
Social philosophy and the polish experiment

Jan Zielonka

The real influence of modern social philosophy on particular emancipatory movements is very difficult to estimate. On the one hand, it is not enough for revolutionary generations to march under the universal slogan 'égalité, liberté, fraternité'. It is also necessary to know how to change the existing system and what the society should look like after this change. What about our new, re-dreamed model of liberty, equality and fraternity? How to implement these ideas into common-day practice; and how much will they be affected by the means which we intend to use in order to abolish the previous, unjust system? There are a lot of such difficult questions and there are social philosophers who are working on them.

However, on the other hand, we hardly ever find the great fathers of particular social and political doctrines, as well as their ideas, in the first wave of revolutions. Robespierre and Saint-Just rather than Rousseau, and Lenin rather than Marx, influenced directly rank and file of the emancipatory movements of their time. They all were inspired by a great master, but adopted only those parts of their master's ideas, which were appropriate to the particular historical situation. By doing this they left out some important elements of the original doctrine, some others they exaggerated deliberately, using them as a motto of their revolutionary practice. Following up our examples, Rousseau's idea of the social contract was used as an excuse for the Jacobin terror, Marx's idea of the 'class war', permitted Bolsheviks to establish a specific dictatorship of the proletariat. Significantly, they both dropped important elements of their master's doctrine, like e.g. Rousseau's idea of direct democracy in preferably small republics, or the pluralist elements in the doctrine of Marx.

This process of doctrinal change and re-adaptation always provokes great theoretical controversies. As for Marx, for example, there is still a hot debat about what is real marxism and what is only the unjustified warp of his ideas. Leszek Kolakowski in his book *The main currents of marxism* explicitly states, for example, that marxism can not longer be considered as solely the work of Marx, but also as everything that was developed on the basis of his work.¹ The problem looks rather scholastic, in particular because Marx himself did not expect that his ideas would be implemented most consistently in Russia. And this is in fact nothing exceptional. Montesquieu did not foresee that his doctrine would find an imple-

mentation in the American Constitution.

In recent decades the problem is even more complicated. The prediction of the end of ideology turned out to be false. Time and again disillusioned masses are on the move. This process of emancipation requires a doctrinal guideline. However the lack of such guideline is very characteristic nowadays. We observe not only a lack of great ideologies and doctrines, but even a lack of perspective on long-term programmes. On the one hand, evolutionary theories, still dominated by marxists, are bowed down by the heritage of a discouraging marxist reality in the communist countries of today. On the other hand, the so-called functionalistic social theories (Popper, Rawls, etc) cannot fill the gap between their abstract social models and the aspiration of the great emancipatory mass-movements in some countries.²

In a country like Britain e.g., this gap was for many decades fruitfully filled by the existing practice of direct involvement of particular thinkers in political life as B. Shaw, S. and B. Webbs, G. D. H. Cole or H. Lasky. However this practice became obsolete with the death of persons like Richard Crossman or Anthony Crosland at the beginning of the seventies. Today, even in the American economy policy, with its profusion of doctrines, we can hardly recognize the original ideas of the father of this neo-liberal policy – professor F. Hayek.

This article is not intended to answer the general question: what is the influence of social philosophies on emancipatory movements? The idea is to present a contemporary case study of the 'Polish experiment', created by the trade union *Solidarność* in 1980-1981. On the basis of the experiences with more than 30 years of a communist system in Poland, a new, original vision of state and society was created. This vision, based on the idea of selfgovernment, participation and self-management, closely resembles the historical ideas of social anarchism and could be included in the doctrinal current, called 'the anti-state collectivism'.

This article shows the structural similarity between the *Solidarność* programme and this anti-state collectivist doctrinal current. I do not indicate historical continuity or direct historical inspiration of this doctrinal orientation on the *Solidarność* programme. Although we can find some evidence of the existence of such a continuity, the lack of recognition of its doctrinal ancestry is a general tendency of the Polish movement.

The communist system is characterized by direct intervention of the state, centralized bureaucracy in every area of public life, that leads toward disintegration of the Polish society. Thus it is not by accident that the experiences with this system resulted in the creation of an anti-state collectivist vision. Therefore, in my future studies, I shall look for the more specific causes of this phenomenon.

1. Doctrinal parallels

When looking for certain parallels between the ideas carried on by Solidarność and the views of the men we can call their 'precursors' let us first direct our attention to the trend in social philosophy, e.g. represented by Robert Nozick in his book *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, advocating a minimal state limited to the narrow functions of protection against force, theft, fraud, enforcement of contracts, and so on.³ Nozick and his famous predecessors argue that a more extensive state will violate the right of people not to be forced to do certain things, and is thus unjustified. But some of their arguments, e.g. that a 'minimal state is inspiring as well as right', emerge from a pure individualistic approach, while Solidarność antistate arguments have rather a collectivist nature. So, it is better to include Solidarność into the trend which Rodney Backer recently called 'the anti-state collectivism'.⁴ This is not only because the new-born Polish ideas are more comparable to Peter Kropotkin's idea of 'mutual aid', than to Max Stirner's idea of a 'union of egoists' (as indicated even by the name of the movement – Solidarity). It is mainly because Solidarność, although calling for the replacement of the authoritarian state by some forms of nongovernmental cooperation between individuals, considered these forms as collectivist by nature.

Here we can recognize the idea of David Owen, Charles Fourier and in particular Pierre Proudhon, with his vision of a great federation of communes and workers' co-operatives. Going further, we can recognize Peter Kropotkin's local communes and the idea of 'mutual agreement' between the members of a society. This mutual agreement is based on the sum of social customs and habits. We can also find traces of the French syndicalists' ideas with their emphasis on the revolutionary trade union, both as an organ of struggle (the general strike being its most potent tactic) and also as a foundation on which the future free society might be constructed. From this it is a short way to the utopia of Tolstoy and to the pacifist anarchism that appeared mainly in Holland, Britain and the United States before and during the Second World War.⁵ The latter accepted the idea of a general strike as a weapon which on the one hand allows fundamental social change, and on the other hand compromises their pacifist ideal by not using negative (i.e. violent) means.

In the area of industrial relations we can see specifically the parallel between Solidarność' concept of 'self-management' and the British theory of 'guild socialism'. I am especially thinking of S. G. Hobson and G. D. H. Cole and their idea that the control of each industry should be left to democratically organized, decentralized guilds, while the state should merely own the property that the guilds will use.

It is also characteristic that in going beyond these original socialist roots we can more easily find some parallels to the conservative collectivists, like D. H.

Lawrence or G. K. Chesterton (and his book *The Napoleon of Notting Hill*, 1904) than to the pure individualistic trends of liberals or neoliberals.

This anti-state collectivist family mentioned above, divided and diverse as they are, shares a common approach to the basic social questions. All these doctrinal trends emphasize the special role of social and economic relations as a main field in which organization is necessary. They have different opinions concerning the way of changing society (violent or peaceful). Some distrust all cooperation beyond the barest minimum for an ascetic life while others envisage an extensive network of interconnecting mutual aid institutions. But they all share the view that economic and social relations should dominate political ones. Some called themselves apolitical or even anti-political. All these trends also share a naturalistic view of society. They believe that man is naturally social and that he naturally has all the attributes which make him capable of living in freedom and in social concord. Their emphasis on the natural origin of societies leads them to reject not only Rousseau's idea of a social contract, but also the authoritarian communism of Marx with its emphasis on a dictatorship of the proletariat to impose equality by external force

All of these trends contain deeply moralistic elements. They see progress not in terms of a steady increase in material wealth and complexity of living, but rather in terms of the moralizing of society, by the abolition of authority, inequality and economic exploitation.

Peter Kropotkin recognizes two main doctrinal currents. The first tendency, based on 'mutual aid', is exemplified in tribal customs, village communities, medieval guilds, where all institutions are developed and worked out, not by legislation, but by the creative spirit of the masses. The second is the authoritarian current beginning with magi, shamans, wizards, rain-makers, oracles and priests and continuing to include the records of laws and the 'chiefs of military bands'.⁶ Solidarność is easily seen as belonging to the first current.

2. Self-governing Commonwealth

The most visible example of the structural parallels between the anti-state collectivist doctrine and the Solidarność one is the model of 'self-governing commonwealth'. Undoubtedly the idea of a self-governing republic was (after some months) a leading Solidarność doctrine.

A spectacular example is the programme of Solidarność, adopted during the first Annual Congress in October 1981. It states that public life in Poland requires a deep and comprehensive reform which should lead to the establishment of self-government, democracy and pluralism. 'We are aiming at a strong reform of the structure of the state and at the establishment of independent self-governing institutions in every area of social life.' The latter idea is expressed not only in a

special chapter of the programme, called 'The self-governmental commonwealth', but throughout the whole programme. Moreover it emerges from every Solidarność document and statement, as well as from particular political initiatives.

The starting point is the attack on the state machine; 'we are united in our protest against the state which treats citizens like its property', the programme says and 'the state should serve a man and not dominate him, the state organizations should serve the society and cannot be identified with a single political party. The state must be a common good for the whole nation...'. Another document, the declaration of the 'Clubs of self-governing commonwealth' says precisely that the state can interfere in social life only in order to realize the basic social goals and all its activity should be under public control. 'State power should be limited as much as possible by the society which should be organized in workers' self-management and territorial self-government, cooperative and consumer movements, various associations and its federations'. State property should be transformed into various forms of social (public) property of the local self-governments and the various associations.

Solidarność is convinced that the most relevant way of implementing their goals is by socialization of the whole system of management and economy. That is why the idea of workers' self-management is basic to their programme. The enterprises should be ruled by workers councils elected in a democratic way. These workers councils, and not the state nor the Party make the most important decisions. In order to implement these decisions workers councils elect directors of firms, who are completely responsible to them. This workers' self-management is the key element of the planned, great economic process. In the view of Solidarność, this reform is supposed to be based on three principles: self-reliance, self-management and self-financing.

The economic reform which would be implemented on every level of industrial relations and which would lead to the elimination of the central, bureaucratic practices in the Polish economy, should be initiated and organized from below by the spontaneous, grass-root workers' movement of self-management. The first practical expression of this movement was a body of workers' representatives of large enterprises, so-called 'Sieci', sponsored directly by Solidarność. This body elaborated its own project of economic reform based on the comprehensive idea of self-management.

The other key element of the new commonwealth vision is territorial and local self-government. The new territorial self-governing bodies should be based on self-reliance legally, organizationally and financially, thus being a real representation of the local community. The territorial selfgovernment is supposed to deal with all local problems, and the state cannot interfere with their work.

Self-governing organizations and bodies should be represented at the national

level as well. Solidarność not only demands democratization of the Polish parliament which includes among other things, a new, democratic electoral system and the right of legislative initiative for trade unions. It also proposes the establishment of a second chamber in Parliament, the so-called self-governing or socio-economic chamber. This is accompanied by a proposed reform of the judicial system, which would be independent and which would control the police forces. The institution of self-government of judges was proposed with the right to appoint to every judicial position.

The self-governing system is supposed to be introduced into nearly every area of social life. Particularly, much discussion took place concerning a self-governing organization of science, education and culture. 'We have to stop the central and bureaucratic management of Polish science... universities should become independent, self-governing communities' – argues M. Iłowiecki in *Polityka*⁷, and in the whole country students organized a sit-in demanding full autonomy of university education and their full participation in the university decision-making.⁸

The policy of cultural self-organization and self-government was elaborated during the Congress of Polish Culture in December 1981. During this Congress A. Kijowski, a famous writer, said: 'What Polish writers can say about their successes during the last 35 years, is that the sole receiver of their creations was the state machine... it is time to replace this state receiver by the social one'.⁹

The self-governing system is supposed to be introduced into the mass media: 'self-governing bodies of t.v. and radio broadcasting should have the decisive voice concerning their programme... Mass media are the property of the whole society, they must serve the whole society, and be under its control', the Solidarność programme says. Initiatives of self-government and demands of a complete independence for various cooperatives took place in agriculture. The institution of 'mutual aid' was suggested on several occasions.

Solidarność as an organization which combines in itself the 'features of a trade union and a great social movement', is the essence and the guarantee of this programme. Solidarność emerged from a widespread strike movement. 'Economic protest had to be simultaneously a social one; social protest had to be, at the same time, moral'. Significantly, Solidarność does not call itself a political movement. But as a mass workers' organization it recognizes its role as the 'moral movement of national regeneration'. Dignity and 'respect for human beings' form the basis of its whole activity. 'History learned us that there is no bread without liberty. We started our struggle for justice, democracy, truth, rule of law, human dignity, freedom of opinion, reparation of Poland and not only for bread, butter and sausage... power of some groups over others cannot be accepted... and therefore we aim at building a self-governing Poland'.¹⁰

Going through these quotations from the Solidarność programme there cannot be any doubts on the perspective and doctrinal vision of this movement.¹¹

3. The lack of historical inspiration

The structural similarities between social anarchism and the Solidarność programme do not imply any historical continuity between them. As we mentioned at the beginning, the lack of recognition of its doctrinal ancestry is a general tendency of the Polish movement. We can present some reasons for this situation.

First of all, it was clear that theoretical analysis could not keep up with the quick and spontaneous development of this emancipatory movement. We can observe this phenomenon not only in the social science, but also in culture (literature, film, theater). Ideas were usually born in factory yards and docks, and often ordinary workers spontaneously created new programmes and visions. I remember that during one such programme discussion about the proposal to create a Second industrial self-management Chamber in the Polish Parliament, somebody told the participants that a similar proposal was presented by Harold Lasky in Britain in the 1920's. That remark evoked a great confusion. Participants in this discussion were convinced that they created a completely new institution, exclusively relevant to the Polish situation.

Of course notwithstanding this spontaneity, there was an intellectual inspiration. Solidarność drew primarily intellectual inspiration from two sources: from KOR circles (Committee of Social Self-Defence) and from the academic society.

As far as the influence of academic society is concerned we should say that the discussed area of social philosophy was not only neglected by Polish science itself, but this neglect was also caused by a special supervision of scientific censorship.¹²

The influence of KOR on the Solidarność programme was more visible. Solidarność' idea of the self-governing commonwealth has direct roots in the ideas presented by leading KOR members in the late seventies. The book of Jacek Kuroń, *Zasady ideowe* (The ideological principles), is the best example.¹³ But again although their ideas are very close to the presented doctrinal current of anti-state collectivism, KOR did not recognize their historical ancestry. The KOR programme also emerged as a reaction to the recent experiences with communism. It aimed at an opposition against the social atomization and disintegration brought by communist, centralized statism. The general discussion in KOR was oriented at contemporary Polish problems and not so much directed at deep historical comparisons. As one of the leading KOR members Antoni Maciarczyk explained, the discussion inside KOR was about 'the attitude towards the tradition of Polish independence, the tradition of socialism and marxism in Poland, the origin of the Polish communism and its development'.¹⁴ Moreover, contradictions and discussions were evoked by questions of tactics and methods of action rather than by basic ideological problems.¹⁵ This context of discussion causes KOR to recognize doctrinal ancestry neither in the work of Kropotkin or Bakunin, nor in the work of e.g. J. S. Mill, H. Spencer, L. Bernstein or R. Luxembourg.

At this moment, it is also good to point out that *Solidarność* and KOR have tried to avoid accusations of being linked to any anarchistic movement, because that could be very unpopular in political, simplified categories.

It is remarkable that the Polish socialist tradition had greater influence during the Polish 'renewal' of 1956 than during the 'Polish experiment' of 1980-1981.

Nevertheless, there are some indications that the historical doctrines had an influence on the *Solidarność* programme.

In August 1980 an important book *Oblicza pluralizmów* (Faces of Pluralism) was published in Poland, in which Stanisław Ehrlich advocates the ideas of Proudhon, Sorel, Kropotkin, as well as of guild socialists, British Fabians and other representatives of this socialist current.¹⁶

In September 1981, in a very spectacular article, published in the weekly *Polityka*, Wojciech Sadurski (activist of *Solidarność* at the University of Warsaw) not only reminds of the famous names of Polish non-orthodox, anti-state socialists, like E. Abramowski, S. Krusiński, J. Hochfeld, W. Nałkowski, L. Krzywicki, K. Kelles-Krauze, S. Czarnowski, S. Ossowski, but also states that the only chance for the Polish democratic left emerges from the consciousness of a double threat: 1) from the side of the inhuman system of economic exploitation and 2) from the side of the equally inhuman, arbitrary compulsion of the bureaucratic apparatus. 'The concept of self-government, co-operative movement, grassroots social initiative, linked with the system of democratic planning, can protect us from these threats', he writes. Sadurski is convicted that statism is incompatible with self-government: 'slogans advocating a steady growth of the state, ultimately leading to... a dying away of this state, or slogans about the re-transformation of the state into the popular self-government are primitive verbal tricks... the reality is that the more self-governing regulation, the more limited are the function of the state apparatus'.¹⁷

We can find less recognized roots in one of the basic 'renewal' documents, one which was borne under *Solidarność* umbrella, an opening declaration of the 'Clubs of self-governmental commonwealth'. (Some authors of this document were KOR-members.)

This declaration indicates its pedigree in work and activity of such Polish socialists like J. Piłsudski, E. Abramowski, W. Witos and I. Daszyński. Here only Edward Abramowski is a typical representative of the discussed anti-state collectivism. Abramowski is one of the best-known Polish anarchists, who was at the same time involved in the struggle for Polish national independency. But mentioning the name of J. Piłsudski together with Witos and Daszyński is rather unfortunate.¹⁸

The above examples cannot fill the gap between the well-developed contemporary program of *Solidarność* and a relative lack of recognition of any doctrinal origins. But development of the ideas related to the tradition of the anti-state

collectivism was the very reality. Moreover, we can see that it was not a tactical choice of Solidarność, but a doctrinal one.

4. Doctrine and rationality

The idea of workers' councils and workers' self-management was a leading one during the great, widespread Polish workers' resistance movement in 1956. Thousands of workers' councils were established at that time and they functioned quite well for about two years. However, because of the lack of a comprehensive political and economic concept, as well as the lack of a central organizational structure and leadership, they were used by the PUWP (Polish Communist Party) as a source of political mobilization against the old Stalinist clique. When the new Party leadership had achieved these ends, they were able to tranquillize and eventually anaesthetize the whole movement. The councils were gradually transformed into purely economic bodies and finally in 1958 into the bureaucratized impotence of the so-called Conference of Workers' Self-Government.

This bad experience caused workers to demand free trade unions and not workers' self management in 1980.¹⁹ The new trade unions were supposed to play a similar role as the traditional Western trade unions. This role is based on the opposition to the employer (in our case a state employer) and collective bargaining is the main form of activity.²⁰

'The government wants us to take responsibility for efficiency of production' – said B. Borusewicz, leader of Solidarność in the weekly *Polityka* in the autumn of 1980 – 'We think that it would lead us to the situation of the old trade unions – forcing workers to work'. And Lech Wałęsa has added: 'We do not want to be bureaucrats, but activists-examiners. We would like to do our jobs and examine'.²¹ Solidarność did not want to take responsibility for a system, that they could not influence enough.

Yet it was the government rather than Solidarność that pressed for self-management and self-government at that time.²² The government intended to repeat the same trick as in 1956 or at least to create self-management in the Yugoslav, Communist-controlled way. At the beginning Solidarność was evidently against such a proposal and it has taken some months before they changed this position. But what they proposed afterwards was, as we have seen, a complete different view of self-management, not the weak and limited governmental approach.

Solidarność proposed a developed and comprehensive model of a self-governing society. The new-born, great, popular trade union was supposed to play a decisive role in the construction of this new society. The model was based on independent organizations and bodies, that had grown up spontaneously after August 1980. But the option of a 'self-governing commonwealth' was not a spontaneous one. It was a doctrinal and rational choice, which was deliberately

adopted by the movement.

There is another significant example of a direct link between this emancipatory vision and the discussed anti-state current of social philosophy. Although this emancipatory movement did not recognize its doctrinal identity and historical pedigree, in fact it has become a victim of the basic weakness of this doctrine.

The basic weakness of the various forms of the anti-state collectivist approach is that they could not combine their destination – a de-centralized, grassroot based organization of society – with a strategy to achieve this goal. I am not only speaking about the question of a violent or a peaceful way of change. The problem is more complicated. History shows that in order to abolish the unjust, centralized, totalitarian and autocratic system it is probably necessary to use also the centralized, even dictatorial power of a revolutionary movement. However this usually leads to the establishment of revolutionary dictatorship and terror in the Jacobin or Bolshevik way. It is clear, that it also unavoidably leads to the model of government which is precisely contradictory to the anti-state collectivist vision. But without using this centralized revolutionary power, it is practically impossible to abolish or to change the existing dictatorship. The Ancient Régime always uses brutal force to preserve its power: history shows us many examples. Gradual reform is probably only possible in countries with relatively mild oppression and weak social contradictions. But this was neither the case in 1789 in France, nor in 1917 in Russia, nor in many other cases. In fact, this was also not the case in 1980 in Poland.²³

Solidarność, like their doctrinal fathers mentioned above could not overcome the contradiction between the required strategy in a politically dominated world and their doctrinal concepts, a contradiction arising from the conviction that means profoundly affect ends. Sharing metaphorically Christ's contention that one cannot cast out devils by Beelzebub they regard peaceful ways of protest as the most appropriate and the general strike as the way of manifesting their standpoint and strength but not as a way of taking over the state power.

All revolutions carried out by political means have ended in dictatorship; the resort to coercion has transformed them and betrayed the revolutionary ideal. Solidarność tried to avoid this revolutionary scheme and the vision of a gradual and peaceful way of change was an inseparable element of Solidarność way of thinking. It was additionally supported by an awareness of the geopolitical reality. They were aware that it might indeed be impossible for a society to move in one step, in one night to complete freedom, without even paying a price in blood. But they were determined to continue their peaceful way of struggling and to use every weakness of the unfree society to reach their ultimate goal.

Guns and tanks in the Polish streets in December 13th 1982 have forced them to pay a high price for this doctrinal deficiency and weakness.

It is, however, characteristic that despite the introduction of military repres-

sions, Solidarność (now underground) confirmed its will to continue implementation of the 'self-governing commonwealth' vision in a peaceful, gradual way.²⁴

The Polish experiment provides fascinating material for political and doctrinal analyses. The questions – why KOR and later on Solidarność adopted the anti-state collectivist doctrinal orientation; is this development specific to Poland or can we expect a similar process in the other communist countries; what about the great anarchist dilemma – means versus goals – in the new, Polish context – require further study and analysis. The recognition of the general doctrinal orientation of Solidarność may be of some use in these studies.

Notes

This paper was presented to the Symposium to found Cheiron-Europe, at the Free University of Amsterdam in September 1982. I am indebted to Dr. Theo Kuipers for his useful comments on the draft of this paper.

1. L. Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism*, Oxford 1978, vol. 3, p. 258.
2. W. Bieńkowski, *Filozofia dziejów a teoria społeczna*, (Zapis) London 1968, p. 153-155.
3. R. Nozick, *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, Oxford 1974, p. ix.
4. R. Baker, *The Modern British Politics*, London 1979. Baker distinguishes between individualism, pro-state collectivism and anti-state collectivism.
5. G. Woodcock, *Anarchism*, Harmondsworth 1962, p. 18.
6. P. Kropotkin, *Modern Science and Anarchism*, London 1912.
7. M. Ilowiecki, *Polityka* nr. 13, Warszawa 1981.
8. See e.g. A. K. Wróblewski, *Polityka* nr. 9, Warszawa 1981.
9. A. Kijowski, *Literatura i kryzys*, *La Culture* nr. 6/147, Paris 1982.
10. Quotations from the Programme of Solidarność, adopted by the First National Congress in September 1981.
11. We can hardly find similar ideas in the works of dissidents in other communist countries. However we can find some, but very weak traces in the work of the Russian dissident group, called 'socialists'. See F. J. M. Feldbrugge, *Samizdat and Political Dissident in the Soviet Union*. Leiden 1975, p. 83 and v.v.
12. The later on mentioned book of prof. S. Ehrlich was published after some years of bargaining with the authorities.
13. J. Kuroń, *Zasady Ideowe*, Paris 1978.
14. A. Maciawicz, *Samorządność* nr. 3, Gdańsk 1981.
15. A. Maciawicz, *Samorządność* nr. 3, op. cit., p. 9.
16. S. Ehrlich, *Oblicza Pluralizmów*, Warszawa 1980.
17. W. Sadurski, *Polityka* nr. 38, Warszawa 1981.
18. J. Piłsudski was linked with socialists in his early period of political activity. However after 1926 we cannot link him anymore with the Polish Left, represented by W. Witos and I. Daszyński.
19. See e.g. N. Ascherson, *The Polish August*, Harmondsworth 1981, p. 233-235.
20. See in particular H. Clegg, *The Changing System of Industrial Relations in Great Britain*, Oxford 1979, p. 444 and vv.
21. Interview with leaders of Solidarność, *Polityka* nr. 44, Warszawa 1980.
22. When, for example, farmers demanded registration of their independent trade union, the government did not accept it, but proposed a new Act of Farmers Self-government. This

provoked a great controversy.

23. L. Hartz in his book *The Liberal Tradition in America*, New York 1955, p. 26 and v.v., makes the very interesting remark that it is different to be born equal, than to become equal. The remark is based on comparative studies of the French and American Revolution. Americans were born equal in some way, French people had to become equal. To become equal they had to abolish an existing structure of feudalism, which was only possible by using force and centralized power.

24. This idea is expressed in the document *The underground society*, issued in July 1982 by the TKK (Temporal Coordination Committee of Solidarność).