KRZYSZTOF BRZECHCZYN

Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu
Instytut Filozofii
e-mail: brzech@amu.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0001-8789-5641

From Proletarian Revolution to National Uprising. An Overview of Conceptualizations of Polish Solidarność[1]

Abstract. *The purpose of paper* From Proletariat Revolution to National Uprising. An Overview of Conceptualizations of Polish „Solidarność" *is to review of various approaches to this movement in the social science and the humanities. The author is going to seek answer to the following interpretative question: whether a given conceptualization grasp „Solidarity" movement in dynamic or in static way. In the second part of the paper interpretations of „Solidarity" in analytical categories of insurrection, civil, ethical revival, postmodern, religious, republican, revolutionary and social movements are presented. Finally, the author tries to identify reasons of dynamic or static approach to „Solidarność."*

Keywords: *Solidarność, Solidarity, republicanism, civil society, revolution, messianism, social movements*

1. Introduction

Solidarity" is – generally by foreign researchers as Polish ones are much more restrained – considered as one of the fundamental modern events in line with

---

[1] The article was written within the framework of the Central Research Project of the Institute of National Remembrance, "Opozycja i opór społeczny w Polsce 1956-1989" ("Opposition and social resistance in Poland 1956-1989").

the 20th century freedom movements whose charismatic leaders were Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King.[2] The subject-matter literature also includes other examples. James H. Billington compares "Solidarity" to the Paris Commune.[3] He argues that the 19th and the 20th centuries witnessed the domination of social imagination by three secular ideas: freedom, brotherhood and equality giving life to three various social movements: constitutional liberalism, romantic nationalism and egalitarian socialism. The social thought of "Solidarity" was noticed to have limitations of those three social ideas transformed into a new synthesis based on five constructive principles.[4] They were as follows:

– religiousness – these three ideas that primarily were secular are transcendentally rooted;

– radicalism – the aim of "Solidarity" was not to seize power, but to force the authorities to act in compliance with the public interest;

– citizenship – it aims at expanding the autonomy of civil society and limiting the state's role;

– egalitarianism – it is based on grassroots and decentralized activities;

– pacifism – although "Solidarity" as a mass-based movement was able to mobilize its members, it generally renounced violence in practice and in theory.[5]

Arista Maria Cirtautas,[6] through comparing the Polish "Solidarity" to the American and French ones, wonders: "Was it a modern democratic revolution in keeping with the historical traditions of the American and French Revolutions, or was it a national liberation revolution more in keeping with the traditions of 1848?"[7] The author notices that "Solidarity" was characterized by national, democratic, liberal, and populist features. However, in no way it discredits the Polish revolution as the American and French revolutions also contained some clusters of unmatched characteristics. Cirtautas points out that: "the American, French and Polish Revolutions can all be seen as pivotal "core" cases (to borrow Wallerstein's terminology) of democratic development that had significant impact not just domestically but also internationally [on the afore-mentioned countries – K.B.]."[8]

"Solidarity" that evades – as each fundamental event – any express analytical categories is vulnerable to numerous conceptualizations deriving from various fields of social and humanistic sciences: history, political sciences, sociology or

---

[2] A. Touraine, *Solidarność. Analiza ruchu społecznego 1980-1981* [Solidarność. An Analysis of Social Movement, 1980-1981], Europejskie Centrum Solidarności, Gdańsk 2010 [1982], p. 24.

[3] J.H. Billington, *Introduction*, in S. W. Reiquam (ed.), *Solidarity and Poland. Impact East and West*, Washington D.C. 1988.

[4] Ibidem, p. 2.

[5] Ibidem, pp. 2-3.

[6] A.M. Cirtautas, *The Polish Solidarity Movement. Revolution, Democracy and Natural Rights*, Routledge, London – New York 1997.

[7] Ibidem, p. 8.

[8] Ibidem, p. 9.

philosophy. Many authors emphasize that it is necessary to apply a vast number of perspectives to research "Solidarity."[9] In this context, it is worth citing Dariusz Gawin who argues that "Solidarity" in the period of 1980-1981 "may be viewed from the perspective of the theory of social movements and may be a source of a leftist and working-class nature, and hence a revolutionary nature of the movement […], it is also completely justified to interpret "Solidarity" in the spirit of the Polish insurrection tradition."[10] Antoni Dudek specifies expressions of "Solidarity" through referring to the definition of a trade union, revolutionary social movement, national uprising and political party fighting for seizing power and abolishing power (this was argued by opponents of "Solidarity").[11] This author classifies "Solidarity" into categories of a working-class revolt and a national uprising. The usefulness of the first analytical category is prejudged by its elemental nature, proletariat identity of its members and presence of socialist ideology, particularly egalitarianism and plots of social Utopian vision (vision of the self-governing Republic of Poland).[12] On the other hand, the category of the national uprising was useful only when there was a specific enemy such as the management of PZPR (Polish United Workers' Party) dependent on the Soviet Union, a charismatic leader and national solidarity and romantic concept of the nation that were present in the programme and activity of the Trade Union

Presumably, the author of the broadest possible overview of analytical categories applied in research on "Solidarity" is Elżbieta Ciżewska who distinguished five conceptualization perspectives: workers' uprising (i), revolt (ii), religious community (iii), national uprising (iv), civil society (v), social movement (vi), and republican movement (vii).[13]

The aim of this paper is, therefore, to delineate various conceptualizations of the "Solidarity" phenomenon and to order them at least partly. In this overview, I will

---

[9] Cf. e.g.. A. Leszczyński, *Jaką historię „Solidarności" lat 1980-1981 warto napisać? Zarys projektu badawczego*, [What Kind of Solidarność's History is Worth to Write. An Outline of Research Project] "Pamięć i Sprawiedliwość" 2/2003, pp. 76-78; M. Latoszek, *"Solidarność": ruch społeczny, rewolucja czy powstanie?* [Solidarność: Social Movement, Revolution or Uprising] in M. Latoszek (ed.), *"Solidarność" w imieniu narodu i obywateli*, Arcana, Cracow 2005, p. 241; M. Kaczmarczyk, *Wielowymiarowa teoria Solidarności* [Multi-Dimensional Theory odf Solidarność], "Studia Socjologiczne" 3/2010.

[10] D. Gawin, *Sierpień 1980 w świetle tradycji republikańskiej* [August 1980 in the Light of Republican Tradition], in A. Sułek (ed.), *Solidarność. Wydarzenie, konsekwencje, pamięć*, Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN, Warsaw 2006, p. 45.

[11] A. Dudek, *"Solidarność": rewolucyjny ruch społeczny czy powstanie narodowe?* [Solidarność: Revolutionary Social Movement or National Uprising] in W. Wrzesiński (ed.), *Między irredentą, lojalnością a kolaboracją*, Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2001, p. 413.

[12] Ibidem, p. 415.

[13] The overview of conceptualizations of the phenomenon of "Solidarity", see E. Ciżewska, *Filozofia publiczna Solidarności* [Public Philosophy of Solidarność], Narodowe Centrum Kultury, Warsaw 2010, pp. 23-68; M. Latoszek, *"Solidarność": ruch społeczny...*, pp. 240-274; J. Pakulski, *The Solidarity Decade: 1980-1989*, "Humanities Research" 16/2010, no. 3, pp. 57-59.

present interpretations of "Solidarity" in categories of: insurrection movement (i), civil movement (ii), post-modernist movement (iii), religious and moral movement (iv), republican movement (v), revolutionary movement (vi), social movement (vii) and ethical revival movement (viii). Some specific interpretations have their variants and they may be mixed on a conceptualization basis.

It is easy to notice that the recommended overview does not fully meet requirements for logical division. The distinction of the universe of division would face problems because some authors analysed the activity of "Solidarity" (e.g. Jadwiga Staniszkis, David Ost), others – common awareness of the movement (e.g. Elżbieta Ciżewska), and others – the established political and social thought and programme (e.g. Alain Touraine). In this case, a homogeneous division criterion would exclude some conceptualizations, and hence impoverish the presentation. Further, the discussed conceptualizations have a different level of systematicity. Some of them were broadly analysed in books and a series of scientific articles, whereas others were outlined in essays written in commemoration of subsequent anniversaries of the August 1980.

Under these circumstances, it is only possible to partly order the afore-mentioned overviews. There may be distinguished two modes of interpreting "Solidarity" in the years of 1980 and 1981, and, hence the social – political thought generated by "Solidarity." The first interpretation mode captures both the Solidarity social movement and its social-political thought in a dynamic way (alternatively, "diachronic" term may be used). This interpretation mode is characterized by the evolution of the "Solidarity" revolt and its social-political thought, it presents mechanisms of this evolution and restores development alternatives and ideological dilemmas faced by the movement.[14]

The latter interpretation mode delineates "Solidarity" and its social – political thought in a static way (alternatively, "synchronic" term may be used). This interpretation mode ignores the internal development and ideological tensions of the political thought of "Solidarity" by using categories that capture this social phenomenon as fully and globally as possible. As a rule, this interpretation perspective considers the entire decade of the 1980s jointly without selecting the so-called first "Solidarity" period.

---

[14] The problem of factors affecting the dynamics of "Solidarity", see N. Boratyn, J. Brodacki, B. Brzostek, P. Długołęcki, J. Galewski, A. Górski, D. Jurkun, B. Kaliski, J. Kochanowicz, M. Kula, K. Lipski, K. Mórawski, A. Naimska, S. Nowaczewski, A. Pietrucha, M. Rogalski, K. Rokicki, U. Ruzik, T. Ruzikowski, M. Skoczylas, Z. Wóycicka, *Czynniki określające dynamikę ruchu „Solidarność w latach 1980-1981* [The Factors Influencing the Dynamics of Solidarność Movement in years 1980-1981], in M. Kula (ed.), *Solidarność w ruchu, 1980-1981*, Niezależna Oficyna Wydawnicza NOWA, Warsaw 2000, pp. 7-150.

2. Overview of conceptualizations

2.1. "Solidarity" as an insurrection movement

The notion of "Solidarity" as another national uprising firstly emerged in the programme discussion in the "Tygodnik Mazowsze" weekly in the early 1982.[15] The subject-matter literature used this category of national uprising to describe "Solidarity" in, as a rule, anniversary essays and occasional scientific articles.

This is exemplified by Gerard Labuda's essay that notices that a definitive feature of the uprising is an armed struggle. On the other hand, this Poznań historian asserts that the armed resistance is one of the whole range of measures that may force the opponent to make concessions and capitulate. Gerard Labuda points out that each uprising may be analysed in terms of the following characteristics: goal and methods (i), social base (ii), military and/or social capabilities (ability to mobilize, organize a strike, etc.) (iii), leaders' organizational efficiency (iv), opponent's crisis (v), and favourable international situation (vi).[16]

Based on the above, Labuda briefly characterizes the Polish national uprisings: from the Kościuszko insurrection to the outburst of "Solidarity." The last uprising differed from the previous ones in terms of its resignation from violence. However, Labuda argues that if we consider "Solidarity" as a link of the entire chain of protests against the Communist authorities, then it appeared that violent clashes had erupted before "Solidarity" was formed in Poznań in 1956 and on the Baltic Coast in 1970, as well as after martial law was declared (pacification of the Wujek coal mine and events in Lubin). The social base of the insurgent movement was the entire society (characteristic ii) and the elected efficient management of the movement (iv) was able to effectively mobilize the entire society (iii) – arranging nationwide strikes and forcing the authorities to redevelop the state system. Thus, "Solidarity" had specific goals and methods to achieve them (i). 1981 did not witness characteristics (v) and (vi). The party apparatus, following the first surprise, began a counter-attack and declared martial law. The international situation was also unfavourable – Leonid Brezhnev ruled the Soviet Union and the "soft" Jimmy Carter was the U.S. president. This changed in 1981 when Ronald Reagan was elected as president and served two terms, and Mikhail Gorbachev became the 1st General Secretary of the Soviet Union in 1985. That time, in Poland the authorities

---

[15] About discourses in the first half of 1982, see K. Brzechczyn, *Program i myśl polityczna NSZZ "Solidarność"* [Programme and Political Thought of Solidarność], in Ł. Kamiński, G. Waligóra (eds.) *NSZZ "Solidarność" 1980-1989*, vol. 2: *Ruch społeczny*, IPN, Warsaw 2010, pp. 49-56.

[16] G. Labuda, *Ruch „Solidarność" w perspektywie historycznej* [„Solidarność" Movement in Historical Perspective], in J. Kulas (ed.), *Sierpień '80. Co pozostało z tamtych dni?* Uniwersytet Gdański, Gdańsk 1996, p. 100.

did not manage to break up the independent society, and the increase in the subsequent feeling of social dissatisfaction accelerated the conclusion of the Round Table agreement. Labuda evaluates that this longest Polish uprising "commenced in 1956 and finally ended in 1989 was completely successful. It is difficult to overestimate the role of the Independent Self-Governing Trade Union "Solidarity" that concentrated all patriotic forces in that period of its activity, particularly in the ground-breaking two years' period."[17]

Of a similar nature is considerations of Inka Skłodowska who asserts that: "in August 1980 – with the establishment of "Solidarity" – the national uprising broke out in Poland. It was the longest in the Polish history – it almost lasted a decade until 1989 when it ended with a victory – regaining of the national independence and national sovereignty."[18] The uprising of "Solidarity" aimed at rebuilding civil society, democracy and national sovereignty. It was accompanies by setting the record of history and culture straight. The peaceful nature of the insurrection of "Solidarity" was a result of the remembrance about the Warsaw Uprising – the strive to regain freedom together with prudence and moderation. In the 1980s the authorities did not manage to abolish the movement of civil movement that, as a consequence of the 1989 agreement, won the June elections and seized power. That was the end of the longest Polish uprising.[19]

On the other hand, Marek Latoszek's concept is distant from this solemn and anniversary tone of the aforesaid articles. This author attempts to turn to account the national uprising category in a more analytical way. The author compares three analytical categories applied to do research on "Solidarity": social movement, revolt and uprising, arguing that the most research productive is the national uprising category. As a rule, the category of revolt excludes external conditions of a specific social community and concentrates on the social change made by such community. The category of social movement – formulated in Western sociology – is perceived by Latoszek as inadequate due to two reasons: firstly, its natural scope of application is Western democracy.[20] Secondly, this category omits peculiarities of totalitarian societies in a version of Soviet ones. The social mobilization directed against such systems considerably affected the structure of the movement.[21]

The insurrection approach, as the author asserts, distinguishes the nation as a collective author of events. The aim of the collective activities is to regain the lost independence and secure sovereignty. The civilization and economic transformations are considered as secondary goals that may be achieved not until the

---

[17] Ibidem, p. 107.

[18] I. Słodkowska, *Najdłuższe polskie powstanie* [The Longest Polish Uprising], "Więź" 7/2005, p. 18.

[19] Ibidem, p. 27.

[20] M. Latoszek, *"Solidarność": ruch społeczny*…, pp. 240 and 248-249.

[21] Ibidem, pp. 267-269.

nation regains its freedom. Latoszek argues that "the uprising approach allows for a series of specific phenomena in the movement of "Solidarity" and of the opposition in the years 1980-1989, e.g. the organization of the independent society and its institutionalization, periods of the first and second "Solidarity", martial law as a counter-revolution, whereas these events analysed globally are considered as local, and hence marginal."[22]

The insurrection approach is also supported by Maciej Korkuć. This Cracow-based historian believed that the most essential message of the insurrection tradition was willingness to participate in the armed uprising aimed at regaining independence. This means that the armed struggle was not an end in itself, but it was only a measure to reach the desired goal – freedom and independence – when other methods appeared ineffective in specific conditions. The consent to existence of "Solidarity" expressed under coercion by the authorities of the Polish People's Republic did not exclude insurrection traditions but it established such tradition as: "the awareness of the rooted traditions of unrest and insurrections made a far-reaching psychological pressure on representatives of the imposed regime. The fear that it could be worse forced them to make concessions."[23] The afore-mentioned Warsaw Uprising also affected the Soviet management and forced it to restrain and react moderately to the August 1980 events in Poland.

Maciej Korkuć notices that the period of the first "Solidarity" witnessed the revival of insurrection traditions to which the enterprise press and regional trade union consciously referred. It was manifested by the movement's independence symbols: the crowned eagle, portraits of Marshal Józef Piłsudski, symbols of the Fighting Poland and setting the record straight on the Home Army, the Warsaw Uprising and workers' unrests in 1956 and 1970.[24] The author distinguishes two layers of the movement of "Solidarity": leadership together with circles of advisers and plebeian level. Insurrection traditions were exceptionally vivid in the grassroots trade union: " issues that frequently vanished into thin air during intellectual disputes at the upper level began to live a life of its own in the grassroots. Even if the leadership of the Trade Union pursued the self-restraint policy, millions of grassroots members were affected by the simplest references to traditions of fighting for freedom and independence."[25]

---

[22] Ibidem, p. 265.

[23] M. Korkuć, *Solidarność a polska tradycja insurekcyjna* [*Solidarność versus Polish Insurrection Tradition*] in J. Kłoczowski (ed.), *Polska Solidarności. Kontrowersje, oblicza, interpretacje*, Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, Cracow 2011, p. 184.

[24] About historical awareness of the Solidarity, see, e.g. M. Meller, *Rola myślenia o historii w ruchu Solidarność w latach 1980-1981* [The Role of Thinking about History in Solidarność movement in years 1980-1981], in *Solidarność w ruchu…*, pp. 219-266.

[25] Ibidem, p. 190.

2.2. "Solidarity" as a civil movement

Ireneusz Krzemiński is one of the first authors analysing "Solidarity" in categories of civil movement. He argues that: "a basic issue and category that recognizes – like in a lens – a key direction of social desires of "Solidarity" is an idea of civil society. Being a citizen, discovering its full sense and reforming the system of social life to be in line with it – this is, I think, the most concise description of the main trend of the activity of "Solidarity.""[26]

Civil society is a state that: "perfectly meets this need to 'feel yourself' and to feel 'at home'. 'Civil society' is based on an idea that each society member, irrespective of who this member is and how important is for the society, has the right to decide about his or her faith and to speak on all matters that refer to him or her."[27]

All citizens' equal right to participate in the public life referred to transcendent values. According to Krzemiński: "motivations of individual and collective actions concentrated not only on 'people's equality' but also on h u m a n d i g n i t y. It was the central value. The central place was occupied by a human being and human value a s a p e r s o n, id est as an entity that is morally responsible for his/her faith, and hence as a citizen. The equality of people a s m o r a l e n t i t i e s resulted from the reference of man to God."[28]

This religion-based common civil awareness caused that "Solidarity" identified with the Church, and this identification had two forms: the first one was universal and Christian-ethical, the second form was particular and national; the latter form considered the Church as a guarantor of the national culture and identity. Ireneusz Krzemiński emphasizes that this tendency is extremely manifested by a figure of a Catholic Pole, and despite being present in "Solidarity", it did not become an element that motivated the members of "Solidarity" to take common actions as the "movement" and "organization."

It does not mean, however, that the idea of civil society paved its way in the movement's conscious without hindrance. Two particular tendencies opposed this idea. One of them is a populist orientation that considers the social reform movement as the working class' exclusive work that should make the workers a leader in a new social system. Its opposite was an individualistic tendency that was popular with the intelligence for which the main goal of the movement was to primarily secure the personal freedom. Its opponent was the "tyranny of the majority," unity and cult of mediocrity. The representatives of both opinions – as argued by Krzemiński – ignored the idea of civil society as a basis for social

---

[26] I. Krzemiński, *Polska i „Solidarność" – sens ludzkiego doświadczenia* [Poland and Solidarity – a Sense of Human Experience], in idem, *Świat zakorzeniony*, Grupy Polityczne „Wola", Warsaw 1988, p. 26.

[27] I. Krzemiński, *Świat zakorzeniony* [Enrooted World], in ibidem, p. 38.

[28] I. Krzemiński, *Polska i Solidarność…*, p. 31.

order. Another division in the relationship is described by Krzemiński as "more authoritarian" and "more liberal."[29] The first one was to emphasize the need to make self-restrictions and comply with the adopted principles and rules of conduct, whereas the latter one accentuated the significance of negotiation process and its related rules of operation and conduct arising from such negotiations, and hence they were considered smoothly.[30]

Krzemiński's approach is part of static interpretations as it analyses dilemmas and phases of the "Solidarity" movement evolution. However, there may be appointed some authors who use the civil society category in a way that describes movement dynamics. Such interpretations are presented by David Ost and Andrew Arato.

David Ost points out that: "civil society referred to the public space for citizens to interact as equals on a variety of levels, not just the level of the marketplace."[31] This American sociologist refers here to Habermas' theory of the public sphere based on publicity and openness that emerged at the turn of the 19th century at the moment of birth of capitalism. Relations between civil society and capitalism were, however, ambivalent. On the one hand, this system allowed for an emergence of a wide public sphere, independent of the state, dealing with economic transactions. However, on the other hand, in the capitalist system all relations were subject to mercantilism, and this fact limited the equal participation of all entities in the public life.[32]

Ost argues that state socialism agreed on the existence of civil society controlled by the state. In socialism, the state, instead of the market mechanism, decided what social forces should be allowed to participate in the public life and what forces should be excluded. In practice, this author notices that the state monopolized the public sphere and abolished the right to free discussion.[33]

Meanwhile, the social movements that emerged in the West and East after 1968 did not back either the mercantilist or aesthetic rule for civil society organization.[34] They paved the way to "anti-political third way" that combined such movements as the Polish "Solidarity", the Green movement in Germany, the Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia, Catholic communities (base communities) in Latin America or feminist and ecological movements in the USA. The fundamental aim of those movements was to maintain free and untroubled communication.[35] It was their anti-political nature that resulted in exceeding political boundaries and, at the

[29] I. Krzemiński, *Świat zakorzeniony*, p. 42.

[30] Ibidem.

[31] D. Ost, *Solidarity and the Politics of Anti-Politics. Opposition and Reform in Poland Since 1968*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia 1990, p. 20.

[32] Ibidem, pp. 22 and 30.

[33] Ibidem, p. 30.

[34] Ibidem, p. 31.

[35] Ibidem.

same time, referring to inspirations of Hannah Arendt and Alexis de Tocqueville or Antonio Gramsci and Jűrgen Habermas. In Poland, the intellectual preparation of the solidarity movement was political thought of Jacek Kuroń and Adam Michnik.

David Ost emphasizes that the solidarity practice, particularly in the first period of the existence of the Trade Union, was a practical embodiment of "permanently open society" and it was reflected by various discussions and debates that were considered as a measure to acquire power but it was an end in itself.[36] The author divides sixteen months of "Solidarity" into three periods:

(i) from August 1980 to December 1980 "Solidarity" attempted to keep far from political issues and act as the Trade Union organization; it means that leadership of Solidarity tried to seek such a structure that would seem to be the most appropriate to fight for social democratization as part of the existing political conditions.

(ii) from December 1980 to August 1981 there arose the awareness that the declared / practiced depolitization of the movement became less and less adequate in the then social conditions of real socialism. "Solidarity" began to formulate a political programme forcing the Party to reform the state. Such political efforts resembled neo-corporatism contracts between the state and society.

(iii) from August to December 1981 "Solidarity" ceased to resist to its political involvement, increasingly realizing that the "anti-political model" of social democratization is inadequate and inconsistent. The Trade Union openly requested the conclusion of a new political agreement that would radically change the functioning of the power system. It was divided into supporters of "pluralist" and "neocorporatist" solution.[37]

In the first period of "Solidarity" the authorities implemented a strategy to restrict the scope of a new Trade Union's activity by giving strikers wage rises in exchange for ceasing to establish their own trade union organization. Moreover, communist authorities supported reorganization of old trade unions (associated in the Central Council of Trade Unions), and tried territorially restrict the applicability of the Gdansk agreement to some regions of Poland. Also, official trade unions – in order to mislead the strikers – changed their names and described themselves also as "independent" and left the Central Council of Trade Unions.[38] Although the Gdańsk Agreement was formally recognized, the authorities' obstacles to developing structures of "Solidarity" undermined the confidence of the governed to the government and led to the neocorporatist model. According to Ost: "this crisis of confidence, crippling for any government, could only be overcome, if an independent societal organization could vouch the credibility of the government."[39] Only could "Solidarity" save the isolated and non-legitimized state. The

---

[36] Ibidem.
[37] Ibidem, p. 78.
[38] Ibidem, p. 79.
[39] Ibidem, p. 110.

experienced lack of social confidence allowed the state to open the door to settle the intensifying crisis in a corporate manner. "Solidarity" would guarantee a social and political stabilization, if the state recognized the permanent presence of social independence. Democratic representatives of the society could cooperate with the state-party, if it accepted the institutionized influence of leaders of "Solidarity."[40]

David Ost, similarly as Phillip Schmitter, considers c o r p o r a t i s m as a situation in which various interests of civil society are represented in the political system and there is no need to gain power through parliamentary elections.[41] He distinguishes two models of corporatism: s o c i a l (neo-corporatism) and s t a t e. The social corporatism emerges when the grassroots force the state to recognize and legally legalize the privileged status of certain groups of interest. In the state corporatism the state gives some groups and associations of interest a corporate status. In this case, those organizations are rather "established" than "recognized" by the state on which they depend.[42] On the other hand, the selective pluralism means a spontaneous establishment of organizations representing various social interests that – through a mechanism of competitive interaction – affect the public policy.[43]

This American sociologist wonders whether in the present circumstances neo-corporatism was a much more effective instrument necessary to build democracy and civil society than pluralist. He believes that it depends on the definition of citizenship. If citizenship is only associated with election rights, then neo-corporatism together with its emphasis on realizing interests seems to restrict democracy through narrowing the citizenship principle. However, citizenship means equal political opportunities, then this dependency is reversed. Neo-corporatism may boost democracy through considering these social interests that are not systematically represented in the polyarchy system. Ost summarizes that: "by guaranteeing that certain social interests will be considered by political decision-makers, neocorporatism can be more democratic than what might be called 'actually existing pluralism,' if by democratization we understand the equalization of political opportunity and not the practice of free elections alone."[44] By the same token, neocorporatism can be far more democratic than "actually existing socialism."[45]

According to Ost, "Solidarity" unconsciously supported neocorporatism. However, to implement it, it was necessary to convince the communist mono-party and to meet at least three conditions: discipline trade union masses effectively (i), have an almost monopolistic status of the only representative of "society" (ii) and keep moderate political leadership that would reject the request of political pluralism (iii).[46]

---

[40] Ibidem.
[41] Ibidem, p. 114.
[42] Ibidem, p. 115.
[43] Ibidem, p. 117.
[44] Ibidem, p. 118.
[45] Ibidem.
[46] Ibidem, p. 120.

In the period between January and August 1981 the strategy of "Solidarity" was torn between the restitutive approach (anti-political in its meaning) and neo-corporatism (political). The mistake made by "Solidarity" was not that it attempted to conduct a neo-corporatism-based politics, but that it did it too little decisively and limited it to issues of food distribution or economy reform. The breakthrough came at the August meeting of the National Coordinating Commission held in 1981 that began to openly discuss long-term political solutions. That time the pluralist option was represented by Stefan Kurowski who demanded free elections to the Sejm, whereas the neo-corporatism option was advocated by Karol Modzelewski and Jacek Kuroń. Kuroń endorsed the establishment of the self-governing chamber of the Parliament and argued for establishing the Council of National Salvation as a political accent of the neo-corporatism solution.

From September 1981 in "Solidarity" there prevailed neo-corporatism – in the last weeks before the introduction of martial law it was manifested by a postulate to establish the Social Council for the National Economy. Following the appointment of Wojciech Jaruzelski as the 1st Secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party, the party management offered a corporative conflict solution through establishing the Front of National Accord. The recommended accord version provided that the almost-ten-million-member Trade Union would be one of the seven members of the Front. Therefore, it is not surprising that "Solidarity" refuse to further participate in negotiations. In the end, the agreement was not reached as the party introduced martial law, rejecting neo- or even corporative solution of the social conflict.

Another author who uses the category of civil society to describe "Solidarity" of the years of 1980-1981 is Andrew Arato.[47] He argues that the idea of civil society essential to understand the development of Western societies was absent in real socialism as the system of needs was eliminated by state planning, institutional pluralism was replaced with monopoly of one party, the rule of law was liquidated by the principle of substantive justice (i.e. revolutionary), and a network of public sphere was remodelled to the idea of absolute knowledge.

Two attempts preceding the outburst of "Solidarity" to reconstruct civil society in Eastern Europe appeared unsuccessful. The Hungarian uprising in 1956 was suppressed by the aggression of the Soviet Army, and the top-down reforms in Czechoslovakia provoked the intervention of the Warsaw Pact. On the other hand, Poland implemented a different strategy of reconstruction of civil society defined by the author as the grassroots imposition of structural reforms. It was developed by Polish opposition activists before 1976, and "Solidarity" was a specific realization of this political project. In this context, Arato referred to the *Tezy o nadziei i beznadziejności* (Theses about Hope and Hopelessness) by Leszek Kołakowski, *Nowy ewolucjonizm* (New Evolutionism) by Adam Michnik, and *Myśli o programie*

---

[47] A. Arato, *From Neo-Marxism to Democratic Theory. Essays on the Critical Theory of Soviet-Type Societies*, M.E. Sharpe, New York 1993.

*działania (*Thoughts About Programme of Action) by Jacek Kuroń written between 1971 and 1976.

According to Arato: "the emergence of a new type of civil society in Poland […] was characterized by several institutional innovations."[48] There were legality. pluralism, priority of collective rights over individual ones, public sphere, and democratic participation. This American sociologist argues that:

– the legality of the movement's stress on political freedoms of assembly, association, actions taken to protect one's interest (right to strike), and freedoms of speech and of press;

– priority of collective rights meant that: "individual rights and freedoms were seen as necessary presuppositions of collective rights rather than, as in the West, being tied to private property;"[49]

– pluralism principle provided for voluntary solidarity within and among the various particularistic interest groups that cooperated to one another despite having various interests and goals;

– public opinion was based on *samizdat* and development of the second publishing circulation;

– democratic participation was guaranteed by democratic planning and self-governance in factories and other spheres of social life.

In his analyses, Andrew Arato refers to the concept of Domenico Mario Nuti who noticed that the Trade Union had to simultaneously meet three roles: an opposition party forcing political concessions, a standard trade union fighting for wage rises, a social-democratic trade union requesting its participation in company management. These internal tensions finally led to the withdrawal from the trade union's formula of activity after the Bydgoszcz provocation in March 1981. According to the author, it was caused by:

– a lack of institutionalized forms of realizing interests of social and professional groups represented by the trade union;

– a lack of other forms of pressure of the authorities except for the strike effectiveness that was becoming increasingly problematic;

– a provocative politics of the power apparatus toward "Solidarity";

– internal growth in the "Solidarity" organization in connection with the deteriorating economy; especially food supplies;

– grassroots radicalization of trade union members.

The ideological evolution of the Trade Union found its counterpart in the ideological evolution of its leaders and advisors. Arato analyzes the political evolution of Jacek Kuroń who initially advocated a pure restitutive form of activity under which the Trade Union should be apolitical and represent professional interests of the world of work. Later, Kuroń concluded that the Trade Union should be one

---

[48] Ibidem, p. 215.
[49] Ibidem.

of the alternative centres of power in changing conditions. A cause of the change of Kuroń's views was his opinion that: "only rapid democratization of the Polish *society* can save the existing state structure from uncontrollable revolutionary challenge (hence disintegration followed by Soviet intervention), and that such democratization is impossible without "Solidarity" continuing to play a key political role."[50] However, such ideological transformations in the Trade Union did not happen smoothly as Arato notices that: "For a period of three months or more no new identity and political profile was crystallized. For a while, several possibilities of activities were simultaneously put forth. This was the only time when none apparently had primacy."[51] That time, the Trade Union could choose the following strategies of activity:

– depolitization of society that concentrates on cultural and educational activities modelled on the activity of the Catholic Church; this strategy would be subject to social corporatism as it would guarantee autonomy of the cultural sphere and a compromise in the cultural sphere of social life;

– social pluralism – a concept presented by some activists of the Committee of the Workers' Defence (mainly by Adam Michnik) that accepts a mono-political structure of the state and the existence of diversified civil organizations that would negotiate with the state to reach a social compromise; the course of negotiations and their results would be reviewed by the pluralist and uncensored public sphere;

– corporatism – a concept represented by Jacek Kuroń under which an agreement is concluded with the state on the basis of which the state would be responsible for foreign politics, whereas the social partner would concentrate on internal issues, particularly economy.

– parliamentary pluralism advocated by Leszek Moczulski that presupposes that free elections would deprive PZPR of its power.[52]

These strategies remained unfulfilled as the Jaruzelski regime decided to forcibly resolve the conflict through introducing martial law in December 1981.

2.3. ′Solidarity″ as a post-modernist movement

The authors of this interpretation – Wojciech Czabanowski and Błażej Skrzypulec – do not consider post-modernism as a cultural formation following modernist era, but as "a new way of thinking that may emerge in various historical moments and it does not need to be closely associated with new social phenomena."[53] A distinctive feature of this new way of thinking was to create a "little narrative." The distinction between a little and great narration is essential for them to perceive post-modernism.

---

[50] Ibidem, p. 187.

[51] Ibidem, p. 228.

[52] Ibidem, p. 193.

[53] W. Czabanowski, B. Skrzypulec, *Postmodernistyczna Solidarność* [Postmodern Solidarność], "Pressje" 11/2010, p. 18.

The authors considered the great narrative as "a general view of the world that is a source of a universal criterion used for resolving disputes."[54] Such great narrative is exemplified by Marxism. Although the authors do not define *expressis verbis* the little narrative, but it seems that it does not provide a general description of the world nor does it constitute a universal criterion used for resolving all disputes. The authors argue that "with the end of great narrations, there does not exist a criterion that could force others to agree that we are right. It does not mean, however, that we are wrong, but it means that we do not have means (what is more, we cannot have them) to prove that our position is outside the little narration."[55]

This distinction was developed by Paweł Rojek who implemented two criteria of narration division: its scope and role legitimizing the social order.[56] Considering the scope, narration may be classified into great narrations that claim the right to universal description of reality and "little narrations" that are free of such claims. The latter criterion (legitimization) divides narrations into absolute narrations that form the basis for dispute resolutions and relative that are free of this function. By crossing these two criteria, four types of narrations are obtained:

(i) great narrations: universal and absolute (e.g. Marxism and Leninism);

(ii) universal but relative narrations (the author claims that it is difficult to exemplify them);

(iii) little narrations, but absolute ones (Catholicism);

(iv) little narrations: local and relative.

Both the little narrations, i.e. local and relative, and the local but absolute ones are classified by Rojek as post-modernist. He asserts that: "the discourse of "Solidarity" was deprived of absolute elements, but as a rule it was incomplete[57]. Therefore, it could join various groups, ideas and symbols." This characteristic was supplemented by Czabanowski's and Skrzypulec's arguments that: "post-modern-ism [...] causes that each narration, even the most "funny", is considered seriously. One may support one of the small narrations and considered it as the only correct, and hence one may generate deep and authentic conflicts with people of different opinions. One may also constantly choose between several identities (e.g. solidarity narrations of a Catholic, socialist worker, social activist and involved intellectual) and change them as appropriate. The same permanence or variability of our identity may be considered as an advantage on the basis of our little narration."[58]

The author compares two documents: preamble of the Constitution of the Polish People's Republic from 1952, the Appeal of the Gdynia General Strike Committee from

---

[54] Ibidem, p. 18.

[55] Ibidem, p. 19.

[56] P. Rojek, *Solidarność: ruch republikański, katolicki czy postmodernistyczny?* [Solidarność: Republican, Catholic or Postmodern Movement], in J. Kłoczowski (ed.) *Polska Solidarności. Kontrowersje, oblicza, interpretacje*, Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, Cracow 2011, pp. 286-287.

[57] Ibidem, p. 287.

[58] W. Czabanowski, B. Skrzypulec, *Postmodernistyczna Solidarność*, p. 24.

1970 and 21 postulates of the Inter-Enterprise Strike Committee written and accepted on August 17 1980. The preamble of the Constitution includes the great narration – a basic category that arranges the description of the social order is a "scientific social-ism" term, whereas a "social progress" term legitimizes activities of new authorities.

Czabanowski and Skrzypulec emphasize the egalitarian nature of the appeal of the Gdynia General Strike Committee and 21 postulates of the Inter-Enterprise Strike Committee – the workers did not demand any free market and competition, but they requested the authorities to fulfil the rules of socialist economy. The workers' postulates dated August 1980, particularly points 1-5, are of a different nature: "although […] these are only demands to fulfil declarations set forth in the Constitution of the Polish People's Republic, they refer to issues different than purely economic ones. These are rights that allow the workers to freely narrate."[59] According to the authors: "post-modernist nature of "Solidarity" is impressive here. The grassroots, decentralized and spontaneous movement requests the modernist authorities to actually meet their promises and build true. Therefore, the working class – a constitutional cornerstone of the system – is to deconstruct the system through requesting its realization. Obviously, it is impossible since the consistent implementation of the freedom of speech and printing would result in the failure of the post-modernist narration of the Polish People's Republic, and the real and complete introduction of socialist economy in such a poor country would be an economic disaster leading to the regime collapse."[60] The post-modernist nature of "Solidarity" was also manifested by aesthetics of "Solidarity" comprising various symbols. This thesis was proved by decoration of the OHS Hall at the Gdańsk Shipyard, in which a Lenin statute was placed next to a crucifix, national symbols and other accessories.

This afore-mention interpretation may, however, give rise to many doubts – both a way of perceiving post-modernism by the authors and the utility and the way of using this category to interpret "Solidarity." Although, here, it is not worthwhile disputing the post-modernism definition, but it seems that the limitation of dis-tinctive features to little narration and resignation from the functions that legiti-mizes the social order is too narrow[61]. Even if we agree with such perception of

---

[59] Ibidem, p. 22.

[60] Ibidem.

[61] It is here worth mentioning the characteristics of Chris Lorenz who argues that this intel-lectual formation has three characteristics: anti-reductionism combined with anti-unitarianism and anti-objectivism. The first two characteristics lead to the distrust of any meta-narration of history and reject the possibility to reduce pluralism occurring in history to unity. On the other hand, anti-objectivity rejects the existence of reality independent from its symbolical (especially language) representation. This author argues that those trends occurred independently as early as modernistic thought, and only their post-modernistic combination is original. Ch. Lorenz, *You got your history, I got mine. Some reflections on truth and objectivity in history*, "Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften" 10/1999, pp. 563-584; about history and philosophical interpretation of post-modernism, see also: L. Nowak, *On Postmodernist Philosophy: An Attempt*

post-modernism, it is necessary to ask what the implementation of this category brings to understanding the phenomenon of "Solidarity." It seems that not too much. Ideological eclecticism – evaluated differently – was perceived by many authors writing about "Solidarity."[62]

This is quite unfortunate to compare two incomparable documents: the Constitution of the Polish People's Republic dated 1957 and strike postulates. The Constitution was prepared by the Constitution Committee established in 1952, but works on its draft lasted since at least 1949 (the first draft of the Constitution discussed by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party was made in October 1950). In those legislative works the totalitarian communist authorities had access to complaisant professionals and experts (but last amendments were made by Stalin himself). On the other hand, strike postulates was a spontaneous record of common awareness of movement participants at the moment of the protest. It would be better to compare the Constitution and the Programme of the Independent Self-Governing Trade Union "Solidarity" adopted at the 1st National Convention of Delegates. Paweł Rojek argues that "Solidarity" did not develop a new project but it deconstructed the old one. It did not provide a new great narration but it appeared on behalf of small tales. In this sense, it may reasonably be said that "Solidarity" was a post-modernist movement."[63]

It is unknown how Rojek understands the "little narration" notion. If we carefully read through the Trade Union's programme documents adopted at the 1st National Convention of Delegates, we notice that such documents interpret the post-war history of Poland, refer to one thousand years of Polish nation's history and European heritage, and the "Message to the Working People of Eastern Europe" is addressed to all the societies of the Eastern Bloc. Therefore, it seems that the range of solidarity narration was not so small.

2.4. "Solidarity" as a religious and moral movement

The phenomenon of religiousness of the Polish protest was numerously discussed by Western and national authors. The Catholic religiousness present in "Solidarity"

---

to Identify its Historical Sense, in S.-E. Liedman (ed.), *The Postmodernist Critique of the Project of Enlightenment, Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities*, vol. 58, Rodopi, Amsterdam – Atlanta 1997.

[62] E.g.: L. Nowak, *Cena braku perspektywy* [The Prize of the Lack of Perspective, 1981], in idem, *Polska droga od socjalizmu. Pisma polityczne 1980-1989*, ed. K. Brzechczyn, IPN, Poznań 2011, p. 250; T.G. Ash, *The Polish Revolution. Solidarity*, Jonathan Cape, London, 1983, p. 307; Z. Krasnodębski, *Demokracja peryferii* [Democracy of Peryphery], Słowo/obraz terytoria, Gdańsk 2003, in particular the chapter entitled: "Idee polityczne Solidarności."

[63] P. Rojek, *Postmodernizm, katolicyzm, Solidarność* [Postmodernizm, Catholicism, Solidarność] "Pressje" 21/2010, p. 8.

was responsible for initiating independent social ties,[64] acted as a public religion defining civil society at the meta-political and ethical level[65] or was an organizational model.[66] This article discusses the last two ways to comprehend religiousness.

Dariusz Karłowicz describes the phenomenon of "Solidarity" in categories of the Church through referring to the Greek meaning of this term. The Greek word "*eklesia*" means an assembly of all citizens of an ancient *polis*. Therefore, the Catholic Church was to serve as a model of political community for "Solidarity." According to Karłowicz, this makes it possible to talk even about ecclesiology of "Solidarity" that describes such aspects of the movement as:

– spiritual unity – a counterpart of the unity of the entire "society" in confrontation with "authorities" strengthened by a dualist view of the social world (division into „we" and "they") in the religious vision of the world is a division of people into saved and damned;

– conversion - joining "Solidarity" was a para-religious act that resulted in breaking hypocrisy and committing to live in the truth and dignity;

– axiology – the movement was not axiologically minimalist, and a group of values was widely developed together with solidarity and related virtues at the forefront.[67]

The author positively assesses the fact that the Catholic Church was to be an organizational model for "Solidarity": "Is it anything strange in the fact that spontaneously creating "Solidarity" became similar to the Church in terms of many essential issues. Could it be otherwise? Did not generation raised behind the Iron Curtain consider the Church as the only well-known model of the free public forum not controlled by the party? For most of the subsequent members of the Trade Union the only experimentally available area of freedom in relations that go beyond boundaries of family and Church was the world that starts behind the walls of parish. It was the Church where the communication community endured and was recreated."[68]

The interpretation of "Solidarity" in categories of messianism is advocated by Krzysztof Małysa. In this interpretation messianism was similar to the Catholic religion, legitimizing the public sphere. This author admits the following basic determinants of messianism: "the conviction about an alternative model of the

---

[64] M. Osa, *Creating Solidarity: The Religious Foundation of the Polish Social Movement*, "East European Politics and Societies" 2/1997, pp. 245-247.

[65] Z. Stawrowski, *Doświadczenie "Solidarności" jako wspólnoty etycznej*, in D. Gawin (ed.), *Lekcja Sierpnia. Dziedzictwo "Solidarności" po dwudziestu latach* [The Legacy of Solidarność after 20 Years], Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN, Warsaw 2002, pp. 103-122; see also: K. Brzechczyn, *Religijne wymiary solidarnościowej myśli społecznej w latach 1980-1981* [Religious Dimensions of Social Thought of Solidarność], "Przegląd Religioznawczy" 1/2011, pp. 189-199.

[66] D. Karłowicz, *"Solidarność" jako Kościół* [Solidarność as the Church], in D. Gawin (ed.), *Lekcja Sierpnia. Dziedzictwo "Solidarności" po dwudziestu latach*…, pp. 39-62.

[67] Ibidem, pp. 43-46.

[68] Ibidem, p. 47.

perception of the existing world, possibilities to make changes, and finally about the mission of nations or entities, or possibly about the existence of a charismatic entity that will affect the development of a new reality, and messianism may refer to these notions and values that arise from the acceptance of the idea of the national mission."[69] Such messianism that emerged in the Polish culture in the 19th century considerably evolved in the late 19th century. That time, Poland ceased to be perceived as Christ of nations, and the messianism notion was used to describe the key role of nation, to make politics moral and ethical.

Therefore, the usefulness of the reference to the romantic and messianistic tradition in the interpretation of the phenomenon of "Solidarity" is determined, according to the author, by the situational pathos that causes that there naturally referred to the language of moral values and romantic perception of the national community. Hence, this is a source of popularity for romantic literature – declamation of the *Księgi narodu i pielgrzymstwa polskiego* (The Books of the Polish Nation and the Polish Pilgrimage) by theatre actors during the strike at the Gdańsk Shipyard. It was accompanied by renaissance of Catholicism manifested in the public sphere in settings of ceremonies and decorations of striking enterprises (displaying portraits of the Lady, pope John Paul II and cardinal Stefan Wyszyński). An essential element was Lech Wałęsa who, in a sense, consciously referred to the romantic tradition of national uprisings and was anointed by collective waiting for a providential man and the conviction about the exceptional role of Poland and "Solidarity." According to the author: "these episodes from the years 1980-1981, emphasis of tradition of uprisings, presence of a charismatic leader – "man of destiny," idea of national solidarity with developed patriotic phraseology, strong feeling of indestructibility of the movement may suggest relations to this trend" [romantic and messianistic tradition – K.B.].[70] According to the author the political messianism was also proved by the "Message to the Working People of Eastern Europe" adopted at the 1st National Convention of Delegates that referred to the idea of fight for "our freedom and yours."[71]

The discussed concepts usually omit a sociological measurement of the institution of the Church – the influence of earthly interests and goals on the conduct of hierarchy and Catholic priests and, in return, they stress the spiritual mission of the Church. This causes that the aforesaid analyses are of a static nature and they do not show dynamics and ideological dilemmas of the movement through describing it from a certain overall perspective. However, "Solidarity" may be considered in categories of the religious and moral movement in a completely different way. A sample of such analysis was presented by Andrew Arato who

---

[69] K. Małysa, *Solidarność – ostatni wielki ruch mesjanistyczny* [Solidarność – the Last Great Mesianistic Movement], in W. Polak, P. Ruchlewski, V. Kmiecik, J. Kufel (eds.) *Czas przełomu. Solidarność 1980-1981*, ECS, Gdańsk 2010, p. 81.

[70] Ibidem, p. 85.

[71] Ibidem, p. 88.

distinguished three variants of politics which the Church in Poland could conduct in 1981. They were as follows:

(i) acceptance of the acquired unprecedented religious freedom at the cost of political passiveness;

(ii) authoritarian solution that consists in reaching an agreement with the authorities and granting them national and catholic – ideological legitimization;

(iii) refusal to conclude a separatist agreement with the authorities and support for social pluralism which entails separating the Church from the state and ensuring autonomy to the society.[72]

According to the author the choice of each of these strategies is affected by profit and loss statement of the church hierarchy. The consequent development of this mode of analysis could lead to a dynamic interpretation of "Solidarity" and the social – political thought of the movement.

2.5. "Solidarity" as a republican movement

The supporters of the interpretation of "Solidarity" in the spirit of the republican tradition notice in "Solidarity" the renewal of civil society that was considered differently than in the liberal tradition. Dariusz Gawin proves that the republican: "considers the civil life as an ethical ideal", and this causes that the successful civil life depends on a certain catalogue of virtues. They consists of a common reflection, debates and actions for the common good.[73] Gawin inspired by the reflexion of Hannah Arendt notices that: "if […] we agree that the exceptional sensation of "public happiness", a sensation arising when free citizens constitute political freedom, and hence they establish a political community, then we are able to observe in the Gdańsk Shipyard pathos accompanying the republican spirit since the beginning of the Western civilization. The spirit of the civil activity, the same spirit that previously hit Athens, Rome, Philadelphia and Paris, revealed its power in Gdańsk in the summer of 1981."[74]

---

[72] A. Arato, *From Neo-Marxism…*, pp. 195-200.

[73] D. Gawin, *Sierpień 1980 w świetle tradycji republikańskiej* [August'80 in the light of Republican Tradition], in A. Sułek (ed.), *Solidarność. Wydarzenie, konsekwencje…*, p. 48; B. Świderski, *Gdańsk and Ateny. O demokracji bezpośredniej w Polsce*, IFiS PAN, Warszawa 1996. On social ontology and notion of fredom in republicanism, see R.P. Wierzchosławski, *Filozofia społeczna i problem wspólnotowości: o pożytkach płynących z rozważań na temat ontologii społecznej dla filozofii politycznej* [Social Philosophy and the Problem of Community: on Benefits from Social Ontology for Political Philosophy), in M.N. Jakubowski, A. Szahaj, K. Abriszewski (eds.), *Indywidualizm, wspólnotowość, polityka*, Wydawnictwo UMK, Toruń 2002, pp. 81-108; R.P. Wierzchosławski, *Czy ingerencja wyklucza wolność? Wokół republikańskiego ujęcia libertas* [Does Intervention Exclude Fredom? Aroun Republican Approach to Libertas], in J. Miklaszewska (ed.), *Liberalizm u schyłku XX wieku*, Meritum, Cracow 1999, pp. 283-317.

[74] D. Gawin, *Sierpień 1980…*, pp. 50-51.

The republican tradition is for Gawin a key in the interpretation of the "Solidarity" of the years 1980-1981. He argues that a prototype of the civil community in August 1980 was the Gdańsk Shipyard. An average plant was a polis, and "Solidarity" was a confederation – a symmachia of individual *poleis*. According to the author: "The strike of "Solidarity" – as the August formula – included in itself such understanding of the common activity. Specific teams, individual "factories" exceeded the horizon of their own particularity through creating a universal political platform. During a strike the "case" did not refer to the particular interest of individuals or specific factories, but rather – as asserted by one of strikers – the case was to strive to "change the form of our life."[75] The condition for constituting the civil community was the notion of equity and dignity of all of its members. The tool for the operation and maintenance of the civil community was a public debate which was a factor that democratized the Polish society. Therefore, the Poles could better know and trust one another: "Speeches, a common debate, finding of relevant words and arguments in a reasonable time create [...] public space and allow one's to construct a free and authentic community of participation."[76] And that created demand for knowledge about the past that was censored by the authorities of the Polish People's Republic.[77] Gowin also reinterprets the explosion of Polish religiousness. The public expression of religious feelings sacralised and somehow legitimized public space and that time Catholicism was a civil religion.

What constitutes the strength of such civil community is at the same time a source of its weakness as it is impossible to constantly sustain the civil mobilization. Thus, it is difficult to institutionalize the "republican spirit." Dariusz Gawin claims that: "a republic tradition is not, therefore, a real project, but it is rather a normative utopia, measurement that may refer to social and political reality and may be used to analyse it in a critical way. By paraphrasing Arendt who mentioned the lost treasure of that tradition, this treasure is constantly regained and lost until the next flash, historical manifestation of primary and pure politics."[78]

Another author who interprets public philosophy of "Solidarity" in the republican spirit is Elżbieta Ciżewska who argues that: "public philosophy […] is common and public believes why a given way the society is arranged or functions is recognized as desired and proper, why a certain political community is trusted by us and we are ready to make it sustainable."[79] Hence, public philosophy is to be of a common sense and practical nature, and this fact differs it from a political philosophy focused on universal problems. The political philosophy is inherently of

---

[75] Ibidem, pp. 55-56.
[76] Ibidem, p. 70.
[77] Ibidem, p. 63.
[78] Ibidem, p. 73.
[79] E. Ciżewska, *Socjologia Solidarności jako filozofia publiczna* [Sociology of Solidarność as a Public Philosophy], in Jan Kłoczowski (ed.), *Polska Solidarności. Kontrowersje, oblicza, interpretacje*, Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, Cracow 2011, p. 245.

a particular nature and it may be created by each sufficiently long existing society. According to the author it justifies a thesis about the existence of public philosophy of "Solidarity" characterized by the following features:

– moralism – it was subject to the conviction that political as well as social and economic problems may be solved at the level of individual morality; in the solidarity thinking special attention was drawn to human dignity deriving from transcendent values.

– intuitiveness – values were "read" or actually discovered while recognizing their objective nature; they might be discovered by everyone who wished to use their own conscience;

– eclectism – a consequence of intuitive cognition was to be the movement's programme eclectism expressed by the combination of various intellectual traditions;

– aideology – the movement benefiting from numerous ideological inspirations did not finally choose nor did it manage to reach any of them.

The fundamental elements of public philosophy of "Solidarity" were human dignity, freedom, justice, law and order, equality and solidarity.[80] Freedom was considered as personal autonomy of an individual resulting from their dignity. Such freedom made people assume responsibility for their faith and faith of others, and hence it inspired to strive for self-governance and to act for common good. This involved ensuring the sense of security that led to questions about the scope of social and economic justice.

Another element of public philosophy of "Solidarity" was law and order legally ensured fundamental freedoms, most notably freedom of speech and printing. The right was perceived as a condition necessary to secure freedom, not as its threat. Therefore, Elżbieta Ciżewska proves that anarcho-syndicalist ideas did not have any prospect for dissemination despite their presence in "Solidarity." Equality in the thinking of "Solidarity" was recognized as equality before the law, abolition of privileges, and principle of equal start. The author asserts that: "the trade unionists did not consider equality as a material one, as economic postulates, even though they are enormously important, were prioritized lower than cultural and political issues."[81]

In comparison with the previous formulations of David Ost and Andrew Arato, the republic interpretation of "Solidarity" is statical as it omits internal ideological dilemmas of the trade union and the problem of the selection of an adequate activity strategy in the totalitarian surrounding.

---

[80] E. Ciżewska, *Filozofia publiczna Solidarności*, p. 324.
[81] E. Ciżewska, *Socjologia Solidarności…*, p. 257.

2.6. "Solidarity" as a revolutionary movement

One of the first authors who analysed "Solidarity" in terms of the category of the revolutionary movement was Jadwiga Staniszkis. She implemented a term of self--limiting revolution that became one of the classic descriptions of the events in the years 1980-1981. Even those authors who sceptically referred to the term itself notice that this oxymoron is useful to describe "Solidarity." Sergiusz Kowalski notices that: "Solidarity" was a revolution, but it was the most special of any previous ones: it did not use any violence; it renounced its intention to topple the existing authorities; it did not have any eschatological dreams of a specific revolutionary grade; it was a trade union, the power of which, unprecedented in the history of trade movement, meant the actual dual power in the country; it was a social movement, but extremely extensive, the range of which covered almost all aspects of collective life; it was an organization that was permanently destabilized and uncertain of tomorrow. Having a bit of everything it did not have one full element."[82]

Jadwiga Staniszkis distinguished three development phases of the movement: its institutionalization (September 1980 – March 1981), crisis of identity (March – July 1981) and seeking of a social movement formula (July – December 1981).[83] In the initial period the radical wave of protests was forced into the narrow corset of the trade union formula. It resulted in the following tensions and crises of the Trade Union. The most important crisis was described by the author as the crisis of identity that was a contradiction between the Trade Union's power to block the authorities' decisions and a lack of decisive instruments. The authors distinguishes three measurements of this crisis. Firstly, the limited revolution of "Solidarity" was unable to change the structure of economy based on the state ownership of production means, and the existence of the Trade Union itself strengthened the central control of economy that was responsible for the economic crisis. Secondly, following initial successes in building the organization, the autumn and early winter of 1981 witnessed a deadlock in the Trade Union's activity. "Solidarity" – limited in its activity by the approved Trade Union's formula – could not openly involve in the activity that might be defined by the other party as "political." This deadlock was deepened through the internal centralization of the movement forced, among others, by the mode of negotiations that were carried out in offices, not publicly. Thirdly, the crisis of the effectiveness of the Trade Union's activity resulted from the passive observance of the authorities and effective protests against them, but without the possibility to take positive actions that would relate to the assumption of responsibility for the state of economy.

---

[82] S. Kowalski, *Krytyka solidarnościowego rozumu. Studium z socjologii myślenia potocznego* [The Critque of Solidarność's Mind], Wydawnictwo Pen, Warsaw 1990, p. 17.

[83] J. Staniszkis, *Samoograniczająca się rewolucja* [*Self-Limited Revolution*], ECS, Gdańsk [1983] 2010, p. 36.

The understanding of this crisis of identity, that is the necessity to simultaneously play various social roles by the central authorities of "Solidarity" causes that at the turn of July and August, 1981 there emerged the third phase of the movement. The trade union formula was considered too narrow and "Solidarity" began to refer to itself as a social movement. And this led to the manifestation of two types of mentality:[84] "The first of them was a pragmatic orientation rooted in the tactics of the institutional revolution, effective but conducted at the expense of the avoidance of fundamental issues. The second type was a fundamentalist approach that may be described as moralist. All these declarations were accepted in good faith and practically the dissonance between them and a real activity was not tolerated."[85] The pragmatic mentality was popular with the Trade Union's advisors and experts, whereas fundamentalist one - among the Trade Union's grassroots. This mentality was characterized by ahistoricism, moralizing that perceived the world black and white and believed that it was enough to be right to win, and by instrumental treatment of law. According to Staniszkis "Solidarity" was dominated by the status orientation that leads to the personalization of politics and the lack of an interest in establishing protections against corruption and lawlessness of the political authorities. Consequently: "the movement's mentality in connection with the afore-mentioned characteristics of its formula constitute a special mirror image of PZPR's mentality with its small tolerance for internal conflicts and large areas of silence resulting from the erosion and ritualization of ideology […] Consequences of such fundamentalism are similar for both movements: tendency to polarize social powers, personification of politics, contempt for formal rules in the name of invoking substantial legality based on the common sense of justice."[86]

Another author that applies the category of revolution to "Solidarity" is Roman Laba who emphasizes the working character of "Solidarity," and at the same time argues over the thesis that the postulate for establishing independent trade unions was implemented by the intellectuals of the Committee of the Workers' Defence. The author notices that three issues were necessary to establish "Solidarity": a sit-down strike, territorial structure of founding committees of new trade unions and establishment of the national structure.[87]

The author proves that the idea of the sit-in strike named the Italian strike appealed in Poland in the 1920s. This type of strike became popular in Poland in the years 1931-1933, and in 1936 this strike was adopted in France (named as the Polish strike). In Poland of the Stalinist period any attempts of the sit-in strike were

---

[84] Staniszkis applies the "mentality" term as "a synonym of a special structure of cognitive forms and reasoning models oriented towards actions and having emotional content." Ibidem, p. 161.

[85] Ibidem, pp. 41-42.

[86] Ibidem, p. 138.

[87] R. Laba, *The Roots of Solidarity. A Political Sociology of Poland's Working Class Democratization*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1991, p. 112.

cruelly, suppressed by the authorities, and hence it was forgotten. The first worker's protest that initiated the exit from the Stalinist era held in Poznań in a form of street demonstrations.[88] The birth of "Solidarity," according to Laba, was a result of the social learning under a collective historical experience that led to the belief that in condition of real socialism the most effective weapon was the sit-in strike. In this process of social learning the crucial role was played by historical memory about the November and January uprisings, mentions about the Warsaw uprising, experiences of the defeat of the Hungarian revolution in 1956 and the reform movement in 1968 in Czechoslovakia, as well as conclusions from the Polish months: June 1956, March 1968, December 1970, and June 1976.[89]

Laba argues over the thesis that the 1970s preceding the establishment of "Solidarity" witnessed the evolution of the workers' postulates: from economic to political. This evolution was to be performed through intellectual activities of opposition and the Catholic Church that raised awareness of the working-class masses.[90] His analysis of the workers' postulates made during the strikes in 1970 on the Baltic Coast, 1971 in Szczecin and in 1980 in Poland proves that the demand to establish free trade unions emerged as early as 1970.[91] The little role of the organized opposition and the Church to aware the working-class masses is exemplified by Lublin where the opposition was active and the Catholic University of Lublin existed. Despite this fact during the strikes in July 1980 this city did not see the postulate to establish free trade unions.

Laba proves that "Solidarity" faced a synthesis of two movements: insurrection-national that referred to symbols and communication code of the movement and democratic socialist tradition that shapes the movement's goals and intentions: defend the weak, fight against exploitation and injustice, and strive for participating equality and democracy.[92] The crucial aim of "Solidarity" was the fight against injustice and unreasonable privileges of party and state apparatus. The Polish workers defined justice as the state of equality where each person earns more or less the same amount, as each person has more or less the same needs.[93] The author comments it as follows: "as the socialist regime threatened basic needs of food and shelter, it stimulated the most egalitarian sentiment of justice. It may be that these sentiments applied only to moments of stress and crisis, when everyone was asked to sacrifice for the common good."[94]

The "anti-intellectual" attitude of Laba causes that he omits more sophisticated forms of learning in the revolutionary process such as formulation of programmes

---

[88] Ibidem, p. 102.
[89] Ibidem, pp. 169-170.
[90] Ibidem, p. 173.
[91] Ibidem, pp. 155-161.
[92] Ibidem, p. 128.
[93] Ibidem, p. 165.
[94] Ibidem.

and ideological discussion. Consequently, he omits the role of intellectuals who
are consultants and experts in the Trade Union since for the workers "the mono-
lithic state-entrepreneur began to be considered by its workers as institution and
ideology."[95] Therefore, the workers' postulates were to be a simple reverse of the
system against which they fought: in lieu of nomenclature and privileges they
postulated the introduction of equality in lieu of hierarchical pillars of control – the
most decentralised form of democracy. Thus, if we can speak at all of any one's
tutorial influence, it was not the opposition's influence, and the Leninist state: "if
there was any role for a teacher in this school of life […], so it may be empathet-
ically suggested that the teacher was not the Polish Church or the opposition, but
the Leninist state."[96] The author writes about learning on the basis of historical
experience that may be identified with learning through trial and error. However,
the period of learning mainly applies to the period of 1956-1980 and consists in
working out an optimal fight method, i.e. the sit-in strike.

By comparing both concepts it may be noticed that Staniszkis' concept is dy-
namic, whereas Laba's one is static. Staniszkis identifies programme dilemmas of
"Solidarity" and presents phases of the movement's evolution. On the other hand,
Laba's concept is of a static nature. This American sociologist claims that the Pol-
ish workers properly understood the essence of the system and applied adequate
methods of fight against it. Therefore, the author omits the role of intellectuals and
advisors of the Trade Unions within the period of sixteen months of "Solidarity."
Laba does not also make reference to the leadership's increasing awareness of wear-
ing a basic tool used to fight against the system, i.e. the sit-in strike or dilemmas
about the restitutive economy co-management functions conducted at the same
time. This causes that the presented concept does not refer to the Trade Union's
programme evolution and dilemmas about choosing an adequate strategy of activity.

2.7. "Solidarity" as a social movement

The category of the social movement with respect to "Solidarity" is easily used
as the Trade Union's programme documents applied this term to describe itself.
Obviously, this notion was applied differently than in the Western sociology where
the theory of new social movements was born in the 1970s and in the 1980s it gained
recognition and significance. The Western sociology defines new social movements
as social movements established in Western societies after 1984. Donatella Della
Porta and Mario Diani assert that participants of social movements as a party to the
conflict with an explicitly defined opponent, they are part of an informal network
of connections and they have a separate collective identity.[97] Characteristic featu-

---

[95] Ibidem, p. 180.
[96] Ibidem.
[97] D. Della Porta, M. Diani, *Ruchy społeczne. Wprowadzenie* [Social Movements.
Introduction], Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Cracow 2009, pp. 23-26.

res of new social movements should go beyond a narrow formula of politics and to achieve such non-economic goals such as recognition, equality before women, sexual and cultural minorities, peace, and environmental protection.[98] The class origin is not a criterion, nor a basis for the participation in new social movements. Their fundamental adhesive is a community of the achieved goals, not a hierarchical organizational structure, but they have a loose network-based organizational structure. It allows the organization of protests in a way that goes beyond traditional protest actions (strikes and demonstrations).[99]

With reference to "Solidarity" a pioneer in applying this category was Alain Touraine who together with a team of Polish colleagues conducted in Poland in 1980-1981 field studies as part of the so-called intervention sociology. This French sociologist distinquished in the programme and activity of "Solidarity" three spheres: social, political and national. These three domains of "Solidarity" resulted from a nature of real socialism where: "party-state is simultaneously the master of political life and employer of almost all the employed, and it is subordinated to the central authority of the empire."[100]

The programme of "Solidarity" shows the tendency to defend workers' interests and the programme to free the society from the pressure of totalitarian surrounding. The author distinguishes the following key programme options inside "Solidarity":

(i) defensive and communal option that defends economic interests of a claim nature and settles immediate professional problems;

(ii) defensive and reformist option that strives to defend the workers' economic interests and to reform economy;

(iii) communal and defensive option that frees the society from the totalitarian authorities and proclaims populist and nationalistic slogans;

(iv) reformist option that gradually creates inside the system rational institutions that would guarantee the internal democracy and rationalization of the management process.[101]

Alain Touraine distinguishes three stages in the evolution of "Solidarity": "The fight for liberating the society is at first aimed at ensuring the existence of an independent trade union, then it covers problems concerning the company and the

---

[98] The approach of new social movements in categories of non-Marxian historical materialism, see L. Nowak, *Efekt kresowy w procesie historycznym* [The Margin Effect in the Historical Process], in L. Nowak, P. Przybysz (eds.), *Marksizm, liberalizm, próby wyjścia*, Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka. Poznań 1997, pp. 307-319.

[99] I use the following studies published in Polish: D. Della Porta , M. Diani, *Ruchy społeczne…*, S. Wróbel (ed.), *Teoretyczne problemy ruchów społecznych i politycznych* [Theoretical Problems of the Social and Political Movements], Wydawnictwo Grado, Toruń 2011, K. Gorlach, P.H. Mooney (eds.), *Dynamika życia społecznego. Współczesne koncepcje ruchów społecznych* [Dynamics of Social Life. Modern Conceptions of Social Movements], Scholar, Warsaw 2008,

[100] A. Touraine, J. Strzelecki, F. Dubet, M. Wieviorka, *Solidarność. Analiza ruchu społecznego 1980-1981*, Europejskie Centrum Solidarności, Gdańsk [1982] 2010, p. 80.

[101] Ibidem, pp. 107-108.

entire economic activities and finally it enters the sphere of political activities in the exact meaning of this word, and thus it creates more and more global conditions for defending trade union freedoms."[102] According to this French sociologist the breakthrough was held in the summer of 1981. Since then it may be noticed the explicit dividedness in the activity of "Solidarity." The activities of the national level increasingly engage in the political activity, whereas the activists of enterprise commissions concentrate on the trade union activity. It is associated with the gradual demobilization of the Trade Union's grassroots activists together with the top activism, but mainly the Trade Union's leaderships of a political nature.

The example of the use of the social movement category to analyse "Solidarity" may also be Maryjane Osa's research.[103] This author argues that the emergence of the social movement depends on three factors: political opportunities, creation of the organizational network and establishment of cultural interpretation frameworks that allows one's to understand the movement participants' actions. Crucial for the development of the social movement is, however, the earlier establishment of a social activity network that creates alternative information circulation channels, forms a basis for gathering and distributing resources, reduces any risk of repression for opposition activity, and enhances the social solidarity, contributing to creating the collective identity.[104] Osa argues that the earlier establishment of the social activity network is a condition necessary to create the "civil society."[105]

The author analyses the creation of social co-existence networks in the years 1956-1970. They comprised the milieu of Catholic activists who published "Tygodnik Powszechny," "Znak" and "Więź" and the activists of the Catholic Intelligentsia Clubs from five cities. According to the author other independent social networks consist of the the revisionist milieu at Warsaw University, the group of "Tatra mountaineers" and the conspired "Ruch" organization. The "Catholic" network was characterized by the greatest stability and consistency. Three subsequent networks were of an island-based nature and were disintegrated under the influence of the authorities' repression. Osa argues that these networks were of an island nature, they did not cooperate with one another and they occasionally contacted one another, if at all.

The networks of informal links developed in the years 1976-1980 were different. Primarily, this network characterized by increasing expansiveness. Secondly,

---

[102] Ibidem, pp. 146-147.

[103] The use of this category to make research on "Solidarność", refer to the overview article: A. Mielczarek, *Ruch „Solidarności" w świetle teorii ruchów społecznych* [Solidarność Movement in the light of the Theory of Social Movements], in K. Ciechomska-Kulesza, R. Kossakowski, P. Łuczeczko (eds.) *Kultura Solidarności. Socjologiczno-antropologiczne analizy kulturowego dziedzictwa "Solidarności"*, Orbis Exterior, Pszczółki 2011, pp. 107-132.

[104] M. Osa, *Sieci opozycji w PRL* [Opposition networks in PRL], in *Dynamika życia społecznego. Współczesne koncepcje ruchów społecznych…*, p. 216.

[105] Ibidem, p. 217.

the key role was played by the civil sector comprising such organizations as the Committee of the Workers' Defence, the Movement for the Defence of Human and Civil Rights, and the Society for Academic Courses that conditioned the cooperation among various nexuses of the network and affected its non-inclusive nature.

The further part of the author's analysis differentiates the "main interpretation framework" and the "collective activity interpretation frameworks." According to the adopted definition, the main interpretation frameworks: "are of a general nature, they are a paradigm and they establish a symbolic and essential universe, inside which the conflict is organized around certain plots."[106] They facilitate the internal communication and form the basis for developing a common identity of the protest participants. On the other hand, the interpretative frameworks for collective activity are reifying and heuristic developments of the symbols occurring within the main interpretative frameworks. These developments are adapted to the particular social situation and specific group of addresses. Osa asserts that the main interpretation frameworks used to interpret social protests in the Polish People's Republic were developed in the 1960s by Stefan Cardinal Wyszyński. During the preparation of the Great Novena, cardinal Wyszyński developed the theology of nation comprising messianism of the romanticists and realism of the national democracy. Wyszyński considered the nation as a supra-individual entity characterized by common ethical, cultural and religious features. The last included Catholicism that was identified with Polishness. According to Osa, it was a confrontational paradigm because: "a supportive nation with a national historical and religious tradition, the main symbol of which is the Black Madonna and the key defender is the Church[107] was contrasted with "the atheistic and artificial (deprived of tradition) communist state."[108] However, the Primate did not confront the communist state in the field of politics or economy, but he did it in culture. The cited author asserts that: "by giving "politics" back to communists, the Church wanted to maintain its control over private life, most notably over the family, individual morality, parenting and religious education. The Church also wished to comment the public life from the outside as a voice of morality."[109]

These of frameworks of cultural interpretations were a source of a conceptional and symbolic structure for the "Solidarity" of the years 1980-1981. It was manifested by decorations of gates of striking enterprises: the gates were decorated with crucifixes, religious pictures, flowers, and portraits of the Pope and Primate, as well as masses were celebrated in enterprises. The discourse of "Solidarity" also

---

[106] M. Osa, *Stwarzanie Solidarności. Religijne podstawy ruchu społecznego* [The Creating of Solidarność. Religious Foundations of Social Movement], "Pressje" 21/2010, p. 101; on discourse of Solidarity see also: P. Rojek, *Semiotyka Solidarności. Analiza dyskursów PZPR i NSZZ Solidarność w 1981 roku* [Semiotics of Solidarność. An Analysis of Solidarność and PZPR's Discourses], Nomos, Cracow 2009.

[107] M. Osa, *Stwarzanie Solidarności…*, p. 104.

[108] Ibidem.

[109] Ibidem.

referred to the main interpretative frameworks developed by Stefan Wyszyński: "the Baltic Coast workers' demands for decent working conditions were accompanied by symbols referring to the entire nation, not only to the factory workers or party leaders. Semiotics of "Solidarity" associated the movement with the Polish mythology and symbols of the Great Novena: The Black Madonna, exhausted Christ, and Christian nation.[110] The universality of the main interpretative framework was useful for social mobilization. However – as Osa notes – it was difficult to translate it into the collective activity interpretative frameworks that would provide a specific and feasible strategy of conduct in certain social-economic and social-political conditions. The main interpretative framework hindered such development, inducing activities that go beyond the reached August agreements and obstructed the movement instutionalisation. Osa argues that such state of affairs was caused by religious contents of the main interpretative framework that facilitated the social mobilization in 1980, but later they hindered "the movement from going beyond the scope of symbolic politics."[111]

2.8. "Solidarity" as a Movement of Ethical Revival

In Krzysztof Mazur's approach, the Independent Self-governing Trade Union "Solidarity" was primarily a movement of ethical revival or, as Marcin Król called it, an existential revolution. Mazur distinguishes three levels of the ideological thinking of Solidarity. The first, deepest one, consisted of a set of ideological principles which were accepted by all members of the movement and determined the ideal political order. Mazur claims that the core of the movement was "rediscovery of human dignity – every human being's inalienable value and desire, which stems from human nature, to live in accordance with moral principles."[112] Apart from human dignity, which is realized in many communities (family, nation), those fundamentals included: recognizing universal human rights, accepting Christian moral values, transcending the opposition between the individual and the community, making the nation and national bonds – defined on the basis of its cultural aspect – the foundation for the political and social community, and appreciating the social role of the Catholic church.[113]

Below the fundamentals, "there was the level of concrete postulates of the Union, which were an attempt to implement those ideas in a particular social and political reality."[114] In 1980-1981, the assumed ideological fundamentals were

---

[110] Ibidem, p. 110.
[111] Ibidem, p. 112.
[112] K. Mazur, *Przekroczyć nowoczesność. Projekt polityczny ruchu społecznego Solidarność* [To Go Beyond Modernity. The Political Project of the Solidarity Social Movement], Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, Cracow 2017, p. 403.
[113] Ibidem, pp. 406-407.
[114] Ibidem, p. 407.

infused in the vision of the Self-governing Republic, a program passed during a convention. On the third, eclectic and pragmatic, level of ideological thinking of Solidarity specific solutions – which derived from various ideological traditions – were proposed.

The ideas from the first level of ideological thinking were excluded from the current political dispute, but the second- and third-level program proposals became the subject matter of negotiations and compromise. Mazur believes that in the first phase of the movement, the option of social pluralism won. It was based on the concept of social control of the state. The Union avoided responsibility for economic issues and was only interested in shaping the level of remuneration, in the principles of remuneration, and in caring for working conditions.[115] The most important proponents of that option were Tadeusz Mazowiecki, Bronisław Geremek, Lech Wałęsa – who was the president of the National Coordinating Commission – and moderate union activists of the medium rank.

The supporters of the bottom-up self-government movement, whose most important representatives were Jacek Kuroń and Karol Modzelewski, were in favor of an economic reform based on enterprise self-government and restrictions of the economic prerogatives of the government, but did not want to formally abolish the state ownership of the means of production. They were for "broadening the scope of the social revolution so that it encompasses new aspects of life, in order to further limit the monopoly of the communist authorities, in a grassroots process."[116] The proponents of political pluralism – who were the majority of the leadership of the Union in the last two months of its legal existence – postulated a holistic transformation of the economic and political order,[117] by means of free elections to the Sejm and territorial councils of self-goverments. Mazur writes that Jan Rulewski, Marian Jurczyk, Stefan Kurowski – an expert of the Union – and the "Głos" group supported those postulates.[118] Power proportions between those three options were shifting. In Mazur's words: "it is not possible to give a definite answer to the question which of the three competing visions of the relations between the unionized society and the communist party […] finally won in Solidarity." Mazur is of the opinion that the strategy of social pluralism was dominant after the Gdańsk Agreement in 1980. It was only in the summer of 1981, when the social and economic crisis deepened and the loss of social trust in the leadership of the Union became visible, that the Union saw the need to adjust its strategy: to base its concept of the reform of the communist system on a bottom-up self-governing movement, which was reflected fully in the program passed during the 1st National Convention of Delegates of the Independent Self-governing Trade Union "Solidarity" in the fall of 1981. However, "as it was difficult to implement Kuroń's strategy, which was

---

[115] Ibidem, pp. 286-290, 398.
[116] Ibidem, p. 293.
[117] Ibidem, pp. 398-399.
[118] Ibidem, pp. 294-295.

based on the strong engagement of workers in employees' self-government, and as there were new crises in the negotiation between the Union and the government, the leadership of Solidarity took, in November and December of 1981, a radical position with a direct postulate of free elections to the Sejm."[119]

3. Summary

Static interpretations consist of conceptualizations that consider "Solidarity" as:
– insurrection (Korkuć, Labuda, Latoszek),
– civil (Krzemiński),
– post-modernist (Czabanowski/Skrzypulec, Rojek),
– religious (Karłowicz, Małysa),
– republican (Ciżewska, Gawin),
– revolutionary (Laba),
– social movement (Osa),

Dynamic interpretations consist of conceptualizations that consider "Solidarity" as:
– civil movement (Arato, Ost),
– revolutionary movement (Staniszkis),
– social movement (Touraine)
– movement of ethical revival (Mazur).

The discussed conceptual perspectives are applied one-dimensionally (statically or dynamically) and two-dimensionally (statically or dynamically). The one-dimensional static conceptualizations include notions of "Solidarity" in the perspective of the insurrection, post-modernist, religious and republican movements. The two-dimensional conceptualizations applied statically and dynamically presents "Solidarity" from the perspective of civil, revolutionary and social movements.

It is difficult to clearly prejudge, however, what caused that a specific conceptualization category was applied statically or dynamically. This means whether it was decided by a nature of the selected perspective or by other aspects – the author's time perspective, research goal, and generation. It seems that the choice of the conceptualization perspective does not prejudge the way it is used (dynamic or static). For example, the choice of insurrection perspective – as proved by historiography of Polish national uprisings – does not need to lead to the statical approach. In this

---

[119] Ibidem, p. 296. Also read: K. Brzechczyn, *O ewolucji solidarnościowej myśli społeczno-politycznej. Studium z filozofii społeczne*j [On the Evolution of Socio-Political Thought of Solidarność. A Study from Social Philosophy], Wydawnictwo Naukowe WNS UAM, Poznań 2013; K. Brzechczyn, *On the Evolution of the Political Thought of the Independent Self-Governing Trade Union "Solidarność," 1980-1981: An Attempt at Interpretation*, in *Ucovering Facts and Values. Studies in Contemporary Epistemology and Political Philosophy*, ed. A. Kuźniar, J. Odrowąż-Sypniewska, Brill/Rodopi, Leiden – Boston 2016, pp. 347-364.

case, a dynamic factor is interactions between the fight for national independence and the fight for social independence.[120] Moreover, the description of "Solidarity" from the perspective of the religious movement, as argued by Andrew Arato, does not need to lead to the statical approach.

It seems that in this case other issues were decisive. Some authors such as e.g. Dariusz Gawin, Grzegorz Labuda, Dariusz Karłowicz, and Maciej Korkuć, describing "Solidarity" from the perspective of the entire 1980s, presented the so-called first "Solidarity" in whole without distinguishing any individual development phases and analysis of the movement's programme and ideological dilemmas. The same refers to the considerations of Maryjane Osa who analysed "Solidarity" from the view of the "long-lasting" development of the network of informal relationships covering the period from 1956 to 1980.

Accounts that exclusively analyse the first "Solidarity" seem to better understand the evolution and internal dilemmas of "Solidarity." This refers to two American authors, Andrew Arata and David Ost. Also Jadwiga Staniszkis belongs to authors who analyzed the internal dynamics of Solidarity. However, this thesis is falsified by the case of Elżbieta Ciżewska. It is difficult to find in her comprehensive book any description of internal dilemmas of "Solidarity" and the programme evolution of this movement. This may be caused by the fact that she belongs to the generation of researchers who does not directly remember the then situation in Poland. The mere knowledge of sources without any contextual knowledge of the participant and witness of events, may sometimes hinder them from recognizing certain research problems such as ideological dynamics of the Trade Union and mechanisms of its development (an exception in Krzysztof Mazur). However in this respect, the books by David Ost and Jadwiga Staniszkis are more insightful becasue were written by the direct observers and participants of the sixteenth Polish months, and individual chapters of their books were frequently made under the pressure of current events, not from a certain time distance. Therefore, Ost's opinion that "Solidarity itself did not fully understand what it was striving toward" and "still did not have a language or model to explain where it was headed" remain valid.[121] Likewise, social science and humanities have not fully understood it yet. However, there has been some progress.

Literature

Arato A., *From Neo-Marxism to Democratic Theory. Essays on the Critical Theory of Soviet-Type Societies*, M.E. Sharpe, New York 1993.

Ash T.G., *The Polish Revolution. Solidarity*, Jonathan Cape, London, 1983.

[120] The relation of both plots, see M. Kula, *Narodowe i rewolucyjne* [National and Revolutionary], Aneks, Warszawa 1991.

[121] D. Ost, *Solidarity and the Politics of Anti-Politics*…, p. 113.

Billington J.H., *Introduction*, in S. W. Reiquam (ed.), *Solidarity and Poland. Impact East and West*, Washington D.C. 1988.

Boratyn N., Brodacki J., Brzostek B., Długołęcki P., Galewski J., Górski A., Jurkun D., Kaliski B., Kochanowicz J., Kula M., Lipski K., Mórawski K., Naimska A., Nowaczewski S., Pietrucha A., Rogalski M., Rokicki K., Ruzik U., Ruzikowski T., Skoczylas M., Wóycicka Z., *Czynniki określające dynamikę ruchu „Solidarność w latach 1980-1981* [The Factors Influencing the Dynamics of Solidarność Movement in years 1980-1981], in M. Kula (ed.), *Solidarność w ruchu, 1980-1981*, Niezależna Oficyna Wydawnicza NOWA, Warsaw 2000.

Brzechczyn K., *O ewolucji solidarnościowej myśli społeczno-politycznej. Studium z filozofii społecznej* [On the Evolution of Socio-Political Thought of Solidarność. A Study from Social Philosophy], Wydawnictwo Naukowe WNS UAM, Poznań 2013.

Brzechczyn K., *On the Evolution of the Political Thought of the Independent Self-Governing Trade Union „Solidarność," 1980-1981: An Attempt at Interpretation*, in *Ucovering Facts and Values. Studies in Contemporary Epistemology and Political Philosophy*, ed. A. Kuźniar, J. Odrowąż-Sypniewska, Brill/Rodopi, Leiden – Boston 2016.

Brzechczyn K., *Program i myśl polityczna NSZZ "Solidarność"* [Programme and Political Thought of Solidarność], in Ł. Kamiński, G. Waligóra (eds.) *NSZZ "Solidarność"1980-1989*, vol. 2: *Ruch społeczny*, IPN, Warsaw 2010.

Brzechczyn K., *Religijne wymiary solidarnościowej myśli społecznej w latach 1980-1981* [Religious Dimensions of Social Thought of Solidarność], "Przegląd Religioznawczy" 1/2011.

Cirtautas A.M., *The Polish Solidarity Movement. Revolution, Democracy and Natural Rights*, Routledge, London – New York 1997.

Ciżewska E., *Filozofia publiczna Solidarności* [Public Philosophy of Solidarność], Narodowe Centrum Kultury, Warsaw 2010.

Ciżewska E., *Socjologia Solidarności jako filozofia publiczna* [Sociology of Solidarność as a Public Philosophy], in Jan Kłoczowski (ed.), *Polska Solidarności. Kontrowersje, oblicza, interpretacje*, Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, Cracow 2011.

Czabanowski W., Skrzypulec B., *Postmodernistyczna Solidarność* [Postmodern Solidarność],"Pressje" 11/2010.

Della Porta D., Diani M., *Ruchy społeczne. Wprowadzenie* [Social Movements. Introduction], Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Cracow 2009.

Dudek A., *"Solidarność": rewolucyjny ruch społeczny czy powstanie narodowe?* [Solidarność: Revolutionary Social Movement or National Uprising] in W. Wrzesiński (ed.), *Między irredentą, lojalnością a kolaboracją*, Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2001.

Gawin D., *Sierpień 1980 w świetle tradycji republikańskiej* [August 1980 in the Light of Republican Tradition], in A. Sułek (ed.) *Solidarność. Wydarzenie, konsekwencje, pamięć*, Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN, Warsaw 2006.

Gorlach K., Mooney P.H. (eds.), *Dynamika życia społecznego. Współczesne koncepcje ruchów społecznych* [Dynamics of Social Life. Modern Conceptions of Social Movements], Scholar, Warsaw 2008.

Kaczmarczyk M., *Wielowymiarowa teoria Solidarności* [Multi-Dimensional Theory odf Solidarność], "Studia Socjologiczne" 3/2010.

Karłowicz D., *"Solidarność" jako Kościół* [Solidarność as the Church], in D. Gawin (ed.), *Lekcja Sierpnia. Dziedzictwo "Solidarności" po dwudziestu latach* [The Legacy of Solidarność after 20 Years], Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN, Warsaw 2002.

Korkuć M., *Solidarność a polska tradycja insurekcyjna* [*Solidarność versus Polish Insurrection Tradition*] in J. Kłoczowski (ed.), *Polska Solidarności. Kontrowersje, oblicza, interpretacje*, Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, Cracow 2011.

Kowalski S., *Krytyka solidarnościowego rozumu. Studium z socjologii myślenia potocznego* [The Critque of Solidarność's Mind], Wydawnictwo Pen, Warsaw 1990.

Krasnodębski Z., *Demokracja peryferii* [Democracy of Peryphery], Słowo/obraz terytoria, Gdańsk 2003.

Krzemiński I., *Polska i „Solidarność" – sens ludzkiego doświadczenia* [Poland and Solidarność – a Sense of Human Experience], in idem, *Świat zakorzeniony*, Wola, Warsaw 1988.

Krzemiński I., *Świat zakorzeniony* [Enrooted World], in idem, *Świat zakorzeniony*, Grupy Polityczne „Wola", Warsaw 1988.

Kula M., *Narodowe i rewolucyjne* [National and Revolutionary], Aneks, Warszawa 1991.

Laba R., *The Roots of Solidarity. A Political Sociology of Poland's Working Class Democratization*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1991.

Labuda G., *Ruch „Solidarność" w perspektywie historycznej* [„Solidarność" Movement in Historical Perspective], in J. Kulas (ed.), *Sierpień '80. Co pozostało z tamtych dni?* Uniwersytet Gdański, Gdańsk 1996.

Latoszek M., *"Solidarność": ruch społeczny, rewolucja czy powstanie?* [Solidarność: Social Movement, Revolution or Uprising] in M. Latoszek (ed.), *"Solidarność" w imieniu narodu i obywateli*, Arcana, Cracow 2005.

Leszczyński A., *Jaką historię „Solidarności" lat 1980-1981 warto napisać? Zarys projektu badawczego*, [What Kind of Solidarność's History is Worth to Write. An Outline of Research Project] "Pamięć i Sprawiedliwość" 2/2003.

Lorenz Ch., *You got your history, I got mine. Some reflections on truth and objectivity in history*, "Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften" 10/1999.

Małysa K., *Solidarność – ostatni wielki ruch mesjanistyczny* [Solidarność – the Last Great Mesianistic Movement], in W. Polak, P. Ruchlewski, V. Kmiecik, J. Kufel (eds.) *Czas przełomu. Solidarność 1980-1981*, ECS, Gdańsk 2010, p. 81.

Mazur K., *Przekroczyć nowoczesność. Projekt polityczny ruchu społecznego Solidarność* [To Go Beyond Modernity. The Political Project of the Solidarity Social Movement], Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, Cracow 2017.

Meller M., *Rola myślenia o historii w ruchu Solidarność w latach 1980-1981* [The Role of Thinking about History in Solidarność movement in years 1980-1981], in Solidarność w ruchu…, pp. 219-266.

Mielczarek A., *Ruch „Solidarności" w świetle teorii ruchów społecznych* [Solidarność Movement in the light of the Theory of Social Movements], in K. Ciechomska-Kulesza, R. Kossakowski, P. Łuczeczko (eds.) *Kultura Solidarności. Socjologiczno-antropologiczne analizy kulturowego dziedzictwa "Solidarności"*, Orbis Exterior, Pszczółki 2011.

Nowak L., *Cena braku perspektywy* [The Prize of the Lack of Perspective, 1981], in idem, *Polska droga od socjalizmu. Pisma polityczne 1980-1989*, ed. K. Brzechczyn, IPN, Poznań 2011.

Nowak L., *Efekt kresowy w procesie historycznym* [The Margin Effect in the Historical Process], in L. Nowak, P. Przybysz (eds.), *Marksizm, liberalizm, próby wyjścia*, Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka. Poznań 1997.

Nowak L., *On Postmodernist Philosophy: An Attempt to Identify its Historical Sense*, in S-E Liedman (ed.) *The Postmodernist Critique of the Project of Enlightenment, Po-*

znań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities, vol. 58, Rodopi, Amsterdam – Atlanta 1997.

Osa M., *Creating Solidarity: The Religious Foundation of the Polish Social Movement*, "East European Politics and Societies" 2/1997.

Osa M., *Sieci opozycji w PRL* [Opposition networks in PRL], in *Dynamika życia społecznego. Współczesne koncepcje ruchów społecznych* [Dynamics of Social Life. Modern Conceptions of Social Movements], Scholar, Warsaw 2008.

Osa M., *Stwarzanie Solidarności. Religijne podstawy ruchu społecznego* [The Creating of Solidarność. Religious Foundations of Social Movement], "Pressje" 21/2010.

Ost D., *Solidarity and the Politics of Anti-Politics. Opposition and Reform in Poland Since 196*8, Temple University Press, Philadelphia 1990.

Pakulski J., *The Solidarity Decade: 1980-1989*, "Humanities Research" 16/2010, no. 3.

Rojek P., *Postmodernizm, katolicyzm, Solidarność* [Postmodernizm, Catholicism, Solidarność] "Pressje" 21/2010.

Rojek P., *Semiotyka Solidarności. Analiza dyskursów PZPR i NSZZ Solidarność w 1981 roku* [Semiotics of Solidarność. An Analysis of Solidarność and PZPR's Discourses], Nomos, Cracow 2009.

Rojek P., *Solidarność: ruch republikański, katolicki czy postmodernistyczny?* [Solidarność: Republican, Catholic or Postmodern Movement], in J. Kłoczowski (ed.) *Polska Solidarności. Kontrowersje, oblicza, interpretacje*, Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, Cracow 2011.

Słodkowska I., *Najdłuższe polskie powstanie* [*The Longest Polish Uprising*] , "Więź" 7/2005.

Staniszkis J., *Samoograniczająca się rewolucja* [*Self-Limited Revolution*], ECS, Gdańsk [1983] 2010.

Stawrowski Z., *Doświadczenie "Solidarności" jako wspólnoty etycznej*, in D. Gawin (ed.) *Lekcja Sierpnia. Dziedzictwo "Solidarności" po dwudziestu latach* [The Legacy of Solidarność after 20 Years], Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN, Warsaw 2002.

Świderski B., *Gdańsk and Ateny. O demokracji bezpośredniej w Polsce*, IFiS PAN, Warszawa 1996.

Touraine A., *Solidarność. Analiza ruchu społecznego 1980-1981* [Solidarność. An Analysis of Social Movement, 1980-1981], Europejskie Centrum Solidarności, Gdańsk 2010 [1982].

Touraine A., Strzelecki J., F. Dubet, M. Wieviorka, *Solidarność. Analiza ruchu społecznego 1980-1981*, Europejskie Centrum Solidarności, Gdańsk [1982] 2010.

Wierzchosławski R.P., *Czy ingerencja wyklucza wolność? Wokół republikańskiego ujęcia libertas* [Does Intervention Exclude Fredom? Aroun Republican Approach to Libertas], in J. Miklaszewska (ed.), *Liberalizm u schyłku XX wieku*, Meritum, Cracow 1999.

Wierzchosławski R.P., *Filozofia społeczna i problem wspólnotowości: o pożytkach płynących z rozważań na temat ontologii społecznej dla filozofii politycznej* [Social Philosophy and the Problem of Community: on Benefits from Social Ontology for Political Philosophy), in M.N. Jakubowski, A. Szahaj, K. Abriszewski (eds.), *Indywidualizm, wspólnotowość, polityka*, Wydawnictwo UMK, Toruń 2002.

Wróbel S. (ed.), *Teoretyczne problemy ruchów społecznych i politycznych* [Theoretical Problems of the Social and Political Movements], Wydawnictwo Grado, Toruń 2011.