„Journal of Management and Business Administration. Central Europe"
Vol. 25, No. 4/2017, p. 209–243, ISSN 2450-7814; e-ISSN 2450-8829

Identity and Diversity: What Shaped Polish Narratives Under Communism and Capitalism

Witold Morawski[1]

at first, the motherland
is close
at your fingertips
later
it bleeds
hurts
– Tadeusz Różewicz (1999, p. 273)

Aims

I shall refer to concepts of identity and difference on the border between culture and society not only to better understand and explain waves of social anger experienced by individuals or communities but also to reflect on ways in which to address the challenges that emerge within the social environment. One is angry when struggling with financial insecurity due to unemployment or low income; economists analyse this phenomenon. Another one is angry because of the mediocrity of those in power; political scientists explore this matter. The media, whose task is to bring the above to public attention, also become instruments that shape events and they aspire or even engage in exercising power. Thus, I shift the focus to society and its culture as sources of anger and, at the same time, areas where we may appease anger (Mishra, 2017; Sloterdijk, 2011). People often tap into the power of identity and difference as a resource. I do not assume that culture prevails, but society needs to take it into account if it is to understand itself and change any distressing aspects of reality.

The concepts of 'identity' and 'difference' ('diversity') have recently been invoked in the context of the collapsing neo-liberal globalisation. It promotes so many 'differences'

[1] Kozminski University
Correspondence address: Kozminski University, Jagiellonska St. 59, 03-301 Warsaw, e-mail: w.morawski45@gmail.com.

Ministry of Science and Higher Education
Republic of Poland
English-language translation of that article was financed under Agreement 763/ P-DUN /2016 with funds from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education allocated to the popularization of science.

DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

that it may prove a threat to 'identities;' i.e., the cultural order, *ergo* various forms of the Establishment. Differences are identities, too, but they are the identities of the Other; often the Faceless Other, someone who may not be our neighbour. Differences proliferate because the world forms a whole – a globe – and globalisation is a conscious social attempt at extending the boundaries up to the limits of the globe itself. Globalisation may, therefore, be conceived as a project that coaxes individuals to accept differences or to think of themselves as open and tolerant. However, the outbreak of the 2007–2009 economic crisis and, more recently, the surge of migration in Europe have proven enough to make us think of differences with dread and perceive them as negative. Populism, economic protectionism, political turmoil, the resurgence of nationalism, or even the threat of deglobalisation all testify to it. This triggers the search for the culprit who would take the blame for anything that goes wrong. In the absence of the real culprit, we create a scapegoat (Girard, 2006). This phenomenon is accounted for either by the inherently selfish and aggressive human nature or by the search for competitive advantage in the world inhabited by intelligent actors: individuals, companies, and states. The atmosphere is suitably reflected by the race that takes the form of various ratings. Even the President of the United States gives in to this trend: after all, he has managed to convince voters that America should still be "first" and "great again."

References to identities and differences help us in the battle for a better tomorrow. To what extent? It remains vague, although we must undoubtedly refer to these two concepts. Culture, as Clifford Geertz explains, is "a historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and their attitudes toward life" (Geertz, 1993, p. 89). Geertz does not shrink from comparing culture to religion and a grand opera, but he also refers to culture as an octopoidal system "moving" by disjointed movements of its tentacles (Geertz, 2005, p. 448).

The concept of identity allows us to distinguish "the qualities of a person or group that make them different from others" (*Cambridge Dictionary*, 2008, p. 713). Identity is a signpost that prescribes relations between an individual and the community to which he or she belongs. It may well serve as a signpost but, with all the twists and turns of life, identity is also subject to change; according to a prominent scholar, it is a "*narrative* that has to be *constantly retold* and reformulated in the light of new *circumstances*" (Stevenson, 2006, p. 278). Berger argues that, although one may easily recognise the main components of identity, it may be "uncertain and variable," as "to live in modern society is to live at the centre of a kaleidoscope of ever changing roles" (Berger, 1995, p. 52). Another author claims:

> We all have multiple identities; even if I accept that I have a primary cultural identity, I may not want to succumb to it. Besides, it would not be too practical. I operate within the market, live through my body and fight while subjugated by others. If I am to perceive myself only as a cultural being, I leave myself little room for manoeuvre and for questioning the world in which I live (Kuper, 2005, p. 213).

Cultures divide more than they connect. This applies to both collective and individual identities. I posit that we picture identity as a circle that becomes gradually covered with differences as they emerge. Or, else: that identity is like the sun which slowly becomes obscured by the moon. Various forces, with unequal resources, collide within the domain of identity:

> Power relationships are constitutive of society because those who have power construct the institutions of society according to their values and interests. Power is exercised by means of coercion (the monopoly of violence, legitimate or not, by the control of the state) and/or by the construction of meaning in people's minds, through mechanisms of symbolic manipulation ... [at the same time,] where there is power, there is always counter-power, for instance in the form of social movements" (Castells, 2013, p. 16–17).

On the one hand, there are traditional forces of the power/coercion hierarchy, striving to control the world, not unlike a champion of chess or snooker; on the other hand, there are decentralised network connections – typical of the most modern societies – capable of eroding rigid hierarchies (Slaughter, p. 2017).

Most challenging are situations in which the pendulum swings too much towards either identity or differences. Barbara Skarga phrases it most aptly: we cannot live without a sense of identity, as we would find ourselves in the land of chaos, yet there may also exist "the imperialism of the Same" (pl. *imperializm Tego–Samego*; Skarga, 1997, p. 14–15). Therefore, there is a risk that, in identity politics, the assessment of reality may become conditional on political affiliation or one's generational perspective, or reveal a particular democratic immaturity (Walicki, 1996). The same applies to difference: those who have no access to difference live in a confined world, while those who are flooded with waves of differences look at the world as it gradually becomes unfamiliar through imperialism, colonialism, communism, neo-liberalism, postmodernism, multiculturalism, etc. Interest in these problems is fuelled by wars, globalisation, technological and communication revolutions, migrations, etc. The latest wave of globalisation left the West feeling delighted with itself, yet the economic crisis that broke out in

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

2007–2009 put an abrupt end to this complacent self-satisfaction and replaced it, instead, with a general feeling of uncertainty and chaos. At the same time, let us not forget that globalisation brought more hope than fear to the Asian countries (Moisi, 2007).

I shall present identity and difference narratives in pairs: a narrative of difference is followed by a narrative of identity, in which difference is perceived as a challenge. In regard to state socialism, I have identified:

1. Total and geopolitically imposed difference *versus* community resources and strategies allowing people to cope in the 'no-alternative world;'
2. Hopes of state socialism: 'socialism with a human face' as an unsuccessful attempt to escape the tyranny of the system *versus* workers' identities counteracting the manipulation of those in power, the movement of dissent;
3. Socialist pseudo-technocracy as failed attempts of modernisation *versus* the opposition like the Polish Workers' Defence Committee (KOR);

Within capitalism (and democracy), I have distinguished:

4. Imitative modernisation (the result of geopolitics or of 'free choice?') *versus* the national state and traditionalism that oppose the liberal West;
5. Differences that are conditional/selected in uncertain times *versus* the new anchors of identity.

Two narratives

Certainly, the willingness to accept the Other has its limits: acceptance fades away if I lose my job because an immigrant is ready to do it for a lower wage; an often-quoted example is the 'Polish plumber,' a common cliché in France. The threat may come from the Distant-Other, working on another continent, if products of his/her work replace mine (outsourcing). Nearly anything that characterises the Other may trigger adverse reactions: the way he/she dresses, eats, prays, or plays. We cannot eliminate differences, and global interdependencies confront us with them more directly. This process is further facilitated by information and communication technologies (the Internet), the spread of multinational companies, and the emergence of new communities, such as economic migrants, tourists, etc.

Diversity inspires some of us to cooperate while, in others, it sparks jealousy, a feeling of uncertainty, or even makes them change their attitude towards migrants. It appears,

for instance, that the presence of Poles in the UK was an essential factor prompting Brits – in particular, older and less educated representatives of small-town Britain – to vote in favour of Brexit. Politicians are rarely puzzled by the voters' behaviour as, most of the time, they are responsible for orienting members of the public towards the path that they consider appropriate. Anger is often legitimate, but the important question is who and how will take advantage of the social wrath. Let us recall that the collapse of the previous – second – wave of globalisation precipitated fierce attacks on rationalism, universalism, liberalism, and Christianity. That wave ended in the self-destruction in the form of two world wars and the birth of two totalitarian ideologies, fascism and Nazism on the right and communism on the left, the great economic crisis of the 1930s, the Holocaust, etc. The current wave may not be so menacing, although it has jeopardised the entire Western middle class. This is why we tend to seek solace in the forces of identity, hoping that they will help us find a better place on the maps of time, space, occupation, income, and social status. After all, the identity forces have at their disposal the great community resources, such as family, religion, historical tradition, education, production patterns, and national culture.

Differences appear without warning, let alone consent. They also inspire a plethora of reactions: shame, discomfort, jealousy, resentment, withdrawal, but also institutional innovations, protest, or change in one's political orientation. Rapid and creative solutions in response to challenges are rare, which is why, as advocated by neo-liberalism, the process had to begin with adjustment. Yet, adjustment has only heightened the economic and social inequalities and, therefore, it has failed to amend the situation. It revealed the truth that had thus far been partially hidden: the recommended adjustment obscured the so-called 'structural violence.' Nothing is new under the sun: violence is ubiquitous in the written history of humankind as argues the book devoted to the subject by North, Wallis, and Weingast (2009). Conversely, others claim that violence is declining and its place take "better angels," such as empathy, self-control, reason, the moral sense, and gentle commerce (Pinker, 2015, p. 727–849). Certainly, market mechanisms that promote creative imitation or plain copying may not be naked violence, but can we qualify them as "angelic endeavours?" The effects of such actions are more visible when we refer to the activity of NGOs rooted in specific values and norms, such as social justice or religion.

We may track these phenomena along two axes. Functional differences in the sphere of economy, politics, and society form the vertical axis. They are the result of the reward and punishment structures. We call this process modernisation; it creates hierarchies of wealth, power, and prestige, even if they are distinct and contingent on the system: free market/democratic, authoritarian, communist etc.

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

The horizontal axis comprises a variety of connections that bind individuals with communities at local, regional, national, European, and global levels. There are identity ties that are to hold together whatever the sphere of functional diversity separates and keeps apart. A particular kind of glue called trust or social capital (Sztompka, 2016) is necessary to ensure the harmonisation or coordination of systems. Alternatively, one may refer to the traditional forms of integration: nation, religion, race, brotherhood of Europe, etc. The modern nation, which is to draw people together, is often the product of the state that, through modernisation processes, differentiates and divides society into classes, thus distancing individuals from one another.

Further considerations presented in this article relate primarily to the second axis; the first axis shall serve as the conditioning background. First and foremost, we shall discuss socio-cultural and political identities, devoting less attention to economic identities. I regard differences not as gaps in identity because we tend to accept them (although much less willingly these days), even if out of self-interest rather than love for the Other. In short: the major challenge is to strike a balance between identity and difference; that is, to definitely combine divergent ways of life. The most important types of relationships are:

1. imposed relationships that give rise to confrontation. They may be inflicted militarily but also through mechanisms of state and legal coercion;
2. complementary relationships, such as 'glocality' (global plus local). They tend to develop through imitation, for instance through market mechanisms;
3. mutual osmosis, with numerous asymmetrical solutions: the result of interactions between many divergent factors;
4. friendly support when symmetrical solutions predominate due to certain normative mechanisms.

Total difference as a result of geopolitics

The establishment of the Polish People's Republic is an example of a absolute difference imposed to a great extent externally: not only militarily by the victorious Soviet army marching on Berlin, because the regime was also shaped by agreements concluded by the USSR with the Western Allies (for instance in Yalta). Therefore, in expounding the genesis of the new system, accent must be placed on the geopolitical factor. It should be considered decisive as much for the emergence of the new system (1944–1945) as – several decades later – for its collapse in 1989.

The difference marks a break in the historical continuity on a scale that surpasses anything that had been known throughout the Polish history. In the words of the philosopher Ryszard Legutko: "The symbolic homeland of Poles has been shifted outside of its present geographical boundaries, and for the vast majority it meant no more than Thermopylae, Appomattox, or Père-Lachaise" (2008, p. 12). Even though this thesis may seem far-fetched, it reveals something about the millions of Poles who could not cultivate their Polishness where their parents and grandparents had lived. Fortunately, the new regime did not manage to implement all of its total reconstruction plans. Despite the tremendous change that happened to Poland in that period, it preserved remnants of what many call 'Polishness' (although some sociologists prefer to speak of the 'national character' in this context).

This does not mean we can skip questions about the criteria applied to evaluate the situation. The first thing that springs to my mind is Saint Augustine's conviction that "war is the mother of all things." War, which brings suffering and death, steers our thoughts towards religion, culture, civilisation, or these parts of the 'spiritual canopy' that may determine the content of identity and difference narratives. Undoubtedly, one also needs to account for the particular issues affecting each person, family, group or social class, nation, or society. For example, one cannot forget certain facts from Polish history: our neighbours, Germans and Russians, consciously murdered educated Poles (*inter alia* in Katyń); Poland's boundaries were moved by hundreds of kilometres; people were chased from their homes in the East (*Kresy*) and resettled; the lands of the former Piast realm in the West were returned to Poland after the Second World War; nearly 40 per cent of the national wealth was lost; the aim of the Holocaust was to exterminate the Jewish minority, which before the Second World War formed an important part of the slowly developing Polish middle class.

This background contributed to the shaping of the party-state, which fully developed in the period between 1948 and 1956. Differences introduced at the time clashed with the values and culture of Polish society. The process was called a revolution, which the architects of the new system identified with the inexorable progress of history (historical materialism), and only to a lesser extent with social forces, particularly the proletariat, which was to foster a revolution in the name of historical justice to legitimise the system. Let us emphasise that the new system never managed to attain complete normative legitimacy, even though the agricultural reform, the Western Territories, mass social advancement for millions of people, etc. were consonant with the expectations of millions of Poles. In the process, the system was gaining the so-called instrumental acceptance. The new system gave Poles a sense of having a state of their own. Similar systems had already been in place in Poland's history (e.g. Kingdom

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

of Poland). Therefore, when explaining the genesis of the system, we need to point to a combination of different factors (Fitzpatrick, 2017).

The offensive of the total difference introduced at the time took several forms: first, a complete break with the political tradition inherited from the Second Polish Republic; second, the construction of the party state modelled on the USSR, a state that is not an emanation of the nation (nation-state) but a concretisation of a vision formulated by the Communist Party apparatus; third, the centralisation of political life; fourth, the nationalisation of the economy and its subjection to the tenets of central planning and command economy; fifth, the abolition of civil society as an independent source of initiative and human activity; six, promoting cultural patterns that not only contradicted the canons of national culture but attacked them as relics of the past that inhibit social advancement; seven, the construction of the 'new human,' mainly through school, work, and, to a much lesser degree, home.

The offensive brought modest effects: changes would have taken place even without the involvement of state authorities. After all, for two generations of Poles, the Polish People's Republic was their 'own history,' a special kind of common good within the no-alternative world of the Cold War. For this reason, claims about the 'revolution' as the result of the will of the people seem misconstrued. For from the onset of this 'revolution,' reality itself surpassed the external invasion, the tyranny of the local state-party apparatus, the utopia of the doctrine, or even the dreams of the socialist (non-communist) left. It was up to society to look for practical answers to the challenges of the time, and the limited national sovereignty alone could not prevent it from this pursuit. The need to change was stronger which clearly transpires from the diaries and memoirs of Polish peasants, Poles from the Western Territories, and industrial workers, that Polish sociologists collected and analysed.

We should assess other products of the 'revolution,' such as industrialisation or modernisation, in a similar manner. Every modern society undertook such challenges, and always a solution appeared, even if, in certain cases, it was so radical that it brought about tragic consequences (for instance, higher classes in Russia, unlike in Japan, failed to take action, hence the revolution of 1917 and attempts at industrialisation by revolutionary activists). In Poland, like in the USSR, it was accomplished by the Communist party elite; in other countries, liberal, conservative, imperial, and other elites undertook the task (Kerr, 1973). In other words, the confrontation between society and the imposed differences was unavoidable but also lessened by geopolitics and the challenges of modernisation (first and foremost, industrialisation). The latter inspired general hope for change, which opened a window of opportunity for the

authorities; unfortunately, they proved incapable of exploiting it. The social divide was gradually deepening, or it would probably be more accurate to say that social life followed several tracks. Poles wanted to accept certain differences, regarding them as less oppressive than those externally imposed; they were ready to embrace the identities that allowed them to hold their heads high.

Community resources: how to use them in the no-alternative world?

> I am like a flag surrounded by vast, open space.
> I sense the coming winds and must live through them,
> while all other things among themselves do not yet move:
> The doors close quietly, and in the chimneys is silence;
> The windows do not yet tremble, and the dust is still heavy and dark.
>
> I already know the storms, and I'm as restless as the sea.
> I roll out in waves and fall back upon myself,
> and throw myself off into the air and am completely alone
> in the immense storm.
>
> – "Premonition", Rainer Maria Rilke (2006, p. 52)

The 'total difference' narrative contrasts with the dominant socio-cultural order, which has a variety of resources at hand. First, national and Catholic values. Second, the peasant culture along with the political forces that appeal to them (PSL, Mikołajczyk). Third, the tradition of fighting against the occupant during the Second World War, in particular, the Polish Underground State and the Home Army, alongside the collective memory of this period, especially the tragedy of the 1944 Warsaw Uprising. The legend of the so-called 'cursed soldiers' (pol. *żołnierze wyklęci*) testifies to the disagreement within the Polish society about proper action after the end of the Second World War. Fourth, family as the vital cell of the social organism. Fifth, culture and traditions, especially those rooted in the Romanticism and Positivism.

Yet, no uniform institutional system developed behind these values, beliefs, customs, and opinions, with the exception of the Catholic Church. The Soviets imposed an alternative order, even though political differences inherited from previous periods would become visible over time. One of them was the tradition of National Democracy, whose advocates placed particular emphasis on national unity, while the Sanation camp favoured the idea of diversity as a value rooted in the multinational Jagiellonian tradition. The authorities of the Second Republic of Poland succeeded at erasing some of these differences, but a number of them re-emerged after the war. For instance,

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

sociologists explain the differences in the results of post-1989 elections by referring to the divergences rooted in Poland's partitions of the 19th century.

Despite various obstacles, Polish identity gradually strengthened. Did the process afford us the right questions and the right answers? The prominent Polish 20th-century writer, Witold Gombrowicz, was pessimistic about it: Poles are unable to express themselves and, therefore, he claimed: "Poles should be safeguarded from Poland ... [in order to] become less submitted. We need to detach ourselves a little bit. Get off our knees" (Gombrowicz, 1986, p. 6). However, it seems that Gombrowicz was wrong: in the 1980s, Poles disproved his judgement. How do other societies manage when faced with such challenges? According to the American historian, James Hadley Billington (2004, p. 158–160), there are four paths of finding oneself.

The first path is to erase the problem from social consciousness. For example, in the People's Republic of China, no criticism fell on those responsible for genocide. Also in Poland, the state authorities used to permanently remove certain issues from the field of vision of the public – for instance, the sub-standard living conditions – while other problems, such as anti-Semitism, disappeared only temporarily. The scale of the scheme was incomparable to the manipulations that took place in China or the USSR.

The second path is to shift the responsibility for evil deeds from oneself to others, preferably external enemies. The Polish Communist elites conveniently applied this method due to the country's historically unfavourable geopolitical location.

The third path is to avoid the problem of evil within society by creating the image of the noble elites, allegedly capable of rectifying evil. One may find a number of negative examples of this path in Polish history: the elites did not always fulfil their duties as expected because they either "deserted" (Kaminski, 2014) or acted like "lumpen elites" representing an inadequate ethical level (Pawełczyńska, 2004, s. 144–156).

The fourth path is to defeat evil through the redemptive power of innocent suffering, such as the suffering of Christ. This path is deeply rooted in the Polish tradition. Interestingly, politicians capitalise on this vein whenever the situation in the country improves: the excellent example is the enthronement of Jesus Christ as the King of Poland under the current government of Law and Justice (PiS), albeit without much enthusiasm of the Catholic Church.

The situation immediately after the Second World War was not conducive to the broad discussion on these issues. More mundane questions occupied Poles at that time:

shelter, work, safety, etc. Ideology did not help people find the right answers to these questions as only one primitive rule prevailed: the old means are wrong, and individual pursuits hinder social development. Thus, whatever was the most valuable could be defended through either collective or individual action.

The first path involves the organisation of an entire community against the imposed difference. People appeal for help to the nation, spirit, community, religion, etc. For a long time, it was not a viable path, although it encompassed various experiences, including the military. The Polish society was divided. Marcin Zaremba qualifies the years 1944–1947 as a period of "anxiety" rather than fear. Zaremba cites Jean Delumeau:

> fear has a specific object which one can confront. Anxiety does not and it is experienced as a painful expectation of a danger all the more frightful for not being clearly identified... Consequently, it is more difficult to bear than fear... Anxiety is not experienced collectively, it is individual, subjective (qtd. In: Zaremba, 2012, p. 38).

For a long time, the Polish society was incapable of any collective action. What testifies to this inability is the number of accounts of many years of misery and exile experienced by thousands of Poles expelled from Warsaw to the General Government and the Reich after the 1944 Uprising (Przybysz, 2017). Collective action which involved the entire society happened not earlier than at the beginning of the 1980s. However, local outbreaks of organised collective rebellion appeared in Poland since 1956.

The second path encompasses the actions of individuals who are conscious of their value and revere freedom; such disposition was not deeply anchored in the Polish mentality. While liberty, defined as collective independence, always had priority in Polish culture, it refers to individual freedom as proposed by liberalism. This has always proven problematic. The weakness of Polish capitalism has thwarted the development of liberalism. Essentially, there is no liberalism and liberal democracy without autonomous individuals, just as there is no democracy without democrats.

Like in the words of Rilke, "all other things among themselves do not yet move," this situation persisted in Poland over 35 years. It was not until 1980 that 10 million Poles engaged in a social movement and their participation required individual decisions about membership in Solidarity. According to the philosopher Józef Tischner (1993), Poles may have regained their collective freedom as a nation, but they are not capable of taking advantage of their liberty. It is only through combining the two paths that we have a real chance to succeed. In that period, one could not foresee that these events

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

directly followed the end of the war. The first signs of change only became discernible in 1956, among industrial workers; most migrated to Poland's largest cities from the countryside. For a long time, their viewpoints did not have the hallmarks of the "cultural knife;" instead, their actions resembled "the octopus, whose tentacles are in large part separately integrated" (Geertz, 2005, p. 448).

Social imaginaries of Polish individuals and communities needed time to form and ripen (Taylor, 2010). Such process is partly spontaneous and partly organised by elites. In the 1980s, negative attitudes towards the state authorities united and connected the people into a close-knit 'we.' This linkage was a non-deterministic mechanism, and nothing within it was certain, as opposed to the deterministic influence of external structures – geopolitics and the governing regime – in which we can discern the causal mechanisms. Regardless of our assessment of the cultural order, the impact of Solidarity was the prerequisite for orienting society towards the path of qualitative change.

Attempts at fleeing the system: "socialism with a human face"; or, socialist pseudo-technocracy

The events of 1956 marked a qualitative change within the system, yet not a change of the system itself. The party state was no longer totalitarian, although it undoubtedly still had all the makings of an authoritarian system. The country, ruled by a clique of top party officials, was democratic in name only. We should mention several changes "for the better" introduced after 1956 which mostly resulted from:

1. The Poznań Uprising in June 1956 when seventy people were killed and 600 wounded. A change in the top leadership of the party followed in October: the national communist Władysław Gomułka returned to power. The Ministry of Public Security released from solitary confinement Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński who, then, called on Poles to go to the polls. Some unlawfully arrested prisoners were released;
2. The authorities consented to the establishment of workers' councils on one condition: social participation was authorised if workers contributed to productive and economic mobilisation;
3. The administration made attempts at reforming the economy in the spirit of decentralisation. This strengthened indirect links of power and, in the long run, fostered the emergence of socialist technocracy, or a new type of middle class;
4. Fourth, the party abandoned the idea of agricultural collectivisation. Peasants became a double force: rural areas were a source of labour for the industry

and cities as well as the force that oriented the economy towards the market. Eighty per cent of the arable land remained in the hands of private owners;
5. There appeared a liberalisation in the intellectual sphere, which took the form of changes in the university curricula, partial relaxation of censorship, and consent to public discussion on sensitive topics. Although these changes were temporary and conditional, they distinguished Poland from other countries of the Soviet Block;
6. Six, following the death of Stalin, the communist party itself changed. Furthermore, the following deserve mention: the independence of the Chinese Communist Party, the expectations of the Western Left, and the emergence of dissidents and revisionists, or party reformers.

Many hailed these changes the "renewal of socialism" or "socialism with a human face." After a few years, they transpired less spectacular than initially heralded. The changes were significant but, certainly, did not keep up with the growing expectations of the public. On the one hand, the "Polish October" marked the end of the cruellest period in the history of the imposed political system; on the other hand, it was also associated with lost hopes for a real reform of state socialism. The disappointment was bitter, especially for those close to the party – let us label them the camp of the ingenuous – but also for the so-called realists who regarded the socialist Poland as their only real homeland and wanted actively strived to see it grow. It should be clearly stated that political reforms initiated at that time could never have succeeded as they did not encompass a number of vital achievements of human civilisation, such as private property, the rule of law, independent civil society, the separation of powers, etc. Even more curious were the declarations of the introduction of direct democracy; workers' councils and self-governing trade organisations. These announcements transpired to be yet another manipulation that only contributed to the ritualization of the system and the game of appearances. Nevertheless, industrial workers saw it differently.

The idea of a "renewal of socialism" waned within the party itself, although it both fostered the development of the revisionist movement and, unfortunately, resulted in the reinforcement of the nationalist faction (1968). Following another social revolt in December 1970–44 people were killed and 1,200 wounded during the events in the north of Poland – the authorities once again undertook to reform the state. The aim was to "improve the system" through:

1. improved consumption and new transport infrastructure: roads, stations, and small cars;

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

2. the country's opening to the West: using foreign loans and capitalising on tourism and foreign contacts to boost investments;
3. the modernisation of the economy: changes to the central planning and economic management system; the so-called large economic organisation reform;
4. the delegation of certain decisions from the top to the middle level. Thus, a group of party technocrats appeared which consisted of engineers, economists, management students (at the time, this area of knowledge was in its infancy in Poland) and – occasionally – sociologists;
5. the reduction of grass-roots participation – workers' councils, self-governing trade organisations – to ritual functions. The Committee of Workers' Councils, as the main institution of self-government, was only empowered to introduce cosmetic changes to the decisions of top party officials.

To this day, many Poles look back to the period of Edward Gierek's government with nostalgia, even though it also was somewhat disappointing, just like the changes after October 1956. The Party tried to fix the system but not change. Changes were rather perceived as a form of political theatre as in the famous dialogue between the Party's First Secretary and the labourers: "Will you help? – We will." We should, however, remark on the real progress, evidenced by the fact that the Party refrained from using force to quash the workers' protests in 1980. Instead, the state authorities negotiated with the protesters which, eventually, led to the adoption of the Gdańsk Agreements. This was a fateful moment, headlined throughout the world, and a rare source of genuine national pride in the Polish history. Still, the success was temporary as the new government introduced martial law. According to the long-term study of the Polish opinion polling institute CBOS, it remains a peculiar kind of national tragedy that Poles seem most inclined to justify, even several decades later (Wenzel, 2010).

At the same time, as Karl Polanyi remarks, a counter-movement started to strengthen and develop: in the mid-1970s, free trade unions started mushrooming, there began the Workers' Defence Committee, and several Polish cities witnessed riots. Notwithstanding numerous differences, the approach of Wojciech Jaruzelski's government, which relied on military power, was analogous to the style of government initiated by Gierek. I qualify it as pseudo-technocratic: a more educated state apparatus with society as a self-operating machine without people, even though it promoted consumption or foreign travel. This approach resulted in all kinds of disasters: a "normal" economic crisis; institutional anarchy like the emergence of a "bureaucratic market" instead of an economic market; continuous horse-trading between systems of power; and, the loss of hope among the general public who no longer believed in the possibility of any real change. The system entered its twilight phase, and it soon fizzled out

Three attempts at modernisation were made during this period of Polish history – by Gomułka, Gierek, and Jaruzelski – yet none of them may be qualified as modern. The ruling elites were convinced about their ability to lead Poland towards the subsequent stages of social development, but neither the system nor its people could "surpass" themselves. The elites believed, for example, that Poland could selectively take advantage of certain solutions offered by the Western economy, such as loans or technological licenses; these hopes omitted the fact that all these efforts would be fruitless without the rule of law, private ownership, the development of an independent civil society, etc. It resembles Lenin's way of thought, yet his approach seems more consistent with the Russian tradition. This contention may seem peculiar, but I refer to the theory of Billington, who claims that Russian culture does not shrink from imitating foreign solutions, or even importing them altogether, be it the Byzantine icon, German war economy, or Taylorism. In this tradition, "plants can be transplanted without roots" (Billington, 2004, p. 48). Stalin managed to involve Westerners in building the Soviet state, for instance, by engaging them in the construction of steelworks and the town of Magnitogorsk; Kotkin (1995) explores this subject in a fine monograph.

The system that initially favoured fast economic growth eventually pushed Poland on the trajectory of civilisational drift. The economic collapse in the mid-1970s – energy crises – persisted over the next sixteen years (Kochanowicz, 2010). It was a nail in the coffin for the entire system. The famous prophesy of Tocqueville was coming true: attempts at repairing a defective system may easily lead to its collapse, should they reveal the true principles of its operation. Gorbachev's reforms in Russia – 'glasnost' and 'perestroika' – are one of the examples of this historical institutional trap. These reforms indirectly helped Poland, as they irrevocably erased the illusion that socialist technocracy was capable of developing and operating an autonomous vision. As a consequence, the differences between the 'socialism with a human face' and socialist technocracy, which were to ideologically distance Poles from the West, with their unsustainability drew us closer. Such was the world of the 'socialist fiction' – a complete cacophony. The outside world won the systemic competition in all disciplines: from military to economic to cultural. People lost the hopes of both the October generation and First Secretary Gierek's era.

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

Worker identities rectify the intentions of authorities

(...)
In the vacant places
We will build with new bricks

Where the bricks are fallen
We will build with new stone
Where the beams are rotten
We will build with new timbers
Where the word is unspoken
We will build with new speech
There is work together
A Church for all
And a job for each
Every man to his work.
– Eliot (2007, p. 184, 185)

"October" in Warsaw or, earlier, "June" in Poznań were social revolts against the degeneration of the totalitarian system; they marked the beginning of "Poland's path out of communism" (Pełczyński, 2007). They were attempts at escaping the tyranny of the one-party system. According to some, the endeavour proved successful; others claim the opposite.

The situation seemed promising. At a political rally by the Palace of Culture and Science, the inhabitants of Warsaw enthusiastically greeted Gomułka as the "national communist" who was to regain a slice of sovereignty for Poland. No one expected to see such changes to result from a conflict within the political elites. In fact, the riots of 1956 were not so much about erasing the failures and transgressions of the party state, as presented by the Communist Party, but yet another manifestation of social emancipation: Poles started to take matters into their own hands. The historian Topolski who analysed the Poznań events accurately qualifies them as an "uprising" (2015, p. 336).

Changes, albeit minor, were real. They inspired hope for the future. For a period, the system would assume a more human face which many called the "renewal of socialism". How should we assess it? First of all, we must bear in mind the historical perspective and remember that the countries of Central and Eastern Europe were to remain within the sphere of control of the USSR for the following thirty years. Thousands of Hungarians were killed in the uprising of autumn 1956. The West remained indifferent

to freedom movements in the countries of the Soviet Block (Kamiński, 2017, p. 46–49). It is also true, however, that Władysław Gomułka managed to negotiate with Moscow successfully. As a result, eighty per cent of agricultural land in Poland remained in the hands of individual owners, and Poles enjoyed certain freedoms; for instance, the possibility of foreign travel. Access to such privileges was much more limited for the citizens of other countries of the Soviet Block. It was important, but it was a far cry from the freedom and democracy that Poles wanted. 1956 marked yet another new beginning, one of countless in Poland's history (Urbankowski, 2015).

The most far-reaching collective action was the creation of workers' councils, first at the FSO car factory in Żerań (Warsaw), under the leadership of Lechosław Gaździk, who was a Communist Party member. The workers' movement soon started to gain momentum and spread over the entire country. It was the response of industrial workers to the malevolent system. Initially, the answer was simple: the system requires repair. When it transpired that problems defy fixing, the workers' anger no longer appeared as the destruction of national property – as the party's propaganda had it – but as a movement with a moral dimension. Life, work, and spirit all form a coherent whole. Workers were the salt of the earth – Pope John Paul II said – because they wanted to be co-responsible for the operation of the plants they operated, just as Thomas S. Eliot writes in "Choruses from *The Rock*" in 1934.

Workers' councils were the earliest forms of direct democracy in Communist Poland. Poles drew inspiration from the communist Yugoslavia: Edward Kardelj's writings appeared in translation, and many analysed the practices of Yugoslavian communism, even though they came under harsh criticism from Moscow. In terms of the doctrine, workers self-government also stemmed from the social-democratic movement or "distributive socialism," but the Polish movement originated in another way. Czesław Miłosz writes that although "political terror affected each Pole," "communism shifted Poland, for the first time, into the orbit of European thought, for better or for worse" (Miłosz 2006, p. 115; Miłosz, 2013, p. 424). Even though those who remained within the communist paradigm rarely produced anything remarkably original, it did not prevent others from creating a wealth of outstanding and memorable works of art and culture. The literary work of Miłosz, who was never a Marxist himself, is a prime example of this.

Today's assessments of the events of October 1956 vary. For some, it was the beginning of Poland's path out of totalitarianism and towards an authoritarian system (Z. Pełczyński, A. Walicki). For party reformers, it was a wasted opportunity to establish 'socialism with a human face.' For others, it resembled a rebellion of slaves who lacked

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

imagination and experience in fighting the system. For many, it was a source of inspiration, even if haunting for a long time after. Today, negative – and often unjust – assessments prevail. They are unjust because the judgement is formulated on the basis of the present-day criteria, which bear little resemblance to the divided world of the Cold War period. Let us recall that the bloody suppression of the uprising in Hungary did not prompt any intervention from the West, as evidenced by the repeatedly quoted statement made by the US Secretary of State, John F. Dulles.

Regardless of any positive statements one may make about that enslaved generation, it is fair to say that the 'coming of age' of social actors and their preparation to take action slowly appeared, although both the workers and political elites knew of the persistent systemic deficiencies. So was the academia, for instance, sociologists. Was it slow because the skills necessary to repair the system were lacking? Or, maybe the system simply was beyond repair? It was only the emergence of Solidarity in 1980 and the subsequent events, which culminated in 1989, that testify to the development of intellectual and social resources. There is general agreement with respect to several issues:

First, Solidarity was created by industrial workers. They decided to self-organise on a horizontal basis – locally and regionally.

Second, in their actions, the workers referred to specific needs and values, such as respect for work, human dignity, or, more generally, recognition. High on their list of priorities, the workers also placed wages, working conditions, and employment.

Third, the workers gave substance to what Rainer Maria Rilke refers to as "hidden" and what may be described as a 'spiritual heightening.' Workers would go to confession at the shipyard, which was later shown on public television. The Church played a major role in this process; Pope John Paul II confirmed the Church's involvement during his later visit to Warsaw: "Let your Spirit descend and renew the face of the earth, the face of this land." As the representative of the Catholic Church in Poland, Cardinal Karol Wyszyński advocated gradual change. This attitude was to bring positive results, given that the state authorities acted both ineptly and confrontationally.

Fourth, the liberal intelligentsia joined the workers' movement despite the Communist Party's earlier attempts to raise mutual hostility among these two social classes, for example in 1968.

Workers led the fight autonomously. They were both soldiers and officers fighting the system, unlike in previous epochs, when insurgences tended to be organised by the upper classes.

Fifth, the 1981 programme presented by Solidarity in Gdańsk-Oliwa was naïve and voluntarist, as if from a world that never existed. It was a socialist utopia that encompassed workers' self-government. Workers wanted state property to become public property. They were against the kind of capitalism that prevailed in Western countries, as it afforded no room for any real involvement of workers in the decision-making process which they desired. Pope John Paul II's supported their concept in his encyclical entitled *Laborem exercens*, published in the autumn of 1981, on the ninetieth anniversary of the encyclical *Rerum novarum*. As explains the historian of ideas Andrzej Walicki, it was a "populist socialist" movement, not a free market movement (2016, p. 14). Any neoliberal would regard the programme of Solidarity as anachronistic, anarchist, and socialist. Solidarity's endeavours ceased upon the introduction of martial law. The movement prepared framework for an alternative system: a romantic fantasy that could never come true neither in the reality of state socialism nor within any capitalist economy. Could it be that this dream gave Solidarity the strength necessary to fight for freedom?

Imitative modernisation: the product of geopolitics or "free choice?"

> From the East – sly lies and obscurantism
> Cowed obedience and a golden cage
> Leprosy, venom and filth.
>
> In the West – glittering lies of knowledge,
> Truth's formalism – vacuous interiors
> And arrogance!...
> – "Song from Our Land", Cyprian Kamil Norwid (1999, p. 68)

The sequence of events initiated in 1989 with the Round Table Agreement turned into a systemic transformation project; it was not "the end of history" as Francis Fukuyama proclaimed in the West but, rather, some 'escape from fate,' which others ambitiously refer to as 'free choice.' The latter should come with a question mark: after all, was it not again the shape of an externally imposed systemic change? Did geopolitics not play a decisive role in the process? This time, the Western option prevailed, and Poland behaved like a neophyte in a new order. We readily embraced an extreme version of

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

neo-liberalism like a miracle drug that should cure the ills of the socialist economy. Numerous descriptions of the implementation of various recommendations of Western experts in Polish reality now sound ludicrous (Klein, 2007).

The year 1989 is recurrently referred to as annus mirabilis. A number of events took place during this 'wonderful year' in Poland: Round Table talks in April; partially free parliamentary elections on the 4th of June; the creation of the first non-communist government led by Tadeusz Mazowiecki as the Prime Minister in September; the Sejm's adoption of the act on the systemic economic reform in late December. Poland's accession to NATO followed in 1999 and the EU in 2004; for Poles, they form part of the same sequence of events. However, the electoral victory of PiS in 2005 and 2015/2016 casts a gloom over any positive evaluations of this series of events. First, PiS won the parliamentary elections by juxtaposing "solidary Poland" against "liberal Poland." Some critical assessments expressed by PiS were valid and a number of solutions implemented by the new government that took over in 2015/16 – mainly the "500+ Family" programme – have improved the situation of the most disadvantaged, even if the expected demographic effects of these policies remain negligible. Nevertheless, PiS government's systemic changes encounter growing intellectual and social resistance which deepens the divide among Poles. These negative assessments go hand in hand with the applause of approximately thirty-five per cent of Poles who believe that the ruling party is right in its attempts at "fixing" the state.

Just as in 1944/1945, and earlier in 1918, †he external factors played a major role in shaping the events of 1989. Most importantly, communism lost the war with capitalism. Since the 1960s, communism was undergoing a spectacular disintegration throughout the world. Such was the background that determined the events in Poland and throughout Central and Eastern Europe. It set the direction and style of the modernisation process, dubbed "imitative modernisation," tainted with several kinds of unfortunate dependencies from the West (Krasnodębski, 2003). I believe that this term intends not to imply condemnation of any form of imitation but, rather, the kind of imitation that is not creative and innovative. Whether Polish values and interests have been taken into account in the process of its implementation is another matter. PiS claims that they were not, while the Civic Platform (PO) argues the opposite.

Undeniably, the modernisation process took place with Poland being part of the West as the dominant global system. It is a regime of "structural violence" with institutions that safeguard its dominant position: the World Bank, the International Monetary System, etc. The West stands atop the global pyramid of wealth, power, and prestige. A Marxist would qualify it as a system of exploitation and inequality, but even a (neo)

realist, that is, a conservative, will agree that the West has all the makings of a "liberal empire," and that the United States are the hegemon of the modern world. Those who do not concur with the above may perhaps agree with the thesis that violence has been ubiquitous throughout the history of humankind (North, Wallis and Weingast, 2009). I refer in this context to the "substitution" of the East by the West (Morawski, 2014). I advocated Poland's "selective" acceptance of the West (the EU), or even the need to build the country on the basis of its "own design." Needless to say, it would require closely working with the West and playing a particularly active role within the EU.

The defeat of communism enabled Solidarity members to launch the process of transformation, just as in 1918 the defeat of the three invaders allowed Piłsudski – or the insurgents of Wielkopolska and Silesia – to succeed. Without the collapse of communism, Solidarity would not have become an effective driver of internal change. Few Poles criticise the country's orientation towards the West, yet the number of those who have a negative opinion of the EU is growing. In 2017, eighty-eight per cent of Poles wanted the country to remain part of the EU. Critics of the West emphasize that they belong to it. The only way forward seems to be wise/prudent rationality (for, as claimed by Hayek, not all rationality is prudent/wise). A medium-size country cannot aspire to lead other, smaller states. It should not, however, remain 'on its knees' forever.

We carried out our transformation process to the best of our abilities, doing a better job than many countries, even if we lag behind the top-ranking few. The Round Table 'transaction elites' conducted the task. As argued by Clark Kerr and others, almost everywhere and always there will be elites willing to undertake such a task (Kerr, 1973). We may insist that transformation elites would have been better than transactional elites. It is incontestable and something favoured by any country under transformation. Undeniably, Polish political elites seemed willing to indiscriminately imitate Western models, many of which could be classified within the neoliberal paradigm. Nowadays, these decisions come under widespread criticism. The most frequent allegation is the conflict of interest between the EU and the Polish cultural tradition, in particular, the national and Catholic identity. A theoretical discussion on this topic is, however, rudimentary. Several interesting studies explore the constantly changing challenges posed by modernisation, but most analyses consider only the past (Jedlicki, 1988). Some critics of imitative modernisation reject its very notion (Lubbe, 2010) and suggest that another coherent version of modernity is possible, one that would bring about the kind of 'normalisation; consistent with the will of society. I do not believe this to be feasible. There will always be several concepts of modernisation. Hence, I agree with Michael Ignatieff, who claims:

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

> "Modernity is a reality shaped by human will, capitalist, anticapitalist, liberal, conservative, socialist, all pulling in different directions to produce the vast and fragmented reality in which we have to live" (Ignatieff, 2017, p. 6).

The breakthrough of 1989 surpassed the imagination of the entire generation. Few expected the system to collapse, even though millions fought against it. External factors may have been decisive in this process (the defeat of communism by capitalism, 'Star Wars,' etc.), but the internal erosion of the system was also of great consequence. Twenty years ago, Józef Tischner predicted that this newly gained freedom would leave us unsure what to do (Tischner, 1998). We have not advanced in this respect since then, although, following its electoral victory, PiS has managed to impose new topics of public debate. It is still too early to predict the consequences of this change. Going back to the subject of imitation of Western standards, we must state that our expectations in the economic sphere have been constrained by the rules governing the global markets, whose openness is guaranteed by several powerful institutions with a global reach. We had to bear certain costs, including some form of restriction of national sovereignty; after all, there is no such thing as free lunch.

In its transformation, Poland emulated the model of Anglo-Saxon capitalism with the neo-liberal variant of economic globalisation. Poland is a country of semi-peripheral capitalism based on free market and private enterprise. Polish society rejected its more radical variants first in 2005, and even more vehemently in 2015–2016. Will the new government's policies, implemented under the slogan of "good change," really alter the situation? It will only become apparent with time. Today, Poland's economic situation is quite good, as if the potential accumulated over the years has finally started to take action autonomously. The economic upturn within the UE positively impacts our situation as well.

The national state and traditionalism against the liberal west

Critics of imitation transformation regard the outcome of the 'Round Table' negotiations as 'conceived in sin,' even though the world applauded the compromise, even in the countries of the Communist Block. Its critics endeavour something more, though. First of all, they want to settle political accounts with those representatives of Solidarity who reached an agreement with the moderate faction of the defeated regime. This phenomenon is not uncommon in human history: children of the revolution tend to devour each other. Secondly, we observe attempts at formulating a new interpretation of Polish history. In both strategies, one needs a mental liberation of Poles. It is understood as the rejection of the values represented by the neo-liberals and the secular

vision of the state. The main instrument of the critics is the national state or, in a more extreme version, 'the Catholic state of the Polish nation.' Officially, the Church does not seem to support this standpoint, as it is well aware of the fact that, in the long run, unduly close ties with the authorities and the ruling party will always prove detrimental and tarnish its moral reputation.

The critics of the previous Establishment construe an alternative system under the slogan of 'good change,' advancing the 'extinction' of anti-values allegedly represented, among others, by Andrzej Wajda or Tadeusz Mazowiecki. Such is the viewpoint expressed by the representatives of PiS, and they follow their declarations with actions. The new government introduced a number of institutional and legal changes to strengthen the type of state which seriously threatens the principle of the separation of powers, the primacy of the Constitutional Tribunal, or the autonomy of the judicial system. Sweeping personnel changes do not end with the distribution of political spoils after the electoral victory – after all, such is the right of the victorious party – but they seem oriented towards the creation of a so-called "new hub of political command" (Sadurski, 2016, p. 12). The real shape of 'the new' is not yet fully visible. The direction of change will become clearer after the upcoming elections: parliamentary, local, and presidential, as well as the newly appointed political teams. Let us only cite the opinion of Karol Modzelewski, historian and prominent activist of the Solidarity movement, who claims that Poland is in the midst of building a "police state" (Modzelewski, 2017).

How should we comprehend the concept of a nation-state? First and foremost, economic and political globalisation seems to diminish the importance of the state, as it engulfs it with larger, global structures. Nevertheless, it does not eliminate the state, but merely redefines it. The state remains important yet receives a different role and assumes new external functions. It is not unfounded to expect that, through strengthening the state the nation will better cope with any imminent challenges. However, is Poland doing it right? The process seems to immoderately reflect the vision of a single party which, needless to say, does not have to be shared by everyone. It may clash with the vision of other parties or large parts of society. Subsequent governments and political parties eulogise their concepts of the state yet often fail to take into account the historical examples of situations in which the pursuit of this goal – the construction of a strong Polish state – was neglected. As Adam Zamoyski argues, it is not only the *liberum veto* tradition which "prevented the transformation of Poland into an absolute monarchy," but something more general, namely the fact that the state does not have a strong position in the Polish historically-shaped institutional and mental system. Zamoyski further posits that,

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

> A suspicious attitude towards central government has been ingrained in the Polish political life since its earliest days.... Resistance towards the state has long been regarded as a virtue and has shaped both peasant's way of thinking about a policeman and general attitude towards the government (Zamoyski, 2009, p. 419).

Communist governments have not helped to rebuild social trust in the state. Now, it is a cross-party endeavour, even though at any given time, it is undertaken by a specific political grouping. Any political party that calls for the construction of a 'good' and 'strong' state is right, at least in defining the objective of its pursuits. Doubts arise only when we try to define the method of repairing the state. Are the current changes, aimed at a greater centralisation of the state, beneficial for Poland? Changes have already affected the Constitutional Tribunal, led to the merger of the General Prosecutor's Office with the Ministry of Justice, and undermined the independence of courts. These decisions subvert both the democratic system founded on the rule of law and the economy. Economic reforms include the re-Polonisation of banks (which in the light of data on the presence of foreign capital in Poland seems rather desirable) and appointment of PiS representatives to the boards of State Treasury companies. Changes shall be introduced at the top positions of the Polish army (approx. 80% of army commanders have already resigned from their posts). Last but not least, the sector of culture is to be affected by the 'good change.' Reasons behind these changes reflect PiS's attacks on the West and the openness of European states to certain ideological trends: multiculturalism, gender, single-sex couples, environmental protection, etc. The ruling party only spared the revilement of our membership in NATO and ties with the USA. They still do vilify Germany, yet with varying intensity.

The West probably does deserve criticism. After all, the EU seems unable to cope with the growing number of challenges of the modern world: economic crises, unemployment, national and personal debt, migration, etc. Critical voices have multiplied since the 2008 global financial crisis. Subsequent opinion polls show that most Poles strongly favour the country's membership in the EU. The same is true when it comes to globalisation. For instance, according to the results of a public opinion poll from November 2016, "in the opinion of the majority of respondents [based on a representative sample of Poles], globalisation positively affects the economy (sixty-one per cent).... The majority of respondents also believes that globalisation processes ... will benefit Polish employees" (CBOS 2016b: 1).

It is clear that Poles do not regard the West as invaders, although such claims recur in the rhetoric of the PiS government, in particular when it refers to the operation of

foreign corporations and claims that they "take money out of Poland." Having said that, in 2017, the government signed numerous agreements with Western corporations, regardless of the frequently stated opinion that Poland is "the assembly line of Europe." Although PiS calls for walling the nation within its national territory, or within the region, such claims rarely see a practical application. The party seems to build an ideological trap for its electorate.

Critical attitudes towards the West seem historically justified if we take into account that the West, with its high opinion of itself, tends to patronise others. Poland has often been guilty of the same in relation to its eastern neighbours. The West criticised us since the Enlightenment, when Voltaire, Diderot, and other thinkers advised Poles to take advantage of the experience of Russia, Poland's ruthless invader (Wolf, 1994). Undoubtedly, there were exceptions: Rousseau, for instance, was very appreciative of Poland. We must not forget that Poland's invaders propagated the cliché of Polish ineptitude as our national flaw. All in all, our critical attitude towards the West is not entirely unfounded.

There is no alternative to cooperation with the West. A realistic stance towards Poland's Western or Eastern partners is hampered by the lack of efficient institutions – operating at the EU and global level – that would take into account Poland's true potential. We hear similar critical elsewhere – most recently, in the United Kingdom – which one may attribute to several factors. These days, we often hear about political power being easily relinquished to markets and their institutions, mainly to financial corporations, in the process of neo-liberal globalisation. This process does not need to be conducted at the expense of the national state; the principle of subsidiarity could have been applied to numerous problems, requiring them to be solved at the lowest possible level. It means that only in particular situations, when necessary, decisions ought to be taken in Brussels or Strasbourg and not at the national level. Such was the conclusion reached by the Britons (Brexit) and Americans (Donald Trump's election); regardless of what we might think of these two events, we must consider them in the discussion.

This background is conducive to the confrontation between the narratives of identity and difference in the form of the recommended imitation of external models. There is nothing inherently wrong with this discourse. The challenge consists in finding an intelligent institutional answer not only to economic and political but also to socio-cultural and moral matters. Recently, confrontations in the latter two spheres seem to escalate. We could go as far as calling them a cultural war or, more cautiously, the presence of two cultures within a single nation (Himmelfarb, 2007). A cultural

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

war has been gaining ground also in Poland, and its negative consequences will become increasingly evident, if we see ourselves as a nation with certain immutable qualities, one that cannot cope with differences among its citizens. This would be a breeding ground for nationalism. As Craig Calhoun explains: "Key to nationalist discourse is its rejection of any notion that identity is essentially fluid and shifting from one situation to situation. National identity is commonly claimed to trump all others" (Calhoun, 2007, p. 191).

The fight is as much about the collective as it is about the individual identities. The ruling party focuses on the common, national identity and it tries to prove that the nation-state is in a much better position to ensure social welfare than the liberals or the left. The 500+ Family programme allows PiS to maintain high popularity ratings. With its welfare elements, the 'good change' programme has a social and conservative character and has proven a popular alternative to social liberalism. In the long run, the social climate – or more deeply anchored social emotions – will prove decisive. The world is non-ergodic; as Douglass C. North claims, today's institutions fail to keep the pace with the changes precisely due to the variability of the socio-cultural factors (North 2014, p. 13–39). The institutions of state socialism collapsed because they were unable to keep with the developments. Today, the government does not keep abreast because of its traditionalism: it strives to find in the glorified past ready solutions to apply to eliminate today's ills. Recourse to tradition proves beneficial only when it is selective; it requires rational respectfulness instead of indiscriminate idolisation of 'all things past,' which should be qualified as traditionalism rather than respect for tradition.

All governments try to build their new service class, and PiS is no exception. It remains to be seen whether this is merely a technique of exercising power or a form of systemic transformation, although the latter seems to be the goal. What we do know is that the current government divided the Polish society, created disarray and chaos, implemented populist policies to maintain power. Elites always engage in rent-seeking (see, for instance, Hayek or Buchanan) and, therefore, they always deserve criticism. The interests of society as a whole set the limits of acceptable rent-seeking. Ultimately, fighting the evil will only be effective if the 'ordinary people' believe that the government's personnel policy bases not on the interests of this political party. That is the case at present, and PiS even boasts about it (personnel changes in the army). If the widespread support for the ruling party and the state remains despite the government's hiring strategy, we should interpret it as a sign of Poland's entering a dangerous phase in which people are afraid to say what they think.

Conditional differences at the time of great uncertainty

Everything –
A smug and bumptious word.
It should be written in quotes.
It pretends to miss nothing,
to gather, hold, contain and have.
While all the while it's just
a shred of gale.
– "Everything", Wisława Szymborska (2014, p. 58)

Doubts about the imitation formula advocating the use of a universal – although *de facto* Western, or even American – design began to burgeon with the outbreak of the economic crisis in the USA and the West in 2007. Most discarded the notion of the end of history along with the belief that democracy and market capitalism are universally applicable systems. A window of opportunity for unique and individual solutions opened, including a more favourable view of the national state. It translated into state protectionism postulates, especially with respect to each country's economy; its most explicit expression was Donald J. Trump's presidential campaign which convinced American voters but startled large parts of the world. The United States managed to overcome the crisis during the Obama presidency, while many years of economic efforts in the EU proved unfruitful. Generally speaking, for the first time in eighty years, the West as a whole has entered a period of great economic uncertainty. Additional problems surround this issue, such as the migration crisis and its consequences or Brexit. The latter makes one wonder whether Europe has ever been meant to operate as a whole. All such experiments throughout Europe's history eventually failed: let us recall the endeavours of Charles the Great, the Habsburgs, Charles V, or Napoleon (Jones, 2003, p. XXXVI–XXXVII; Judt, 2012, p. 157–158).

The crisis has become the language of public discourse, although 2017 brings some hope for positive changes following the elections in the Netherlands, France, and Germany, as well as the economic upturn in the EU Member States. However, the overall assessment of the situation in the EU is negative. "Europe has lost its appeal," claims Timothy Garton Ash, arguing that Europe, once an ideal essence, as defined by Plato, now represents abnormality, with the return of "nationalism, war, revolution and poverty" (Ash, 2017, p. A12). Poland strove to address any external challenges autonomously, which seems understandable. However, can Poland be truly independent after it concluded numerous agreements with the EU and benefitted from EU funding? The EU is a system based on cooperation that requires the coordination of various joint undertakings.

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

Criticism towards the EU has become an integral part of PiS's strategy under the 'good change' slogan. Thus, it is now inherent in the Polish identity. Even before PiS took over, the country had not entered the Eurozone, unlike several other countries from Central and Eastern Europe. The crisis of 2007/2009 reassured Poles that the decision to not adopt the euro was right. Poland was hailed as a "green island on the map of the EU." This process continues: Poland refuses to become involved in other EU initiatives; most importantly, it has rejected refugee assistance programmes. In addition, the new government have been introducing changes into the judiciary, which has come under bitter criticism of the West. These measures can only be regarded as signs of Poland's confrontational attitude towards the EU. Thus far, European authorities have remained restrained in their declarations, even though they persistently denounce the new policies implemented in Poland. We must also be aware of further potential areas of conflict if the initiatives of France, Germany, and other Western countries are to ensure a greater economic integration, improved defence, or involve joint actions for the environment. Contrary to the claims of the Polish government, such measures do not necessarily imply any further federalisation of the EU. They may, however, confirm the two-speed development of Europe. Member States who initiate these processes do not intend to wait for laggards, such as Poland or Hungary.

Given the above, Poland is likely to be accused of sliding into an authoritarian system of government. Is it really the case? In order to comprehend what is happening, we will need to wait for the results of the next local and parliamentary elections. My hesitation is not due to the lack of political doubts – the changes happen, and my assessment of them is negative – but I do wish to stress that they are accepted by many Poles. As long as individuals are not directly impacted by the effects of the political strategies implemented, any criticism from the media, the political opposition, or the academia, even if valid, has relatively little actual weight. The Polish society is politically and culturally divided, but this is the case of many other nations, too.

Searching for new identity anchors

The confrontation of the nation-state and its economic patriotism with the practice of imitative modernisation and its ideological backdrop in the form of liberal democracy forms the axis along which opposing diagnoses, therapies and strategies from identity and difference narratives clash. This is where identity forces assault difference, which – even if inconvenient at times – has thus far been considered acceptable. This leads to an ever-extending spiral of change whose direction is still unknown. The longer shift of the epicentre of public opinion between democracy and its alternatives, the rule of law and particracy, democratic society and authoritarian rule, contending with the

West and questioning the West, etc., the worse the consequences for the country. Despite the declarations to the contrary, we may no longer define the process as sustaining the national tradition – such endeavour could even be commendable – but it serves the purpose of traditionalism, or resuscitating bygone traditions. Tradition and traditionalism are contradictory: the former means drawing lessons from past conflicts in order to face current challenges, while the latter implies sanctifying obsolete solutions and a gradual eradication of pluralism and openness to criticism, which prevents taking into account any solutions that originate within society. As we know, experience and tradition can foster trust, but they do not always provide solutions to new problems, which have been mushrooming as a result of the scientific and technical revolution (J. March).

Subjects of public debate promoted by the government do not provide solutions to the most pressing challenges. Instead, they foster resentment and social animosity; a good example of this phenomenon are the monthly commemorations of the plane crash in Smolensk. On the other hand, the absence of an active attitude towards migration and the refugee crisis distances us from the EU understood as a community of interests. The reforms of Polish legal institutions prove that we have been relinquishing standard solutions. There are attempts at rewriting the Polish history: there will be no place for Lech Wałęsa or the Round Table – which is claimed to be "arranged in Moscow" – and the names of Tadeusz Mazowiecki, Bronisław Geremek, or Adam Michnik. We do not need to look very far back in time to see that such endeavours are bound to fail. As a result, Poland is becoming a "closed house" (A. Lincoln). Despite the pleas of Pope Francis or the Primate Archbishop Wojciech Polak, who demanded Poles "to recognise Christ's face in the faces of refugees" (Wiśniewski, 2017, p. 30), the latter are not welcome in Poland.

The sources of confrontation are, therefore, both internal and external. We live in a world dominated by networks, so we cannot shut ourselves away. Transactions with the EU, mainly Germany, form the bulk of the Polish trade. Millions of Poles live in Western countries. Our world and their world, seemingly external, are strongly interconnected. We must, naturally, be aware of the decisions taken and the games played by the world's major powers, but in order to understand the dynamics of trade, crime, disease, human rights, and terrorism, we need to look into decentralized and non-hierarchical networks, claims Anne-Marie Slaughter in *The Chessboard and the Web: Strategies of Connecting in a Networked World* (Slaughter, 2017). This ontology of the world opens the door for minority orientations that want to exist away from the main axis, enjoying autonomy and originality. In Poland, many statements are made only within close circles, which may trigger questionable attempts at independence. It is generally

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

assumed that two antagonistic tribes inhabit Poland; this diagnosis seems false. Those who belong to neither of the two camps must not feel like meaningless plankton.

Division lines have formed on several levels. Some should not spark much controversy. For example, in a globalised world, the importance of the national state is somehow limited, but both sides may agree on a new definition of the nation-state that would take into account the reality of the networked world. This is the basic level. Reaching an agreement seems trickier on higher levels, as the advocates of the nation-state have no qualms about calling their adversaries "non-Poles" or "the worse sort" and accuse them of ignoring the Catholic traditions of Polish society. They claim that these traditions impose on Poles the obligation to regulate human behaviour in the sphere of biology and morality (in vitro, contraceptive pill, abortion, common-law partnerships, etc.) by means of legal acts. It is not about moral judgments as such, but something that has been called "the resurrection of the idea of a nation as a theological society." This discourse goes hand in hand with an abusive use of religious symbols to gain political interest. The advocates of the "theological society" regard Christianity as if it were genetic, and Polishness as the "new circumcision" and guarantee of a special covenant with God, as I read in a Catholic weekly (Prusak, 2017, p. 5). This is an example of neo-messianism whose revival has been recently observed in Poland.

There is no chance of compromise at these higher levels. Therefore, no wonder that the Polish Bishops' Conference decided to unequivocally express its stance at the plenary meeting held on the 14 March 2017. This decision of the Polish Bishops' Conference is of great consequence. The authors of the document entitled the *Christian Form of Patriotism* state as follows:

> In its teachings, the Church clearly distinguishes between noble patriotism that deserves propagation, and nationalism, which is a form of egoism... Patriotism, therefore, differs from the nationalist ideology, which favours severe diagnoses and political programmes, often marked with aversion towards the other, over conventional contacts and relations with people within a family, at school, work or place of residence. Nationalism tries to squeeze any cultural, regional, or political diversity into a uniform and simplistic ideological scheme (*Chrześcijański kształt patriotyzmu*, 2017).

Final, yet still preliminary remarks

The present article is an essay, that is "a short piece of scientific or literary writing, which examines a topic subjectively, combining elements of artistic, scientific, and journalistic prose" (Uniwersalny Słownik, 2003, p. 850). Now, in reference to this definition, I shall try to formulate some ideas more explicitly.

Artistic elements. I quote several of my favourite writers and poets: Eliot, Gombrowicz, Miłosz, Norwid, Rilke, Różewicz, Szymborska. I believe that they are capable of expressing the spirit of a particular phenomenon, an individual, or an epoch more pointedly than scientists and academics, such as the author of this essay. Eliot's poems, written back in 1934, allow one to better understand the spirit of Polish workers' protest in 1980. Forty-six years earlier, Eliot prophesied what the workers of the Gdańsk shipyard, the Ursus Factory, or Nowa Huta steelworks would experience. Not only in those memorable days but also throughout the period when industry and its technical tools shaped their work and life. They also carved their spirit. In Eliot's poem, four elements – work, life, religion, and the Church – form a coherent whole.

The same happened in Gdańsk, where workers would go to confession in the shipyard itself. Eliot's translator and commentator claims that in "Choruses from *The Rock*" the poet confronts simple religious truths with the ideologies of modernity" (Pomorski, 2007, p. 395). We may accept this interpretation provided that we define modernity either as postmodernity or "late modernity," or even its antithesis: outworn conservatism. This outlook is legitimate, even if I am convinced that, for Gdańsk shipyard workers, their workplace was the only symbol of modernity they had ever known. The majority of them, including Lech Wałęsa, was of peasant origin; they prayed because religion had always been part of their lives. A lot must have gone wrong for them to finally decide to rebel against the situation. Nevertheless, they always considered the shipyard as their own. They did not oppose modernity, but they defined it in their own way, infusing it with a particular meaning and sense. For example, strong emphasis was placed on the dignity of work (Kapuścinski, 1980). There is no single modernity, no single pattern of reaction to it, but rather a pursuit of harmony encompassing work, life, spirit, and religion. At least, this can be said about the events that took place in August 1980 in Poland.

Scientific elements. The main scientific element of my essay is the use of the concept of agency versus structure. The actor (an individual, a company, a city, a state, etc.) builds a world that mirrors its values and interests, draws on (individual and collective) identity to succeed within rigid structures, which it can adapt to or confront, comple-

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

ment, selectively coexist with etc. When it comes to structures, between 1945 and 1989, Poles and Polish institutions faced two great structures: the communist East and its Polish version in the form of the Polish People's Republic on the one hand, and the capitalist West on the other hand, which served as reference in the process of post-communist transformation of the political and economic system (1989–2017).

The communist East would impose a number of variants, from totalitarian rule to 'socialism with a human face,' from the pseudo-technocracy of the 1970s to the fall of communism in 1989; therefore, the differences were the main point of reference for identity forces. Society rejected these differences more or less vehemently, but it also assimilated them. I call it instrumental acceptance, which is decidedly not normative. It was unacceptable for two generations of Poles to ignore the existence of the only real state they had ever known – their homeland. Geopolitical forces landed within the "no-alternative world" of the Cold War, with its tragedies, humiliations, shame, and daily discomfort. Can we, therefore, regard as collaborators the three million Poles who were members of the Polish United Workers' Party (PZPR)? Or should we qualify as the "worse-sort" the majority of Poles who, over the thirty-seven years that followed December 1981, accepted the introduction of the martial law? This would be too simple. People-agencies adopted different attitudes towards difference: often, instrumental acceptance and even support, but probably the most common stance was the realistic approach, which involved the construction of many worlds to coexist side by side: most importantly, the official and the simulated. The strategy comprised numerous complementary elements. Confrontation was not a prevalent element of everyday life; heroic acts on a large scale are, after all, a hallmark of periods of rebellion and breakthrough. They are typical of singular, heroic individuals who, undoubtedly, deserve praise for their courage.

The capitalist West is yet another structure that has been externally imposed by geopolitical mechanisms; i.e., the defeat of communism. Solidarity played an important role in this process. One would expect that positive attitudes of adaptation would predominate, based on identity capable of absorbing differences coming from the West. This was the case during the first 15 years of systemic transformation until the elections of 2015/2016, following which Poles are once again divided in terms of attitude towards the new structure, in particular, the EU. Politicians use identity narratives as a counterweight to the narratives of differences inherent in liberal democracy, the free market, and autonomous civil society, hence the criticism of the Western model of pluralism, multiculturalism, and liberalism. It is done in the name of national unity and the Catholic tradition. This is probably a desperate call, as the sole alternative is even more problematic for the nationalist forces: fight against Germany or the EU.

Journalistic elements. Assessments of arguments in favour of the ongoing changes in the course of systemic transformation are often so contradictory that the author can do no more than simply report differences of opinion, which are represented by large portions of the public. This current situation is diametrically different from the situation before 1989 when, despite the existence of numerous differences, it was easy to identify certain common elements of the desired political order, such as democracy, free market, and civil society. It has always been a path from communism towards capitalism.

Discrepancies between opinions, especially when followed by institutional solutions, generally appear as functional, conducive to openness and innovation, and helping society to address the challenges of the near and distant future in the networked world. This image of the social reality offer the sociological theories classified as conservative, for instance, the structural and functional theory. I wish to emphasize something simple, namely the fact that the advocates of the 'good change' implemented by PiS readily classify – often with recourse to epithets – any representatives of a different opinion as being outside of the 'real' nation, outside of the pool of mentally healthy people, and among those who have been jointly dubbed "the worse sort." We also observe such escalation of political emotions in the USA; it could be considered normal if it was not for the fact that the ruling party defines itself as a conservative party. In fact, it is a radical party that uses left-wing methods of action yet remains relentless in its references to the social doctrine of the Church. Regarding it as innocence is not necessarily correct. Glaring examples which confirming that it does not guarantee any common good abound in the 20th-century history of Europe: Italy under Mussolini, Spain under Franco, or Portugal under Salazar. Polish Church is more experienced.

References

Ash, T.G. (2017). Europa straciła siłę przyciągania (rozmowa Pawła Szaniawskiego). *Rzeczpospolita*, 22 June.

Berger, P. (1995). *Zaproszenie do socjologii*. Warszawa: PWN.

Billington, J.H. (2004). *Russia in Search for Itself*. Washington-Baltimore: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and The Johns Hopkins University.

Calhoun, C. (2007). *Nations Matter. Culture, History, and the Cosmopolitan Dream*. London and New York: Routledge.

Castells, M. (2013). *Sieci oburzenia i nadziei. Ruchy społeczne w erze internetu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

CBOS (2016a). *Świadomość historyczna Polaków*. Komunikat z badań nr 68/2016.

CBOS (2016b). *Postrzeganie globalizacji gospodarki*. Komunikat z badań nr 167/2016.

Chrześcijański kształt patriotyzmu (14 March 2017). EkAi: Analizy. Opinie. Komentarze.

Eliot, T.S. (2007). *W moim początku jest mój kres*. Warszawa: Świat Książki.

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215

Fitzpatrick, Sh. (2017). What's Left? *London Review of Books*, 30 March.

Geertz, C. (2005). *Interpretacje kultur. Wybrane eseje*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Girard, R. (2006). *Początki kultury*. Kraków: Znak.

A golden opportunity. The second Jagiellonian age. Special Report Poland. *The Economist*, 28 June: 1–10.

Gombrowicz, W. (1986). *Dzieła*, t. 3. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Himmelfarb, G. (2007). *Jeden naród – dwie kultury*. Warszawa: WAiP.

Ignatieff, M. (2017). Which Way Are We Going? *New York Review of Books*, April 6–19.

Jedlicki, J. (1988). *Jakiej cywilizacji Polacy potrzebują. Studia z dziejów idei i wyobraźni XIX wieku*. Warszawa: PWN.

Jones, E. (2003). *The European Miracle. Environments, Economies and Geopolitics in the History of Europe and Asia*. Cambridge University Press.

Judt, T. (2012). *Wielkie złudzenie. Esej o Europie*. Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy Rebis.

Kamiński, A.Z. (2014). *Dezercja elit. Konsolidacja elit w postkomunistycznej Polsce*. Warszawa: ISP PAN.

Kamiński, Ł. (2016). Rok 1956: stracona szansa. *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 30 October.

Kapuściński, R. (1980). Notatki z Wybrzeża. *Kultura*, 19 September.

Kerr, C. et al. (1973). *Industrialism and Industrial Man. Problems of Labour and Management in Economic Growth*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Klein, N. (2007). *The Shock Doctrine. The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. Toronto: Alfred Knopf of Canada.

Kochanowicz, J. (2010). Polska w epoce nowoczesnego wzrostu gospodarczego. In: W. Morawski (ed.), *Modernizacja Polski. Struktury. Agencje. Instytucje*. Warszawa: WAiP.

Kotkin, S. (1995). *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as Civilisation*. Berkeley: University of California.

Krasnodębski, Z. (2003). *Demokracja na peryferii*. Gdańsk: słowo/obraz terytoria.

Kuper, A. (2005). *Kultura. Model antropologiczny*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Legutko, R. (2008). *Esej o duszy polskiej*. Kraków: Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej.

Lubbe, A. (2010). Transformacja, modernizacja, czy po prostu normalizacja? Wybory modelu gospodarki polskiej po 1989 roku. In: W. Morawski (ed.), *Modernizacja Polski. Struktury. Agencje. Instytucje*. Warszawa: WAiP

Miłosz, Cz. (2006). *Rozmowy polskie 1979–1988*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Miłosz, Cz. (2013). *Rozmowy zagraniczne*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Mishra, P. (2017). *Age of Anger. A History of the Present*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Modzelewski, K. (2017). Kaczyński buduje państwo policyjne. *Przegląd*, 9–15.01 (interview by Robert Walenciak).

Moisi, D. (2009). *The Geopolitics of Emotion. How Cultures of Fear, Humiliation and Hope Are Reshaping the World*. New York: Knopf.

Morawski, W. (2010). *Konfiguracje globalne. Struktury, agencje, instytucje*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Morawski, W. (2014). „Path Dependence": How Geopolitics Shape Divisions in Poland after the Fall of Communism. *Polish Sociological Review, 4*(188).

North, D.C., Wallis, J. and Weingast, B.R. (2009). *Violence and Social Orders. A Conceptual Framework for Interpreting Recorded Human History*. Cambridge University Press.

North, D.C. (2014). *Zrozumieć przemiany gospodarcze*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wolters Kluwer Polska.

Norwid, C.K. (1999). Pieśń od ziemi naszej. In: M. Wawrzkiewicz i K. Gąsiorowski (eds.), *Od Kochanowskiego do Szymborskiej*. Warszawa: KiW.

Pawełczyńska, A. (2004). *Głowa hydry. O przewrotności współczesnego zła*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Test.

Pełczyński, Z. (2007). *Polska droga od komunizmu. Refleksje nad historią i polityką 1956–2006*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

Pinker, S. (2015). *Zmierzch przemocy. Lepsza strona naszej natury*. Poznań: Zysk i S-ka.

Prusak, J. (2017). Biskupi: krzyż to nie bagnet. *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 14 May.

Przybysz, K. (2017). *Krajobrazy poniewierki. Zachowania społeczeństwa polskiego wobec exodusu ludności Warszawy*. Warszawa: Muzeum Historii Polskiego Ruchu Ludowego.

Rilke, R.M. (2006). *Osamotniony na szczytach serca*. Warszawa: Świat Książki (poem *Przeczucie*).

Różewicz, T. (1999). Oblicze ojczyzny. In: M. Wawrzkiewicz i K. Gąsiorowski (red.), *Od Kochanowskiego do Szymborskiej*. Warszawa: KiW.

Sadurski, W. (2016). Kaczyński nas uprzedził. *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 24 August.

Selznick, Ph. (1960). *The Organisational Weapon*. New York: Free Press.

Skarga, B. (1997). *Tożsamość i różnica. Eseje metafizyczne*. Kraków: Znak.

Slaughter, A.-M. (2017). *The Chessboard and the Web: Strategies of Connection in a Networked World*. Yale University Press.

Sloterdijk, P. (2011). *Gniew i czas*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

Sowa, J. (2011). *Fantomowe ciało króla. Peryferyjne zmagania z nowoczesną formą*. Kraków: Universitas.

Stevenson, N. (2006). Identity. In: B.S. Turner (ed.), *The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology*. Cambridge University Press.

Sztompka, P. (2016). *Kapitał społeczny. Teoria przestrzeni międzyludzkiej*. Kraków: Znak.

Szymborska, W. (2014). *Chwila*. Kraków: Znak.

Taylor, Ch. (2010). *Nowoczesne imaginaria społeczne*. Kraków: Znak.

Tischner, J. (1993). *Nieszczęsny dar wolności*. Kraków: Znak.

Tischner, J. (1998). *W krainie schorowanej wyobraźni*. Kraków: Znak.

Topolski, J. (2015). *Historia Polski*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.

Toynbee, A. (1947). *A Study of History: Abridgment of Volumes I to VI*. Oxford University Press.

Uniwersalny Słownik Języka Polskiego (2003). ed. Stanisław Dubisz, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Urbankowski, B. (2015). *Adam Mickiewicz. Tajemnice wiary, miłości i śmierci*. Poznań: Zyska i S-ka.

Walicki, A. (1996). *Fałszywe podziały (interview by Marian Turski)*, „Polityka", 20 January.

Walicki, A. (2016). Zapisane w dzienniku. *Zdanie*, *3–4*(170–171).

Wenzel, M. (2010). Doświadczenia z okresu stanu wojennego i podziemnej „Solidarności". In: M. Grabowska (ed.), *Solidarność" – doświadczenie, pamięć i dziedzictwo*. CBOS Opinie i diagnozy, nr 16.

Wiśniewski, L. (2017). Polska, dom zamknięty. *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 22–28 May.

Wolff, L. (1994). *Inventing Eastern Europe. The Map of Civilisation on the Mind of Enlightenment*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Zamoyski, A. (2009). *Polska. Opowieść o dziejach niezwykłego narodu 966–2008*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Zaremba, M. (2002). *Wielka Trwoga. Polska 1944–1947*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak i ISP PAN.

 DOI: 10.7206/jmba.ce.2450-7814.215