UDK 930.1:070(438):94(438)"1918/1939"
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.23.258973

Lidiya LAZURKO
PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor, Professor of the Department History of Ukraine, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (lazurkol@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-9748-9249
Researcher ID: D-4089-2019

Mykhailo KELMAN
PhD hab. (Law), Professor, Professor of the Department of Theory of Law and Constitutionalism, Institute of Law, Psychology and Innovative Education of Lviv Polytechnic National University, 14 Stepana Bandera Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79000 (muchaylo_lviv@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0002-4393-4626

Лідія ЛАЗУРКО
докторка історичних наук, доцентка, професорка кафедри історії України, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (lazurkol@gmail.com)

Михайло КЕЛЬМАН
доктор юридичних наук, професор, професор кафедри теорії права та конституціоналізму, Інститут права, психології та інноваційної освіти Національного університету "Львівська політехніка", вул. Степана Бандери, 14, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79000 (muchaylo_lviv@ukr.net)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Lazurko, L. & Kelman, M. The Polish state during the interwar period in Francisk Bujak's views (based on the magazine "Wieś i Państwo", 1938 – 1939). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin], 23,* 110–122. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.23.258973

THE POLISH STATE DURING THE INTERWAR PERIOD IN FRANCISK BUJAK'S VIEWS (BASED ON THE MAGAZINE "WIEŚ I PAŃSTWO", 1938 – 1939)

Abstract. The purpose of the study is *to elucidate the specifics of Franciszek Bujak's views on the Polish state functioning during the interwar period – the founder of the Lviv School of Socio-Economic History.* ***The research methodology*** *is based on the principles of historicism, systematicity, scientificity, verification, authorial objectivity, moderate narrative constructivism, as well as the use of general scientific (analysis, synthesis, generalization), special and historical (historical and genetic, historical and typological, historical and systemic) methods.* ***The scientific novelty*** *consists in the reconstruction of F. Bujak's views on the peculiarities of state-building processes in the Second Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.* ***The Conclusions.*** *Franciszek Bujak, the founder of the Polish School of Socio-Economic History, one of the most authoritative researchers of interwar Poland, left behind not only scientific but also journalistic heritage. An active participant in the "intellectual" competition for the*

restoration of historical Poland, in particular as a consultant at the Paris Peace Conference, F. Bujak had even some experience in politics as the Minister of Agriculture. He witnessed the formation and transformation of the political system of the Second Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and witnessing influenced his interests and was reflected in his scientific and journalistic work.

F. Bujak, a native of a peasant family and a longtime member of "the People's Party", paid special attention to the problems of the state's relations with peasants, the most numerous social stratum of that time. Considering the state as the highest degree of social organization based on coercion, he advocated harmonization through solidarity. F. Bujak interpreted solidarity as the best model of state organization, believing that solidarity of society members is the primary and determining factor in the state success.

Reflecting on the social order in interwar Poland, sandwiched between two totalitarianisms – Bolshevik and fascist – F. Bujak paid attention to the peculiar "Polish totalitarianism" of J. Piłsudski, in which there was preserved the appearance of democracy. The researcher considered "classical" totalitarianism impossible in Poland due to the incredible diversity of the Polish society. As for the latter, F. Bujak was mostly interested in issues related to the peasantry, which he considered not only the economic but also spiritual basis of the state. The researcher considered the problems of the peasantry in opposition to the nobility as a privileged part of society, which also underwent significant transformations. In this context, one of the urgent tasks he considered overcoming the prejudices of the state towards the peasants and the peasants towards the state. The latter, in his opinion, was possible only by raising the educational and cultural level of the peasantry.

Key words: *Rzeczpospolita II, state, scientific press, magazine "Wieś i Państwo", Polish historiography.*

ПОЛЬСЬКА ДЕРЖАВА МІЖВОЄННОГО ПЕРІОДУ В ОЦІНКАХ ФРАНЦІШЕКА БУЯКА (ЗА МАТЕРІАЛАМИ ЧАСОПИСУ "WIEŚ I PAŃSTWO", 1938 – 1939)

Мета дослідження *– розкрити специфіку поглядів на питання функціонування польської держави міжвоєнного періоду Францішека Буяка – творця львівської соціально-економічної історичної школи.* ***Методологія дослідження*** *ґрунтується на принципах історизму, системності, науковості, верифікації, авторської об'єктивності, поміркованого наративного конструктивізму, а також на використанні загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез, узагальнення) та спеціально-історичних (історико-генетичний, історико-типологічний, історико-системний) методів.* ***Наукова новизна*** *полягає у реконструюванні поглядів Ф. Буяка на особливості державотворчих процесів у II Речі Посполитій.* ***Висновки.*** *Францішек Буяк, засновник польської школи соціально-економічної історії, один з найбільш авторитетних дослідників міжвоєнної Польщі, залишив по собі не лише наукову, а й публіцистичну спадщину. Активний учасник "інтелектуальних" змагань за відновлення історичної Польщі, зокрема як консультант на Паризькій мирній конференції, Ф. Буяк навіть мав досвід політичної діяльності як міністр сільського господарства. На його очах відбувалося становлення і трансформація політичної системи II Речі Посполитої, і це впливало на його зацікавленості та відображалося у науковій і публіцистичній творчості.*

Виходець з селянської родини, багатолітній член "Стронніцтва людового", Ф. Буяк звертав особливу увагу на проблеми взаємин держави із селянами – найбільш чисельною тогочасною суспільною верствою. Розглядаючи державу як вищий ступінь суспільної організації, заснованої на примусі, ратував за гармонізацію цього шляхом солідаризації. Ф. Буяк трактував солідаризм як найкращу модель державної організації, вважаючи, що саме солідарність членів суспільства є первинним та визначальним фактором успішності держави.

Роздумуючи про суспільний устрій міжвоєнної Польщі, затиснутої між двома тоталітаризмами – більшовицьким та фашистським – Ф. Буяк приділяв увагу своєрідному "польському тоталітаризму" Й. Пісудського, при якому зберігалася видимість демократії. Дослідник уважав неможливим у Польщі "класичний" тоталітаризм через неймовірну строкатість польського суспільства. Що стосується останнього, то найбільше Ф. Буяка цікавили питання, пов'язані з селянською верствою, яку він вважав не лише економічною,

а й духовною основою держави. Проблеми селянства дослідник розглядав у опозиції до шляхти як привілейованої частини суспільства, що також переживала значні трансформації. У цьому контексті одним із нагальних завдань називав подолання упереджень держави до селян та селян до держави. Останнє, на його думку, було можливим лише завдяки підвищенню освітнього і культурного рівня селянської верстви.

Ключові слова: *ІІ Річ Посполита, держава, наукова преса, часопис "Wieś i Państwo", польська історіографія.*

The Problem Statement. Franciszek Bujak – a historian, intellectual, active participant in the state-building processes in interwar Poland, is considered one of the most famous researchers of that period, after all, his name is associated with the creation of a new historical discipline. He witnessed and participated in the creation, formation and development of the Second Commonwealth – a European state with significant historical traditions and all the problems inherent in the newly created state. Analyzing the issue of these topics comprehension by F. Bujak in the pages of the specialized scientific and journalistic magazine "Wieś i Państwo", we reconstruct the researcher's views on the state-building problems of Poland during the interwar period.

The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches. The study of the scientific activity of the founder of the first Polish School of Socio-Economic History has its own tradition, dating back to the 60–70s of the XXth century, and is so diverse that it deserves a separate study. The first attempts to evaluate the work of F. Bujak were made by Ye. Topolski in the context of understanding the scientific achievements of one of his students and colleagues – Roman Grodetsky (Topolski, 1963, pp. 56–76), and V. Kula, analyzing issues about the problems and methods of economic history (Kula, 1963). In Polish historiography these attempts gave rise to the first discussions on the theoretical and methodological foundations of the scientific work of F. Bujak (Madurowicz-Urbanska, 1976, pp. 37–170) and initiated attempts to analyze the problem holistically (Grabski, 1976, pp. 101–124).

Notable, in the context of the time of its appearance, was the work of A. K. Shelton, American researcher, dedicated to F. Bujak as a bearer of the democratic idea in Polish historiography (Shelton, 1989). The next wave of interest in F. Bujak's personality and his scientific work happened at the beginning of a new millennium, which was presented in the project "Multicultural Historical Environment of Lviv" (Budzyński, 2004, pp. 309–328, Wójcik-Łagan, 2007, pp. 500–510), the "Golden Book of Lviv Historians" was the result of project work (Budzyński, 2007, pp. 421–440). In 2009 the monograph was published on the life and work of F. Bujak (Szafraniec, 2009).

In addition, some aspects of F. Bujak's activity aroused the interest of researchers: his scientific and pedagogical work (Wójcik-Łagan, 2007, pp. 500–510; Hrytsak, 2014; Yureiko, 2019, pp. 461–477), formation of socio-economic history as a discipline at Lviv University during the interwar period (Sroka, 2015, pp. 651–653), research of the history of socio-economic studies in the pages of the Polish scientific press at the beginning of the XXth century (Lazurko & Shcherban, 2020, p. 46–53). It is worth noting the emergence of source publications on personal and scientific relations of F. Bujak (Pisulińska, 2020, pp. 361–397). In the researches there were also reflected some aspects of studying of F. Bujak's activities such as: an initiator of various publishing projects (Franaszek, 2000, pp. 37–46), a supporter and one of the ideologues of agrarianism in Poland (Kowalczyk, 2016, pp. 85–98), a critique of the Polish agrarian policy during the interwar period (Baran & Sypko, 2019, pp. 89–102).

However, taking into consideration the scale of the scientific achievements of F. Bujak, his active social and political position, many issues still need elaboration. One of such issues is

F. Bujak's understanding of formation and development problems of the restored Polish state during the interwar period. This issue is of great interest to us, because nowadays Ukraine is no in a similar situation of state development.

The Purpose of the Research. Reconstruction of F. Bujak's views on the peculiarities of state-building processes in the restored (and, in fact, newly created) country – the Second Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

The Results of the Research. In 1920, agreeing to move to Lviv at the invitation of the then dean of the Department of Philosophy and his longtime friend S. Zakshevsky, F. Bujak wrote to him: "It's about time and peace for work, I hope that in this regard, the Department of Philosophy will treat me kindly and with understanding. So in advance, I decided not to take up any public work, let alone political" (Pisulińska, 2019, p. 378). Thus, started the founder of the Lviv School of Socio-Economic History, later known in Europe and equated, in scope, including publishing, to the French School of the Annales (Zamorski, 2020, p. 73). F. Bujak wanted to have a half-year leave and asked: "As for the seminar, I would like to avoid the hassle of organizing it, I would gladly agree to accept me for a seminar on the history of Poland, so I don't have to buy and create a separate library" (Pisulińska, 2019, p. 379). Apparently he had a hard time the year he spent in Warsaw before moving to Lviv, where he did not make a political career (he was the Minister of Agriculture in the government of V. Grabsky for one month only), and did not like teaching at the local university and the Higher School of Commerce.

Lviv seemed to F. Bujak a great location for a quiet continuation of his scientific career. In September of 1920, by the rescript of the Head of State (at the request of the rector) F. Bujak was appointed the head of the Department of Socio-Economic History created for him at Lviv University specially. Due to the circumstances, he was able to take up his duties only at the beginning of 1921, but the activity exceeded all possible expectations and did not fit into F. Bujak's idea of quiet work at the periphery. Ten years later, the Department, which from the very beginning, in addition to the usual classes and scientific and publishing activities, was transformed into the Institute of Socio-Economic History. The main reason for this transformation was the "specificity" of F. Bujak's school – a combination of scientific and didactic work: students received feasible research tasks at the first classes (Budzyński, 2004, p. 316), the best of which were published.

To implement publishing, in 1925 F. Bujak founded the publishing series "Studies in Social and Economic History", which represented the main directions of scientific work of the department and in which there were published research results of his students and colleagues. Taking into consideration what was done in a relatively short time – less than a decade – this first large-scale project of F. Bujak was very successful. In 1931 this success enabled F. Bujak and J. Rutkowski to dare to create a specialized magazine "Annuals of Social and Economic History" ("Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych"), aiming at socio-economic history, and later to launch another publishing series "Library of History and Culture of Village" (1936) and another magazine "Wieś i Państwo" ("Village and State") (1938). The latter became a kind of tribune, expressing F. Bujak's position and his associates on the issues of possible forming relations between the "agrarian state with its own largest social group – the peasants" (Baran & Sypko, 2019, p. 91).

Creating a specialized magazine "Wieś i Państwo" in 1938, its authors remarked: "To resist this situation [it was about the antagonism of the state and the peasantry, which intensified during the strikes of 1937 – L. Lazurko] and call for the cooperation of all those who feel

responsible for the fate of Poland, those who want and know how to work for its growth and future" (Od wydawnictwa, 1938, N1, p. 1). The pages of the magazine were opened to discuss the ways to achieve this cooperation through the study of the mutual importance of the village and the state, mutual rights and responsibilities, to avoid crises. Announcing the basis of their own activities, the authors of the publication emphasized the need for truthful coverage of current issues, based on verified facts, statistics, sociological analysis and trying to compare everything with similar processes in the world.

In form it was a monthly magazine and during the year of 1938 10 of its issues were published. The following year, by September, they had published six issues. The issues were quite voluminous – up to 80 pages each and contained the following sections: more than half of the content was occupied by "research and articles", the rest – "reviews", "chronicle", "reports", "bibliography". The published materials were not only scientific from a formal point of view (taking into account the applied scientific apparatus), but first of all from the point of view of "spirit and content". At the same time, outlining the direction of the publication, it was noted that it was aimed at not only specialists but also at a wide range of people who were interested in these issues.

In a political sense, the magazine took a neutral position: "Our magazine will focus on the creation and dissemination of the programme of the Polish countryside in all directions and consideration of methods of work on a rural development" (Od wydawnictwa, 1938, p. 3). Actually, this project was about practical goals. At that time in Poland there were already two state institutions of theoretical orientation: "Institute of Rural Culture" and "Institute of Rural Sociology", which developed their own publishing activities and were focused on research activities. Instead, this magazine was to function as a mediator between theory and practice, between scientific knowledge and the application of its results in life.

F. Bujak wrote on rural and agricultural topics since the beginning of his scientific career, which was probably influenced by his own rural origin. His journalistic activity became much more active at the beginning of World War I. F. Bujak saw his civic duty in social activities aimed at raising the level of education and justifying the need to change the existing economic system. As it was mentioned above, his effective participation in the political life of the Polish state after independence was not very successful. F. Bujak was a supporter of democracy and social equality, being a member of the national camp for a while, after the rise of nationalist sentiment there, he left the ranks. And already during the period of independence he joined the Polish People's (Peasants') Party "Piast" (Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe "Piast"), which in 1931 transformed into the People's Party ("Stronnictwo Ludowe") (Budzyński, 2007, p. 429).

In a series of essays published in the pages of this magazine, F. Bujak described the young Polish state of the interwar period and reflected on the gains, losses and prospects of its development. The first issue began with a kind of programme article by F. Bujak, which was called, like the magazine itself, "Village and State" (Bujak, 1938, N1, pp. 5–12). In four points the author outlined the importance of the village in the Polish state formation and development. Focusing on the "new times of totalitarianism" that swept Poland after the May coup of 1926 and the introduction of the policy of reorganization, he noted that this was not the first and obviously not the last wave of confrontation between the state and the individual.

In this essay, F. Bujak interpreted the state as "the highest organization of human societies, based on coercion and encompassing all people living in its territory" (Bujak, 1938, N1, p. 5). In his opinion, this happened historically. Only the volume and intensity of state activity

changed, as well as the set of measures used by it, as it always depended on the level of culture and goals set by the state (more precisely, a group of people in power).

Thus, in the issue of relations between the state and citizens, the state and the individual were, in his opinion, "doomed to coexistence, mutually supporting each other and mutually dependent on each other" (Bujak, 1938, N1, p. 5). The most difficult, and therefore dramatic item in this process was always the search of balance, a fair finding of the boundaries of interdependence, and the difficulty of respecting them.

Trying to justify what had said, the author presented his vision of the state formation from ancient times, with special emphasis on the attitude of the state to the village, i.e., to a group of small farmers who lived in the village and represented a separate form of settlement in Poland. Analyzing the issue of the state formation, he began with the question of what the oldest socio-political institution was – the village or the state. According to the author, the village was the oldest form of a social organization: "Once the state was as small as the village, and the village was the state – a prototype of the state" (Bujak, 1938, N1, p. 6). According to the researcher, such pre-state formations were characteristic of the Paleolithic, when settlements had their own defined territory, their own government (council of elders), which regulated relations with the world of nature (through beliefs), relations within the community (through a system of prohibitions) and external relations (interacting with other communities). The complication of this system led to the separation of the monopoly way of governing and the emergence of a hierarchical social structure.

According to F. Bujak, the mechanism of the state formation was "the forced unification of villages, which continued to preserve their original structure and way of life… But after thousands of years of the state existence and its cultural development, the village did not cease to exist in its original form" (Bujak, 1938, N1, p. 7). The specificity of Poland as the state was that it followed this path a little later than the countries formed in the lands of the Roman Empire. In other respects, everything was similar: the upper classes (the gentry) were also replenished with newcomers from foreign lands and from their own rural population, which also became a replenishment source of artisans and merchants.

Trying to emphasize the importance of the peasantry for the state, F. Bujak noted that in the Middle Ages the peasantry representatives were also actively involved in the defense of the Polish state. Later, they formed the basis of the commonwealth nobility, which included village elders, and in modern times the infantry from the peasants of the royal villages joined the mercenary army. In addition, at all times the army was supported by taxes paid by ordinary, common people. The last attempt to involve these "silent witnesses" of the Second Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth decay into the affairs of the state, as F. Bujak noted, was the participation of peasants (cossins) in the uprising of T. Kościuszko. Characterizing the situation of the XIXth century the researcher wrote: "It is a pity and sad to mention the importance of the passivity of the peasants for the restoration of Poland's independence, the reason for which was the reluctance of the nobility to lose their privileges and recognize the peasants as owners of their land" (Bujak, 1938, N1, p. 7).

F. Bujak paid special attention to the importance of preserving the Polish national culture during the period of statelessness. In his opinion, the peasants were the elements that preserved the language and religion (thus preventing the process of "erosion" of the ethnic group) and folklore – the basis of a national culture. And characterizing the contemporary period, he argued that "the condition for the preservation of the Polish state is to raise the culture of the masses in order to reduce the gap between ordinary people and the educated

class, between the ideals of the people and the ideals of the intelligentsia, because the latter were based on the historical noble tradition" (Bujak, 1938, N1, pp. 10–11). Therefore, the greatest internal threat to interwar Poland, in his opinion, was the lack of a national solidarity between the two parts of the people. Since F. Bujak interpreted solidarity as the best model of a social organization, it was the solidarity of society members that he proclaimed the primary and determining factor in a public life. And the shortest way to achieve social solidarity, which could increase the state's defense capabilities and the functionality of its apparatus, he considered the rise of education of the masses.

In accordance with the ideology of solidarity, F. Bujak considered justified the need for the state regulation, the existence of socially significant laws, various voluntary associations, and etc. more. In this context, he considered one of the urgent tasks to change the attitude of the peasant masses to the state and the state to the peasants – in order to achieve solidarity. Indicative in this sense is his statement: the Poles without peasants cannot be considered people" (Bujak, 1938, N1, p. 11). After all, even from an economic point of view, the main breadwinner of the population of interwar Poland were peasants – small landowners, who accounted for 75% of the country's population. But governments which kaleidoscopically changed during the 20–30's of the XX century, managed to organize an agrarian reform (after the failed one in 1920) until 1925, but its main provisions were very contradictory (Baran, Sypko, 2019, pp. 89–102).

The issue of solidarity realization through the involvement of peasants in joint work for the benefit of the state became especially acute in the 1930s of the XXth century – before the threat of war and the possible re-loss of Poland's independence. In this regard, F. Bujak wrote: "If the nobility in the past could not maintain independence, then even more at present there can be no question of maintaining independence by the state, which pushes away the majority of the population, which plays the most important role in its body" (Bujak, 1938, N1, p. 11).

Another issue, in addition to the problems of forming a solidary basis for the functioning of the Polish state, which attracted F. Buyak's attention was the issue of a political system. In the article "Village and Totalitarianism" F. Bujak expressed his vision of this problem, in his opinion, the most topical problem at that time (Bujak, 1938, N2, p. 88). The importance of this issue grew due to the fact that in the 30's of the XXth century Poland still faced the problem of choosing the road it had to take. Therefore, the researcher focused on the sources of totalitarian ideas, ways to implement them in the modern world and the prospects for implementation in Poland.

According to F. Bujak, the main sources of topical totalitarian ideas were: Marxism, whose supporters aimed to change the social order in the world in a revolutionary way and World War I, which led to profound changes in the economic, social and political life of many European countries. F. Bujak stated that socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia became possible as a result of the war, and fascism in Italy, National Socialism in Germany (as well as similar systems in other European countries) appeared in opposition to this Bolshevik socialism. Mussolini and Hitler came to power using the contradictions of the existing systems in their countries and the unprecedented propaganda of their own ideas. According to F. Bujak in Poland, the feeling of the need for a strong leader stemmed from external and internal threats (and not without the influence of Mussolini's success) and emerged when it became clear that coalition governments could not assure the state security and sustainable development.

Then, first R. Dmovsky and V. Vitos began to advocate for strong power, and later in May of 1926 J. Piłsudski carried out a coup d'etat. As a result, the democratic state system was seemingly preserved, but J. Piłsudski remained a dictator until the end of his life, subordinating the army and foreign policy and influencing through his protégés to resolve all issues of domestic life (Pobóg-Malinowski, 1956; Wielka historia Polski: 1918 – 1939, 2000). An interesting description of these processes as "inevitable" is found in the monograph of N. Davis: "A society in which two-thirds of the population lived on subsistence agriculture and one-third consisted of national minorities could hardly afford the liberal atmosphere of a gradual change characteristic of wealthy and stable Western countries" (Deivis, 2008, p. 752). Nor did it seem that F. Bujak was particularly "upset" by this "Polish" totalitarian way (which, apparently, he did not consider quite real), different from the Italian and German. It is also interesting that the researcher believed that the ground was not very favourable for "Marxist" type of totalitarianism in Poland. But the post-World War II situation "plowed" the soil of many Eastern European countries.

F. Bujak was also interested in the implementation of totalitarianism, its implementation in the state practice. According to the researcher, this happened in "a network" way: "the enthusiasm and outrageous energy of the creators of totalitarianism in Italy and Germany… spread through a network of supporters and then captured the masses" (Bujak, 1938, N2, pp. 90–91). F. Bujak, a supporter of the "new history", used to take into account socio-psychological factors in the historical process (Grabski, 2000, p. 116) and he said that masses of people were taken into "a mental captivity". Propaganda, well-trained supporters, a leader, gaining (or seizing) power, establishing a one-party system and subordinating the entire system of the state power – this is the way in which totalitarianism captured nations. Instead, in Poland, everything was different – a secret preparation for a coup, which took the form of re-subordination of troops to the Head of the state. Without propaganda, without creation of a corporate system (except for "Piłsudski's colonels", later – sources of the state administrative resource). That is why, after the death of J. Piłsudski all this "special" totalitarianism fell apart like a house of cards in Poland, in 1935. "This is not surprising", said F. Bujak, "because without an idea and a leader, people do not understand what to believe in and what to do" (Bujak, 1938, N2, p. 92). On the basis of this fact the researcher concluded that in Poland true totalitarianism could be implemented only the same way as in other European countries: through an ideological movement (based on deep feelings and needs of the people) and in the presence of a charismatic leader who would be passionate about these ideas.

Reflecting on the prospects of totalitarianism in Poland, F. Bujak sincerely thought that this type of the state power had no chance in this country. F. Bujak considered the peculiarities of the Polish society as the main reason for this. He wrote: "Society is difficult to be disciplined, although by nature it is passive and prone to obedience. Among the intelligentsia there are many who are uncritical and who are easy to be bribed with beautiful words, many weak-willed, poor, ready to remain silent… However, all are too different" (Bujak, 1938, N2, p. 93). According to F. Bujak, the only totalitarianism that could be realized in Poland could only be the way it was during the life of J. Piłsudski – a significant moral authority for the majority of citizens.

Therefore, Poland's prospects in the totalitarian system seemed to him different from the prospects of totalitarianism in Poland. According to F. Bujak, this system did not correspond to the nature of "Polishness": "In totalitarian system's frame, totalitarianism will never be fully explained, especially taking into consideration the military needs due to the geographical

location of the country. If public opinion claims that in Italy and Germany, totalitarianism depletes (sterilizes) artistic creativity and weakens a scientific creativity, then we should be even more afraid of it (Bujak, 1938, N2, pp. 93–94). According to F. Bujak, it was necessary to be especially wary of this in the sphere of public administration due to the instability of traditions in the young state, which critically needed professional, not party (loyal) personnel. "After all, F. Bujak noted that in Poland public officials are not very sympathetic to the people anyway, but what will happen if they get an unlimited power?" (Bujak, 1938, N2, p. 93).

Reflecting on the question of totalitarianism in relation to the Polish village, he wrote: "As for the village, it has never created totalitarianism, it is a form of government, which was only imposed on the village… The peasant instinctively feels that totalitarianism brings an increase in duties in favour of the state, economic and political control through increased bureaucracy" (Bujak, 1938, N2, p. 94). All this could be seen on the example of the Soviet Union at the beginning of the 30's of the XXth century. However, in Poland, according to the data, the official introduction of "its own" totalitarianism, at least at the beginning, did not worsen the situation. But F. Bujak believed that the village should resist totalitarianism, because it had something to lose: "Initially, militarization of the economy leads to its growth, but temporarily. Militarization threatens to restrict civil and political rights and leads to further deterioration of economic, cultural and political life… For example, if magazines for peasants are banned now, in the future only the government press will be published. If even now the elections are quite conditional, in the future they will be nominal" (Bujak, 1938, N2, p. 95).

It is interesting that for F. Bujak totalitarianism – like everything human – is better and worse. He wanted to hope that the Polish totalitarianism, which implied freedom of conscience and religion, freedom of individual organizations, speech and press, was better. But he was also aware that from his point of view (both geographically and temporally) the value of totalitarianism remained unknown. In this regard, F. Bujak wrote: "It [totalitarianism" is still being tested. Some attempts has already ended catastrophically, and the boldest Russian attempt terrifies all mankind and, despite its short duration, threatens catastrophe. A great war is imminent, which will help clarify the situation undoubtedly. Until then, the results of the war will show whether the constitutional and democratic system or totalitarianism, better ensure the existence and future of the state and nation" (Bujak, 1938, N2, p. 95).

Analyzing F. Bujak's views on the Polish state of the interwar period, one cannot ignore his vision of those transformations which all, and especially the privileged social strata, underwent under new conditions. In the essay "Nobility" F. Bujak focused on the situation of this class representatives in restored Poland (Bujak, 1938, N3, pp. 161–168). To do this, he made an excursion into the history of the concept of "nobility", emphasizing, first of all, its negative connotations, which began to spread with the emergence of social democratic tendencies in the society (shortly after the defeat of the November Uprising) and were closely associated with the modernization of life at that time. In a broader sense, according to F. Bujak, the concept of "the nobility" included a negative view of the rural population – underestimation of its weight, exclusion from influence on public affairs – i. e., everything that contained harmful aspects to the village, state and its authorities.

The most characteristic feature of the nobility was the social superiority of its representatives. The feeling of superiority over the peasant and the right to rule over him was based on the theory of multi-tribal or even racial origin of the nobility and peasants. "The peasants", wrote F. Bujak", are considered inferior, incapable of spiritual development, forced to work and obey". This vision is similar to and follows from the same source as in

classical antiquity on slaves and barbarians and in the Western European view on colored people nowadays. (Bujak, 1938, N3, p. 164).

But in addition to the negative, F. Bujak emphasized the positive features of the nobility, also represented by highly moral, capable, educated, sacrificial and hardworking people. He also noted that the Polish nobility was characterized by democracy. After all, the role of the nobility in the emergence of democratic currents stemmed from its cultural seniority and the process of a partial declassification under the influence of modern economic conditions. In fact, in his opinion, negativism towards the nobility dominated at the time when its representatives allowed to "shake" a powerful state and voluntarily agreed to the first two divisions of the country.

F. Bujak spoke about these negative features, warning against the elitism of his day, which, like totalitarianism, was harmful to the development of the young Polish state. He saw the greatest harm from the nobility in its one-party rule, which was followed by the slogan "the state is us". He wrote: "By not allowing the others to rule the state, the magnates actually reduced the dark and economically dependent petty gentry to the role of an instrument in their hands. This resonates perfectly with the modern idea of elitism and with today's totalitarian tendencies" (Bujak, 1938, N3, p. 166). The researcher interpreted contemporary elite as a sociological (rather than heraldic, tribal) continuation of the former nobility, because of the similarity of defining features, and in this he saw serious threats to the democratic development of the state. However, in response, representatives of the elites accused the supporters of democracy that the lower classes showed the same political shortcomings as the nobility, therefore, they must be deprived of political rights in order to protect the state from the anarchy and disintegration born by the "seimocracy".

Later, F. Bujak, developing this "noble-peasant" theme, analyzed the issues of comparative assessment of the spiritual traits of these classes representatives (Bujak, 1938, N4, pp. 258–269). That is why, it was about refuting the accusations of some politicians that the involvement of broader social groups in the state-building processes at the beginning of the 20's of the XXth century brought an element of anarchy no less destructive than the chaos in the activities of the nobility in the Second Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

According to F. Bujak, cultural figures, like politicians, also saw in the representatives of the people elements other than the nobility, namely – the inability to recept and create culture in the same direction as the higher class did. The researcher noted that such views were the result of the historical cultural distance between the nobility and the people, and long-standing mutual prejudices. Trying to understand this, F. Bujak immersed himself in history, turning to the topic of depicting the nobility and the peasants by Jan Dlugosz, who in the first book of his "History of Poland" included a section entitled "On the Nature and Customs of the Poles". "The analysis of Jan Dlugosz's views shows, wrote F. Bujak, that in the eyes of the greatest connoisseur of Poland of that time, the Polish nation was homogeneous at the end of the Middle Ages, and the differences between the nobility and the peasants were determined only by the degree of wealth and culture" (Bujak, 1938, N4, pp. 258–269). The nobility in a modernized society left the historical arena and the peasant, according to F. Bujak, was to become "the expression of Poland". Without trying to preach F. Bujak, however, predicted the beginning of a new period in the development of the Polish nation and culture – a period of predominance of the peasant element, which he preferred to consider the "peasant spring" (Bujak, 1938, N8, p. 488).

F. Bujak, however, did not consider this confrontation insurmountable and optimistically noted that "The two main strata of the Polish nation had a significant common feature, which

can be considered an advantage or a disadvantage depending on the point of view – the unwillingness to tolerate rape and coercion, based on deep feelings of self-righteousness and internal dignity. 150 years passed since the first partition and 200 years since the first Russian intervention (the quiet Sejm of 1717), and the nobility-nation did not stop striving for independence until it finally achieved independence" (Bujak, 1938, N4, pp. 268–269).

The Conclusion. Franciszek Bujak, the founder of the Polish School of Socio-Economic History, one of the most authoritative researchers of interwar Poland, left behind not only scientific but also journalistic heritage. An active participant in the "intellectual" competition for the restoration of historical Poland, in particular as a consultant at the Paris Peace Conference, F. Bujak even had experience of a political activity as the Minister of Agriculture. He witnessed the formation and transformation of the political system of the Second Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and this influenced his interests and was reflected in his scientific and journalistic work.

F. Bujak, a native of a peasant family and a longtime member of the People's Party, focused on the problems of the state's relations with the peasants, the most numerous social stratum of that time. Considering the state as the highest degree of a social organization based on coercion, he advocated the harmonization of it through solidarity. F. Bujak interpreted solidarity as the best model of a social organization, believing that the solidarity of the society members is the primary and determining factor in the success of the state.

Reflecting on the social structure of interwar Poland, sandwiched between two totalitarianisms – Bolshevik and fascist – F. Bujak focused on a kind of "Polish totalitarianism" of J. Piłsudski, which maintained the appearance of democracy. The researcher considered classical totalitarianism impossible in Poland due to the incredible diversity of the Polish society. As for the latter, F. Bujak was mostly interested in issues related to the peasantry, which he considered not only the economic but also the spiritual basis of the state. The researcher considered the problems of the peasantry in opposition to the nobility as a privileged part of the society, which also underwent significant transformations. In this context, one of the urgent tasks he considered overcoming the prejudices of the state towards the peasants and the peasants towards the state. The latter, in his opinion, was possible only by raising the educational and cultural level of the peasantry.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for the given advice during the preparation of the article for publishing.

Funding. The authors did not receive any financial assistance for research, preparation and publication of the article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baran, Z. & Sypko, B. (2019). Ahrarna polityka polskoho uriadu v otsintsi F. Buiaka [Agrarian policy of the Polish government in the assessment of F. Bujak]. *Kwartalnik Kolegium Ekonomiczno-Społecznego Studia i Prace, 3,* 89–102. Doi: 10.33119/KKESSiP.2019.3.4 [in Ukrainian]

Budzyński, Z. (2004). Szkoła historii społeczno-gospodarczej Franciszka Bujaka na Uniwersytecie Jana Kazimierza we Lwowie [Franciszek Bujak's school of socio-economic history at Jan Kazimierz University in Lviv]. *Wielokulturowe środowisko historyczne Lwowa w XIX i XX wieku*. (t. 2, pp. 309–328). Rzeszów: Wyd. Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego. [in Polish]

Budzyński, Z. (2007). Franciszek Bujak (1875 – 1953) [Franciszek Bujak (1875 – 1953)]. *Złota księga historiografii lwowskiej XIX i XX wieku.* (pp. 421–440). Rzeszów: Wyd. Uniwersutetu Rzeszowskiego. [in Polish]

Bujak, F. (1918). *O naprawie ustroju rolnego w Polsce* [About improving the agricultural system in Poland]. Warszawa, 160 p. [in Polish]

Bujak, F. (1938). Chłop wyrazicielem duha Polski [The peasant expresses the duha of Poland]. *Wieś i Państwo, 8,* 486–488. [in Polish]

Bujak, F. (1938). Po latach dwudziestu [After twenty years]. *Wieś i Państwo, 9,* 641–649. [in Polish]

Bujak, F. (1938). Szlachetczyzna [The Noble]. *Wieś i Państwo, 3,* 161–168. [in Polish]

Bujak, F. (1938). Wieś a Totalizm [Village and Totalizm]. *Wieś i Państwo, 2,* 88–92. [in Polish]

Bujak, F. (1938). Wieś i Państwo [The Village and the State]. *Wieś i Państwo, 1,* 5–12. [in Polish]

Bujak, F. (1938). Z jednej gliny jesteśmy [We are from One Clay]. *Wieś i Państwo, 4,* 258–269. [in Polish]

Deivis, N. (2008). *Bozhe ihryshche: istoriia Polshchi* [God's Playground: History of Poland]. Kyiv: "Osnovy", 1080 p. [in Polish]

Franaszek, P. (2000). Bujakowska koncepcja badania dziejów gospodarczych ziem polskich. "Badania z Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych" i Informator statystyczny do dziejów społeczno-gospodarczych Galicji [Bujak's concept of researching the economic history of Polish lands. "Research on Social and Economic History" and a statistical guide to the socio-economic history of Galicia]. *Celem nauki jest człowiek... Studia z historii społecznej i gospodarczej ofiarowane Helenie Madurowicz-Urbańskiej*. (pp. 37–46). Kraków. [in Polish]

Grabski, A. F. (1976). Franciszek Bujak i historia gospodarcza (Uwagi o metodologicznych poglądach uczonego) [Franciszek Bujak and economic history (Notes on the methodological views of the scientist)]. *Historyka, 9,* 101–124. [in Polish]

Grabski, A. F. (2000) *Zarys historii historiografii polskiej* [An outline of the history of Polish historiography]. Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, Poznań, 278 p. [in Polish]

Hrytsak, Y. (2014). Ukrainskyi vymir shkoly Frantsishka Buiaka [Ukrainian dimension of the school of Frantsisk Buyak]. *Ukraina na istoriohrafichniy mapi Yevropy*. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy, 251 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kowalczyk, E. (2016). Agraryzm i jego wyraz w myśli społeczno-ekonomicznej F. Bujaka, W. Stysia i W. Grabskiego [Agrarianism and its expression in the socio-economic ideas of F. Bujak, W. Stys and W. Grabski]. *Przegląd Prawa i Administracji, 105,* 85–98. Doi: 10.19195/0137-1134.105.6 [in Polish]

Kula, W. (1963). *Problemy i metody historii gospodarczej* [Problems and methods of economic history]. Warsawa: Wyd. Naukowe PWN, 786 p. [in Polish]

Lazurko, L. & Shcherban, O. (2020). Historical and economic problems on the pages of the journal "Kwartalnik Historyczny" (1887 – 1918). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin], 14,* 46–53. Doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.14.197178 [in English]

Madurowicz-Urbanska, H. (1976). Franciszek Bujak – o nowy kształt historii [Franciszek Bujak – about the New Shape of History]. *Bujak F. Wybór pism*. (t. 1, s. 37–170). Warszawa: PWN. [in Polish] Od wydawnictwa. (1938). [From Publisher]. *Wieś i Państwo, 1,* 1. [in Polish]

Pisulińska, J. (2020). Rzecz o przyjaźni i nauce historycznej. Listy Franciszka Bujaka do Stanisława Zakrzewskiego w zbiorach Biblioteki Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich we Wrocławiu [On friendship and historical sciences. Letters from Franciszek Bujak to Stanisław Zakrzewski in the collection of the Library of the National Ossolineum Institute in Wrocław]. *Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych, 81,* 361–397. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/RDSG.2020.13 [in Polish]

Pobóg-Malinowski, W. (1956). *Najnowsza historia polityczna Polski 1864 – 1945* [The recent political history of Poland 1864 – 1945]. Vol. 2, Part 1. Londyn, 665 p. [in Polish]

Shelton, A. K. (1989). *The democratic idea in the Polish history and historiography: Franciszek Bujak (1875 – 1953)*. Colorado: Columbia University Press, 315 p. [in English]

Sroka, Ł. T. (2015). Historia społeczno-gospodarcza [Historia społeczno-gospodarcza]. *Academia Militans. Uniwersytet Jana Kazimierza we Lwowie*. (pp. 651–653). Kraków: Wyd. Wysoki Zamek, Instytut Pamięci Narodowej. [in Polish]

Szafraniec, B. (2009). Franciszek Bujak (1875 – 1953). Życie, działalność naukowo-dydaktyczna *i* społeczna [Franciszek Bujak (1875 – 1953). Życie, działalność naukowo-dydaktyczna i społeczna]. Toruń, 305 p. [in Polish]

Topolski, J. (1963) Badania historyczno-gospodarcze w Polsce [Historical and economic research in Poland]. *Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych, 25,* 56–76. [in Polish]

Wielka historia Polski: 1918 – 1939. (2000). [The Great History of Poland 1918 – 1939], T. 9, [aut. t. Michał Śliwa]. Kraków, 272 p. [in Polish]

Wójcik-Łagan, H. (2007). Franciszek Bujak jako dydaktyk historii [Franciszek Bujak as a history educator]. *Wielokulturowe środowisko historyczne Lwowa w XIX i XX w.* (t. 5, s. 500–510). Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, 512 p. [in Polish]

Yureiko, P. (2019). *Lvivska naukova shkola suspilno-ekonomichnoi istorii (1921 – 1939 rr.)* [Lviv Scientific School of Social and Economic History (1921 – 1939)]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu*, 461–477. [in Ukrainian]

Zamorski, K. (2020). Historia gospodarcza Jerzego Topolskiego. Narracja o wybranych wątkach dziejów gospodarczych Polski [Jerzy Topolski's narration on selected issues of the economic history of Poland]. *Historyka. Studia Metodologiczne, 50,* 71–87. Doi: 10.24425/hsm.2020.134797[in Ukrainian]

The article was received June 22, 2021.
Article recommended for publishing 25/05/2022.