Zdzisław Szymański

The System of Social Justice in the Vision of History of Henry Kamieński

Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska. Sectio H, Oeconomia 20, 33-54

1986

ANNALES
UNIVERSITATIS MARIAE CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA
LUBLIN — POLONIA

Vol. XX, 3 SECTIO H 1986

Zakład Historii Gospodarczej i Myśli Ekonomicznej
Wydziału Ekonomicznego UMCS

Zdzisław SZYMAŃSKI

The System of Social Justice in the Vision of Henry Kamieński

Wizja ustroju sprawiedliwości społecznej Henryka Kamieńskiego

Картина справедливого общественного строя у Генрика Каменьского

1. ASSUMPTIONS OF THE THEORETICAL SYSTEM OF HENRY KAMIEŃSKI

One of the most outstanding representatives of the Polish socio-economic thought of the 19th century was Henry Kamieński (1813—1866). In his works dated from the 1840s, especially in "Filozofia ekonomii materialnej ludzkiego społeczeństwa" (The Philosophy of Material Economy of Human Community), Kamieński presents an extremely broad scope of his philosophical, economic and social knowledge giving a formulation of "necessary truths" expressed in general, synthetic socio-philosophical system called philosophy of material economy. He constructed this system which in its assumptions was supposed to explain the regularities governing the development of mankind, referring on the one hand to the idealistic philosophy of Hegel, and, on the other hand, to the concept of West-European utopian socialism and Anglo-French economy.

In Kamieński's conviction, the union between philosophy and science about the phenomena occurring in economic process was to be made possible by discovering the governing principle of the mechanism of socio-economic development, which could simultaneously overcome the discrepancy between idealistic German philosophy and the knowledge of practical social changes, between the "futility" and empiricism, as was put by the author of "Philosophy of Material Economy". Thanks to that, material economy would be transformed not only into a theoretical

science but it would occupy the principal place in the system of social sciences.[1]

Material economy as a science cannot be, therefore, limited to specific research and description of economic phenomena, but it should reach at the very essence of the progress of human community and become a factor accelerating this progress.[2] These ambitious goals and tasks put forward by Kamieński concerning material economy made it possible for him to develop a number of interesting cognitive drifts in which he frequently goes ahead of the socio-economic thought of that time.

According to Kamieński, the subject of economy is "material development of society", general struggle with nature led by society. In the struggle taking place in the process of labour, people are engaged into definite social relations, society itself is getting improved. Society is viewed by Kamieński in a naturalistic way, originating from Renaissance philosophy as an atomized collection of units "united in a common struggle against the matter by the power of the spirit" [3], and on the other hand (and this form predominates) he treats society as a super-natural whole which is in the process of development.

Proprietary relationships are a significant part of social relations. Kamieński treats the former as relations occurring between people in the process of production, in this way approaching the later view of the

---

[1] H. Kamieński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej ludzkiego społeczestwa z dodaniem mniejszych pism filozoficznych (Philosophy of Material Economy of Human Society with Addition of Smaller Philosophical Papers)*, Warsaw 1959, pp. 55—56 and 60—61. It should be emphasized that this striving towards overcoming the dissonance between Hegel's philosophy and social sciences was spread in the whole socio-philosophical literature in Europe of the 1840s. Among Polish authors, apart from Kamieński, this subject was taken among others by August Cieszkowski, Karol Libelt, Bronisław Trentowski and Edward Dembowski.

[2] Cf.: Z. Szymański: *Przedmiot i rola ekonomii politycznej w systemie nauk w ujęciu Henryka Kamieńskiego i Józefa Supińskiego (Subject And Role of Political Economy In the System of Sciences As Viewed by Henry Kamieński And Józef Supiński)*, Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, sectio H, Lublin 1979/1980, p. 217. Saint-Simon ascribed political economy a big role to play in future social system. In his conviction, political economy will become a primary science; politics, theory of freedom and morality will come down to it. Cf. J. Szczepański: *Socjologia. Rozwój problematyki i metod. (Sociology. Development of Problems And Methods)*. Warsaw 1969, p. 39. This thesis of Saint-Simon certainly exerted a serious influence on the way of viewing material economy by Kamieński.

[3] H. Kamieński: *Filozoficzne pojmowanie ekonomii politycznej, a raczej ekonomii materialnej społeczeństwa (Philosophical Viewing of Political Economy, Or Rather, Material Economy of Society)* (in) H. Kamieński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, pp. 352—353.

problem by Charles Marx.[4] Property — writes Kamieński — "...is a relation of man to man, and not of man to thing, the latter being called utilization (i.e. productive or consumptive waste — added by Z. Szymański) caused only by physical necessity. Property, therefore, is purely spiritual in character, whereas utilization is purely material." [5]

Proprietary relations are for Kamieński the most important element of economic relations, since they determine the relations of "universal wealth" created by the labour of the whole society at the same time affecting all social relations. Referring to Saint-Simon, the author of "Philosophy of Material Economy" emphasizes that property as economic category "...undergoes constant movement and progress..." [6], therefore it is a historical category. At the same time, he makes an important observation which is a new element in the theory of socio-economic development, that transformations of proprietary relations should be viewed as a source of changes in social relations.

Each form of possessing means of production already at the time of its birth was rational and justified by the state of social development reached at a given time. However, one can carry out an objective estimation of progress of particular social relations corresponding to definite historical epochs and which are counterparts of a Marxist division of history into socio-economic formations. It is significant to note the influence which they exert on consolidating the "unity between people", and the role which they play in stirring up the efficiency of the work of individual producers whose personal interest is, according to Kamieński who in this respect follows Smith, a driving factor of social progress and economic development.

In Kamieński's theory, the process of changes in social relations takes place both by way of gradual, evolutionary development through "unity among people", and by way of class struggle. Regarding "progress in unity" the most desirable, ideal form of social development, he remarks in the second volume of "Philosophy of Material Economy" that class struggle brings the "necessary spread of progress" so they are not only possible but necessary in the situation when social relations are based on different forms of direct or indirect pressure. One cannot assume, writes Kamieński, that only the understanding on the part of the exploiting class of purposefulness of transforming social relations in the direction of more just principles, the process being carried out in the

---

[4] Cf.: J. Górski: *Na marginesie nowego wydania "Filozofii ekonomii materialnej" H. Kamieńskiego (On the Margin of A New Edition of "Philosophy of Material Economy by H. Kamieński).* "Ekonomista" No. 4, Warsaw 1961, p. 881

[5] Kamieński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, p. 75.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 72.

name of long-term economic interests of this class, will automatically lead to supressing the exploitation of man by man, or at least to its appeasement, "...as such a situation can be reached by a preliminary struggle of the oppressed brought about either by a radical political shock supported by the masses bringing justice themselves, or by any other means of transforming the social system." [7]

It follows from the above statements that, in Kamieński's work historism is clearly seen as a method of investigating historical reality, historism being associated with elements of theleologism. Process of development is purposeful, leading to constant perfection of material and social forms which is an expression of development of man's freedom in its most important aspect understood as "...liberating spirit from the power of the matter".[8] At the same time Kamieński notices the casual character of the regularity. He understands that transfer from one socio--economic formation to another is a "work of political functions", that is it takes place through a change of the apparatus of state authorities and establishing new forms of property which automatically results in a change of social relations.[9]

Considering the problem of the ways of transfer from lower to higher phases of social development, Kamieński expresses a fundamental thesis that the character of relations of production depends on the level of the development of productive resources. He writes as follows: "Ordinary human power, namely spiritual power (that is productive resources, added by Z. Szymański) is the most important agent of relations in society, it disperses all material power, hence most important are those abuses which refer to its inequalities".[10]

---

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 170—171. In the light of the quoted words spoken by Kamieński, it is difficult to agree with opinions concerning his concepts of the laws of social development as presented in most recent papers. J. Rosicka, for instance, concludes that Kamieński while presenting his vision of linear, evolutionary progress, rejects dialectics. Kamieński, suggests Rosicka, while assuming the standpoint of idealism, does not see the division of society into opposing social classes, so he does not notice the class struggle. Cf.: J. Rosicka: *"Filozofia ekonomii" (H. Kamieńskiego (Philosophy of Economy by H. Kamieński)* Zeszyty Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej in Cracow, No. 150, Cracow 1982, pp. 111 and 124 and of the same author, *Własność jako centralna kategoria systemu Henryka Kamieńskiego* wyłożonego w *Filozofii ekonomii materialnej ludzkiego społeczeństwa (Property As a Central Category of the System of Henry Kamieński presented in "Philosophy of Material Economy of Human Society)*, No. 18, Cracow 1972, p. 161. An analogous statement can be found in the wolk by L. Guziski, S. Żurawicki: *Polscy ekonomiści XIX i XX wieku (Polish Economists of 19th and 20th Centuries)*, Warsaw 1984, p. 47.

[8] Kamieński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, p. 63.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 225—226.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 236.

Kamieński's words quoted here bring to mind a characteristic sentence by Marx contained in his "Hired Labour and the Capital" (1847). "Social relations in which individuals take part producing goods, social relations of production therefore, change together with the change and development of material means of production, productive resources." [11] This regularity which Marx expressed in another work in a simplified but concise, vivid way saying: "Hand mill gave us society of feudal lords, steam mill — society of industrial capitalists" [12], was later on raised to the rank of the law of necessary agreement between relations of production and the character of productive resources.

These materialistic elements in Henry Kamieński's theory were not, however, consistently developed by him; they mingled with idealistic ones. The author of "Philosophy of Material Economy" emphasizes that it is not only material profits which make particular strata of the population change social relation since quite a big part is played in this respect (and it is here where his idealism characteristic of utopian socialists shows) is by "...images of beauty and good" that is the sense of justice as the idea of a just social system sums up in itself all the features of "...beauty, good and utility in the world of societies".[13]

In Kamieński's conviction, capitalist system based on exploitation of man by man" that is on the exploiting class sweating the oppressed one by way of indirect pressure is a system historically transitional just like earlier socio-economic foundations: slavery and feudalism based on direct pressure — "physical violence".

However, for Kamieński the proletariat is not a class conscious of its goals, a power able to form the future history. It is no surprise then that it was not proletarian revolution where he sought an agent of transforming capitalist society into society of social justice. Such an attitude corresponding to the views of West-European utopian socialists, is in Kamieński's theory contradictory to the regularity of dialectical development of productive resources and means of production which he frequently accentuated. In Kamieński's theory, a just social system does not emerge from the analysis of transformations in relations of production taking place under the influence of the law of progressing development of productive resources but it means adjusting relations of production to principles of justice abstractedly deduced from cognitive theory.[14]

---

[11] Ch. Marx: *Praca najemna i kapitał (Hired Labour And the Capital)*, Warsaw 1949, p. 27.

[12] Ch. Marx: *Nędza filozofii (Poverty of Philosophy)*, Warsaw 1949, p. 123.

[13] H. Kamieński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, p. 171.

[14] Kamieński did not notice the historical role of the proletariat, which was noticed already by Ch. Marx in *Święta rodzina (The Holy Family)* (1844). His

Therefore, Kamieński while criticizing the utopian character of social concepts of Saint-Simon and saint-simonists, also forms a vision of a system of social justice.

The main features of this system were presented by Kamieński in the last chapter of "Philosophy of Material Economy" entitled "Business, vocation". Nevertheless, loose remarks concerning the subject are scattered over the pages of the whole work. Having analysed philosophy of economy in the earlier parts of his work, Kamieński goes on to carry out a detailed characterization of economic categories. This comprises both categories of capitalist economy, and categories of the model of a system of social justice created by this economy. The latter are only a modified reflection of the analysis of real capitalist system.

The model of a just social system drawn by Henry Kamieński is a two-phase model. In the first phase, the basis of social relations it the interest of small producers — owners of means of production. The basis for shaping relations between people in the second stage of society of social justice is a change of the attitude to labour, transforming people's mentality so that the whole work performed might become the "work of vocation".

In formal terms, the two-phase character of the model of just social relations created by Kamieński, draws this system closer to the solution presented by Fourier. Propagating a co-operative system, a system of harmony and drawing its detailed characteristics, Fourier also gives a description of another system (quarantism) which, in his opinion, will follow the period of civilization contemporary to him if humanity does not follow his advice and does not pass to a state of harmony.[15] Contrary

---

theory of socio-economic development grown on the base of home social relations in which the basic contradictions of capitalism had not appeared yet, is a reflection of Polish and not West-European historical reality.

[15] Cf.: W. P. Wołgin: *Poprzednicy naukowego socjalizmu (Predecessors of Scientific Socialism)*, Warsaw 1958, p. 254. A two-variant model of socialism is also characteristic of the concepts of two Ricardian socialists, William Thompson and John F. Bray. Cf. T. Kowalik: *Wizja socjalizmu w Szkole Owena i u Saintsimonistów (Vision of Socialism In the School of Owen And Sainsimonists)*, *"Ekonomista"* No. 2, 1971, pp. 257—262. In Polish conditions, the two-phase model of a system of social justice was also created by Edward Dembowski. In his system, these are: a stage of "social unity" and a stage of "political, social and mental unity", the difference between the two consisting in principles of division. At the first stage, the principle according to the deserts, i.e. according to the word done, binds, whereas at the other, it is replaced by the principle of division according to the needs. Cf. A. Śladkowska: *Poglądy społeczno-polityczne i filozoficzne Edwarda Dembowskiego (Socio-Political and Philosophical Views of Edward Dembowski)*, Warsaw 1955, p. 159.

to Fourier's fantastic picture of socialist society, Kamieński does not create such a detailed vision of a just system; he only outlines the general framework of this system.

2. THE FIRST PHASE OF A SYSTEM OF SOCIAL JUSTICE — "SOCIETY BASED ON COMMON INTEREST"

The model of the first phase of a system of social justice is society of small producers — owners of means of production, and simultaneously direct producers. Kamieński calls this stage in the development of social relations, relations based on "good will", or, interchangeably, social relations which realise the "unity between people". This last definition suggests that on this stage of society's development its further transformations will take place without any conflicts of class character.

Giving his vision of a system of social justice, Kamieński postulates a right of each individual to his own property and he is clear at putting forward the ideal of spreading this property. Therefore, in relations based on "good will" an individual acquires the right to possess the capital, the economic category which he identifies with the notion of a "tool of work", a product of work serving to obtain the goods of nature.

Against this background, the problem of fetishization of the notion of capital by the author of "Philosophy of Material Economy" is a controversial question. Such a thesis was put forward by Z. Chodkiewicz in the 50s in his introduction to "Wybór pism" (Selected works) by Kamieński; the thesis is also supported in most recent works pertaining to this subject.[16] Identifying the capital with production, Kamieński really treats this economic category in ahistoric way. In his approach, the capital was used both in formations based on extra-economic pressure and in capitalism; it will be an indispensable element of the process of production in the future system, too.

Actually, Kamieński approached a social interpretation of this economic category in capitalist economy. The capital, he stresses, while increasing efficiency of labour, its "divisibility" causes that its owner also gets "income of the capital" apart from returns of the capital" (the no-

---

[16] Cf. Z. Poniatowski, J. Bibrowska, Z. Chodkiewicz: *Wstęp (Introduction)* (To:) H. Kamieński: *Wybór pism (Selected Works)*, Warsaw 1953, p. XLIV; and J. Rosicka: *Rola kapitału jako kategorii ekonomicznej w systemie H. Kamieńskiego (Role of the Capital As an Economic Category In the System of H. Kamieński)*, „Studia z historii myśli społeczno-ekonomicznej", No. 21, Cracow 1973, pp. 38—40. Cf. also: L. Guzicki, S. Żurawicki: *Polscy ekonomiści XIX i XX wieku, op. cit.*, p. 53.

tion is supposed to mean the value of means of production utilized in the process of production). "Income of the capital" is a "...service performed by the capital", hence obtaining it becomes a stimulus for accumulation since the services performed by the capital increase the national wealth.[17]

However, in the conditions of capitalist relations of production one encounters the phenomenon of "exclusiveness of the capital" consisting in the means of production being monopolized in the hands of one social class, which makes the height of "income rate of the capital" to be settled through "one-sided freedom" of the capital owners. In this situation the profit from the capital "...must be higher than the contribution made in creating the tools of work". In this oncome both the value of the service performed by the capital and the unpaid part of a worker's labour are contained.[18]

According to Kamieński, quite a different sense is acquired by the notion of capital in the system of social justice where the owner of the means of production is the direct producer. Then, "income of the capital" is merged with the payment for live labour and its height is determined by the mechanism of the law of value, fixing the quantity of this income in a proper relation to advantages brought by the capital functioning in the sphere of production. In this system, income is a "...fair payment for the work devoted to the capital formation and does not strain the attribute of distribution, adequacy to the deserts".[19] It follows from the above that the ideal state which would realise Kamieński's postulates would be the situation described: "If no man needed to use somebody else's tools and no man could have any income from the capi-

---

[17] H. Kamieński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, pp. 267—268. Kamieński, treating labour as the basic source of values, mixes up the problem of creating values with the problem of creating utilitarian values. In such an approach, the capital may seem to be of productive character as it increases work efficiency and, as a productive factor of the process of production, acquires rights to the income. In Kamieński's theory, therefore, one can notice certain elements of vulgar approach; similar approach could be notices both in theories of numerous representatives of utopian socialism and in the views of Simonde de Sismondi, defender of the stratum of small producers ousted by capitalism. Cf. J. C. L. Simonde de Sismondi: *Nowe zasady ekonomii politycznej, czyli o bogactwie i jego stosunku do ludności (New Principles of Political Economy, Or, Wealth And Its Relation to Population)*, Warsaw 1955, vol. I, pp. 97—98.

[18] H. Kamieński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, p. 277. In Kamieński's theory one can clearly notice certain elements of the theory of surplus value which fit in the category of the "income of the capital" borrowed from Say. According to him, profit of a capitalist being a part of the income from capital, should be treated as deduction from the product of the labour of hired workers.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 270.

tal which would not serve him as a tool of work, then possessing the capital would not free anybody from the obligation to work." [20]

It follows from Henry Kamieński's statements contained in his work that in "society based on common interest" one can encounter a phenomenon of distinguishing the capital from labour for instance in consequence of the lack of predispositions in some people to make tools of work or of underestimation of advantages resulting from having one's own workshop. In both cases, however, the phenomenon of separating the capital from labour should be accompanied by payment, for both factors of production should be treated as exceptional not resulting from any forms of pressure — direct or indirect one.[21]

In agriculture, a predominant domain of Polish economy in the middle of the 19th century, a condition to realise "society based on common interest" would have been to guarantee everybody working in this sphere of economic activity a direct right to the land, that is individual property. "The land, writes Kamieński, belongs to all people and all of them have equal rights to it".[22] However, in effect of the advancing development of social division of labour, appearance of new professions and branches of production, not all people can occupy themselves with agriculture. Therefore, realisation of man's natural right to the land consists in ensuring all society most abundant advantages resulting from cultivating the land. This goal is carried out through "direct right to the land" that is on the basis of a definite form of land ownership which, according to Kamieński, should assume a form of individual ownership in a system of social justice.

In this future system, small agricultural producers, that is the users of a definite right to the land, should be treated as performing their services for the benefit of all population like those performing other activities in production. Their direct right to the land should be then interpreted as payment for the expenditures of labour spent for intensifying agricultural production with the aim of its maximum increase conditioning satisfaction of the needs of population to the greatest degree.[23]

---

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 278.

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 279—281.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 253.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 256—258. Motivation adopted by Kamieński in order to reconcile the fact of the existence of small land property with requirements of a system of social justice is to a significant degree close to the views of Thomas Paine, an outstanding socialworker and writer in the period of a struggle for independence of the United States and during French Revolution. Kamieński's interpretation, however, is by far more mature and complete. Paine referred to the theory of natural law, the law modified by his doctrine of ever-renewing social agreement.

The projected social system, relations based on "good will" assumes, therefore, *ex definitione* doing away with man exploiting man. However, contrary to Saint-Simon,[24] and especially his disciples who, while formulating the principles of industrial system spoke against privileges connected with birth, even postulating (chiefly Enfantin) that inheriting within a family should be abolished, Kamieński does not put forward any propositions as to changes of the principles of the law of succession. In his opinion, the question of inheritance is a problem secondary in relation to the question of "contention and exclusiveness of the capital". In "society based on common interest" inheriting the capital will be "its simple transfer" and not a privilege.[25]

Relations based on "good will" create a real chance for reconciling each producer's own interest viewed historically by Kamieński, with the general interest of the whole human community. In this system each man" serves common good" treating it as a means of realizing "his individual good and not as the highest purpose". Conversely, society creates conditions in which economic intitiative of particular citizens may develop, and through these conditions it coordinates productive activity of producers assuring them equivalence in market exchange.[26]

Consequence of this type of relations of production is "distribution of wealth according to the deserts". The principle dividing the national revenue produced to everybody according to the quantity and quality of his work, as this is to which Kamieński's formula comes dows, is the best lever of increasing the efficiency of work of small producers, it associates their personal interest with general one in possibly most ideal way. Another feature of a system of social justice flows logically from this principle. Work in "society based on common interest" becomes a duty of every man, thanks to which this system is able to satisfy the growing needs of population provided there is no room for personal interest understood in a wrong way.[27]

Yet, realization of both of these principles requires previous quaranteeing a right to work to every man, the right which, in Kamieński's

---

renewed in every generation, whereas the Polish economist based his arguments on the theory acknowledging labour as the only source of values. Cf. V. L. Parrington: Główne nurty myśli amerykańskiej (Main Currents in American Thought), Warsaw 1968, vol. I, pp. 478—479.

[24] Cf. The doctrine of Saint-Simon, Wykłady A. Bazarda i B. P. Enfantina (Lectures of A. Bazard and B. P. Enfantin), Warsaw 1961, pp. 262—269.

[25] K a m i e ń s k i: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, pp. 283—284.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 315.

[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 315—316. The principle, „according to the deserts" is close to the crierion of division as formulated by the school of Saint-Simon, "to everybody accoring to his abilities, to each ability according to its works".

opinion, is natural for each man. Observing mans' rights in general, and the right to work in particular, should be, according to him, the subject of the care of organs of state authorities and the more they realise this right, "...the better performance of material functions they assure." [28] In conditions of "good will" each producer possessing his own workshop is "set in a possibility to work according to his strength and vocation owing to which he acquired the rights to participate in the division of the accumulated material and cultural wealth of society.[29]

A society of small producers which guarantees a right to work to all its members, is for Kamieński a synonym of society of relative affluence, a society where the ever-increasing human needs can be satisfied. This does not mean that Kamieński identifies "society based on common good" with society of abundance. For the author of "Philosophy of Material Economy", contrary to Owen or other utopian socialists, the range of human needs is unlimited and it grows with the advancing development of productive resources.

Members of this society realise individualistic — egoist ethics in everyday life. In this situation, the state of prosperity of each citizen, his "richness" is in proportional relation to the performance of a duty of work, "so that everybody keeps his fate in his own hands." [30]

The problem of assuring proper living conditions for people unable to work (as a result of illness or senile age) remains an unsolvable and open question. Kamieński concludes, referring to "nobler feelings" of citizens active professionally.[31] In this respect he was outpaced by Dembowski who in his model of a socialist system assumes that maintaining people unable to work, children including, would take place at a general cost.[32]

---

[28] K a m i e ń s k i: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, pp. 196—197. Kamieński's thesis concerning a necessity of ensuring every man a right to work as a *sine qua non* condition for realisation of social justice appears in nearly all utopian-socialist doctrines of the first decades of the 19th century. It was born under the influence of progressing industrial revolution which while introducing technological progress, classical economy, the principle of utility was a theoretical justification of reason-in Western Europe.

[29] *Ibid.*, pp. 311—312.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 304.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 307. Such an attitude of Kamieński results from his acceptance of homo oeconomicus of Smith (Kamieński transferred it onto his own concept of private interest of small producers). Both in Bentham's doctrine and in the English classical economy, the principle of utility was a theoretical justification of reason aable egoism as an aesthetis attitude of social co-existence.

[32] E. D e m b o w s k i: *Twórczość w żywocie społeczności (Creativity in the Life of Community)* (in) E. D e m b o w s k i: *Kilka myśli o eklektyzmie oraz inne pisma wybrane (Some Thoughts Concerning Eclecticism And Other Selected Papers)*, Warsaw 1957, p. 134.

The model of a system of social justice as presented by Kamieński assumes the existence of relations of market and money. Market exchange has in this type of social relations a voluntary and equivalent character since "each man has an influence on distribution in relation to the services performed by him"; it is also the only and effective tool in realising the principle of dividing the national revenue" "according to the deserts".[33]

The system of social relations realising the "unity between people" is integrally associated with self-acting market mechanism. In Kamieński's understanding, existence of the market is a phenomenon desirable and necessary at each stage of society's development. On the one hand social need, that is the demand and on the other, the size and structure of production find their reflections at the market.

Contrary to certain suggestions of the interpreters of Henry Kamieński's views, in his theoretical works two models of market economy are presented. One is the model of capitalism free of competition which is approved by bourgeois economists and which is subject to criticism directed against Kamieński as being based on "exclusiveness" that is monopolyzing means of production in the hands of one social class. The other, opposite one, is a model of economy of small producers which in Kamieński's economic system is personalization of a system of social justice.[34]

In a model of free competition of small producers, Kamieński sees the most effective mechanism of the functioning of economy and guarantee of fair division of the national revenue. With the exception of the works of outstanding authors going ahead of the epoch with their novel

---

[33] H. Kamieński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, p. 214.

[34] Approvement of the idea of competition by Kamieński was cited in scientific literature in the 1950s as proof that the author of "Philosophy of Material Economy" was in a positive relation to capitalism. Cf. eg. Br. Baczko: *Henryka Kamieńskiego system filozofii społecznej. Próba interpretacji (Henry Kamieński's System of Social Philosophy. Attempt at Interpretation)* (Epilogue to): H. Kamieński *"Philosophy of Material Economy..."*, p. 562. One should state that competition as a form of economic mechanism was in principle approved of by the foremost critic of capitalism from the standpoint of lower middle class, Simonde de Sismondi, simultaneously pointing at negative consequences of capitalist competition: crises of surplus production, unemployment, pauperisation of the workers' class. A majority of representatives of utopian socialism, too, attacked only a specific form of competition — capitalist competition. Cf.: W. J. Grabski: *Karol Fourier (1772—1837), jego życie i doktryna (Charles Fourier (1772—1837), His Life and Doctrine)*. Warsaw 1928, pp. 67—69. A negative evaluation of such competition, equally emphatic, is also found in Kamieński's works: "Philosophy of Material Economy", and especially in "Obraz porównawczy pauperyzmu" (Comparative Picture of Pauperism).

ideas, the "general will" (i.e. the self-acting market mechanism) is able to estimate all the needs of society and to put them in a proper hierarchy.[35]

Social relations which will be created in a "society based on common interest" will make it possible, in Kamieński's conviction, to introduce technological progress on a large scale. Application of new technology will not be connected, as was the case with the capitalist system, with socially negative consequences of displacing human labour with the work of machines. The factors which might prevent the negative consequences of technological progress will be the very realisation of social relations based on "good will", assuring all people a right to work and constant increase of human needs in a society of small producers reaching high incomes.[36]

In future society of social justice everyone will be guaranteed a right to education. Kamieński, like Smith, assumes that general education is a stimulus of the increase of work efficiency, hence the „exclusiveness of education" identified in present political systems with the privilege of certain groups of population is contradiction to the very principle of dividing the national revenue "according to the deserts".[37]

There is still another question to be interpreted, namely the means of realising the first phase of a system of social justice. In a general aspect, this problem has already been dealt with in point one of the present article where two ways of carrying the social progress into effect have been pointed at as viewed by Henry Kamieński: a way of gradual, evolutionary changes, and one of class struggle.

This problem is explained by Kamieński in greater detail in the last chapter of "Philosophy of Material Economy". He writes as follows: "Political functions and social reforms resulting from progress are limited to realisation of good will relations and they cannot do anything more than that." [38] It should be concluded on the basis of this that realisation of "good will relations" may take place only through previous seizure of political power by revolutionary forces representing the direc-

---

[35] K a m i e ń s k i: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, pp. 218—219.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 288. Serious doubts are roused by Kamieński's postulate concerning a possibility to introduce technical progress in small industrial workshops or small agricultural farms. Even greater doubts concern the problem of producing machines on the basis of craftman's methods. To justify these highly utopian projects of Kamieński, we can only cite the fact that machines used at that time were not characterized by high technical parameters, and the production of machines itself was not separated as a distinct branch of industrial production.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 291.

[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 323—324.

tion of socio-economic thinking as outlined by Kamieński and through carrying out the necessary social reforms by these political agents. Therefore, realisation of a system of social justice, "society based on common interest" may be carried out only by way of social revolution. This revolution, however, need not be a "bloody one" just like the agrarian revolution reconstructing Poland's independence need not be such. As in the case of agrarian revolution, a factor preventing the counter--revolutionary attitude of the gentry and revenge of the people was to be the "historical mission of Polish slavery" as worked out in "O prawdach żywotnych narodu polskiego" (Of Vital Truths of the Polish Nation), probably an analogous role was to be played at the second stage of the revolution by a "synthesis of different moments of progress" performed by him in his "Philosophy of Material Economy".

An interesting problem is also the question of whether Kamieński identifies agrarian revolution with the revolution which would carry a system of social justice into effect. The agrarian program drawn in "Of Vital Truths..." is not clearly formulated. Kamieński puts forward a postulate of unconditional enfranchisement of peasants cultivating the land on villein principles (realisation of this program would mean changing society in the direction of bourgeois democracy as made in classical Prussian way); at the same time, however, he makes some very general remarks of granting the land to peasants with no farmland of their own. To grant the lands, so numerous in the territory of the Kingdom and in the two other sectors of partitioned Poland, as well as to give a truly agricultural character to the dwarf farms (which was demanded by Kamieński in his articles published in Warsaw periodicals) would require a necessity to do away with the grange. This would mean a transfer of Polish agriculture from feudalism to capitalism on the basis of more progressive American-type way which was called for by revolutionary-democratic program of Councils of the Polish People and Edward Dembowski. In Polish agriculture, the basic branch of economy on the Polish land, this would mean a possibility of realising the first phase of a system of social justice, that is the relations of "good will".

Such a program could not be openly declared for tactical reasons, by an ideologist of a struggle for the country's independence and such was Henry Kamieński. Such a program was impossible to be accepted by the Polish gentry in its mass in which the author of "Vital Truths..." saw the leader of a future uprising. Kamieński probably put off realisation of this program for a later period, after the country's independence was regained and strengthened.

3. THE SECOND PHASE OF A SYSTEM OF SOCIAL JUSTICE — "AN IDEAL MOMENT FOR SOCIETY WHEN VOCATION COULD TAKE PLACE OF INTEREST"

In Henry Kamieński's understanding, there does not exist a society in which man's personal interest would be the only stimulus for productive activity, or, in a broader meaning, any creative activity. Apart from prospects for advantages of material character, the very will to work, the will to work for the whole society, that is "the work of vocation" could be, and is, a stimulus for work. The "work of vocation" resulting from spiritual stimulants, from an "instinct to work" is an aim in itself, and not a means of carrying out other intentions. Thus work resulting from the stimulants of "vocation" contains in itself a reward, at the same time standing above labour in the hierarchy of values, the motive of labour being the worker's own interest.

The "work of vocation" in the long run will lead, in Kamieński's opinion to the formation of qualitatively different, more humanitarian relations between people. These problems were dealt with by Kamieński in the second part of the last chapter of his work, "Philosophy of Material Economy" entitled, "Business, Vocation".

Business and vocation, claims Kamieński, define two different stages of social relations in the frameworks of a system of social justice. Labour whose motive is producer's own interest reflects the lower level of society of social justice. On the other hand, society in which labour is the aim in itself, forms social relations which are embodiment of an ideal system. This ideal social system is able to liberate and develop all creative powers of an individual as "Only those whose work results from vocation are able to reach true greatness, their labour is a pure sacrifice for humanity, it is only them to whom humanity owes so much." [39]

The thought that in specific conditions labour may become an aim in itself, an activity providing satisfaction to them who perform it, occurs in the works of a number of utopian socialists. The principle of labour attractiveness as an effective lever of increasing work efficiency lay at the basis of Fourier's system of harmony, a system of small socialist communities called falanges in his terminology.

The thought of labour attractiveness in future socialist society also occurs in the works of the founders of scientific socialism and we can notice it already in the early period of their activity. In "Remarks to Selections From Economists" written at the same time as Kamieński's

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 317.

main work, Charles Marx conceives labour as a creative act in which human life finds a manifold reflection. At the same time he points out that in socialist society labour will become a source of delight and the basis for brotherly co-operation between people performing services for one another.[40] Frederick Engels in his "Situation of the Working Class In England" also emphasizes that a natural desire of every man to create may be satisfied only by voluntary work which is the "highest delight we know", whereas "obligatory labour is the most severe, disgraceful torment". With abolishing the bourgeois power, labour will completely change its character — having been obligatory, it will become free, therefore creative.[41]

Kamieński, while drawing his utopian vision of an "ideal moment for society, all the time has a strong sense of contrast existing between reality accessible for him, and the suggested "society of vocation". That is why the whole chapter was writtern in the conditional mood. In his conviction, if a possibility of setting up such a type of social relations were real, then this should be accomplished in a peaceful way through gradual evolution of the motives of economic activity of small producers, substituting "business" with vocation. Like Robert Owen, Kamieński claims that the building of an ideal social system may be accomplished only by changing people's attitudes, by no means can it be the work of the apparatus of state authorities. The political agent is able only to realise "good will" relations, while it cannot, and should not, lead to eliminating the personal interest from social relations.

Kamiński is not clear at giving his opinion on the subject of the possession of means of production in the second phase of society of social justice. Although he writes that the "ideal moment of society" would not change the character of property and material functions, that is labour and exchange, he adds that this type of social relations would perfect "...their outer shapes, providing them with attributes of higher level", and so, possession of means of production "...would be raised to a higher moment..." because instead of personal interest, the very willingness to work would be a motive of people's economic activity.[42] It seems that Kamieński, while recognizing the private property of small producers as the basis fo an "ideal moment of society", foresaw the

---

[40] Cf. D. Rozenberg: *Zarys rozwoju nauk ekonomicznych Marksa i Engelsa w latach czterdziestych XIX wieku (An Outline of Development of Economic Sciences of Marx and Engels in the* 1840s). Warsaw 1957, pp. 145 and 156.

[41] Cf. F. Engels: *Położenie klasy robotniczej w Anglii (Situation of the Working Class in England)* (in:) Ch. Marx and F. Engels, *"Dzieła"* (Works) Vol. 2, Warsaw 1961, p. 405.

[42] Kamieński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, p. 321.

existence of certain collective forms of cooperation between people in the process of production in this system.[43]

Kamieński clearly idealizes the description of perfect "social system". Individualistic-egoistic ethics of "society based on common interest", society satisfied with consumption of goods but devoid of any creative inventiveness or enthusiasm, is opposed to pathos of dynamic development of society "in which there would be no business, and vocation would take its place". "Labour governed only by vocation would be man's highest spiritual utility. People would enthusiastically throng to get it, it would be a delight to work, delight desired by everybody devoting fruits of his labour to society." Placing "vocation" at the chief place in the arsenal of means of economic initiative would mean exceptional development of productive potential of society and humanization of relations between people. "...Only a general desire to be useful for society" would be a guarantee of payment for expenditures of human labour. Division of labour in such a system would have spontaneous character "according to human strength", whereas the national revenue produced would be divided "according to the needs".[44]

Although in the sphere of dividing material goods at a higher stage of society of social justice, a communist principle "according to the needs" would govern, "higher and purely spiritual goods" would be divided "according to the deserts". Thus, Kamieński assumes, like Fourier, a certain hierarchy in society as regards titles and rewards. These operations would aim at satisfying human vanity, probably, however, also outstanding abilities and creative achievements would be rewarded (in the doctrine of Saint-Simon, the national revenue itself was divided according to the following formula: "to each according to his abilities, to each ability according to its works." [45]

This stage of society of social justice also assumes the existence of relations of market and money. Market exchange itself would assume a different character as resulting from displacing "business" from social relations and substituting it with "vocation". The purpose of exchange, one would expect, would not be a desire to maximilize incomes by producers but a necessity to supply oneself with missing raw materials or

---

[43] J. Rosicka supposes that a reason that this form of the category of property which was expected to exist at the "ideal moment of society" was not precise, was that Kamieński did not distinguish between personal and private property, Cf. J. Rosicka: *Własność jako centralna kategoria systemu* Henryka Kamieńskiego wyłożonego w "Filozofii ekonomii materialnej ludzkiego społeczeństwa", *op. cit.*, p. 161.

[44] H. Kamieński: *Filozofia ekonomii materalnej...*, p. 320.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 321.

consumptions articles, the necessity resulting from specialization of production conditioned by natural factors.[46]

The self-acting market mechanism would still remain a regulator of the size and structure of production. Kamieński is of the opinion that centralized methods of administering a country's economy in this social system would be much more purposeless than in "society based on common interest". It follows from Kamieński's further arguments that at this stage of social development not only the economic function of state would disappear but there would occur a phenomenon of state's dying out as an apparatus of administrative and juridicial power. Then, a characteristic decentralization would take place leading to whole society performing political functions indirectly. [47]

4. FINAL REMARKS

Concepts pertaining to socio-economic system as put forward by Kamieński in his fundamental work "Philosophy of Material Economy" as well as in other works from the 1840s, give rise to greatest controversies in scientific literature. In publications of the 1950s there were attempts to classify his postulates for socio-economic changes within the bourgeois-democratic current and make him advocate of the capitalist system in Poland [48], whereas in most recent works, attempts to estimate that current of his intellectual output are more cautious and reserved. To give an example, Janina Rosicka in one of her articles devoted to the analysis of Kamieński's views presents a thesis that the ideology of "Philosophy of Material Economy" to some extent reflects aspirations of so-called "Polish middle class" also called "the third class", recruited from the lowered gentry. The author emphasizes, however, that Kamieński while sharing aspirations of this social stratum, its aspirations to independence, does not approve as was the case with Sismondi, representative of the interests of the lower middle class in the West, of the longing of the "middle class" for the epoch which belonged to the

[46] *Ibid.*

[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 321—323.

[48] Cf. A. Śladkowska: *Poglądy społeczno-polityczne i filozoficzne Edwarda Dembowskiego, op. cit.*, pp. 50—58; Br. Baczko: *Poglądy społeczno-polityczne i filozoficzne Towarzystwa Demokratycznego Polskiego (Socio-Political And Philosophical Views of Polish Democratic Society)*, Warsaw, p. 238; Z. Poniatowski: *O poglądach społeczno-filozoficznych Henryka Kamieńskiego (Socio-Philosophical Views of Henry Kamieński)*, Warsaw 1955, p. 15, and Z. Poniatowski, J. Bibrowska, Z. Chodkiewicz: *„Wstęp"* (do:) H. Kamieński: *Wybór pism, op. cit.*, p. XII.

past.[49] On the other hand, in the works by L. Guzicki and S. Żurawicki, "Polscy ekonomiści XIX i XX wieku" (Polish Economists of 19th and 20th Centuries) we can find a suggestion that the program put forward by the author of "Philosophy of Material Economy" concerning formation of society of free, small owners understanding the importance of agreement and co-operation in the name of the general interest is idealization of Kamieński's postulates of the enfranchisement of peasants with vivid reflection of Staszic's concept which guided Kamieński when he founded the Hrubieszów Society.[50]

Despite Kamieński's distinct distrust in utopian considerations, it seems that his vision of a system of social justice contains significant elements of utopian socialist society.[51] The fact that socio-economic concepts of Henry Kamieński were formed in the conditions of backwarness in the economic structure, in the country before the agrarian revolution which was supposed to abolish the villein relations predominant on the Polish land, and facing necessity of an armed combat for independence, determined the character of the adopted model solutions.

The model of a system of social justice which according to Kamieński could be realised in relatively close future, consisted in society of small producers. It is obvious that the spread of individual property and making each citizen the owner of his place of work would only lead to faster development of capitalist relations on the Polish land. Kamieński's postulates aiming at realisation of society of small producers, in his subjective opinion being a synonym of socialist system, in their objectivity expressed radical bourgeois views.

However, it should be stressed that Kamieński did not give absolute character to his model of a system of social justice — "society based on common interest". Treating each form of possession of means of production as a historical category, he did not exclude a possibility of creating a social system based on collective forms of management on the Polish land in more distant future. At this point it is worth to pay attention to Kamieński's thesis formulated in his work "Of Vital Truths..." as well as in the article, "O małej własności ziemskiej" (Of Small Land Property), that the form of common possession of means of production may

[49] Cf. J. Rosicka: *"Filozofia ekonomii" Henryka Kamieńskiego, op. cit.*, pp. 125—126.

[50] Cf. L. Guzicki, S. Żurawicki: *Polscy ekonomiści XIX i XX wieku, op. cit.*, p. 52.

[51] Such a thesis was for the first time put forward by Janusz Górski. „Such an opinion, he writes, is justified to the extent in which we give the attribute of socialist to a great majority of utopian concepts, especially to so-called socialism." Cf. J. Górski: *Na marginesie nowego wydania "Filozofii ekonomii materialnej" Henryka Kamieńskiego, op. cit.*, p. 886.

become real for developed countries; Poland, however, must first go through a stage of individual possession in order to draw profits from this form of possession.[52] Thus, Kamieński does not definitely forejudge the future model of the agrarian structure in Poland. In "Of Vital Truths..." he clearly points out that he does not deny postulates of communities of the Polish People calling for "general possesion of the land of the whole nation"; however, he considers such desiderata useless in the future national uprising.[53]

It is with no doubt that the model of a system of social justice as put forward by Kamieński cannot be classified among developed concepts of utopian socialism based on common, consciously organized administration. Nevertheless, one can encounter numerous socialist currents in Kamieński's ideology. Without any doubt, the idea of attractive labour, "labour of vocation" borrowed from Fourier is an element of the utopian vision of socialism. One can also see socialist undertones in Kamieński's postulate to introduce as a criterion of dividing the national wealth, the principle "according to the deserts" that is according to quantity and quality (at a higher stage of society of social justice this principle would undergo transformation into the communist formula "according to the needs"). Socialist elements can also be traced in still other postulate formulated by Kamieński, realisation of which was to be ensured by society of small producers, this was the postulate of guaranteeing every man a right to work. We should not consider Kamieński approving of the market as a regulator of production in the model of a just social system. As an element contradicting principles of socialist economy. From the perspective of present economic experiences of many socialist countries, it is not possible to identify market economy with capitalism. Socialism has developed forms of market economy, too.

In Kamieński's views one can see a distinct predomination of that ele-

---

[52] H. Kamieński: *O małej własności ziemskiej (Of Small Land Property)*, "Przegląd Naukowy", Warsaw 1844, No. 7, vol. I, pp. 220—221, and H. Kamieński: *O prawdach żywotnych narodu polskiego (Of Vital Truths of the Polish Nation)*, Brussels 1844, p. 73.

[53] H. Kamieński: *O prawdach żywotnych narodu polskiego, op. cit.*, pp. 72—74. It should be emphasized that it was also E. Dembowski who in his theoretical papers spoke for common property in the sphere of political activity did not go that far which is proved by documents from the period of Cracow revolution. See: *"Rewolucja i Lud" (Revolution and People)*, Dziennik Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej, No. 2, Cracow, 27 February 1846, and *"Dyktator do wszystkich Polaków umiejących czytać" (Dictator to All Poles Who Can Read)*, *Dziennik Rządowy Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, No. 3, Cracow, 28 February 1846 (in:) *Rewolucja polska 1846. Wybór źródeł (Polish Revolution of 1846. Selected Papers)*, Wrocław 1950, pp. 136 and 141—142.

ment of social Utopia which is close to many concepts of West-European utopian socialism. It seems that it is not French socialists such as Saint-Simon or Fourier and their disciples who are closest to Kamieński but certain English socialists deriving from the group of so-called Ricardian socialism, especially Hidgskin and Gray, and, to some extent, Thompson (first variant of socialist society). The postulate of doing away with small-producers' property is rejected by socialism of the lower middle class; in Polish conditions constituting the base on which Kamieński's theory of socio-economic development had grown, this postulate must have seemed especially abstract and contradictory to demands of the time. After all, in Kamieński's theory all questions of socio-economic nature were subordinated to his primary idea, the idea of fighting for Poland's independence.

STRESZCZENIE

Jednym z najwybitniejszych przedstawicieli polskiej myśli ekonomiczno-społecznej XIX wieku był Henryk Kamieński (1813—1866), autor dzieła „Filozofia ekonomii materialnej ludzkiego społeczeństwa", wydanego w latach czterdziestych XIX wieku. W pracy tej Kamieński rozwijając szereg interesujących wątków na temat roli stosunków własnościowych w procesie zmian stosunków społecznych, czy też dróg realizacji postępu społecznego, tworzy zarazem utopijną wizję ustroju sprawiedliwości społecznej.

Model sprawiedliwego ustroju społecznego Henryka Kamieńskiego to model dwufazowy. W pierwszej fazie podstawą stosunków społecznych jest interes drobnych producentów — właścicieli środków produkcji. Kamieński nazywa ten etap rozwoju stosunków społecznych stosunkami opartymi na „dobrej woli" lub zamiennie „społeczeństwem opartym na interesie wzajemnym", czy też stosunkami społecznymi, które realizują „jedność pomiędzy ludźmi".

Tworząc wizję ustroju sprawiedliwości społecznej, Kamieński postuluje prawo każdej jednostki do własności indywidualnej i wyraźnie wysuwa ideał jej upowszechnienia. W stosunkach opartych na „dobrej woli" jednostka nabywa więc prawo do posiadania kapitału, czyli „narzędzi do pracy", co, w pojęciu Kamieńskiego, jest równoznaczne z likwidacją wyzysku człowieka przez człowieka, stwarzając przy tym realną szansę pogodzenia interesu osobistego każdego producenta z interesem powszechnym całej zbiorowości ludzkiej.

W społeczeństwie opartym na stosunkach „dobrej woli" wytworzony dochód narodowy dzieli się według ilości i jakości pracy, a praca staje się obowiązkiem każdego człowieka. Dzięki temu ustrój ten zdolny jest zaspokoić rosnące potrzeby ludności, gwarantując zarazem każdemu człowiekowi prawo do pracy.

System stosunków społecznych realizujących „jedność pomiędzy ludźmi" jest integralnie sprzęgnięty z samoczynnym mechanizmem rynkowym. W modelu wolnej konkurencji drobnych producentów Kamieński widzi najskuteczniejszy mechanizm funkcjonowania gospodarki, i gwaranta sprawiedliwych zasad podziału dochodu narodowego.

W drugiej fazie społeczeństwa sprawiedliwości społecznej, o ile taka możli-

wość zaistnieje, podstawą ułożenia stosunków międzyludzkich będzie — według Kamieńskiego — zmiana stosunku do wykonywanej pracy, przekształcenie mentalności ludzkiej, tak aby wykonywana praca stała się „pracą powołania". Podobnie jak Robert Owen, Kamieński sądzi więc, że zbudowanie idealnego ustroju społecznego może nastąpić jedynie poprzez zmianę postaw ludzi, w żadnym wypadku nie może być natomiast dziełem aparatu władzy państwowej.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Одним из самых выдающихся представителей польской экономической и общественной мысли 19 века был Генрик Каменьский (1813—1866), автор, в частности, „философии материальной экономии человеческого общества" — произведения, вышедшего в свет в 40-е годы 19 века. В этом труде, развивая ряд интересных положений в области роли отношений собственности в процессе изменений общественных отношений, или же путей общественного прогресса, Г. Каменьский создает утопическую картину справедливого общественного строя.

Модель справедливого общественного строя Г. Каменьского имеет две фазы. В первой фазе основой общественных отношений является личная заинтересованность мелких производителей — собственников средств производства. Г. Каменьский называет этот этап развития общественных отношений отношениями, опирающимися на „добрую волю", говорит об „обществе, построенном на взаимной выгоде", или же об общественных отношениях, реализующих „единство между людьми".

Создавая картину справедливого общественного строя, Г. Каменьский высказывается за право каждого человека на личную собственность, заметно подчеркивая ее всеобщий характер. Итак, в условиях, опирающихся на „добрую волю" единица получает право владеть капиталом, т.е. „орудиями для труда", что, в понимании Г. Каменьского, равнозначно устранению эксплуатации человека человеком, а также созданию реальных предпосылок для согласования личных интересов каждого производителя с интересами всей человеческой общности.

В обществе, построенном на основе „доброй воли" произведенный национальный доход распределяется по количеству и качеству труда, который становится обязательным для каждого человека. Благодаря этому, такой строй способен удовлетворить растущие потребности населения, гарантируя каждому человеку право на труд.

Система общественных отношений, реализующих „единство между людьми", отличается сцеплением с автоматическим рыночным механизмом в одно целое. В модели свободной конкуренции мелких производителей Г. Каменьский видит наиболее эффективный механизм функционирования экономики и гарантию справедливых оснований распределения национального дохода.

Во второй фазе справедливого общественного строя, если будет существовать такая возможность, основой междучеловеческих отношений будет, по мнению Г. Каменьского, изменение отношения к выполняемой работе, преобразование человеческого образа мыслей, так, чтобы труд стал „трудом призвания". Итак, подобно Р. Оуэну, Г. Каменьский считает, что построение идеального общественного строя может наступить исключительно путем изменения подхода людей к труду, и ни в коем случае не может быть результатом действий государственного аппарата.