

Philosophical Reflection on the Changing Face of Economic Development in the Context of Sustainability

Łukasz Chrynowicz

PhD Student, Faculty of Philosophy, Sofia University
lukasz.chrynowicz@gmail.com



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract: This article examines the changing nature of economic development through the lens of sustainability. It explores agriculture's evolving role within the economy—not only as a productive sector but also as a provider of public goods such as biodiversity, landscape preservation, and food security.

The analysis draws on classical and modern theories, including Friedrich List's stages of national development and A. Fisher's three-sector model, which outlines the structural shift from agriculture to industry and services. Keynesian interventionism is revisited to highlight the state's role in stabilizing economies and supporting vulnerable sectors, with the New Deal serving as a practical example.

A central focus is the concept of sustainable development, traced from its origins in forestry to its adoption by global institutions. The article emphasizes the need to balance economic growth with environmental protection and social equity. Ecological agriculture is presented as a model aligned with sustainability principles, despite its lower input efficiency.

The article synthesizes diverse theoretical perspectives and empirical insights, advocating for a multidimensional approach to development that harmonizes economic, social, and ecological goals. The analysis is based on Polish academic publications, translated by the author for the purpose of this study.

Keywords: philosophy of economic thought, sustainable development; economic transformation; agriculture; structural change.

I. Introduction

The scholarly output in the field of development is extensive, both in terms of the diversity of concepts and the depth of analysis. As Strzeszewski notes: "The issue of economic development is today considered universally as the most important and most contentious problem on a global scale" (Strzeszewski, 1980). Agriculture undoubtedly belongs to the sectors whose specificity presents considerable challenges in evaluation, while simultaneously offering opportunities for the emergence of often radically divergent perspectives (Ratajczak, 1974).

The position of agriculture as the primary producer of goods that satisfy the biological needs of society is not permanently fixed. It undergoes constant transformation alongside the development

of other sectors of the national economy and is increasingly shaped by them. Therefore, in order to demonstrate the significance of agriculture as a stimulator of economic development, it is first necessary to reflect on its place within the broader economy—especially since, as we shall soon see, this is not a straightforward matter in our specific conditions (Gałązka, 2017). Economic development frequently provokes reflection on the ethical dimensions of these processes (Grzelak, 2012). It entails changes in the structure of the economy's productive potential, the structure of production and consumption, socio-economic relations, and the system of economic functioning. It encompasses the entire sphere of human economic activity, including both production and the distribution of goods—not only through quantitative growth, but above all through structural and qualitative transformations within the broadly understood process of economic management (Jaczuk, 2013).

Contemporary characterizations of globalization and the definitions, models, and regularities derived from them largely pertain to modifications in the macroeconomic development of the world (Prokopowicz, 2012).

II. Friedrich List's Theory of National Development Stages

Emerging from the philosophical foundations of German Romanticism, the historical school of economics developed as a critique of the universality of classical theory—namely, the belief that classical economic theory could be applied to any country at any time. Representatives of the German historical school argued that the views of Smith, Ricardo, and other classical economists were valid, but only for well-developed, industrialized nations such as England. They were not, however, suitable for the agrarian economy of Germany. The German historical school was not entirely homogeneous, and differences can be observed among its proponents.

One of the most prominent figures of the older historical school was Friedrich List. He identified five mainstages of development (*Hauptentwicklungsgrade*):

- the state of savagery (*wilder Zustand*),
- the pastoralstage (*Hirtenstand*),
- the agriculturalstage (*Agriculturstand*),
- the agricultural-industrial stage (*Agricultur-Manufakturstand*),
- and the agricultural-industrial-commercial stage (*Agricultur-Manufaktur-Handelsstand*) (Stankiewicz, 1998).

These stages of economic development formed the foundation of List's theory of trade. He emphasized that a nation's level of civilization, political relations, and strength were both dependent on and determinants of its stage of economic development. The first two stages held little relevance for international trade. List advised that nations at these levels should strive to reach higher stages in order to build independence and increase prosperity. To achieve these higher stages, such nations should, in their own interest, adopt the principles of free trade. The third stage was divided into two phases. In the initial phase, dominated by agriculture, there were no factories, developed transportation systems, large urban agglomerations, or industrial

infrastructure, including modern machinery. The nation remained in a static stage of development. Only in the subsequent phase did development occur through commercial interactions with merchants from more advanced countries and increasing external influence (Kłosowicz-Toborek, 2018).

These trade contacts led to changes in the social structure, the availability of new (foreign) products, and the introduction of new ideas and experiences, which stimulated new social needs. This, in turn, awakened entrepreneurial spirit in the agrarian nation and initiated industrial development (Myszczyzyn, 2017).

Friedrich List warned that production based on raw materials and foodstuffs, although important for shaping a domestic market in the case of a large nation, would not ensure future prosperity if it relied solely on the export of grain, wine, flax, hemp, and wool—typical of the early stages of development. A country seeking greater prosperity and strength would achieve its goal by importing more raw materials and exporting industrial (processed) goods, while simultaneously transforming its domestic consumption structure (Szcukocka, 2013).

Although List was not opposed to free trade, he believed that weaker and less competitive economies should be protected until they were ready to compete with stronger participants. He developed his theory of exchange within the context of the German economy. It is therefore unsurprising that in W.H. Dawson's 1904 publication *Protection in Various Countries: Germany*, the author explicitly stated that the fiscal policy of the German states—considering the interests of industry and agriculture in the emerging empire—was inherently protectionist (Szcukocka, 2013). List argued that a natural pattern of economic development involves progression from lower to higher stages. He also emphasized the shift in the center of economic activity from agriculture to industry, and subsequently to commerce. Moreover, he highlighted the importance of industry in advancing agriculture, as well as the transition of labor from the agricultural sector to the industrial one (Szcukocka, 2013).

Since List's time, there was a period of diminished interest in the development of individual sectors of the economy. Although his theory no longer aligns with current political and economic realities, it had a significant influence on his contemporaries. From the perspective of economic history, it clearly illustrates the shift in development priorities—from agriculture-based economies toward industrialism as the next stage leading to economic prosperity (Szcukocka, 2013).

III. A. Fisher's Three-Sector Theory

In structural macroeconomic research, a sectoral approach is frequently employed, whereby data from entities operating in various segments of the national economy are aggregated. This ultimately leads to the identification of three sectors: agricultural, industrial, and service (Adamczyk, 2012). The first mature attempt to capture the regularities and causes of these transformations was undertaken in the 1930s by New Zealand economist A. Fisher. His research was later expanded by C. Clark and J. Fourastié. The issue also attracted the attention of many contemporary economists, including S. Kuznets, V. Fuchs, H.B. Chenery, A. Sauvy, L. Menz, and G. Stigler (Kwiatkowski, 1982).

The circumstances surrounding the emergence of this concept are quite interesting. At the time, the terms *primary production* and *secondary production* were already in use, particularly in official statistics in Australia and New Zealand, to emphasize the differences between food-producing sectors and other areas of material production (Kwiatkowski, 1982).

The three-sector theory outlines a specific path of development for every economy and distinguishes three stages of this process:

- **Pre-industrial stage** – characterized by dominant employment and production in Sector I, with the economy being underdeveloped.
- **Industrial stage** – marked by dominant employment and production in non-agricultural sectors, especially Sector II.
- **Post-industrial stage** – defined by the predominance of employment and production in Sector III (Adamczyk, 2012).

According to Fisher's concept, Sector I includes areas producing food and raw materials, with agriculture and extractive industries playing the most significant roles. Sector II encompasses all types of industrial (processing) production, while Sector III comprises the remaining areas of economic activity focused on providing services—such as trade, transport, gastronomy, personal services, education, art, healthcare, insurance, and upbringing (Kwiatkowski, 1982). It is worth noting that Fisher did not emphasize business services within the service sector. This changed with Colin Clark, who, in developing Fisher's concept, incorporated financial and banking services into Sector III (Kwiatkowski, 1982).

The concept of structural transformations in the economy as part of the development process is most clearly presented in its earliest form by Fisher. He divided the process of economic development into stages based on the role of individual sectors within the economy. In the first stage of development, the primary goal of production was to ensure an adequate supply of food and to meet basic needs. At this stage, referred to as “primitive civilization,” approximately 80% of the workforce was employed in Sector I, according to Fourastié (Kwiatkowski, 1982).

However, as economic development progressed, the role of Sector I began to diminish. This led to a phase of dynamic growth in Sector II, associated with the reallocation of production factors from agriculture to industry. According to Fisher's concept, this marked the second stage of development, which in Western European countries began around the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries (Kwiatkowski, 1982). Once the second stage reached a certain level of advancement, further increases in real income began to be directed increasingly toward the consumption of various services. This initiated the so-called process of economic servicization, characterized by the rapid expansion of Sector III. This phase required intensified transfers of labor and capital resources into the service sector. The third stage of development, in highly developed European countries, is dated to the 1930s (Kwiatkowski, 1982).

In contemporary economic literature, the prevailing view is that the causes of structural transformations should be sought in both demand-side and supply-side factors. Earlier theorists such as Fisher, Clark, and to some extent Fourastié, tended to prioritize one set of factors over

the other. Today, structural changes in the economy are understood as the result of the combined influence of consumption patterns and production dynamics (Kwiatkowski, 1982). According to this theory, the significance of the agricultural sector diminishes with economic development, as reflected in its declining share of total employment. Nevertheless, the three-sector theory contributed to the establishment of a widely accepted classification of economic activities, which greatly facilitates comparative structural analysis on an empirical level (Jankowska and Majka, 2016; Adamczyk, 2012).

IV. Economic Interventionism According to Keynes

In the second half of the 1930s, under the influence of the Great Depression, economic thought shifted away from the liberal concept of the state, which had been based primarily on individual freedom in all areas of human activity. Keynes, rejecting this liberal approach and refuting Say's Law, redefined the economic responsibilities of the state. As he argued: "I shall argue that the postulates of classical theory are applicable only to a special case and not to the general case, the situation which it assumes to be one of possible equilibrium. Moreover, the characteristics of the special case assumed by classical theory are not those of the economic society in which we actually live, with the result that its teaching is misleading and disastrous if we attempt to apply it to the facts of experience" (Keynes, 1973). This critique was justified, as Say's Law contained a fundamental error—namely, the assumption that income generated in the production process automatically equates to effective demand. This stemmed from the belief in the flexibility of prices, wages, and interest rates, which were thought to ensure shifts in the structure of aggregate demand (e.g., increased investment), but did not account for prolonged declines in demand and involuntary unemployment (Danowska-Prokop, 2014).

Keynes's vision of the state diverged significantly from classical theory. According to him, the state had to intervene in the economic sphere, as only through such involvement could it improve the utilization of productive capacities, correct market imperfections, prevent social unrest, and reduce the scale of involuntary unemployment (Szymaniuk&Zygula, 2009). A passive role of the state in economic life led to a deterioration in the condition of the economy, encouraged non-competitive monopolistic behavior, and deepened socially unacceptable disparities in wealth and income. Among the indirect tools for influencing economic cycles, Keynes assigned a special role to monetary and fiscal policy. To ensure relative equilibrium in the economy, state intervention was essential, particularly through counter-cyclical policies. This redefinition of the state's role in the economy marked a significant breakthrough (Danowska-Prokop, 2014; Kacperska, 2010).

To stimulate and sustain economic activity, the state should ensure that other economic entities have easy access to cheap money, as only in this way can the desired level of investment in both the private and public sectors, as well as consumer spending, be achieved. As a result, effective global demand increases and new jobs are created—indirectly financed by the state (Danowska-Prokop, 2014).

State interventionism refers to the heightened activity of the government and public administration, aimed at creating institutional conditions for the functioning of social actors. The

state, acting as an active participant and regulator, exerts a real influence on the types of decisions made by economic entities (Rogalska, 2005).

Regulatory interventionism can be described as a “policy of institutionalization,” understood as the process of shaping institutions through which economic power is exercised and group or particular interests are fulfilled (Rogalska, 2005). Increasing state activity in the economic sphere encounters barriers related to the financial capacity of the national budget. The state has only as many resources as it collects from citizens in the form of various taxes or loans. The financial demands accompanying the growth of interventionism result in increased tax burdens. A lower disposable income for economic entities means reduced savings and lower investment levels in the economy (Rogalska, 2005). In fulfilling its regulatory function, the state defines the micro- and macroeconomic conditions under which economic entities operate. The steps taken by the government to implement economic policy objectives form a system of incentives for entities functioning within the institutional framework shaped by the “visible hand” of the state (Rogalska, 2005). Among the direct methods of stimulating economic activity, Keynes included public works, government procurement, subsidies, grants, and the development of the defense industry. Of these, he paid particular attention to public investment programs, such as the construction of roads, dams, schools, and public buildings, as well as river regulation and bridge construction (Danowska-Prokop, 2014). All of these investments were characterized by their non-productive nature—that is, they did not increase the scale of already existing goods and services production. These investments did not expand the scale of already existing goods and services production. In cases where the state possessed well-developed infrastructure, it could afford to finance socially non-essential investments (Danowska-Prokop, 2014).

Moreover, J.M. Keynes did not perceive any contradiction between the active role of the state in the economy and the individual activity of entrepreneurs. A practical example of interventionist philosophy in action is the New Deal policy implemented by Franklin Delano Roosevelt upon taking office. Although many economists from the subjective-marginalist school considered it inadequate for the prevailing circumstances, the New Deal helped Americans survive the harsh realities of the Great Depression and had a significant impact on society (Mordzak, 2016; Drenda, 2012). The idea of the New Deal included a range of regulations and instruments targeting all sectors of the U.S. economy. Two of these packages focused specifically on agriculture. The first was the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA), which established an organization tasked with reducing agricultural production in order to raise food prices and prevent the collapse of farms and businesses in the sector. The second was the Farm Security Administration (FSA), which provided direct financial assistance to impoverished farmers through various instruments (Szymaniuk and Zyguła, 2009; Piętak, 2016). Nevertheless, interventionist policy faces other obstacles. According to Keynes, one such challenge is that political decision-makers may become “slaves” to the theories of long-deceased economists. Additional difficulties include discrepancies between expected and actual outcomes of decisions, as well as the lingering effects of previous governments’ policies on current economic conditions (Smajdor, 2015).

Agriculture is a sector that typically undergoes significant intervention in developed countries. This stems from several key factors, including the necessity of consumption and the resulting role of food in meeting basic human needs, as well as the dependence of farmers’ economic

outcomes on environmental conditions (Piętak, 2016). Agriculture also provides public goods such as landscape, culture, and environmental stewardship, and plays a key role in ensuring food security. These factors contribute to the sector's susceptibility to significant state intervention in developed countries (Grzelak, 2012).

Toward the end of the 1970s, neoliberal thinkers began to criticize the excessive involvement of the state in the economy. Economic neoliberalism emerged in the late 1930s and early 1940s as a response to the views of Keynes and his followers. Neoliberals argued for a return to the free play of market forces and generally rejected state interventionism (Rogalska, 2005; Zawajska, 2006). Criticizing neoliberalism, Żyżyński simultaneously pointed to the desired direction of economic policy: “Undoubtedly, the goal of economic policy should be long-term development—sustainable not only economically, but also socially and ecologically” (Żyżyński, 2010).

V. Sustainable Development

Originally, the concept of sustainable development (SD) came from forestry and was introduced by Hans Carl von Carlowitz. Today, sustainable development is understood as a philosophy of socio-economic progress harmonized with care for the natural environment (Terlecka, 2014). Over the past two decades, the idea of sustainable development has become a prominent element in contemporary debates about the state of both the environment and global economies. Although opinions on the impact of human economic activity on the natural environment are divided, there is a growing consensus that modern economics should take it into account (Osiecka-Brzeska, 2011).

The concept of sustainable development emerged in response to a range of global challenges, including rapid and uncontrolled population growth, excessive consumption of natural resources, increasing environmental degradation, rising consumption levels, and widening disparities in quality of life between developed and developing countries (Brzoska and Lewandowska, 2013). As Brzoska and Lewandowska jointly state: “The concept of sustainable development is often analyzed in economic terms—as the best proposal for overcoming socio-economic and economic crises” (Brzoska and Lewandowska, 2013). Siekierski also notes in a terminological discussion: “In Poland, a dichotomous category has emerged: sustainable and durable development, which is likely the result of an incorrect initial translation of ‘sustainable development’ into Polish. In foreign academic literature, there is no such separation, let alone opposition, between durability and sustainability” (Siekierski & Rutkowska, 2008).

Sustainable development occupies a special place in economic sciences, particularly in ecological economics, environmental economics, and more recently in socio-economic studies. Frequently, when economic growth becomes a national priority, environmental protection issues are treated as secondary. Sustainable development, however, offers an opportunity to: reduce environmental degradation, protect renewable and non-renewable resources and natural values, change consumption models, rationalize production, and improve and equalize social welfare—both now and in the future (Siekierski & Rutkowska, 2008).

It should be noted that highly developed countries understand the concept of sustainable development differently than developing countries. For the latter, sustainable development is often equated with growth expressed through consumption indicators. In highly developed countries, modern, market-oriented, and subsidized agricultural enterprises are capable of producing far beyond the capacity of domestic demand. In developing countries, the application of biological advances and modern production technologies has also led to increased output and the emergence of export surpluses (Adamowicz, 2014).

The socio-economic dimension of sustainable development is illustrated by the economic theory of sustainable development, which uses the well-known category of welfare. From this perspective, sustainable development can be interpreted in two ways. On one hand, it may be economically irrational: caring for justice for future generations could lead to reduced availability of natural resources, resulting in lower current production of goods. This would mean fewer goods available on the market, which—according to classical economics—would not lead to increased welfare (Zadrożniak, 2015). Uneven distribution of resources in the market, resulting in a lack of equilibrium between supply and demand. On the other hand, it is now widely acknowledged that the market mechanism is flawed, and overproduction of goods is a frequent phenomenon. In many cases, supply significantly exceeds market demand. It is likely that restrictions introduced to promote rational management of natural resources would lead to increased production costs and, consequently, reduced supply (Osiecka-Brzeska, 2011).

Since the 1980s, the concept of sustainable development has gained increasing importance in development theory and policy. The definition of sustainable development was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1983, and the corresponding document, *Our Common Future*, was published in 1987. According to this document, sustainable development is defined as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Roszkowska-Mądra, 2009; Latoszek, 2016). This commission also contributed to the convening of the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro—formally known as the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. The conference’s guiding theme was “Environment and Development,” marking another milestone in shaping the concept of sustainable development (Latoszek, 2016).

Under current global conditions, one particularly important contribution to the development of sustainable growth theory comes from MongsawadPrasopchoke. She emphasizes that economic growth cannot be measured solely by increases in GDP, production, employment, or income. It must also maintain existing levels of social, relational, and environmental capital to ensure intergenerational justice. As she states, “balance is essential.” Therefore, the principles of sustainable growth should be considered appropriate from a macroeconomic perspective. Her proposal is firmly rooted in the realities of globalization (Prasopchoke, 2010). Albert A. Bartlett similarly asserted: “Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without diminishing the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (Bartlett, 1998). The concept of “meeting one’s own needs” (Bartlett, 1998) is central to sustainable development. In their approach, Komiyama and Takeuchi (2006) emphasize that strong attention is paid not only to eliminating barriers to growth and poverty, implementing innovative solutions, and increasing intangible assets, but also to environmental protection and the renewal of resources—an aspect of particular importance in the current global context.

In analyzing this issue, evolutionary and social change perspectives are essential. Social sciences have often reached beyond the present state, aiming for prognostic frameworks. A notable example is Alvin Toffler's "three waves" theory. The Second Wave, representing industrial society, was expected to fade as society adopted the industrial paradigm, which manifested in humanity's ability to transform the natural environment—often through excessive exploitation of its resources (Toffler, 1980). The Third Wave is a response to this overexploitation, marked by the search for new energy sources and the need for harmonized action across various forms of capital—economic, social, environmental, and cultural. These concepts have shaped a more integrated view of environmental issues, treating the environment not as an isolated segment but as part of a broader system. Rational human activity is increasingly defined by the harmonization of different spheres of life. Actions in societal management stem from a belief in the rationality and directionality of change. These actions are also motivated by reference to what may be called the common good, which can take various forms—such as global public goods. These include ecological and environmental security, which are now recognized as essential components of sustainable development (Pirages and DeGeest, 2004; Latoszek and Kłos, 2023).

Although society has reached a high level of development, this progress has often come at the expense of nature and the environmental conditions necessary for human life. In agriculture and rural areas, the concept of sustainable development becomes even more critical. The need to prioritize the natural environment in the implementation of strategic development goals is especially important in sectors whose outcomes are directly dependent on nature (Żmija, 2014; Widomski and Musz-Pomorska, 2023).

It is important to emphasize that ecological agriculture should not be viewed merely as an alternative, but as an integral component of sustainable development. As Henryk Runowski notes, "Ecological agriculture refers directly to the principles of lasting sustainable development" (Runowski, 2009). This system is highly restrictive from an environmental protection standpoint, as it prohibits the use of industrially derived production inputs such as synthetic fertilizers and chemical plant protection agents. Consequently, ecological agriculture is less productive in terms of input efficiency compared to conventional agriculture. On the other hand, conventional agriculture, which relies on industrial inputs, imposes a significant burden on the natural environment and is therefore less effective in achieving ecological goals (Runowski, 2009).

Furthermore, according to the concept of sustainable development in modern economies, the goal is to use natural resources efficiently and sparingly, care for the environment, and strive to equalize living standards across different social groups. In agriculture, this translates into efficient land management using other production factors—namely labor and capital—at levels that do not harm the environment (Komorowska, 2014).

Given the limited possibilities for further agricultural expansion and the goals of sustainable development, there is a growing need to reframe the role of agriculture. Increasing attention is being paid to its non-productive functions, such as maintaining biodiversity, landscape preservation, and contributing to rural vitality. These functions are essential for the creation of public goods that market mechanisms alone cannot ensure (Komorowska, 2014).

VI. Conclusion

The analysis presented in this article underscores the dynamic and multifaceted nature of economic development, particularly when viewed through the prism of sustainability and societal transformation. Agriculture, once perceived solely as a foundational sector for meeting basic human needs, has evolved into a complex domain that intersects with environmental stewardship, cultural heritage, and public goods provision. Its role in the economy is no longer confined to production, but increasingly reflects broader developmental priorities.

Classical theories, such as Friedrich List's stages of national development and A. Fisher's three-sector model, offer valuable historical insight into the structural shifts that economies undergo. These frameworks help contextualize the transition from agrarian societies to industrial and post-industrial systems, while also highlighting the limitations of applying universal economic models to diverse national contexts.

The Keynesian perspective on state intervention remains relevant, especially in times of economic instability and structural imbalance. The New Deal serves as a historical example of how targeted government action can mitigate crises and support vulnerable sectors. In today's globalized economy, such interventionist approaches must be adapted to address not only economic fluctuations but also environmental degradation and social inequality.

Sustainable development emerges as a unifying concept that integrates economic efficiency, social equity, and ecological responsibility. It challenges traditional growth paradigms and calls for a redefinition of progress. Ecological agriculture, despite its lower productivity in conventional terms, exemplifies this shift by prioritizing long-term environmental health and social well-being.

This study, based on Polish academic literature translated by the author, contributes to the broader discourse on development by offering a perspective rooted in Central European thought. It advocates for a multidimensional approach to economic policy—one that harmonizes sectoral transformation with sustainability principles and recognizes agriculture as a strategic pillar of future development.

Reference

- [1] Gałązka A (2017). Teoretyczne podstawy rozwoju regionalnego – wybrane teorie, czynniki i bariery rozwoju regionalnego. *Studia BAS*. 1(49):13–30.
- [2] Strzeszewski C (1980). Koncepcje rozwoju ekonomicznego i ich ocena. *Rocz Nauk Społ KUL*. 8:75–90. [3] Ratajczak K (1974). Rolnictwo jako stymulator rozwoju gospodarczego. *Ruch Praw EkonSocjol*. 1:165–180.
- [3] Grzelak A (2012). Etyka z perspektywy rolnictwa i polityki rolnej. *Zesz Nauk USz Współczesne Probl Ekon*. 4:157–170.
- [4] Jaczuk L (2013). Determinanty rozwoju społeczno-gospodarczego regionów w Polsce. *Rocz Nauk Społ KUL*. 5(41):121–138.

- [5] Prokopowicz D (2012). Globalizacja, współpraca międzynarodowa i handel zagraniczny. Sięgając w przeszłość. *Przedsiębiorstwo Przyszłości*. 1(10):47–60.
- [6] Kłosowicz-Toborek K (2018). Istota protekcjonizmu w XIX wieku oraz współcześnie. *Zesz Nauk SGGW ProblRoln Świat*. 18(1):90–102.
- [7] Stankiewicz W (1998). *Historia myśli ekonomicznej*. Warszawa: PWE; p. 200–215.
- [8] Myszczyzyn J (2017). Wpływ protekcjonistycznej polityki celnej na koncentrację i rozwój przemysłu ciężkiego na przykładzie branży stalowej w Niemczech. *Myśl Ekon Polityczna*. 2(57):46–60.
- [9] Szczukocka A (2013). *Statystyczna ocena znaczenia sektora usług w gospodarce Polski*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo UŁ; p. 11–25.
- [10] Adamczyk P (2012). Regionalne zróżnicowanie przemian w trójsektorowej strukturze osób pracujących w Polsce po akcesji do Unii Europejskiej. *RoczEkonRolnRozw Obsz Wiej*. 99(4):30–40.
- [11] Kwiatkowski E (1982). Z problematyki genezy teorii trzech sektorów gospodarki. *Acta Univ Lodziensis Folia Oeconomicus*. 19:11–20.
- [12] Jankowska D, Majka A (2016). Zmiany w zatrudnieniu w sektorze usług a rozwój gospodarczy regionu. *Stud Prace WNEIIZ USz*. 454(2):254–270.
- [13] Danowska-Prokop B (2014). Od liberalnej do keynesowskiej wizji państwa. *Stud Ekon*. 176:52–65.
- [14] Keynes JM (1973). *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*. Cambridge: Macmillan & Cambridge University Press; p. 3–25.
- [15] Szymaniuk E, Zyguła A (2009). *Cykliczne wahania aktywności gospodarczej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo AFM; p. 25–35.
- [16] Kacperska M (2010). Liberalizm czy interwencjonizm? Recepta na kryzys. *Przegląd Politologiczny*. 15:148–160.
- [17] Rogalska E (2005). Społeczna szkodliwość interwencjonizmu. *Dialogi Polityczne*. 5–6:103–110.
- [18] Piętaś Ł (2016). Zrównoważony wzrost gospodarczy w teoriach i modelach wzrostu i rozwoju gospodarczego. *Gosp Praktyce Teorii*. 2(43):56–70.
- [19] Mordzak A (2016). Nowy Ład prezydenta Franklina Delano Roosevelta w oczach Wiktora Podoskiego. *Acta Univ Lodziensis Folia Historica*. 96:189–200.
- [20] Drenda L (2012). Istota polityki New Deal – przyczynek do dyskusji na temat wolności w gospodarce. *Zesz Nauk AE*. 1:29–40.

- [21] Smajdor D (2015). Rozwój teorii na temat roli państwa w gospodarce. [in:] Malczewski J, ed. Idea jako czwarty czynnik produkcji. Kraków: Kasper; p. 113–125.
- [22] Zawajska A (2006). Liberalizm, neoliberalizm, wolność ekonomiczna i polityczna a rozwój gospodarczy kraju. Zesz Nauk SGGW EkonOrganizGosp Żywnościowej. 58:9–20.
- [23] Żyżyński J (2010). Neoliberalizm – ślepa uliczka globalizacji. [in:] Kołodko GW, ed. Globalizacja kryzys i co dalej?. Warszawa: Poltext; p. 21–35.
- [24] Terlecka MK (2014). Idea zrównoważonego rozwoju – o genezie, definicji, celach i zasadach słów kilka. [in:] Kleśta A, Terlecka MK, eds. Zrównoważony rozwój – idea czy konieczność?. Tom I. Krosno; p. 7–18.
- [25] Osiecka-Brzeska K (2011). Zrównoważony rozwój w świetle wybranych teorii ekonomicznych. Prace Mater IHZ UG. 30:23–35.
- [26] Roszkowska-Mądra B (2009). Koncepcje rozwoju europejskiego rolnictwa i obszarów wiejskich. Gosp Narodowa. 10:83–95.
- [27] Latoszek E (2016). Koncepcja zrównoważonego rozwoju w ONZ. [in:] Latoszek E, ed. Zrównoważony rozwój a globalne dobra publiczne w teorii i praktyce organizacji międzynarodowych. Warszawa: Elipsa; p. 27–40.
- [28] Prasopchok M (2010). The philosophy of the sufficiency economy: a contribution to the theory of development. Asia-Pac Dev J. 17(1):123–144.
- [29] Bartlett AA (1998). Reflections on Sustainability, Population Growth, and the Environment. https://www.albartlett.org/articles/art_reflections_part_1.html (accessed: 07.02.2025); p. 1–22.
- [30] Rosicki R (2010). Międzynarodowe i europejskie koncepcje zrównoważonego rozwoju. Przegląd Naukowo–Metodyczny. 4:48–56.
- [31] Żmija D (2014). Zrównoważony rozwój rolnictwa i obszarów wiejskich w Polsce. Stud Ekon. 166:150–165.
- [32] Runowski H (2009). Rolnictwo ekologiczne – rozwój czy regres?. Rocznik Nauk Roln Ser G EkonRoln. 96(4):183–195.
- [33] Komorowska D (2014). Prawidłowości rozwoju rolnictwa a rozwój współczesnego rolnictwa. Zesz Nauk SGGW ProblRoln Świat. 14(3):105–110.
- [34] Grzelak A (2012). Etyka z perspektywy rolnictwa i polityki rolnej. Zesz Nauk USz Współczesne Probl Ekon. 4:157–170.