The "Second Circulation" of the 1970s and 1980s as a Component of a Social Movement: Applying Social Movement Theory to the Analysis of the Polish Opposition

Adam Mielczarek

Two parallel traditions are continuously present in theories of social movements developed since the early 1970s. The first of them emerged among American scholars and reflects their experiences; it is a theory of resource mobilization that puts a strong emphasis on the rational character of the activities of leading players who have some institutional affiliation, and the political character of the challenges. This theory describes the development of social movements from the perspective of managers who are conscious of their goals, and who have at their disposal certain material and nonmaterial resources and skillfully use them to acquire broad support for collective action.[1] The second tradition developed primarily in Europe and was principally a reaction to the experiences of European counterculture movements; it emerged from a relatively diverse array of theories called the new social movement theories. This tradition places a strong emphasis on the cultural background and identities of individuals involved in a movement, and notices that movements emerging in modern societies usually concentrate on specific nonmaterialistic (or postmaterialistic) values such as social participation, self-governance, or autonomy.[2] However, many authors maintain that despite many differences these traditions can be treated not as alternatives, but rather as complementary ap-

[1] Steven M. Buechler, "Beyond Resource Mobilization? Emerging Trends in Social Movement Theory," *The Sociological Quarterly* 34, no. 2 (1993): 217–35.

[2] Steven M. Buechler, "New Social Movement Theories," *The Sociological Quarterly* 36, 3 (1995): 441–64.

proaches that augment one another.[3] In my view the Polish experience of Solidarność and in general the anticommunist movement of the 1970s and 1980s supports this latter view as it demonstrates that depending on the structure of political opportunities, the dynamics of the development of the Polish opposition followed one or the other logics of action described in these traditions.[4]

This applies as well to publishing, a very important part of the opposition movements of 1970s and 1980s. The history of publishing is a good illustration of the complicated mechanisms governing these movements. Contrary to the apparently obvious interpretation, the Polish "independent publishing movement" or "underground printing infrastructure" cannot be seen as a simple asset at the disposal of the leadership, utilized as a medium for articulating their objectives and communicating with followers. If the publishing movement sometimes fulfilled these utilitarian functions, it was by no means a complacent tool in the hands of the movement's strategists. First of all, it was not a uniform entity that could be ordered to do this or that; it was rather a form of activity by many people willing to get involved. This form had its own dynamism with a significant impact on the functioning of the opposition as the whole.

The Development of the Repertoires of Contention

The independent publishing movement should be considered above all as an important element in the opposition's repertoires of contention. In the initial period during the mid-1970s the array of means available to potential Polish dissidents to press their demands was ill-defined.[5] In many circles discontent with the existing system of power persisted and grew, but all forms of resistance and dissent seemed ineffective. Still, a catalogue of imaginable opposition activities existed. It was culturally determined by the traditions inherited from the dissident experiences of the past, both recent and from the times

---

[3] Bert Klandermans and Sidney G. Tarrow, "Mobilization into Social Movements: Synthesizing the European and the American Approach," in *From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movement Research Across Cultures*, ed. Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Sydney G. Tarrow (Greenwich, CT: JAI-Press, 1988).

[4] Adam Mielczarek, "Ruch Solidarności w świetle teorii ruchów społecznych," in *Kultura solidarności: Socjologiczno-antropologiczne analizy kulturowego dziedzictwa Solidarności*, ed. Karolina Ciechorska-Kulesza, Radosław Kossakowski, and Paweł Łuczeczko (Gdańsk: Orbis Exterior, 2011).

[5] The definition of repertoires of contention by Charles Tilly, as quoted in Donatella della Porta and Mario Diani, *Social Movements: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999).

of the Polish partitions.[6] This catalog consisted of both techniques employed earlier and innovative behaviors that could be reconciled with the opposition values of the time.

Undertaking a particular form of activity was probably a matter of choice by an individual, but also his or her rational calculation about the activity's appeal and effectiveness—and also personal safety, as this factor seems to me to be an important variable. The pioneers of dissident activities can be seen as explorers performing difficult experiments with their own lives and freedom at stake. Initially the repertoire probably included both violent and nonviolent activities, but the power assessment seemed to tip towards the latter.

The experimenters included members of the future dissident elite as well as various opponents of the system today largely forgotten, such as the Kowalczyk brothers or many members of Ruch.[7] Their activities included "hallway sitting" at political trials, signing petitions and open letters, writing antigovernment slogans on walls, and ordering patriotic masses and celebrations.[8] Nobody yet was at the head of the forming opposition, nobody energized it—it can be said that each and every participant tried to fight the system by himself and walked an unbeaten path.

The emergence of leaders, people who drew the attention of other potential dissidents, was a consequence of these pioneers' success. It was a result of their actions that fell onto fertile ground and appropriately responded to a given political opportunity structure. As it turned out, these actions were relatively effective and safe ways and means of displaying one's discontent, and they seemed to offer the prospect of developing a dissident community. Thus emerging leaders gained some ability to direct the others interested in work-

---

[6] See Ann Swidler, "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies," *American Sociological Review* 51, no. 2 (1986): 273–86.

[7] In 1971 brothers Ryszard and Jerzy Kowalczyk planted a bomb at the Opole University to protest against repressions against workers. The bomb exploded but there were no casualties. The perpetrators were captured and sentenced: Ryszard to death, and Jerzy to 25 years in prison; as a result of the protests of leading Polish intellectuals against the severity of the punishment, Ryszard's sentence was commuted to 25 years. Ruch (the Movement) was the largest underground organization in post-Stalinist Poland aiming at making Poland a democratic country. It was active from mid-1965 to 1970; at its peak it counted ca. 100 members. In 1970 the organization was apprehended by the security on the eve of its planned destruction of the Lenin Museum in the Tatra Mountains. During the ensuing trial the Ruch leaders were sentenced from four to seven years in prison.

[8] Political trials were theoretically open to the public, but often the audience was filled with SB agents, hence the practice of sitting in the hallway in front of the courtroom to express solidarity with those on trial.

ing with them. This does not change the fact that every time the effectiveness of their inspiration depended on how each individual participant assessed his or her potential gains or losses resulting from the activity. Joining a group that had some achievements and was associated with a person with a recognizable name was attractive—it opened possibilities of collaboration with others and development of a shared dissident identity. Yet it was not a kind of appeal that could prompt potential participants to engage in activities outside of what they themselves considered appropriate and potentially successful.

I believe this also applies to the genesis and development of the publishing movement in Poland. Printing was one of the activities considered possible by different actors at that time. As we know not all of them were ready to use it. Andrzej Friszke wrote about the concerns among the KOR members about crossing the border of "the illegal" by using duplicators; this likely resulted in the fact that the first KOR publications were published like samizdat.[9] But among the dissidents there were also people of a different opinion, ready to take a risk, and their experimentation proved effective. Janusz Krupski's duplicator that Jacek Kuroń was afraid to use was eventually put to work without triggering the expected repressions. This prompted the inclusion of this form of activity in the repertoire of contention of the entire opposition, and subsequently had an impact on the range of activities of all dissident leaders and the resources at their disposal. But it was the coincidence of a rational political decision by a manager of a movement and a grassroots dynamics independent of his will that made this decision possible.

The Resource and the Autonomous Power

Among the ideas advanced by one of the best known theoreticians of new social movements, Alberto Melucci, there is a proposition to break with the notion of social movements as uniform entities expressing the presumed common goals of communities united around these goals. Melucci stresses that the unity often attributed to a movement is a theoretical abstraction which does not reflect reality. In reality, individuals are driving forces behind actions; they define the conditions of their collaboration during these actions through interactions and agreements.[10] The beginnings of the Polish opposition of the

---

[9] Andrzej Friszke, "*Biuletyn Informacyjny KOR* (1976–1980)," in *Solidarność podziemna 1981—1989*, ed. Andrzej Friszke, (Warsaw: ISP PAN, 2006). See also Andrzej Friszke, *Czas KOR-u: Jacek Kuroń a geneza Solidarności* (Cracow: Znak; ISP PAN, 2011).

[10] Alberto Melucci, *The Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society* (London: Hutchinson Radius, 1989).

1970s illustrate this opinion well. The ideas to create some form of opposition dawned in many heads, groups, and salons, and the climate of relative tolerance that developed during the rule of Edward Gierek's regime was conducive to bringing these ideas gradually into the open and forging contacts between their proponents. Even if some members of the opposition elites from past historical events were present in the emerging movement, it was largely amorphous, and it was not predetermined who would join forces with whom. The movement's political profile was shaped in salon debates, and only later emerging local activists were to face difficult choices as to whether they were closer to KOR or ROPCiO, and if the latter, aligned to which faction.

But with the passage of time the movement was gradually forging its organizers. Jacek Kuroń's writings testify to the fact that at least some of the emerging leaders referred to the notion of a social movement and thought about its effective employment as a tool to exercise political pressure and achieve political goals. Kuroń thought of giving the budding social movements direction and mobilizing them, and imagined them as a grass-roots power that could become a base for political actions of the opposition leaders. He advocated the emergence of "the Poland of social movements"—which largely came true.

Many activities undertaken by KOR or other ideological hubs of the opposition had a character typical for the workings of political managers trying to mobilize social movements. This entailed them treating publishing initiatives as a "conveyor belt" to the wide audience: a tool to enlighten and activate communities important to these leaders. Such was the character of many publications conceived as more or less official organs of the movement, or the journals aiming at the activation of particular social groups or circles, like *Robotnik*, for instance. On the other hand, almost from the beginning the publishing movement developed autonomy. Authors, editors, and printers did not want to be treated as mere tools. Very soon they started to use freedom of speech according to their liking and to print whatever they deemed appropriate. They did not always follow the words of political leaders because they did not entirely feel like their underlings.

Independent publishers, though, usually had some identifiable affiliation within the political spectrum of the Polish opposition, but were for the most part recognized as autonomous players. Political leaders could be sure that the published texts would fully conform to their views only if they wrote them themselves. More importantly, in the intelligentsia circles where the opposition developed, texts intended for these circles' internal consumption instantly appeared—the best example of this phenomenon is *Zapis*. Independent publishing from its very beginning displayed a propensity to become "normal"—a market for the literature that interested the publishers themselves,

and a place to exchange ideas between the participants. The publishing part of the opposition got involved in serving the political ends of the opposition leaders, but for the most part it was conscious of its organizational separateness and autonomy.[11] This sense was reinforced by the antipolitical ideology prevalent in the 1970s among the largest part of independent publishing connected with KOR.[12] According to this ideology, creating institutions like the free press was not a tool in the struggle for freedom, but an objective itself.

The Interlude

After August 1980 the independent publishing movement changed its character, as did the entire opposition. The existing independent publishing houses to some degree disappeared in the large gray sphere of union publications (printed in compliance with the existing law "for internal union use only"). Some independent publishers transferred their resources to Solidarność, while others chose to remain underground. Due to the accessibility of uncensored printed matter, the activity of dissident publishers seemed to have temporarily lost the unique identity it had had before and was to restore later. Publishing houses had a similar independence and similar relation to the rest of the Solidarność movement as its other participants. When grand politics was played elsewhere, they left the limelight.

Yet publishers remained an extremely important factor in the dynamics of the movement as a tool for breaking information taboos established by the authorities. The particular informal status of publishers permitted them to be the gauges of truly free speech, while at the same time setting the standards of free speech within the revolution as it was happening. If we agree that the change brought by that revolution was primarily about the great cognitive freedom experienced by nearly all participants of these events, then the publishing movement played an enormous role in that change.

That extraordinary period of freedom had a momentous impact on both the existing operating conditions of the opposition and its resources for the future, i.e., the coming martial law. The order hitherto deemed unchangeable turned out to be possible to modify, and almost all the workforce in Poland became members of Solidarność, an organization openly incompatible with real

---

[11] This character is captured in the description of the publishers in the 1970s by Jan Józef Lipski in *KOR: Komitet Obrony Robotników—Komitet Samoobrony Społecznej* (Warsaw: IPN, 2006), 274-78.

[12] Compare David Ost, *Solidarity and the Politics of Anti-Politics: Opposition and Reform in Poland since 1968* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990).

socialism. The symbols of the opposition became instantly recognizable, and participation in its culture became common. A prevailing part of the society supported the opposition and felt this in their everyday activities.

The technical base of the publishing movement considerably increased. Solidarność brought in hundreds of printing machines, some of which would avoid confiscation under martial law. At the same time the publishing cadre—trained printers or people familiar with the publication process—grew exponentially because of the unrestricted production of internal Solidarność publications. In addition, virtually every literate Pole became a potential reader of independent publications.

All Over Again

The skillfully executed coup of December 13, 1981 left the great and awakened social movement leaderless and without structure. As the union formula dominant during the previous 16 months collapsed, a pool of potential opposition activists much larger than before August 1980 faced the necessity to develop a new repertoire of contention, appropriate for the dramatically changed situation.

The dissidents largely found themselves in the situation of "starting all over again," beating unknown paths, and testing possibilities that carried unknown repercussions. In the new circumstances it was hard to predict which actions would be effective and what would be the reaction of the authorities. The pre-martial law leaders initiated such discussion but they had no brilliant ideas how to solve the new problems of the opposition. The behavior of rank-and-file activists that started to manifest itself independently of declarations of the political leaders was of greater consequence.

The people who wanted to defend Solidarność at first resorted to activities that had already been tried: strikes, community support, impromptu sharing of information, and various symbolic gestures such as wearing mourning clothes or electrical resistors, lighting candles, and taking ostentatious walks outside during the official nightly TV news. All of these expressed the society's anger and opposition towards the authorities. These activities emerged spontaneously on the basis of individual decisions and calculations of gains and losses, and they were based on historically determined patterns of behavior.

The movement intuitively resorted to various examples including those from distant historical epochs (especially the 1863 January Insurrection). But more often these were recent models. This was possible because Solidarność created its distinct tradition, and the new repertoire of contention, adjusted to the conditions of martial law, was to be built from it. The features of this

tradition based on the movement's self-perception as strong, popular, and en-dowed with moral right that sooner or later will bring the enemy to its knees. This self-image determined the general principles: the focus on "society" and the concern with societal support, the emphasis on information and symbolic actions, as well as renouncing violence. These principles shaped the activities during the first months of martial law.

In contrast, there were certain resources for which the movement could reach. They comprised the earlier experiences of the independent publishing movement. They included people with certain skills, preserved equipment and materials, as well as the public accustomed to independent publications and naturally linking the tradition of Solidarność with printed, uncensored words. The movement also had access to other resources such as, for instance, the infrastructure of the Catholic Church that was supportive of Solidarność, and which during the entire seven years between 1982 and 1989 served as a home for various cultural initiatives of the opposition, including those supporting independent publishing.

Finally, the third important factor was the limited choice of political possibilities when certain forms of protest seemed too risky. In conditions of open terror, clandestine publishing might appear as a reasonable compromise between the desire to openly resist the authorities and the care for one's own safety. However, I must stress that this was not the only possible compromise, and many activists chose to engage in other activities.

Commencing activities necessarily entailed the emergence of leaders, people capable of connecting separate resources and coordinating the group. In conditions of an energized social movement with a rich reservoir of potential activists but communication limited by martial law, leaders emerged at the local level.[13] This was natural at a time when the countrywide Solidarność and opposition leaders were in prison. In the first weeks and months of martial law many on the local level spontaneously created groups and explored possible forms of activity. The most effective of these groups survived, the ones that, on

---

[13] A spontaneous individual initiative was the best recommendation to get accepted into a larger entity. This is how in 1983 Bogdan Borusewicz described recruitment to the underground. "If someone wants to be active, he gets on with it and doesn't run after money […] If someone tells me that he'll do some printing, but only after he gets a new printing machine from the West, original stencils, and at least 50,000 zlotys to start, then I give him nothing, absolutely nothing […] It's a different story when a person comes with some talent, who's competent organizationally (because he can get paper), intellectually (because he can write), and physically reliable (because he can manage to roll stencils for hours). This kind of person will always get help." In Maciej Łopiński, Marcin Moskit [pseud.], and Mariusz Wilk, *Konspira: Solidarity Underground* (Berkeley: University of California Press), 145–46.

the one hand, met their members' expressive needs and, on the other, proved resistant to the repressive environment of martial law. Their evolution naturally took the direction of merging smaller initiatives into bigger and better-equipped ones while at the same time preserving the diversity reflecting both different opinions and characters of the individual activists.

Even if the movement was at a higher stage of development than a few years before, the process of creating its repertoire of contention had to a certain extent repeat itself in order to adapt to the new circumstances. Only some forms of activity survived that evolution, including publishing, which became almost a synonym for underground Solidarność. The publishing movement fit easily into existing traditions, was effective because of its previous experience, and the level of danger of imprisonment or repressions by the authorities turned out to be acceptable to the participants.

Underground Managers

Although the evolution of underground Solidarność after December 13, 1981 was in my opinion primarily a grass-roots process, we should not overlook the Solidarność politicians who tried to play the role of managers of a social movement. But I do not think their role was great. Most of them found themselves in internment camps without influence on what was happening outside. Also, those who remained at large initially had limited possibilities to determine whether and how the resistance was developing.

At the end of March 1982 the Warsaw leaders (Jacek Kuroń, Zbigniew Bujak, Wiktor Kulerski, and Adam Michnik) discussed the methods of underground activities in *Tygodnik Mazowsze*. The declaration "Underground Society" summarizing this initial stage of programmatic discussion was published in July 1982.[14] Understandably the creation of any central underground structure amidst repression and persecution took some time. But in the meantime the spirit of resistance among the broad masses of activists was so strong that they moved significantly ahead of the movement's political representation. Thus that discussion took place when underground Solidarność was already a fact and a social practice. The leaders were not showing the ways but endorsing the solutions that had already proven themselves.

Moreover, neither that exchange nor the later initiatives of the underground political leaders (whether those close to the TKK Solidarność or their

---

[14] See Krzysztof Brzechczyn, "Program i myśl polityczna NSZZ 'Solidarność,'" in *NSZZ Solidarność 1980–1989,* ed. Łukasz Kamiński and Grzegorz Waligóra (Warsaw: IPN, 2010), 2: 49–58.

opponents from other underground structures) had a major positive impact on the ways the underground developed. The existence of a political centrum was important as a symbol, but it did not generate effective ideas for action. The practice demonstrated that protests which had been planned top-down did not always work. An example of this was the less-than-expected turnout at the November 10, 1982 demonstrations called for by the TKK.[15] Whether it would have been possible to come up with something more effective is a different matter.

Alternatively, mid-level leaders had a much greater impact on the functioning of the underground. The structure, functionality, and resilience of underground units and organizations depended on their industriousness and inventiveness. Even if the underground developed countrywide structures, and individual cells acknowledged some organizational unity with the centrum, they remained largely autonomous. Also, much depended upon local circumstances. If we compare the conditions for opposition activities in Warsaw with even the most active provincial centers, we see they differed radically. Dense networks of various dissident initiatives existed in some places, while in others there were scattered groups of activists, and still in others there were isolated ephemeral actions. In symbolic terms the Polish opposition was undoubtedly a single large movement, but in terms of its organization and activities in various places, it varied significantly. This in turn impacted the locally declared objectives and repertoires of contention.

The Significance and the Weakness of the Publishing Underground in the 1980s

Despite the introduction of martial law in 1981, there was still a relatively widespread opposition movement in Poland. Its repertoire on contention included diverse legal and semi-legal activities as well as what we summarily call the Solidarność underground. The delineation between these spheres was rather tenuous, as often the same people driven by the same motivations participated in more than one of them. The character of these activities was diverse depending upon local conditions and the needs of the community. In some circles the opposition self-organized around books, in others around the patriotic masses—while also attending unofficial exhibits and film screenings, or participating in street demonstrations.

---

[15] See A. Friszke, "Tymczasowa Komisja Koordynacyjna NSZZ 'Solidarność' (1982– 1987)," in *Solidarność podziemna 1981–1989*, ed. A. Friszke (Warsaw: ISP PAN 2006), 41–51.

Regardless of the diversity of locally created patterns of opposition activities, it seems the underground was of principal importance to the movement. The underground was the only part capable to formulate the movement's demands directly and openly display its prohibited symbols. Publishing was by all means the most important activity of the underground; it had the qualities of continuity and permanency, and its products were accessible to all participants of the movement. An underground book or journal was for many years tangible proof that illegal Solidarność was alive and active. Its networks of production and distribution sustained the networks of collaboration in society at large and maintained a certain level of its mobilization.

At the same time, at least starting in the mid-1980s the publishing movement found itself in a serious crisis. It remained a significant social phenomenon, but it was increasingly clear that it was not a method of overcoming the system. Underground publishing no longer harmed the logic of the system which was redefined after December 13, 1981, and which was resigned to the fact that the opposition existed openly and communist power had to be based, at least partially, on open coercion. Independent publishing was an important instrument in providing the sense of continuity of the opposition's struggle, but it lost its offensive character. Despite wide reach and increased production of publishing houses, social demobilization progressed in Poland; among other things the shrinking pool of activists was a symptom of this erosion.

While before independent publishing had been linked to a clearly growing impact of the opposition, during martial law a stagnation occurred. In the 1970s uncensored publications were a novelty for the broad audience, tangible proof of emerging organized opposition that had not existed before. They offered the possibility to learn what that the opposition had to say. Around them a certain habit of reading developed in the circles of the intelligentsia; being connected with the opposition gradually became fashionable. During the period of legal Solidarność, alongside semi-legal union publications, underground production was the principal medium of the great cognitive breakthrough (as already mentioned, the boundary between the legal and the illegal was tenuous). Independent publications were a vehicle for much of the hitherto inaccessible information, and especially for the new interpretative framework offered by the movement. These factors contributed to the movement's appeal.

During martial law, especially in its initial period, these functions were of course still important. It was necessary to communicate to the public that the opposition had survived the catastrophe of December 13, 1981, as well as to formulate its position, or positions. The fulfillment of these tasks by the publishing movement meant that that, despite repressions, the opposition move-

ment retained its shared identity and remained a significant social force. The publishing underground "utilized" and "preserved" most of the opposition human resources, people who, having been mobilized by the emergence of Solidarność, now were actively ready to resist the communists. The new cultural model of the opposition activist was related to the involvement in independent publishing that was a kind of showcase for the opposition.

Furthermore, in the conditions marked by terror, the opposition pushed underground was not an attractive proposition for the broad public, even if the events of the early 1980s had largely de-legitimized the existing system and its leaders. This public was a willing consumer of the opposition's production such as independent publications, but it was not eager to get directly involved. Also the fact that this production was of a largely intellectual character did not help its appeal. At this new stage the Solidarność opposition could no longer offer attractive prospects that would offset the risk involved in actively joining the movement.[16]

The publishing underground followed certain models of opposition behavior well rooted in the traditions both old and newly generated. At the same time publishers looked for innovations that would increase their appeal—for instance, by publishing books not related to politics, or investing in graphically attractive covers, or producing popular underground ephemera like calendars, stamps, or postcards. As a result the repertoires of contention offered by them met the social need to demonstrate opposition to the intolerable system and retain links to the rebellious community.

However, the number of people willing to play the traditionally positive character of a conspirator in the age-long scenario of the national struggle for independence decreased. During the years of the 1980s' "normalization," the activists were discouraged by the futility of their conspiratorial work. Tons of paper printed with underground literature seemed to have no effect on the balance between the opposition and the authorities. Interest in the opposition and its publications diminished, and the underground experienced attrition in personnel. In particular it no longer attracted young activists who, during legal Solidarność, had not been of age. This was not just a result of effective counteractions by the authorities, but also the inability to propose activities genuinely affecting the regime.

---

[16] About ten percent of adult Poles claimed regular or nearly regular access to independent publications from the time of martial law and later in the 1980s. If we include those who had access "from time to time," this number increases to about twenty percent. See Adam Mielczarek, "Raz jeszcze o sondażowych szacunkach zasięgu wydawnictw podziemnych lat osiemdziesiątych," *Pamięć i Sprawiedliwość* 23, no. 1 (2014).

When martial law was officially lifted in 1983, the publishing movement was obviously stronger than ever before. But in subsequent years it weakened, and this was a part of the dwindling of the entire underground. The political leaders did not have sound ideas for continuation. They were interested in maintaining the level of social support and mobilization, but they could offer very little in terms of immediate gratification or a prospect of success that would rationally balance the costs paid by the activists. Thus the survival of the movement can be attributed more to the inertia and the particular model of patriotism rooted in the Polish romantic tradition of sacrifice and martyrdom than to logical calculations of the movement's participants.

This weakness also translated into what they managed to gain later, during the transition. The underground certainly greatly contributed to the preservation of favorable attitudes towards the opposition in society at large, in particular by keeping the political leaders recognizable and credible. Yet, at the time of the 1989 breakthrough, the underground was not a political power. The power was in the hands of the politicians at the Round Table. And even if they once again used underground structures to organize the elections, and gave the underground leaders hope of acquiring more influence through the Citizens' Committees, in the long run they were not interested that the structures of the existing social movement played a significant role in transforming the system.

It is also important to note that independent periodicals did not survive the transition of 1989. In many local centers the editors tried to change into legal publishers of the Citizens' Committees' bulletins or union publications. These initiatives lacked professional resources and were unable to compete with local Party press repainted into democratic colors on the one hand, and *Gazeta Wyborcza* on the other. Former managers of the social movement now coming to power had no intention of supporting their colleagues from the underground; they were interested in suppressing grassroots activity rather than strengthening it. In the adopted transition model, grassroots activity of a social movement was not a rational choice. So the worn-out activists took the symbolic political breakthrough as a good excuse to withdraw from their activities.

Conclusion

The development of the Polish opposition as a social movement and publishing, which was an especially important part of the movement, were influenced both by the mechanisms of grassroots mobilization and the decisions of political leaders who tried to direct this movement. But the principal factor was the

rebellious energy of the rank-and-file activists looking for opportunities to become politically involved. Each was a kind of manager at his or her particular level of the organization's structure, making decisions about how much effort to put into it and calculating whether the possible gratification was worth the risk.

This was largely due to the fact that the movement had no good rational road map leading to a predictable victory. The involvement itself offered activists some rewards like prestige or a sense of being a part of the Polish patriotic tradition, and a satisfaction with immediate accomplishments, but these benefits were relatively weak compared to the actual dangers. Hence the movement was difficult to direct by its potential political leaders who de facto did not have the resources to provide the activists with adequate rewards.

That publishing was the main current within the opposition in Poland was a coincidence of several factors: the authorities' relative tolerance towards this kind of activity, preexisting cultural models, resources and skills developed over time, and finally a tradition created by the movement itself. Even if the underground printing movement played a great role as an instrument of social mobilization during the whole period of the social conflict in the 1980s, it did not evolve into a real political power at the collapse of communism. This was because the mechanism of the great change was different; ultimately, it was not a result of social pressure but political decisions. The dynamic of that change was that of top-down modifications for which the ongoing power of the social movement could have been more than just a threat.