

The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law

CUA Law Scholarship Repository

Scholarly Articles and Other Contributions

Faculty Scholarship

1984

Personal Reflections of Academic Freedom in Poland

Rett R. Ludwikowski

The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.edu/scholar>



Part of the [Eastern European Studies Commons](#), and the [Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rett R. Ludwikowski, Personal Reflections of Academic Freedom in Poland, CENTER J., Spring 1984, at 69.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at CUA Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarly Articles and Other Contributions by an authorized administrator of CUA Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact edinger@law.edu.

- 15 Ibid., pp. 276, 301.
 16 Ibid., pp. 322, 323; "Na drodze do normalizacji" (On the Way Toward Normalization), *Tygodnik Powszechny* (Universal Weekly), (Krakow, 4 July 1971).
 17 James Feron, "Poland Ends Church Obligation to Submit Financial Records," *New York Times*, 29 February 1972.
 18 Quoted in A. Micewski, *Wyszynski*, p. 367.
 19 "Kazanie Kard. K. Wojtyly wygloszone podczas konsekracji Kosciola w Nowej Hucie-Bienieczech, 15 maja, 1977 r." (Sermon of Karol Cardinal Wojtyla, Delivered during the Consecration of the Church in Nowa Huta-Bieneczyce, 15 May 1977), (Krakow, 24 May 1977).
 20 Ibid.
 21 Karol Cardinal Wojtyla, Sermon, "We Support the Bishop of Katowice and Together with Him Present the Same Claims Regarding the Respect for Lord's Day, Free Sunday for Miners and Other Workers," delivered 29 May 1977 to workers and pilgrims during their yearly pilgrimage to the shrine of the Holy Mother of Plekary, (Krakow, 5 June 1977), A. Micewski, *Wyszynski*, p. 307-392.
 22 Ibid., p. 388; A. Ostoja-Ostaszewski, ed., *Dis-sent in Poland, December 1975-July 1977* (London: Association of Polish Students and Graduates in Exile, 1977), pp. 147-164.
 23 A. Micewski, *Wyszynski*, pp. 355-358; "Wojtyla's Prayer for Peace and Justice in Poland: Three Sermons on Church and State" in the special issue, *The Pope and His Nation*, *Detroit Free Press*, November 1978.
 24 A. Micewski, *Wyszynski*, p. 393.
 25 *Chrześcijanin w Swiecie* (A Christian in the World), No. 93 (Warsaw, September 1980), pp. 4, 5, 8, 10.
 26 Ibid., No. 100 (July-August 1981), p. 49.

Center Journal
 Spring, 1984

Personal Reflections on Academic Freedom in Poland

Rett R. Ludwikowski

When I am in the United States I am often asked, "How is it possible for a political scientist in a Soviet Bloc country to publish books, pamphlets and articles without losing his intellectual independence? Is there a kind of academic freedom which allows him to express his political views?"

Two basic attitudes reveal themselves in these questions: first, a deep skepticism that academic freedom exists at all under a Communist regime and, second, an undisguised perplexity as to how I was able to survive so long without sacrificing my intellectual integrity. My questioners obviously find it odd that, not being a member of the Communist Party, I was permitted to lecture and write in the sensitive areas of political science and history.

These questions are obviously very important. Both, however, stem from assumptions which seriously oversimplify the realities of life in Communist states. First, they take for granted that societies in these countries consist either of dissidents, who openly fight against the Communist regime and most often are unable to publish

Rett R. Ludwikowski is currently senior fellow of the Marguerite Eyer Wilbur Foundation.

and teach officially, or of opportunists, whose survival rests on a self-serving accommodation or compromise with the authorities. Second, they assume that most often we deal with situations in which we enjoy either full freedom or no freedom at all. The reality is much more complicated.

Realistically, we must admit that total suppression of academic freedom is infeasible in any place, at any time. For its own advancement a nation must encourage its more talented citizens in the search for new knowledge and for fresh understanding of the old. Unfortunately, Communist regimes are looking for more than talent in their citizens. They also demand political reliability or, at least, neutrality. However, even in Communist countries, academic freedom and development of human knowledge go hand in hand and this fact means that independence of a sort must be at least tolerated in a typical Soviet Bloc nation. Despite all the valid reproaches heaped on academic freedom in the Soviet Bloc by Western critics, we must admit that the Communist system has produced a considerable body of scholarly and scientific findings. Hence, something like academic freedom cannot be dismissed as impossible. The problem is, however, in the scope of this freedom.

It is often suggested that what I am speaking of in Poland is not full academic freedom, and I agree. No freedom is boundless; otherwise, anarchy results. Every freedom has its congruent restrictions that are more or less reasonable to accept. If, however, these restrictions multiply, there comes a time when freedom dwindles to the vanishing point and the word becomes a mantle for bondage. Freedom, thus, is a function of a variable that is the sum total of all the restrictive elements—social, economic, political and religious—that exist in a society. From this viewpoint all freedom is relative; depending on the time and place, some who are free are more free than others.

Although the scholar in the West enjoys a more stable situation, his freedom, too, has certain relativistic aspects. It varies with his rank and reputation as well as with his particular institution, his field of study and the popular mood. Obviously, in the West, the principle of academic freedom is sacrosanct, an integral part of the democratic tradition. It does not mean, however, that it is unlimited or that it is never threatened or abused. In other words, the notion "full academic freedom" should be used with great prudence and its meaning should be carefully explained in each usage.

There is, of course, one important difference in the approach to academic freedom in the West and the Communist states. Western scholars can complain about abuses of freedom; they can protest, contest, debate, even petition the courts for redress, but both they and the authorities believe that academic freedom is a value worth protecting. In the Soviet Bloc, where Communism pervades society as a dogmatic creed, brooking no dissenters, academic freedom is something like an unwanted stepchild. It makes no difference whether Communist authorities really believe in ideological goals or whether ideology primarily serves as an instrument to legitimize political power. The Communist Party always combines policy with methodological dogmatism in a program for the permanent indoctrination of society. Obviously, in this situation, academic freedom is often inconvenient for the Communist regimes and the bonds between freedom and discovery are not appreciated enough.

Not even the Communist Party has succeeded in destroying the whole scope of academic freedom. It exists at the highest echelon of learning, in the special, rarefied world of the academy where scholars continually try to find fields toward which the censors are indifferent, or to write subtly between the lines in other sensitive areas. This kind of activity often makes possible considerable

achievement in research and educational work. An open attack on the party and its ideology, or detection by censors of this subsurface criticism, usually means the end of an academic career. Sometimes the scholar stops his work himself when he realizes that his scope of freedom has been constrained so much that, without the abuse of the principles of academic ethics, he cannot continue his courses and research.

These few personal reflections are, in a way, a record of one of these numerous battles for academic freedom in Poland. I lost my battle. Here I give you a kind of record of the struggle.

First Steps of "Education"

Every young scholar who begins his career in a Communist state must adjust to its peculiar mechanisms. To preserve his position he must learn to make adjustments of a special kind, not in his commitment to the truth but in the ways of seeking and expressing it. Before starting work on a thesis, article or book, he has to ascertain as well as he can just what is the extent of the freedom obtainable in his discipline at the moment. He might find his freedom is as cramped as a prisoner's in a small cell, but he learns to move within its confines without losing his self-respect or the esteem of his colleagues. Otherwise, his work is destined to be pigeonholed for years or forever.

I remember the shock I experienced the first time I discovered what academic freedom in Poland really meant. Obviously, in the years prior to settling into a professional career as an academic, I had gleaned some understanding of the workings of the Communist system of education. When I was graduated in 1966 from Jagiellonian University in Krakow with a Master of Arts in law I no longer had any illusions about the extent of censorship in Poland

and the severe restrictions on all freedoms in countries of the Eastern Bloc. But I did entertain the naive conviction that my learned professors comprised a unique class exempt from the routine strictures imposed on the masses. I told myself that the authority of these talented and highly qualified individuals was such that the government and the party had to respect and defer to them. I genuinely thought that a process of inquiry, the autonomy of the academy and the independence of professors were possible in Poland. Here was a reliable method that commended itself to all reasonable men for locating the truth amid a welter of conflicting and dissenting opinions. Such diverse opinions, I felt, fuel all political struggle, which is then seen ultimately as struggle for truth.

Moreover, it was my contention that people who believe in something seek the truth if only to confront it defensively, if threatening, or to embrace it, if supportive. I hoped that Communists were believers, too, and that despite their erroneous concepts and the reprehensible measures adopted to propagate their ideology they could be debated and reasoned with, and even persuaded when in error.

I believed, too, that the Communists needed the truth. Even if the party and the government, in their own self-interests, might present a distorted picture of reality in propaganda aimed at controlling the minds of the populace in general, they required for the formulation of policy and action reliable sources of authentic information on social, economic and political conditions at home and abroad. No matter how completely the nation as a whole might be ideologically walled in by the authorities, there had to be at least one small window to let the light in. Gradually, however these naive views gave way to disillusionment: my personal experiences proved more and more distinctly that the ideological struggle in the Communist countries was not the struggle for truth, and that

Communism was nothing more than a tool in the hands of a ruling elite.

Let me describe the first steps in my "education." I remember well March 14, 1968, when I walked to my office at the university where I was working as an assistant to a professor of the history of political ideas. I was going to show to my mentor the manuscript of my doctoral dissertation. It was not a well-chosen time for academic endeavors. Students had taken to the streets that day in large numbers to protest both the arrest of the popular 22-year-old activist, Adam Michnik,¹ and the closing by the authorities of the patriotic play *Dziady*, in which Poland's finest romantic poet, Adam Mickiewicz, depicted the sufferings of the Poles under the rule of Czarist Russia.

I had almost reached the university when I was caught up in a crowd of shouting demonstrators which the Special Police Troops were trying to scatter with tear gas and water cannons. Earlier these troops had beaten several members of the university faculty. (So much for my naive faith in the exempt status of professors.) I started running for the nearby building which housed my office; suddenly I found myself the target of two water cannons whose jetting streams slammed me hard against a wall. Shielding my face with my briefcase I managed to scramble to safety.

Since there was no possibility of leaving for several hours, I went to see my mentor, with whom I had a lengthy and memorable discussion. He studied my damp manuscript for some time before putting it down in evident dismay.

"This is on Mill's concept of liberty. Who do you think would publish that now? Are you crazy? They have closed down the production of *Dziady* and you think that somebody will publish your book and allow you to defend these ideas on liberty?"

I countered that they had closed the play for political reasons. On the other hand, in my work I was dealing with philosophical ideas which had universal significance, applicable in any society. Mill's methodology was valuable to every student and scholar. Furthermore, what was involved here was not a political play, but Jagiellonian University, established in the 14th century. "Moreover," I added triumphantly, "have we no academic freedom?"

"You do not understand anything," my professor said patiently. "What does academic freedom in Poland really mean? You yourself can say and write a little more openly than a student—usually. I can publish more openly and supposedly more courageously than you. This does not necessarily mean that my freedom is greater than yours, but simply that I have more experience and know how to write on sensitive problems."

"You would like to ask why I participate in this charade. That is quite simple. First, having some authority, I really am free to say more than any other scholar would be allowed. Second, you and your colleagues are used to reading between the lines of my writings. You are more clever in this than the obtuse censors. Third, enjoying the confidence of the government to some degree, I can publish my historical essays without the usual restraints.

"So, if you wish to raise the question of academic freedom in this country, let me give you some advice. If you believe that academic freedom means the *freedom to teach the truth* and you adopt Communism as the ready textbook of these truths, then you will experience a sense of full freedom and have no problems. But if you believe that academic freedom means the *freedom to seek the truth*, you must not manifest this conviction openly and you must choose subjects which are rather neutral regarding current policy. In a totalitarian state this is not an easy task, but perhaps you can search out a historical period not off-limits to the search for truth. Now take your manuscript,

write another dissertation, say, on Mill's concept of representative government."

Thus my professor ended his eye-opening lesson on survival in the academic world of Communist Poland. It chilled me more than the water cannon that had drenched me several hours earlier.

Still, it took some time for the lesson to sink in. I went home stubbornly determined, despite my professor's advice, to do things my own way and outwit the system. I did a new dissertation under the title, "Liberty as a Guarantee of Representative Government in J.S. Mill's Political Doctrine." I was certain that this subtle reworking of my original thesis would slip by ideologically critical eyes.

I was wrong; the title of the dissertation was not accepted and nobody even read the whole manuscript. It took me three more years to earn my first Ph.D. Ironically, the title of the successful dissertation was the one originally suggested by my politically shrewd mentor: "Mill's Concept of Representative Government." It lay buried in the archives for a decade before being published in 1980 after Solidarity came to the fore.

This uphill struggle against the oppressive weight of official restrictions cost me not only three years of my work but also most of my illusions about full academic freedom at the university level. The experiences of the ensuing years would demolish these illusions altogether and complete the education begun by my mentor.

The Principle of *Partiinost'*

As time went by, it became clear to me that political rather than ideological considerations inspired the imposition of restrictions on academic freedom. True, the ruling Communist elite does jealously foster the orthodoxy of

Marxist-Leninist doctrine, but not for any reasons related to the establishment of social or economic programs, to which lip-service is given. Rather, it is to insure a formidable, theoretical foundation on which to build a mounting superstructure of political power.

For this reason, restrictions are imposed on the exercise of academic freedom not so much for the protection of ideological truth as for protection *against* truth in general which, freely circulated, would endanger the philosophical basis of Communist political power.

As I studied Communism at work in Poland, I became increasingly aware of its deep political cynicism that no attempt at camouflage could effectively hide. Party policy dogmatizes Communism in order to cover up its lack of genuine ideals. In this process, any dogma once presented and accepted as part of the party's creed must never be revised. Moreover, one must restrict oneself to the discussion and exposition of only those Communist truths useful at the moment to the party's and the government's policies. Other dogmas, inappropriate or embarrassing for the moment, need not be renounced or shed, but are discreetly held in limbo to be called up when the time is ripe for their use. As one of my Communist acquaintances in Poland used to repeat: "If Communist ideas are not true, all the worse for truth." Truth was not judged on its own merits but according to a typically Communist pragmatic principle known as *partiinost'*.

Speaking in New York at a symposium on "Academic Freedom Under the Soviet Regime," A. P. Ohloblyn described *partiinost'* as "silent obedience, unquestioning and even enthusiastic acceptance in one's works of everything that the Party at any time commanded, and most important, at the time when the Party commanded. For, often what the Party considered truth today was heresy yesterday and might be heresy again tomorrow. *Partiinost'*

involved a great and dangerous balancing, great opportunism and also great degradation of professional and personal integrity"²

The principle of *partinost'* in science was demonstrated (following Lenin) in the Soviet Union in 1932 by an official document, an article written by the Chief of the Propaganda and Agitation Department of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party.³ The author of the article quoted some so-called scientific works certainly worthy of broader attention: "Marxism and Surgery," "The Dialectics of High Quality Steel," "All Phases of Venereal Disease and Dermatology from the Point of View of Dialectic Materialism," "For Partinost' in Mathematics," "For Marxist-Leninist Theoretical Purity in Surgery," "Sea-fish: A Dialectical Process," "Marxist-Leninist Theory in Forge Operations."³ The titles of these books need no commentary.

This principle of *partinost'* has never been declared openly in Polish science, which apparently enjoys greater liberty. Still, even in those countries with relatively greater freedom it unofficially determined and determines the work of every scholar. It can pave the way for unlimited scientific deception, elevate scholars who have no academic achievements and close the way to academic careers for the most valuable individuals. *Partinost'* stands revealed as a cynical exercise in political expediency to further Communist interests.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the operations of the Central Offices for Control of Press, Publications, and Performances. Its Official Books of Directives and Recommendations set forth detailed instructions for the elimination of any negative comments on party decisions or any reference to official blunders or bungling.

Here are a few examples from one of the so-called Black Books of Polish Censorship:

"It is forbidden to publish any information whatsoever about the sale of Polish meat to Russia."

"All criticisms of religious affairs in socialist countries should be expunged."

"Figures illustrating the state and growth of alcoholism on a national scale are not to appear in the mass media."

"All information about the direct threat of industry and the use of chemicals in agriculture to human life and health must be expunged."

"Information concerning Poland's purchase of licenses from capitalist countries is to be eliminated from the mass media."

"All publications presenting general statistics with regard to conditions of safety and hygiene at work or to occupational diseases must be withheld."

"Absolutely no information is to be published concerning the Katowice mine disaster in which four miners lost their lives."⁴

Under so broad a censorship, basic economic, social and political information went unpublished. Costly scandals and blunders in urban planning, housing, seaport management and many other matters were withheld from the public. All scientific disciplines based on statistical data were affected by this blackout.

Reliance on similar misinformation, economic naivete unsupported by genuine economic research, and the arbitrariness of decisions made by the central authorities go a long way toward explaining the rapid collapse of the Polish economy and the economic weakness in all Communist countries. Any gathering of verifiable statistics and empirical data was, of course, impossible given the *partinost'* mentality of the Central Office for Control. The information available was mostly misinformation.

A friend working on statistics at the police criminal office explained to me once how reports on criminal activity

are put together in Poland. His task was to "improve" the data received from each police station to show a lower level of crime. "The Ministry of Internal Affairs," he tried to explain, "would then review the composite report and most probably send it back for 'proofreading,' a euphemism for a downward revision of the figures. It is the routine procedure, repeated in each reporting period, regardless of the originally quoted figures." Understandably, the nation was jolted when Solidarity revealed such practices, the corruption, economic bungling and democratic abuses that had gone on so long without public knowledge.

The *partitost'* principle carries over into the academic realm, particularly in sociopolitical and religious areas. Besides the generally known restrictions, there exist specific directives of which the ordinary scholar is unaware. It is only when he sends a manuscript to an editor or delivers an inappropriate lecture that he finds "there is not interest in his publication," or "his courses are insufficiently prepared."

He never finds out in what he has been remiss. If, through some oversight by the censor, his work is published and it is found inappropriate, the book suddenly is out of stock and magazines containing his article disappear suddenly from the stands.

An Academic Career in Poland

Now let us return to the questions, how is it possible for a political scientist to preserve his intellectual independence, and how was I able to survive so long without sacrificing intellectual integrity? My own problems were probably typical of many Polish scholars.

Like other academics, I encountered difficulties finding my way into print. Let me mention only one example. The manuscript of one of my early books, *Black Radicalism in the United States*, lay on the editor's desk for three years

while awaiting clearance for publications about the United States. The situation changed only when the university recommended my work as important reading for students in political science.

The book enjoyed profitable popularity and was due for a second printing until the appearance of a hostile review by a young party activist. He took me to task for obscure Marxian methodology in researching the problem, for missing the "class aspect" in my study and for failure to disclose the struggle of the black proletariat with white capitalists.

I forwarded a sharp rebuttal to several magazines, which refused to publish it. Next, I wrote to *Polityka* (The Policy), a weekly open to some critical comments. My letter was published, but in a heavily edited version. I was informed in confidence that my critics had sparse knowledge of actual social conditions in the United States, and that it was not my alleged crimes against Marxian methodology that prompted the derogatory review but rather the political ambitions of the writer, who was the son of the secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. In my book he found grist for his ideological mill. Within the week, all remaining copies of my book vanished from the stalls.

The fate of *Black Radicalism* meant that, for a few years at least, I would be unable to publish anything in political science. Obviously I was unwilling to write and put my manuscripts in a drawer. I decided to heed the advice of my erstwhile mentor and fall back on my studies in philosophy and history with a view toward future publication efforts.

A historian was also limited in subjects for study. There were, for example, the forbidden zones covering the period between the wars and the postwar period, which were open only to scholars enjoying the special confidence of the authorities. Compounding the problems of

research, access to politically sensitive archival and source materials was difficult, if not impossible, for people like me who lacked party affiliation or connections. Even when it came to the actual writing, the scholar found himself in something of a straitjacket, being required to follow official stipulation about style, methodology and format of composition.

After close study I detected a gap in the thorny thicket of regulations which hedged in academic enterprise. I decided to concentrate my research on the rightist currents of Polish political thought in the 19th century. The vigilance of the censors was too occupied, I reasoned, with writings that dealt with the years of Soviet-Polish relations to bother about what Poles were thinking in the last century.

There were other considerations behind my choice of subject. First, I had for many years been interested in the period, particularly in the impact of European liberalism on the conservatism of the Polish right. Second, the study of the Polish right during this period had been completely neglected and so provided a fertile field for thorough research. Third, this was an area in which a writer did not have to state continuously his admiration for Marxian methodology. The history of political ideas was a relatively young discipline in Poland, and no one was really sure how Marxian methodology applied.

My assessment of the censorship situation proved accurate and my decision fortunate. In the late 70s I was able to publish, without difficulty, several books and pamphlets as well as articles dealing with Polish political thought and its European connections. I also succeeded in developing a broad research program of studies about European rightist and moderate political movements. I gathered about me a group of bright young scholars interested in this subject.

My status improved steadily, but dangerously. As I

gained prominence I found myself receiving more attention from the authorities. For a time this attention proved more of an asset than a liability. Although I had never been a member of the Communist Party, I was successively appointed to positions of greater authority within the university. I was again permitted to lecture on political science. My academic freedom increased. Everything I wrote was published, including several critical analyses, which to my surprise were treated as expressions of "healthy socialist criticism." My career was replicating that of my doctoral mentor, who had advised me so wisely.

In the late '70s I prepared a series of articles on Polish political culture, which were gathered into a booklet for general readership. Unfortunately, one article, actually a report written for the government, touched on a raw political nerve. In detailing the historical background of my topic, I discussed quite frankly the social attitudes that underlay the opposition to Communist rule. Only an obtuse reader could miss the implied criticism of the current government which pervaded the report.

The book failed to receive approval for publication. A year later I was notified that my treatment in the book of the policies of the Catholic Church in Poland was too favorable. The implication was clear. If I would balance my criticism of the government with criticism of the church, the publication might be approved. I refused. A year later I again heard from the censor, who in a reversal of his previous attitude suggested I rewrite my assessment of church policy in even more favorable terms. It was not difficult to understand why. In the interim a significant development had taken place: Cardinal Wojtyła was elected Pope John Paul II. In an apparent effort to exploit the national pride over this event the Communist government sought friendlier relations with the church in order to blunt the growing opposition that culminated in

the Solidarity movement. I again refused. Eventually my book was published, just before the first signs of social unrest that heralded the appearance of Solidarity in August, 1980.

Concurrently with my publication difficulties, I was running into other problems. The authorities took issue with my lectures; my courses came under fire for manifest nonconformist attitudes. Two lectures were especially memorable. Afterwards I was invited to the Party Committee and instructed as to the "value" of my teaching.

The first time I was speaking about the comparison between the Western, so-called formal democracy, and socialist democracy. I tried to veil my conclusions a little but I knew that they could be read between the lines of my presentation. After all, my students knew as well as I that the conclusion was simple: "Real democracy does not exist in Communist countries."

"Professor," a student asked me during the discussion period, "last year I attended a few sessions of our parliament and during vacation I also visited legislatures in a few Western capitalistic countries. I observed with great surprise that their (capitalistic) representatives are not wiser and sometimes even much stupider than ours. How is it that, notwithstanding, their general decisions are balanced, reasonable, useful and their countries move step by step forward when we spiral down?"

I answered a little jokingly: "Go out and ask people at random on the street to estimate the population of London. One will tell you, one million; another, five million; still another, fifteen million. However, if you collect 300 answers, add the figures and divide the sum by 300, you probably will obtain a result approximately correct. This is the basic idea of democracy. Well, are you now able to discern the difference between the so-called formal (capitalistic) and the socialist form of democracy?"

"Yes, Professor," he answered, "I believe that in our

democracy the final political, economic and social decisions need no calculation. They are simply based on the opinions of those who insist that London has a population of a half million."

With some anxiety I noticed a new student who diligently noted every word of our discussion—maybe too carefully. . . .

In the second presentation I dealt with recent American conservatism. In the course of discussion one of the Communist scholars from another college asked me, "Professor, you presented these conservative ideas as favorably as if you were not aware that they, with other currents of capitalistic ideology, help the American capitalist state to stupefy and suppress American workers. It is especially obvious when we take into consideration the decision of President Reagan who so eagerly fired American Air Traffic Controllers."

How to discuss such stupidity?, I thought, somewhat irreverently. Fortunately, one of the students supplied the answer that I was just trying to frame.

"Sir," he said to the Communist professor, "I agree with you that American workers are terribly suppressed by American capitalists. I have only one question and maybe your answer will explain this problem. Why, if they are so suppressed, have I never heard about any American worker who ever escaped to the Soviet Union?"

The stormy laugh of the audience closed this short discussion. In the corner of the lecture hall, however, I saw again the same unknown diligent student who was assiduously writing down every word of this conversation. On the next day I was asked to return to teaching philosophy and the history of political ideas. The authorities had promptly discovered that I presented Marxism as only one of many philosophical and ideological systems. Similarly, in the area of history, political pressures harassed me and hobbled my teaching. The Communist Party had

suddenly found the uninhibited study of history to be a hotbed of dissidence. Communist theory always believed that politics dictated history. The party quickly planned an organized campaign against non-Marxist-oriented history. Only the appearance of Solidarity prevented the campaign from getting fully under way.

During the 18 months of Solidarity, until December, 1981, academic freedom flourished in Poland. My lectures were not checked; my articles were published without restriction. Solidarity and the Independent Students' Union fought for full autonomy of universities and colleges, for the right of the students to share in curricula development, and for full freedom to learn and to teach.

The official Marxist versions of philosophy, sociology and economics—as well as the Russian language—ceased to be compulsory subjects. Officers of the universities and colleges were elected rather than appointed by the state. Revision was called for in the system of confirmation of academic degrees and positions by the Ministry of Science, Technology and Education.

The imposition of martial law ended all these gains and reforms. The junta quickly resumed the suspended attack on history and its teaching. The Institutes of Political Sciences were reconstituted with scientific Marxism as the main focus of their courses. The last state of Polish higher education was worse than the first.

Events now quickly closed in on me. My interest in rightist movements and liberal thought was recognized as evidence of a serious nonconformist attitude; the fact that I always used revisionist methodology was exposed.

I sensed the day of reckoning was near: I would have to choose between remaining in Poland at the cost of my integrity and freedom, or leaving my native country to seek freedom elsewhere.

That day came very quickly. When the universities were reopened, I was asked to deliver lectures on the benefits

of martial law. As a member of Solidarity and a believer in human freedom I had to refuse. No longer could I temporize or find ways to evade official restraints. The scope of my academic freedom had so narrowed that it almost ceased to exist.

After almost 20 years, my personal struggle for academic freedom in Communist Poland was lost. It was, however, not a total defeat. In leaving my country I gained the academic freedom of the West—something that Western scholars and students take for granted. Undoubtedly, my experience of life in the Soviet Bloc helps me to appreciate its value. Yet, I also appreciate how extremely precious—how tiny but so hard-won—is the scope of academic liberties under the Communist regime. The fact that it still exists and that there are scholars ready to fight for their integrity cannot be underestimated.

References

- 1 A. Michnik (born 1946) joined the youth club Seekers for Contradictions when he was 15. The club was sponsored by the Socialist Youth Union, but was later banned. In the mid-'60s he studied under the tutorial direction of Jacek Kuron, who was later a charter member of KOR (Underground Committee of Workers' Defense), established in 1976. In the late '70s Michnik was one of the spiritual leaders of KOR and later one of Solidarity's advisors.
- 2 A. P. Ohloblyn, lecture "Soviet Historiography," given at symposium "Academic Freedom Under the Soviet Regime," New York, April 3-4, 1954.

- 3 V. I. Lenin, *Sochineniia I* (Works I), 4th ed. (Moscow: 1940-1950), pp. 380-381; A. Stecki, *Ob uprosichenstrae i uprosichentsakh* (Pravda, 4 July 1932).
- 4 *Official Censorship in the Polish People's Republic* (Ann Arbor: The North American Study Center for Polish Affairs, 1978), p. 4.

Center Journal
Spring, 1984

Marxism Versus Socialism In Polish Christendom

Aleksander Gella

Thesis I: Marxism, not socialism, is the main enemy of Christianity.

Thesis II: Socialism could develop within various socio-political systems, and does not need to undermine the Christian faith.

Thesis III: Poland is a great laboratory where some socialist ideas and institutions are liberating themselves from the Marxist faith and adapting to Polish Christendom. In the popular mentality, socialism is understood as an all-embracing ideology akin to Communism, rather than simply one of many possible models of economic organization. Thus, I feel it is necessary to liberate the term "socialism" from all the ideological burdens with which it has become associated.

Since I take the risk of presenting an independent and perhaps unpopular point of view, the terms I use should be clarified, to avoid the possibility of their misinterpretation or their use in an ambivalent or twisted sense. Therefore, let me start with definitions of the three terms which appear in the title.

Aleksander Gella is professor of sociology at the State University of New York at Buffalo.