

## FAMILY POLICY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE – OR WHY INVEST IN HUMAN CAPITAL?

Michał A. MICHALSKI

Adam Mickiewicz University; mmichal@amu.edu.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-9854-0069

**Purpose:** The article attempts to analyze family policy as an area for the realization of the idea of social justice, a concept which seems to be somewhat marginalized and less popular than social equality at present. Therefore, the main purpose of the article is to revisit the concept of social justice and point at the potential and importance of this perspective and its supportive role in designing, developing and evaluating family policy in particular, and social policy in general.

**Design/methodology/approach:** This is achieved by reviewing the definition and scope of meaning of concepts and issues key to this study, their interconnectedness, and showing the legitimacy of their joint application to achieve the adequacy and effectiveness of actions designed within social policy. In terms of specific family policy tools, the article is illustrated with selected examples from Poland from the period 2015-2021. The concepts of the “tragedy of the commons” and the “free-rider problem” are also evoked, which – when applied to describe a particular way of thinking about parenthood and its economic and demographic effects - may prove useful for grasping important interactions and interdependencies within not only social policy, but socio-economic development in general.

**Findings:** The article argues that families raising children – thus creating human capital – are the group whose contribution to welfare and socio-economic development is proportionally greater. This fact – contributing to demographic challenges we face today – has not always been adequately recognized and compensated. This began to change with the introduction of the “Family 500+” programme and with subsequent tools of family policy developed in Poland over the last few years.

**Originality/value:** The paper proposes to approach social policy in general, and family policies in particular from the perspective of social justice with regard to human capital creation. Therefore, paper offers innovative and coherent perspective for designing, developing and evaluating social policy for those engaged in decision-making, implementation and control processes.

**Keywords:** family policy, social policy, social justice, human capital, responsibility.

**Category of the paper:** Conceptual paper, General review.

## 1. Introduction – Human capital as a target outcome of social policy

In public discourse, as well as in academic publications, one can find different opinions and positions on family policy<sup>1</sup>. In the context of Poland, these disputes most often concern the "Family 500+" programme, which can be regarded as a kind of breakthrough in the state's efforts for families with children. It seems that in the often heated ongoing discussions, the arguments are much more frequently about its effectiveness and cost-effectiveness, and much less frequently about social justice. The latter seems today to be, on the one hand, a somewhat forgotten perspective and, on the other hand, not understood clearly enough. This problem is alluded to by Dariusz Pieńkowski, who notes that '(...) the very concept of justice is not popular among economists and is often relegated to "non-economic" areas of consideration' (Pieńkowski, 2013, p. 9, cf. Wilkin, 1997, p. 23).

It seems, however, that in view of the disputes concerning social policy - and family policy in particular - implemented in Poland over the last three decades, it is worth revisiting this category, as it may indeed help to structure and adequately link the various elements, tools and understand certain interdependencies.

Social policy is understood as '(...) activities of public institutions aimed directly at people's well-being. In a broader sense, it includes such areas as education, health care, the labour market or housing conditions, while in a narrower sense it covers income and - less frequently – consumption' (Panek, 2020, p. 437). From this definition, it follows that the goal of social policy can be most briefly described as human capital formation. Since we otherwise know - if only on the basis of the invaluable contribution of Gary S. Becker (Becker, 1993, p. 21) - that the family is the main source of this capital, it can be concluded that the essential task of social policy is to shape and influence the broad socio-cultural context in such a way as to create optimal conditions in which families can effectively perform their functions with regard to, among other things, the essential task of human capital creation.

In turn, its fundamental relationship to social justice can be perceived in the way in which we understand the function of social policy. The aforementioned entry edited by Tomasz Panek indicates that '(...) the assessment of the rationality of social policy revolves around the answer to the question: who are benefits directed to, and how does their receipt affect the position of the recipient? In particular, it is necessary to answer the question whether benefits are received by those who need them most and whether the amount of benefits allows recipients to achieve a noticeable improvement in their material situation' (Panek, 2020, p. 437).

Thus, the object that social policy deals with automatically directs us towards social justice as the final perspective and desired framework within which society would like to locate all interactions, processes and influences.

---

<sup>1</sup> In public discourse, the term also appears in the form of 'family-friendly policies' - we will consider the two terms as synonymous.

## 2. Social justice as a *modus vivendi* for the functioning of society

The aforementioned position is confirmed by Stein Ringen, who, when analysing the broad context of family functioning in society and social policy settlements, states that 'in the broad perspective of the social sciences, where I feel at home, justice becomes the vision' (Ringen, 2009, p. 175). Of course, the issue is not so simple, probably due, on the one hand, to the complexity of the concept of justice and, on the other, to its socio-cultural mediation. This problem is aptly summarised by David Miller, who states that: 'each basic conception [of justice] is linked to a different model of society, and no model of society is so widely accepted that disputes about justice can be resolved. To shed further light on the concept of justice, it would first be necessary to investigate in greater detail what factors influence people to adopt one model of society rather than another; and second to consider whether any of the models offered can be given a rational justification' (Miller, 1974, p. 399).

What emerges from the above passage is the fundamental observation that the field of social policy, as it were, naturally directs any consideration of the subject towards the question of social justice. In turn, social justice, especially in political narratives concerning social issues, seems to be often replaced by the idea of equality in recent years. Therefore, it is all the more important in this situation to recall what available knowledge and research say about justice. In this regard, we will refer to the work of John Rawls, arguably the most recognized scholar on the subject, who formulated the well-known two principles of justice, which read as follows: '(...) The first: every person is to have an equal right to the widest possible system of equal fundamental freedoms reconcilable with a similar system of freedoms for others. The second: social and economic inequalities are to be so arranged that they are both (a) reasonably expected to benefit everyone and (b) associated with positions and services open to all' (Rawls, 2009, p. 107).

These two principles lead to a more general conception of justice, which Rawls formulates as follows: 'All social values - liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the social basis of self-respect - are to be equally distributed, unless an unequal distribution of any (or all) of these values benefits everyone' (Rawls, 2009, p. 109).

The essence of justice is considered similarly, though in a slightly different way, by Chaïm Perelman, according to whom the essence of the principle of justice is to treat similar cases alike, which he expresses as follows: 'We can thus define formal or abstract justice as a principle of action according to which entities in the same essential category must be treated in the same way' (Perelman, 1963, p. 16; quoted in Perlikowski, 2020, p. 23).

Oddly enough, the concept of a fair level of social inequality, as pointed out by, among others, Michał Gabriel Woźniak and Łukasz Jabłoński (Woźniak, Jabłoński, 2008 p. 47), resonates with such an understanding of justice on economic grounds.

Invoking both Rawls's and Perelman's definitions seems particularly necessary today, when the argument of the aforementioned equality as a political *panaceum* is often unreflectively used in discussions, and the long-term perspective of intergenerational interactions and interdependencies, which are highly visible in the family, is completely ignored.

This issue is also addressed by Rawls, who first states that '(...) generations follow one another in time' (Rawls, 2009, p. 419), and that the flow of actual material benefits takes place in only one direction. Herein, one can certainly object when considering, for example, pension schemes based on intergenerational solidarity. It seems that in the following sentences Rawls completes his position when he writes that 'this situation can change, and in view of this the question of justice does not arise here. What is just or unjust is how institutions deal with natural constraints, and the way in which they are constructed to take advantage of historical possibilities' (Rawls, 2009, p. 419). At this point, it seems that the category of justice is straightforward referred as a necessary criterion for the construction and evaluation of social policy solutions, a point to which we will return later.

### **3. Social policy and the family - between justice and injustice**

In order to illustrate these dilemmas of justice and equality understood in different ways, as well as responsibility as an important - and largely underrated - category, it is worth tracing how approaches to families have played out within social policy. To a large extent, the picture presented in this paper corresponds to the situation in many European countries, and relates primarily to the Polish context of the last three decades.

At this point, we come to two conclusions - firstly, that social policy must be considered in terms of justice and responsibility and, secondly, that the demographic crisis currently affecting many countries is, to some extent, the result of long-term social injustice. The following paragraphs will describe this phenomenon in a more detailed way.

Going back to the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, when the so-called solidarity (*pay-as-you-go*) pension systems and social security institutions - which are part of social reality today - were established, one can say that the world presented itself and functioned differently in many respects. At this point, one important assumption should undoubtedly be noticed, which at the time seemed unquestionable and unchangeable, namely that people would always marry and enough children would be born to ensure the replacement of generations. Over time, it has become increasingly clear - as a result of a number of overlapping factors and processes - that it can no longer be assumed that this is the dominant way of life that future generations will surely be choosing. This issue has already been addressed and probably deserves further analysis in order to verify to what extent current attitudes towards marriage and parenthood have changed in recent decades under the influence of trends and phenomena

such as secularisation, individualisation, commercialisation, counterculture, or late postmodernism (see: Michalski, 2021).

Despite declining fertility rates, the designed social security systems continued unchanged, while the orientation of welfare states gradually modified, focusing increasingly on the absolutised expectations and demands of individuals. As a result, the family and community perspective was not given priority, resulting in its marginalisation in the social and economic policy dimension. At the same time, justice as an essential reference for the functioning of society gradually began to be replaced by equality, which over time led to - perhaps unintentional - injustices within, i.e., social policy.

As a result of these transformations, families began to recede into the background of the horizon taken up by politicians and other people designing social policies, and the primary place began to be taken by individuals, to whom it is easier to apply an equal - and not necessarily fair - measure. In this way, marital and parental relationships began to be increasingly treated as a private matter of the individual, who should not be privileged for this reason. As a consequence, for instance, for years pension systems made no difference between allowances, and treated equally parents and people without children. In consequence of such solutions, parents - the vast majority of them being women - who, as a result of the decision to bring up more children had been forced to limit or abandon their professional work, received a lower benefit or no benefit at all when entering the retirement age. In Polish family policy, an important feature that tries to address this problem was the launch on 1st March 2019 of the "Mama 4+" programme, which guarantees a minimum pension to those parents who have raised four or more children. Thus, it underlines the essential role of parenting and childcare, which are long-term investments that create the human capital that is so important for socio-economic development.

Reflecting further on the shape of pension arrangements, it can be seen that, by ignoring the link between bringing up children and future benefits, they have perpetuated injustice and fostered an individualistic perspective, thereby encouraging the abandonment of marriage and parenthood. In other words, the pension systems have been sterilising the soil on which they grew. It is therefore worth looking at them - and social policy more broadly - from the perspective of concepts familiar in economics, such as the *free-rider problem* and the *tragedy of the commons*.

In their optics, it is easier to analyse how social policy mechanisms, including pension systems, have rewarded those individuals who have treated life in society analogous to riding without a ticket. It is also worth pointing out that it is not possible to blame this only on individual citizens who have benefited - and are benefiting - from the opportunities created by the system. On the other hand, one should question those who can influence the modification of such a constructed reality, in which it is now possible with relatively smaller individual effort to receive greater benefits from others - thanks to future possibility of employment and taxes paid by other people's children.

In this way, it seems easier to see – i.e., in the perspective of the aforementioned concepts of the *tragedy of the commons* (Hardin 1968) and the *free-rider problem* (Grossman, Oliver, 1980) - how, for many decades, families with children, whose efforts and labour benefited society as a whole, were an unequivocally exploited asset. On this basis, it can be argued that it is primarily parents who are the victims not only of legally sanctioned and culturally perpetuated injustice, but also of institutionalised social injustice. An important, perhaps unintentional and not fully realised, consequence of this situation is that young people are now stepping into such a role less and less frequently - and less willingly.

Therefore, in the context of current efforts to reverse unfavourable demographic trends, family policy should also be regarded as an important and necessary tool for restoring and promoting social justice. At the same time, such a perspective may prove useful for evaluating individual social policy solutions in general, whether they exist already or are being planned.

#### **4. Towards a fair and effective family policy**

Family policy should be carefully distinguished from social assistance, with which it is often, and unjustifiably, identified. There is a kind of blurring of concepts in this regard, which makes discussions in this area all the more difficult (Fandrejewska-Tomczyk, 2019).

Therefore, at this point, it is worth recalling its definition. As we read in the work „*Ekonomia polityki rodzinnej*” [The Economics of Family Policy], ‘family policy focuses on the nuclear family and its needs, especially those related to procreation and bringing up children, and in view of the persistence of low level of fertility that does not guarantee simple reproduction in developed countries, relatively much attention is paid primarily to solutions favouring procreative decisions’ (Kotowska 2021, p. 18). It is worth emphasising at this point that it is still sometimes perceived not as an investment in socio-economic development, but as a cost burdening the budget of the state or local government authorities. Therefore, relating the functioning of families and family policies to the issue of creating human capital may make it easier to perceive their importance for the expansion of welfare and the sustainability of the social, cultural and economic order.

To this end, with regard to human capital as the final outcome of social policy, it is necessary to propose a way in which social assistance can be distinguished from family policy. While the former is oriented towards intervening in crisis situations and solving specific problems faced by individuals or social groups, the latter should be preventive in terms of actions that optimise the conditions for the functioning of existing families and the formation of new ones. Human capital proves to be a useful link between these two areas of social policy: in the case of social assistance, the aim is to provide help and support in those cases where the formation of human capital has stopped or is at risk, while in the case of family policy, the goal is to provide support

aimed at guaranteeing continuity and efficiency and possibly strengthening the process of human capital formation. Analogously, these issues could also be described in relation to social capital (Michalski, 2014, pp. 72-5), the importance of which we do not deny here in any way, but that we leave - due to the limited size of the paper - outside the spectrum of the analyses undertaken here.

Another important benchmark that is worth taking into consideration when analysing the adequacy and effectiveness of family policies is to ask whether or not the benefits offered are conducive to taking responsibility for the activities that are appropriate to the subject being supported, and whether the level and quality of these activities increases as a result.

On the question of responsibility, it is worth recalling what emerges from the analyses undertaken by David Schmitz. This author points out the significant impact of the so-called externalisation of responsibility - which is particularly evident in relation to the field of social assistance. He states that:

‘many people from both sides of the political barricade note that when social assistance programmes were set up to provide support for the poor, the latter’s overall quality of life began to decline, even though the quality of life for the rest of society was constantly increasing. Why? The decline in quality, if it ever occurred, coincided with the successes of these programmes in externalising responsibility for the welfare of the non-working poor’ (Schmitz, 2019, pp. 129-130).

In other words, if, as we have indicated, the objective of social policy can be defined as promoting the creation of human capital, this "resource" as an effect can constitute a tool for verifying and evaluating the functioning of family policy precisely in terms of its effectiveness and respect for social justice. In this way, the argument raised by critics of various family policy measures and solutions is also taken into account, namely that ineffectively spent resources, i.e. those that have not contributed to an increase in the quantity and quality of human capital, are resources that have been misspent - implicitly unjustly - because they have somehow been taken away from other entities that could have used them in a different manner.

A useful illustration of such a situation can be the 'Family 500+' programme, which can undoubtedly be seen as a breakthrough in the area of pro-family policies in Poland, as never before have such large financial resources been transferred from the state budget to families, not due to some difficult crisis situation, but due to the fact of raising children. While most of the critical voices on this topic point to the unsatisfactory pronatalist effects of this programme, its importance, in terms of investing in human capital, is almost completely overlooked (cf. Gromada, 2018; Brzezinski, Najszub, 2017; Kucharska, 2020; Panek, 2020; Paradysz, 2021; Bartnicki, Alimowski, 2022). Therefore, in the context and on the example of this programme, it is worth looking at family policy precisely as compensation and investment in future human capital. By the way, it seems reasonable to state that it fulfils the aforementioned criterium of responsibility, in the sense that the supported activities are carried out by parents, i.e. the entities most appropriate for this purpose and most adequate to take responsibility for

this process. It is worth adding that support in the area of child rearing, which is the main objective of this programme, does not fully compensate for the overall contribution of parents and families to prosperity and socio-economic development. In other areas, such as the labour market (Letablier et al., 2009) and the pension system already mentioned, there still seems to be much to be done to ensure that parenthood is not a factor that reduces the chances of fair pay and adequate social security.

## **5. Summary - conclusions and recommendations**

Society is undoubtedly an extremely complex and dynamic entity, and the identification of its regularities constitutes an immensely important and necessary task, but also a very difficult and complicated one. Nevertheless, one cannot fail to attempt to understand and explain these phenomena and actions, which have a real impact on the lives of present and future generations on a daily basis. It seems that the current demographic crisis, which can be considered as a symptom of the most serious existential crisis that the Western world has been facing for decades, has still not been fully adequately diagnosed and described.

This paper attempts to highlight the perspective of social justice and responsibility as dimensions that may prove helpful in evaluating current family policy solutions and designing new ones. On this occasion, one important recommendation made here is to understand the difference between family policy and social assistance, and to skillfully separate and adequately apply each of them, bearing in mind their interdependence.

It would seem that, after Gary S. Becker, no one doubts any longer that the family should be taken very seriously in economics and social policy. Unfortunately, discussions on family policy repeatedly reveal an elementary lack of this knowledge, sometimes reducing the assessment of family policy to a question of inputs and costs, which are often considered in a short-term perspective. This makes it all the more necessary to clearly recall that 'the family supplies the market with people: it is the sole and most important producer of human capital' (Giza-Poleszczuk, 2005, p. 200), and that '(...) the economic role of the family in reproducing human capital has long been pointed out; not only in the sense of bringing to life and 'investing' in the education, skills or 'taste' (cultural capital) of children, but in the everyday sense of leisure, regenerating or even enhancing individual motivation in the external sphere (work, public activities, etc.)' (Giza-Poleszczuk, 2005, p. 18).

Since the relationship between the functioning of the family and the creation of human capital is so fundamental, family policy can be regarded as a special area of social policy. Its task is thus to protect and preserve the family as a source of this resource, which fundamental importance the economic sciences today have no doubt about (cf. Michalski, 2020).



Therefore, justice seems to be an indispensable criterium for assessing the effectiveness of family policies. Today, it clearly indicates that the effects of parental effort in the form of shaping and educating young generations are largely treated as a "common pasture", which turns out to be excessively and unequally exploited in the context of pension systems based on so-called intergenerational solidarity, among other things. An important hint in this context seems to be that of Rawls, who states that 'obviously, if all generations are to gain (except perhaps the earliest ones), the parties must agree to a principle of saving that ensures that each generation receives what is due from its predecessors and passes on its fair contribution to those who come later' (Rawls, 2009, p. 419).

Thus, it seems that social justice, implemented with respect for the requirements of internalized responsibility, should be regarded as the most appropriate perspective and at the same time as a benchmark for evaluating family policy in particular, and social policy in general (Schmidtz, 2019, p. 33).

At the same time, it seems much more likely that, under conditions of such a fairer socio-economic order, younger generations of potential spouses and parents will want to start families and have children, making the coming demographic winter and the associated shortage of human capital temporary and relatively mild. However, if this does not happen, we will all face a future that still seems hard to imagine today.

## References

1. Bartnicki, S., Alimowski, M. (2022). W poszukiwaniu demograficznych efektów rządowego programu „Rodzina 500 Plus”. *Studia Socjologiczne*, 1(244), 193-219, DOI: 10.24425/sts.2022.140601.
2. Becker, G.S. (1993). *Human Capital. A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
3. Brzeziński, M., Najsztab, M. (2017). The impact of "Family 500+" Programme on household incomes, poverty and inequality. *Social Policy*, 1, 16-25.
4. Fandrejewska-Tomczyk, A. (ed.) (2019). *Polityka społeczna. Wspierajmy ludzi, nie kryzysy*. Warszawa: Warsaw Enterprise Institute. <https://zpp.net.pl/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Polityka-spo%C5%82eczna.-Wspierajmy-ludzi-nie-kryzysy.pdf>.
5. Giza-Poleszczuk, A. (2005). *Rodzina a system społeczny. Reprodukacja i kooperacja w perspektywie interdyscyplinarnej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
6. Gromada, A. (2018). Czemu służy Program Rodzina 500 plus? Analiza celów polityki publicznej i polityki partyjnej. *Ruch prawniczy, ekonomiczny i socjologiczny, Year LXXX*, vol. 3, 231-244.

7. Grossman, J., Oliver, D. Hart, O.D. (1980). Takeover Bids, The Free-Rider Problem, and the Theory of the Corporation. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, Vol. 11, No. 1, Spring, pp. 42-64.
8. Hardin, G. (1968). The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science, New Series*, Vol. 162, No. 3859 (Dec. 13, 1968), pp. 1243-1248.
9. Jakubiec, M. (2012). Państwo opiekuńcze czy minimalne? In: W. Zuciak, J. Mysona Byrska (Ed.), *Równość w życiu publicznym*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła II w Krakowie.
10. Kotowska, I.E. (2021). Uwarunkowania polityki państwa wobec rodzin. In: J. Szczepaniak-Sienniak (Ed.), *Ekonomia polityki rodzinnej. Wybrane zagadnienia*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu.
11. Kucharska, P. (2020). Ocena skuteczności Programu „Rodzina 500+” w zakresie ograniczenia ubóstwa i zwiększenia dzietności w Polsce. *Zeszyty Naukowe UEK*, 5(989), 83-100.
12. Letablier, M.-T., Luci, A., Math, A., Thévenon, O. (2009). *The costs of raising children and the effectiveness of policies to support parenthood in European countries: a Literature Review*. European Commission.
13. Michalski, M.A. (2021). What Happened to Our Will to Serve in the West? Secularization, Individualism, Family and the Decline of the Civilization. *The Person and the Challenges. The Journal of Theology, Education, Canon Law and Social Studies Inspired by Pope John Paul II, S.l.*, v. 11, n. 1, march, pp. 89-102, doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.15633/pch.3886>.
14. Michalski, M.A. (2014). *Znaczenie rodziny dla międzypokoleniowej transmisji kultury gospodarczej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
15. Michalski, M.A. (2020). Ekologia źródeł „kapitału ludzkiego” i jego przyszłość wobec kondycji rodziny i materializacji kultury. In: M. Młokosiewicz, K. Włodarczyk (eds.), *Kształtowanie i rozwój kompetencji pracowników – problemy i wyzwania* (pp. 9-18). Warszawa: Akademicka Oficyna Wydawnicza EXIT.
16. Miller, D. (1974). The ideological backgrounds to conceptions of social justice. *Political Studies*, 22(4), 387-399. <https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1467-9248.1974.tb00033.x>.
17. Panek, T. (ed.) (2020). *Statystyka społeczna. Procesy społeczne, źródła danych i metody analizy*. Warszawa: PWE.
18. Paradysz, J. (2021). Recenzja książki Statystyka społeczna. Procesy społeczne, źródła danych i metody analizy pod redakcją Tomasza Panka. *Wiadomości Statystyczne*, 66, 11, 64-68.
19. Perelman, Ch. (1963). *The Idea of Justice and the Problem of Argument*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited.
20. Perlikowski, Ł. (2020). *Pluralizm i racjonalność w świetle idei demokracji deliberatywnej*. Płock: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Mazowieckiej Uczelni Publicznej w Płocku.

21. Pieńkowski, D. (2013). *Sprawiedliwość dystrybutywna w świetle optimum Pareto i idei rozwoju zrównoważonego*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku.
22. Rawls, J. (2009). *Teoria sprawiedliwości*. Warszawa: PWN.
23. Ringen, S. (2009). *Citizens, Families & Reform*. New Brunswick-London: Transaction Publishers.
24. Schmitz, D. (2019). *Dobrobyt społeczny a odpowiedzialność jednostki*. Wrocław: Fijorr Publishing.
25. Walzer, M. (2007). *Sfery sprawiedliwości. Obrona pluralizmu i równości*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
26. Wilkin, J. (1997). Efektywność a sprawiedliwość jako problem ekonomiczny. In: J. Wilkin (ed.), *Efektywność a sprawiedliwość*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Key Text.
27. Woźniak, M.G., Jabłoński, Ł. (2008). Nierówności społeczne i akumulacja kapitału ludzkiego a wzrost gospodarczy. Próba empirycznej weryfikacji współzależności na przykładzie Polski. *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie*, nr 786. Kraków.