

WŁODZISŁAW ZEIDLER\*

*Hohenwestedt*

## DOES HISTORY OF POLISH PSYCHOLOGY EXIST? MULTIPLE FACETS OF THE HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The reason for the question in the title is that during the First World War, Poland was not an independent country. So there was no official Polish psychology contribution in the war effort. Nevertheless, psychology could develop at two universities (in Cracow and Lviv) as an academic discipline. On the other hand, in the areas under Russian jurisdiction the development of psychology started as a practical discipline (organisation of psychologists – Polish Psychological Society, care for children with special needs – Szyc, Grzegorzewska). In the areas that would soon become Polish again, as early as at the beginning of the 20th century, psychology was being developed in Polish language and it served exclusively peaceful purposes (education, manufacturing) for the future independent state. That means, that as opposed to other “European psychologies” before and after the First World War, Polish psychology did exist and was developed strictly for peaceful purposes.

**Keywords:** history of psychology and their models, history of psychological thought, empirical and experimental psychology, psychology in religious and ideological contexts, record and interpretation, brentanism in Austrian-Hungarian monarchy

The above title is a travesty of the opening sentence of Hermann Ebbinghaus' *Grundzüge der Psychologie* (1910). In the same text (pp. 22–23), he expressed the opinion that psychology became a science when its potential was directed at the problems of its own development, according to the then valid criteria of science. In this sense, the status of science was a condition for becoming a part of history. And making its own history. It was an interesting proposition, however, it complicated the situation in several different ways. The question of whether and in what sense psychology is science was debated for many years to come. It was only after 50 years that Herbert Feigl (1962) found a satisfactory answer: yes, psychology is a science because it can explain or interpret facts and make predictions.

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was originally published in Polish as Zeidler, W. (2016). Czy polska psychologia ma swoją historię? Różne oblicza historii psychologii. *Studia Psychologica*, 16(1), 5-21. The translation of the article into English was financed by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland as part of the activities promoting science - Decision No. 676/P-DUN/2019 of 2 April 2019. Translation made by GROJ Translations.

Correspondence address: wlzeidler@gmail.com

However, the same psychology soon became the subject of criticism from the student revolution of 1968. The reason for the criticism of young students was the social-historical reflection. It was claimed that psychology became a tool to support the interests of the bourgeoisie. This unusual discovery and the radical formulation was intended to instrumentalise psychology for the needs of this ideology, which, after the bitter experience of the Second World War, was trying to gain control over the minds of Western European citizens. The same ideology, “under the banners of progress and science”, enslaved the social and scientific life of Eastern Europe since the end of World War II. At the same time, it *de facto* reduced psychology to the formula applied to natural sciences, at the level of physiology. Thus, the “ideological prescription” of practising psychology proved to be contradictory to Herbert Feigl’s diagnosis, as it lacked space for interpretation. The error of the ideology consisted in the fact that it reduced or even closed psychology in the circle of natural sciences, ignoring known and noteworthy attempts to classify the sciences of Heinrich Rickert (1863–1936) and Wilhelm Windelband (1848–1915).

A challenge for psychologists in the so-called socialist countries was a need for a structure that would be able to combine the realities of natural sciences with the ideology of the political system. Psychology itself decided to accomplish the task, using a special type of “interpretation”, consisting in making appropriate, i.e., ideologically correct, labels. No wonder that psychologists have lost interest in the history of their science, which has started to put on an increasingly different ideological costume. Further information on the problems of Polish psychology in this period can be found in other publications, examples of which are the articles by Zofia Ratajczak (2011) and Teresa Rzepa (2013).

Similarly to justifying the advantages of psychology as a science, the founders of psychology also had problems with describing and justifying the independence of their science. For Wilhelm Wundt (1913), it was hard to think of separation between psychology and philosophy! The supporters of experimental psychology usually had the opposite opinion. Wolfgang Köhler (1958), who saw the need for interdisciplinary cooperation in this matter, took a different stance, and therefore wrote:

[...] these lucky moments in the history of science appear when facts, which until now have been treated only as single phenomena, suddenly, combined with seemingly distant, other facts, appear to us in a completely new light [...] going beyond the limits is one of the most effective methods of practising science. (Köhler, 1958, p. 91)

As if anticipating Wolfgang Köhler’s suggestions, already on the threshold of the 20th century Hugo Münsterberg (1863–1916) postulated the establishment of social psychology as a separate (in terms of subject and methods) psychological discipline. Brothers Floyd and Gordon Allport implemented his postulate. Soon, social psychology became a separate and independent discipline to such an extent that it started writing its own history.

Of course, we have not yet described the entire spectrum of varieties of psychology. At the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries several more “conventions” appeared, which also sought a place in the “salon of sciences”: psychoanalysis, psychotherapy, character studies. Wolfgang Martynkiewicz (2009) presented interesting but disturbing examples of forming, in the 1920s and 1930s, the relations of some psychology varieties with emerging power structures in both ideology and politics. These were only some of the possible ways that led to institutionalisation and, in the next step, to the instrumentalisation of psychology. Some of these ways were already in use during the First World War, others during the Second World War, and some after its end.

At this point, it should also be noted that in various historical periods and different countries, the relations of psychology with the surrounding reality, i.e., with time and location and with the social system, were both clear and varied, and its history was recorded in various conventions. Understandably, there was also a heterogeneous interest in psychology and its history. This was reflected in the creation of new models (ways) of dealing with or even practising the history of psychology (cf. Zeidler, 2003). Helmut Lück (2008) distinguished four models of practising it: lives of the noblemen, history of ideas, history of problems, social history. It should also be reminded that after a period of a weak interest or aversion to the history of psychology, this attitude has changed. They were replaced by curiosity or inquisitiveness.

## 1. INTEREST IN THE HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY

The occurrence of factors in social life that strain the mental functioning of individuals or entire groups becomes a reason for seeking help, including in psychology. Such an attitude functions at the emotional level, while the interest in the history of psychology is rather cognitive. It is initiated by cognitive dissonance. That is to say, lack of knowledge or the availability of incorrect or obsolete knowledge. We know that a wide wave of interest in the history of psychology, from the USA to Europe, was caused by the 100th anniversary of the so-called psychological laboratory in Leipzig. Its influence also reached Poland and became well visible, especially after the collapse of the communist dictatorship. In Poland, the result and expression of this interest in the history of psychology, liberated from ideological ties, was an excellent manual by Ryszard Stachowski (2000), whose values – due to the specific perspective of the subject of interest (history of psychological thought) and the avoidance of simplified interpretations – exceed those attributed to the manual of E. G. Boring *A History of Experimental Psychology* (1950, ed. II; cf. Zeidler, 2003, pp. 58–60).

The second one, extremely valuable in this context, is the work of Teresa Rzepa and Bartłomiej Dobroczyński (2009): *Historia polskiej myśli psychologicznej* (A history of Polish psychological thought). The special value of this work is that its authors replaced the search for “foreign” elements in Polish psychology by showing the specificity of the history of Polish psychological thought, and they dared to present this peculiarity clearly. The consequences of these successes were reflected, among other things, in an increase in readers’ interest in the history of psychology. In addition to them, there was an intensification of research in the field of the history of Polish psychology, while noticing its links with the development of European psychology. A peculiar novelty was the fact that several scientific meetings (including conferences) and publications were carried out in relation to an attempt at Polish-German cooperation. The results of this trend were presented at two scientific conferences in Warsaw (2009 and 2011, University of Finance and Management) and in several scientific publications (Herrmann & Zeidler, 2012; Zeidler, 2009; Zeidler & Lück, 2011). One can think that the extremely interesting series *Na Drogach i Bezdrożach Historii Psychologii* (*On-roads and off-roads of the history of psychology*), which has been published in Lublin since 2011 and edited by Teresa Rzepa and Cezary W. Domański (2011), is another stage of satisfying the interest in the history of psychology. Adopting such perspective, it should be said that since the beginning of the 21st century there has been a keen interest (of both researchers and readers) in the

history of psychology, with particular emphasis on those areas that were either avoided or “prohibited” during the communist era. We should add that this way of practising the history of psychology in Poland has been successively changing, thanks to which we can say that, apart from “factual” works, publications with a clear focus on interpretation in the relevant social and political context are more and more frequent (e.g., Gołąb, 2015; Hryniewiecka, 2015; Izdebski, 2015).

This brief description of the development of our interest in the history of psychology in Poland allows us to imagine the extent and significance of this issue since we are determined to consider it in a broader context: European or continental one. Until now, the description and analysis of the history of psychology have been limited to the historical and political borders of the selected country (England, Germany, USA, Poland). Meanwhile, according to the previously cited quote, “going beyond the limits is one of the most effective methods of practising science” (Köhler, 1958, p. 91). With regard to the history of psychology, including Polish psychology, Wolfgang Köhler’s indication seems both correct and extremely difficult. Problems begin when we try to assess the state of psychology at a particular moment and in a particular country while respecting the existing affinities or peculiarities. It seems that it is only possible to organise the history of psychology per nations, continents or schools superficially, based on the Lück’s principle called the history of the noblemen. Attempts to find more sophisticated principles of division may end with failure, one that has limited the value of Abraham A. Roback’s work<sup>2</sup> (1970). In his *History of psychology and psychiatry*, originally published in 1961, for all the countries that did not have state independence until World War I, there is no mention of psychology. Can it be therefore assumed that psychology was unknown in all the three parts of Poland during the period of the Partitions of Poland? And if “some” already was established, could it have been the Polish psychology?

## 2. DID EUROPEAN PSYCHOLOGY EXIST?

The actual state of affairs deserves more attention than *Roback’s error*, justified by unknown reasons. It is therefore worth taking into account certain realities, which, from the European perspective, must be more visible than if we want to see them ‘from the other side of the Ocean.’ The question arises whether, during the partitions of Poland (and this was the “Polish specificity”), in their territory, psychology could already have been “Polish”, i.e., did it use Polish language as a tool to express its own views and create its own theories? Of course, the functioning of a given science in the national language increases its availability in a given nation, and thus: interest in its contents. Max Dessoir (1902) emphasised that the process of creating one’s own, psychological terminology in German was the work of three generations of German psychologists. The specificity of this process with reference to the Polish language was presented by Rzepa and Dobroczyński (2009) as well as by Panczyk and Zeidler (2011). In Poland, the achievement of “terminological identity” took place during the partitions of Poland in a different and specific way for each of them. Therefore, it should be assumed that Polish psychology, i.e., the one that carried out its research and expressed its results in the Polish language, already existed

---

<sup>2</sup> I provide a more accurate picture of his work in my work: Zeidler, 2011, pp. 47–48.

before the outbreak of the First World War. A good example is the work of Francisca Baumgarten (1917): *Kłamstwo dzieci i młodzieży* (The Lie of Children and Youth), which will be discussed in a separate article (Zeidler, 2018).

Let us return to what we called Roback's error, i.e., his omission of the importance of Franz Brentano's concept for the development and shape of psychology in Europe at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. In the already quoted manual on the history of psychology, Stachowski (2000) often returns to the content and role of Brentano's views. Other historians of psychology treat the views and meaning of this scientist in a variety of ways. Norton Hunt (2007) ignores both the author himself and his views. Unlike him, Duane P. Schultz and Sydney E. Schultz (2008), also American authors, have published on two pages a compact but successful description of both Brentano's views and his significance for the development of psychology. They stressed that his main work, *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* (1999), was first published in 1874, the same year when Wundt published *Grundzüge der physiologischen Psychologie*. These two works had different but fundamental significance for the two different options of practising the "emerging" new psychology. The empirical psychology (Brentano) and the experimental one (Wundt). Moreover, Brentano has become the founder of a new theoretical orientation, known as the psychology of acts. The authors of this manual call Brentano one of the pioneers of psychology and consider him to be a precursor of character psychology and humanistic psychology.

It should also be remembered that at that time in the history of Europe, changes took place, which included not only political, economic, social and military events, but also science, and they, of course, occurred also in philosophy. And this one was subject to modifications during the 19th century, about which Władysław Tatarkiewicz wrote: "Poland has also been moving from extremity to extremity in its philosophy over the century: it began with positivism, moved on to messianic metaphysics after the November Uprising, and then returned to positivism after the January Uprising" (Tatarkiewicz, 2001, p. 7). All these transformations, regardless of whether we look at them from the European or Polish perspective, were exceptionally important, because in each of them they were "multifactorial", i.e., political coexisted with military ones, economic with scientific ones, etc. When viewing the well-known "separation" of psychology from philosophy in such a more varied perspective, it is worth considering both the facet of this newly emerging psychology and that "old" philosophy from which it has already separated or just wanted to separate. The peculiarity of possible situations is even more interesting because at the time in question, different philosophical orientations existed or prevailed in different parts of Europe. Psychologists already knew this circumstance when the first psychological "orientations" started to take shape, i.e., when Wundt and Brentano wrote their main works. Both to create new relations between philosophy and psychology. Their intentions were unambiguous, but their implementation brought different results. Brentano, moving away from speculative philosophy, became an advocate of empirical psychology. Wundt, who was "critical" of French and English philosophy and at the same time referred to the rules of the natural sciences, became an advocate of experimental psychology. This is the image we are getting with a superficial look. It will be deepened by reading Wundt's controversial work from 1915 *Die Nationen und ihre Philosophie. Ein Kapitel zum Weltkrieg*.

Wundt focuses in this work on three types of variables, which he first distinguishes and characterizes. These are philosophy, "nationality" and religion. The latter turns out

to be the least explicit and dissolves into a group of such terms as tribe, nation, society, empire. In turn, religion overlaps with language and causes further differences. Thus, the author of experimental psychology, apart from the philosophy of the “French” and “Englishmen”, which is relatively uniform, encounters problems with the “German” philosophy. At that time there were several German-speaking nations in Europe, and they differed in religion. Thus, there were Catholic and Protestant nations. This was a fact that was of great importance when views on ontological issues, the theory of cognition and methodology had to be agreed upon in the field of psychology. Of the three powers occupying Poland, two had “something” to offer Polish psychology, but the concepts also differed. The one was in line with the Catholic faith, the other with the Protestant. If we take into account several political realities, which are characteristic of the final phase of the partitions, then we understand that in Poland – the concept closer to Catholicism attracted more interest. This means that Brentano’s empirical psychology was more accessible to the Polish mentality than other orientations.

However, it would be simplistic to say that only religion decided about the greater accessibility of Brentano’s psychology to the Polish mentality. Political and organisational factors also played an important role here, i.e., a more liberal attitude to Polish tradition and organisation in the Austrian partition. Above all, a clearer presence of Polish language in the everyday and cultural life of the society in this partitioned sector. And as its consequence, the presence of Polish science in the official system of sciences, accepted in this sector. In 1986, the University of Vienna published a study on the last 100 years of its history. It contains some details that illustrate the problem we are interested in. From the last partitioned sector two Polish universities “survived”: in Cracow (year of est. 1364) and in Lviv (year of est. 1661). Both were Germanised, and it was only after 1867 that they were gradually repolonised, which was “completed” in 1879 with a decree stating that the “official” language at the University of Lviv was Polish. In the academic year 1884/1885 there were 976 matriculated students and in 1913, 5.206 students. At the Jagiellonian University, there were 871 matriculated students in the academic year of 1884/1885 and 2.605 in 1913. Let me remind that Kazimierz Twardowski, after taking up his professorship in Lviv, translated some of his works into Polish. It was a process similar to that of Dessoir: it consisted in translating “Latin works” into the national German language. Some further important information on the functioning of psychology in the Austrian Empire can be found in the works of Gerhard Benetka<sup>3</sup> (1995, 2009), who reminds that Franz Brentano’s teaching period at the University of Vienna was 20 years “only”: 1874–1894. The next 28 years in the history of Vienna Psychology (i.e., until Karl Bühler became director of the Institute) were marked by multiple changes in orientation (both scientific, social and political) that did favour neither the protection nor dissemination of Brentano’s views at this University.

However, interest in his *Psychology from the empirical point of view* continued (1999). Brentano’s views, thanks to the activity of his students, were spread in the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Kazimierz Twardowski is a good example here, but not the only one. The influence of Anton Marty from the University of Prague was equally broad, and also in the trends of Brentano’s views (cf. Antonelli, 2011). It is not possible

---

<sup>3</sup> Prof. Dr. Gerhard Benetka (born 1962) is the director of the Institute of the Faculty of Psychology at the Sigmund Freud University in Vienna. He deals with the theoretical foundations of psychology, research methodology and history of psychology.

to exhaust this topic in this study. Therefore I will limit myself to pointing out that the collapse of this double monarchy had a very negative influence on the further interest in the views of Franz Brentano. Restitution of this interest can only be observed at the end of the 20th century (cf. Rzepa, Galewicz, Benetka & Antonelli<sup>4</sup>). In Poland, during the communist era, downgrading or even ignoring the importance of Brentano's views was conditioned by ideology. Meanwhile, the development of Polish psychology and philosophy during the partitions and later, already in the interwar period, as well as their shape – free from connections with “Brentanism” – is unthinkable.

### 3. POLITICAL DIGRESSION

Usually, the choice of the language of university lectures was justified by political reasons. However, in the case of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy there were other traditions and customs. It should therefore be noted that the universities in Cracow and Lviv “had” Polish language, but despite this, Poland did not exist as an independent state. And it was this very circumstance that limited the possibility of “Poland’s” participation in the First World War. It was only at the end of the war, in point 13 of President Wilson’s peace declaration of 8 January 1918, that a plan for the restitution of the Polish state appeared<sup>5</sup>. The restitution meant – even before the signing of the Treaty of Versailles (10 January 1920) – that all institutions necessary for the functioning of social, economic and political life had to be created anew. It was already known about psychology that it has significant importance for mental and economic life, both in terms of education and training and production efficiency.

Meanwhile, due to the lack of state independence, none of the three partitions could be, and was not, a party in World War I. This means that, logically, Polish psychology could not be a tool to help the state in waging war, which did not exist at that time! We must therefore assume that, despite having a national self-awareness, Polish psychology could start functioning in an institutionalized manner only within the framework of new state structures: an independent Polish state. In reality, however, the restitution of the Polish state could only begin after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles (10 January 1920), and this meant that all instances necessary for the functioning of the state as a social, economic and political organism had to be created anew.

---

<sup>4</sup> Prof. Dr. Mauro Antonelli (born 1962) is a professor at the universities of Milan and Graz. He deals with the history of European psychology, with a particular emphasis on the psychology of Franz Brentano and the School of Graz. In 2016, the first issue of the *European Yearbook of the History of Psychology* was published, of which he is the initiator and editor-in-chief.

<sup>5</sup> President Wilson’s peace plan of 8 January 1918, point XIII. “An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.” The same content appeared a year earlier, in Wilson’s “Speech” of 22 January 1917. The original English term *should be erected* is not an exact equivalent of the term *restitution*. However, while respecting historical realities, it must be accepted that President Wilson had in mind the political and organizational realities of the time, the collapse of the monarchy and empires, which meant nothing more than a state of independence. Therefore, it seems that taking into account the historical reality, in the Polish language, the use of the term *restitution* is justified.

#### 4. DIFFICULTIES WITH THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE HISTORY OF POLISH PSYCHOLOGY

When we talk about history, the history of psychology or the history of Polish psychology, the difference between actual events (history) and their recording and interpretation must be respected. The latter requires special attention. Each piece of history is an element in the structure of a different, larger whole. Two of them are particularly important. We call the former *a nation*, the latter *a state*. History is littered with evidence that these structures are not clearly and forever separated from each other. Juan J. Linz (2009) showed a whole range of reasons and types of blurring the boundaries between these structures and their degeneration towards totalitarian regimes. His work makes us aware of some deformations in the process of history – in the process of creating and transforming Europe. That Poland has participated in these changes since the Middle Ages requires no proof. On the one hand, one can observe the strengthening of the sense of national identity, and on the other hand, of Polish statehood: their further successes, threats or even failures. The period of partitions was particularly difficult. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Europe were periods of the transformation of all the principles and structures of social, mental, economic and political life. Each of them was based on two different substrates. The former was a sense of national identity, rooted in a specific culture, the latter – the statehood. The specificity of the history of Europe in that period included, as one of its characteristic features, the domination of state structures and their subordination, or even limitation of the independence of national structures, most often using violence and rape. An appropriate example was the compulsion to study in the language of the invader. Where the official language was the language of the invader, it was difficult or even impossible to record and publish the history of one's own nation.

No wonder that recording and disseminating the history of Polish psychology was also difficult, and its interpretation inconvenient. When Władysław Heinrich and Kazimierz Twardowski wrote their excellent doctoral and post-doctoral (“habilitation”) dissertations at foreign universities (cf. Panczyk & Zeidler, 2011), was it an achievement of Polish or German psychology? Ryszard Stachowski (2011) recalled the work of Jan Wł. Dawid – the first Polish questionnaire to study the mentality of Polish children, edited and published in 1886! In 1912 Franciszka Baumgarten (1927) conducted original research on the lie of children in a Russian school, but in the Polish language! And in 1990 Helmut Hildebrandt and Eckart Scheerer rated Władysław Heinrich's contribution to the theory of research on attentiveness and apperception very highly – his work in German language, *Die moderne physiologische Psychologie in Deutschland*, 1895 (cf. Heinrich, 1988).

Of course, it is neither my task nor the aim to further point out examples of the presence of Polish psychologists in European psychology. Evidence of the existence of Polish psychology during the partitions, as a collective activity, is also the activity of two scientific societies: the Polish Psychological Society (Warsaw 1907; Celińska, 2009) and the Polish Society for Child Research (Warsaw 1907; Report, 1908). Each of them contributed to the emergence and development of Polish psychology, first during the partition periods, and later also in subsequent periods of historical cataclysms that posed a threat to both Polish statehood and national, or perhaps simply cultural identity.

## 5. COLLAPSE AND REBIRTH: THE UNEXPECTED CONSEQUENCES OF THE GREAT WAR

In a very solid historical monograph, *Pandora's Box*, Jörg Leonhard (2014, pp. 460 ff.) noted that the sacrifice, including the sacrifice of the lives of many thousands of soldiers during World War I on the Western front are commemorated by monuments cherished with the utmost respect and care. However, no monuments commemorate even more numerous victims in the battles on the Eastern Front. But are they really needed? It is, after all, the case that all these cruel human sacrifices on the Eastern Front document the political events, perhaps more important than those about which Horacius wrote: *monumentum aere perennius...* – events that were the immediate aftermath of the Great War and brought liberation from imperial dependency to many nations. Leonhard is referring to the rise or rebirth of a series of national states, formerly belonging to one of those empires that had just collapsed as a result of *la Grande Guerre*. Instead of dealing with the increasingly laborious determination of causes and guilt, contemporary historiography tends to maintain – contrary to the earlier views<sup>6</sup> – that, in fact, the Great War primarily closed one chapter of European history<sup>7</sup>. In many European countries, the former monarchies began to be replaced by democracy<sup>8</sup>, which implied two kinds of changes. On the one hand, the former powerful state organisms, even entire empires, were falling apart! On the other hand, their place was taken by much smaller countries, which were created by regaining their former freedom and independence. Regarding state identity: rape and violence were replaced by the sense of national identity (probably exactly the one analysed by Wilhelm Wundt in his *Völkerpsychologie*), which was extremely important. If the psychology of that time had something “own” to say about war, it would be that the former empires must have had the greatest difficulty in establishing national identity, in which the idea of a multinational and imperial state was the highest value so far! No wonder that here and there, at different times, the sense of national identity built on the “patterns” of the imperial state led to radical nationalism. In Juan Linz’s work (2009) we recognize it under various masks, in the costume of ever-new totalitarian and authoritarian regimes. Reduced to political aspects, it can be said, the idea has retained its vitality to our times. And even more: at various times, it has been the driving force behind what we call the course of history (cf. Herrmann & Zeidler, 2012).

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, F. Fischer (1961). This earlier view was also respected in psychological literature, e.g., E. Scheerer (1989).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. e.g., Hans Herzfeld (1991), *Erster Weltkrieg und Friede von Versailles*.

<sup>8</sup> Juan J. Linz defines democracy as follows: “Wir nennen dann ein politisches System demokratisch, wenn es bei Wahrung der Grundrechte auf Vereinigungs-, Informations- und Kommunikationsfreiheit die freie Formulierung politischer Präferenzen erlaubt” (2009, p. 12). “We call a political system democratic if it allows the free formulation of political preferences while safeguarding the fundamental rights to freedom of association, information and communication).”

## 6. MULTIPLE FACETS OF THE PSYCHOLOGY(?)

In this journal, we often meet the same “actors”: history and psychology. The former – rather as a record or reminder of history, and only occasionally as their interpretation. Let us also say that psychology during the Great War, despite significant progress in development, was not able to reverse the sense events, and was not always properly prepared to meet the expectations addressed to it. It should be added, however, that the psychology of that period, although present in science, in political and social activities, was not yet a uniform creation. Apart from the academic one, there were also psychoanalysis and psychological techniques<sup>9</sup> looking for a way to their institutionalization. The former and the latter were willing to take into account the needs and tasks resulting from on-going warfare. Besides that, academic psychology then focused on experimental research in laboratories, was not able to satisfy the requirements resulting from the war landscape. Perhaps a certain oversight of psychologists, and later also historians of psychology, was to understand academic psychology in a one-sided way – as natural science. Meanwhile, even before the start of the Great War, another orientation had emerged, which found expression in Dilthey’s dispute with Ebbinghaus. This orientation, entangled in the contradictions of its time, instead of explaining, tried to understand the course of specific events! And not only this orientation. Perhaps this type of narrative should also be recalled with reference to the ongoing *la Grande Guerre*, which Scheerer (1989) called wartime journalism.

The author placed all publications with the journalistic title *Kriegspsychologische* outside the boundaries of scientifically understood psychology, which at that time was only slowly and with some difficulty acquiring the “spurs of truthful science”. This is because there was no guarantee that the publications with this *Kriegspsychologische* in the title still had something to do with psychological discourse. Julia Barbara Köhne (2014) described such studies as *fachliche und belletristische Kriegspublizistik*. With adjective *psychological* in the title, they built their content using common sense, but they were not based on the psychological results of scientific research. Their journalistic attractiveness was to replace scientific competences.

## 7. THE WAY FORWARD: TOWARDS EUROPEAN IDENTITY?

The authors of the works included in this issue tend to treat *la Grande Guerre* as the next stage in the development of European history. On the other hand, the course and results of this war are treated with an awareness of what Franziska Baumgarten<sup>10</sup> has

---

<sup>9</sup> Additional interesting details about the “variety”, meaning and specific “richness” of current non-academic trends in psychology in the 1920s in Germany were presented by Wolfgang Martynkiewicz (2009).

<sup>10</sup> “Die Zeit des 1. Weltkrieges war eine Fermentzeit für die angewandte Psychologie. In jedem kriegsführenden Lande gab es das gleiche Problem: wie... erringt man den Sieg über die Feindesmacht...– (as cited in Daub, 2011, p. 225).

“The time of the First World War was a fermenting time for applied psychology. In every warring country there was the same problem: how ... one can achieve victory over the enemy power...” (Daub, 2011, p. 225).

already noticed as a kind of challenge for psychology (Daub, 2011, p. 225). Imperial states' policies during the war assigned to psychology the selection of recruits or the care of soldiers after injuries. However, the tasks that psychology had to perform after the end of the war for the needs of newly established national states, including the independent Polish state, were completely different. It consisted in building the principles of one's own national pedagogy, general and vocational education, and the use of psychological techniques (Baumgarten, 1928/1930).

Perhaps the conviction that *la Grande Guerre*, in fact, concluded one of the periods of political and cultural development in Europe is a heuristically more valuable proposition than it initially seems. For the newly established countries that were looking for a way to their future, regaining freedom and independence was a reward for the hardships and sacrifices made in the war in someone else's interest. But freedom was nothing more than a challenge and a task: the search for national identity in the landscape and climate of the 20th century. Of course, with the participation of political awareness, but also with the use of accessible sciences. Was psychology one of them? Did psychology at the beginning of the 20th century have a "mandate" and appropriate tools to explain to any human being what a *nation* and what a *state* is?

This is an important circumstance if we start thinking about the institutionalization of Polish academic psychology. Actually, this process was possible even before regaining independence – at two universities (in Cracow and Lviv), psychology had the right to use the Polish language in its scientific and didactic activities. In our journal, Teresa Rzepa and Ryszard Stachowski show the creation of the foundations of academic psychology in Poland using the examples of the achievements of Kazimierz Twardowski and Stefan Błachowski. Twardowski created philosophy and psychology based on the former Polish university in Lviv, however, based on the current, modern psychology of Franz Brentano from Vienna. Błachowski, based on the knowledge and experience from universities in Lviv, Vienna and Göttingen, formulated at the new university in Poznań the foundations of such psychology that wanted to be European. To avoid blurring the truth, it should be added that both Błachowski and Twardowski built their psychology in direct contact with German psychology. For historical reasons, it was then also the closest and the "best" one.

In the territory of the former Russian partitioned sector, the situation of psychology was more difficult. Despite this, active individuals educated outside the annexation zone, acting under the influence of specific ideas of *Warsaw positivism*, tried to introduce psychology into social life. It was thanks to them that the Polish Psychological Society was founded in Warsaw in 1907 (Celińska, 2009). Also in Warsaw, from 1908, the Polish Society for Child Research was active – inspiring, initiating and caring for psychological research on children who were to become free from enslavement in a few years. Paweł Izdebski, using the example of Aniela Szyk, presents in our journal several details about the psychology of a child in a country where children at school could not use their own language. The author also had the opportunity to reveal the testimony of a kind of solidarity between Aniela Szyk and Franciszka Baumgarten. This solidarity manifested itself in 1912, when Franciszka Baumgarten planned to conduct her research on the lie of children and young people in Łódź in 1912 (*sic!*) in the Polish language! Włodzisław Zeidler described the history and significance of this work in a separate article.

The completion of the whole picture or an outline of its complexity presents the article by Cezary Domański. We learn there about the “consequences” of warfare: psychiatric patients, just soldiers of the proud Austro-Hungarian army, hospitalized in Lublin under the care of Viktor Tausk, a physician of the Imperial-Royal army, of a psychoanalytical orientation.

I would like to thank all the authors for their cooperation in the preparation of this journal. My heartfelt thanks go to Prof. dr hab. Henryk Gasiul, editor-in-chief of *Studia Psychologica*, who encouraged all the authors to work on the preparation of the issue, and in difficult moments raised their spirits.

A special reward for the work of the entire team of Authors will be when the studies collected in the journal increase the interest of readers and become an incentive for further research on the history of European psychology.

Włodzisław Zeidler  
Hohenwestedt, February 2016.

### REFERENCES

- Antonelli, M. (2011). *Die Deskriptive Psychologie von Anton Marty. Wege und Abwege eines Brentano-Schülers*. In M. Antonelli & J. C. Marek (Eds.), *Anton Marty, Deskriptive Psychologie* (pp. 11–83). Würzburg, Germany: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Antonelli, M., & Marek, J. C. (Eds.) (2011). *Anton Marty. Deskriptive Psychologie*. Würzburg, Germany: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Baumgarten, F. (1917/1926). *Die Lüge bei Kindern und Jugendlichen. Eine Umfrage in den polnischen Schulen von Lodz* (ed. II). Leipzig, Germany: Johann Ambrosius Barth.
- Baumgarten, F. (1927). *Klamstwo dzieci i młodzieży*. Warsaw, Poland: Nasza Księgarnia.
- Baumgarten, F. (1928). *Die Berufseignungsprüfung. Theorie und Praxis*. München, Germany: Oldenbourg. [Polish edition: Baumgarten, F. (1930). *Badanie uzdolnień zawodowych*. Lviv–Warsaw, Poland: Książnica-Atlas].
- Benetka, G. (1995). *Psychologie in Wien*. Vienna, Austria: WUV – Universitätsverlag.
- Benetka, G. (2009). Vienna Institute of Psychology in the interwar period. *Studia Psychologica*, 9, 167–178.
- Brentano, F. (1999). *Psychologia z empirycznego punktu widzenia* (Trans. & introd. W. Galewicz.). Warsaw, Poland: PWN.
- Brett, G. S. (1969). *Historia psychologii* (Ed. R. S. Peters). Warsaw, Poland: PWN.
- Celińska, K. (2009). Powstanie i początki działalności Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego. In W. Zeidler (Ed.), *Psychologia europejska w okresie międzywojennym* (pp. 61–76). Warsaw, Poland: Vizja Press & IT.
- Daub, E. (1996). *Franziska Baumgarten: Eine Frau zwischen akademischer und praktischer Psychologie*. Frankfurt/M., Germany: Peter Lang.
- Daub, E. (2011). Franziska Baumgarten-Tramer: Für die Wissenschaftlichkeit praktischer Psychologie. In S. Volkmann-Raue, H. E. Lück (Ed.), *Bedeutende Psychologinnen des 20. Jahrhunderts* (223–234). Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften DOI: [10.1007/978-3-531-93064-0\\_17](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-93064-0_17) [Trans. for Polish by: E. Daub, (2015). Franziska Baumgarten-Tramer: o naukowość psychologii praktycznej. In S. Volkmann-Raue & H. E. Lück (Eds.), *Najwybitniejsze kobiety w psychologii XX wieku* (pp. 269–282), (Trans. W. Zeidler). Sopot: GWP].

- Dessoir, M. (1902/1964). *Geschichte der Neueren Deutschen Psychologie*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: E.J. Bonset.
- Ebbinghaus, H. (1910). *Abriss der Psychologie*. Leipzig, Germany: Veit & Comp.
- Feigl, H. (1962). Philosophical Embarrassment of Psychology. *Psychologische Beiträge*, 6(3–4), 340–364.
- Fischer, F. (1961). *Griff nach der Weltmacht. Die Kriegszielpolitik des kaiserlichen Deutschland 1914/1918*. Düsseldorf, Germany: Droste.
- Galewicz, W. (1999). *Brentano anatomia życia psychicznego*. In F. Brentano, *Psychologia z empirycznego punktu widzenia* (pp. 13–65). Warsaw, Poland: PWN.
- Gołąb, A. (2015). Alina Szemińska: Niedoceniona odkrywczyni. In S. Volkmann-Raue, H. E. Lück (Eds.), *Najwybitniejsze kobiety w psychologii XX wieku* (pp. 363–385). Sopot, Poland: GWP.
- Heinrich, W. (1988). *U podstaw psychologii i inne pisma*. Warsaw, Poland: PWN.
- Herrmann, T., & Zeidler, W. (Eds.). (2012). *Psychologen in autoritären Systemen*. Frankfurt/M., Germany: Peter Lang.
- Herzfeld, H. (1991). Erster Weltkrieg und Friede von Versailles. In G. Mann (Ed.), *Propyläen Weltgeschichte: Vol. IX* (pp. 75–127). Berlin, Germany: Propyläen.
- Hildebrandt, H., & Scheerer, E. (1990). Einleitung. In H. Hildebrandt & E. Scheerer (Eds.), *H. Münsterberg: Frühe Schriften zur Psychologie* (pp. 11–48). Berlin, Germany, Springer.
- Hoeres, P. (2004). *Krieg der Philosophen. The deutsche and british Philosophie im Ersten Weltkrieg*. Paderborn, Germany: Ferdinand Schöningh.
- Hryniewiecka, A. (2015). Maria Grzegorzewska: Psychologia wobec niepełnosprawności. In S. Volkmann-Raue & H. E. Lück (Eds.), *Najwybitniejsze kobiety w psychologii XX wieku* (pp. 341–362). Sopot, Poland: GWP.
- Hunt, M. (2007). *The Story of Psychology*. New York, NY: AnchorBooks.
- Izdebski, P. (2015). Joseph Joteyko: Psychological tests. In S. Volkmann-Raue & H. E. Lück (Eds.), *Najwybitniejsze kobiety w psychologii XX wieku* (pp. 321–340). Sopot, Poland: GWP.
- Köhler, W. (1958). *Dynamische Zusammenhänge in der Psychologie* (org. En. *Dynamics in Psychology – 1940*). Bern, Germany: Hans Huber.
- Köhne, J. B. (2014). Papierne Psychen. Zur Psychographie des Frontsoldaten nach Paul Plaut. In U. Heikau & J. B. Köhne (Eds.), *Krieg! Juden zwischen den Fronten 1914–1918* (pp. 65–104). München: Jüdisches Museum München.
- Leonhard, J. (2014). *The Büchse der Pandora. Geschichte des Ersten Weltkrieges*. München, Germany: C.H. Beck.
- Linz, J. J. (2009). *Totalitäre und autoritäre Regime*. Potsdam, Germany: WeltTrends.
- Lück, H. (2008). *History of Psychology: Orientations, schools, directions of development*. Warsaw, Poland: Vizja Press & IT.
- Martynkiewicz, W. (2009). *Salon Deutschland. Geist und Macht 1900–1945*. Berlin, Germany: Aufbau.
- Panczyk, P., & Zeidler, W. (2011). Jak powstawała polska naukowa terminologia psychologiczna: Koncepcja abstrakcji Kazimierza Twardowskiego. In W. Zeidler & H. Lück (Eds.), *Psychologia europejska w okresie międzywojennym: Sylwetki, osiągnięcia, przykłady* (pp. 245–270). Warsaw, Poland: Vizja Press & IT.

- Ratajczak, Z. (2011). Nauka Pawłowa a polska psychologia. In T. Rzepa & C. W. Domański (Eds.), *Na drogach i bezdrożach historii psychologii: Vol. 1* (pp. 205–228). Lublin, Poland: UMCS.
- Roback, A. (1970). *Weltgeschichte der Psychologie und Psychiatrie*. Olten–Freiburg im Breisgau, Switzerland–Germany: Walter (Trans. K. Thiele-Dohrmann). [Org.: *History of Psychology and Psychiatry* (1961).]
- Rzepa, T. (1997). *Psychologia w szkole lwowsko-warszawskiej*. Warsaw, Poland: PWN.
- Rzepa, T. (2013). *W poszukiwaniu ideologicznego piętna*. In T. Rzepa & C. W. Domański (Eds.), *Na drogach i bezdrożach historii psychologii: (Vol. 2, pp. 193–208)*. Lublin, Poland: UMCS.
- Rzepa, T., & Dobroczyński, B. (2009). *Historia polskiej myśli psychologicznej*. Warsaw, Poland: PWN.
- Scheerer, E. (1989). Kämpfer des Wortes: Die Ideologie deutschen Psychologen im Ersten Weltkrieg und ihr Einfluß auf die Psychologie der Weimarer Zeit. *Psychologie und Geschichte*, 1(3), 12–22.
- Schultz D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (2008). *Historia współczesnej psychologii*. Cracow, Poland: UJ.
- Sprawozdanie (1908). *Report of the Polish Society for Child Research*. Warsaw, Poland: Drukarnia Naukowa.
- Stachowski, R. (2000). *Historia współczesnej myśli psychologicznej: Od Wundta do czasów najnowszych*. Warsaw, Poland: Scholar.
- Stachowski, R. (2011). Pierwszy polski kwestionariusz psychologiczny. In W. Zeidler (Ed.), *Kwestionariusze w psychologii: Postępy, zastosowania, problemy* (pp. 139–160). Warsaw, Poland: Vizja Press & IT.
- Tatarkiewicz W. (2001). *Historia filozofii, T. III. Filozofia XIX wieku i współczesna*. Warsaw, Poland: PWN.
- Wundt, W. (1913). *Die Psychologie im Kampf ums Dasein*. Leipzig, Germany: Kröner.
- Wundt, W. (1915). *Die Nationen und ihre Philosophie. Ein Kapitel zum Weltkrieg*. Leipzig, Germany: Alfred Kröner.
- Zeidler, W. (2003). O różnych sposobach uprawiania historii psychologii. *Edukacja Humanistyczna*, 1–2, 49–63.
- Zeidler, W. (Ed.). (2009). *Psychologia europejska w okresie międzywojennym*. Warsaw, Poland: Vizja Press & IT.
- Zeidler, W. (2011). Kwestionariusze w psychologii: Kierunki rozwoju i pierwsze filiacje teoretyczne. In W. Zeidler (Ed.), *Kwestionariusze w psychologii: Postępy, zastosowania, problemy* (pp. 15–78). Warsaw, Poland: Vizja Press & IT.
- Zeidler, W., & Lück, H. (Eds.). (2011). *Psychologia europejska w okresie międzywojennym: Sylwetki, osiągnięcia, problemy*. Warsaw, Poland: Vizja Press & IT.
- Zeidler, W. (2018). *Psychologia i psychotechnika w twórczości Franciszki Baumgarten* (pp. 48–66). Warsaw, Poland: Liberi Libri.