about the study of the class of landed proprietors.

²⁰ J. Szacki, *Słowo wstępne...* [Foreword...], p. 7.

²¹ M. Wiener, *Preface*, in: *Modernization, The Dynamics of Growth*, ed. M. Wiener, New York 1966, p. V; J. Appleby, *Modernization Theory and the Formation of Modern Social Theories in England and America*, "CSSH", vol. XX, 1978, No. 2, pp. 260—261.

²² J. Szacki, *Tradycja. Przegląd problematyki* [Tradition. Review of the Problems], Warszawa 1971, pp. 67—70; S. N. Eisenstadt, *Studies of Modernization*, p. 226.

²³ The same, *Modernization...*, p. 2; R. Bendix, *Force...*, p. 108. Many works in this field were affected by the stereotype contrast of modernity and tradition and by a very strong (though varied in tone) emotional commitment of the authors, see among others: D. Lerner, *The Passing of Traditional Society. Modernizing the Middle East*, London 1964; P. Laslett, *The World We Have Lost*, London 1965.

²⁴ See A. Inkeles, D. N. Smith, *Becoming Modern. Individual Change in Six Developing Countries*, Cambridge, Mass. 1974; A. Inkeles, *Exploring Individual Modernity*, New York 1983.

²⁵ M. J. Wiener, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850—1980*, Cambridge 1981; A. J. Mayer, *The Persistence of the Old Regime. Europe to the Great War*, New York 1981; P. Thane, G. Crossick, *Introduction. Capitalism and Its Pre-Capitalist Heritage*,

In the case of Poland these questions assume, as Antoni Mączak has indicated lately, a quite peculiar shape.²⁶ As a starting point for any considerations on the attitude of Polish landed gentry towards tradition and modernity we must take the social and economic realities of the Polish Kingdom during the pre-enfranchisement period. The gentry's economy had to struggle at that time with serious difficulties—it was a structural crisis which manifested itself, among other things, in a lowering of labour efficiency and consequently in a rise of the cost of living.²⁷ That particular crisis should be considered as one of the aspects of a wider phenomenon: the long-ranging, lasting almost two centuries, process of the gentry's worsening social position.²⁸

It is not easy now to describe with greater precision what were the views amongst the wider circles of landed gentry then. It seems that conservative attitudes did prevail and that "modernity had a difficult access to Polish country houses".²⁹

In the early 19th century, even in the more enlightened circles they tried to cultivate traditional patterns of life, and in spite of the growing impact of modern civilization the attitude of an

in: *The Power of the Past. Essays for Eric Hobsbawm*, ed. P. Thane, G. Crossick, R. Floud, Cambridge 1984, pp. 1—2.

²⁶ A. Mączak, *Vicissitudes of Feudalism in Modern Poland*, in: *The Power of the Past*, pp. 283—297.

²⁷ A. Jeziński, *Problemy rozwoju gospodarczego ziem polskich w XIX i XX wieku* [*Problems of the Economic Development in Poland in the 19th and 20th centuries*], Warszawa 1984, pp. 227—228; the same, *Handel zagraniczny Królestwa Polskiego 1815—1914* [*Foreign Trade in the Polish Kingdom 1815—1914*], Warszawa 1967; J. Blum, *The End of the Old Order in Rural Poland*, Princeton 1978, p. 241, see review by A. Mączak, "The Journal of European Economic History" vol. VIII, 1979, No. 3, pp. 777—781. On the state of the peasant farming, see: J. Kochanowicz, *Pańszczyźniane gospodarstwo chłopskie w Królestwie Polskim w I połowie XIX wieku* [*Peasant Soccage Farming in the Polish Kingdom in the First Half of the 19th Century*], Warszawa 1981.

²⁸ J. Rychlikowa, *Ziemiaństwo polskie 1772—1944. Dzieje degradacji klasy* [*Polish Landed Gentry 1772—1944. History of a Class Degradation*], "DzN", vol. XVII, 1985, No. 2, pp. 3—21.

²⁹ J. Leskiewiczowa, *Ziemiaństwo...* [*Landed Gentry...*], in: *Przemiany społeczne w Królestwie Polskim 1815—1861* collective work done under the editorship of W. Kula and J. Leskiewicz, Wrocław 1979, p. 387.

“average rustic gentleman” was probably not much affected by it.³⁰

There were many reasons for that situation. But let us concentrate here on economic problems although the question of modernity used to appear in many other spheres of life as well. So speaking about the landed proprietors' attitude to innovation in husbandry one must indicate that for the less prosperous among them the farm's modernization was in fact a rather risky adventure. In their case the lack of a financial reserve, indebtedness and difficulties in obtaining credits went together with organizational incapacity, frequently incompetence in business and a low level of technological know-how.³¹ This was coupled with the deep rooted habits of the gentry community and the often manifested dislike of the “white country-house's” resident to the outer world with all its uncertainties.³² Not many investigations have been done into that area, so we must satisfy ourselves with pointing to those general reasons for the reluctant acceptance of modernity.

This reluctance or passivity of probably the majority of the landed gentry was even more strongly contrasted by the activities of what could be called “the modernization elite”.³³ The first attempts to introduce the nobles into the world of modern farming

³⁰ Z. Stankiewicz, *Szlachta-ziemiańskie w świetle ankiety włościańskiej 1814* [*The Landed Gentry in the Light of a Rural Poll of 1814*], in: *Ziemiaństwo polskie 1795—1945*. A collection of works on the history and people of that class, editor J. Leskiewiczowa, Warszawa 1985, pp. 85—120; R. Czepulis, *Myśl społeczna twórców Towarzystwa Rolniczego (1842—1861)* [*Social Thought of the Founders of the Agricultural Society, 1842—1861*], Wrocław 1964, p. 121.

³¹ See J. Rychlikowa, *Dzieje ziemiaństwa polskiego w latach 1795—1945. Zarys problematyki badawczej* [*History of the Polish Landed Gentry in 1795—1945. An Outline of the Research Problems*], “DzN”, vol. VIII, 1976, No. 1, pp. 124—126; J. Bartyś, *Początki mechanizacji rolnictwa polskiego* [*The Beginnings of Mechanization in Polish Farming*], Wrocław 1966, pp. 412—417; *Zarys historii gospodarstwa wiejskiego w Polsce* [*A Historical Outline of Polish Farming*], vol. II, Warszawa 1964, pp. 343—344.

³² J. J. Jedlicki, *Obozy ideowe Królestwa wobec zmian społecznych* [*The Ideological Camps of the Kingdom in the Face of Social Change*], in: *Przemiany społeczne* pp. 465—469.

³³ See among others S. N. Eisenstadt, *Modernization...*, pp. 47—48.

went back to the 18th century—in that spirit Jacek Jeziński drew up his programme.¹⁴ In the Polish Kingdom of the mid-19th century the postulates of modernization emanated first of all from the circle of gentry—intelligentsia focused around Andrzej Zamoyski, originally the initiator of meetings held at his country residence Klemensów in the years 1843—1847, and the founder of “*Roczniki Gospodarstwa Krajowego*” [Annuals of Country Husbandry], and subsequently leader of the *Towarzystwo Rolnicze* [Agricultural Society], existing in the years 1858—1861. So let us look at the way those people dealt with the problems of modernity and tradition, first of all in farming whose modernization proved closely connected to other spheres of social life.

We know that in the opinion of the gentry activists associated with Zamoyski Polish capitalism had to be an agrarian capitalism.¹⁵ But was it possible for Poland to develop as an agrarian country? True, one was satisfied with the view that “Poland was only countryside and would remain countryside”¹⁶ (this was a statement of the fact and also its approval), but on a closer look at that problem those who were concerned with it saw how actually complicated it was. Not always the statement of facts led to the same evaluation, nor did the choice of agrarian development mean rejection of other possibilities. Adam Goltz stressed that the countries more developed than Poland “owed their prosperity to the manifold development of their industry and an extension of their trading relations” and he went on to warn that “an exclusively agrarian country which is obliged to satisfy its needs with products brought from other countries is like an infant in cradle, frail and far from being a grown-up man”.¹⁷

¹⁴ K. Zienkowska, *Jacek Jeziński, kasztelan łukowski (1722—1805)* [Jacek Jeziński, Łuków Castellan, 1722—1805]. *Z dziejów szlachty polskiej XVIII w.* [From the History of Polish Nobility of the 18th Century], Warszawa 1963.

¹⁵ J. Jedlicki, *Obozy ideowe...* [The Ideological Camps...], pp. 476—479.

¹⁶ L. G[ó]rski, *Rzut oka na stan teraźniejszy i przyszły gorzelni w Polsce pod względem ich wpływu na rolnictwo* [A Look at the Present and Future State of Distilleries in Poland and Their Influence on Farming], “*Roczniki Gospodarstwa Krajowego*” (farther—“RGK”), vol. I, 1842, p. 186.

¹⁷ A. G[oltz], *O potrzebie bliższego badania i opisywania krajowych*

There can be found many statements in the contributions by the publicists of the "Annuals" which suggest that they did approve to some extent the Western model of development ("to found by any means new towns, strengthen industrial and trading population").³⁸ But this ideal, when it did appear, remained a sort of abstraction, a model cherished by some but only as a pure idea.

This is not to say that in the Kingdom's economic landscape they saw only fields, meadows and forests, country houses and peasant huts. "Of great benefit to the country are beautiful mining and factory settlements set up in various regions by the Bank of Poland or by private persons such as the Counts Łubieński, Evans brothers and many other citizens. They brought new life, a lot of movement to places once wild and unknown to the world [...] and thousands of hands, before idle, they have sent to useful and well-paid labour".³⁹ This is how Kajetan Garbiński wrote in 1842. By the way the word "industry" [*przemysł*] had then a wider meaning than it does today. It denoted any production with the stress often laid on its modern character; industry in its present meaning was linked to the notion of "factory" (so they would say "factory industry"). But to return to Garbiński's statement: enthusiastic words on technological progress were not then so often used as they would be a dozen years later,⁴⁰ but even

gospodarstw oraz o korzyściach, jakie z tego dla ogółu wyniknąć mogą [About the Necessity of Investigating and Describing the Home Farming and About the Benefits This May Bring to the Nation], "RGK", vol. I, 1842, pp. 110—111.

³⁸ K. G [arbiński], *Czyli życie przemysłu naszego, mianowicie przemysłu rolniczego, pojmujemy ze stanowiska odpowiedniego naszej miejscowości?* [Our Industry, That Is Rural Industry, As Seen From the Stand of Our Locality], "RGK", vol. I, 1842, p. XXX.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. XL—XLI; see A. G [oltz], *O potrzebie...* [About the Necessity...], pp. 110—111.

⁴⁰ "Steam, The Executor of the 19th Century Most Daring Ideas..." (F. Lutosławski, *Plugi parowe* [Steam Ploughs], "RGK", vol. XXXIV, 1859, p. 145); "Man has used it in all his needs, covers by means of it great distances, prolongs the course of his life, makes the boundaries closer, speeds up education", ([P.] Folkierski, *Machina parowa zastosowana w gospodarstwie we wsi Radonie pod Grodziskiem* [Steam Engine Used On a Farm at Radonie near Grodzisk], "RGK", vol. XXX, 1857, p. 311);

at the early stage of the “Klemensowczyks’” activity (called so after the meeting place at Andrzej Zamoyski’s country residence), technology and its new applications fascinated many people. Indeed the vision of modernity was in many respects very attractive; the feeling that Poland was lagging behind other more developed countries went together with the conviction that she had to become part of the new world, just then shaping up.⁴¹ But they would stress at the same time that she should strive for it in her own way, in accordance with local conditions.

The afore-quoted article by Kajetan Garbiński, from the first volume of the “Annuals”, a text with programmatic aspirations, did somewhat differ in its concern with economic development from other voices of that milieu, still let us note its title: *That is the Life of Our Industry, Namely Agricultural Industry...* So the focus was on agriculture—for people of Zamoyski’s circle just agriculture was “their industry”. Or rather it had to become so because it was generally felt that it had a long way to go to be an “industry”.

All those pronouncements on the necessity for development would change distinctly when they turned from general questions to concrete Polish problems. Adam Goltz while writing, as we remember, about the weaknesses of Polish exclusively agrarian economy draw also attention to the fact that the influence of towns, “those major centres of civilization and industrial movement”, upon the Kingdom’s economy was very limited. Although he did notice “the mining and factory establishments”, and said

“Industry, equipped with coal and iron, conquered the nations most advanced in civilization, and discovered for them the inexhaustible sources of prosperity and wealth” (P. Walewski, *Wystawa paryska, część trzecia* [Paris Exposition, Part Three], “RGK”, vol. XLII, 1861, p. 428).

⁴¹ “Our farming is still in a cradle”, (L. Górski, *O obecnym stanie gospodarstwa wiejskiego w Rawskim i dalszym onego kierunku* [About the Present State of Farming in the Rawa Region and Its Prospects for the Future, “RGK”, vol. VI, 1845, p. 120); “Where a great part of the West is now in its agricultural development, we shall find ourselves perhaps in 30 or 50 years time”, (L. Kąkolewski, *Przegląd odkryć, postrzeżeń i nowych zastosowań z gospodarstwem związków mających w ciągu roku 1858* [A Review of Discoveries, Findings and New Applications in Farming Made in 1858], “RGK”, vol. XXXVI, 1859, p. 513).

that they were flourishing and promised well for the future he also indicated that Polish economic life was restricted almost exclusively to country estates.⁴²

Also Garbiński wrote in a similar vein though he would stress other things than Goltz did. While the latter thought that the agricultural sector should be developed above all, Garbiński was more in sympathy with urbanization enterprises and claimed that just through the modernization of agriculture was it possible to develop other sectors as well.⁴³ But these are only nuances, rather than serious divergencies of views.

In the texts under review we get only outlines of modernization conceptions—suggestions prevail in them over concrete propositions. It was the reform of agrarian conditions that was coming to the fore: for the landed élite the system of serfdom in the country had become anachronistic and was hampering the development of agriculture (Garbiński: “To wish to maintain the present position and to strive for progress at the same time is like wishing water to flow up instead of down”).⁴⁴ One could plan no modernization without having solved that major problem, moreover only the occupying powers were competent to deal with the agrarian question in a complex way. Hence the growing attempts, in favourable circumstances, to deal with that problem in the forum of public opinion, which led to the setting up of the *Towarzystwo Rolnicze* [Agricultural Society]. In the 1840s one would hardly extend one’s activity in this field outside one’s own estate, while the pressure of censorship restricted considerably the range of subjects discussed in the home press. The situation in the Kingdom when it was criticised, very cautiously at that, it was in the publications issued abroad, and the criticism had to be the more cautious the more political colouring had the problems under discussion. Those particular publications, when they did quote examples of a solution (far from perfect) of the peasants’ serfdom, they referred to what had been done in the Poznań area, that is in

⁴² A. G [oltz], *O potrzebie...* [About the Necessity...], pp. 111–112.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, p. 112; K. G [arbiński], *Czyli życie przemysłu...* [Our Industry...], p. XXI.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, p. XLIII.

the Prussian sector.⁴⁵ The home press, instead, was concerned with practical instructions that could be fulfilled by the landed proprietors.

In the "Annuals" the situation of the home agriculture was described as very bad, although there was some optimism regarding the transformations that were being introduced. A tone of moderation prevailed, although sharp opinions were also voiced and the editors felt obliged to add a mitigating commentary: "Ten years ago our economy had no guiding idea, indeed it was like an ancient mummy, a collection of thoughtless generalities, motionless in its routine and outdated notions—and that was all".⁴⁶

With all their differences the "Klemensowczyks" were unanimous in tracing the general line of development: the home agriculture should be that of an "industrial farming" and be based on strict calculations. Farming was for them a rational activity and this rationality was derived from the laws of political economy—those were formulated by the liberal school ("Klemensowczyks" were familiar with the writings of Say and Chevalier).⁴⁷

Some writers have already pointed to the dangers inherent in

⁴⁵ See [P. Łubieński], *O uregulowaniu stosunków włościańskich w Wielkim Ks. Poznańskim i o potrzebie zastosowania tegoż do Królestwa Polskiego* [About the Settlement of Peasant Relations in the Grand Duchy of Poznań and About the Necessity of Doing the Same in the Polish Kingdom], Leipzig 1843, pp. 74—75.

⁴⁶ K. Malczewski, *O przyczynach upadku gospodarstwa krajowego* [About the Causes of the Decline of Home Farming], "RGK" vol. II, 1843, p. 35; see T. P[otocki], *O cukrownictwie z buraków na skalę gospodarską wraz z opisem prób i doświadczeń w tym kierunku w Chrzęstkowie wykonanych* [About Beet Sugar Industry with the Descriptions of Tests Made to This Effect at Chrzęstków], "RGK" vol. IV, 1844, pp. 51—52.

⁴⁷ Most extensively on it: [T. Potocki] A. Krzyżtopór, *O urzędzeniu stosunków rolniczych w Polsce* [On the Settlement of Farming Relations in Poland], Poznań 1851, p. 54, 100 ff.; the same, *Poranki karlsbadzkie czyli rozbiór zarzutów, uzupełnień i uwag nad pismem "O urządzeniu stosunków rolniczych w Polsce"* [The Karlsbad Mornings that is An Analysis of Criticism, Supplements and Remarks Over the Writing "On the Settlement of Farming Relations in Poland"], Poznań 1858, pp. 81—83.

the conceptions of free trade and in those opposed to the "artificial" development of industry.⁴⁸ This particular strategy of the country's development was dictated first of all by the interests of the landed gentry. It must be noted that the modernization programme which was intended to be a remedy for the farming crisis was actually based on the age-long tradition of the gentry's thinking about economy: the gentry were very deeply convinced that the Poles were born to be farmers and that free trade had beneficial consequences. One can only speculate how much that agrarian, free-trade ideology had been strengthened in the middle of the past century by all the hard experiences of that time's industrialization.⁴⁹

In dealing with this problem one is tempted, though it may be risky, to go into comparative studies and see how things were developing in this respect in central, southern and eastern Europe.

⁴⁸ J. Jedlicki, *Obozy ideowe... [The Ideological Camps...]*, pp. 478—479. One could mention here a distinction made by a group of sociologists between "modernization" and "development": the first would concern changes stimulated from a developed industrial centre, as well as the processes strengthening economic dependence; the second would signify getting independent of the centre by building up one's own, diverse industrial structure. See P. Schneider, J. Schneider, E. Hansen, *Modernization and Development: the Role of Regional Elites and Non-corporate Groups in the European Mediterranean*, "CSSH", vol. XIV, 1972, No. 3, pp. 328—350.

⁴⁹ See J. Jedlicki, *W sprawie automatycznego krachu feudalizmu [On the Automatic Collapse of Feudalism]*, in: *Między feudalizmem a kapitalizmem. Studia z dziejów gospodarczych i społecznych. Prace ofiarowane W. Kuli [Between Feudalism and Capitalism. Studies in the Economic and Social History. Works dedicated to W. Kula]*, Warszawa 1976, pp. 230—237; the same, *Nieudana próba kapitalistycznej industrializacji. Analiza państwowego gospodarstwa przemysłowego w Królestwie Polskim XIX w. [A Failed Attempt at Capitalistic Industrialization. An Analysis of the State Industrial Economy in the Polish Kingdom in the 19th Century]*, Warszawa 1964; W. Kula, *Początki kapitalizmu w Polsce w perspektywie historyczno-porównawczej [The Beginnings of Capitalism in Poland Against the Historical-Comparative Background]*, in: the same, *Historia, zacofanie, rozwój*, Warszawa 1983, pp. 83—93; A. Jezierski, *Handel zagraniczny [Foreign Trade]*, *passim*; I. Ichnatowicz, *Przemysł, handel, finanse [Industry, Trade, Finances]*, in: *Polska XIX wieku, Państwo, społeczeństwo, kultura*, (ed) S. Kieniewicz, Warszawa 1982, pp. 56—92.

There were many tempting similarities but at the same time differences between particular regions which suggest caution. Keeping this in mind, let us try to look at the example of Italy of the mid-19th century.⁵⁰

Just in Italy a vision of an agrarian country supplying agricultural products and raw materials to Europe's industrial centres was strongly rooted in the mind's of that country's élite.⁵¹ There is no need to mention how much economically differentiated that country was—wide gap was separating the underdeveloped Lazio from Lower Lombardy.⁵² But there were also common features in those Italian economies: the basic one was their agrarian character and the dominance of big landed proprietors who were increasingly introducing, in the more developed regions, capitalistic forms of production.⁵³

Among those people the ideas of economic liberalism were readily accepted and became—at least in some circles—a model of economic policy, as well as an essential part of their outlook on life.⁵⁴ The landed owners were interested in the free export

⁵⁰ See A. Jezierski, *Problemy rozwoju...* [*Problems of Development...*], pp. 7, 10—11. One of the essential aspects of Polish-Italian comparative studies is discussed by J. Leskiewiczowa, *W kwestii połowicznej organizacji produkcji rolnej* [*On the Partial Organization of Agricultural Production*], in: *Między feudalizmem a kapitalizmem*, pp. 313—324.

⁵¹ F. Bonelli, *Il capitalismo italiano. Linee generali d'interpretazione*, in: *Storia d'Italia, Annali I: Dal feudalismo al capitalismo*, Torino 1978, pp. 1196—1197.

⁵² P. Villani, *Il capitalismo agrario in Italia (sec. XVII—XIX)*, "Studi storici", 1966, No. 3, pp. 482—510; B. Caizzi, *L'economia lombarda durante la Restaurazione (1814—1859)*, Milano 1972; P. L. Ghisleni, *Le coltivazioni e la tecnica agricola in Piemonte dal 1831 al 1861*, Torino 1961; M. Berengo, *L'agricoltura veneta dalla caduta della repubblica all'unità*, Milano 1963; S. Lanaro, *Società e ideologie nel Veneto rurale (1866—1898)*, Roma 1976, pp. 66—72.

⁵³ F. Bonelli, *op. cit.*, p. 1197 ff.; R. Romeo, *Risorgimento e capitalismo*, Bari 1970; L. Cafagna, *La rivoluzione industriale in Italia, 1830—1900*, in: *L'industrializzazione in Italia (1861—1900)*, (ed) G. Mori, Bologna 1977, pp. 62—65.

⁵⁴ R. Romeo, *Il Risorgimento: realtà storica e tradizione morale*, in: the same, *Dal Piemonte sabaudo all'Italia liberale*, Torino 1964, p. 262.

of agricultural products and in the import of industrial ones; this went together with the enlightenment-inspired struggle against feudalism and with resentment against the policy of some governments of the Restoration era (especially against the Austrian authorities' policy towards Lombardy).⁵⁵

In the Polish Kingdom of the mid-century the major figure among the advocats of the landed model of modernization was Andrzej Zamoyski, recognized as leader of the "Klemensowczyks". In Italy a prominent representative of the liberally-minded landed gentry was Camillo Cavour. The two did differ in their position, possibilities of acting, in personality and views on many matters. Bearing this in mind and without seeking easy analogies one can notice in their pronouncements and practical acts, in their mentalities and styles of life an individual piece of evidence of some similarity in the modernization dilemmas experienced by both the Polish and Italian gentry (similarity does not of course mean identity).⁵⁶

Cavour's private economic initiatives exemplified clearly the gentry's submission to the "spirit of modernity": modernization of farming (mechanization, fertilizers, financial speculation, industrial enterprises connected with agriculture and finally committment to the building of railway lines).⁵⁷

Camillo Cavour, by the way, grew up in an atmosphere favouring economic thinking: his father Michele had been publishing articles on agricultural innovation, he also had been taking part in the mid-1820s in the organization of the first steam shipping line on the lakes Maggiore and Como. However, unlike Camillo he was suspicious of industrial enterprises—his advice was to

⁵⁵ G. Mori, *Osservazioni sul libero-scambismo dei moderati nel Risorgimento*, in: the same, *Studi di storia dell'industria*, Roma 1966, pp. 32—35.

⁵¹ See S. Kieniewicz, *Między ugodą a rewolucją (Andrzej Zamoyski w latach 1861—62)* [*Between Reconciliation and Revolution—Andrzej Zamoyski in the Years 1861—62*], Warszawa 1962, pp. 35—37.

¹⁷ R. Romeo, *Cavour e il suo tempo*, vol. I (1810—1842), Bari 1977, p. 566, 623 ff., vol. II (1842—1854), part I, p. 132 ff.; the same, *Risorgimento e capitalismo*, p. 34; P. Guichonnet, *Cavour agronomo e uomo d'affari*, Milano 1961, p. 26 ff.

engage in government deliveries and financial operations. This was the traditional pattern of capitalistic activity in pre-industrial society. One could say that father and son were in agreement about the fact of Italy's economic backwardness but the conclusions they drew from it were different: father advised to adjust one's activity to the circumstances, son was prepared to actively oppose them—paying sometimes with failure for his risky enterprises.⁵⁸

Till the middle of the last century Piedmont's rather anachronistic legislature and institutions did not favour novatory enterprises.⁵⁹ And this affected the position of that region's landed proprietors. While Cavour senior represented the more conservative part of that class, Camillo, with his sympathy for modernization, formed a striking contrast with those views. But there were such situations, too, when his look at "modernity" was quite critical.

Many of the Italian enthusiastic advocates of economic liberalism were ill-disposed towards industrialization pointing to its deplorable social consequences: a concentration on material values, the principle of production for the sake of production were supposed to lead to moral decay, pauperization and social conflicts; the development of industry was thought to impoverish agriculture and cause the appearance of restless proletariat. So an apology of free trade did not simply express economic interest but was becoming part of the strategy of development and an element of the world outlook.

The position of those who were lagging behind in the evolution of civilization was now becoming rather specific. Reading, travels, studies abroad made it possible to see the style of life in more developed countries, yet the reflections stimulated by it were sometimes mixed. Those who called for a march towards modernity were at the same time afraid of many consequences of

⁵⁸ R. Romeo, *Cavour*, vol. I, p. 120 ff., 169—179; the same, *I problemi attuali della ricerca cavouriana*, in: the same, *Del Piemonte sabauda...*, pp. 210—211.

⁵⁹ The same, *Il Risorgimento in Piemonte*, in: *ibidem*, pp. 45—78; P. L. Ghisleni, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

that advance such as : economic crises, social unrest, demoralization.⁶⁰

In Poland likewise—knowledge of the West's experiences shaped the ideas how the country should develop. Tomasz Potocki while voicing the opinion that "the only way of improving people's life is to increase production" was also saying that "agriculture is clearly the calling of our nation, being for it the most suitable branch of industry ; a rational arrangement of agrarian relations removes the fear of poverty and of proletariat, those two plagues of civilization ; the social revolutions that derive from them are not an illness which must necessarily appear in this country".⁶¹

Thus modernity but not without a proviso. And once more an opinion of Potocki : "progress is a necessity for man, and a continuous education is something normal for society. But if there is no progress without a change, then any change, any movement, any destruction is not progress by itself".⁶² This view, common then among moderate conservatists, apart from its political and social connotations, had also a civilizational sense. The gentry élite was convinced that modernization was becoming indispensable, but at the same time that it was bringing with itself all sorts of dangers.

So hesitation and doing things by halves, inability to make a consistent whole of two separate scales of value ?⁶³ Probably not only this. Let us note the continuous—although perhaps futile—effort to reconcile what was then appearing as two opposites. From the gentry's point of view the progress of civilization was likely to upset the social order and the system of accepted values. So if they did not reject the very idea of civilizational advance, as the

⁶⁰ V. Hunecke, *Cultura liberale e industrialismo nell'Italia dell'Ottocento*, "Studi storici" 1977, No. 4, pp. 23—32 ; F. Sirugo, *Introduzione : L'Europa delle riforme, Cavour e lo sviluppo economico del suo tempo (1830—1850)*, in : C. Cavour, *Scritti di economia 1835—1850*, (ed.) F. Sirugo, Milano 1962, p. XLIX—L.

⁶¹ [T. Potocki] A. Krzyżtopór, *O urzędzeniu stosunków rolniczych...* [About the Settlement of Farming Relations...], pp. 19, 66.

⁶² *Ibidem*, p. 367.

⁶³ J. Jedlicki, *Obozy ideowe...* [The Ideological Camps...], p. 481.

hard-line conservatives were doing, then they had to find some ways of preserving order in the process of evolution. The liberal-minded landed proprietors were attracted to the British model: a combination of expanding modern civilization with the retention of the land-lords' high position appealed to them very much indeed. The continental advocates of "free but secure" progress had been traditionally admiring the British solutions. Although there was also in this country some criticism concerning social relations in the United Kingdom.

Andrzej Zamoyski, who had been studying in Edinburgh and thought highly of British models, after the experiences of the Springtide of Nations became an enthusiastic admirer of the Second Empire. Camillo Cavour, while regarding favourably British ways, did criticize the social effects of the farming modernization in that country: collapse of small holdings replaced by the impersonal type of human relationships. In Cavour's view farming was something more than a mere sphere of production. In view of the revolutionary menace he advocated a close cooperation between the progress-minded bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy who exercised political control over society. When he was saying that "agriculture is in this century the most suitable and pleasant occupation" he did it not simply because he himself was fond of farming but because he regarded agriculture as a real support for the whole social order. Agriculture—dominated of course by big landed property—was not just a sphere of production but also (and perhaps even above all) a network of human relationships, a way of life, a system of values.⁶⁴

This was also the view of those who surrounded Zamoyski.⁶⁵ They had behind themselves a strong background of the age-long gentry tradition which endowed farming and rustic life with a special ideological value. This ancient justification of gentry's

⁶⁴ S. Kieniewicz, *Między ugodą a rewolucją...* [*Between Reconciliation and Revolution...*], pp. 38—39; R. Romeo, *Cavour*, vol. I, pp. 572—577, 622—623, 736; F. Sirugo, *op. cit.*, p. LX.

⁶⁵ See R. Czepulis, *Myśl społeczna...* [*Social Thought...*], p. 42n; J. Jedlicki, *Obozy ideowe...* [*The Ideological Camps...*], pp. 479—480.

dominance in society was still holding good, although in changed circumstances it was assuming a new meaning, not without the influence of the romantic idealization of rustic existence. And how could one reconcile such feelings with an approval of progress in civilization?

As time went by—this was felt distinctly towards the end of the 1950s—opinions were increasingly voiced among the landed élite which showed their fascination with technology. Michel Chevalier—a welcome contributor to the “Annuals”—maintained that “the introduction of machines was the main spring of mankind’s liberation”.⁶⁶ At least a number of home writers were equally in favour of technical innovations. It might have been the sign of a new generation beginning to take part in active life. Kajetan Garbiński’s son, Władysław, wrote: “In our time agriculture is becoming more and more connected with industry [...]. Steam engines, which until recently had been characteristic of factory industry, especially in the British Isles, have become common in farming and proved so efficient that their spreading is likely to be growing all the time. And apart from steam engines what a lot of other wonderful mechanical devices are available [...]. The use of chemistry in agriculture, it too has felicitous results and is now done on a big scale”.⁶⁷

One of the writers indicating in the “Annuals” the reasons for the abandonment of traditional methods of farming stated: “Among them I must mention the major one, the great inventions of the 19th century which having changed the conditions of time and space brought about such radical transformations in all branches of industry and so widened the scope of both private and public needs that it is impossible for us to remain with our farming in the previous position for the simple reason that we

⁶⁶ M. Chevalier, *Listy* [Letters], translated by A. Z[amoyski], “RGK”, vol. XVIII, 1851, p. 78.

⁶⁷ W. G[arbiński], *Rozbiór dzieła pod tytułem “Rys gospodarstwa krajowego w Anglii, Szkocji i Irlandii”*. p. L. de Lavergne [An Analysis of the Book Entitled “An Outline of Home Economy in England, Scotland and Ireland” by L. de Lavergne], “RGK”, vol. XXVIII, 1856, pp. 272—273.

may lose ground under our feet. So we must advance, pushed by that irresistible current of civilization".⁶⁸

In the late 1850s and early 1860s one could already hear numerous statements expressing a belief in the continuous growth of man's technical possibilities. So for instance the idea of applying steam engine to tillage was commented like this: "everyone may regard that system as a figment of imagination, but let us recall that our age has already produced a lot of useful inventions which at first had also seemed to be nothing but dreams...".⁶⁹

But once technology got practically applied to farming that original enthusiasm had soon to be tempered. So frequently in the same articles, along with the words of praise for innovation, there would appear numerous objections as well. "Everyone of us can see now daily that the same improvement which proved so useful for one of our neighbours, brought to the other nothing but great exertions and finally disappointment which would prevent him once for all from any further attempts [...]. Any improvement, even the virtually best one, becomes really useful only when it meets a local need, when it is introduced by means of sufficient resources, guided by reason and experienced hand".⁷⁰

We can find in those publications repeated calls for the theory to be thoughtfully combined with practice, foreign patterns suited to local conditions and above all—to be put in prudently. "We do like farming novelties, but the farmers should seize them prudently [...]. One must try not to sink into routine but also not to act rashly [...]. We are all for progress, continuous, yet done step by step".⁷¹ Ludwik Górski stated: "there are two extremes

⁶⁸ G. Zieliński, *Rzut oka na przepisy policji wiejskiej w Prusach i Francji* [A Look at the Rural Policy in Prussia and France], "RGK", vol. LX, 1860, pp. 53—54.

⁶⁹ M. O [borski], *Nowsze postępy gospodarstwa w Anglii* [The Recent Rural Progress in England], "RGK", vol. XCVII, 1862, p. 388; see L. Kąkolewski, *Przegląd odkryć, postrzeżeń i nowych zastosowań z gospodarstwem związek mających w ciągu roku 1858* [A Review of Discoveries, Findings and New Applications Relating to Farming During 1858], "RGK", vol. XXXVII, 1856, p. 73.

⁷⁰ M. Oborski, *Wystawa paryska, część druga* [Paris Exposition, Part Two], "RGK", vol. XLI, 1860, p. 537—538.

⁷¹ *Zycie na wsi* [Life in the Country], "RGK", vol. XLIV, 1861, p. 601;

that we face in farming, both equally fatal—pure theory and rusty empirism”.⁷⁰

As early as in the first volume of the “Annuals” one could read about the “poetic frenzy of precipitate innovations” against which the young farmer had to guard.⁷¹ Modernity was becoming fashionable and, although this was not perhaps very important after all, it should be taken into account.

Conditions were not then favourable in this country for bold innovators. In 1842, a farming correspondent of the “Annuals”, while communicating his experience to the readers, was pointing to the shortage of good specialists, to swindlers who would undertake to introduce technical novelties in the farm.⁷² The conclusion was rather doleful: „Innovations have to overcome so many obstacles with us, it is so difficult to carry them through because

see L. G ó r s k i, *Nowatorstwo i rutyna—rozmowa o gospodarstwie* [New Ways and Routine—a Talk on Farming], “RGK”, vol. XXIV, 1854, pp. 95—150; J. W e r n e r, *Opis gospodarstwa w dobrach Konstantynów w powiecie bialskim, guberni lubelskiej położonych* [A Description of Farming in the Konstantynów Estate, Biała District, Lublin Gubernya], “RGK”, vol. XV, 1849, p. 313; T. J a c k o w s k i, *Grabie konne i spychacz konny* [Horse-drawn Rake and Horse-drawn Bulldozer], “RGK”, vol. XXXVII, 1858, pp. 118—119.

⁷⁰ L. G ó r s k i, *Przegląd gospodarstwa w Michałowie i przyległych folwarkach, odbyty w dn. 20 i 21 lipca r.b.* [An Inspection of Farming at Michałów and the Adjoining Granges, Done on 20th and 21th July this Year], “RGK”, vol. XI, 1847, p. 296.

⁷¹ K. W. z Kaliskiego [of Kalisz Region], *Opis terażniejszego gospodarstwa poprzedzony wyznaniem sumiennym jego historycznego przebiegu i popełnionych w nim błędów* [Description of Current Farming, Preceded by a Conscientious Admission of Its Historical Evolution and Committed Mistakes], “RGK”, vol. I, 1842, p. 127.

⁷² “For the sake of economy, soon after 1821, I engaged an Englishman, who had been brought by one of our celebrated agronomists, and I ordered him to make thrashing-machines and grinders. He was said to have been good when he came but then he took to drinking and made them badly” (*ibidem*, p. 139); “The newcomer, an alleged plumber but in fact a crook from Vienna though carrying excellent testimonials—built up at my great expense a dike, flood-gate and sluice; the latter, when I was absent, he had made so badly that the spring water destroyed it immediately” (*ibidem*, p. 145).

of the absence of experience, inconsistency, that they usually fail, unless we ourselves see to every detail.”⁷⁵

This was the way of thinking among the landed proprietors who were more conservative than those of the Zamoyski circle. Their criticism could have a moralistic slant as it did in the case of Henryk Rzewuski or Józef Ignacy Kraszewski in the author's Wolhynian period, but it was also sometimes expressed in pragmatic terms. So did Józef Gołuchowski who stressed more or less real difficulties inherent in the farming modernization. According to Gołuchowski a switch-over to an industrialized agriculture was an extremely expensive undertaking, requiring great efforts and in most cases doomed to failure.⁷⁶

In 1852, “Annuals” tried to look back at what had been achieved in that sphere. They stressed that in view of the downward trends in corn prices and the rising competition on world markets the gentry's estates should necessarily become more profitable. There was some progress in that sphere but not sufficient yet. In the preceding years the hasty and often amateurish modernization doings had largely compromised modern methods in farming. And a majority of the gentry was still attached to the old ways. The ill-considered, taken over mechanically from abroad innovations did not fail to ruin financially numerous estates, “many farmers, who at first were observing with curiosity and then with derision the introduced novelties and the losses they caused began looking with repugnance at any ideas of improving agriculture, at anything that was coming from abroad in this field; seeking the causes of these failures not in the wrong application of improvements but in the very principle they arrived at the conclusion, not without some justification, that he who runs a farm according to a foreign book and he who engages in wild-goose chase can equally expect success.” Although in time some advocates of modernization began having success, the gentry opinion remained mostly against modernity. Jan Kanty

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 140.

⁷⁶ [J. Gołuchowski], *Rozbiór kwestii włościańskiej w Polsce i w Rosji w r. 1850* [A Look at the Peasant Question in Poland and Russia in 1850], Poznań 1851, p. 117 ff.

Gregorowicz wrote: "In the meantime voices were circulating throughout this country, with thousands of natural additions, about the losses and disappointments incurred at the very beginning by the honorable innovators; and the farming community was becoming more and more disinclined to take up foreign novelties".⁷⁷

A separate question, though linked to the one under discussion, was the relation of peasants to modernity. At this moment we can only suggest that the latest studies lead us to some revision of the stereotype of peasant conservatism; their attitudes towards modernity were complex, determined often by a number of factors.⁷⁸ During the "Klemensowczyks" period the views and behaviour of country people were not regarded as a problem, although some attention was paid to them, just by recording their contacts with modernity without however analysing this question.⁷⁹ The pronouncements made on this subject, and there

⁷⁷ J. K. G[regorowicz], *Uwagi nad środkami podniesienia w kraju naszym gospodarstwa wiejskiego* [Remarks on Improving Our Rural Economy], "RGK", vol. XXI, 1852, pp. 98—110.

⁷⁸ J. Borkowski, *Problemy badawcze chłopów polskich w epoce kapitalizmu* [A Study on the Situation of Polish Peasants in the Capitalistic Era], "DzN", vol. VIII, 1976, No. 1, pp. 45—80; W. Kula, J. Kochanowicz, *Chłoptwo: problem intelektualny i zagadnienie nauk społecznych* [Peasantry—an Intellectual Problem and That of Social Sciences], Warszawa 1981, pp. 36—44; E. Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 3n, 41, 151—153, 479—481; G. Levi, *Innovazione tecnica e resistenza contadina: il mais nel Piemonte del'600*, "Quaderni storici", vol. XIV, 1979, No. 42, pp. 1092—1100.

⁷⁹ Andrzej Zamoyski, initiator of steam shipping on the Vistula, wrote in his report on the test cruise that one of the journey stages ended "... with cries of joy and admiration from a crowd of people who were coming running to the bank and looked at a wonder unheard of in that region (A. Z[amoyski], *O żegludze parowej na rzekach naszych* [About the Steam Shipping on Our Rivers], "RGK", vol. XIII, 1848, p. 159. Was in this a mere convention or a description of the authentic scene—one cannot now judge. Other writers drew attention to "a reluctance of the adults for any innovation" with the young being more inclined to accept it); A. Barciński, *Ocena dziełka pod tytułem "Rachunek podwójny dla gospodarzy..." przez M. Kątskiego w Wilnie 1850 r.* [The Evaluation of a Booklet "Double Accounting for Farmers..." by M. Kątski in Vilna 1850], "RGK", vol. XVII, 1850, p. 192.

were few of them, stressed the fact that any peasant initiative would be frustrated by the soccage and dependence upon the mansion.⁸⁰

The propagation of modernization made its advocates exaggerate sometimes the country's backwardness—one tends to exaggerate what one fights.⁸¹ Occasionally it was dictated by practical reasons: it was a good thing to support a veiled suggestion of founding an agricultural society with a dramatic report on the efforts made by the modernization advocates.⁸² Still, that dependence was not so simple: a pessimistic evaluation of the country's state could go together, as in Gołuchowski's case, with a conservative stand, while many exponents of modernization did not exaggerate Polish backwardness.

Outside the relatively small circle of the social élite the awareness of the gentry economy's crisis was manifesting itself, it seems, in the already customary grumbling about the hard times.⁸³ On the other hand, people close to Zamoyski did realize that in the soccage system the unprofitable farms could drag out their wretched existence but their prospects for the future were bleak.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ K. G [arbiński], *Czyli życie przemysłu* [Our Industry], p. XLIII; E. Witkowski, *Fabryki cukrowe w Prusach* [Sugar-Mills in Prussia], "RGK", vol. X, 1847, p. 232; see R. Czepulic, *Myśl społeczna...* [Social Thought...], p. 142 ff.

⁸¹ *Obozy ideowe...* [Ideological Camps...], p. 477; see K. Malczewski, *op. cit.*, p. 44: "The landed proprietor's position is dreadful; he is obliged to struggle with the prosperity and advance of his neighbours, with his own and other people's prejudice, with intellectual weakness, with the shortage of capable people and with his own ignorance, with the banishment of each innovation, etc., and do it all with a constant lack of capital".

⁸² J. K. G [regorowicz], *op. cit.*, p. 122.

⁸³ The economic condition of the landed gentry, their technical and organizational equipment are a matter requiring a constant study, see J. Rychlikowa, *Dzieje ziemiaństwa polskiego...* [History of the Polish Landed Gentry...], p. 125; J. Kochanowicz, review of *Ziemiaństwo polskie 1795—1945* [Polish Landed Gentry 1795—1945]. *Zbiór prac o dziejach warstwy i ludzi* [A Collection of Works on the History of that Class and Its People]—"Kwartalnik Historyczny" vol. XCIV, 1987, No. 2, pp. 526—527.

⁸⁴ "A factory owner who would succeed only like that, that is, who would get only return from his outlay and costs, would soon be obliged to

Modernization, although it had raised high hopes, could be neither easy nor immediate solution of the gentry's difficulties, both at the level of a particular farm or at that of the whole Kingdom. We know that the benefits derived from innovations used to be modest initially and would appear sometimes only after a long time.⁸⁵ So the crisis suggested a necessity for modernization and at the same time it also kept back from its realization.

This ambivalence could be seen in the way the gentry saw the country's future. Here was Maksymilian Oborski who tried to prove that only rich societies, advanced in their economy and culture, could contemplate a high rate of growth: "a nation of this kind can go far, it moves by leaps and bounds along the road of progress". Backward societies had to adapt their development plans to their possibilities: "such a country should move on with great caution, almost with fear; it should measure its steps by its small resources, without reaching for what it admires abroad and trying instead to achieve what is strictly necessary and what is not beyond its means but the lack of which is humiliating".⁸⁶

But this attitude was not simply evidence of all the gentry's problems, their financial worries and frustrated attempts to get credits. One can feel in Oborski's reasoning the presence of the decades of Polish economic initiatives, strivings for accumulation and attempts at industrialization—accelerations of growth and break-downs, hopes, disappointments, the whole lot of experiences which could lead to that eulogy of "mediocrity".

And yet the vision of progress in civilization had a great power of attraction. It was charged with emphatic phraseology and its

shut down his enterprise", A. G[o]ltz, *O potrzebie...* [About the Necessity], p. 113; see A. Jezierski, *Problemy rozwoju...* [Problems of Development...], pp. 227—228; J. Łukasiewicz, *Drogi rozwoju rolnictwa na ziemiach polskich* [The Development of Agriculture in Poland], in: *Polska XIX wieku*, pp. 13—55.

⁸⁵ C. M. Cipolla, *The Diffusion of Innovations in Early Modern Europe*, "CSSH", vol. XIV, 1972, No. 1, pp. 46—47; on the difficulties in the introduction of new technology see T. P[otocki], *O cukrownictwie...* [About the Sugar Industry...], pp. 54—57.

⁸⁶ M. Oborski, *Wystawa paryska, część druga...* [The Paris Exposition, Part Two...], p. 538.

propagators referred to the highest values. Tomasz Potocki wrote that the conquest of the material world is man's destiny: "matter must yield to the power of immortal spirit and nature must turn into a humble servant"; Aleksander Kurtz stated that "man must base the existence of his spirit upon the necessities of material being", and "one could regard work, like one does speech, as the first-born daughter of the spirit realizing itself, because work shows the existence of moving thought in the world at the material plane as speech does it at the ideal one". So by using, in a somewhat amateurish way, Hegel's method (he had studied in Berlin) Kurtz comes to the conclusion that it is the mission of industry today "to change the reason of our age, appearing as thought, into real acts and make the educated, theoretical civilization a practical property of the whole nation".

Progress in civilization was thus becoming a foundation for moral progress: "There is nothing to demoralize people more than it is done by privations and poverty [...]. Just well-being is the best arms against temptation and evil, it defends morality and all the virtues. So let us seek well-being for all the people, then those who have strayed will find the right way and strengthened by new principles will discover a new world for themselves".⁸⁷ Prosperity as a condition for moral and social order—this was a statement recurring in the texts related to the "Annuals". Yet this was not an easy problem.

The critics of modernization were speaking at length about the moral dangers involved in what they called "the alleged progress".⁸⁸ But Andrzej Zamojski was trying to convince readers

⁸⁷ [T. Potocki] A. Krzyżtopór, *O urządzeniu...* [About the Settlement...], p. 5; A. Kurtz, *O przemyśle, jego historycznym postępie i wpływie na bieg cywilizacji* [About Industry, Its Historical Progress and Influence Upon Civilization], "Biblioteka Warszawska", 1841, vol. I, pp. 92—93, 337, 341.

⁸⁸ J. Jedlicki, *Polskie nurty ideowe lat 1790—1863 wobec cywilizacji Zachodu* [Polish Ideological Trends of 1790—1863 and Their Relation to the Western Civilization], in: *Swojskość i cudzoziemszczyzna w dziejach kultury polskiej* [Home and Foreign Ways in the History of Polish Culture], (ed.) Z. Stefanowska, Warszawa 1973, pp. 186—231; the same, *Obozy ideowe...* [Ideological Camps...], pp. 465—469; the same, *Polskie prorocstwa zagłady Zachodu* [Polish Prophecies of the West's Decline], in: *O społeczeń-*

that the opponents of material benefits were wrong: "They are mistaken in depicting industry as a mammon—and by industry I do not mean only handicraft, I include in it also useful fields, farming, all sorts of crafts, trade. Progress in the industry of any country does not show that material rapacity and the cult of the golden calf get an upper hand in them".⁸⁹

But Aleksander Kurtz, while extolling in the afore-quoted article the benefits of "industry", advanced also some objections. He wrote that the thought of guiding production "does not rise above the world's material being and aims at nothing else in its activity but at work and its products. That is why industry makes human existence so very material, it wholly engages man in practical life, makes him indifferent to anything that is not of material value, that exceeds the individual interest and temporary gain".⁹⁰

So even in the eyes of a gentry advocate of modernity the progress in civilization was charged with many negative aspects. And these concerned not only moral questions but also those of social and political connotation. Among the gentry an opinion used to be voiced that "civilization by satisfying sensual expectations and getting increasingly free from the rules of religion and morality managed to awake, not only with the prosperous classes but also the poor ones imitating them, a lot of sensual desires they did not know before...".⁹¹ One would console oneself in this respect with the idea that a better knowledge of the experiences gained by more developed countries would make it possible to avoid many problems, while the backwardness would for the time being be a protection against the evil (this kind of argumentation

stwie i teorii społecznej. A book dedicated to the memory of S. Ossowski, (eds) E. Mokrzycki, M. Ofierska, J. Szacki, Warszawa 1985, pp. 276—288.

⁸⁹ A. Z [a m o y s k i], *O postępie* [About Progress], "RGK", vol. XXII, 1853, p. 57.

⁹⁰ A. Kurtz, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

⁹¹ [J. Gołuchowski], *op. cit.*, p. 194; see J. Jedlicki, *Polskie proroctwa...* [Polish Prophecies...], p. 280; M. Król, *Konserwatyści a niepodległość. Studia nad polską myślą konserwatywną XIX wieku* [The Conservatives and Independence. Studies on Poland's Conservative Thought in the 19th Century], Warszawa 1985, pp. 143—146.

was also used by the Italians).⁹² But at the same time there was a strong conviction that the changes were inevitable which only increased the importance of a close connection between progress in civilization and in morality.

Zamoyski, who declared himself on many occasions as an enthusiastic exponent of political economy, indicated at the same time that it was based on religious tenets.⁹¹ A significant statement expressing not only his belief that civilization was developing in accordance with Christian faith but also a conviction that progress in civilization has not in itself a moral value. Not all the adherents of the "Annuals" were prepared to agree wholeheartedly with Zamoyski on this score. Still, a characteristic feature of the style of thinking of those people was a tendency to combine progressive ideas with elements of tradition, first of all those of religion with an addition of commonly accepted romantic morals.

Ludwik Górski wrote in his probably best-known text, intended as a sort of the "Klemensowczyks" programme declaration: "To believe so strongly in the power of tradition as to reject everything progressive and new in our ways of thinking and our needs, to blame any attempts at keeping us at the level of European civilization is tantamount to take prejudice for truth, ignorance for tradition". But this was only one side to his thinking. A few years later while discussing Kraszewski's *Choroby wieku* [*The Ailments of the Century*] his argument went like this: "So neither

⁹² A. Z [amoyski], *O zakładach dobroczynnych w kraju naszym* [*About the Charity Establishments in this Country*], "RGK", vol. XVII, 1850, pp. 117—118; J. Jedlicki, *Obozy ideowe...* [*Ideological Camps...*], pp. 479—480; R. Czepulis, *Mysł społeczna...* [*Social Thought...*], p. 154 ff.; In Italy of the spring time of nations, the small number of those employed in industry and the absence of big cities was presented by the "moderates" as a major obstacle for a Republican revolution, M. d'Azeglio, *Timori e speranze*, Torino 1849, p. 42; see also F. Sirugo, *op. cit.*, p. XXIX; V. Hunecke, *op. cit.*, p. 25 ff.

⁹¹ A. Zamoyski, *O własności i dzierżawie ze względu na włościan naszych* [*On Property and Lease in Regard of Our Peasants*], "RGK", vol. VII, 1845, pp. 247—249; the same, *Kilka praw z ekonomii politycznej czyli gospodarstwa krajowego* [*A Few Truths on the Political Economy that is the Home Economy*], "RGK", vol. XII, 1848, p. 266.

industry nor trade are by themselves materialism once they have been elevated and ennobled by a higher purpose, by an intention of fulfilling one's duty, of using profitably for ourselves and our fellow men the gifts granted us by God. But without that purpose, that higher motive, industry falls to the level of the meanest materialism, even if it is a manifestation of intellectual life".⁸⁴

So they did accept progress but it had to be "elevated and ennobled" by a "higher purpose", rooted in Christian tradition and modeled on the romantic pattern. Activity restricted to production, based on rational calculation, was often regarded as something questionable, marked by egoism and ruthlessness.⁸⁵ Though occasionally remarks of another kind were made too: Władysław Garbiński stressed the moral value of work and he derived "materialistic" behaviour simply from laziness.⁸⁶ But the prevailing opinion was that "industrial" activity should be based on other values than those created by modernity.

Thus in 1842, at the beginning of the "Klemensowczyks" activity, Adam Goltz published an article which was aimed at the overcoming of dilemmas resulting from the opposition of town and country, of tradition and modernity. "The pious countryside, distant from the stormy life of towns which is like a sea foaming with the waves of social life, with thousands of human inventions joining it like rivers, that countryside is unwilling to cross the frontiers of its existence. Its very essence is nourished by the sources of religion and of heart".⁸⁷ The author has summed up here the ideas that were becoming common at that period:

⁸⁴ L. Górski, *O konserwatyzmie w Polsce* [About Conservatism in Poland], in: the same, *Wybór pism. Wydawnictwo jubileuszowe* [Selection of Writings. A Jubilee Publication], Warszawa 1908, p. 180; the same, *O "Chorobach wieku" J. I. Kraszewskiego* [About the "Ailments of the Century" by J. I. Kraszewski], "RGK", vol. XXX, 1857, p. 280.

⁸⁵ A. Kurtz, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

⁸⁶ W. G[arbiński], *Przypisek* [Annotation], in: L. Górski, *O "Chorobach wieku"* [About the "Ailments of the Century"], pp. 295—296.

⁸⁷ A. Goltz, *Wieś i miasto w ich społecznym do siebie stanowisku* [Country and Town in their Mutual Social Position], "Biblioteka Warszawska", 1842, vol. I, p. 93.

countryside as an embodiment of social and moral order, and town—as that of development. Some aspects of that development are viewed critically in Goltz's article while the country's moral superiority appears in it obvious.⁹⁸ However, in the author's view that particular state is only a stage in a greater process. For all its faults the town's existence is highly justified because "there is no progress without a duality".⁹⁹ So the opposition of town and country would be an indispensable condition for the improvement of mankind.

The countryside should "restrain with the virtue of its ancestors the disolute and stormy activity of the town"—Goltz depicts the urban evil as a temporary phenomenon, endowed virtually with no real nature. And he writes at the same time: "Let the country seek in towns the resources of life to give vent to all the feelings it keeps stored in its womb and its delightful simplicity will then embrace all the shrines of progress so that those will no longer disturb the quietness of its space".¹⁰⁰

The country life, for all its benefits, cannot remain in the state of rustic torpor. "A countryman, attached to the past, does not look much into the future and does not care for what is going on in the world. He is not fond of novelty and of progress since these disturb his peace and banish the holy gods of his hearth [. . .]. His thought is still asleep and his feelings are not blown into the virile power of creativity". Although the countryman "keeps his tongue, faith and customs in sacred purity", he too, "staying as it were in emotional blindness, needs a guardian who will help him to get out those feelings and shield them against wickedness which might happen without proper enlightenment".¹⁰¹

The traditional partiarchal aspirations nourished by the gentry were assuming here a new tinge: in Goltz's view it was the

⁹⁸ "... alongside with the noble virile power we can see in the towns base selfishness, alongside with the astonishing products of human genius in art, with the churches filled with pious people we can also see unbridled passions and effeminate debouchery, alongside finally with luxury and comfort terrible misery and suffering" (*ibidem*, p. 105).

⁹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 106.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 95—96.

¹⁰¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 109—110.

mission of the gentry to achieve a synthesis of rustic and urban elements. This Hegelizing scheme was supposed to strengthen the intellectual background of the gentry modernization based on a coexistence of tradition and a modernistic vision. Goltz was formulating his ideas very clearly, but that motive of a synthesis was indeed present in the more general pronouncements emanating from the Zamoyski circle. It was a desirable synthesis and yet a precarious one, understood as a way out of the crisis and at the same time as a means to preserve that classe's dominant position in society.

Any modernization activity on a bigger scale was limited by the scarcity of resources and the country's political-social circumstances. But in the planning itself serious difficulties were arising too. The "Klemensow" ideal of modernization was based on the principle of combining innovation with tradition since the rejection of the first of these elements made any movement towards modernity impossible, and the rejection of the second rendered the whole process unacceptable to the gentry. So this was a modernization reflecting the needs and ambition of the advocates of agrarian capitalism who were at the same time representatives of a class used to social domination and attached to their age-old duty of responsibility for the nation's fate.

"The nobility should now lead in the improvement of this country since it has been deprived of any other occupation", noted Zamoyski in his diary. This motif would appear in the writings of the "Klemensowczyks" to the extent they could avoid the barriers of Russian censorship.¹⁰² There was to this gentry programme of modernization a national aspect, although the political conditions did not facilitate its manifestation.

The relationship between tradition and modernity was one of the essential ideological problems in the work carried out at

¹⁰² A. Zamoyski, *Moje przeprawy* [*My Incidents*], vol. I, Kraków 1906, p. 36; see S. Kieniewicz, *Między ugodą a rewolucją...* [*Between Reconciliation and Revolution...*], p. 17; "Since the tilt-yards have been closed for the knights and new social needs and duties have arisen, they became leaders of the nation in work, industry, education" (L. Górski, *O konserwatorstwie...* [*About Conservatism...*], p. 179—the article was published for the first time in Poznań in 1853).

the roots of society, and was particularly important in the activities of the Zamoyski group. By contrast with the hard-line conservatives the founders of the Agrarian Society used to maintain that modernization did not by any means lead to the destruction of national values, just the opposite: it could be used to protect and strengthen them. Yet not every model of modernization had in the "Klemensowczyks'" eyes that national value. We have already seen how many reservations they used to attach to their acceptance of the modernization idea trying to set up a model of coexistence between tradition and modernity. Also the work at the society's roots in the version of the Zamoyski group stressed the necessity to keep a balance between those two factors.¹⁰¹ Contemplated from the national point of view, modernization seemed a process as diversified as it was when its economic and social aspects were considered.

In the last century, the work at society's roots, similar to that in Poland, was also carried out in other communities striving for national emancipation.¹⁰⁴ As there is an absence of extensive comparative data on this subject, one cannot present more detailed conclusions, but even random studies reveal here a similarity of problems and styles of thinking.

Let us quote briefly an example: the Italian "moderates" were convinced that their programme of development had a clear national meaning. When Cavour wrote, in 1843, about the importance of building a railway line he saw in that new means of transport not only an element of technical-economic progress but also a vehicle of Italian unity. The Italians regarded the advance in civilization as a way of liberating themselves from Austrian domination and achieving unification, and at the same

¹⁰¹ M. Król, *op. cit.*, pp. 149—152.

¹⁰⁴ See S. Kieniewicz, *Problem pracy organicznej 1840—1890 [The Problem of Working at the Social Roots in 1840—1890]*, in: the same, *Historyk a świadomość narodowa [Historian and National Awareness]*, Warszawa 1982, p. 36; about a similarity between the Polish and Italian realities—the same, *Les Polonais et le Risorgimento 1848—1849*, in: S. Kieniewicz, K. Morawski, *La Polonia e il Risorgimento italiano*, Roma 1961, p. 4.

time the latter were supposed to accelerate that advance.¹⁰⁵ While thinking so the “moderates” tried mostly to reconcile modernity with tradition and in their programmes the idea of material progress was to be combined with a cultivation of a hierarchy of values.¹⁰⁶

And as regards the Hungarian realities we can find a similar ideology and style of activity in the doings of their landed gentry.¹⁰⁷ Yet in order to explain the background and nature of that similarity of problems one would have to carry out far-reaching comparative studies.

(Translated by Ludwik Wiewiórkowski)

¹⁰⁵ C. Cavour, *Des chemins de fer en Italie*, in: the same, *Scritti di economia*, pp. 225—248; R. Romeo, *Cavour*, vol. II, part I, pp. 216—220, part II, p. 476; *ibidem*, vol. III (1854—1861), Bari 1984, p. 943.

¹⁰⁶ K. R. Greenfield, *Economia e liberalismo nel Risorgimento. Il movimento nazionale in Lombardia dal 1814 al 1848*, introduction R. Romeo, Bari 1964; R. Ciasca, *L'origine del "Programma per l'opinione nazionale italiana" del 1847—48*, Milano 1916.

¹⁰⁷ G. Barany, *Stephen Szechenyi and Awakening of Hungarian Nationalism, 1791—1841*, Princeton 1968; P. Hanak, *The Bourgeoisification of the Hungarian Nobility—Reality and Utopia in the 19th Century*, in: *Etudes Historiques Hongroises 1985, publiées à l'occasion du XVI^e Congrès International des Sciences Historiques par le Comité National des Historiens Hongrois*, vol. I, Budapest 1985, pp. 403—413.