

# Goćkowski, Janusz

---

## The Polish Academic Community's Ethos Since the Positivists : Continuity and Change

---

Organon 20 21, 119-135

---

1984 1985

Artykuł umieszczony jest w kolekcji cyfrowej Bazhum, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych tworzonej przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego.

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie ze środków specjalnych MNiSW dzięki Wydziałowi Historycznemu Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.



Janusz Goćkowski (Poland)

THE POLISH ACADEMIC COMMUNITY'S ETHOS  
SINCE THE POSITIVISTS:  
CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

If scientific inquiry is a good school of hard work, inselphness and responsibility, how can one possibly deny that science is ethically useful?

Feliks Koneczny: *The Development of Morals*

1. THE ETHOS OF RESEARCHERS

*The problem.* "A researcher is someone permanently concerned with intellectual inquiry, [...] someone whose scholarly pursuits are regarded by society as fulfilling certain objective criteria and hence objectively valuable. This public recognition is implicit in the circumstance that the researcher is accorded, on account of his scholarly activity, a *social status* which carries with it some prerogatives, as well as a *social function*, that is, a set of certain responsibilities. Anyone who avails himself of the prerogatives implicit in such a status and discharges the responsibilities implicit in such a function, fulfills the *social role of researcher* in the given social circle. A person can fulfill the social role of researcher only inside a circle of people who, like he himself, work in research."<sup>1</sup>

By ethos of researchers I mean the overall axionormative orientation of the academic community, the idea of practice of their cooperation and coexistence, all of this in regard to the value patterns they accept and the rules of conduct they observe and respect. This involves above all scientific truth as the supreme value this community pursues and to which

---

<sup>1</sup> F. Znaniecki, "Uczeni polscy a życie polskie" ["Polish Scholars and Public Life in Poland"], in: *Spoleczne role uczonych*, Warsaw 1984, PWN, p. 211.

it subordinates all principles and rules of cooperation and coexistence. The ethos of researchers amounts to their self-identification (in ideas and practical life alike) with regard to matters of importance for the viability and development of the community of people concerned with the pursuit, formulation and communication of scientific findings.

*The subject.* "As we see that [...] every community emerges for the creation of some good (because everybody is guided by what he considers a good thing in every action), then clearly [...] all [communities] seek some good. [...] Members of a community must have one thing in common, and it will be the same thing regardless of whether or not they partake of it in an equal degree."<sup>2</sup> The conscious subject of the ethos, then, is what is called the *koinone*—something like an "invisible college"—of all people recognizing scientific truth as the most supreme value. The *koinone* forms and lives inside the academic community. However, it is not identical with the entire community but only with a part of it; sometimes it is a minority which advances (both inside the community and toward the outside world) a doctrine concerning the concept and rules of scientific life and seeks to shape the research community's life in line with its own propounded axionormative order. Those in the *koinone* are constantly in struggle for the universal and permanent acceptance of their own principles and rules by all people fulfilling the social role of researchers. That struggle is essentially a bid to win over and train new recruits, to ward off ideas and practices advanced by those opposed to the ethos, and to see to it that those recruited earlier remain true to the ethos. The *koinone*'s subsistence and viability, then, imply that it must combine proselytism with refutation, and education with watchfulness.

The circumstance itself that only some people inside the research community "are guided" or "governed" by norms and rules which merit to be recognized as pertaining to the ethos of researchers must caution the student of the problem to distinguish between this, actually practised, doctrine of scientific life (which is indicative of the researchers' self-identification with regard both to the model of scientific inquiry and their specific social mission) and other models of cooperation and coexistence for researchers. The *koinone* of researchers seeks to make its ethos a "method of building community life" for all people fulfilling the roles of researchers or academic teachers. Should it succeed in this bid, the entire community will become "a whole with a fully developed structure", "a separate human community". The great significance of such actions becomes clear and visible when it is recalled that the research community is typical of a civilization which works according to the principle of "unity in diversity". It is the "Latin civilization" in which every association of people, (a) "subsists in diversity" and "is composed of different entities which are basically pervaded by a sense of

<sup>2</sup> Aristotle, *Politics* [Polish translation], Warsaw 1964, PWN, pp. 3, 303.

unity"; (b) "is born out of the deliberate will of people who associate voluntarily for purposes arising from the general public's views and aspirations, from human communication".<sup>3</sup> This civilization further "displays respect for manual labor and a desire for truth. These two qualities [...] have resulted in a strong expansion of science and technology."<sup>4</sup> The research community is important and indispensable for this civilization to remain viable and to grow.

The subject of the ethos is only a community which constitutes a separate and self-contained part of the social world's entire structure. This means that the community of people fulfilling the role of researcher can seriously be regarded as the champion of the ethos of men of learning when it has a possibility of formulating independently ideas, concepts and programs concerning scientific life as an axionormative order. If possibility and desire to articulate its aspirations and relevant actions are essential qualities of the subject of the ethos, then the research community is such a subject when its members are united in saying and doing what shows (a) what they, as a community, want to be in their civilization; (b) what mission and function they want to fulfill in it; (c) in what manner they intend to carry out their respective jobs for the purpose of meeting their own scholarly interests as well as the "integrative needs" and "instrumental requirements" of others.

*The meaning.* The ethos discloses what those in the koinone interpret and treat as important for them because it makes the pursuit of continuity and development in scientific life meaningful. That the ethos is observed in practical conduct can be seen from these people's desire of scientific truth on the ground of "intentional cooperation". This desire, in turn, finds expression in the manner in which work is carried out in different institutions ("organized systems of purposeful action")—namely a manner which shows that norms and rules following from the canon of moral injunctions constituting the koinone's credo is abided by. The ethos also gives birth to programs of actions serving the perfection of social ties in the research community, specifically programs for improving informal ties between people of one trade, which endow them with a common "perspective of the world" and with a "symbolic form of cognition."

The ethos integrates what are heterogeneous elements into a permanent and consistent structure. A researcher who acts in keeping with the ethos testifies to a proper understanding of what is good and efficient, honorable and decent, just and noble in science, but above all of anything that serves the truth and gives the people concerned a sense of doing the right thing. The koinone expects these people to take such attitudes because it believes this is important for its unity, permanence, development and identity. Moreover, the following four factors, each of them corollary to

<sup>3</sup> F. Koneczny, *O ład w historii [A Call for Order in History]*, London 1977, p. 27.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37.

the concept of scientific truth as an ethical and gnosiological concept, are also components of the ethos of the research community.

1° *Basic commandments*. Researchers are expected to (a) recognize the autonomy of scientific inquiry and the indigenous value of scientific presentation and explanation of the real world; (b) safeguard the freedom of science as the freedom of speech and scientific inquiry, the freedom of choice of method and topic; (c) consider in their scientific work the accomplishments of their predecessors as well as current problems; (d) recognize scientific achievements as the common good of the entire academic community; (e) remain impartial in the search for scientific truth, be critical of scientific assertions and rules of action, be impartial toward topics of scientific study and show scepticism toward nonscientific assertions about what is true or right; (f) diminish onesidedness and bias *via* scholarly discussions; (g) make science an order and a custom in which “statements which are to be recognized as true, whatever their source, must fulfill previously established criteria of accordance with observation and with existing knowledge”, while “acceptance or refutation of propositions to be embodied in science must not depend on the individual or group qualities of the person who proposes them; such a person’s race, nationality, religion, class status, or personality features as such are immaterial”.<sup>5</sup>

2° *Value patterns*. These include models of scientific theory and method, of scholar and academic teacher, of scientific discovery and scientific work, of scholarly authority and scholarly criticism, of language and experiment.

3° *Norms of conduct*. These concern the manner of (a) scientific inquiry and research, scientific discussion and dispute; (b) educating and training research staffs; (c) management of research teams; (d) public statements made by researchers as specialists and as intellectuals; (e) speaking out in roles such as those of spokesman and champion of a scientific school or doctrine; (f) giving testimony of intellectual integrity and honesty in research work, of solidarity and loyalty to the research community; (g) testifying to a sense of community with other groups of intellectuals, creative artists, philosophers, teachers, and to participation in public life, social movements, and to a commitment to human rights, civil rights, and employee rights.

4° *Rules of cooperation and coexistence*. These apply to human relations in (a) communications networks and in systems of joint research teams; (b) the consideration and assessment of people, actions and products from the standpoint of development of research; (c) the internal life of scientific societies and institutions; (d) the sphere of interactions for strategies of success, both those inside and outside the research community.

What these matters mean for those in the *koinone* can be found out by observing the scientist’s behavior in everyday life, especially in tuition, in situations which test the researcher’s loyalty to their ethos. The manner

---

<sup>5</sup> R. K. Merton, “Science and the Democratic Order” [Polish translation], in: *Teoria socjologiczna i struktura społeczna*, Warsaw 1982, PWN, pp. 581 f.

in which researchers who profess their commitment to the koinone and their loyalty to the canon of the ethos do their work gives outside observers some idea about the real views and beliefs concerning the axionormative order in scientific life. If the substance of the ethos amounts to a common stock of memories and members' loyalty to the koinone, then the style of their fulfillment of the researcher's social role appears to be the main touchstone of accordance between "the method of organization of community life" and requirements of the future of scientific inquiry.

Multi-generational viability was a constitutive feature of the ethos and the koinone. There is no ethos without a tradition. The history of the ethos is the history of the changing fashion of the koinone's overall axionormative orientation, that is, the problem of this community's cultural identity. The ethos, essentially, amounts to a specific comprehension and cultivation of cultural values in keeping with the doctrine of cooperation and coexistence of members of the community which has an important mission for civilization.

Two factors are the main preconditions of viability and identity of the ethos: (a) its "socialization" ("a definite assembly of faculties, such as interest in public affairs, a readiness to sacrifice personal interest for others, an aptitude for cooperation, and a sense of responsibility for the shape of the community"<sup>6</sup>) and (b) the morale (the "degree to which a group keeps its unity and its activity in the face of adversities, the power of endurance of mortifications"; "doing well in adversity is the most undeniable indicator of high morale" because "few desertions or simulations are indicative of a high morale"<sup>7</sup>). The ethos shapes the personality of a researcher as a man whose professional biography amounts to a series of situations which force him to identify himself through a proper choice of an axiologically unequivocal attitude. "Character and 'properties of thinking' are [...] two natural sources of activity [...], character qualities account for the choice of conduct in situations where such a choice is not a matter of course."<sup>8</sup> People who are guided by the ethos are people who know perfectly well why and when a researcher should take a "principled attitude" ("invoking some general principle in a new situation which forces a person to take a new attitude in the face of new circumstances, conflicts, role changes etc.", which makes the researcher "look, in a situation which takes him by surprise, for some general principle from among those which are accessible to him such that he could resort to in this particular situation"<sup>9</sup>) and also when

---

<sup>6</sup> M. Ossowska, *Normy moralne. Próba systematyzacji* [*Moral Norms. A Tentative Classification*], Warsaw 1970, PWN, p. 212.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 209.

<sup>8</sup> Aristotle, *Poetics* [Polish translation], Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1983, Ossolineum, pp. 18, 21.

<sup>9</sup> A. Podgórecki, "Postawa zasadnicza i postawa celowościowa" ["The Principled Attitude and the Purpose-Oriented Attitude"], in: *Poglądy społeczeństwa polskiego na moralność i prawo*, Warsaw, 1971, KiW, p. 54.

he should give testimony to “imponderables” (“honor, virtue, courage, and, generally, human integrity”<sup>10</sup>).

Those in the koinone prove their abidance by the ethos when they display—especially at moments of truth for the community—what Ibn Khaldun in his *Prolegomena* called *asabiya* and Niccolo Machiavelli in his discourses on the first 10 books of Livy called *virtù*. The ethos implies close interest in the personality (and not just in this or other role) of anyone in the koinone, and evaluates and treats those in the koinone from the vantage point of the accepted moral model. The core of the ethos is the canon of rules and commandments, any violation of which is tantamount to an attempt on the order of cooperation and coexistence in community, amounting to questioning “the method of organization of community life” for researchers. The core of the koinone is composed of groups and circles of courageous and dedicated guardians and champions of the ethos.

*Functions.* These depend on the koinone’s views and beliefs on what researchers need as a specific and separate community which seeks and teaches the truth, and on what it considers its responsibility as a contributor to civilization. The ethos, as the koinone’s frame of reference and factor of structure development, fulfills the following six functions.

1° *A conjugative function.* The substance of the ethos acts as an effective cementing factor causing those in the koinone to think, feel, act and live along closely similar lines. Social ties (“awareness of membership”, “a cult of common values”, “awareness of common interests” and “readiness to put group interests above personal interests whenever such a conflict arises, or at least the belief that group interests should be put above personal interests”<sup>11</sup>) are shaped by the ethos as a general axionormative orientation and “a method of organization of community life”.

2° *An educative and educational function.* The ethos is a body of ideas, the learning, comprehension, recognition and acceptance of which by anyone in the koinone amount to assimilating the knowledge and skills he needs to perform properly the role of researcher and to choose his strategy for success in life and his motive for scholarly inquiry.

3° *A function determining the way of life.* The ethos tells those in the koinone what they should aspire to and why just this and no other thing; in other words, the ethos shows to those in the koinone what makes sense in the scholar’s life as well as in the lives of professional researchers constituting a community.

4° *A well-ordering function.* The ethos provides those in the koinone with a knowledge of (a) what is obligatory for whom and why, (b) what, and how, is legitimately interpreted and practised, (c) what is normal and

<sup>10</sup> J. Piłsudski, *Pisma zbiorowe [Collected Writings]*, vol. IX, Warsaw 1937, p. 9.

<sup>11</sup> S. Ossowski, “O osobliwościach nauk społecznych” [“Peculiarities of Social Science”], in: *Dziela*, vol. IV: *On Science*, Warsaw 1967, PWN, pp. 153f.

what a deviation, (d) what rigorism and what tolerance are recommended, (e) what of the inherited and established axionormative order can be modified and what should be taken over unchanged, (f) what is valuable while still having a price and what is priceless, (g) what is loyalty and what is treason, (h) who is a "saint" and "hero" and who a "villain" and "renegade", (i) what deeds are fair and what judgements just, and what deeds are disgraceful and what judgements unjust, (j) what is the sense of the scholar's dignity, integrity and responsibility.

5° *A reinforcing function.* Thanks to the ethos a scholar finds in the community, which is the koinone, a "mini-homeland", or a common value which involves a common duty and a common task, a prerogative and a use, a common reward. The ethos counteracts alienation, makes those in the koinone immune to anomy, turning individuals into persons and the community into the koinone.

6° *A mobilizing function.* The ethos (a) shows to those in the koinone what tasks follow from the doctrine about the civilizational mission of scholars as well as a concept of the status and functions of science in global society; (b) unites and encourages them in their pursuit of the goals which follow from the adopted model of science and the vision of global social order.

## 2. RESEARCH PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE ETHOS OF POLISH SCHOLARS

The ethos of Polish scholars as a general axionormative orientation of the community of researchers and teachers (whose social roles predetermine their specific knowledge and mode of cognition), which is socially and culturally a separate entity, began to develop only since the late 19th-century epoch of Positivism. It is in the era of Positivism that the Polish intellectual community first begins to undergo substantial socio-cultural changes. That process resulted from the emancipation of science (as a "perspective of the world" and a "symbolic form of cognition", meaning the manner in which the outward reality is determined, represented and interpreted) from other kinds of knowledge, but it also developed owing to the growing professionalization and institutionalization of research and teaching as performed by people fulfilling the role of scholars. The period which begins in the era of Positivism and which lasts to this day marks the history of the koinone and of its ethos. Throughout that period scholars undertook efforts (a) to ensure a continuity of the canon of rules and injunctions concerning scientific life; (b) to adapt interpretations of this canon to changes which were taking place in Polish society; (c) to provide in the ethos for changes taking place in the structure of scientific knowledge and research method; (d) to boost the morale of members of the koinone and to expand its social base; (e) to combine the desired status of science in society with what society expects and demands science to do.



The present article is designed to outline research problems concerning the ethos of Polish scholars, as research and inquiry conducted according to the following rules: (a) constant and close cooperation of historians with sociologists; (b) interpreting and treating the subject of research as a component of scientific life in one of several domains of the world of science and as a component of community life of a major segment of the Polish intelligentsia; (c) devoting special attention to the continuity of the axionormative orientation of Polish scholars and the changing conditions of their operation as professional researchers; (d) attaching much importance to elections (especially involving people regarded as scholars of authority) in situations under which scholars have to prove their truth to the ethos; (e) taking account of disputes concerning the model of axionormative order in Poland's scientific life and the status and functions of science in Polish society; (f) attaching importance to civilizational accomplishments to which Polish scientists working according to the rules and commandments of their ethos made substantial contributions.

*Cooperation of historians with sociologists.* The fact alone that the ethos of Polish scholars has proved viable for so many generations shows it merits historical study. As for sociologists, their interest in this phenomenon is self-evident if one recalls that the ethos "is the lifestyle of a community, the general [...] orientation of a culture, the hierarchy of its values either in explicit formulations or implicit in human behaviors".<sup>12</sup> Thus, historians must cooperate with sociologists, both in the area of study and inquiry and in discussions for mutual understanding and agreement. But, to be effective, this cooperation must be based on certain conditions. Specifically, when they agree to cooperate, the two sides should (a) draw up a list of topics for study common for their respective inquiries and studies which will specify the matters for discussion and debate; (b) define each side's competences and functions, because such undertakings will involve specialists differing by their knowledge and skills which may prove useful in inquiry and in studies, concerning topics of interest to both sides; (c) in recognition of the truth that they have different research methods, concepts and models of thinking, topics and interests, they should view their cooperation as a gradual reconciliation of their respective scientific orientations and mentalities; (d) concentrate on topics which are important for a generalizing socio-historical account of the ethos of Polish scholars; (e) consider what, from the standpoint of complementarity of findings, the two sides have established in their inquiries—this with a view to formulating more general propositions which may result from the recognition of both sides' gnosiological perspectives and vantage points. But the most important thing for both sides is to consider the ethos of Polish scholars as a process and a structure,

---

<sup>12</sup> M. Ossowska, *Etos rycerski i jego odmiany* [*The Ethos of Knights and its Varieties*], Warsaw 1973, PWN, p. 7.

taking account of its "long persistence" and "historical trend", its "cultural identity" and "social order", its "sociological type" and "historical specificity".

*Scholarly life and public life in Poland.* The ethos of Polish scholars is part of the culture of researchers (as science is universal in character) as well as part of Polish society's own culture (scholars participate in their nation's public life). The *koinone*, as a conscious subject of this ethos, is an important section of the Polish intelligentsia as a group which (a) is committed to shaping its national culture in keeping both with Polish and European traditions, but also in line with Poland's reality and with up-to-date models of thinking and action; (b) tries to fulfill its mission, which amounts to carrying out tasks pertinent to guardians and champions of those values that give meaning to Polish public life in its different forms, in particular to enlightenment and education, to cooperation and creativity inside this group and for the benefit of Polish society. But the *koinone*, as a section of the Polish intelligentsia fulfilling its civilizational mission, operates in a separate community— that of producers and teachers of scientific knowledge. Society expects Polish scholars above all to participate in meeting demands and aspirations in their roles of producers and teachers of scientific knowledge. Scholars, for their part, also try to demonstrate their allegiance to the intelligentsia by imparting an orientation and style to their activities which is in keeping with their professional qualifications and expertise. The way they operate in Poland's cultural life as one section of the Polish intelligentsia involves above all their work as academic researchers and teachers, experts and popularizers of science, apart from working as organizers and administrators of scholarly institutions and scientific societies. But also when they act in their role of intelligentsia, they demonstrate that they are scholars above all. In discussions and analyses of human affairs and civilization they demonstrate their allegiance to models of thinking and expression which show they belong to the world of scholars. Scholarly life is their proper area of invention and cultural activity. Whoever does not participate in the definition of scientific values (scientific propositions and notions, heuristic models, exploratory directives) or in the training of research staffs, is not a scholar. Poland's scholarly life, although it has multiple and significant connections with other areas and forms of public life in Poland, is an inalienable component of international scholarly life. One major feature of science as a form of knowledge and cognition is the primacy of its "epistemic function" over its "humanistic function" (perfection of human wisdom and imagination) and its "technical function" (perfection of human ingenuity and skills). Thus, a Polish scholar can meaningfully serve his society (people, country, state) provided he observes the norms and commandments of his professional ethos. But these are universal in character and involve actions designed to produce universal values. The patriotic ethos of Polish scholars, then, implies that they fulfill their duties toward their country in a way which

confirms their truth to the professional ethos of all researchers. Honesty in thought and perseverance in work are conditions of preserving the dignity of scholars as producers of theories and authors of expert opinions, as teachers of research personnel and communicators of scientific knowledge. Success in research and teaching is what builds up a scholar's professional authority. Such success is the most persuasive record he can produce when seeking to play any significant role in the process of developing the culture of the society in which he lives and works and with which he identifies himself as a patriot. The ethos of Polish scholars must therefore be considered (a) as the ethos of people who regard themselves as part of the academic community as well as a section of the Polish intelligentsia; (b) as a general axionormative orientation of a community which is guided by an ambition to produce scholarly knowledge and help develop Polish society because scientific truth and the native country are its supreme values; (c) as a "method of organizing public life", which is designed and practised in such a way as to ensure concordant actions for achieving the desired status in the international academic community and in their own country. Professional recognition (that is, recognition by the international scholarly community) and usefulness for Polish society (that is, recognition by the Polish intelligentsia) are two imperatives for those in the koinone as the conscious subject of Polish scholars' ethos.

*Continuity of orientation and changing conditions.* Since the period of Positivism, conditions of work of professional researchers have been changing almost constantly. The following factors changed several times: (a) legal regulations concerning the organization of scholarly institutions, scientific degrees and titles, the status of researchers at different levels of professional hierarchy, service regulations for researchers, the freedom of research and teaching, of education and selection of candidates for researchers, rights and duties of scientific societies; (b) expenditure on research, along with sources and rules of financing this kind of activity; (c) the social concept of science's functions, and hence the substance and procedures for checking requirements put to professional researchers; (d) concepts, forms and procedures of science's connections with different spheres of social practice; (e) government guidance and practical policies toward science with a view to its uniformization and practical utility in line with the national interest and with needs of public life at any given time. The concept and practice of research organization can be seen to have been changing steadily, especially as concerns the structure and functions of research. If sociotechnical actions change not owing to changes in scientific life itself as an area of cooperation for gaining knowledge according to norms and rules specific to a peculiar "perspective of the world", then scholars face the following possibilities of choice: (a) an attitude of "heroic integrity" (demonstrating their loyalty to the koinone as their "true spiritual homeland", along with unswerving allegiance to the professional ethos regardless of orders

or requirements coming from outside the koinone or of any conditions set up for professional work), with a view to defending a scholar's dignity; (b) an attitude of "cynical opportunism" (conformism with all orders and requirements concerning the way in which they act as researchers, and putting up with any conditions set up for professional work), with a view to benefits or "to being left alone" or to ensure their "home-made stability"; (c) an attitude of "ethical realism" (seeking a compromise between loyalty to the professional ethos and loyalty toward official orders and requirements concerning the way of playing the role of researchers, and taking account of changing conditions in their morally evaluable behavior), with a view to preserving their professional dignity while also forestalling hazards to their professional work. The changing character of these orders and requirements and conditions, which is characteristic of Polish science in its evolution, compels the koinone to be constantly on the watchout for preserving its cultural identity. It also set up forbidding barriers to the possible expansion of the koinone within the community of professional researchers. Still, it can be said that, during the period we are concerned with, the axionormative orientation of those scholars who are members of, or are influenced by, the koinone remained the same, especially as concerns the general concept of moral standards and rules of conduct in inquiry. This continuity implies, primarily, constant endeavors to remain true to the fundamental commandments of scholars' universal ethos. But it also involves a continuity of endeavors to remain true to the fundamental commandments binding for Polish intellectuals in their role as scholars. These commandments oblige the persons concerned, (a) to serve their country by undertaking such tasks which make it a more civilized country and boost Polish science's prestige, and also by attaining such goals which serve the overall national interest of an independent Polish state; (b) to bring into accord the rules of intellectual life in Poland with the tradition of "Latin civilization" and to expand and strengthen its links with European intellectual culture; (c) to ensure a social order in their country, which implies pluralism in culture, civil liberties in public life, and lawful government in relations between authorities and citizens; (d) to cooperate with artists, engineers, educators, physicians, economists, lawyers, etc. in seeking solutions to major public problems; (e) to ensure a free choice of world outlook, enabling the persons concerned to fulfill their role of intellectuals as well as specialists, and to participate in discussions of the model of culture for Polish society; (f) to act, in public life, as a cultural elite which is an autonomous partner in relations with bodies and movements which have the power of decision on what specific forms social relations will take; (g) to guarantee that creative individuals will be granted autonomy, independence and individuality in whatever socio-economic or socio-political processes they may participate as such individuals. Polish scholars who are in the koinone are willing to serve the public, as they have demonstrated

many times. But they believe that scholars can properly serve the public when those who expect and need such services will not infringe upon the researcher's or teacher's rights. By their conduct Polish scholars have repeatedly shown that they are remote from anarchism or nihilism, that they are good patriots and citizens. But they have also shown they have no intention of being reduced to the status of yesmen, hacks, or functionaries waiting for orders to be carried out. Thus they have demonstrated that, faced by requirements which may infringe or obliterate the "cardinal rights" of their profession, they are ready to say, "Here we stand. We can do no other." The continuity of the koinone's axionormative orientation survived through a period rife with events affecting various areas of public life which were significant for the status and future of Polish science. This continuity, then, is a fact which merits the interest of those who study the "history of persistent processes" in culture. This also testifies to the high moral standards of the academic koinone in Poland. Furthermore, it is proof of viability of the Aristotelian concept of research activity.

*Factors and indicators of continuity of the ethos.* The following factors of continuity deserve to be mentioned: (a) maintaining links to the international scholarly community and partaking of its scientific accomplishments, as well as the intentional and real participation in the international koinone of researchers; (b) the recurrent emergence of challenges and dangers, in successive generations of researchers, which put those in the koinone before the alternative of truth to or betrayal of their professional ethos; (c) the continued generation-to-generation education of research staffs to become scholars (specialists and intellectuals) and members of the Polish intelligentsia (experts and citizens alike); (d) the similarity of life patterns to which different categories of the Polish creative intelligentsia adhere; (e) the visible and experienced connection between what endangers science (as a separate form of knowledge and cognition) and what endangers Polish culture (values and rules of which the Polish creative intelligentsia wants to be a guardian and champion); (f) the Polish creative intelligentsia's determination and perseverance in its allegiance to what is significant in the "Latin civilization" and to its intellectual and artistic heritage as well as to contacts with Western cultural elites. This continuity will be seen in the behavior of Polish scholars (above all, of those in koinone) in situations requiring their self-identification in matters concerning Polish science and culture. The circumstance that this behavior takes many different forms should direct students' attention to the necessity to examine all utterances and acts which are indicative of the axionormative self-identification of producers and teachers of scientific truth who view themselves as a section of the Polish intelligentsia. The continuity of the axionormative orientation is connected with the continuity of the koinone's moral standards. But even this variety of behaviors diminishes at times. Even the courage and ardor of these people "undulates".

*Choices in ordeals.* The Polish academic community has repeatedly been subjected to tests of loyalty to the ethos of Polish scholars ever since the epoch of Positivism. The self-identification of the intellectual elites of this community deserves special attention. In other words, we should study the choices made by people of great intellectual and moral standing who commanded a great deal of trust and respect both among their colleagues and in the general public and who were authorities on matters of substance and method in their respective sciences or disciplines. The history of Polish scholars since Positivism down to our times abounds in moments of truth for scholars. Polish scholars often faced challenges to which they had to respond to preserve their dignity and authority—they were called on to deliver responses which were evidence of their ability to resolve scientific problems in a way which had an effect on the solution of problems of public life in Poland. Often, too, they were submitted to tests of their moral integrity. They have faced pressures and enticements. If they want to “save their faces” in the eyes of the international scientific community and of the Polish intelligentsia, they must respect the commandments of the ethos, even if this loyalty entails suffering or deprivation for them. The late 19th-century idea of the “Flying University” which was an example of a successful preservation of scientific life independently of the foreign powers ruling Poland, is evidence of how they could combine a dedication of freedom of disseminating scientific truth with their service to the nation. Much the same is true of clandestine scientific life under the Nazi occupation, when Poles were denied all rights to engage in scientific pursuits of their own. Individual and group protests in defense of academic freedom against plans contrived by “juntas” keen on extending what Alexis de Tocqueville called “administrative centralization” over science, are evidence of the importance Poles attached to the status of science and of scholars in Poland. Practices of the champions and advocates of “administrative centralization” were criticized also after World War II. Those in the *koinone* speak out against various kinds of constraints imposed on academic freedom and launch independent attempts for scholars to organize scientific life themselves. Participation in the reconstruction or building of scientific institutions, both in the interwar years and after World War II, is proof of ardent patriotism and civic responsibility in the face of needs of Polish cultural life. One particular point of interest after 1945 has been scholars’ participation in revitalizing and organizing Polish scientific life in the western and northern territories Poland regained after World War II.

*Presentations of ideas.* The Polish literature of the subject from Positivism throughout to our times presents views, concerning science as an axionormative order, which are important for humanistic reflections on science and for the development of beliefs and attitudes of people belonging to the Polish academic community. What Polish scholars say on science (as a form of knowledge and cognition, as an area of cooperation and coexistence

of people fulfilling the role of seekers, experts and teachers of the truth, and as a significant public “function” in the Western civilization of modern and recent times) reveals a close connection between the “attitude of researcher” (who is interested in the specific characteristics of science as inquiry) and the “attitude of activist” (who is interested in the specific characteristics of science with a view to shaping them in accordance with a given ethical doctrine). What those in the *koinone* say shows they are interested in the specific characteristics of Polish scientific life and in universal characteristics of science as a “perspective of the world” and a “symbolic form of cognition”. In their considerations of what science is and what it should be they are led up to analyses of what science needs to survive and develop in line with the nature of knowledge and cognition. They also reflect on hazards to this survival and development. The literature I have in mind here presents, among others, the following concepts: (a) freedom of scientific inquiry, taking account of the state’s interests while respecting the inalienable rights of the scholar as researcher and discoverer of truth (Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz); (b) freedom of expression in scholarly disputations, with a view to ensuring pluralism and polyphony in scientific life (Stanisław Ossowski); (c) scholarly discussion in the sense of cooperation for overcoming “one-sidedness” an “arbitrariness” which may befall scholars who work in the same areas of research (Roman Ingarden); (d) honesty in scientific inquiry, which implies the scholar’s ability to combine recognition of changes in the existing body of knowledge with a readiness to revise his view, as well as with impartiality, which implies he should pick his scientific assumptions in accordance with scientific requirements (Tadeusz Czeżowski); (e) “nonconformism in thinking” as a professional duty, which for a scholar implies compliance with the requirement to “consciously participate in the process of development of his own discipline”, a readiness to give true accounts of the substance and formulations of views and scientific propositions, an “openness of his methodological tools”, and a duty to seek epistemically significant scientific knowledge (Stanisław Ossowski); (f) the scholar’s dignity, which implies a scholar is a person “with a strong backbone who does not sway with any whiff of wind” and that he keeps to “a hierarchy of values to which he is attached and which he has no intention of compromising” and also that he wants and is able to stand up in defense of these values (Maria Ossowska); (g) regarding and treating scientific degrees and titles as an effect, and not as the goal, of scientific work (Edward Marczewski); (h) college self-government as a necessary condition for “science itself” and national culture to develop soundly (Oswald Balzer); (i) the social role of “researcher and theorist” as the role which testifies to the survival and development of science proper (Florian Znaniecki); (j) scientific tradition as a deliberate continuation of disinterested formulation of new cognitive problems with a view to approximating the truth by way of a verifiable theory (Felix Koneczny).

Analyzing many of the significant problems in the process of building a humanistic theory of science, Polish scholars make important contributions to the heritage of the international community of students of science. They are concerned with the following problems: (a) the properties of science as a specific and separate axionormative order, especially the autonomy of scientific inquiry and the needs, uses and tasks of inquiry with a view to the epistemic, humanistic and technical function of scientific knowledge; (b) the meaning and limits of freedom a scholar needs to perform his professional jobs, in particular legal safeguards of his freedom to work as researcher and teacher; (c) norms and rules of cooperation for those who take part in the "game of science" in the sense of cooperation for seeking and establishing what is scientific truth; (d) the different kinds of social roles of scholars in connection with different types of structure and tasks of scientific institutions and different areas of scientific knowledge and inquiry; (e) strategies of development of science as a process of improving the quality and expanding the scope of inquiry, especially the significance for this process of researchers' motives and life strategies, as well as the social order and the "method of organizing public life" within which scientific inquiry takes place; (f) intellectual, technical and moral standards a scholar should have as a researcher and teacher, especially the qualities of people who in their areas are recognized as luminaries and masters by their own communities; (g) continuity and change in rules and commandments concerning the profession of researcher inside and outside his institution, especially combining the scholar's presence in the international academic community and in his own native community with different types of links between researchers and other groups and circles of intellectuals and specialists; (h) training researchers within the academic community, especially in small groups (research teams, college seminars, sections or commissions of scientific societies), as well as conditioning them to different social roles they may have to fulfill as scholars on different scenes of cultural life.

Texts which present these ideas are written in different styles and by specialists in various disciplines. By way of example, let us mention just a few, representing only five humanistic disciplines. They include (a) philosophers (K. Ajdukiewicz, L. Chwistek, T. Czeżowski, R. Ingarden, T. Kotarbiński, J. Łukasiewicz, K. Twardowski); (b) historians (O. Balzer, F. Bujak, K. Grzybowski, S. Kieniewicz, F. Koneczny, S. Kot, S. Kutrzeba, T. Manteuffel, W. Tokarz); (c) sociologists (J. Chałasiński, L. Krzywicki, B. Malinowski, M. Ossowska, S. Ossowski, P. Rybicki, J. Szczepański, F. Znaniecki); (d) philologists (A. Brückner, R. Dyboski, S. Pigoń, T. Zieliński); (e) lawyers (J. Gwiazdomorski, B. Winiarski). It should also be pointed out that the journal *Nauka Polska* [Polish Science] published in 1918–39 by the Mianowski Foundation was an important forum of ideas concerning science as an axionormative order. We should perhaps also mention collections of texts such as *In Defense of Freedom of Higher Schools* and *More on the Freedom*



of *Higher Schools*, both published in Cracow in 1933, which present opinions concerning the cardinal rights of scholars and in which the authors seem to be saying "Here we stand. We can do no other"; or *Science and National Defense* (Cracow 1937) which espouses the idea that a scholar's civic duties also include the dissemination of knowledge which is useful for national defense; and also Jan Wilczyński's book *On Academic Custom and the Need to Preserve It in Poland* (Wilno 1932) which is a well-ordered reminder of particularly important rules and values whenever scientific life is facing dangerous actions which threaten to change what is normal into what is abnormal.

*Disputes.* Scholars as well as people from outside the academic community participate in disputes. They concern matters of significance, in general and in particular, for scientific life in Poland. Parties in such disputes include champions and advocates of concepts and projects which are occasionally so different that only with difficulty can participants in them be seen to share a common canon of rules and values of scientific life. Historians and sociologists dealing with the ethos of Polish scholars should pay close attention especially to the following disputes: (a) that over "democratism" vs. "aristocratism", that is, the degree and scope of equality of people at different levels of the academic community (masters, journeymen, apprentices) as concerns their respective rights to shape the reality of scientific life; (b) that over the kind of rules and values to defend which scholars can justifiably avail themselves of the *ius resistendi* and declare *no possumus*, along with circumstances authorizing them to take such defensive attitudes and to resort to legitimate ways of defense; (c) the dispute over the formula of reconciling a scholar's obligation to be loyal to his own community and to the ethos of scholars with his duties toward the state, the people, the Church, the party, as well as the dispute over ways of reconciling the duties of Polish scholars which follow from their presence in the international community of academics with their duties which follow from their being part of the Polish creative intelligentsia; (d) the dispute over the classification of the tenets of the ethos into fundamental and constant ones (those which determine the cultural identity of scientific life) and those that can and should be changed as conditions of professional work for researchers and needs and aspirations of scholars change within any given society; (e) the dispute over the relative importance to be attached to the uses of science as a specific form of knowledge and cognition in the definition of the substance and scope of freedom (of research and teaching, self-government of academic institutions and corporations) which scholars deserve for their work to be fruitful, compared to the importance which should be attached to the uses of science in perfecting various areas of public life (technology, organization, education, control); (f) the dispute over models of social roles scholars should perform in science and in different areas of nonscientific life, as well as over the order of importance

of these roles (from more to less important ones) in a scholar's normal professional biography; (g) the dispute over the kinds and sources of guarantees for the viability and development of normal scientific life in modern societies, especially guarantees which are granted by the central government, and also the dispute over conditions which enable scholars to work well as professional researchers and to develop both as intellectuals and specialists; (h) the dispute over the actors, rules and procedures of evaluation of actions and products turned out by scholars as researchers and teachers with a view to making decisions that may decide the status of these people, and over the evaluation of scientific findings such that leads up to decisions on the uses of scientific knowledge in different areas of public life.

The disputes over the axionormative order of Polish scientific life and of science's status and functions in Polish society are important evidence of the view that the Polish academic community's history should be considered in the aspect of the "long persistence" of the game for the preservation, consolidation and expansion of the viable community of champions and advocates promoting such a "method of organizing community life" which is in line with the needs of science as a specific and separate form of knowledge and cognition. This game has lasted for a long time because there are always those, both inside and outside the research community, who question what is important for this "method of organizing community life", but also because those in the koinone itself take a long time to learn the proper understanding and treatment of science as an axionormative order.

*Contributions to civilization.* Separate thorough-going studies would be needed to present accurately the active and significant contribution of Polish scholars to the Polish nation's civilizational accomplishments. Yet even the knowledge we already have justifies the assertion that Polish scholars have made significant contributions to Polish society's modernization since the epoch of Positivism through to our times, despite the ubiquitous and strong forces acting against Poland's national integrity or against progress. Education and legislation, industry and farming, health service and transports are those spheres of practical life in which the contributions of our scholars to Poland's civilizational accomplishments are most conspicuous. So, too, are consequences of the behavior of scholars which was incompatible with the commandments and rules of their ethos, and the same is true of consequences of barring them from participating in actions which may (and should) help bring about such accomplishments.